Cape Light Compact
Executive Committee &
Governing Board Meeting

DATE: Wednesday, November 9, 2016
LOCATION: Innovation Room, Open Cape Building
3195 Main Street, Barnstable County Complex
TIME: 1:00 – 4:30 p.m.

AGENDA

1:00 pm
Open Session Vote on entry into Executive Session pursuant to M.G.L. c. 30A §§21(a)(3) and (a)(10) to discuss and potential vote on matters below, with a return to open session.
1. Confidential NextEra Energy power supply contract including trade secrets or confidential, competitively-sensitive or other proprietary information if it is determined that disclosure will adversely affect the Compact’s ability to conduct business in relation to other entities making, selling or distributing electric power and energy
2. Pending regulatory litigation strategy (D.P.U. 16-169) regarding dispute with National Grid and Compact and National Grid Agreement for Natural Gas Heated Homes

2:00
Public Comment

Approval of Minutes

Presentation and Discussion of 2015 Independently Audited Financial Statements, Chris Rogers, Clifton Larson Allen

Power Supply – potential vote on Green Aggregation Program for 2017

Energy Efficiency Update
1. Overview of 2017 Energy Efficiency Surcharge
2. Discussion and Potential Vote on Cap for Municipals: Mashpee Public Schools, Margaret Song

Chairman’s Report

Treasurer’s Report

Administrators’ Report:
1. Update on Administrative Services Agreement discussions
2. Discussion and potential vote on designating Compact Records Officer
3. Discussion and potential vote on Compact contract execution process
4. Upcoming vote for Executive Committee members

Board Member Update (Reserved for Updates on Member Activities the Chair Did Not Reasonably Anticipate Would be Discussed – No Voting)
Draft Minutes subject to correction, addition and Committee/Board Approval

Cape Light Compact
Governing Board and Executive Committee
Open Session Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, October 11, 2016

The Cape Light Compact Governing Board and Executive Committee met on Tuesday, October 11, 2016 in the Innovation Room, Open Cape Building, Barnstable County Complex, 3195 Main Street, Barnstable MA 02630 at 2:00 p.m.

PRESENT WERE:
1. Joyce Flynn, Chair, Yarmouth
2. Robert Schofield, Vice-Chair
3. Ronald Zweig, Secretary, Falmouth
4. David Anthony, Barnstable
5. Fred Fenlon, Eastham
6. Valerie Bell, Harwich
7. Thomas Donegan, Provincetown – until 4:11 pm
9. Joseph Buteau, Truro
10. Richard Elkin, Wellfleet
11. Sue Hruby, West Tisbury
12. Paul Pimentel, Edgartown
13. Martin Culik, Orleans Alternate
14. Joshua Peters, Sandwich
15. Richard Toole, Member at Large, Oak Bluffs – By phone at 2:20

ABSENT WERE:
16. Deane Keuch, Brewster
17. John Ally, Dukes County
18. Michael Hebert, Aquinnah
19. Brad Crowell, Dennis
20. Tisbury - vacant
21. Tim Carroll, Chilmark
22. Peter Cocolis, Treasurer, Chatham
23. Andrew Gottlieb, Mashpee
24. Sheila Lyons, Barnstable County

Members physically present: 14
Members present by phone: 1

LEGAL COUNSEL
Jeff Bernstein, Esq., BCK Law, PC

STAFF PRESENT:
Maggie Downey, Administrator
Austin Brandt, Power Supply Planner
Meredith Miller, EM&V Manager
Lindsay Henderson, Analyst
Greg Abbe, Analyst
Jacob Wright, Special Projects Coordinator

PUBLIC PRESENT:
Richard Andre – Vineyard Power

Chr. Flynn opened the meeting at 2:14 pm and recognized Board Members that were participating remotely by phone due to geographic distance.

PUBLIC COMMENT
There were no members of the public present.
CONSIDERATION OF MEETING MINUTES
The Board considered the September 14, 2016 Meeting Minutes. Chr. Flynn moved the Board vote to accept the amended minutes, seconded by R. Schofield and voted by roll call as follows:

2. R. Schofield – Bourne  yes  10. J. Peters – Sandwich  yes
6. V. Bell – Harwich  yes
7. R. Elkin – Oak Bluffs  yes
8. M. Culik – Orleans  yes

Motion carried in the affirmative (12-0-1)

R. Toole joined meeting via phone at 2:20 pm.

UPDATE ON ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DISCUSSIONS WITH BARNSTABLE COUNTY
Maggie Downey discussed a news article that was passed out to the members, and explained she had met with Bob Troy, Jack Yunits, and Compact counsel the previous week to discuss the Compact’s fiscal agency arrangements. All parties agreed that in accordance with MGL Chapter 164 Section 134 counties are not legally authorized to be a municipal aggregator. The authority to administer energy efficiency and power supply programs associated with budgets is under the control of the Compact member towns.
A follow-up meeting has been scheduled for Nov. 14. M. Downey also explained that consensus was reached during the meeting that the County Commissioners are not required to execute contracts. J. Buteau asked if the question of the Compact paying rent to Barnstable County had been resolved. M. Downey and J. Flynn both confirmed that rent is indeed being paid. M. Downey bound insurance coverage for general liability, public officials, property and crime, and umbrella the Compact on 9/31 with MIIA, after soliciting quotes and finding them the most affordable. J. Flynn asked Maggie and Legal to draft a definition of fiscal agent for board members to use in public forums. J. Flynn also asked Maggie to begin using a Compact email address, and wants updated numbers on both legal costs the Compact has paid in dealing with Barnstable County issues, as well as the amount we have paid for various services.

