

## Jeanne Foti

---

**From:** Vincent Cameron  
**Sent:** Monday, December 19, 2011 11:14 AM  
**To:** RMLD Board Members Group  
**Cc:** Jeanne Foti; Paula O'Leary; Jane Parenteau  
**Subject:** FW: Customer Suggestion  
**Categories:** Red Category

See customer comment below.

---

**From:** Customer Service  
**Sent:** Friday, December 16, 2011 10:19 AM  
**To:** Maureen Hanifan  
**Subject:** FW: customer suggestion

fyi..this came in on the customer service inbox, just a suggestion from a customer regarding the renewable energy

---

**From:** Robert Rio [rrio@aimnet.org]  
**Sent:** Friday, December 16, 2011 9:23 AM  
**To:** Customer Service  
**Subject:** Other...

Request From: Robert Rio  
Email: [rrio@aimnet.org](mailto:rrio@aimnet.org)  
Source IP: 38.104.253.130

Address: 74 Riverside Dr  
City: Reading

Phone: 781-944-2783  
RMLD Acct No: 505758-105758

Sell the RECS. I know alot about this area of energy.The RECS will be bought by someone else which means renewable pwoer will still be supported. I people want ot spend more on renewable, have a voluntary program, other wise please sell them.

**Jeanne Foti**

---

**From:** Ronald D'Addario [daddario43@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 20, 2011 11:14 AM  
**To:** Jeanne Foti  
**Cc:** David Williams; Gina Snyder; Joan Boegel; Laurie Ann Sylvia; Michele Benson; Ray Porter; ReadingACCCP; Ronald Daddario; Stephanie New Anderberg; Tony Capobianco  
**Subject:** REC Recommendation from Climate Committee

Hello Jeanne,

I have attached a majority and minority recommendation from the Reading Climate, Energy, and Environment Advisory Committee (RCEEAC) to the chairman of the light board, Dick Hahn. Would you please see that he receives these attachments as soon as feasible.

Happy holidays and thank you for your help, Ron D'Addario,

Chairman

--

Ron D'Addario  
781-439-9146  
A Healthy Earth for our Children

2/27/2012

Reading Climate, Energy, and Environment Advisory Committee  
RMLD RECs  
December 14, 2011

The Reading Climate, Energy, and Environment Advisory Committee (RCEEAC) met on December 14, 2011 and discussed whether to recommend to the RMLD Board of Commissioners to retire or to sell the Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs) that RMLD has in its portfolio. With 4 voting members present, the vote was 3 in favor of retiring the RECs and 1 in favor of selling the RECs.

In the RCEEAC's Action Plan of January 30, 2008, the first of five goals listed states that the committee will work to "reduce Green House Gas Emissions in order to slow global climate change." In addition, in the same document, one of the methods listed to achieve our goals is to "Encourage the use of sustainable energy sources and modes of transportation to reduce our reliance on fossil fuels."

Therefore, in order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, encourage the use of sustainable energy sources, and reduce our reliance on fossil fuels, the Reading Climate, Energy, and Environment Advisory Committee recommends to the Reading Light Board that they retire all of the Renewable Energy Certificates.

"In early 2007, the climate committee, formerly called the Advisory Committee for Climate Change Protection (ACCCP), recommended a target of 10% reduction [in carbon dioxide emissions] by 2012 (from our baseline of 2005), based on review of the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative." With that target in mind, the RCEEAC recommends that the Reading Light Board work toward that goal by adding renewable energy to its portfolio.

Respectfully submitted,

Ron D'Addario, Chair  
Ray Porter  
Joan Boegel  
David Williams

## Minority Report

I agree with the goals of the RCEEAC in procuring renewable energy, and applaud RMLD for its efforts. As I see it, RMLD has paid a premium to the renewable energy company for these RECs. With this money the producer can increase production. If we did not buy the RECs, the producer could sell the RECs and do the same thing. Having bought the RECs, RMLD should sell them at the highest price possible. These RECs offset the higher price for renewable energy at this time, and make fossil fuel energy more expensive. I could hope that the RMLD board uses the money from the RECs in some way to buy more renewable power.

Letting the RECs expire, or retiring the RECs, is an altruist concept that could increase the value of the marketable RECs. Perhaps this is the market-cornering process for which the Massachusetts investor-owned electric companies are being required to own and retire their RECs. RMLD does not have to let valuable credits expire in order to prove that renewable energy was purchased.

David Williams

## Vincent Cameron

---

**From:** Michele Benson [zazzieb@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Tuesday, December 20, 2011 8:32 PM

**To:** Vincent Cameron

**Subject:** Sale of REC's

After meeting with Chairmen Hahn at a recent Reading Climate Committee meeting, and watching the December 20th Selectmen's meeting, as a RMLD ratepayer, I wish to cast my vote or voice my opinion to sell the Renewable Energy Certificates (REC's), if anyone is actually counting.

Michele Benson

## Jeanne Foti

---

**From:** Jeanne Foti  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 27, 2011 10:07 AM  
**To:** RMLD Board Members Group  
**Cc:** Vincent Cameron  
**Subject:** FW: Renewable Energy Certificates

Good morning.

Please see below from Fred Van Magness.

Thanks.

Jeanne Foti  
Executive Assistant  
Reading Municipal Light Department  
781-942-6434 Phone  
781-942-2409 Fax

P Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

-----Original Message-----

From: Priscilla Gottwald  
Sent: Tuesday, December 27, 2011 9:42 AM  
To: Paula O'Leary; Jeanne Foti  
Cc: vanmagness@verizon.net; Vincent Cameron  
Subject: Renewable Energy Certificates

Hi Paula and Jeanne,

Will you please pass along Fred Van Magness's comments to Tony Capobianco (tony.capobianco1@gmail.com) and the entire RMLD Board (rhahn@lacapra.com).

