Concord Municipal Light Board March 10, 2021 Minutes

Pursuant to a notice duly filed with the Town Clerk, a meeting of the Municipal Light Board was held on Wednesday March 10, 2021 at 7:30AM, via a Zoom Webinar. Present were Board Members: Wendy Rovelli, Gordon Brockway, Alice Kaufman (Chair), Pamela Hill and Brian Fouls. Also in attendance were David Wood, CMLP Director; Joe Repoff, CMLP Assistant Director; Carole Hilton; CMLP Customer Service Administrator, Jan Aceti, Energy Conservation Coordinator; Jason Bulger; Concord CIO; Karin Farrow, CMLP Sr. Admin; Greg Marcinek, Telecom Director; Stephen Crane, Concord Town Manager; Ray Andrews, Finance Committee liaison to the Light Board; Terri Ackerman Select Board liaison to The Light Board, Matt Cummings, CMLP Finance Manager/Accountant; Kate Hanley; Concord Director of Sustainability; Heather Bout, Vice Chair CPS School Committee; Pat Nelson, Co-Chair CMS Building committee; Dr. Laura Hunter, Concord Superintendent; Dawn Guarriello, Co-Chair CMS Building Committee; Charles Parker Community Volunteer CMS Building Committee. Staff from SMMA Architecture and Hill International (construction consulting): Kristen Olsen-SMMA, Anthony Jimenez-SMMA and Martine Dion-SMMA and Ian Parks – Hill International. Concord residents: Karlen Reed, Louise Berliner, David Allen, Jerry Frenkil, Courtney Whalen, Gail Hire, Andy Puchrik and Perkins Eastman.

A video recording can be found here https://youtu.be/TT7rK7QeFxA. Time stamps are listed below.

Note definitions for acronyms used in these minutes:

- **AMI**: Advanced metering infrastructure
- **CARES**: Conservation and Renewable Energy Services
- **CMS**: Concord Middle School
- **CPS**: Concord Public Schools
- **CSEC**: Comprehensive Sustainability and Energy Committee
- **EUI**: Energy Use Intensity
- **EV**: Electric Vehicle
- **GASB**: Government Accounting Standards Board
- **GSF**: Gross square feet
- **IOU**: Investor-Owned Utility
- **LEED**: Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design
- **PPA**: Power Purchase Agreement
- **PV**: Photovoltaic - Solar PV is the rooftop solar - it produces electricity from solar energy directly.
- **REC**: Renewable Energy Credits
- **RFP**: Request for Proposal
- **SF**: Square feet
- **TOUR**: Time of Use Rate
- **ZNE**: Zero Net Energy

**CALL TO ORDER (00:00:00)**

Ms. Kaufman called the meeting to order at 7:30 AM. A meeting recording is posted to the Minuteman Media Website as soon as it is available. Noted was that the Zoom chat and Q&A functions would not be utilized during the meeting.

Due to a scheduling issue, Ms. Kaufman suggested a revision in the order of Agenda items. Ms. Rovelli moved to accept a change in the order of Agenda items. Mr. Fouls provided the second and with a
unanimous roll call vote, the motion carried.

FUTURE MEETINGS and MINUTES (00:03:40)

A motion made by Ms. Rovelli with a second from Mr. Foulds and a unanimous roll call vote the minutes for the November 18, 2020, as distributed to Board Members on 3/09/2021 were approved.

A motion made by Ms. Rovelli with a second from Mr. Foulds and a unanimous roll call vote the minutes for the December 9, 2020, as distributed to Board Members on 3/09/2021 were approved.

CONCORD MIDDLE SCHOOL PROJECT – Presentation (00:05:15)
Ms. Kaufman thanked the CMS Building Committee members for coming and providing an update on the project. Ms. Olsen (SMMA Project Manager) introduced her team: Martine Dion (Sustainability Director) and Anthony Jimenez (Electrical Engineer). The Presentation (See addendum A below) was tailored for the CMLP Board Meeting. Currently the project is in the feasibility stage. The Space Summary & Project Requirements stage was recently completed. The Concepts phase will take place during Mar & April and then the Report phase in May.

The Educational Plan – CMS Goals is a major factor during the Feasibility Study and is the basis for the space and layout requirements. During the Concepts Stage, the 2020 Preferred Solution Floor & Site Plans is being utilized as a starting point. The Ground Floor Plan shown is a conceptualization of the Design Sub-committee and the Building Committee agreed were being sought. At a high-level overview the public aspects (gymnasium, cafeteria, media center, etc.) to the left and the academic wing to the right. With a long east/west orientation, it capitalizes on the solar potential keeping it in line with the town’s sustainability goals and the net zero goal for the project. The goals for updating the footprint shown include a reduction in size to the footprint (less perimeter wall), increase energy efficiency, inclusion of the recent educational program design changes. The size of the Gym has yet to be determined. The academic wing is designed to have 1 grade/3 teams per level.

The site plan is being reconfigured from the initial plan to refine the parking requirement, and rotate the building more east/west, which will affect the placement of the athletic fields.

The energy planning and PV planning is where SMMA is looking to partner with CMLP. Current building area is 142,995 GSF with a probable roof area of 74,910 SF.

Ms. Dion continued the Presentation, providing some detail to the PV aspect of the design. Current State Code requirements are that minus the 6’ perimeter clearance that at least 40% of the roof be PV ready. As currently planned, the project will exceed the minimum requirement for PV ready, as the goal is to optimize readiness for a PV installation. At this stage of the feasibility study, it is assumed that ~30% of the roof area is allocated to HVAC equipment. Additional shading factors from both the height differential on the building and nearby forests need to be taken into consideration.

The parking lot will be PV ready. Currently there are two layout options being considered. Generally, parking canopies are installed at the edge of the parking spaces, rarely extending out to the driving pathway to allow passage of vehicles with higher clearance requirements.