PRESENTATION ON PROPOSED OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT, RICHARD ANDRE, VINEYARD POWER
Richard Andre provided a presentation on the offshore wind projects. The Federal Government’s original area was shrunk by half after meeting with commercial fishermen in regards to the wind farms’ potential location. The zoned areas were created in response to prevailing winds and there’s equal shallow and deep pockets in each zone. R. Andre went on to explain that the zones went to developer auction in 2014 and 2 have been purchased. Developers are required to pay $500,000.00 in rent per year until they begin developing electricity. Vineyard Power has partnered with one of the developers to give a community input on the project. Survey work has already begun with local indigenous tribes to determine if previous life or other artifacts may be located on the sites. V. Bell asked if the Federal government had done any preliminary assessments prior to auctioning the sites, to which R. Andre said they had conducted environmental assessments, as well as requiring developers to issue environmental impact statements. R. Elkin asked what the kWh cost will be once these begin generating electricity. R. Andre replied by saying that could be 12-18 cents per kWh over the next 20 years.
Draft Minutes subject to correction, addition and Committee/Board Approval

CHAIRMAN’S REPORT
J. Flynn introduced the Compact’s new Special Projects Coordinator, Jake Wright. Went on to discuss board member packets and cover letter introduced during last meeting, and asked if a list of acronyms could be added so as to alleviate confusion.

ADMINISTRATOR’S REPORT
1. P. Cocolis was not present, Maggie stated the budget reports are inside the packet. No actions were taken from September through October.
2. M. Downey stated that mediation efforts with National Grid regarding Home Energy Services for gas heated homes proved unsuccessful.
3. M. Downey stated that the Annual Report for 2015 is complete and will be passed out at town presentations.

EXECUTIVE SESSION
At 3:59 p.m., Chr. Flynn moved that the Executive Committee enter into Executive Session Pursuant to M.G.L. Chapter 30A M.G.L. 30A, §§21(a)(3), to discuss update on pending regulatory litigation strategy (DPU 15-166) regarding a dispute between National Grid and the Compact related to provision of residential energy efficiency services to homes heated with natural gas. Chr. Flynn stated that the Governing Board would not return to Open Session at the conclusion of Executive Session.

Seconded by R. Schofield and voted by roll call as follows:

2. D. Anthony – Barnstable
3. R. Schofield - Bourne
4. F. Fenlon - Eastham
5. P. Pimentel - Edgartown
6. R. Zweig – Falmouth
7. V. Bell – Harwich
8. R. Toole – Oak Bluffs
9. T. Donegan – Provincetown
10. J. Peters – Sandwich
11. J. Buteau – Truro
12. R. Elkin – Wellfleet
13. S. Hruby – West Tisbury
14. J. Flynn - Yarmouth

Motion carried in the affirmative (14-0-0)

BOARD MEMBER UPDATE
No updates from the Board Members.

Meeting adjourned at 4:33 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Jacob Wright

LIST OF DOCUMENTS & EXHIBITS
- Meeting Notice/Agenda
- September 14, 2016 Meeting Minutes – Draft
- Petition for Ruling from National Grid
- Cape Light Compact FY17 Operating Budget Report dated 10/7/16
Draft Minutes subject to correction, addition and Committee/Board Approval

- Vineyard Power Geophysical Survey Presentation
- Cape Light Compact Annual Report 2015
- 2016 Energy Efficiency Budget through September
Green Aggregation Program

REQUESTED BY: Maggie Downey

Proposed Motion(s)

I move the Board pursue the roll-out of a Cape Light Compact Green Aggregation Program for all participating electric customers effective on January meter reads. Compact staff are directed to roll out the program on Wednesday, December 7, 2016.

The Compact Administrator is authorized and directed to take all actions necessary or appropriate to implement this vote, and to execute and deliver all documents as may be necessary or appropriate to implement this vote.

Additional Information

The Compact has been discussing offering a Green Aggregation program at its Board meetings for the past several months. The Compact held three public forums, and participated in a community forum on Green Aggregation. Attendee’s at all four events expressed interest and support in Green Aggregation.

Record of Board Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion by:</th>
<th>Second by:</th>
<th># Aye</th>
<th># Nay</th>
<th># Abstain</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why do we have RECs?

- Electricity is different than most other commodities in that the product (electrons) coming from the power grid can almost never be traced back to a specific source.

- To capture the characteristics (including environmental) of the electricity being produced (where, when, how it was produced, associated emissions, etc.), certificates are created for every MWh a generator produces. These are traded separately from the electricity itself, and have a separate value. When a certificate is produced from a renewable resource (as qualified by appropriate state agency), it is called a REC.
Renewable Energy Certificates

- There are many different types of RECs, which can be differentiated by:
  - Type of generation resource (e.g., solar, wind, hydro)
  - When resource was constructed
  - State/jurisdiction resource is located in
  - Voluntary vs. Mandatory qualification, etc...
- RECs are defined and “minted” at the state level according to RPS laws & regulations
- Different types of RECs have different economic value and impact on renewable energy generation
- Each REC has a unique identifier (serial number)
Outreach

- CLC held public meetings in W. Tisbury, Mashpee, and Harwich to inform ratepayers about green aggregation proposal and gather feedback.
- Also presented proposal at Brewster Community Network forum.
- Valuable feedback received was:
  - Generally, public understands the need for clean energy and is supportive of taking this step in an effort to address climate change.
  - Price point is a concern – green is great, but as long as it is affordable.
    - Supportive of indicative price impact.
  - It is important to be able to tell customers exactly where their green power is coming from/where their extra dollars are going.
  - Additionality is key – new renewables are important.
  - It was agreed that this adds value to the CLC aggregation, and is another reason to stay on/switch to CLC supply.
2017 Energy Efficiency Surcharge (EES)
Cape Light Compact Governing Board Meeting
November 9, 2016
Maggie Downey
What is the EES?