Priscilla

-----Original Message-----

From: Frederick Van Magness [mailto:vanmagness@verizon.net]  
Sent: Saturday, December 24, 2011 12:03 PM  
To: Priscilla Gottwald  
Subject: Renewable Energy Certificates

Hi Priscilla,

I have no way to directly contact the CAB concerning the upcoming discussion about renewable energy certificates...sell or hold. Please pass on my comments to the CAB representative from Reading, as well as the RMLD Board of Commissioners, that I believe we should sell the certificates at market to maximize the returns to the ratepayers. From what I have read, it would appear that holding them until they expire, unless there is a even larger future financial potential return to the department, seems to be not in the best financial interest of ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Fred Van Magness Sr.  
243 Franklin St.,  
Reading, MA  
781-944-0537

**Tracking:**

**Recipient**

**Read**

**Recipient**

RMLD Board Members Group

Vincent Cameron

**Read**

Read: 12/27/2011 10:31 AM

**Vincent Cameron**


---

**From:** MaryEllen O'Neill [maryellenoneill@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 27, 2011 2:18 PM  
**To:** Richard Hahn; Phil Pacino; Gina Snyder; Bob Soli; Vincent Cameron; Atty. Arthur J. Carakatsane; Jane Parenteau  
**Cc:** John Rogers  
**Subject:** FW: RMLD - excerpts on RECs/green power from Green-e, FTC, UCS, EPA, and Wikipedia

John Rogers, Senior Energy Analyst with the Union of Concerned Scientists, sent me the excerpts and links below to help in understanding the REC issue further. John is also a North Reading resident.

The Center for Resource Solutions, John told me, certifies approximately 70% of the voluntary REC market. The excerpts are from the CRS website, the FTC's Green Guides, the Union of Concerned Scientists' website, and the EPA.

This is for information only.

---



---



---

Center for Resource Solutions (emphasis added): [www.green-e.org/getcert\\_re\\_stan.shtml#standard](http://www.green-e.org/getcert_re_stan.shtml#standard)

Regarding double claims in materials published by a generator or other supplier providing renewable MWh to sellers of Green-e Energy Certified products, **counting electricity from which RECs have been sold as 'zero emissions' when reporting electricity sales constitutes a double claim on those RECs.** For example, if a utility sells RECs to another party and also counts the resulting null power as renewable when reporting electricity sales, this is a double claim resulting in RECs that are ineligible for use in a Green-e Energy Certified product. Likewise, there is a double claim if null power is disclosed as zero emissions for the purpose of informing electricity end users of the overall emissions from delivered electricity. This includes annual reports that display emissions from electricity supplied to end users. It is necessary to assign null power the emissions characteristics of system power for the purposes of reporting emissions linked to electricity sales.

...

Such an interpretation of the requirements of the Green-e Energy National Standard and Code of Conduct are directly in line with the [FTC Green Guides](#), which state on page 223, "If a marketer generates renewable electricity but sells renewable energy certificates for all of that electricity, **it would be deceptive for the marketer to represent, directly or by implication, that it uses renewable energy.**"

FTC Green Guide (p. 223, emphasis added):

<http://www.ftc.gov/os/fedreg/2010/october/101006greenguidesfrn.pdf>

A company places solar panels on its store roof to generate power and advertises that its store is "100% solar-powered." The company, however, sells renewable energy certificates based on the renewable attributes of all the power it generates. Even if the company uses the electricity generated by the solar panels, **it has, by selling renewable energy certificates, transferred the right to characterize that electricity as renewable.** The company's claim is therefore deceptive. It also would be deceptive for this company to



advertise that it “hosts a renewable power facility” because reasonable consumers likely would interpret this claim to mean that the company uses renewable energy.

Union of Concerned Scientists: [http://www.ucsusa.org/clean\\_energy/what\\_you\\_can\\_do/buy-green-power.html](http://www.ucsusa.org/clean_energy/what_you_can_do/buy-green-power.html)

### **How Can You Tell If You're Buying Green Power?**

When power flows from the generator to your house, electrons get mixed together on the wires. You can't specify which electrons you get, but you can make sure that your money goes to support clean, sustainable generators, which has the effect of making the whole system “greener”. To do this, you will need to look closely at utility marketing claims and materials.

EPA (emphasis added): <http://www.epa.gov/greenpower/gpmarket/rec.htm>

### **How do RECs work?**

All grid-tied renewable-based electricity generators produce two distinct products:

- Physical electricity
- RECs

At the point of generation, both product components can be sold together or separately, as a bundled or unbundled product. In either case, the renewable generator feeds the physical electricity onto the electricity grid, where it mixes with electricity from other generation sources. Since electrons from all generation sources are indistinguishable, it is impossible to track the physical electrons from a specific point of generation to a specific point of use.

As renewable generators produce electricity, they create one REC for every 1000 kilowatt-hours (or 1 megawatt-hour) of electricity placed on the grid. **If the physical electricity and the associated RECs are sold to separate buyers, the electricity is no longer considered “renewable” or “green.” The REC product is what conveys the attributes and benefits of the renewable electricity, not the electricity itself.**

RECs serve the role of laying claim to and accounting for the associated attributes of renewable-based generation. The REC and the associated underlying physical electricity take separate pathways to the point of end use (see diagram). As renewable generators produce electricity, they have a positive impact, reducing the need for fossil fuel-based generation sources to meet consumer demand. **RECs embody these positive environmental impacts and convey these benefits to the REC owner.**

Wikipedia: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sustainable\\_energy](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sustainable_energy)

Sustainable energy is the provision of energy that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs. Sustainable energy sources include all renewable energy sources, such as hydroelectricity, solar energy, wind energy, wave power, geothermal energy, bioenergy, and tidal power. It usually also includes technologies designed to improve energy efficiency.

