



TOWN OF OAK BLUFFS

SITE PLAN REVIEW for GREENSKIES RENEWABLE ENERGY, ET AL. (CVEC, ALLPOINT TECHNOLOGIES, TOWN OF OAK BLUFFS) — SOLAR FACILITY AT CAPPED LANDFILL

THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 2020 — MEETING MINUTES

10:00 a.m. | Virtual Zoom Meeting

Site Plan Review Committee: PLANNING BOARD: Ewell Hopkins, Mark Crossland; ENERGY COMMITTEE: Richard Toole, Marilyn Miller; ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS: Andrea Rogers, Llewellyn Rogers

Members Absent: Liz Durkee (CONSERVATION)

Staff in Attendance: Kim Leaird (*Administrator*)

Attendees: Brad Parsons, Liz Argo, Marilyn Miller, Aaron Wilson, Jin Tao, Robert Whritenour, Scott Kronberger, Siva Thashnath, Steve Jaditz, Peter Meleney

Chairperson Hopkins opened the meeting at 10:02 a.m.

Site Plan Review:

T Ewell Hopkins: Good morning. It's 10 o'clock, and I'll get started now. Before the ZBA (the Zoning Board of Appeals) can hold a hearing [to consider a special permit], a town-level site plan review needs to happen per our zoning bylaws under 12.5.1— at a minimum, the committee needs representation from the Planning Board, the Zoning Board of Appeals, the Energy Committee and Conservation.

We've received a letter from Conservation [agent] that they have no jurisdiction or authority on this matter from their assessment and therefore have recused [from this discussion].

Energy Committee is represented by Richard Toole and Marilyn Miller (with Peter Meleney also present).

The Planning Board is represented by Mark Crossland and myself. Under 12.5.1 large scale systems, ground mounted and/or pole mounted solar energy systems having a gross panel area of more than 10,000 square feet shall require a site plan review prior to the consideration of a special permit by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

The Site Plan Review Committee shall consist of at least one or more of or than two members of each of the committees that I named earlier. It's important to understand today that this review is to establish suggestions and recommendations for the Zoning Board to take into consideration.

They are the permitting authority for this initiative, and we'll be looking to our recommendations — but they possess the sole authority. The Planning Board is not the permitting authority in this matter. That's why there's only two members present.

Kim represents the administrative assistant role for [both] the Planning Board and the Zoning Board of Appeals, so she'll be the point of continuity, capturing these recommendations. The meeting will be

recorded so that she can capture the recommendations and suggestions to go to the ZBA, I do not anticipate the need for continuance of this hearing, unless it is deemed otherwise appropriate. So, let us all go into this process with the expectation that we're going to wrap up our recommendations.

At this point I will do screen sharing when appropriate, and ask if Brad Parsons or anyone else wants to screen share at different points to explain anything. By a show of hands, has everyone had a chance to review the material on the website and get at least an initial feel and understanding for the project?

I want to point out a couple of issues from the Planning Board perspective and the work that I've done with Bob Whritenour, town manager, up until now what defines this project and I believe in a good light before it was actually sent to the Commission. (He navigated to the Planning Board section of the town website).

The layout of the panels is over here on the right hand side of the screen, you'll see that the orientation is slightly different to the southeast from the northwest portion. I will have some questions about battery and other technologies, a little bit later, but you can see right up here right behind the highway barn where there will be a battery storage facility and where all of this infrastructure will come together. Additionally, what I think is important for everyone to appreciate, is that this project should be in context with the overall comprehensive view that we have for this area of town.

So currently, you can see with my cursor here to the right, this is where the communication tower was approved and erected. Up in this corner is a proposed Park and Ride facility that we're very early on, but we've done some detailed planning around with other committees in town. And then down here along this section that is the proposed Bellevue Ave. housing development scope of which is still to be defined. But I think it's important for everyone on this call to understand that as we talk about these panels and this infrastructure, you have the tower. You have the ongoing highway department's operation, you have the transfer station. You have the wastewater operation, which was my cursor here, and you'll have a new park and ride up in this corner and possibly housing in here. To me that's the context that I think we should all take into consideration. Are there any initial questions by energy or planning that we should put on the table? We have a quite a few experts, subject matter experts. I'm confident we'll be able to answer any questions.

