Deerfield Energy Resources Committee

Minutes of November 20, 2014, 4:10PM

Present: Kristan Bakker, David Gilbert Keith, MA Swedlund, Reenie, Marie Guerin

- 1. Minutes:
 - a. David agrees to take minutes
 - b. Webinar day
- 2. <u>Next Meeting:</u> Presentation to Selectmen Dec., 3 in evening (waiting for slot). Next regular meeting: Jan. 22, 2015 at 4:00. Reenie moves, approved

3. WWTP Solar Project:

- a. 38 kW
- b. Schmitt called to ask if two-pole system would be okay: says actually takes up less displacement than the one big pole
- c. Permitting process: still in design phase. Once they finish design, they will move on to permits
- d. Hope to be done by early January

4. Landfill Solar Update:

- a. Presentation postponed to Dec. 3.
- b. Preliminary numbers point to over \$3M savings over 20 year period.
- c. We will present Commercial, Community Shared models and recommend hiring owner agent to write RFP and oversee procurement process. We want Beth Greenblatt
- d. Beth has just been hired by Greenfield with owner agent grant to work on Community Shared Solar proposal
- e. DOER has recently published an advisory on developing solar in Massachusetts, with examples of cities that have done these things. (Easthampton is comparable, Borrego did the work, including due diligence, etc.) See module 4 of the pdf at DOER. See also module 7.

5. <u>Community Green Energy [CGE]: David Thurnau, Michael Erickson Webinar</u>

- a. Introductions
- b. They've reviewed site
- c. CGE finances leveraging rules and regulations to benefit more people at best price.
- d. CGE first presented their model, then how they'd best to adapt it to Deerfield: 1.) Town (host) offers a space (roof, landfill, etc. can be commercial) with site consuming all of the power. 2.) Since most states do not have statutes Massachusetts has, so they usually design to utilize net metering with power purchase agreement with lower rate. Assign no-cost development agreement: they develop design, draft and operate facility, then they engage the community in community solar garden subscriptions and promote the project. They do the promoting.
- e. After construction, CGE owns and operates (still in traditional model) and distribute SRECs and lower cost to subscribers. For instance, if panel generates 9 cents of power credit and is granted 24 cents in SREC, subscriber's panel brings them all the benefits as if the panel were on their own roof. Whole revenue stream remains in the community. Opens opportunity to all, including those who may not have space or shaded roofs.

- f. Subscribers do not own a panel, they buy production of X number of kWs. So if their kW is one percent of the project, they receive that portion of revenues. Subscribers cannot buy more kW than they would use in their own home. Essentially like pre-paying electric bill.
- g. Kristan points out that this means subscribers are not actually using the power generated, but the money generated that they can then apply to their bills.
- h. CGE makes its money selling to subscribers: they get their compensation from the perkW price they offer subscribers. Michael adds that cost to subscribers is considerably less than people can get for systems on their own roofs (because of cost of installation, equipment).
- i. Not intended as an investment, but more as the right thing: Of the 45 to 50 community solar garden systems across country, most have 25 to 30 year payback, yet still sold out in short order.
- j. Community Virtual Solar Difference: most standard projects do not distribute benefits and revenue stream as fairly to subscribers. Commercial developer gets most of revenues. At 9cents with 2% escalator, 875,000 kWh/yr over 20 years is worth over \$1.8M, then gets SRECs worth \$400,000. Local profit, as opposed to commercial developer, has local multiplier. Alternatively, commercial developer returns \$0.
- k. Can be built in portions and on private land (EG.: Yankee Candle's roof)
- 1. CGE pictures us as host site. If we don't consume enough of the power, then credit purchase agreement for distribution: can go to private meters.
- m. Benefits depend on how the meter is billed: commercial, residential, municipal rates: if we don't apply for public entity status, then not bound by that status and could assign credits.
- n. If we don't apply as public, then can apply as private and assign SRECs to subscribers as cash, not credit on their bill.
- o. Caps are what utility is required to offer. So total net metering of private is additional 4% over 5% allowed for municipalities (% of local peak load).
- p. Over 1 MW utility has the option of buying the power directly. Under a MW it's automatically bill discount to subscribers
- q. Over 2MW we have to become a public entity
- 6. Further discussion of details
- 7. Meeting adjourned: 6:27PM, moved Reenie Approved

Respectfully submitted: David Gilbert Keith