Ms. Olsen continued the presentation by showing the full Project Schedule with two timing scenarios. Both start with the Project Re-Start and Feasibility Study continuing thru 05/24/21 followed by the Schematic Design Stage (05/25-12/06/2021). From there the timelines differ where Option A there is not an early release of the design
phases (a timeline gap between the 12/10/21 Special Town Meeting and the 03/10/2022 Special Town Election) which puts the projected School opening on March 25, 2025.

In Option B there is potential for the time to slide, which could potentially move the projected School opening to 01/06/2025. Ms. Olsen concluded her presentation by stating that she had focused on the areas of the project that would be of most interest to the Light Board.

Ms. Kaufman thanked Ms. Olsen. She acknowledged that the areas of Light Board interest had been presented and asked to hear about the thought process behind the building configuration of the academic wing.

Ms. Hunter explained that the philosophy was growing that it was beneficial to create smaller school communities within the school environment. The children are clustered into cohorts, within the grade level. (See Addendum B below) There are three clusters, each cluster with its own team of core teachers. They have Math, Social Studies, English and Science within the cohort, and for other classes/activities, the cohorts mingle. The benefits include those teachers have an opportunity to get to know the students better and they can more easily collaborate on interdisciplinary connections.

Limiting the number of students per teacher allows for a more holistic approach to teaching for each student. The teams will have a nice overflow/common area where projects, presentations and collaborations can take place. Each grade level occupies its own floor which additionally fosters the sense of community. The project will allow all Middle School grade levels (6th, 7th, 8th) to attend school in the same building.

After thanking Ms. Hunter, Ms. Kaufman inquired about project costs. Ms. Hunter responded that the overall cost of the project would be $80M-$100M. (See Addendum C below) Current projections move the estimate closer to the $100M mark. Breaking down the project costs: $80M is for constructions costs with a 25% markup for soft costs (i.e. contingencies, architectural fees, consulting fees, utility fees)

Ms. Hunter added that the costs include the space for the team structure outline, space for a rich elective programming (See addendum D below) which includes, Music, Art & Language, A Gymnasium, and alternate PE Space. Additional costs include an Auditorium with seating for 270.

Ms. Guarriello explained that currently the project has been approved through the Schematic Design Phase. In December, a detailed schematic plan with the projected costs would be presented to the Town. Approval is needed before moving forward on to the next phase.

Mr. Crane added that at the December meeting a 2/3 vote in favor would be needed for a debt exclusion. The plan would then go to Town Election. A determination would need to be made if funding for the project would be continued via an alternate source in the interim between the December meeting and the Election. (See addendum A below)

Costs outlined do not include the cost of solar installation or the costs for providing the infrastructure. Mr. Crane explained that as the project would be a Town Building, that it made sense that the solar installation and necessary battery storage would be a CMLP project.

In response to a question by Ms. Rovelli, at this stage of the project Broadband has not been addressed.

Ms. Hill asked for clarification on the term “solar ready”. Would students see solar panels and solar arrays when they walked into the building the first day? Is the Town committed to the use of solar on the project? Would the planned curriculum include sustainability and climate?
In speaking to the “solar ready” portion of the questions Mr. Crane replied that the intent is for solar installation to be incorporated into the final stage of the building construction. The CMS building should open with solar and storage capacity. The plan is that by introducing the solar intent during this stage of the project, it will be integrated into the building design.

Ms. Hanley added that the design and installation of the panels would be a parallel project to the building.

On a more detailed level, Ms. Dion spoke to the need, during the schematic planning stage, for a collaboration with a Solar consultant regarding the square footage necessary for the installation. The structural engineer would also need information on the size and shape of the system. Coordination would also be needed with the electrical engineers so that the everything is ready for solar installation. Energy storage readiness is also already part of the project plan.

Ms. Hunter responded to the curriculum part of the question. Sustainability is already woven into the curriculum culminating with a 9th grade Earth Science requirement. Composting at the schools, which fell off due to COVID restrictions, is returning. The students are invested, and their passion has been seen to carry over into family behavior modification at home.

Mr. Foulds queried into the annual electrical load of the building, and what size array would be needed to meet that load. Would the system be designed to continue to operate in the event of an electrical outage? Has EV charging in the parking lot been considered?

Ms. Dion responded that the ability to continue to operate in the event of an electrical outage would depend on the design of the PV system. The goal of the design is for 25 EUI or better. Preliminary calculations put the roof array at ~1.1-1.3 megawatt depending on the system. Based on similar builds the storage would be in the 400-600 kilowatt range. The system will be a bit oversized by design, as once the building is occupied, use tends to be above the predicted level.

The project is planned to be LEEDs certifiable and 2% of the parking will have installed EV charging stations. During the schematic design, future EV needs will be factored into the EV readiness plan.

Mr. Brockway said that the project looked good and encouraged “big thinking” on the size of the solar. He encouraged collaboration with the Light Plant early to facilitate system integrations. He noted that this opportunity had been missed when the High School was built (Solar panels were added afterwards). He asked that electrification be considered, as any type of combustion at the site would be increasing the world’s carbon.

Ms. Kaufman thanked the Building Committee for the presentation and speaking on behalf of the Board Members and CMLP is looking forward to collaborating on the project.

DIRECTORS UPDATE (00:48:00)

Heat Pumps

- The Concord Clean Comfort Program was launched on February 23rd when the new website, ConcordCleanComfort.org went live. The Program offers customers a list of well-reviewed air-source heat pump installers, a pre-installation heat pump sizing review, and new opportunity to work with heating/cooling coaches, who help customers ease the transition for them to heat pumps.
- In the first 13 days of the program’s launch, they received 15 coaching requests. They have promoted this program with limited social media.