And then I have a list of seven questions that I want to go through. But let me open up the floor at this point.

Richard Toole: I don't have a question. I just want to go on record so people know that I'm chairman of the Energy Committee in Oak Bluffs. I'm also the Oak Bluffs board representative to the Cape and Vineyard Electric Cooperative (CVEC), which is behind this whole project and also Cape Light Compact. Just so people know.

Robert Whritenour: I wonder if I could just make a couple of brief comments. I want to be clear. I appear before you this morning as an applicant. I want to make clear that this is a municipal government town project that is proposed for the capped section of our former landfill. It's an area in town that because of the DEP regulations there is virtually nothing that we can do out there. And since it's been almost 10 years now, we've been working on a project that's been a goal in the strategic plan of the Board of Selectmen along with the Energy committee to try to get some green energy out on this specific facility to help make the town more carbon neutral and also have a good financial impact. So we have, I think, a

highly qualified team of consultants here. When the town sought to do this project we went to the Cape and Vineyard Electric Cooperative and asked for technical assistance and we had a couple rounds of state grants to study the feasibility and all of that work. It's been many years and it really culminates now. So I just want to be clear that, you know, we do have some private sector consultants that helped us take care of the technical aspects of this that you know the town just does not have the engineering staff to get that done. I really want to thank the CVEC folks and our team of consultants. We think we have a very solid project that has been designed to have a limited impact beyond just that capped landfill section of town, which, you know, really is land that is difficult to do anything within. So with that, I want to thank everyone for getting together. I know the circumstances are a little trying.

T Ewell Hopkins: Thank you Bob and I appreciate you participating throughout the entire process. Your input has been very helpful and reassuring, at least to me from the Planning Board perspective that this is a well thought out project and with very little unforeseen consequences, in my opinion, falling from it. Are there any other initial kind of framing the conversation comments and anyone else wants to make this seems like a good flow.

Mark Crossland: I've been told that some of this [property] might be deed restricted for nitrogen credits. We've used some already. I don't know how that will play out. But that's my initial comment.

T Ewell Hopkins: We're going to capture questions in a moment. And I've captured that and I want to answer all of them that we can so thank you there. Um, any other framing comments about the project as a whole. Any other consultants want to make

Liz Argo: I am executive director from Cape and Vineyard Electric Cooperative and I would just point out that the point of using capped landfills for solar has been the norm. So we now have projects, both on the Cape and on the island, that have solar projects on their cap. It's a very good use of an otherwise fallow piece of property and we've had a lot of good consultant help- the town's engineer of record for the capped landfill Dave Billow? of Sovereign Consulting has been on this since the beginning.

We did manage to get what's called a "META" grant Municipal Energy Technology grant in order to do the initial review of the project. And Dave was brought on thanks to that grant to review it very much in the beginning. I'd also point out that the DEP (Department of Environmental Protection) closely weighs in, heavily weighs in, on this use of the property for this. So in terms of where the solar panels can be placed and so on, that they are very much a part of that design, they will not tolerate any damage to either the over layer —meaning the dirt and grass—or the cap, especially, and of course they're working around the vent pipes.

This installation is kind of special because it will include some storage, which the state is now mandating. As of last week with the smart revisions, any solar project that's over 500 kilowatts, which this is very easily, must have a storage component. That's part of the state's new directives and that's in order to be eligible for any of the state's incentives so we are ahead of the game by knowing that we should have the storage as part of it. And I've been very, very impressed with Green Skies and the technical team that we've been working with to develop the battery part as well as the solar part. And with that, I think I can let the experts now speak for themselves.

T Ewell Hopkins: That's great. Thank you. Liz you answered two of my seven questions by just your intro so that's great. Any other framing comments that anyone wants to make? I've captured Mark's

specific question, we're going to get into that in context, in a moment. But are there any other framing questions or comments that people want to make.

