

Ms. Fallis asked if the consultant would be attending the WLAB meeting that morning. Mr. Fines stated the WLAB would prefer the consultant be at the WLAB meeting on the morning of November 7, 2018 with information on winter quarter averages. Mr. Hasheider stated the public had voted on a three percent increase and would like that to be addressed along with what the City Water Bond Issue promised. He added he would like to discuss the bond issue and the legalities. Mr. Johnsen clarified he was requesting the debt service requirement and how it was presented. Mr. Hasheider said he would also like to know what the revenue at risk would be. Mr. Parker suggested a meeting the week following the outreach meeting. The WLAB agreed to meet on Wednesday, November 14, 2018 at 9:00 a.m. to devise a final proposal. Mr. Parker concluded saying only 15 percent of the customers were affected but the report noted 85 percent were affected.

Action Items:

Mr. Parker asked if winter quarter averages could be done for residential. Ms. Talbert noted she would check into that.

Ms. Fines stated the WLAB would prefer the consultant be at the WLAB meeting on the morning of November 7, 2018 with information on winter quarter averages.

Mr. Hasheider stated the public had voted on a three percent increase and would like that to be addresses along with what the City Water Bond Issue promised. He added he would like to discuss the bond issue and the legalities.

Hasheider said he would also like to know what the revenue at risk would be.

Attachments: [Memo Water Rates Coummuity Outreach](#)

Attachments: [Community Outreach Plan - Proposed Water Rate Structure](#)

## VIII. DIRECTOR'S REPORTS

### a) Renewable Energy

#### i) Annual Report Revision

Mr. Johnsen began saying this item had been tabled from the last meeting. He noted staff wanted feedback and/or advice on how the WLAB wanted to see the methodology change. Mr. Johnsen advised this was the opportunity to do so. He noted he understood capacity credit was one area the board was interested in. Mr. Fines stated rebates were second. Mr. Parker provided a handout regarding the renewable energy ordinance calculation of impact on rates. He emphasized the WLAB has had an issue for many years regarding the interpretation of the ordinance. Mr. Hasheider introduced Mr. Dan Shifley with Dogwood Solar and Mr. Tom O'Connor with Solar Engineering. He stated the utility did not report the amount and cost produced by rooftop solar. Mr. Hasheider said there had been different aspects

discussed, the issue had been brought to Council's attention back in May, and Mr. Matt Pitzer had requested if the terminology was changed to allow the utility to account for all rooftop energy. He noted Ameren accounted for rooftop energy exactly as proposed along with other utilities across the country. He advised he had spoken to others that want their rooftop energy accounted for as well. Mr. Hasheider said if the utility accounted for the energy produced it would be substantial. He added there would be less cost for the utility with more benefit for the community. Mr. Hasheider noted Mr. Pitzer had requested to change "Electric Retail Sales" to "Electric Retail Use". Mr. Parker stated it was a simple change. He said to count all as renewable energy and add Photovoltaic to total demand to the the percentage. Mr. Johnsen clarified he meant one approach by adding generation and load. Mr. Parker confirmed. Mr. Hasheider pointed out Mr. Pitzer said to look at changing "sales" to "usage" then bring that back to Council. He added he would like to change "Electric Purchased" to "Electric Produced". Mr. Hasheider noted he would like for the WLAB to move forward for Council to change the wording from "Electric Retail Sales" to "Electric Retail Usage". Ms. Wenneker asked about the effect with the word changed from sales to usage. Mr. Johnsen noted sales leave good numbers adding there was currently no way to measure solar energy generated. Mr. Lucas pointed out production behind the meter was estimated. He added other utilities require production meters. Mr. Fines clarified production meters were meters between that captured the energy produced. Mr. Lucas confirmed he was correct. He added more than half of the estimated production was behind the meter. Mr. Lucas noted in one day, an air conditioner could use energy that would not always come to the utility. Mr. Parker asked about the amount of variation. Mr. Lucas advised last year there was an estimated 4600 megawatt hours (mWh) for one commercial customer. Mr. Shifley stated Boone Electric Coop (BEC) provided production meters. He added BEC would supply the meters and the contractor would install them. Mr. Fines noted the 15.5 percent on the renewable energy report. He said people read that differently. He requested information on what it really meant. Mr. Parker stated it meant that was the percentage the utility was receiving. He added the utility was on track with their goal. Mr. Parker explained the number came from the renewable energy. Mr. Fines asked what the public interpreted it as. Ms. Fallis stated she presumed it meant 15.5 percent of renewable energy was being produced from this utility. She added she felt others probably did too. Mr. Parker noted the interpretation was not unusual. He added some believe the power plant produces all Columbia's energy. Mr. Shifley stated it was his understanding the 15.5 percent accounted for all energy produced. He noted he felt the utility was under reporting the renewables as he felt the solar percentage should be higher. Mr. Parker advised it made a difference to the people who have installed rooftop solar. He added they should be getting credit for what was being produced.

**Mr. Jay Hashieder made a motion to propose changing "Electric Retail Sales" to "Electric Retail Usage" and have staff take the changes to Council**

with a second by Mr. Dick Parker. Motion passed 3-2, Aye from Ms. Kim Fallis, Mr. Dick Parker, and Mr. Jay Hasheider; Nay from Mr. Scott Fines; Ms. Robin Wenneker abstained.

Attachments: [Memo Renewable Energy Report Rev](#)

Attachments: [NM PV Renewable Impact CapRev](#)

Attachments: [Solar Cost Calculation](#)

#### ii) Photovoltaic Rebate Review

Mr. Johnsen noted this was a review of changes made due to concerns from changes to the rebate structure. He advised Mr. Freeman would be presenting this information. Mr. Freeman stated this came from a request from Mr. Hasheider and the breakdown was per year, KWh, Rebate amount, etc. He noted the intent was to make the rebates performance based rebates. Mr. Freeman stated the numbers for solar install included the fiscal year amounts and annual amounts. He explained the current rebate structure allowed for a 25 percent rebate premium for west facing arrays and a 25 percent rebate reduction for east facing arrays. He added the 25 percent premium presented a beneficial choice for systems to face west. Mr. Fines asked if there were many dual roofs. Mr. Freeman answered there were. Mr. Fines asked about complaints from contractors and if there were any issues. Mr. Freeman noted he had received some feedback. He noted the representation was to protect the rebates for longevity to keep it around as long as possible. Mr. Hasheider asked what the average delay from application to approval was. Mr. Freeman advised the time was less than one week from the time the application was received. Mr. Hasheider stated the number of installs had a steep decline from 70 to 24. He claimed other investor owned utilities such as Ameren, Kansas City Power and Light (KCP&L), and Empire, had rebate systems and required the same information as the City of Columbia. He then asked what utility rebate the model was structured from and why the City of Columbia was making it difficult to receive the rebates. Mr. Fines stated he did not feel as though it was being made difficult to receive rebates adding there was no information making that indication. Mr. Fracica asked if other models such as pathfinder had been reviewed. Mr. Freeman advised there had been other models considered and noted pathfinder had been an option. Ms. Fallis asked with new community installs if they would have the opportunity to take advantage of storage. Mr. Freeman advised it was the intent to do so.

Attachments: [Memo Photovoltaic Rebate Review](#)

### IX. CHAIRMAN'S REPORTS

#### a) Climate Action Plan Update (Hay Hasheider)

Mr. Hasheider advised the next meeting would be October 28, 2018 and the group would be reviewing the first draft of the plan.