

**From:** DePrima, Tony [mailto:TDePrima@dover.de.us]

**Sent:** Tuesday, December 04, 2007 4:30 PM

**To:** Cherry Philip J. (DNREC); Anthony Casie (DNREC); Bill Grow; Bunting George (LegHall); Burcat Bruce H (DOS); Cathe Kalisz; Chad Tolman; Copeland Charles (LegHall); David Bacher; Evans-Jackson, Deborah M.; Finnigan Sean (LegHall); Gary Helm; Hocker Gerald (LegHall); Hughes John A. (DNREC); John Byrne; McDowell Harris (LegHall); Michael Fiorentino; Mirzakhallil Ali (DNREC); Nick Dipasquale; Padmore Arthur (DOS); Patrick McCullar; Small David (DNREC); Stu Widom; Thornburg Pam (LegHall); Verne Shortell; Werner James D. (DNREC)

**Cc:** Ward Vicki E. (DNREC); Csizmadia Valerie (DOJ); Bloom David (DOS)

**Subject:** RE: SCR 28 Workgroup Meeting

I cannot make the meeting this Friday here are my thoughts on the Draft Legislation

They are brilliant thoughts so I think someone will advocate them for me on my behalf....thanks to who ever that may be

1. I am undecided on the % allowances for the auction. It seems to me that its a wash anyway we go
2. I do not think it is right that DNREC holds the auction proceeds, distributes them for administration, and then to the public benefit. There should be an oversight agency perhaps the PSC to insure that the public benefit is maximized and that administration is Mimi zed. A blanket \$5 million sounds like a lot to me. I think that the funds should go to PSC (or some other independent group like the budget office, comptroller, me, my mother, etc) that DNREC must prepared and present to PSC (other group) an administration budget for approval. Whatever remains goes to the public benefit. The more money going to administration the less effective the program.
3. The cost of the program is going to be paid for by electric users yet the public benefit is more widely spread out, I would like the benefit tighter. Example...under 9206(e) money can go to Weatherization Assistance. Worthy cause, but should not go to houses heated with oil or Natural Gas, those folks are not paying into this. I would agree for weatherization for poor souls who heat with electric.
4. I am totally against the following uses of the public benefit "funding incentives to attract non or low-CO2 emitting industries to Delaware, promote in state manufacturing of non or low CO2 emitting technologies and finance existing industries transformation to lower carbon emissions." If they are not paying into the pool why should they benefit. How does the public who has higher electric rates benefit. I would support the following. I would be supportive for non or low CO2 emitting power industries and power technologies.
5. I am assuming the City of Dover could not apply for public benefit funds to reduce carbon emissions so why should our money go to attract or help some other industries. The public benefits should go toward low and non CO2 alternative electric energy projects, electric energy conservation, management, and technologies for use in the electric energy field.
6. If you do fund projects that reduce carbon in manufacturing then some sort of credit back to the pool or reduction in the auction amount should be given for the reduction that was funded by the power industry and the rate payers.

Have a happy Delaware Day on Friday. You should all sing the Delaware Song to start the meeting.

Anthony (Tony) J. DePrima, AICP  
Dover City Manager  
P.O.Box 475  
Dover, Delaware 19903  
PH: 302-736-7005  
FX: 302-736-7002  
Check out our website [www.cityofdover.com](http://www.cityofdover.com)

This e-mail, including attachments, is confidential and intended only for the designated recipient(s). If you are not an intended recipient, please delete this e-mail. The unauthorized use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this e-mail, including attachments, is prohibited and may be unlawful.