EV Update

- Mr. Wood has continued to work with Kate Hanley on a grant application for two level 3 Electric Vehicle
charging stations and the installation estimate is almost finished. Once the estimate is completed, we will be ready to submit our DC rapid charging station application. The location that we have selected is the Rideout Parking lot. This location is walking distance to downtown West Concord and minutes from Route 2. Getting power to the stations will be favorable and cost effective. Since this is municipal land, the grant will cover 100% of the cost up to $100k. There is currently a level II station in this parking lot. CMLP will be relocating this station. Since this station is also grant funded, we confirmed with the state we have permission to move this station.

Personnel
- Our Network Engineer candidate has accepted our offer contingent on preplacement screenings.
- The Grade I Line worker that we offered the position to took another job with an IOU. We will be launching a new recruitment for an apprentice Line worker.

Post COVID Re-Staffing Plan – Return to office 5 days a week
- Phase I (Metering Staff): 3/8/21
- Phase II (Customer Service Team): 4/5/21
- Phase III (merging of essential services employee from Teams A&B): 5/3/21
- Phase IV: (return of all non-essential services employees): 6/7/21

Prior to implementing each phase of the plan a Zoom meeting will be set up with each group to review our operating procedures including changes and additions listed below.

The Phase IV non-essential services employees and the remote only employees will need a more detailed review of the COVID Operating Procedures as they have not worked in the office under these protocols.

300 Baker Ave
- We have continued working through the details of this request and still have more to work on. As a reminder the new owner would like to make this building carbon neutral and is looking for a net metering cap increase and requesting a rebate for the 3 MW array. He is looking to replace the existing electric heat with heat pumps. Additionally, he would like to add two residential structures on the property. Between the 2 buildings there would be 215 units. This project is very complicated, and Mr. Wood will keep the board informed as he works through the details.

End of Directors Update

Mr. Foulds asked if staff would have access to vaccines prior to their return to full time on site.

Mr. Wood responded that he was hopeful that vaccines would be available so that staff could be fully vaccinated prior to their return. He emphasized that with current operational protocols currently in place, staff should be safe even if not vaccinated. In the case that an employee who did not have the opportunity to be fully vaccinated prior to a scheduled return date and who cited particular health issues wanted to delay their return, Mr. Crane responded that he couldn’t discuss the particulars of any one-off cases. He added that the Town has taken many safety measures including the placement of air cleaners throughout workspaces. There is not currently a specific policy in place addressing return to work for those vaccinate/unvaccinated. The Town has acknowledged there is sure to be a unique situation that will need to be addressed on an individual basis.

Ms. Hill referred to a comment by the public made during the last meeting. Someone inquired as to the status of a response to the CMLP’s compliance with Federal/State regulations on Smart Meters. Mr. Wood responded that per legal counsel we are Compliant with FCC regulations on Smart Meters.
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL416 – AMI CONSULTANT UPDATE (00:58:05)
The contracts with Lemmerhirt have been executed. A meeting is scheduled for later today between staff and the consultant to discuss the roll out of the project.

LIGHT BOARD GOALS – DISCUSSION/VOTE (00:59:35)
Ms. Kaufman referred to a distributed draft of a Light Board Vision/Goals document (See Addendum E below) and indicated that there were three areas warranting further discussion. There had also been previous discussion that spoke to the historic/culture of Concord being part of the vision statement and if adding that would be appropriate. In the past, there have been clashes with the HDC (Historic Districts Commission) regarding the installation of Solar in the historic section.

Mr. Foulds voiced his support of the addition, as the theme was an integral part of the five-year plan for the Town. As written, the Vision Statement is very focused on sustainability, which is a good thing, but may be perceived as “running over” the goals of others. Suggesting that the edits presented a broader more encompassing vision.

Ms. Hill voiced concern that the Light Board does not go beyond their scope and into the bounds of the Historic Committee and that the language proposed has a lot of room for interpretation, connoting conservatism towards the direction the future is taking us. Related to that concern is that not all residents share the same historical/cultural concerns. Suggesting instead that the language be such that it invites the least amount of push back while clearly addressing the most important focus – sustainability.

Mr. Brockway voiced his agreement with Ms. Hill on the need for the Light Board to stay within their lane. There are opportunities to create balance like the use of rooftop solar and the use of brownfield lands, which promote sustainability without major impact on the historical charm of Concord.

Ms. Kaufman stated that there was enough breadth, with the use of the wording “customers & partners” that could be interpreted to include other towns & committees, and other interests in the community that would include the preservation of the current culture.

Moving the discussion on to the clarification of the Board role in the purchase of utility scale storage and if it was something that would require a Town vote. Ms. Kaufman turned to Mr. Wood. Mr. Wood responded that it would depend on the direction that was taken – if it was determined, that a PPA was most effective then a Town vote would not be necessary. If the decision was to own it then it would most likely go to Town meeting for borrowing to spread the cost out over 10-15 years.

Mr. Foulds inquired about the need for siting and easements requiring a Town vote. Mr. Wood responded that those aspects are typically considered operational and would not need to go before the town or be considered as part of the Board’s Goals. The question of the role of the Board in the Middle School Project seems to have been addressed earlier (during the Middle School Project presentation) and can be removed as a goal as the Light Plant will be an integrated part of the Project.

Mr. Foulds asked for clarification on the most recent edits. Ms. Kaufman explained that the edits consisted primarily around the language used, moving the verbiage of some of the goals to one of oversite instead of one of development. Mr. Foulds asked why the bullet of reviewing the rate design of TOUR rates, to ensure capability with the Assistance Rate and other riders had been removed as a goal. Ms. Kaufman explained
that its removal was because it was inherent as a Board Responsibility and did not need to be specifically identified.

Ms. Rovelli opined that the changes were good and suggested that on item 2 the word “reflect” be changed to “ensure alignment with”. Additionally, suggesting that item 4b wording should reflect a change from the “Opt-out Policy” to the “Analog Policy”. This would be in line with prior discussions. The wording on item 10 should be quantified by adding “Collaborating” on the ZNE school project.