---

**From:** John Rogers  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 21, 2011 3:24 PM  
**To:** MaryEllen O'Neill  
**Subject:** RE: RMLD

Great talking with you, MaryEllen. And thanks for the memo; that's very helpful to see. I will definitely see about attending on the 5<sup>th</sup> to weigh in. - John

*John Rogers*

2/27/2012

Senior Energy Analyst  
Co-Manager, Energy and Water Initiative  
Union of Concerned Scientists  
Two Brattle Square, Cambridge, MA 02238  
Tel: 617-301-8055  
[jrogers@ucsusa.org](mailto:jrogers@ucsusa.org)

*Founded in 1969, the Union of Concerned Scientists is an independent, science-based nonprofit working for a healthy environment and a safer world.*

*[www.ucsusa.org](http://www.ucsusa.org) | Join our [citizen action network](#) or [expert network](#) | [Support our work](#) | Join the conversation on our [blog](#) or follow us on [Facebook](#) and [Twitter](#).*

---

**From:** MaryEllen O'Neill [<mailto:maryellenoneill@hotmail.com>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, December 21, 2011 2:36 PM

**To:** John Rogers

**Subject:** RMLD

Hi John,

Thanks so much for talking with me this morning. Under separate cover, I will send you the memo on RECs that our energy services division (ESD) sent to Vinnie in October. This was the basis for the discussion at a CAB meeting in October and at the Board's Power and Rate Committee meeting in early December.

A good source of information on finances and on kilowatt hour sales by type, by town, etc. can be found on the RMLD website under financial statements. We do operate on a fiscal year, so the June 30, 2011 is a good beginning.

Thanks again. When the agenda for the January 5 meeting is released, I will forward it to you.

Mary Ellen

## Jeanne Foti

---

**From:** Paula O'Leary  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 29, 2011 11:08 AM  
**To:** Vincent Cameron  
**Cc:** Jeanne Foti  
**Subject:** RE: Clarification on GM Memo to Board and CAB

Vinnie,

Would you please send me MaryEllen's email dated December 27, 2011, 2:18 P.M. with the subject being: *RMLD-excerpts on RECS/green power from Green-e, FTC, UCS, EPA, and Wikipedia?*

This is the 2nd e-mail that Arthur wants to include in the CAB Packet.

Thanks.

Paula

---

**From:** Vincent Cameron  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 29, 2011 8:55 AM  
**To:** Paula O'Leary  
**Subject:** FW: Clarification on GM Memo to Board and CAB

---

**From:** MaryEllen O'Neill [mailto:maryellenoneill@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 28, 2011 1:07 PM  
**To:** Richard Hahn; Phil Pacino; Gina Snyder; Bob Soli; Atty. Arthur J. Carakatsane  
**Cc:** Vincent Cameron; Jane Parenteau  
**Subject:** Clarification on GM Memo to Board and CAB

Yesterday the RMLD General Manager sent a memo entitled "Discussion of Renewable Energy Certificates" to the Board and the CAB. Certain points need to be clarified so that all the facts are before the Board and the CAB.

In the first paragraph, page one, the GM states "The RMLD has been directed by the RMLD Board to purchase renewable energy ..." The beginning of this sentence should be corrected to read "The RMLD **staff** has been directed by the RMLD Board to purchase renewable energy...." The "RMLD" as an entity is the staff and the Board, there is no "RMLD" that does not include the Board.

In the section "What can you do with a REC?" on page 1, there is no discussion, nor is there any discussion anywhere in the memo, of the consequences that result from selling RECs. If a utility company sells the RECs bundled with a particular energy purchase, the energy associated with that purchase can no longer be represented or reported anywhere to be green/renewable/sustainable (pick your adjective).

In the section "What do other municipal electric utilities do with the RECs they receive?" on page 3, it is stated "I conducted a survey of municipals in Massachusetts concerning whether they have renewable energy in their portfolio and if they do; what do they do with the RECs they receive. ....all responded that they sell their RECs." As noted previously, no claims to having renewable energy in their portfolio can be made by utilities, municipal or not, once they sell the associated RECs.

In the section "How do the RMLD customers feel about the RMLD acquiring renewable energy?" on page

4, it is stated "...the survey did not ask the customers if they were in favor of paying a higher price for renewable energy." This statement/implication is in direct contradiction to the General Manager's remark in the opening paragraph of the memo, in reference to the Swift River and Concord Steam projects, that "The price of these two projects is very competitive and their effect on the RMLD's rate is insignificant." Please note that this competitive price already includes the RECs.

In the paragraph "What can the RMLD do with the revenue if they sell the RECs?" on page 4, it is stated "A case can be made that any revenue from the sale of the RECs should be credited to the Fuel Charge ..." This is misleading because in response to this question from a member of the Reading Board of Selectmen at a recent meeting, the General Manager stated that any revenue from the sale of RECs **would go** to the Fuel Charge.

In the final section "Does the RMLD have a Sustainable Energy Policy in place?" on page 5, the second sentence "The RMLD wants to work cooperatively with the RMLD Board to establish a policy ...." should be corrected to read "The RMLD **staff** wants to work cooperatively with the RMLD Board to establish a policy..." Once again, the "RMLD" is the staff and the Board, there is no separate "RMLD" that does not include the Board. It is also the responsibility and the prerogative of the Board to set the RMLD's policies.

**Fw: Public comment in support of keeping RECs**

Atty. Arthur J. Carakatsane [carakatsanelaw@comcast.net]

Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2012 5:24 PM

To: Paula O'Leary

Paula,

Please make this part of our official record of the meeting.

