

**Records Management Committee:** RSA 33-A requires the town to have a committee composed of the selectmen (or their designee) the Town Clerk, Tax Collector, an assessor and the Treasurer. We believe the last meeting was in 2007, when it was needed for a grant application for records retention. Carol represented the Board and Suzanne as an assessor. I would suggest the Board of Selectmen appoint John Scruton as their designee and indicate that Suzanne fill the role of an assessor for record retention purposes. ***Does the Board wish to make those appointments?***

**Conservation Commission:** The CC requests approval for the final distribution from Conservation Fund related to Lahey Property. ***Does the Board agree on this distribution?***

**Solar:** I have invited the two companies that submitted qualifications to come and meet with the Board. One has done out a detailed plan while the other concentrates on their training, certification, experience and references to show the company is well qualified to do this kind of a project. I consider both to be responsive to the RFQ but in different ways. The Request for Qualifications did not specify that the respondent had to have a detailed plan developed, but requested response to the following:

1. The ability to provide an analysis to the Town of Barrington's for use of solar energy;
2. A demonstrated understanding of the challenges and opportunities for municipalities and school districts with respect to construction of solar facilities;
3. A demonstrated understanding of how to obtain grants and other funding to develop a solar project including access to Federal, state, and non-profit financial incentives which may or may not be available to the public sector;
4. The ability to provide an integrated turnkey solar system to the municipality including any back-up power supply;
5. Projected costs for services along with any projected savings.

**Revision Energy:** It has 10 years of solar experience, 60 full time employees, including engineers and NABCEP-certified installers, 3,300 solar energy systems installed in 240 towns (many would appear to be hot water). It is a multi-state company. Revision would build two models for the Town that each has no upfront cost, a. Revision owned power purchase agreement and b. a "donor model" where a third party would own and run. Either of these models would allow the town to buy the equipment in year seven at what they estimate to be 20-30% of original cost. They indicate they could sell power at market or below market rates during contract, but are not specific.

**Barrington Power:** This company provided a detailed cost and designed a solution proposal in contrast to Revision Energy which responded with qualifications and a plan for proceeding to develop detailed plans. Barrington Power subcontracts most of the work to others and is a company that has not been in existence for many years. Barrington Power will use a company for installation that has a number of references for projects this size as does the engineering company who will review the design. The proposed project estimates an annual savings of \$2,157 per year depend upon PSNH rates. I would suggest that needs to be negotiated as to future years and also based upon other options to save electrical costs such as bidding out generation costs again. Barrington Power projects the PSNH rate

will increase faster than their guaranteed rate increase but this depends upon assumptions on future power costs following past patterns. That is not an unreasonable assumption but is a risk. Barrington Power's proposal uses PSNH generation rates, which are higher than we obtained using Nextera (successful bid on power generation in 2013). The buyout after 6 years is \$165,000, although there will be some energy credits annually that could help pay off that purchase. One advantage is that two of the three principals are from Barrington.

**Town Administrator's analysis:** The two firms responded in significantly different directions in their approach to this while I consider that both comply with the RFQ. Revision Energy would be the strongest on RFQ points 1-4, although the sub-contractors for Barrington Power show more experience and expertise than the principals. Barrington Power supplied the most detail about #5, cost projections. This presents the Board with a problem. If the town selected Barrington Power to start negotiations with Barrington Power on some of their details for a specific proposed solution, I would not feel comfortable about adopting it at this time without something to compare it to. We could perhaps develop some kind of comparison by checking with the references to see what was offered to other communities by Revision and also check out other communities with other companies. In contrast Revision Energy will develop a solution, if selected, at no cost to the Town. Once that were done the Town could have better numbers on options. Durham loves their experience with Revision Energy. Some would question whether that is fair to Barrington Power, although it was their decision to give the amount of detail they did for the RFQ.

Two things make this a profitable deal for any of the Solar companies involved in this kind of project. There are Federal and state credits up front and a sizable continuing reimbursement by the state for every Megawatt (Mw) created. There is discussion the latter ongoing credit could double in size. We obviously would want that increase to benefit the town, although in the Barrington Power proposal all that benefit goes to the company. A solar company that discussed the project and collected a lot of data, but did not bid, provided an example of a project which it did that was smaller than the one proposed for Barrington. It was a \$600,000 project for 90KW in which the current Mw renewable credit would return \$418,500 over 10 years. That number is actually greater than the federal tax credits and rebate for which a municipality could not qualify. Taken together it showed the project completely paying for itself in about 7 years.

Discussion with others would indicate the installed cost should be less than \$3/kw. If the installed cost is high it makes the buyout and payback period greater.

There are several issues the town has to consider. First is whether the Town wants to be locked into a long contract with a constant escalator for power. Second, should the Town share in the renewal Mw credit, especially if the state increases the renewable Mw credit. Third, if we were interested in proceeding, how do we make sure we know the one project proposed is in fact a good deal for the Town. Fourth, the town should consider whether the town would be better served by pursuing an energy audit and making improvements to reduce our energy consumption or other alternative energy strategy.

*How does the Town wish to proceed? I see four options:*

- 1. Reject both proposals, take a step back and invite proposals for a complete review of our energy usage, not just solar.*
- 2. Delay a decision until the Town has done more research on references and developing information on what makes a good deal.*
- 3. Award the RFQ to Revision Energy and have it at no cost develop a plan which the Board could then accept or reject.*
- 4. Award the RFQ to Barrington Power and use their proposal as a starting point and negotiate with them on many of the contract details.*

**Property and Liability Insurance:** I have put out a request for proposal for coverage of the Town's Property and Liability Insurance needs. When I received indication it would be difficult for some of the for-profit companies to respond by March 20, I extended the deadline to April 7. This is still enough time for the Board to make a decision in time to change July 1.

**NONPUBLIC for personnel evaluation**