Ms. Dritt thanked the Board for considering that the rate at the charging station go up twice, making it an effective motivator for her to charge her car only at the cheaper rate. Additionally, she asked the Board to consider charging those choosing to opt-out of the Smart Meters with all the additional costs associated with their choice.

Mr. Brockway moved to accept the Goals for this year; Ms. Hill provided a second and with a unanimous roll call vote, the Goals, as amended during the meeting, were approved.

Ms. Kaufman thanked the Board for their time and efforts in the establishment of the goal document.

**FINANCIAL STATEMENT UPDATE (01:16:50)**

Mr. Cummings started with a review of the 09/30/2020 Comparative Balance Sheet (See Addendum F below) acknowledging that they were a bit dated as they had only preliminary information for Dec., as the audit had not yet begun.

The spreadsheet contains columns with Light Plant numbers to the left, Broadband numbers in the middle, and combined numbers to the left. Focus will be primarily on the CMLP numbers. Starting out with cash, we seem to be in pretty good shape despite the pandemic, noting that ~1M currently listed as Restricted Cash is owed to the Unrestricted Cash due to timing of the Capitalization of Projects. The accounting transfer to reflect the loan to Broadband is not reflected yet so cash is showing as a large negative number in the Broadband columns. As could be expected, Accounts Receivables is up. Of note is that the number shown reflects both billed and unbilled amounts. Capital Assets are the same amount. The line items labeled Land are mislabeled and should be Construction in Progress. The amount is primarily made up of the Cambridge Project, which will be capitalized in the near future, and the current Underground Project, also which will be completed and capitalized in the near future.

Mr. Wood explained that Projects are not considered as “an asset” until they are completed. Expenses are gathered separately until capitalized. The Deferred Outflows refers to the Pension and OPEB (Other Post-Employment Benefits). During the Audit, the auditors will determine the End of Year figure based on actuary tables and the number shown is likely to come down.

Moving on to the Accounts Payable the large increase is due to a change in how RECs are accounted for.

The large increase in Net Pension Liability can be attributed to a GASB accountability calculation change, which manifests as having to carry a higher liability amount than previously. Prior to the GASB change, only the amount in the OPEB fund was reported. The change requires a reporting of the amount that is expected to be paid out.

Going to the bottom of the spreadsheet Mr. Cummings reminded the Board that the negative number was a good thing as it was the indication of Income and that the 09/30/2019 was not anywhere near where 2019 ended.

Moving on to the Income & Liability portion of the Financials Mr. Cummings noted that the Purchased Power figure was similar to 2019.

The decrease in the General Operating Expense can largely be attributed to the change in accounting for RECs.
At the conclusion of the review, Ms. Kaufman suggested that it would be helpful to receive quarterly updates on the Financials to which Mr. Wood responded that was the intention.

Mr. Brockway inquired about the increase to Distribution and Mr. Cummings explained that it was due to tree trimming costs. During 2020 half the town was specifically targeted as opposed to 2019, where trimming was limited to, as needed basis. Mr. Wood noted that variations to this line could happen as the number/intensity of storms/damage varies.

Mr. Cummings noted that the numbering on the spreadsheet pages presented was incorrect; that there were only 2 pages not 7.

**Collections/ Disconnection Moratorium (01:29:10)**

Mr. Wood reported that as of Feb 26, 2021, there were 999 customers with past due accounts. Detail below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined Totals (999 Accounts)</th>
<th>AR Total Amt Owed</th>
<th>AR Current Amt</th>
<th>AR 30-Days</th>
<th>AR 60-Days</th>
<th>AR 90-Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$680,405.15</td>
<td>$244,377.44</td>
<td>$178,017.33</td>
<td>$50,818.60</td>
<td>$207,191.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electric (629 Accounts)</th>
<th>AR Total Amt Owed</th>
<th>AR 30-Days</th>
<th>AR 60-Days</th>
<th>AR 90-Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$504,265.42</td>
<td>$152,706.95</td>
<td>$40,190.57</td>
<td>$98,984.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water (325 Accounts)</th>
<th>AR Total Amt Owed</th>
<th>AR 30-Days</th>
<th>AR 60-Days</th>
<th>AR 90-Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$164,960.44</td>
<td>$22,179.75</td>
<td>$9,473.88</td>
<td>$104,462.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broadband(45 Accounts)</th>
<th>AR Total Amt Owed</th>
<th>AR 30-Days</th>
<th>AR 60-Days</th>
<th>AR 90-Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$11,179.29</td>
<td>$3,130.63</td>
<td>$1,154.15</td>
<td>$3,744.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a significant amount of money and customer count, so we will be moving forward with the collection process reported Mr. Wood.

Ms. Hilton went on to explain that in March of 2020 the DPU had put a moratorium on service shutoff for non-payment to utility customers. The DPU has extended the moratorium to July 1, 2021. CMLP has decided to follow the same DPU Guidelines that had been set for the IOUs. Per the DPU, soft collection efforts can start as of March 15, 2021. We are planning on having a bill insert go out with both the April & May billings and a bill message reminding people that is not too soon to be paying their past due amounts, encouraging them to reach out to the Customer Service Reps who will work with them on setting up a payment plan. Usually, a payment plan would be 6 months, but due to the moratorium, plans will be for a 12 month period (11 months fixed payment and one month for the settlement payment) for those needing the assistance. Once the CSR’s are back in the office full time, collection calls will start making a soft pass at those customers with a balance 90 days past due before moving on to those in the 60 day category. Due to the number of customers, it may take a couple of months to realize significant progress. May 5th is the plan is for the CSR’s to make a hard push on collections.