Regards,

Arthur J. Carakatsane  
Attorney at Law  
2 South Main Street  
Middleton, MA 01949  
P - 978.777.5393  
F - 978.777.4197  
carakatsanelaw@comcast.net  
----- Original Message -----

From: "David Talbot" <talbot.david@gmail.com>  
To: <rhahn@lacapra.com>; <carakatsanelaw@comcast.net>  
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2012 4:46 PM  
Subject: Public comment in support of keeping RECs

> Dear Mr. Hahn and Mr. Carakatsane,  
>  
> As a Reading resident and RMLD ratepayer, I support the purchase of  
> renewable energy by the RMLD and hope that the Board and staff will  
> continue to pursue renewable energy projects.  
>  
> I urge the RMLD Board of Commissioners to keep the RECs associated  
> with the RMLD's recent purchase of renewable energy from Swift River  
> and Concord Steam.  
>  
> Selling the green attributes of these projects would remove all claims  
> by the RMLD that it has green or renewable energy in its power supply,  
> which would be a real shame.  
>  
> Even if purchasing renewable energy and hanging onto the RECs were to  
> wind up costing me a couple of dollars more a month--and I'm not sure  
> this is the case---I'd still be in favor of it. (In fact, higher bills  
> might prompt me, and others, to do more to conserve energy. As a  
> community we can achieve stable bills this way.)  
>  
> I know many people in town who feel the same way, even though they may  
> not find the time to attend meetings and/or make timely written  
> comments.  
>  
> Thank you for your efforts.  
>  
> Sincerely,  
>  
> Dave and Julie Talbot  
> 75 Linden Street  
> Reading  
>

**Vincent Cameron**

---

**From:** Richard Hahn [rhahn@lacapra.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 05, 2012 7:07 AM  
**To:** Vincent Cameron; Mary Ellen O'Neill; Phil Pacino; Gina Snyder; Bob Soli  
**Subject:** FW: RECs

FYI - I received this email and forward it to you for your information.  
 In accordance with Mass open meeting law, I offer no opinion or comment on this email.  
 Please do not reply to this email.  
 Dick Hahn

---

**From:** mjconeill@comcast.net [mailto:mjconeill@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 04, 2012 6:28 PM  
**To:** Richard Hahn  
**Subject:** Fwd: RECs

Hi Dick,

Got the letter from the Talbots. Forgot to forward this and noticed that not all Board and CAB members were included. Could you send your copy along also?

Thanks,  
 Mary Ellen

---

**From:** "Ronald D'Addario" <daddario43@gmail.com>  
**To:** "Tony Capobianco" <tony.capobianco1@gmail.com>, "John and Mary Ellen O'Neill" <mjconeill@comcast.net>, "Richard Hahn" <rhahn@lacapra.com>, "Gina Snyder" <bogina03@earthlink.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 27, 2011 5:08:55 PM  
**Subject:** RECs

Hello Dick, Mary Ellen, Tony, and Gina,

Thanks to each of you for taking the time to help me understand RECs. As a resident of Reading, I am asking that you please consider retiring the RECs. My wish is to be sustainable in an honest way. I ask that we pay a bit more on our rates and retain our claim to sustainability. In addition, I ask you to consider having the RMLD work toward a 10 % sustainability portfolio of energy within a 5 year period. This would push us to seek a 2 % gain annually.

In 2006, the climate committee asked for a 10% reduction in CO2 output townwide by 2012. With 2012 upon us, I realize that a 10 % reduction in energy use would be extremely difficult to obtain. However, a 2% annual increase in each of the next 5 years could be attained with some effort and a willingness to pay for clean energy to obtain a reduction in CO2 and slow the pace of climate change.

2/27/2012

Thank each of you for the work that you do for our town of Reading. I urge you to make Reading a leader in the use of sustainable energy and an example to communities around us. We either pay for our clean energy now or suffer serious consequences in the near future.

Most sincerely, Ron

D'Addario

--

Ron D'Addario

781-439-9146

A Healthy Earth for our Children

## Vincent Cameron

---

**From:** The Rio Family [olliecat74@comcast.net]

**Sent:** Thursday, January 05, 2012 9:03 AM

**To:** Vincent Cameron

**Subject:** RECS

Vincent: thank for the call yesterday with the opportunity to comment to the Board. I am sending this from my home email rather than work.

Dear members of the Board:

I am an energy specialist at a large trade association in Boston (though a Reading resident and these are my personal views).

It is tough to get the information from the paper as to exactly what is going on, but the way I understand it, contracts for RECs are expiring and the decision is whether to renew them or let them expire.

Please let them expire. I am not sure what types of RECs they were, but the fact Reading is not buying the RECs does not mean renewable power is not being produced – the windmills (I presume they were windmills) are still turning and producing power to the grid. RECs are an artificial subsidy to renewable power developers and are actually meaningless. Some day there may be no RECs or they will be so low as to be near zero. Others will likely buy the RECs but even if someday no one bought them, the windmills will not shut down.

There is no reason for Reading to spend more for power. The Massachusetts (actually NE) Grid is one of the cleanest on the planet (EPA verifies this), save for some areas where hydro is used. We are already 45% gas – the rest Nuke and renewable. Very little coal is used in New England (currently about 14% and declining rapidly) and virtually no oil. People are completely misinformed as to what the impact is and what these mean.

If people want to buy renewable power, have an optional green program where people can buy RECs. What you will find is the same people who want to raise my bill won't pay more themselves.

I deal with many muni light companies and every major utility. Reading is one of the most well run companies and although a few dollars won't make a big difference in the bill, I prefer a muni light company where business decisions are made rationally not because they feel good.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Bob Rio



**Jeanne Foti**

---

**From:** Vincent Cameron  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 05, 2012 9:26 AM  
**To:** RMLD Board Members Group  
**Cc:** Jane Parenteau; Jeanne Foti; Paula O'Leary  
**Subject:** FW: RECS  
**Categories:** Red Category  
FYI

---

**From:** The Rio Family [mailto:olliecat74@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 05, 2012 9:03 AM  
**To:** Vincent Cameron  
**Subject:** RECS

Vincent: thank for the call yesterday with the opportunity to comment to the Board. I am sending this from my home email rather than work.

Dear members of the Board:

I am an energy specialist at a large trade association in Boston (though a Reading resident and these are my personal views).

It is tough to get the information from the paper as to exactly what is going on, but the way I understand it, contracts for RECs are expiring and the decision is whether to renew them or let them expire.