- Energy Efficiency Surcharge (EES) is the primary source of funding for Compact’s energy efficiency programs.
- Also referred to as the EERF (Energy Efficiency Reconciliation Factor).
- A cents/kWh rate added to customer’s bills (rolled into the T&D rate) to recover the portion Compact’s budget not recovered from other funding sources.
- Each November, the Compact files a proposed EES for the following calendar year with the MA DPU (e.g. 2017 EES)
- The rate proposed each year reflects both updates to other funding received and CLC’s expected budget for the coming year, as well as any over- or under-collection amounts and carryover $ from the current (2016) and prior (2015) operating year.
What are all the pieces that fund the Compact's programs?

1. SBC: The System Benefits Charge is a charge of $0.0025 per kWh on customers' bills.

2. FCM: Revenue from the Forward Capacity Market auction run by ISO.

3. RGGI: Revenue from the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative auctions.

4. EES: The Energy Efficiency Surcharge collects from customers the remainder of the Compact's budget.
How do these 4 pieces make up 2016 and 2017 funding?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>2016-2018 Plan</th>
<th>2017 EES</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Change (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBC</td>
<td>$5,031,877</td>
<td>$5,031,888</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCM</td>
<td>$910,855</td>
<td>$910,855</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGGI</td>
<td>$4,418,008</td>
<td>$1,523,724</td>
<td>$(2,894,284)</td>
<td>-66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EES</td>
<td>$31,594,164</td>
<td>$31,594,152</td>
<td>$(12)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$41,954,904</td>
<td>$39,060,619</td>
<td>$(2,894,285)</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBC</td>
<td>$5,009,774</td>
<td>$4,958,981</td>
<td>$(50,793)</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCM</td>
<td>$2,029,070</td>
<td>$2,028,985</td>
<td>$(85)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGGI</td>
<td>$5,114,894</td>
<td>$1,703,379</td>
<td>$(3,411,515)</td>
<td>-67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EES</td>
<td>$30,371,951</td>
<td>$35,806,506</td>
<td>$5,434,556</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$42,525,688</td>
<td>$44,497,852</td>
<td>$1,972,163</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is the Compact’s 2017 budget?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>2016-2018 Plan</th>
<th>2017 EES</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Change (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>$22,799,364</td>
<td>$23,298,822</td>
<td>$499,458</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income</td>
<td>$4,460,916</td>
<td>$5,311,133</td>
<td>$850,217</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;I</td>
<td>$15,243,721</td>
<td>$16,561,050</td>
<td>$1,317,329</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$42,504,001</strong></td>
<td><strong>$45,171,005</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,667,004</strong></td>
<td><strong>6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The difference between the 2017 budget of $45.2 million and the 2017 revenue of $44.5 million is the estimated carryover from 2016 into 2017.
Why is the 2017 budget increasing compared to Plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Change ($)</th>
<th>Reason for Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 800,000</td>
<td>Low-Income (10% minimum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 800,000</td>
<td>OPEB and Pension Liabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 792,203</td>
<td>Demand Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 264,360</td>
<td>C&amp;I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 190,527</td>
<td>Overhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ (180,086)</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 2,667,004</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are the proposed 2017 EES rates and monthly customer bill impacts?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>2016 in Effect</th>
<th>2017 in Plan</th>
<th>2017 Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2.024</td>
<td>1.706</td>
<td>2.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;I</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>1.383</td>
<td>1.647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2016 in Effect v. 2017 Proposed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Bill Impact ($)</th>
<th>Bill Impact (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>$0.13</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income</td>
<td>-$0.26</td>
<td>-0.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;I</td>
<td>$2.81 - $3,530.47</td>
<td>2.25% - 3.99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda Action Request
Cape Light Compact
Meeting Date: 2/11/2015

WAIVER OF INCENTIVE CAP
TOWN OF FALMOUTH ESCO PROJECT

REQUESTED BY: Margaret Song

Proposed Motion(s)

I move the Board vote to revise the waiver of the $150,000 incentive cap for Mashpee High School, increasing the cap to allow for a project incentive of no more than $475,000.

The Compact Administrator is authorized and directed to take all actions necessary or appropriate to implement this vote, and to execute and deliver all documents as may be necessary or appropriate to implement this vote.

Additional Information

The Cape Light Compact caps its incentive for individual municipal projects at $150k, with the proviso that the CLC Board may waive that cap as it deems appropriate. The proposed motion is to approve a waiver for Mashpee High School. Proposed measures include a major lighting retrofit.

The Project facts are summarized as follows:
- Total Annual kWh savings: 477,264 kWh (estimate)
- Benefit/Cost Ratio (BCR): 2.58
- Total Customer Incentive: Not to exceed $450,000

Record of Board Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion by</th>
<th>Second by</th>
<th># Aye</th>
<th># Nay</th>
<th># Abstain</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Aquinnah
Barnstable
Barnstable County
Bourne
Brewster
Chatham
Chilmark
Dennis
Dukes County
Eastham
Edgartown
Falmouth
Harwich
Mashpee
Oak Bluffs
Orleans
Provincetown
Sandwich
Tisbury
Truro
Wellsfleet
West Tisbury
Yarmouth
WAIVER OF INCENTIVE CAP
MASHPEE HIGH SCHOOL

REQUESTED BY: Margaret Song

Proposed Motion(s)

I move the Board vote to revise the waiver of the $150,000 incentive cap for Mashpee High School, increasing the cap to allow for a project incentive of no more than $475,000.

The Compact Administrator is authorized and directed to take all actions necessary or appropriate to implement this vote and to execute and deliver all documents as may be necessary or appropriate to implement this vote.

