Roger Williams University
DOCS@RWU

East Bay Energy Consortium Meeting Minutes | East Bay/RWU Information Collaborative

2-24-2010

East Bay Energy Consortium, Joint Committee Workshop at the Bristol Town Hall, Burnside Building, February 24, 2010, Meeting Notes

East Bay Energy Consortium

Follow this and additional works at: http://docs.rwu.edu/ebecminutes

Part of the Civil and Environmental Engineering Commons

Recommended Citation
East Bay Energy Consortium, "East Bay Energy Consortium, Joint Committee Workshop at the Bristol Town Hall, Burnside Building, February 24, 2010, Meeting Notes" (2010). *East Bay Energy Consortium Meeting Minutes.* Paper 24.
http://docs.rwu.edu/ebecminutes/24

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the East Bay/RWU Information Collaborative at DOCS@RWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in East Bay Energy Consortium Meeting Minutes by an authorized administrator of DOCS@RWU. For more information, please contact mwu@rwu.edu.

East Bay Energy Consortium
Joint Committee Workshop at the Bristol Town Hall, Burnside Building
February 24, 2010
Meeting Notes

Technical Committee members present: Dennis Culberson, Joseph DePasquale, Joseph Fraioli, Mayor Jean-Marie Napolitano, Garry Plunkett, Andy Shapiro (Committee Chair), Diane Williamson

Budget Committee members present: Joseph DePasquale, Mayor Napolitano, Diane Williamson

Legal Committee members present: Joseph DePasquale (Committee Chair), Joseph Fraioli, Mayor Napolitano, Andy Shapiro, Diane Williamson

Also present: Attorney Don Wineberg (Guest), Dan Mendelsohn (ASA), Lee Arnold and Robert Palumbo (The Arnold Group, LLC)

Opening Comments

Andy Shapiro welcomed people and opened the meeting by asking that the order of the agenda items be changed so that the review of the proposed letter of interest to the Dzykewicz Group is discussed as the second agenda item.

Andy also mentioned that he, Dan, Garry and Richard Gross (electrical engineer) spent several hours yesterday touring potential sites in Little Compton and Tiverton. Of particular interest was the site of the Tiverton Industrial Park which although 25 years in existence has hosted only one building, a gasification plant.

Review of ASA Proposed Phase 2 Contract

Dan proceeded to discuss his phase 2 proposal which was developed after a meeting with Andy to more finely tune budget details. Dan explained that after phase1 was completed, approximately 40 sites were identified and the top 15-20 sites were analyzed more fully and that no one site could accommodate the necessary number of turbines needed to meet the 25 megawatt project. If 2.5 megawatt turbines were used, 10 machines would be needed. If 1.65 megawatt turbines were utilized, 15 machines would be needed (1.65 megawatt turbines are currently more popular and accessible). In all, 4 or 5 sites might be identified as needed.

The discussion then turned to the Tiverton Industrial Park (owned by the town) and its availability as a wind turbine farm. The Industrial park shows much promise as it contains approximately 80–100 acres, has good wind and is isolated from residential property. Although the property could not host all of the turbines, it could host a significant number of them. An adjacent property under the control of the Tiverton Fire

and Water District was also identified and this quasi-government entity is open to a wind farm conversation.

Joe asked if other buildings could exist within the park if a turbine farm was placed there. Dan answered in the affirmative which would give Tiverton a double social utility for the property. Dan would contact appropriate Tiverton individuals once he received permission from EBEC.

Dan then explained that sites in Little Compton may be prohibitive because of the electrical interconnect issues. The chronology of activities in phase 2 would address that issue more completely and that EBEC would be asked to make some decisions during this process regarding the extent of Dan's work.

Attention then turned to the budget items. During initial discussions with Andy, Dan explained that due to the number of sites to review and after his discussions with sub-contractors, the cost of phase 2 would be approximately $130,000 (which also included a review of the Drew Dzykewicz project). Due to this cost (only $75,000 was included in the grant for phase 2), the proposal was developed in a line item approach for EBEC review. Dan felt that at a minimum, $90,000 was needed and other options would be included for consideration. It was also mentioned that although the cost seems high, it should be placed in perspective when looking at a $70 million project. The Mayor and Bob both confirmed that planning is most critical in the project process.