Please let them expire. I am not sure what types of RECs they were, but the fact Reading is not buying the RECs does not mean renewable power is not being produced – the windmills (I presume they were windmills) are still turning and producing power to the grid. RECs are an artificial subsidy to renewable power developers and are actually meaningless. Some day there may be no RECs or they will be so low as to be near zero. Others will likely buy the RECs but even if someday no one bought them, the windmills will not shut down.

There is no reason for Reading to spend more for power. The Massachusetts (actually NE) Grid is one of the cleanest on the planet (EPA verifies this), save for some areas where hydro is used. We are already 45% gas – the rest Nuke and renewable. Very little coal is used in New England (currently about 14% and declining rapidly) and virtually no oil. People are completely misinformed as to what the impact is and what these mean.

If people want to buy renewable power, have an optional green program where people can buy RECs. What you will find is the same people who want to raise my bill won't pay more themselves.

I deal with many muni light companies and every major utility. Reading is one of the most well run companies and although a few dollars won't make a big difference in the bill, I prefer a muni light company where business decisions are made rationally not because they feel good.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Bob Rio

2/27/2012

## Jeanne Foti

---

**From:** Paula O'Leary  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 05, 2012 9:38 AM  
**To:** 'carakatsanelaw@comcast.net'; 'ajcarakatsane@verizon.net'; 'ghooper@townofwilmingtonma.com'; 'tollila@acumentrics.com'; 'taollila@verizon.net'; 'tony.capobianco1@gmail.com.'  
**Cc:** Jeanne Foti  
**Subject:** FW: RECs  
FYI only.

See e-mail from Reading resident, Ron D'Addario, at the bottom.

Paula

---

**From:** Vincent Cameron  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 05, 2012 7:14 AM  
**To:** Jeanne Foti; Paula O'Leary  
**Cc:** Jane Parenteau  
**Subject:** FW: RECs

Please send to the CAB and have copies for others tonight.

---

**From:** Richard Hahn [mailto:rhahn@lacapra.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 05, 2012 7:07 AM  
**To:** Vincent Cameron; Mary Ellen O'Neill; Phil Pacino; Gina Snyder; Bob Soli  
**Subject:** FW: RECs

FYI - I received this email and forward it to you for your information.  
In accordance with Mass open meeting law, I offer no opinion or comment on this email.  
Please do not reply to this email.  
Dick Hahn

---

**From:** mjconeill@comcast.net [mailto:mjconeill@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 04, 2012 6:28 PM  
**To:** Richard Hahn  
**Subject:** Fwd: RECs

Hi Dick,

Got the letter from the Talbots. Forgot to forward this and noticed that not all Board and CAB members were included. Could you send your copy along also?

Thanks,  
Mary Ellen

---

**From:** "Ronald D'Addario" <daddario43@gmail.com>  
**To:** "Tony Capobianco" <tony.capobianco1@gmail.com>, "John and Mary Ellen O'Neill"

2/27/2012

<mjcconeill@comcast.net>, "Richard Hahn" <rhahn@lacapra.com>, "Gina Snyder"  
<bogina03@earthlink.net>

**Sent:** Tuesday, December 27, 2011 5:08:55 PM

**Subject:** RECs

Hello Dick, Mary Ellen, Tony, and Gina,

Thanks to each of you for taking the time to help me understand RECs. As a resident of Reading, I am asking that you please consider retiring the RECs. My wish is to be sustainable in an honest way. I ask that we pay a bit more on our rates and retain our claim to sustainability. In addition, I ask you to consider having the RMLD work toward a 10 % sustainability portfolio of energy within a 5 year period. This would push us to seek a 2 % gain annually.

In 2006, the climate committee asked for a 10% reduction in CO2 output townwide by 2012. With 2012 upon us, I realize that a 10 % reduction in energy use would be extremely difficult to obtain. However, a 2% annual increase in each of the next 5 years could be attained with some effort and a willingness to pay for clean energy to obtain a reduction in CO2 and slow the pace of climate change.

Thank each of you for the work that you do for our town of Reading. I urge you to make Reading a leader in the use of sustainable energy and an example to communities around us. We either pay for our clean energy now or suffer serious consequences in the near future.

Most sincerely, Ron

D'Addario

--

Ron D'Addario

781-439-9146

A Healthy Earth for our Children

**Jeanne Foti**

---

**From:** Vincent Cameron  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 05, 2012 11:00 AM  
**To:** RMLD Board Members Group  
**Cc:** Jeanne Foti; Paula O'Leary  
**Subject:** FW: Minority report on RECs from CCCP  
**Categories:** Red Category

I think this is the only other comment I received.

---

**From:** DLVTWilliams@aol.com [mailto:DLVTWilliams@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 15, 2011 5:26 PM  
**To:** Vincent Cameron  
**Cc:** daddario43@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Minority report on RECs from CCCP

Hello Mr. Cameron,

I am writing to ask if my opinion below is correct. I can understand your hedge against needing renewable energy in the future, or presumably selling the RECs as renewables become more valuable.

I was the lone nay vote at last night's meeting of the Climate Control Advisory Committee (RCEEAC) meeting, and would like to submit a minority report to CAB. Mr. Hahn presented his view to our committee yesterday.

Is the following accurate:

I agree with the goals of the RCEEAC in procuring renewable energy, and applaud RMLD for its efforts. As I understand it, RMLD has paid a premium to the renewable energy company for these RECs. With this money the producer can increase production. If we did not buy the RECs, the producer could sell the RECs and do the same thing. Having bought the RECs, RMLD can sell them at the highest price possible. These RECs offset the higher price for renewable energy at this time, and make fossil fuel energy more expensive. I could hope that the RMLD board uses the money from the RECs to buy more renewable power.

Letting the RECs expire, or retiring the RECs, is an altruist concept that could increase the value of the marketable RECs. Perhaps this is the market-cornering process for which the Massachusetts investor-owned electric companies are being required to own and retire their RECs. RMLD does not have to let valuable credits expire.

David L. Williams

I will appreciate your comments. We do not need more wrong information out there.