Additional Information

The Cape Light Compact caps its incentive for individual municipal projects at $150k, with the proviso that the CLLC Board may waive that cap as it deems appropriate. The proposed motion is to approve a waiver for Mashpee High School. Proposed measures include a major lighting retrofit.

The Project facts are summarized as follows:
- Total Annual kWh savings: 477,264 kWh (estimate)
- Benefit/Cost Ratio (BCR): 2.58
- Total Customer Incentive: Not to exceed $475,000

Record of Board Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion by:</th>
<th>Second by:</th>
<th># Aye</th>
<th># Nay</th>
<th># Abstain</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC RECORDS PROCEDURE
CHECKLIST FOR RECORDS ACCESS OFFICER(S) OF MUNICIPALITIES

By: Kevin Bati, Esq. Anderson & Kreiger, LLP

An Act to Improve Public Records
Chapter 121, Acts of 2016

Chapter 121, Acts of 2016 (the “Public Records Act”) was enacted by the Massachusetts Legislature and signed into law by Governor Baker on June 3, 2016. Most of its provisions become effective on January, 2017. The Public Records Act inserts a new section 6A into G. L. c. 66 (the Public Records Law) that requires for the first time that each municipality designate one or more Records Access Officers (RAOs) to assist records requestors, to coordinate responses to requests and to prepare guidelines for access to public records held by the municipality. The municipal clerk, his or her designees and any other persons appointed by the Chief Executive of the municipality, serve as RAOs for the municipality. This checklist is intended to provide a starting point for municipal RAOs to comply with the minimum statutory procedures required by the Public Records Act, but does not address procedures for appeal by requestors to the Supervisor or to Court. The statute prevails over any inconsistencies in this checklist due to parapraghing of requirements. This checklist may be supplemented or superseded by regulations to be promulgated by the Supervisor of Public Records, a draft of which has been released.

1. Receipt of Request for Public Records
   a. Verify request received by hand, by mail or by email.1,2

b. Review request to determine if records “reasonably described.” RAO may request clarification from requestor.

c. Determine and record due date for production of records or response (10 business days following the date of receipt).4,5,6

2. Initial Processing of Request prior to 10th Business Day
   a. Do records requested exist within the possession, custody or control of the municipality or municipal agency for which RAO is responsible?7

b. If RAO is responsible for a department or agency within the municipality, should requestor be referred to RAO of another department, or to the municipal clerk?

c. Send copy of request, and/or contact municipal employees and board members who may have custody of requested records.

d. If records exist, how many business days will likely be required to search, compile and reproduce records? The municipal RAO has the right to an additional 15 business days after the initial 10 business days,8 if the magnitude or difficulty of the request, or multiple requests from the same requestor, unduly burdens the other responsibilities of the municipality and therefore the municipality is unable to produce the records within 10 business days of the request. Therefore, consider the following:
   i. Based on nature of request, assess magnitude (volume) of requested records.
   ii. Based on nature of request, assess difficulty of compliance with request.

1. G. L. c. 66, §10(a). as amended by St. 2016, c. 121. Subsequent citations will be made to G. L. c. 66 only, which will be assumed to include the amendments to that chapter made by St. 2016, c. 121.

2. While the Public Records Act provides that requests “may be delivered to the records access officer by hand or first class mail . . . , or via electronic mail,” the draft regulations issued by the Supervisor of Records continue to allow in-person verbal requests. Under current law and the draft regulations, verbal requests would not trigger the right by a requestor to appeal to the Supervisor.


4. G. L. c. 66, §10(a).

5. Under most statutory regimes, computation of time should begin the business day following the date received. The Supervisor’s draft regulations adhere to this common standard.

6. Under the Supervisor’s draft regulations, “business day” is defined to exclude Saturdays, Sundays, legal holidays and other days that the municipal office is unexpectedly closed.

7. G. L. c. 66, §10(a)(ii).

8. State agency RAOs are limited to an additional 5 business days, or 15 total, following the initial request.
iii. Determine whether records likely to be found in multiple locations, or held by multiple persons.

iv. Has requestor made multiple recent requests, such that request could be considered harassment?

v. Are email records requested? Make preliminary determination of search methodology or search terms for responsive email records and resulting volume or difficulty in producing them.

vi. Based on nature of request, will any requested records likely be withheld as exempt or attorney-client privileged?

vii. Will substantial redaction of records be necessary to protect exempt or privileged material?

viii. Will other immediate responsibilities and priorities limit the availability or time of staff or other persons, such as volunteer board members, who are needed to fulfill request, and therefore impair ability to respond to records request within 10 business days?

ix. Determine if fee should be assessed requestor (see Section 7 on fees).

x. If fee is to be assessed, estimate amount of fee, and provide as soon as possible to requestor.

e. If available as electronic records, records should be provided to requestor in the requested electronic format or in a standard, machine searchable electronic format, unless records are held only as paper records, or requestor is unable to receive or access electronic records.9

i. Are records held in electronic media, or only as paper hard copies?

ii. Has requestor specified that electronic records should be provided in any particular electronic format?

iii. Has requestor indicated inability to receive or access records if provided in electronic format?

f. If more than 10 business days are likely to be needed to comply with request, or if records will likely be withheld or redacted, draft response letter to requestor.