The official delinquent process will resume on June 14th. The process runs along with the billing cycle, which is processed into three groups each month. The first step of the process is a friendly reminder is sent out with the billing. To draw the customer’s attention the reminder is printed in green ink to set it apart from the rest of the bill. The second step will start on June 24 with a message more strongly worded which will be printed in red. Disconnections will resume on July 6, 2021. The focus will be on customers with balances 90 or more days past due with balances greater than $100.
The process will follow similar timelines for each of the remaining groups. DPU Guidelines do not allow for the charging of finance charges to commercial customers until 6 months after the State of Emergency moratorium has been lifted (Jan 2022). In addition to offering payment plans when possible, the administrative fees associated with disconnects and reconnects will be waived. Broadband will not be disconnected during the moratorium. As the building is still closed to the public any customer wanting to make an in-person payment will need to reach out and schedule an appointment. Due to the escalation of the situation, for staff protection, a police detail will be assigned for any disconnections.

Mr. Wood confirmed for Ms. Kaufman that the number of customers with past due balances was higher than usual. Per Ms. Hilton, there is a surprising number of customers that have a substantial overdue balance. Mr. Wood offered that the collection approach was designed to work with the customers on collections so shut-off would not be necessary. Easing into the process also will not overload the CSR’s.

Ms. Kaufman asked about integration with the Hugh Cargill Trust for those experiencing severe financial difficulties and Mr. Wood responded that yes it was part of the process. Typically, the Light Plant funds the Trust $12,000-$14,000 a year to replenish the Trust for monies provided to customers for the payment of their electric bill.

Mr. Crane offered that the effects of the pandemic have been a topic for discussion for the Select Board. In contrast to the Utilities collections of Real Estate taxes has been high so he is planning on meeting with Mr. Wood and Ms. Lafleur (Concord CFO) in an effort to determine what is going on - are the utility customers not paying because they know they can without penalty? Is it a rental vs. ownership issue?

In response to Mr. Foulds questions Ms. Hilton explained that the system does not separate out any further than 90 days. All accounts with balances 90 days or more are captured with the numbers referenced. The number of customers listed as being overdue, most likely have Electric/Water/Broadband overlap. Mr. Foulds then thanked the Light Plant for their approach to the collections.

Ms. Reed suggested that the method that bills are being received (electronic or paper) might be a factor with those with overdue balances. Opining that in the midst of all the email received that it may be easier to overlook an electronic bill than a paper one.

Mr. Andrews voicing his support of comparing the over tax accounts with the overdue utilities wondered if the comparison could be overlaid with the Hugh Cargill requests. Mr. Crane acknowledged that the number of requests to the Trust was up, and in keeping with the confidential nature of those requests did not quantify the increase. Stating that it would be taken into consideration when looking at the big picture.

STATE BIOMASS POLICY – DISCUSSION/UPDATE (01:47:10)

Ms. Kaufman reminded the Board that there had been a Biomass buy-in opportunity presented a little over a year ago and that after a lengthy discussion the decision had been made to pass on the opportunity for several environmental and environmental justice reasons.

Mr. Foulds explained that there had been a statement from the Town to the elected officials on Beacon Hill by CSEC (See addendum G below) stating that the Town and the MLP is not interested in Biomass, that we do not consider it a sustainable resource. The concern over the particulates released into the air during the burning process being a health hazard.

In respect to sustainability there is a timing issue in that the sequester carbonates in the trees are released during the burning process and it takes over 100 years for those carbon to be recaptured. Decay on the other hand, while the same carbonates are released, happens over a longer period of time and the decay provides the ground with natural fertilizer.

Ms. Kaufman added that the State had re-identified, in the ISO standard, that in the form of wood chips it was a renewable energy source. The reason that it is being put before this Board is to offer guidance to the Select Board for
their decision on signing the petition to put before the State. It is her understanding that similar petitions have been presented by other Massachusetts towns.

As the position against the State Biomass policy is in the minority, the CSEC felt it was important to put that position before the government.

Mr. Brockway voiced his agreement in part with the Resolution and admitted that the science and reports present a mixed bag of information on the subject so leaving the science out of it felt confident with making a statement to the Select Board.

Having been discussed, the Light Board decision was to not get involved with Biomass.

In answer to Ms. Rovelli’s question, Mr. Wood assured the Light Board that CMLP had no existing PPA with the project. Ms. Kaufman opined that it may be appropriate for the Select Board to remove the verbiage in the petition regarding seeking legal action for withdrawal from any PPA currently in place.

Ms. Rovelli moved for the Light Board endorsement of the CSEC Resolution, with the removal of the verbiage of withdrawing for any PPA currently in place. The motions was seconded by Mr. Foulds and passed with a unanimous roll call vote.

Ms. Kaufman offered to draft a letter of recommendation of endorsement to the Select Board.

LIASION & PUBLIC COMMNT (02:01:45)

Ms. Dritt opined that Biomass was not just bad for Concord but for everyone. Burning forests are not green.

Ms. Hire shared it was her understanding that most of what was being burned would otherwise go into the waste stream, that it was not typically virgin wood and as wood waste needed to be trucked out, the transport caused a significant environmental impact. The future may bring technology that makes biomass more environmentally friendly.

Mr. Foulds offered that the waste wood in Mass was often composted, as the movement of wood out of state was restricted due to pest control.

Mr. Brockway made a motion to adjourn, Ms. Hill provided the second and with a unanimous roll call vote the meeting was adjourned at 9:37 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian Foulds, Clerk
Town of Concord

Concord Middle School Project

CMLP Listening Session

03.10.21
Today

Space Summary & Project Requirements

Concepts

Report

- CMSBC Meetings
- Community Forum
Educational Plan – CMSGoals

Community

Compassion and loyalty towards the world outside of the self.

High Achievement

Confidence and willpower to learn from mistakes, appreciate success, and grow towards one’s potential.