## Vincent Cameron

---

**From:** Frederick Van Magness [vanmagness@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, January 06, 2012 9:23 AM  
**To:** Paula O'Leary; Jeanne Foti  
**Cc:** Selectmen Reading; Hechenbleikner Peter; Vincent Cameron  
**Subject:** RMLD REC Discussion Jan 5th, 2012

Good morning Jeanne and Paula,  
Would you please pass on this letter to both the RMLD Commissioners and the CAB for me.  
Thanks in advance,  
Fred

Dear RMLD Board of Commissioners and the CAB,

Thank you for the opportunity to be heard at last night's meeting concerning whether to sell or retire REC's that the RMLD has in their possession. I must admit that the final decision by the various Boards to retire the REC's rather than sell them is disturbing to me.

First, taking action that essentially commits to retiring...not selling... REC's for the two current projects for the DURATION OF THE CONTRACTS when future options may not support retiring is problematical. This decision binds future boards for the 15 year life of these contracts. I disagree with the long term duration as part of the decision. While the board could have made a decision to retire REC's for just the next fiscal year through June 2013 as part of an amendment to the main motion that was voted down and revisit the process annually, the long range implications of this decision could prove unwise. It appeared to this observer that some on the boards just wanted to put the issue to bed and not revisit it annually.

Second, the financial impacts to rate payers, despite the boards attempt to downplay the savings, are absolutely significant. As was stated by the RMLD and the boards at last night's meeting, the annual cost impact could be in the range of \$1.5 to \$2 million dollars if the REC's were sold. Since the Boards decided to close the sale process for 15 years into the future, your decision means that a potential extended savings to ratepayers of up to \$30 million dollars over 15 years is not significant. I absolutely disagree. There are many people hurting in this economy and businesses are failing every day. Ms. O'Neil stated last night that selling REC's would reduce an average homeowners electric bill by maybe \$0.50 per month, yet her analysis ONLY covered one set of REC's from Swift River which has the smallest revenue potential from a REC sale and had both sets of REC's been considered, the impact monthly to an average residential customer could have been in the \$2.00 plus range. For the RMLD Board of Commissioners and the CAB to just consider any savings on ratepayer bills from selling REC's as insignificant means, in my personal opinion, that your process is not acting in the best interest of ratepayers. Make no mistake about it....last night's decision was a potential \$30 million adverse impact to ratepayers over the next 15 years. For many people or businesses, any savings today is significant. These REC's constitute a potential \$30 million dollar asset that the Board failed to convert to cash.

Third, the decision to not sell REC's was anchored in some, but not all, of the member's opinion that this action would diminish RMLD past or future actions to support Green energy programs. I find this perplexing in that the RMLD has in fact two current power suppliers using Green renewable sources to provide power over the next 15 years and other suppliers may be in the offing. In my opinion, there is no way that selling REC's could diminish RMLD's efforts to bring new renewable green energy suppliers into our power purchases. I also find that two people involved in the decision last night did not disclose their affiliation with the Reading Citizens for Climate Change where this could constitute a conflict in their role of a commissioner or board member in making a decision that is consistent with the Climate Change Committee agenda. I would have hoped, in fairness, that they would have disclosed this role last night and, in my opinion, they may

have had a preconceived opinion/agenda to support retiring REC's prior to last night's decision that was not disclosed nor was a recusal from the votes offered by them.

It is obvious we have a difference in opinion on this topic. While I applaud every effort to find alternative renewable energy sources other than a reliance on fossil fuels for the long term, I do not support the decision made by the Board(s) last night to not reduce costs to ratepayers. We can all be "Green" and still provide rate relief. These are not mutually exclusive goals.

Sincerely,

Frederick Van Magness Sr.  
243 Franklin St.,  
Reading, MA 01867

## Vincent Cameron

---

**From:** marsie.west@bnymellon.com  
**Sent:** Monday, January 09, 2012 2:58 PM  
**To:** Vincent Cameron  
**Cc:** blelacheur@ci.reading.ma.us  
**Subject:** RMLD Meeting Documents - REC

Hello Vinnie,

Several members of the FinCom board have expressed an interest in the documents presented to the RMLD board for their decision on the sale of the RECs. Could you forward them to me and I will distribute them to FinCom?

Thanks,

Marsie West  
First Vice President, Operations Strategy Group  
BNY Mellon Asset Servicing  
135 Santilli Highway  
Everett, MA 02149-1950

Phone: 617-382-2865  
E-mail: marsie.west@bnymellon.com

The information contained in this e-mail is considered Confidential and is intended solely for the use of the named addressee. Access, copying or re-use of the e-mail or any information contained therein by any other person is not authorized. If you are not the intended recipient please notify us immediately by returning the e-mail to the originator.

The information contained in this e-mail, and any attachment, is confidential and is intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. Access, copying or re-use of the e-mail or any attachment, or any information contained therein, by any other person is not authorized. If you are not the intended recipient please return the e-mail to the sender and delete it from your computer. Although we attempt to sweep e-mail and attachments for viruses, we do not guarantee that either are virus-free and accept no liability for any damage sustained as a result of viruses.

Please refer to <http://disclaimer.bnymellon.com/eu.htm> for certain disclosures relating to European legal entities.

## Vincent Cameron

---

**From:** marsie.west@bnymellon.com  
**Sent:** Monday, January 09, 2012 4:16 PM  
**To:** Vincent Cameron  
**Cc:** Richard Hahn  
**Subject:** Re: RMLD Meeting Documents - REC

Thanks, Vinnie.

One more question - was the initial purchase of the RECs required as part of the purchase of the renewable energy from these sources?

---

**From:** Vincent Cameron [vcameron@RMLD.com]  
**Sent:** 01/09/2012 09:08 PM GMT  
**To:** Marsie Karis West  
**Cc:** Richard Hahn <rhahn@lacapra.com>  
**Subject:** RE: RMLD Meeting Documents - REC

Attached is the RMLD Board meeting package for 1/5/12.