3. Production of Records

a. If no additional time beyond 10 business days will be needed nor records withheld or redacted, communicate to requestor no later than the 10th business day following receipt of the request that records are ready for inspection, retrieval or delivery.

b. When records are available on public website, provide access information to requestor for such records.10

c. Collect fee, if any, prior to providing records to requestor.11

d. Make records available for inspection, for pickup or delivery by mail, email or facsimile, as the requestor requests, in electronic format unless exceptions to production in electronic format apply.12

e. Document date records provided, number of hours of all municipal employees and board members to fulfill request, and fees, if any, charged.13

4. Additional Time for Production and Withholding Records

a. When additional time is needed to produce the records, or records are to be withheld (or redacted), send letter by mail, email or facsimile no later than 10th business day after receipt of request. Letter should include the following:14

i. Confirm receipt of request,

ii. Identify records or categories of records not within municipality’s possession, custody or control;

iii. Identify any other agency, if known, that may hold records requested;

Continued onto page 6
iv. Identify records, categories or portions of records intended to be withheld and reasons and specified exemptions for non-disclosure; if subsequent detailed review of records reveals additional records, categories or portions of records to be withheld or redacted in accordance with state and federal law, supplement this response to identify such records and reasons for non-disclosure;

v. Identify records, categories and portions of records to be produced, and describe in detail why magnitude or difficulty of request unduly burdens other responsibilities of municipality and therefore requires additional time to produce the records;

vi. Identify a reasonable timeframe to produce records sought, not to exceed 25 business days from the initial receipt of request, or a later date agreed to by requestor;

vii. Suggest a reasonable modification of the scope of the request if records could then be produced more efficiently and affordably;

viii. Provide an itemized, good faith estimate of fees, if any, to be charged;

ix. Include statement of requestor's appeal rights to Supervisor of Records and to Superior Court.

b. RAO should consider seeking assistance of counsel to review this letter.

5. Appeal by RAO to Supervisor of Records for More Time

a. If more than 25 business days will be needed to comply with the request, the RAO should make such a determination no later than the 20th business day after receipt of the request (or within 10 business days of a determination by the Supervisor of Records that a withheld record must be produced).

b. The RAO should draft and submit a written petition to the Supervisor of Records no later than the 20th business day after the receipt of the request.

c. The RAO should consider whether to seek assistance of counsel to draft petition.

d. The RAO's petition for additional time should include any of the following information that supports the need for additional time:

i. The time estimated to search for, collect, examine and redact records;

ii. The scope of redaction required to prevent unlawful disclosure;

iii. The capacity and normal hours of business of the municipality to fulfill the request without the extension of time;

iv. Efforts already undertaken to fulfill the current and previous requests;

v. Whether the current and any previous requests are frivolous or intended to harass or intimidate the municipality;

vi. The public interest, or absence of public interest, in producing the documents more quickly.

e. The RAO shall provide a copy of the written petition to the requestor.

f. The Supervisor of Records is to decide such appeal within 5 business days.

g. Records should be produced within time ordered by Supervisor.

6. Fees

a. Costs that may be included in fees for records production:

i. Cost of storage device

ii. $.05/page of materials printed in black and white (both single and double sided pages).

iii. Hourly rate of lowest paid employee with necessary skill to compile, segregate, redact and reproduce records not to exceed $25/hour unless approved upon petition to Supervisor of Records.

iv. Employee time may include outside vendor time.

Continued onto page 7
b. Costs that may not be included in fee for records production
   i. Municipalities with populations over 20,000 may not charge for first two hours of staff time.
   ii. Staff time for segregation and redaction unless required by law or approved by Supervisor of Records.

c. Petition to Supervisor for fee adjustments.
   i. Hourly rates in excess of $25/hour.
   ii. Time spent for segregation and redaction when not required by law.
   iii. Grounds for Supervisor to grant adjustment:
       1. For requests commercial in nature, or
       2. Fee represents actual good faith cost of compliance, request could not have been prudently completed without redaction or increase in hourly rate, fee is reasonable and not designed to limit access to public records.

3. Supervisor shall also consider public interest in limiting fees charged and financial ability of requestor to pay additional fees.

d. Waiver of fees by RAO
   i. If disclosure of records is in public interest.
   ii. If records request not primarily in commercial interest of requestor.
   iii. Upon showing of financial hardship of requestor to pay full fee.

e. Denial of records to requestor who has failed to pay for previously produced records; RAO provides written denial and itemized balance of fees still owed.

f. Forfeiture of fees: If Court awards attorneys fees to requestor who successfully obtains judicial relief in litigation, fees for production of records also forfeited.18

**FLOW CHART OF PROCEDURES UNDER PUBLIC RECORDS LAW**

1. Receipt of Records Request (1)
   - Initial Processing of Request (2)
     - Production of Records Without Withholding or Extending Time (3)
     - Response Letter if Withholding, Redacting or Extending Time (4)

2. Request Supervisor for Additional Time (5)
   - Decision by Supervisor (5)
     - Produce Records by Time Ordered by Supervisor (5)

3. 10 Business Days
4. 10 Business Days
5. 5 Business Days
6. Up to 30 Business Days

---

18 G. L. c. 66, §13A(1)(3)
### Savings from CVEC PV projects through June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>TOTAL PV15</th>
<th>TOTAL PV16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NON PEG To Date</td>
<td>PEG 7-2015</td>
<td>223,666.67</td>
<td>41,232.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC To Date</td>
<td>PEG 2016</td>
<td>221,873.80</td>
<td>75,193.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PEG To Date</td>
<td></td>
<td>445,539.47</td>
<td>116,425.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY 2015 savings to participants through Net Metering Credits or Behind-the-Meter avoided electric costs through June 30, 2016:


FY 2016 savings to participants through Net Metering Credits or Behind-the-Meter avoided electric costs through June 30, 2016:

- PEG 2016 projects.

FY 2017 savings to participants through Net Metering Credits or Behind-the-Meter avoided electric costs through June 30, 2016:

- PEG 2017 projects.

FY 2018 savings to participants through Net Metering Credits or Behind-the-Meter avoided electric costs through June 30, 2016:

- PEG 2018 projects.