Hearing none, let's, let's jump into what I would consider to be questions or concerns. In terms of the project that we should formulate an opinion on and, therefore, be able to respond to the ZBA. The Zoning Board of Appeals is represented on the call today so that they can hear firsthand some of our questions and our comments. I'm going to start off, and we'll for sure, pass the mic around to others when you have questions.

First of all, Liz, you mentioned that it's now a state mandate to have a storage component as a part of a solar project of this size, one of the things that I'd like to get some more clarification, and this was something that I discussed with Gail Barmakian as well is the housing of the storage, the battery technology and transformers. In terms of safety and any concerns about proximity, should they be in the same proximity, should they be spread apart if not give us some level of comfort that those issues of security and safety have been addressed and the location of the transformers and the battery technology.

Liz Argo: I would pass that back to my experts. They have specific information on that.

T Ewell Hopkins: Why don't we get into that, with whoever is appropriate to answer that question, if you could on the record, give me some assurance of how that's been thought through and what best practices have been employed. Do we have Brad?

Brad Parsons: I am with All Points Technology Corporation, just to introduce myself here.

We've got Scott Kronberger from Pure Power too, who was the electrical engineer for the project.

The battery units are self-contained units. The battery is actually located on the left side of that picture. They're kind of where the door is and then the other caged in kind of portion of that is where the inverters for the solar will sit so it's almost like a modular power unit here for the project. And there'll be two of these on site.

Richard Toole: Tell us the dimensions of that.

Brad Parsons: About 20 feet long by 10 feet wide and eight feet high.

T Ewell Hopkins: Thank you and they all are contained in this square by the highway barn. Correct?

Brad Parsons: That is correct. Steve from Stem is on the call as well. So if there are other specific technical questions with regards to the battery or the unit, he can definitely get into more technical questions, I guess.

T Ewell Hopkins: Were the components designed to be in close proximity and by showing us that rack approach, it's obvious that they were designed... it's not as if we're putting transformers and batteries next to each other where others would not have considered that in the past, so that's consistent with the design of the technology.

Liz Argo: These are air cooled, they have basically refrigerators, the same premise of a refrigerator and AC unit in them to keep them cool so the concept that there would be some massive amount of fluids is erroneous. There are no, for instance, oils that are being used to keep the new electronics cool.

T Ewell Hopkins: The second part of my question here... is impact on abutters. To me it seems as though that's probably the best [place] of all because if you envision this square that I'm looking at here, which is vacant right now... the Affordable Housing committee and the Select board are still working diligently on possibly developing housing where my cursor is spanning that scope, we have houses here. And we have houses over here. Well, we have lots that could be developed only one house, kind of, which is a trailer here, but these are lots. A lot of people don't realize and then you have houses way over here that can be considered as well. So actually having the transformer and the battery here to me seems to be most ideal in terms of access because you have a lot of hot top already here. You're not going to have to be pouring any more asphalt to have access and you can come in straight from the road here to service and you don't have to then enter on to the capped landfill in any capacity to do any kind of maintenance or ongoing work.

So that was my first question, the placement of the technology for transformers and batteries. It's a consideration to abutters, and was it designed in such a way to be in such close proximity to one another. I feel good about that and I'll respond to ZBA to that effect the battery details are in the proposal to see the next question that I have is we're going to have construction access to the site and then we're going to have a need for ongoing maintenance access to the site using this slide that's up now. Can someone walk me through how the site will be accessed for construction and then ongoing maintenance of the facility.

Brad Parsons: Yes, the access for the construction is obviously one of the critical pieces is getting on to the cap landfill itself. So with that, we've also taken into account that there's existing drainage. The gray lines around the array on the left on the west side are actually drainage. So the road that runs between the wastewater facility and the settling ponds that would be the access for what I'll call the west side or the West cap to come in and be able to access that and then also potentially being able to use the compost area to the south as some type of lay down area during construction since that would be off the calf as well. And then the access up to the cap itself would be basically just off of where the outfield is left field.

