



UEB Meeting Minutes, April 17, 2019

Meeting Time and Location: Began at 4:30 at Town Hall.

Attendance: Aaron Caplan, Jim Kerr, Jay Stott, Lee Hall, Chuck Keim

Staff: **BOT Liaison:** Mike Karavas **Guests:**

Previous Minutes: March 20, 2019 minutes **approved**.

BoT Report: . Mike K.-Bohn Phase II restarted, \$111,000 extra because of stopping and restarting. Approved connecting the fire hydrant to the high powered water line in Easter Corridor. Will cost \$62k currently unfunded. Continuation of issues with sorting problems at wastewater treatment plant. Sewer line to Eastern Corridor still on hold. Demand letter sent to Lyons Properties. Solar panel roof access from 2018 building code approved. Broadway St. plans not accepted for next round of funding because we did not get our paperwork for Main St. submitted properly or in time. Is alternate possibility for funding in this round.

Staff Update: (Aaron) Latests BOD was high (over 1000) In an email from Ramey they said it was because the centrifuge was running and when that is running it distorts results. It was noted the only other time this year the BOD was over 1000 was also on a Friday and the centrifuge was running.

Ordinance for business surcharge is not being collected yet. Not clear why. Staff had said they still had to work some billing procedures out.

Mentioned who DOLA is - assistance with local issues beyond flood problems? Housing? Behooves us to be more familiar.

446 Main st plans have been sent to staff and related parties to do a site plan review. The UEB.s recommendations and meeting minutes regarding the drainage report that was submitted were passed on to staff..

CDOT Hwy 66 project and LRAP INF 2.2.1 - The McConnell Dr to Hwy 36 part of this project is in our planning area. LRAP 2.2.1- deals with streets. Discussion of traffic dangers at Circle K location on 36/66. Need for analysis of site. CDOT knows about problem. \$ is issue. Need to advocate for bike lanes or seperate path Is this an issue UEB should weigh in on? Consensus yes. Road is designated Rural Hwy- probably should be Suburban or Urban category. Town could annex road?

Motion to recommend: The town should mention the following 4 items to the CDOT Hwy 66 project

1- Horizontal site analysis at Circle K, with regards to accident concerns because of the bend in the road.

2- advocate for bicycle path paralleling 36/66

3- Access control plan from Town of Lyons to Eastern Corridor.

2- look into town annexing part of Hwy 36/66 through Eastern Highland Dr./Eastern Corridor area,

Passed Unanimously

Electric Utility -CAMU Survey,

CAMU Survey - List SFC goals for renewability. List our customers generation Name Plate Capacity since we do not have the actual energy they are producing. The town might be interested in a Colorado Municipal renewable energy pool. How Much? 2% is the cap allowed by MEAN.

SDSG Report, EPSIM Report, MEAN DG policy - How to advocate for Lyons desire to promote renewables with MEAN DG policy. What angles for negotiation are there with MEAN? The SDSG study on page 30 mentions how MEAN seems to actively promote conservation to reduce electricity demand and at the same time discourages solar or other customer generation (also called distributed generation). Why? They do this by requiring all non grandfathered in distributed generation be added back in to calculations that determine how much our electricity costs, or in particular, the fixed cost recovery charge (FCRC). The town should point out there agreement with this and see if this policy might be changed.

MEAN is a coop where members vote and decide on policy. The FCRC is a set amount that each member pays a percentage of based on peak demand. It always gets funded. It is just a matter of how much each municipality has to pay. If we reduce our peak demand with solar then we reduce our share of the FCRC, but every other municipality could do the same and then percentage might remain the same for each municipality. Therefore encouraging everyone to reduce demand with customer generation is not a financial concern for MEAN, it just encourages all municipalities to keep up on reducing demand in some fashion.

Those who have been to MEAN meetings felt many member municipalities do not have the resources to pursue solar and would therefore not want to encourage others at their own expense. It might be futile to try and persuade a majority of MEAN members to make the changes discussed above.

MEAN may start requiring the data they want to see from customers generating electricity, at any time. We might want to focus our RFP for new electric meters on first getting the ones required to provide appropriate data for solar in accordance with MEAN DG policy. We have 28 grandfathered meters- 20% is 6 of those that need production meters. Joe had mentioned a list of customers who volunteered to have one installed. We then need any new customers who are not grandfathered in to have these meters. **Aaron to check with Toby if he has a list of all current customers with DG and total Nameplate capacity. Could also check if he was aware of who might have volunteered.**

MEAN has been willing to work with us with regard to their DG policy. If we could show with data to back it up that all our peak demand is in the evening when solar is not producing they may be willing to work with us in regards to what they require for data.

The cost of buying renewable energy from MEAN (Wind) looks like it is 1 cent per kW more than the wholesale cost per kW. If the town wanted to, it might be cheaper to look at purchasing more, maybe all of or power from this renewable resource than it would be to continue subsidizing customers through our Net Metering plan.

Another priority should be to look into modifying our Net Metering Ordinance. A number of other electric utilities have developed a tiered system after realizing there first system was not sustainable. Early adopters of solar would remain on the original plan or be grandfathered in and then new customers would be placed into a new plan.

Battery or energy storage was also asked about and it was mentioned that a few years ago we did have someone come and talk at a UEB meeting about this possibility.

MEAN requirements for renewable sources. Changes in MEAN requirements. ToL plans for renewables. Possibilities for larger renewable projects in Lyons.

SFSG study- MEAN 2% cap prevents community projects. Tri-states cap is 5%. Issue of are we promoting solar or do we want to promote renewables?

Meeting ended: 6 pm. **Minutes Submitted by:** Jay Stott & Aaron Caplan