Lifelong Learning

Passion to discover new interests and to uncover the fascinating in the mundane.
Site and Building Program Confirmed

---

Proposed Space Summary - Middle Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Type</th>
<th>CMS - Recommended</th>
<th>MSBA Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FLECIN</td>
<td>OF FME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE ACADEMIC SPACES</td>
<td>42,469</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(List classrooms of different sizes separately)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom - General</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Language Classrooms</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Group Seminar (30-35 students) / Recess</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STE Room - Grades 6-8</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STE Storage</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Classroom / Lab - Grades 9</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep Room (shared)</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep Room</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Chemical Storage Rm</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Common</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL EDUCATION</td>
<td>6,025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(List classrooms of different sizes separately)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Contained SPED</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Contained SPED Toilet</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Date: 2/2/2021

(Redacted by the author: EWING COLE, SMMA)
2020 Preferred Solution
Floor & Site Plans
Concord Middle School
Ground Floor Plan

- Building Area: 144,005 SF
- Charge for 2021
  - Compact footprint
  - Update program to include Auditorium
  - 7,000 nsf or 13,000 nsf Gym
Lower Level Plan
Upper Level Plan
Site Plan

- Charge for 2021
  - Refine parking requirement
  - Rotate building
  - Reduce site development area (replace only the affected athletic fields)
Preliminary Area Information (potential to change through Schematic Design)

- **Current Building Area:** 142,995 GSF
- **Probable Roof Area:** 74,910 SF
  - PV readiness
  - 6’ perimeter clearance reduction
  - Approximately 30% roof area allocated to HVAC equipment.
  - Future shading studies (roof height/acoustical screens) may further reduce PV ready roof area.
- **Probable Parking Lot Area:**
  - Total areas include the standard, accessible, and METCO van spaces, but exclude the driveways/maneuvering aisles, bus stalls, and walkways. The two options are within 150 SF of one another.
  - Alternate 1: (136 spaces) 22,665SF.
  - Alternate 2: (135 spaces) 22,518SF.

Total potential PV area between 90,000 and 100,000 sf
Project Schedule
Concord Middle School
# Project Schedule

## Schedule Scenario Option A - No "Early" Release of Design Phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No &quot;Early&quot; Release of SD</td>
<td>Dec 9, 2020 - May 24, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Town Meeting</td>
<td>Dec 10, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Town Election</td>
<td>Mar 10, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalation Projection @ 2023, Q2 should be 9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Re-Start &amp; Feasibility Study</td>
<td>May 25, 2021 - Dec 6, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schematic Design</td>
<td>Jan 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Development / Construction Documents</td>
<td>Mar 18, 2022 - Apr 4, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bid / Award</td>
<td>Apr 5, 2023 - June 13, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Jun 14, 2023 - Nov 18, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punch List &amp; Move-In</td>
<td>Nov 19, 2024 - Mar 24, 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected School Opening</td>
<td>March 25, 2025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Schedule Scenario Option B - "Early" Release of Schematic Design & Design Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Early&quot; Release of SD allows for cushion between SD Completion &amp; Town Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Town Meeting</td>
<td>Dec 10, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Town Election</td>
<td>Dec 17, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT Special Town Election</td>
<td>March 10, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalation Projection @ 2023, Q1 should be 8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Re-Start &amp; Feasibility Study</td>
<td>Dec 9, 2020 - May 24, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schematic Design</td>
<td>May 10, 2021 - Nov 19, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Development / Construction Documents</td>
<td>Dec 30, 2021 - Jan 17, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bid / Award</td>
<td>Jan 18, 2023 - Mar 27, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Mar 28, 2023 - Aug 29, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punch List &amp; Move-In</td>
<td>Aug 30, 2024 - Jan 3, 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected School Opening</td>
<td>January 6, 2025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Educational Program

19-20 **students per class**

3 **teams per grade level**

4 **on-team subjects**

**Program Building Blocks**

**Team Level Organization**

**Grade Level Organization**
Draft Program Cost Check

Preliminary Cost Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction Cost</td>
<td>$49.76 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo/Abatement</td>
<td>$1.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Cost</td>
<td>&lt;$7.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark-ups</td>
<td>Escalation, Contingency, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Construction Cost** = $79.98 million ($99.975 mil. Project Cost)

NOTES
1. Based on $348 / sf building construction cost assumption.
2. Cost as identified in March 2020 estimate
3. 8% based on two reference projects: Bid in Spring 2022 (6%); bid in Summer 2023 (9%)
4. Based on removal lower field work, reduction in site development.
   General: Includes ZNE Ready goal and LEEDv4 Silver certifiable benchmark
Educational Program Development

- Gymnasium and Alternate PE
  - Gym sized for 1 Basketball Court and 150 spectators
  - One Alternate PE space with Fitness Equipment
- Music and Performance
  - 1-grade level auditorium
  - One Orchestra Room, shared with Music
  - One Band Room, shared with Music
- World Language
  - 5 classrooms dedicated to World Language program
Educational Program Development

- **Visual Arts**
  - Two art rooms with kiln space

- **Special Education**
  - Includes small group rooms for pull-over
  - Spaces for three sub-separate programs

- **Media and Maker**
  - Media Center sized the same as the two combined schools
  - Maker Space sized for a whole class to use as a drop-in space

- **FACS and Technology**
  - One space each
Addendum E: CMLP Vision/Goals Board Edits

CMLP

(Old) Vision Statement
We will partner with our customers, civic institutions, and employees to foster a vital community, in the near and in the long term, in which to live, raise family, work, and operate a business.

Proposed: Historic/culture language
Together with our customers and partners, CMLP will help build a stronger and more vital community by providing safe and reliable electricity and broadband services at a fair cost, while actively working to achieve Concord’s climate, sustainability and resilience goals.