If you took left field from the baseball diamond and came over to the landfill, we're going to come up right in between two of those rows and come up the landfill perpendicular. Our proposal is to actually put down a geotextile fabric on the cap landfill itself and then add probably three inches of gravel base. If you're looking at grades that are approximately 20-25% in that range. So basically, we want to make sure that we're maintaining the integrity of the cap and by placing the geotextile and the gravel down, we feel that will maintain the grass coverage, reduce any concern for erosion on the cap there, and get it up to the top of the landfill on the western side.

We do not want to go from the west to the east really with access because there is an existing drainage swale that runs right there. What we'd like to do on the eastern side is coming off the southern highway barn parking area and then somewhere in there, we can figure out exactly where that best spot is based on topography, but coming off the highway barn paved area and then up to the cap, and again, once we get on the cap, we would put down some type of geotextile fabric and gravel. So that way, we're maintaining the integrity of the cap.

At one point in time there was some thought of County Road but I figured with the existing bike path there, I liked the idea of any traffic still coming in and out of the highway barn driveways, where you know anybody on the bike path is used to having vehicles come in and out and not introduce another spot during construction. That's the thought process right now for access during construction.

T Ewell Hopkins: Two clarifying questions: 1) Here off of County road on the bike path right when you settle down where the bike path meets the road there is emergency access to the facility right here. There's a gate in place. I guess for emergency and fire access. You are not anticipating accessing for construction or maintenance through that emergency gate.

Brad Parsons: At is point in time we weren't unless there is some concern from the highway department about coming in off of their parking area. We could use that as a secondary access, it's really what works best for the town here. You know, I think we could really go either way.

My thought process was just there was already traffic coming in and out of the highway barn parking area and that to keep the traffic in that vicinity, where, you know, everybody's used to seeing cars coming in and out vs. reintroducing it somewhere else.

Richard Toole: I will chime in on that. It is a blind corner there. You're coming up a hill and you're going around and it would be a shock to people to all of a sudden have something crossing the bike path there. So if that's not absolutely necessary to do. I would recommend the first plan coming in through the town highway barn.

T Ewell Hopkins: Yeah I would concur, from my perspective, this thick growth here that I'm outlining and all the way to not compromise it in any way would be ideal. So not to access down here in the southeast corner or anywhere along here would be ideal. Because again, this is a good picture this square right here which is for us now is in the thoughts of the town for development. So we would like to maintain as much screening and integrity that I'm highlighting now here as possible and if there's any way to avoid any kind of ongoing access or construction access along this road on Bellevue or here up to the highway barn would be ideal. Okay. And I'm not hearing a strong desire on your part to have that option available to you. Is that a realistic assessment?

Brad Parsons: Yes, that's correct.

T Ewell Hopkins: Okay, I guess I don't have any questions about shading if that can be maintained and we talked about the storage. Mark brought up a question around different credits that nitrogen specifically, that would be a value and benefit to the town by embarking on this project, Liz. Could you talk at all about some of the credits or other relief in financial burden that we may be experiencing beyond the production of electric power.

Mark Crossland: No, we have already used the credits, I believe, for this right here.

T Ewell Hopkins: Okay, so your question is were they aware of that fact.

Mark Crossland: That's what I was told. And it's on the Registry of Deeds that we've already used these credits for other affordable housing projects.

T Ewell Hopkins: Okay. So I guess the question is were you anticipating the use of those credits Liz for this project.

Liz Argo: Well, I think it's a semantic so I think we're talking about housing. Oh, well, you were talking about net metering credits then energy credits. We're not bringing in any kind of computation that would that have that kind the credits that that we're bringing forward or in the form of the energy that would be

produced, and being able to use those as their financial incentive. So I'll leave the discussion of nitrogen credits to others.

Peter Bradford: The property on the bottom right hand side, on the corner of that that whole property right there. We as a town have already done a nitrogen aggregation plan and taken the nitrogen credits from that property and we have applied them to about a dozen other properties in town. And part of that nitrogen aggregation plan, as I understand it, is a limitation that we cannot build any structure on the property. So, there is an aggregation plan in the Registry of Deeds. It was happening and we need to make sure that we're not violating that because it could jeopardize our ability to develop many other lots in town that already have the benefits of those credits.

T Ewell Hopkins: Tell me the property you're referring to.

