UEB Meeting Minutes, 15 Jun 2016

Meeting Time and Location: Began at 4:07 at Lyons Town Hall

Attendance:, Aaron Caplan, Steve Wratten, Lee Hall, Coco Gordon, John Cowdry, Dan Reitz

Staff: Dave Fenity, Kyle Miller **Liaisons:** Jim Kerr **Guests:** Jay Stott, Diane Dandeneau

Agenda Amendments:

Previous Minutes: . Amended 4 May minutes under Q1 Financial Review to replace ? with Fixed Cost Recovery Charge (FCRC). Reviewed and approved May 4th, 18th, and Jun 1st minutes.

BOT Update: The BoT mentioned again wanting to try and get financials done earlier. If the UEB has any expenses to request from the BoT, prepare those. Jim K also mentioned he had heard C-BT water shares had reached $30,000 a share at one time. (Dan Reitz mentioned he had heard about leasing C-BT water shares instead of selling them.)

Staff Update: A contract for the SCADA system for the water utility was being presented at the next BoT meeting. Staff was also making a recommendation for an electric maintenance/repair contract and had selected N-Line Electric. The new electric meters were still waiting to hear about a decision on CDBG grant funding.

MEAN Distributed and Renewable Generation Policy: We received the approved policy which stated May 18th was the effective date and that grandfathered in systems would not be included in the way MEAN determines our FCRC (Fixed Cost Recovery Charge).
Jim K mentioned how their were two different peak times, our peak usage and MEAN's peak usage.
It was pointed out that section 2-11 of the policy says we should take meter readings on the same cycle as our applicable rate schedule. **What is our applicable rate schedule? Aaron will try and find out.**
MEAN legal counsel said they are still working on the details and asked us to bring up our concerns and thoughts at their August meeting
The UEB discussed the fact that most months our PEAK demand from MEAN happens at 9 PM when there is no or very minimal electricity being produced. We can point this out to MEAN and see if we can negotiate using a method other than data from a production meter to give MEAN the data they need.
Purchasing a secondary production meter is a new expense that someone would have to pay for if we can not negotiate another option of supplying data. Who pays for the meters for systems already in place?
Colorado law states the total charge an electric utility can charge for permitting a solar installation is $500.
In earlier legal discussion on this subject Lyons legal stated the cost of meter and installation was included in that maximum $500 charge.

We discussed the fact that this new policy seems to be MEAN's way of trying to make sure their FCRC remains fair to everyone. MEAN determines its total fixed cost for the year and all municipalities pay a percentage of this amount based on their peak demand. Before this policy one town could implement a large generating system and greatly reduce their FCRC. Large municipalities in particular might be able to shift a larger portion of their FCRC onto smaller municipalities.
The UEB was asked to present details on the new policy and give a recommendation to the BoT at their Jun 20th meeting. The 5 remaining UEB members, Steve Wratten had left, voted unanimously to **Recommend that the BoT take no action at this time. We do not have enough information from MEAN.**
Diane Dandeneau presented some recommendations for the Town of Lyons with regard to this new policy from MEAN. They follow these minutes.

UEB meeting times, time commitment, subcommittees: We decided to move meetings back 30 minutes to start at 4:30. They would still be the first and third Wednesdays of the month.
We discussed what kind of time commitment volunteering on the UEB would have. Aaron mentioned he thought members should expect to average 2 hours a week or 8 hours a month, with 4 of those hours being our 2 meetings each month and then 4 additional hours each month.
We discussed the idea of having subcommittees where 1 or 2 UEB members might take the lead on a particular subject. Then all members do not need to work on all topics. Limiting it to 2 members prevents it from becoming another public meeting. The subcommittee can then give the report on that topic at the meeting. As chair, Aaron mentioned he has tried to lean in this direction but has tried to let members decide what they want to take the lead on.

Meeting ended: 5:50 pm. **Minutes Submitted by**: Aaron Caplan

MEAN's Distributed and Renewable Energy Generation Policy
Recommendations for the Town of Lyons: evaluation, understanding, and response
By Diane Dandeneau

The new policy by MEAN is directly in conflict with the sustainability goals stated in the town's Comprehensive Plan and Lyons Sustainability Action Plan. This policy has the potential to negatively impact the ability of the town of Lyons to promote and implement renewable energy, as it negates the potential benefits for both the customer and our utility.

Below are the goals of the Town that are in conflict with MEAN's Policy.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Environment Objective 1.2: Assist and encourage residents and businesses seeking to live or operate in an environmentally sustainable fashion.
Environment Objective 1.4: Integrate sustainability best practices into Town's activities as both a resource consumer and a utility and service provider.
Environmental Strategy 1.4.1: Evaluate Town of Lyons' utility budgets, utility rate structures and energy sources to identify cost-effective ways to support less energy use by businesses and individuals, net metering and usage of alternative forms of energy such as wind and solar power.

Town Services Strategy 1.3.3: In order to attain its sustainability goals, the Town, as both a user and provider of electric, water and wastewater services should endeavor to:
1) Conserve these resources through minimizing its use when possible and
2) Encourage residents to employ renewable energy sources (e.g., solar) and conserve water resources.

Lyons Environment Sustainability Action Plan

Energy Goals:

- Increase the use of clean energy and transition away from fossil fuels

- Improve energy and water efficiency of the community's residential, commercial, and institutional building stock

Energy Recommendations:

En-1a: Conduct a feasibility study for an applicable renewable solution(s) (e.g. micro-grid/distributed generation) that could provide power for the town and offset peak loads.
Score: 8.3 | Priority: First Wave
En-1b: When conducting a feasibility study for renewable solutions consider solar hubs/gardens on each "island" of town that feed into the grid and could be easily converted to charging stations during a future disaster.
Score: 8.0 | Priority: As Appropriate
En-3b: Create a public education campaign to inform residents and businesses about efficiency and renewable programs.

Score: 7.3 | Priority: Second Wave

Recommendations:

1. Send MEAN additional questions to understand our risk, including:
    a. When is the Coincident peak from Wapa?
    b. What does MEAN estimate this will cost us towards our transmission charges.
        i. If they don't know, we need to understand how to calculate we can measure it.
    c. Once we get the answers, we can make decisions about our policy.
2. Don't make any changes yet. We cannot make any recommendation with the lack of data.
3. Create an independent task force that represents a cross-section of the stakeholders and experts interested in this issue.
    a. Diane Dandeneau is interested in leading this group. Suggested makup:
        i. UEB will have two members. Two from SFC. One staff and one BOT. One at large – me.
        ii. Bring in experts.
        iii. Additional members/contributors can include: Justin Spencer, Tom Plant, Bill Ritter, NREL, COSEIA.
    b. Understand the impact of this policy and provide short-term recommendations on actions to take to update existing net metering policies.
    c. Give the concerns for recommendations for change of policy at the August Meeting.
4. This task force will research the issue and questions.
5. Work cooperatively with MEAN to update the policy in a way that is workable for all.

Other requests:

I would like to see recommend that we not set a moratorium on Net Metering until we understand the risk as this could create unintended fear and concern before we understand if we are at risk. This will limit any unintended fears and concerns, especially if we find out there isn't a high risk. Solar data can be calculated and we can measure our risks if we find out more info.

Thank you,

Diane Dandeneau