**Total**:

- Non-PEG To Date: $106,202.44
- PEG 7-2015: $33,670.26
- PEG 2015: $1,416,125.00
- CEC 2015: $1,443,010.69
- Total PEG To Date: $2,325,132.49
- Total PV15: $1,569,037.25
- Total PV16: $2,127,222.94
- Total: $3,717,437.73

**Notes**:

- CVEC avoided an estimated cost of $0.89 to calculate avoided electric costs for the 13 Behind-the-Meter projects.

**Other PEC Projects**:

- The Airport, Fire District, DGY Ground Mount, ME Small Ground Mount, and the two ground mounts in Edgartown.

**Additional Projects**:

- Construction of PV projects in Edgartown.

**Source**:

- Group photo at Earth Day 2015 exhibition on the CPEC facilitates the PV installation.
# BARNSTABLE COUNTY
Revenue From Cape Light Compact
FY16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account #</th>
<th>Account Description</th>
<th>Revenue From CLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001141 4201</td>
<td>Finance Dept Revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07/15-12/15 CLC</td>
<td>9,582.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bank Fee</td>
<td>38.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/16-03/16 CLC</td>
<td>5,446.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04/16-06/16 CLC</td>
<td>970.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,038.44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001910 4220</td>
<td>Rental Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7/1/15-9/21/15 CLC Superior Court</td>
<td>4,517.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/22/15-12/31/15 CLC Innov Bldg</td>
<td>20,416.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01-03/16 CLC Innov Room Bldg</td>
<td>15,289.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04-06/16 CLC Innov Room Bldg</td>
<td>20,642.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,865.14</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012000 4201</td>
<td>Facilities Revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07/15-12/15 CLC</td>
<td>18,452.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/16-03/16 CLC</td>
<td>9,225.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/16-03/16 CLC</td>
<td>9,226.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36,904.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001105 4201</td>
<td>IT Support Services-CLC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07/01/15-12/12/15</td>
<td>16,197.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/13/15-04/30/16</td>
<td>18,038.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05/16-06/16</td>
<td>632.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,869.27</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>148,676.85</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maggie Downey

From: Briana Kane
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2016 11:36 AM
To: Maggie Downey
Subject: Deane Keuch service

Maggie—

I just saw an update on Dean’s service

Service Information
Memorial Service
Saturday, November 12, 2016
2:00 pm
First Church of Harwich
697 Main Street
Harwich, MA 02645

Briana C. Kane
Senior Analyst
Cape Light Compact
P.O. Box 427
Barnstable, MA 02630

508-744-1277 direc: dial
508-237-7893 cell
774-330-3018 fax
www.capelightcomract.org

Stay Connected!

[Social media icons]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Approp</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>YTD Expended</th>
<th>YTD Expended</th>
<th>Encumbrances</th>
<th>Available Budget</th>
<th>% Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8074 CAPE LIGHT COMPACT OPERATING FUND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8074 5100</strong></td>
<td>CLC OPERATG FD-SALARIES</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>148,500.00</td>
<td>67,431.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8074 5199</strong></td>
<td>CLC OPERATG FD-SALARY RESERVE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8074 5213</strong></td>
<td>CLC OPERATG FD-TELEPHONES</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>101.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>293.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8074 5220</strong></td>
<td>CLC OPERATG FD-UTILITIES</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,200.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8074 5233</strong></td>
<td>CLC OPERATG FD-AUDIT/ACCTG SVCS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
<td>10,180.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8074 5233</strong></td>
<td>CLC OPERATG FD-LEGAL SERVICES</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>232,019.00</td>
<td>50,465.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8074 5238</strong></td>
<td>CLC OPERATG FD-IT COUNTY SUPRT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8,750.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8074 5239</strong></td>
<td>CLC OPERATG FD-CONTRACTUAL</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>65,000.00</td>
<td>13,060.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13,162.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8074 5244</strong></td>
<td>CLC OPERATG FD-PROFESS DEVELOP</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>1,100.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8074 5270</strong></td>
<td>CLC OPERATG FD-CUSTO/MAIN-CITY</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9,769.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8074 5281</strong></td>
<td>CLC OPERATG FD-OUTSTATE TRAVEL</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8074 5282</strong></td>
<td>CLC OPERATG FD-IN STATE TRAVEL</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16,000.00</td>
<td>2,025.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>151.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8074 5291</strong></td>
<td>CLC OPERATG FD-ADVERTISING</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>45,100.00</td>
<td>6,224.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,985.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8074 5293</strong></td>
<td>CLC OPER-OUTRCH/MARKETG CONTRC</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>36,000.00</td>
<td>13,530.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>18,422.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8074 5294</strong></td>
<td>CLC OPERATG FD-FREIGHT/SHPFG</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8074 5295</strong></td>
<td>CLC OPERATG FD-FRINTG/COPYG</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
<td>3,061.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8074 5320</strong></td>
<td>CLC OPERATG FD-FOOD SUPPLIES</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>755.61</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>101.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8074 5361</strong></td>
<td>CLC OPERATG FD-POSTAGE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12,852.00</td>
<td>2,788.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8074 5399</strong></td>
<td>CLC OPERATG FD-SUPPLIES</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>37.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Barnstable County