Peter Bradford: That entire block (lower right-hand corner) from County Road about halfway down Bellevue. All the way out to County Road and then back down to Bellevue that's where that property already had one of these nitrogen aggregation plans. It was started about 15 years ago and a few of the ones that have the benefits of the credits have already been developed so it's something we need to check into with the Board of Health and the DEP to make sure that we're getting the solar array on top of this property isn't going to jeopardize our developed properties or the ability of our other properties.

T Ewell Hopkins: Or we have to find an alternative to find those credits somewhere else.

Peter Bradford: Or somewhere else, or that yes, of course. I mean, it shouldn't because we're not creating any nitrogen by building a solar array, but that's going to be up to the DEP and the Board of Health.

T Ewell Hopkins: Duly noted.

Marilyn Miller: Back when Brad was describing the access to the site, he mentioned a fabric. I just wanted to know if that is technology that's currently in use successfully for this purpose.

Brad Parsons: Yes. It's what we refer to as geotextile fabric. The best way to put it, is it's like a landscaping cloth, just a little bit more engineered and to provide that separation, so we can pull the gravel up afterwards and not have any damage to the cap.

Richard Toole: I'd like to hear a little bit about financial benefits so that everybody's aware of what they are to the town. I still don't understand energy credits, but Liz is very good at it. I want people to know that this is going to be a net benefit to Oak Bluffs, it's not going to cost the town anything.

Liz Argo: The beauty of state incentives is that they are in place to encourage renewable energy as we shift to that being our source of power for electricity ... a net metering credit is built on the value of different portions of your electric bill and so by putting in this solar array, for every kilowatt hour of power it produces there will be a net metering credit awarded to the town. That value right now is about 17 cents per kilowatt hour.

Compare that to the typical kilowatt hour costs charged by the electric company: between 20 and 22 cents.

So again, going back to the value of a net metering credit, it's 8.5 cents per kilowatt hour. However, the reason there is no capital costs to develop these projects is through what's called a power purchase agreement. The developer will be charging a power purchase fee per kilowatt hour — in this case, we haven't landed on the final fee because we're waiting to see which part of the incentive program we fall into. That's one reason we've all been working very diligently to bring it forward carefully, but quickly so that we can get the best incentive.

It's built on capacity. Once the capacity of the incentive is filled you drop into a less advantageous reward so the PPA that was bid was about eight cents per kilowatt hour, there is a CVEC "operational adder" which is half a penny that gets added to that eight cents. So you take your 17 cents and you subtract your eight and a half cents of the fee. That's what's the whole project is going to cost and you have your net 8.5 cents.

Essentially you have to pay half of your benefit back to the developer for them to have built, paid off all of the capital and to maintain the project. That eight and a half cents comes in the form of cash because this project does have a size where the utility has historically decided to cash these projects out. Alternatively, we would give them a directive that would tell them to send a very minute portion of the that award to each account in the town of Oak Bluffs. They've determined they don't want to be responsible for that kind of management distribution, so they will have the option, and they historically cash out. The town will get a check for the full net metering credit. Out of that credit they will then have to pay the developer the eight cents and they pay CVEC the half a penny.

CVEC manages all of that and this is part of why you keep us in so the checks actually come to CVEC and we net out the amount to the developer while CVEC keeps the half a penny to pay for its services. All of this is very carefully recorded and audited.

Richard Toole: So what is the potential production of this project if everything goes well.

Liz Argo: With the size of the project we're looking to see about \$130k per year go to the town in the form of cash with all of the costs netted out.

Richard Toole: Okay. There's a buyout that can take place if the town so chooses. Is that still going to be enforced?

Liz Argo: Yes. All of our contracts have buyouts. It's basically market value buyouts. CVEC did do an investigation to see if it was worthwhile to do buyouts for some of our projects that have been up and running for five years now, and we found that the financials weren't there for us. There are many legs to the stool on the developer side and other expenses that we're not even aware of, but yes, down the line there would be a buyout and clearly at a year when the contract term is expired. Then we will have to look at what do we do now. There's also decommissioning funded right up front so should the town decide that they want to remove the whole installation, that's already been paid for and secured.