The line item budget is as follows:

Site Selection & Town Coordination	$12,800
Technical Assessment	$34,600
Environmental	$16,800
Permitting	$5,600
Economic Assessment	$15,600
Report	$4,600
Total	**$90,000**
Option A: Eco Industrial due diligence	$21,900
Option B1: MET Tower	$37,700
Option B2: SODAR	$79,200
Option C: Meetings	$5,800

After significant discussion among committee members which included what pieces of the $90,000 could be delayed until more funding was secured (possibly environmental); and would RIEDC purchase the SODAR equipment for EBEC; a motion was put forward by Joe and seconded by Gary. *The motion recommended that the full EBEC membership approve ASA to move forward with Phase 2 of the feasibility study with a cap of $75,000 and that EBEC would ask for supplemental funding from our grantors for the additional $15,000 needed for this phase of the project.* The motion was passed unanimously.

Review Proposed letter of Interest to Dzykewicz

Don Wineberg presented his draft letter to the members for review. Don stated he would add to the letter requests for wind speed information and it was noted that Mayor Napolitano and not Andy Shapiro should be the signatory. *Motion was made by Joe and seconded by Gary to recommend that the full EBEC membership approve sending the letter of interest with the appropriate changes noted to Dzykewicz.* The motion was passed unanimously. Anne Wolf Lawson will send the final draft of the letter to the full membership for a vote at the March 1st meeting

Don also mentioned that he recently attended an informational meeting at the State House regarding the net metering law and potential changes to it in the current legislative session. Discussions at that meeting included peak load for net metering and public/private partnerships. Since the next item on the agenda was a review of the legal RFP responses, Don was then asked to leave.

Review Legal RFP Responses

Andy stated that he received responses from three legal firms: Nixon Peabody, LLC, Ursillo Teitz & Ritch, Ltd., and Chace Ruttenberg & Freedman, LLC. He distributed copies of the documents to those members who had not yet received them. Gary asked that the responses to the RFP be sent to the full EBEC membership before the March 1st meeting.

A discussion of the proposals followed. It was noted by Andy that the Nixon Peabody, LLC proposal was very well done and it represented a large national firm. Locally, however, there was little legal experience in the items requested in the RFP. It was stated that this firm might serve as a valuable resource for a phase 3 of this project.

Chace Ruttenburg & Freedman's proposal was well received by the committee members. The mayor noted that the firm has a good reputation and others felt that the firm was very knowledgeable about local energy issues. *Joe made a motion that the full EBEC membership accepts the Chace Ruttenberg & Freedman proposal to perform legal work in Phase 2 not to exceed $10,000.* The motion was seconded by Gary and unanimously passed by the committee members.

Review Proposed Budget for 2010

Bob distributed the EBEC February 11th budget and the updated draft February 22nd budget prepared by Lee with changes suggested by the Mayor and Andy. Lee explained the changes suggested in the most recent budget draft which included $15,000 needed for phase 2 completion, $16,000 for public relations, $2,000 for industry participation, and $3,000 for Consortium miscellaneous expenses. Revised costs identified a supplemental need of $33,641 in the budget. Lee mentioned that he and Bob had met with Julian Dash previously and that whatever additional amount requested and approved by EBEC and Julian could be executed through a modification letter to the current grant rather than a

new grant application. If the latest iteration of the budget was approved by the full EBEC membership, Lee and Bob were asked to convene a meeting with our grantors to pursue the additional funding request. Joe volunteered to attend the meeting as well. Andy asked that Lee and Bob put forward the request for the $33,641 as the first item of business. Separately, a request that RIEDC purchase the SODAR equipment for EBEC use should be explored. Finally, a budget for the final six months of the year needs to be developed. Andy suggested that Lee and Bob relate to Julian that a six month budget will be forthcoming.

A motion was made by Joe to recommend that the draft budget be provided to the full EBEC membership for approval. The motion was seconded by the Mayor and was passed unanimously by the committee members.

Other

A discussion took place regarding the scheduling of joint committee meetings. It was agreed that the third Monday of each month would be the date set for these committee meetings. It was also agreed that emergency meetings would be scheduled as needed.

The joint committee meeting was adjourned at 11:40 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Lee H. Arnold
Mr. Robert P. Palumbo, MBA
The Arnold Group, LLC