---

**From:** marsie.west@bnymellon.com [mailto:marsie.west@bnymellon.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 09, 2012 2:58 PM  
**To:** Vincent Cameron  
**Cc:** blelacheur@ci.reading.ma.us  
**Subject:** RMLD Meeting Documents - REC

Hello Vinnie,

Several members of the FinCom board have expressed an interest in the documents presented to the RMLD board for their decision on the sale of the RECs. Could you forward them to me and I will distribute them to FinCom?

Thanks,

Marsie West  
First Vice President, Operations Strategy Group  
BNY Mellon Asset Servicing  
135 Santilli Highway  
Everett, MA 02149-1950

Phone: 617-382-2865  
E-mail: marsie.west@bnymellon.com

The information contained in this e-mail is considered Confidential and is intended solely for the use of the named addressee. Access, copying or re-use of the e-mail or any information contained therein by any other person is not authorized. If you are not the intended recipient please notify us immediately by returning the e-mail to the originator.

The information contained in this e-mail, and any attachment, is confidential and is intended solely for

2/27/2012



the use of the intended recipient. Access, copying or re-use of the e-mail or any attachment, or any information contained therein, by any other person is not authorized. If you are not the intended recipient please return the e-mail to the sender and delete it from your computer. Although we attempt to sweep e-mail and attachments for viruses, we do not guarantee that either are virus-free and accept no liability for any damage sustained as a result of viruses.

Please refer to <http://disclaimer.bnymellon.com/eu.htm> for certain disclosures relating to European legal entities.

The information contained in this e-mail, and any attachment, is confidential and is intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. Access, copying or re-use of the e-mail or any attachment, or any information contained therein, by any other person is not authorized. If you are not the intended recipient please return the e-mail to the sender and delete it from your computer. Although we attempt to sweep e-mail and attachments for viruses, we do not guarantee that either are virus-free and accept no liability for any damage sustained as a result of viruses.

Please refer to <http://disclaimer.bnymellon.com/eu.htm> for certain disclosures relating to European legal entities.

**Jeanne Foti**

---

**From:** Mary Ann Quinn [maryann@maryannquinn.net]

**Sent:** Friday, January 20, 2012 9:58 AM

**To:** Jeanne Foti

**Subject:** Letter for Distributuion

Hi Jeanne,

Can you please distribute this letter to the board.

Thank You Mary Ann



**Mary Ann Quinn, CBR,CRS,GRI,PMN,SRES**

Century 21 North Shore

32 Lincoln Street

Reading, MA 01867

617-710-6852 Cell

781-872-4093 Fax

[www.MaryAnnQuinn.com](http://www.MaryAnnQuinn.com)

[MaryAnn@MaryAnnQuinn.net](mailto:MaryAnn@MaryAnnQuinn.net)

Past President EMAR

Past Realtor of the Year

[Click here for Today's Top5 News](#)

---

**From:** Century 21 North Shore Reading [mailto:readingscanner@c21northshore.com]

**Sent:** Friday, January 20, 2012 9:45 AM

**To:** maryann@maryannquinn.net

**Subject:** Visioneer OneTouch Desktop Documents Link

PLEASE DO NOT REPLY TO THIS EMAIL. PLEASE CONTACT YOUR AGENT DIRECTLY

## Making Reading Better

Residents and Businesses Working Together

January 13, 2012

Board of Commissioners  
Reading Municipal Light Department  
230 Ash Street  
Reading, MA 01867

Dear Commissioners:

The Reading residents of Making Reading Better strongly encourage you to reconsider the January 5, 2012 decision to retire rather than sell the Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs) the company has earned through the purchase of green energy. Timely reconsideration is particularly important given the original decision is reportedly binding for 15 years, eliminating the opportunity to correct an error well into the future.

In our opinion, the Board of Commissioners was unable to present a compelling case on why RMLD should retain the REC's. We believe the vote was not in the best interest of the ratepayers and recent public dialogue on the issues suggest there are more residents that share this opinion.

We believe these REC's should be sold as soon as possible. And the revenue should be returned to programs that will enhance RMLD's ability to responsibly expand its investment in renewable energy resources to the fullest extent possible or alternatively, the money should be distributed as a refund to the ratepayers.

The pressure surrounding debates and votes on issues of importance can often lead to mistaken conclusions and counter productive results despite the best intentions of all involved. That may very well be the case in this instance. Regardless, the issue of selling the REC's is of significant importance to the wellbeing of the community and the Commissioners should revisit their current decision and arrange to sell the REC's,

Respectfully,

*James M. Biondi*  
*Mary Ann C. O'Connell*  
*St. Catherine*  
*Honora Dudley*  
*John E. Carpenter*  
*P. L. Carl*  
*Hayden*

Cc: Reading Board of Selectmen

**Jeanne Foti**

---

**From:** Donna D [donnadudley@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 25, 2012 10:52 AM  
**To:** abourque@town.lynnfield.ma.us; rmackendrick@town.lynnfield.ma.us; william-gustus@town.lynnfield.ma.us  
**Cc:** Jeanne Foti; Vincent Cameron  
**Subject:** RMLD Decision to Forfeit Substantial Revenues from Sale of Renewable Energy Certificates  
Good Morning Town of Lynnfield Representatives,

As you know, the RMLD Board of Commissioners recently voted to retire RECs in FY12 with an approximate value of \$400,000-\$500,000.  
For upcoming fiscal years, our portfolio of RECs could be worth many more millions of dollars.

I've attached a document that tries to explain and clarify the issue that is on the table. It is my belief that this complicated issue was not properly vetted with all the towns, businesses and customers served by RMLD. Virtually all of the public discussion took place during December and the early days of January, the middle of holiday season.

I believe that a decision of this financial magnitude requires a more overt campaign on the part of the elected Board and appointed Citizens Advisory Board, to reach out to all of its customers to explain the situation, and to have a well advertised period of time to seek public input.

