

Minutes
Clean Energy Development (CED) Board Meeting
June 13, 2012

In Attendance:

<u>Board Members</u>	Attending	Absent
Elizabeth Catlin (EC) Blue Wealth Management	X	
Sam Swanson (SS) – Pace Energy & Climate Center	X	
Jo Bradley (JB) – VT Economic Development Authority		X
Alex Ibey (AI) Commerce & Economic Development	X	
Patty Richards (PR) – La Capra Associates	X	
Gaye Symington (GS) High Meadows Fund	X	
Will Wiquist (WW) – Green Mountain Club	X	

Other Attendees:

Andrew Perchlik (AP) – Director Clean Energy Development Fund, Dept. of Public Service
Ed Delhagen (ED) – Department of Public Service

Attendees for part of the meeting:

Elizabeth Miller – Commissioner, Dept. of Public Service

Meeting brought to order at 1:11 pm with Gaye Symington and Andrew Perchlik presiding over the meeting.

I. Agenda

- a. Discussed & agreed upon meeting agenda.

II. Prior Meeting Minutes

- a. Reviewed the revised minutes from 12/14/11 meeting. EC moved to approve, SS seconded. Vote to approve was unanimous.
- b. Reviewed minutes from 3/14/12 meeting. AI moved to approve, EC seconded. During discussion the following sentence was requested to be added: “Board expressed an interest in having VT re-join CESA and in working with CESA and Mr. Sinclair on the CEDF’s strategic plan” (*add to section IV*). Vote to approve with amendment was unanimous.

III. Fund Manager Report

AP provided a review of CEDF’s May 31, 2012 financial statements. AP pointed out that the financial statements now include the outstanding loan balance owed to the CEDF from its borrowers. The outstanding balance of May 31st was \$2,977,202.33. AP highlighted the cash available position of the fund had improved significantly to the point were \$1.8M was available for deployment.

AP informed the Board that the solar and small wind incentive program was quickly deploying funds and that at the current pace would run out of funds by September. He

suggested that some of the available funds could be used to keep the program running for a short time until more sustainable funding could be secured for the program. There was brief discussion about the incentive program.

IV. Strategic Plan Discussion

A revised draft timeline was presented for consideration. The timeline included a final release slated for late October. There was discussion about moving the December Board meeting to November during which time the Board would be asked to vote on approving the plan. There was general support the timeline as presented and in changing the quarterly meeting from December to November 14th.

AP then walked through a printed outline for the plan. The outline included the use of two funding scenarios, a modest funded scenario from the generation tax (\$5M/yr) and a scenario with increased funding (\$7M/yr). There was a request to include quarterly budget numbers in the strategic plan's budget section.

There was a general discussion regarding CEDF's goals that led to an agreement to have Board members review the current goals and objectives developed in 2010) and suggest any changes/additions/deletions to those goals/sub-goals and objectives by June 29th. AP was requested to send out consolidated set of CEDF goals based on the comments sent in by Board members and changes suggested by CEDF staff.

Discussion turned to the possible change of the CEDF focus from it's past focus on getting the money out to projects quickly. Now, with funding at a pause point, there is an opportunity for the Board to review the goals and potentially generate a new set of goals and criteria to evaluate progress/success.

A question was asked as to whether the staff had conducted any kind of evaluation of previous projects. AP replied that there is no formal evaluation, but that staff will be getting together all the funding data since CEDF inception to review. Since the two prior fund managers now work in the Department AP said they would be getting together to review program successes and challenges. There were some projects that did not pan out and studies that did not lead to action. Staff will be looking at these past projects and program designs to help design strategies for the plan.

Conversation shifted to consideration of community scale projects, such as community scale solar. Board members questioned whether there was an opportunity for CEDF to incentivize projects at community scale with community ownership?

This led to a discussion on the pros and cons of limiting the scope of CEDF offerings. Historically, CEDF provided funding via grants, loans and rebates to a wide variety of clean energy technologies. Some board members felt that the fund should continue to fund many different kinds of projects and that issuing grant solicitations open to all technologies had advantages. Staff, expressed an interest in focusing the CEDF efforts to selected technologies that advance the Fund's goals the most. There was a discussion about focusing a grant program not on selected technologies but instead on the customer class, such as municipalities, public buildings, or public serving institutions. There was interest in such an approach but there was no clear decision about which direction to go.

There was agreement that this is one of the types of questions of importance for the strategic planning exercise.

The fund manager shared a set of *Planning Questions* for Board members to review. Responses to these scoping/planning questions were described as helping to shape or bound the planning exercise, and define subsequent proposed CEDF activities. Both staff and Board members were invited to share their individual reflections on these, including divergent opinions among staff and Board members who may have different perspectives.

- V. There was a quick review of next steps and the schedule for future meetings before the meeting adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 3:05