Richard Toole: Let me be sure people understand: this project, even though it sits on a public piece of property in the town of Oak Bluffs, is not going to belong to the town of Oak Bluffs. Even though it's sponsored by our organization (Cape and Vineyard Electric Cooperative) it's not owned by CVEC — it is only managed by CVEC, but is owned by a private developer.

Liz Argo: Correct. And that's true of all the capped landfills.

Richard Toole: If the town chose to do this themselves [it would have to] pay for it, and it would cost a lot of money but their return would be all of that net metering credit. Or actually, the return would be the power well if they could use the power. If the town wanted to invest in this, they could, but I don't think we could come up with the money.

Liz Argo: We haven't come across any town that has that kind of capital.

T Ewell Hopkins: Thank you for that line of questioning Richard. Liz why we have you on the hotspot, you mentioned the state mandate for storage, which is new. Can you explain the rationale behind that mandate?

Liz Argo: One of the challenges with bringing renewable energy forward is that it is intermittent that is, that the when the sun is shining the power is flowing and when it's not, power is not flowing. What the batteries are meant to do is make it more of a constant so it flattens the curve.

T Ewell Hopkins: Right, but in this case it's flattening the solar curve which peaks when the sun is at its strongest and then falls off in the late afternoon.

Liz Argo: With the addition of battery storage, you now can have the power able to go into the evening hours and that's going to help the grid manage itself better so that's the rationale for the State saying we need to have this in what we call the duck curve. The batteries are the solution for flattening the duck curve and making solar power and wind power less of a spiky type of resource.

Richard Toole: One more question on that which might be interesting to people in the case of an emergency and we were cut off from America. Is there any way that we could benefit from this project?

Liz Argo: So the resiliency aspect of this project tying into any facility you don't have enough power usage anywhere near this solar installation. The resiliency piece which is very attractive is not what we started with. We had envisioned being able to power the waste treatment, the barn and the DPW barn with power from the PV and have the battery to make that power available when the grid is down, but the power requirement or the power usage at all three of those facilities is remarkably low.

The power that's coming off of your capped landfill far exceeds what any of those facilities or all three of those facilities combined can handle so that's why we went to the town and presented both options and the financial reward from doing what we called in this case "front of the meter." The power is going into the grid and benefiting all of those facilities but benefiting them indirectly in a virtual form rather than directly — that was the better benefit. To bring forward the potential resiliency wasn't financially sound — also they do all have generators [and we] didn't feel these were such critical that it warranted jeopardizing the financials for their own resiliency.

T Ewell Hopkins: I want to hear from other members of the Energy committee that Richard chairs if they haven't had a chance. I know we haven't heard from Peter Meleney. Any questions or comments that you want to make that for the record to go to the ZBA?

Hearing none, let me ask Andrea, you're on the line. Are there any other Members from the Zoning Board of Appeals? Do you have any questions that you would like for us to be able to answer before we send our recommendations?

Andrea Rogers: My question is purely a zoning question. If you look at the grid on the right, there's a little square... I was told that is residential property. So I just wanted to know if it was a residential property privately owned and because it's a zoning issue (Zone 3), what about the property line? On this grid it looks extremely close to that line.

T Ewell Hopkins: Yes, we have discussed. And Brad can comment in on this, as well as Bob. We have configured those arrays to be in compliance with setback requirements for that lot. Right now that lot has issues with its ability to be developed and accessed. As you can see, it's fairly landlocked. The town manager has been cognizant of this and I know Brad, we brought this up in an earlier meeting a few months ago and asked that that array here be configured to comply with zoning. Brad do you have any additional thoughts?

Brad Parsons: Ewell, I think we actually made the decision to, in this case, almost not comply with the setback zoning because it would have been— it's a foot setback and it would have drastically reduced the amount of output we would have seen there.