Select Board Goals Framework

1. **Governance**: Effective, Responsive and Transparent Governance
2. **Public Health and Safety**: Exemplary of Best Practices for the Safety of All
3. **Financial Stability**: Fiscal Responsibility and Financial Stability/Sustainability
4. **Infrastructure**: Sufficient and Sustainable, Well-maintained and Reliable
5. **Quality of Life**: High Level Maintenance of Town Services for Concord Citizens
6. **Balance and Equity**: Balance and Equity among divergent individual, neighborhood and town wide interests
7. **Diversity**: Conscious Decision Making to Support Economic and Social Diversity and Inclusion
8. **Historic and Cultural Heritage**: Preservation and Promotion of Historic and Cultural Heritage
9. **Agricultural and Natural Resources**: Protection and Enhancement
11. **Economic Resilience**: To Protect the Vitality of the Town and Businesses
12. **Regional and State Interests**: Advancement of Concord’s Interest in the Region and the Commonwealth

Concord Municipal Light Board Draft Specific Goals

1. Review and approve CMLP annual budget ensuring fiscal accountability taking into account inherent risks in market fluctuations [SB Goal #2]
2. Update Strategic Plan to reflect Article 51, Envision Concord and the Concord Climate and Resiliency Plan, and Concord’s GHG Inventory [SB Goal #1, 3, 4, 5, 9] and utility market changes (#3 and #4 are inherently part of this)
   a. For discussion: review 2030 goal; role of distributed energy storage; community updates on progress towards goals
3. Power Supply – review non-emitting policy decision regarding nuclear as a percent in power portfolio
4. Develop and implement AMI multi-year strategy – [SB Goals # 4, 9]
   a. Approve RFP technical specs for installation of advanced meters in 2023
   b. Approve opt-out policy [SB Goal #4]
   c. Develop marketing and education plan for customers on the implications and benefits of AMI and related TOUR rate structure
5. Develop Board competency and knowledge of Time of Use Rates to inform better policy and rate decisions [SB Goals #1,3,4,6]7,10,11
   a. Review rate design ensuring that TOUR rates are compatible with Residential Assistance and Farm Rider Rates, and distributed energy assets.
6. Research and implement utility scale battery storage [SB Goals #4,9]
7. Evaluate incentive programs for scalability, financial and marketing commitments and impacts on GHG emissions reductions.
8. Investigate opportunities for providing financing to incentivize greater weatherization and energy efficiency opportunities or installation of appropriate technology that reduce GHG contribution to the town’s inventory [SB Goals # 1, 4, 9]
   a. Explore on-bill financing
9. Citizen engagement through public listening sessions, and benchmarking progress on meeting town energy goal [SB Goals #1, 5, 9]
10. ZNE Middle School project, [SB Goals # 1, 2, 3, 4, 9]
11. Training of new board members [SB Goals # 1, 7]
## SUMMARY Comparative Balance Sheet

as of September 30, 2020

### L I G H T  P L A N T  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Type</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>$ Variance</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASH AND RESTRICTED INVESTMENTS</td>
<td>$64,973,807.00</td>
<td>$68,581,508.79</td>
<td>$3,607,701.79</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Cash</td>
<td>8,556,150.51</td>
<td>6,772,691.10</td>
<td>(1,783,459.41)</td>
<td>(18.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Cash</td>
<td>7,665,011.40</td>
<td>8,031,045.78</td>
<td>376,034.38</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Deposits</td>
<td>2,782,112.19</td>
<td>3,267,121.12</td>
<td>485,008.93</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT ASSETS</strong></td>
<td>$9,075,565.71</td>
<td>$9,302,054.22</td>
<td>$226,488.51</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unamortized Bond Premium</td>
<td>$40,918,589.57</td>
<td>$9,302,054.22</td>
<td>(31,616,535.35)</td>
<td>(77.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated Depreciation</td>
<td>$1,321,912.40</td>
<td>$1,002,864.33</td>
<td>(319,048.07)</td>
<td>(24.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NONCURRENT ASSET</strong></td>
<td>$3,837,011.69</td>
<td>$4,066,406.06</td>
<td>$229,394.37</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercompany</td>
<td>$65,993.29</td>
<td>$65,993.29</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMBINED</strong></td>
<td>$43,713,461.91</td>
<td>$45,292,408.25</td>
<td>$1,578,946.34</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B R O A D B A N D  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Type</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>$ Variance</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>$33,038.05</td>
<td>$26,984.65</td>
<td>(6,053.40)</td>
<td>(18.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes Payable</td>
<td>$33,038.05</td>
<td>$26,984.65</td>
<td>(6,053.40)</td>
<td>(18.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td>$1,002,864.33</td>
<td>$1,089,638.47</td>
<td>$86,774.14</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>$209,315.14</td>
<td>$279,112.68</td>
<td>69,797.54</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NONCURRENT LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td>$209,315.14</td>
<td>$279,112.68</td>
<td>69,797.54</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMBINED</strong></td>
<td>$1,002,864.33</td>
<td>$1,089,638.47</td>
<td>$86,774.14</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C O M B I N E D  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Type</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>$ Variance</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notes Payable</td>
<td>$33,038.05</td>
<td>$26,984.65</td>
<td>(6,053.40)</td>
<td>(18.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td>$1,002,864.33</td>
<td>$1,089,638.47</td>
<td>$86,774.14</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>$209,315.14</td>
<td>$279,112.68</td>
<td>69,797.54</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NONCURRENT LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td>$209,315.14</td>
<td>$279,112.68</td>
<td>69,797.54</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMBINED</strong></td>
<td>$1,002,864.33</td>
<td>$1,089,638.47</td>
<td>$86,774.14</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### L I A B I R Y & E Q U I T Y  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equity Type</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>$ Variance</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated Depreciation</td>
<td>$33,038.05</td>
<td>$26,984.65</td>
<td>(6,053.40)</td>
<td>(18.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes Payable</td>
<td>$33,038.05</td>
<td>$26,984.65</td>
<td>(6,053.40)</td>
<td>(18.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td>$1,002,864.33</td>
<td>$1,089,638.47</td>
<td>$86,774.14</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>$209,315.14</td>
<td>$279,112.68</td>
<td>69,797.54</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NONCURRENT LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td>$209,315.14</td>
<td>$279,112.68</td>
<td>69,797.54</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMBINED</strong></td>
<td>$1,002,864.33</td>
<td>$1,089,638.47</td>
<td>$86,774.14</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Comparative Statement of Revenues and Expenses

