

**From:** Springer, Darren [Darren.Springer@state.vt.us]  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 08, 2015 6:14 PM  
**To:** Rebecca Ellis  
**Subject:** RE: H.40 - page 18

Took a look and I think Aaron got it right (this is definitely Aaron's drafting, not Warren's version). Not sure I could shorten or simplify. But for whatever help it is, here is my explanation of what this means:

You are saying utilities have to meet DG with 5 MW or under. In a given year if the utility takes all net metering, all standard offer, all their own projects, and is still short they have to do this RFP. They have to ask the market for DG RECs alone, and also DG projects with RECs included that are cost-effective and consistent with the utility's Integrated Resource Plan (i.e. don't force VEC to take solar if not helpful to their grid, whereas wind would be...). If the utility does all of that and still can't meet the 5 MW, like Hallquist says he might not, then utility can use larger new renewable that meets rest of DG definition.

Hope that is helpful, thanks.

Darren

---

**From:** Rebecca Ellis [ellisvermont@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 08, 2015 4:21 PM  
**To:** Springer, Darren  
**Subject:** Re: H.40 - page 18

Below is what Aaron drafted, which I think is taken verbatim from Warren.

I don't oppose the concept, I just think it's unnecessarily complicated.

If only we could drop footnotes into legislation....

(D) Distributed generation greater than five MW. On petition of a retail electricity provider, the Board may for a given year allow the provider to employ a renewable energy plant with a plant capacity greater than five MW to satisfy the distributed renewable generation requirement if the plant would qualify as distributed renewable generation but for its plant capacity and the provider demonstrates that it is unable during that year to meet the requirement solely with qualifying renewable energy plants of five MW or less. **The provider's petition may demonstrate that, after issuance of one or more requests for proposals, it is unable for that year to obtain:**

(i) the construction and interconnection to its system of distributed renewable generation that is consistent with its approved least-cost integrated resource plan under section 218c of this title and that will cost less than or equal to the sum of the applicable alternative compliance payment rate and the applicable rates published by the Department under the Board's rules implementing section 209(a)(8) of this title; and

(ii) tradeable renewable energy credits for distributed renewable generation at a cost that is less than the applicable alternative compliance rate.

On Sunday, February 8, 2015 4:16 PM, "Springer, Darren" wrote:

I worked on concept but Warren drafted. I will look at his last email to Aaron unless you have something more current drafted by Aaron?

Thanks

Darren

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 8, 2015, at 4:14 PM, Rebecca Ellis <[ellisvermont@yahoo.com](mailto:ellisvermont@yahoo.com)> wrote:

yes

Rep. Rebecca Ellis

Vermont Legislature

Vice Chair, House Natural Resources and Energy Committee

email: [ellisvermont@yahoo.com](mailto:ellisvermont@yahoo.com)

cell: 802-839-0515

On Sunday, February 8, 2015 4:08 PM, "Springer, Darren"

<[Darren.Springer@state.vt.us](mailto:Darren.Springer@state.vt.us)> wrote:

Is this the RFP language?

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 8, 2015, at 4:07 PM, Rebecca Ellis <[ellisvermont@yahoo.com](mailto:ellisvermont@yahoo.com)>

wrote:

Sorry to bother you but ... Did you work with Warren  
Coleman on VEC's proposal for tier 2 language? It's very  
complicated and I am hoping we can come up with something

simpler. Any ideas?

Rebecca

Rep. Rebecca Ellis

Vermont Legislature

Vice Chair, House Natural Resources and Energy Committee

email: [ellisvermont@yahoo.com](mailto:ellisvermont@yahoo.com)

cell: 802-839-0515