#### EXPENDITURE TOTALS

**FOR 2017 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIGINAL APPROP</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>YTD EXPENDED</th>
<th>YTD EXPENDED</th>
<th>ENCUMBRANCES</th>
<th>AVAILABLE BUDGET</th>
<th>% USED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8074 5421</td>
<td>CLC OPERTG FD-SPONSORSHIPS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
<td>11,005.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>18,995.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8074 5423</td>
<td>CLC OPERTG FD-SUBSCRIPTIONS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>18,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>14,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8074 5433</td>
<td>CLC OPERTG FD-PUBLIC OFFICE INS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,692.38</td>
<td>2,307.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8074 5462</td>
<td>CLC OPERTG FD-BUILDING RENTAL</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>21,174.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>21,174.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8074 5463</td>
<td>CLC OPERTG FD-EQUIP RENTAL</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8074 5499</td>
<td>CLC OPERTG FD-BANK FEES</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL EXPENSES**

|                | 790,634.23 | 193,370.01 | 0.00 | 38,181.96 | 559,082.27 | 29.3% |

**GRAND TOTAL**

|                | 790,634.23 | 193,370.01 | 0.00 | 38,181.96 | 559,082.27 | 29.3% |

**END OF REPORT - Generated by Maggie Downey**
Cape Light Compact

2015 Audit Exit Conference

Date: November 9, 2016

Presented by: Chris Rogers, CPA, Principal

Agenda

- Financial statements
  - Structure
  - Reporting entity
  - Terminology changes
  - Financial Highlights (opinion, numbers, footnotes, etc.)

- Reports on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting and on Compliance and Other Matters

- Governance Communication

- Questions
Financial Statement Structure

- Auditors’ Opinion (1-3)
- Management’s Discussion and Analysis (4-8)
- Financial Statements and Notes (9-19)
- Additional Information
  - Combining Statement of Net Position by Program (20)
  - Combining Statement of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Net Position by Program (21)
  - Reconciliation of Audited Energy Efficiency GAAP Expenses to DPU Report (22)

Reporting Entity

- Financial statements include the direct financial activities of the Compact, such as:
  - Energy efficiency programs funded by:
    - Energy efficiency/system benefit charges
    - EERF charges
    - RGGI proceeds received via the Commonwealth
    - Forward capacity market
  - Opt-in green program
- Financial statements do not include:
  - Federal and state grants received by Barnstable County but administered by the Compact
    - These funds are reported as governmental funds in Barnstable County’s annual audited financial statements
Terminology Changes

- Salaries and benefits now reported as contracted labor
- Accrued payroll now reported as accrued contracted labor payable
- Due to Barnstable County (OPEB) now reported as accrued long-term liabilities
- Compensated absences now reported as accrued contracted labor – compensated absences

Financial Highlights

- Opinion (p 1-3)
  - Unmodified, which is the best opinion available and consistent with prior years
  - What does “Unmodified” mean?
    - Financial statements presented fairly, in all material respects, the financial position and results of operations and cash flows in accordance with US generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP)
Financial Highlights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of Net Position (p 9)</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Change ($)</th>
<th>Change (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>$4.1M</td>
<td>$9.3M</td>
<td>($5.2M)</td>
<td>-56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivables</td>
<td>$3.6M</td>
<td>$3.6M</td>
<td>$0.0M</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital assets</td>
<td>$0.5M</td>
<td>$0.0M</td>
<td>$0.5M</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payables</td>
<td>$5.1M</td>
<td>$8.8M</td>
<td>($3.7M)</td>
<td>-42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued contracted payroll and CA</td>
<td>$0.2M</td>
<td>$0.1M</td>
<td>$0.1M</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued long-term liabilities</td>
<td>$3.1M</td>
<td>$0.6M</td>
<td>$2.5M</td>
<td>416%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Position</td>
<td>($5.1M)</td>
<td>$3.5M</td>
<td>($3.6M)</td>
<td>(103%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial Highlights

- Components of Net Position by Program
  - Energy Efficiency - ($1.3M)
  - Power Supply Reserve - $0.9M
  - Operating Fund - $45k
  - Green Program - $227k
Financial Highlights

Statement of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Net Position (p 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Revenues</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Change ($)</th>
<th>Change (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficiency</td>
<td>$33.7M</td>
<td>$29.9M</td>
<td>$3.8M</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML adder</td>
<td>$0.7M</td>
<td>$1.0M</td>
<td>($0.3M)</td>
<td>(30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental</td>
<td>$2.0M</td>
<td>$1.9M</td>
<td>$0.1M</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Program</td>
<td>$0.1M</td>
<td>$0.1M</td>
<td>$0.1M</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Expenses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Labor</td>
<td>$4.4M</td>
<td>$1.8M</td>
<td>$2.6M</td>
<td>144%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficiency</td>
<td>$35.3M</td>
<td>$34.6M</td>
<td>($0.7M)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to CVEC</td>
<td>$0.0M</td>
<td>$0.4M</td>
<td>($0.4M)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>$0.6M</td>
<td>$0.8M</td>
<td>($0.2M)</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$1.0M</td>
<td>$0.6M</td>
<td>$0.4M</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial Highlights

Statement of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Net Position (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonoperating Revenues (Expenses)</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Change ($)</th>
<th>Change (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forward Cap Market</td>
<td>$1.1M</td>
<td>$1.1M</td>
<td>$0.0M</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC's and Inv Income</td>
<td>$0.2M</td>
<td>$0.2M</td>
<td>$0.0M</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Net Position</td>
<td>($3.6M)</td>
<td>($4.0M)</td>
<td>$0.4M</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial Highlights

- Note 5 - Long-term Obligations (p 16)
  - Accrued Long-Term Liabilities - $3.1M
    - Represents charge backs from the County related to the Net OPEB Obligation ($693K) and Net Pension Liability ($2.4M)
    - FY 15 was the first year the Net Pension Liability was charged back to the Compact since the County had to implement GASB No. 68, *Accounting and Financial Reporting for Pensions*, during their fiscal year 2015.
    - See Note 6 (p 16-17) for further detail
  - Compensated absences - $138K