I want to point out a couple things for Andrea, as well as say yes, it is a private lot. However, that private lot is half on the capped landfill. So you can see the gray line, that's actually the approximate limits of the capped landfill. This lot itself actually falls within the DEP site assignment for the landfill and the transfer station so I think part of the thought is while it may be a private residential lot it's not actually a buildable lot. And how that transaction transpired at some point in time for somebody to be able to still be holding on to that lot and not the town that is interesting, but I think that was the rationale — it's really not a buildable lot. There is some flat space on that lot that we probably could have [considered] and likely would have liked to use and increase our production just a little bit more. However, since we didn't own it, we stayed off of it. We are right up to the edge of that that lot with the array.

T Ewell Hopkins: I appreciate that clarification, Brad. I was involved in some of the earlier conversation so realistically what we're looking at is only from where my cursor is over to here off of the DEP oversight.

Brad Parsons: Right. Correct. But the only way that that parcel could potentially even have access to itself is along that paper street just below it, which again is part of the site assignment. So anything that would need to be done there, they really don't even have access to the area because it is almost fenced off.

Also this is actually six parcels, and two papers streets. And we are showing the array crossing other town lots that have not been combined as one, even though the parcel is basically treated as one lot.

Andrea Rogers: Okay you clarified that for me. Thank you so much.

Marilyn Miller: I have two small questions. On the diagram up at the highway barn building [trapezoid area north of right array], can you tell me what that is?

T Ewell Hopkins: That's the communication tower which is currently in place now.

Marilyn Miller: Okay, so that's no longer proposed that's in place.

T Ewell Hopkins: The reason they designed that was in their shading measurements and other layouts of the panels, they wanted to determine the impact of the tower. I was curious about access to the tower and would this affect it. It doesn't designate it but if the tower were to fall, what's the circumference of it falling.

Marilyn Miller: Okay and that's all been satisfied. The other question is, looking at this stuff online and the document that had all the different views from different places, what is the impact, or what will be seen from Beach Road? There was a picture of the water tower, so what of this facility, if anything, will be seen with the view sheds.

Richard Toole: I think that they will be visible from Beach road, from the beach.

Marilyn Miller: The array itself?

Richard Toole: Yes.

Brad Parsons: I believe that when you see this photo [of water tower] here you may see the very top of the array. In this photo, you can see the top of the capped landfill, so that western array likely will be visible on top of the capped landfill just in front of the water tower.

Marilyn Miller: Okay, so what we're looking at in this photo is the existing [way it looks]. Are these panels fixed or are they rotating?

Brad Parsons: They are fixed tilt and if I remember the orientation, looking at the map correctly, you'll probably be looking more or less at the side of the panels. The panels will be angled slightly up there and they're almost pointed south-southwest. I think they will blend more with those tree lines just to the north and the south where you can see the landfill itself.

Marilyn Miller: So you don't anticipate any issues with glare or reflection or anything like that.

Brad Parsons: No, I don't believe so. And we did submit [plan] to the FAA and they ran their hazard analysis tool and determined that no glare study or further studies were required for this location.

Marilyn Miller: Okay, great. Thank you.

Richard Toole: And I would just like to chime in on that too, because I was on the MVC when we approved the tower. The FAA looked at that, too and that wasn't something they felt the need to worry about in flight path.

T Ewell Hopkins: Okay, are there any other questions of from the review committee? Kim, is there anything else needed?

Kim Leaird: The special permit granting authority is the ZBA so they just need [committee's] comments.

T Ewell Hopkins: So I'm not going to call for a vote of any sort. I just wanted to make sure that everyone was completely heard and that the record acknowledges that Conservation, Energy and Planning [along

with representation from ZBA], had a hearing and thoroughly vetted the application with representatives and you have a running list of who was here.

Are there any last points or comments before I call for adjournment?

Richard Toole: Speaking for the Energy Committee, the future goal for the whole island — for the world for that matter — is to reduce the use of fossil fuels to zero as soon as possible and that will require improving our renewable and increasing renewable energy supply, and this is a huge, huge, huge step in the right direction.

T Ewell Hopkins: Okay, with no other comments, is there a motion to adjourn?

Richard Toole: So moved.

Seconded by Andrea Rogers. All were in favor.

Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 10:10 a.m.

Documents on File: *Agenda; zoom video*