

Public Hearing under RSA 41:14-a to grant long term lease/easement/license for solar location on town property.

The Planning Board and Conservation Commission have both made comments on the proposals. The Planning Board made some suggestions related to site plan issues like set back from road and vegetative screening between it and homes. The minutes of the Planning Board will reflect in detail the comments. Memo from Conservation Commission included below: MEMORANDUM May 8, 2015

At its meeting last night, the Conservation Commission heard the presentation by Jack Bingham of Seacoast Energy about the town granting an easement on town land for the placement of solar panels.

The Commission enthusiastically supports the proposal. First, it is very likely to save the town money in the long run. Second, and perhaps more important in our view, the use of renewable energy in place of that generated by the burning of fossil fuels helps to limit the despoliation of the environment caused by their extraction and also reduces the emission of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere.

If you have any questions, contact me via the Town Office at 664-5798 or via email at crawford@myfairpoint.net. Thank you.

Locations:

Barrington Power representatives have met with Peter Cook and Rick Walker regarding improving the location as regards use of the property now and into the future. In brief at the Public Works Facility it pushes the solar panel location further away from the cemetery to allow for snow removal activities at the recycling center. Peter and I believe some further adjustment is needed shifting a portion of the panel, but it appears doable. Also the BYA has less of our stuff on their land as originally thought after a careful review of the survey (the line does not go straight back from the road). At the Safety Complex the proposal changes the shape to allow more room for future expansion of the police station, making the long side of the rectangle run roughly parallel to the property line furthest from Route 9. While Rick indicates this would be more acceptable he still does not like the idea of committing land that might be needed in the future for expansion of the building.

Here is a summary on locations prepared by Jack Bingham.

Behind the safety building: This represents an easy install, easy access for maintenance and cleaning of snow.

Safety building roof: While slightly less expensive then ground mounts, removing snow on a large system can a problem. This could mean, through a winter like the last, a month or more of no production. In addition the roof should be replaced first representing a cost of around \$12,000.

The new garage: It faces nearly due east and has a very shallow pitch. So it would have less production per dollar than one would like, and snow will definitely bury the system for extended periods.

The library: Is a good south facing roof but because of its slight pitch would require a bit of custom engineering to make a ballasted system work. Again it is a shallow pitch and would suffer in snow.

Behind the garages: These are ideal locations. Installation and trenching to meters would be simple. There are 3 meters within a short distance. The sandy soil will take pounded posts with no concrete insuring a very economical installation.

The landfill. While landfills are being talked about a lot these days, this one has a fair steep pitch. There are racking systems now available for this but it could add \$20-30,000 to the cost of that portion of the overall system. That would clearly have an effect on the rate. We looked at other options, like pounded posts (penetrate the cap) or ballast (need to dig them into the slope so they are flat and again risk puncturing the cap).

Here are some arguments put forward by Jack for benefits of the proposed Solar Electric Systems

1. Based on current rates and a 3% annual increase the town could save around \$95,000 over 20 years
2. When you consider group net metering savings there is an additional \$1400.00 per year or \$28,000 over twenty years not counting increased rates.
3. The town will know the cost of the bulk of its electricity for the next 20 years, eliminating the potential for dramatically higher utility costs.
4. Expectations of lower costs would most likely make this no worse than break-even
5. The town has to pay no up front money.
6. The town will only pay for the power it is provided. Each year there is an accounting and reckoning.
7. Barrington Power will help create a curriculum for the schools.
8. Barrington Power will maintain, insure and operate the systems.
9. The locations were chosen for the best performance, lowest cost and least obstruction to town operations.
10. Barrington will be making a commitment to lower its carbon footprint and assist the state in hitting its 2025 renewables target.
11. Barrington Power will be an active participant in helping to lower the town's energy usage to continue to cut utility purchased power.
12. The town will be helping to reduce peak electrical demand (i.e. mid day summertime when cooling loads are high)
13. Barrington will be joining NH other towns in setting an example that it is a technological leader and encourages renewable energy solutions.
14. The solar panels are expected to continue to produce power for 40+ years.

My comments are a reflection of Doug Langdon's comments that the rate of Eversource (previously PSNH) increase will significantly impact savings. Any development of best likely case/worst likely case is dependent upon what assumptions are made. An increase in the Eversource rate greater than 3% will increase savings while a decrease in the Eversource rate will decrease savings or even result in a slight loss over time. An increase in electrical usage (for example going to a heat pump system in a building) will increase the potential savings. A decrease in electrical usage will decrease potential savings.

Here are pictures of the proposed locations, the first being at the Safety Complex (despite label)





Delegation of enforcement authority: An issue has arisen with the Cedar Creek waterline extension. Jae wrote "...regarding the issuance of a cease and desist order against the developer for failure to maintain a bond for completing construction of the road - Ralf Santora. It appears that neither the zoning ordinance nor the PB's regulations provide for enforcement of PB regulations or conditions of approval. Therefore, the selectmen are authorized to do so. The selectmen can vote to delegate their authority to you, the town administrator or the code enforcement officer to enforce violations in general - not just deal with this one. Alternatively, they can vote to just authorize on a case by case basis. Most do a general delegation so that enforcement action can be taken quickly if necessary, and this is what I recommend." The issue is the lapsing of a bond on the road. ***Does the Board delegate its authority to the Code Enforcement Officer either for this project or in general to enforce PB regulations or conditions of approval including issuance and follow through of cease and desist orders?***

R&D. We estimate the added cost of the amount we will pay for paving this year over extending last year's contract with a tie-in to the oil price and a now-required performance bond (\$12,500) would have been \$3,300. Last year's price included tack (a cost of about \$7,000 this year) and a lower price per ton based on the drop in the price of the oil to make the asphalt (total of these two items \$15,200).