Financial Highlights

- Note 7 – Related Party Transactions (17-18)
  - Administrative Services agreement with County at a cost of $55,000
  - Rent and custodial services paid to the County at a cost of $38,000
  - The Compact has secured a $100k line of credit for CVEC
    - No amounts have been drawn
  - The Compact purchases (at CVEC’s cost) REC’s purchased by CVEC for the Compact’s Green Program
    - Purchases totaled $32,000
Financial Highlights

- Note 10 – Commitments (18-19)
  - REC Purchases
    - Committed under an agreement to purchase RECs at fixed prices through June 2017
      - Estimated commitment totals $9.9M
    - Committed to purchase all REC’s purchased by CVEC for an amount equal to CVEC’s cost through September 2015
      - Amount cannot be reasonably estimated
  - REC Sales
    - Committed to sell REC’s it has acquired (or had committed to acquire) at fixed prices through June 2017
      - Expected inflows total $9.9M

Financial Highlights

- Note 10 – Commitments (18-19)
  - Compact participates in ISO-NE Forward Capacity Market
    - Committed to deliver specified units of EE at a fixed price per unit
      - Penalties are assessed if Compact fails to deliver its capacity supply obligation
Financial Highlights

- Additional Information (20-22)
  - Combining Statement of Net Position by Program (20) and Combining Statement of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Net Position by Program (p 21)
    - These statements segregate the Compact’s activities between Energy Efficiency, Power Supply Reserve, budgeted operating funds and the Green Program
  - Reconciliation of audited GAAP EE operating expenses to annual DPU report (p 22)

Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting and on Compliance and Other Matters

- Required by Government Auditing Standards
- No opinion provided
- Must report the following:
  - Any significant deficiencies or material weaknesses in internal control over financial reporting
  - Material noncompliance related to laws, regulations, contracts and grant agreements
- Results
  - No findings
Governance Communication

• Contents of letter
  – Accounting policies, estimates and disclosures
  – Difficulties encountered
  – Uncorrected and corrected misstatements
  – Disagreements with management
  – Management representations
  – Management consultations with other independent accountants
  – Other audit findings
  – Other information contained in the audited financial statements

Questions
2017 Energy Efficiency Surcharge (EES)
Cape Light Compact Governing Board Meeting
November 9, 2016
Maggie Downey

What is the EES?

- Energy Efficiency Surcharge (EES) is the primary source of funding for Compact's energy efficiency programs.
- Also referred to as the EERF (Energy Efficiency Reconciliation Factor).
- A cents/kWh rate added to customer's bills (rolled into the T&D rate) to recover the portion Compact's budget not recovered from other funding sources.
- Each November, the Compact files a proposed EES for the following calendar year with the MA DPU (e.g. 2017 EES)
- The rate proposed each year reflects both updates to other funding received and CLC's expected budget for the coming year, as well as any over- or under-collection amounts and carryover $ from the current (2016) and prior (2015) operating year.
What are all the pieces that fund the Compact’s programs?

1. SBC: The System Benefits Charge is a charge of $0.0025 per kWh on customers' bills.
2. FCM: Revenue from the Forward Capacity Market auction run by ISO.
3. RGGI: Revenue from the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative auctions.
4. EES: The Energy Efficiency Surcharge collects from customers the remainder of the Compact's budget.

How do these 4 pieces make up 2016 and 2017 funding?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>2016-2018 Plan</th>
<th>2017 EES</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Change (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBC</td>
<td>$5,031,877</td>
<td>$5,031,888</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCM</td>
<td>$910,855</td>
<td>$910,855</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGGI</td>
<td>$4,118,008</td>
<td>$1,523,724</td>
<td>$(2,594,284)</td>
<td>-66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EES</td>
<td>$31,594,164</td>
<td>$31,594,152</td>
<td>$(12)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$41,954,904</td>
<td>$39,060,619</td>
<td>$(2,894,285)</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>2016-2018 Plan</th>
<th>2017 EES</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Change (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBC</td>
<td>$5,009,774</td>
<td>$4,958,981</td>
<td>$(50,793)</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCM</td>
<td>$2,029,070</td>
<td>$2,028,985</td>
<td>$(85)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGGI</td>
<td>$5,114,894</td>
<td>$1,703,379</td>
<td>$(3,411,515)</td>
<td>-67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EES</td>
<td>$30,371,951</td>
<td>$35,806,506</td>
<td>$5,434,555</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$42,525,688</td>
<td>$44,497,852</td>
<td>$1,972,163</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is the Compact's 2017 budget?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>2016-2018 Plan</th>
<th>2017 EES</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Change (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>$22,799,364</td>
<td>$23,298,822</td>
<td>$499,458</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>$4,460,916</td>
<td>$5,311,133</td>
<td>$850,217</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;I</td>
<td>$15,243,721</td>
<td>$16,561,050</td>
<td>$1,317,329</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$42,504,001</td>
<td>$45,171,005</td>
<td>$2,667,004</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The difference between the 2017 budget of $45.2 million and the 2017 revenue of $44.5 million is the estimated carryover from 2016 into 2017.

Why is the 2017 budget increasing compared to Plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Change ($)</th>
<th>Reason for Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>Low-Income (10% minimum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>OPEB and Pension Liabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$792,203</td>
<td>Demand Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$264,360</td>
<td>C&amp;I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$190,527</td>
<td>Overhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(180,086)</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,667,004</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are the proposed 2017 EES rates and monthly customer bill impacts?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EES Rates (¢ / kWh)</th>
<th>2016 in Effect</th>
<th>2017 in Plan</th>
<th>2017 Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2.024</td>
<td>1.706</td>
<td>2.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;I</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>1.383</td>
<td>1.647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016 in Effect v. 2017 Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table continues with similar entries for other projects.