as of September 30, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L I G H T   P L A N T</th>
<th>B R O A D B A N D</th>
<th>C O M B I N E D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$ Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1,845,327.14)</td>
<td>(872,485.37)</td>
<td>(972,841.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total OPERATING REVENUE</td>
<td>(21,829,152.69)</td>
<td>(20,971,805.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total EXPENSE</td>
<td>20,015,688.65</td>
<td>19,755,638.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total OTHER INCOME AND EXPENSES</td>
<td>(31,863.10)</td>
<td>348,681.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OPERATING REVENUE

| (21,829,152.69) | (20,971,805.41) | 857,347.28 | (3.9 %) | (923,987.57) | (1,023,302.38) | (99,312.81) | 10.8 % | (22,753,140.26) | (21,995,725.79) | 757,414.47 | (3.3 %) |

### OPERATING EXPENSES

| 20,015,688.65 | 19,755,638.64 | (260,050.01) | (1.3 %) | 642,472.48 | 780,647.37 | 147,174.99 | 22.9 % | 20,658,181.13 | 20,549,286.01 | (121,895.12) | (0.5 %) |

### OTHER INCOME AND EXPENSE

| (31,863.10) | 348,681.40 | 375,544.50 | (1,178.6 %) | 9,305.63 | 7,351.57 | (1,950.06) | 21.0 % | (22,657.45) | 351,032.97 | 373,594.44 | 1,655.9 % |

### SUMMARY

- **Net Income/Loss**: $(1,845,327.14)
- **Purchased Power**: 15,121,681.56
- **Depreciation**: 1,403,860.94
- **Customer Accounts**: 794,335.39
- **Transmission**: 56,521.40
- **Distribution**: 647,957.32
- **Interest Income**: (355,963.89)
- **Interest Expense**: 119,421.36
- **Intergovernmental Obligations**: -
- **Loss (Gain) on Investments/Disposal of Fixed Assets**: 23,107.91
- **Other**: (35,228.48)

### Percentage Variance

- **Variance**:
  - **Operating Revenue**: 1038,522.49
  - **Operating Expenses**: 1038,522.49
  - **Net Income/Loss**: 1038,522.49

- **% Variance**:
  - **Operating Revenue**: 1038,522.49
  - **Operating Expenses**: 1038,522.49
  - **Net Income/Loss**: 1038,522.49

### Other Notes

- **Combined**
  - **Revenues**: $20,015,688.65
  - **Expenses**: $19,755,638.64
  - **Net Income/Loss**: $24,015,688.65
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A Resolution in Opposition to State Subsidies & Incentives for Biomass Plants
As voted by CSEC on February 18th, 2021

WHEREAS, the Select Board of the Town of Concord, advised by the Town’s Comprehensive Sustainability and Energy Committee, is committed to ensuring and safeguarding the health, safety, and environment of the residents of our community, and

WHEREAS, wood-burning biomass plants are a highly polluting form of energy generation, known to release pollutants including fine particulate matter, volatile organic compounds, nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide, and carbon dioxide, and

WHEREAS, the Commonwealth adopted science-driven Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) regulations in 2012 recognizing that wood-burning power plants emit more carbon dioxide than fossil fuel power plants per unit of energy generated,

WHEREAS, due to the 2012 RPS regulations, the only wood-burning biomass plants eligible for Massachusetts renewable energy subsidies have been small, efficient combined-heat-and-power biomass plants, and

WHEREAS, if the weakened RPS regulations proposed in December 2020 by the Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources (DOER) go into effect, Massachusetts subsidies and incentives would be available for inefficient large-scale biomass power plants, and

WHEREAS, the proposed RPS regulations would wrongly incentivize and directly subsidize the construction of a large-scale wood-burning biomass plant proposed by Palmer Renewable Energy in Springfield, an Environmental Justice community already heavily burdened by industrial air pollution and by record-setting rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, and

WHEREAS, our Select Board stands in solidarity with the residents of the City of Springfield, and the Springfield City Council, which passed a resolution on December 21, 2020, opposing Massachusetts state subsidies and incentives for wood-burning biomass plants,

WHEREAS, Palmer Renewable Energy has been marketing energy from its proposed Springfield biomass plant to municipal light plants across the Commonwealth,

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Select Board opposes any state subsidies or incentives for commercial wood-burning biomass plants in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Select Board calls upon Concord Municipal Light Plant not to enter into any agreements to purchase electricity produced from woody biomass combustion and to explore all legal avenues for withdrawing from any such existing agreements,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Select Board calls upon the Massachusetts DOER to revise the proposed RPS regulations by returning the woody biomass provisions to their previous, science-based language, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Select Board calls upon the Joint Committee on Telecommunications, Utilities, and Energy of the Massachusetts Legislature to hold an accessible public hearing on said proposed RPS regulations, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Select Board urges its State Legislative Delegation to support legislation in the forthcoming session of the Massachusetts General Court to remove and bar taxpayer and ratepayer incentives for commercial biomass power plants in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Michael Barrett and Tami Gouveia, as well as Governor Charles Baker, DOER Commissioner Patrick Woodcock, and the Co-Chairs of the Joint Committee on Telecommunications, Utilities, and Energy Committee, Senator Mike Barrett and Representative Jeff Roy.