I urge you to attend tonight's RMLD meeting being held at the RMLD, 230 Ash Street, starting at 7:30pm. If you cannot make this meeting but would like to make your thoughts known on the issue, please contact the following:

selectman@ci.reading.ma.us - Reading Board of Selectmen  
jfoti@rmlid.com - Board contact  
vcameron@rmlid.com - General Director of RMLD

I thank you very much for your attention to this matter.

Donna Dudley  
Reading Citizen

---

1/25/2012

As you all, hopefully, are aware, the RMLD Board of Commissioners recently voted to retire, rather than sell, the Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs) associated with two current long term contracts with renewable energy projects, specifically Swift River and Concord Steam. The financial impact of this decision is that approximately half a million dollars of revenue will be forfeited for FY12 and potentially many more millions will be forfeited in the coming fiscal years. Is this okay with you?

The differentiation between the generation sources of energy lies with its creation, rather than its consumption. New England has a shared power GRID. Electricity generated from many different sources – nuclear, waste, wood, water, oil, etc. - feeds the grid. Once it's in the grid however, much like a stomach, the energy can no longer be differentiated. What comes out of the grid is a mixture of sorts, of everything that went into it. In other words, once in the black box of the grid, an electron is an electron. They are all identical. It is the *genesis* of that electron that differentiates one from the other.

What the heck is a REC you ask? One REC is equal to one megawatt of electricity. The REC documents the attributes of that energy, i.e. hydro, biomass, solar, etc. It attests to the “generation” of the energy as being from a renewable source. All RECs in New England are tracked within the NE Generation Information System (GIS). These attributes, or RECs, can be uncoupled and sold in the energy market. And herein lies the conundrum.

Still with me?

In the state of Massachusetts, **investor owned utilities**, or public utilities, like NSTAR are required to meet certain Renewable Energy Portfolio standards (RPS). This year the amount was 6% of their energy portfolios. Another important restriction on the investor utilities is that they cannot make any claims to renewable attributes of the energy within their portfolios if they haven't directly retired the RECs. The GIS substantiates the REC attributes that each utility possesses and settles each year to meet compliance. The public utilities, with their annual RPS reporting must also provide the GIS information to substantiate what they've reported. Municipal utilities do not.

Municipal electric companies like RMLD, are exempt from compliance and reporting of any RPS. Let me repeat that. Municipal utilities do not have to have, or to report on, any renewable energy in their portfolios. To their credit, RMLD and several other municipal utilities have nevertheless made a decision to voluntarily increase the amount of renewable energy contracts in their portfolios which increases the demand for and amount of renewable energy going into the grid. Because public utilities are not subject to RPS compliance, this means that all of their RECs are *excess* RECs and have a certain monetary value in the energy marketplace.

Private utilities like NSTAR are currently meeting their compliance standards for renewable energy by having their own contracts with renewable projects, as well as by purchasing excess RECs from other sources. And this is why RECs have a monetary value. The compliance standards require that NSTAR actually possess and retire RECs to document the renewable energy within its portfolio. If they fall short of that 6%, they can purchase sufficient, decoupled RECs from other sources to bring the portfolio into compliance.

If you haven't drowned in acronyms by this point, read on.

Only by settling (retiring) RECs within GIS can utilities make any claims to the environmental attributes. Nevertheless, the municipalities of Concord, Wellesley, Taunton & Ipswich are selling their

RECs because they do not believe it to be fiscally prudent to forfeit millions of dollars and because the municipal immunity from regulatory reporting provides an economic advantage to their goal of increasing demand for renewable energy by entering into their own contracts with renewable projects.

The question for all residents, businesses, and municipalities of Reading, North Reading, Wilmington, Wakefield & Lynnfield is whether or not you'd rather have the environmental claim, or the money. For some, the environmental claim takes precedence over any amount of money. For others, the current economic times dictate that millions of dollars of revenue must trump environmental claims at this time.

## Jeanne Foti

---

**From:** Vincent Cameron  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 25, 2012 2:52 PM  
**To:** RMLD Board Members Group  
**Cc:** Jeanne Foti  
**Subject:** FW: Retiring RECs

**Categories:** Red Category

FYI

-----Original Message-----

From: Stephen Goldy [mailto:sgoldy@creekridgecapital.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2012 2:37 PM  
To: Vincent Cameron  
Subject: Retiring RECs

Vinnie,

I cannot attend the meeting tonight but I want to weigh in on the agenda item regarding retiring RECs. I agree with Mr. Pacino's suggestion of revisiting this after one year.

RMLD and the elected board have a fiscal responsibility to the rate payers. I do not feel that the previous vote taken by the Board protected the rate payers on a long term basis.

Please pass along my support for a one year trial period.

Thank you,  
Stephen A. Goldy



## Vincent Cameron

---

**From:** Frederick Van Magness [vanmagness@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 25, 2012 3:35 PM  
**To:** sskjoleary@comcast.net; bmauceri@northreadingma.gov; sdelaney@northreadingma.gov; jyull@northreadingma.gov; mprisco@northreadingma.gov; gbalukonis@northreadingma.gov; Selectmen Reading  
**Cc:** Vincent Cameron; donnadudley@comcast.net  
**Subject:** REC's

Hi all,

Concerning Donna Dudley excellent note today on REC's, I must point out that the recent vote of the RMLD board was to "retire"...not sell these REC's for 15 years based on a motion that was initially put forth by Mr. John Norton, the North Reading Representative on the RMLD Citizens Advisory Board. The Citizens Advisory Board voted to accept Mr. Norton's motion prior to the RMLD board voting. The adverse impact of this motion was that as much as \$30 Million or more in revenue over 15 years, that could be received and passed on to ratepayers from the sale of REC's, is instead being forgone. The figure of \$2 million is the estimated impact for one year and the motion that was made was for these REC's to NOT be sold for the ENTIRE DURATION of the contracts...ie: 15 years. I disagree strongly with the RMLD Board's action of tying the process up for 15 years. Being "green" and purchasing renewable energy is an objective that I and most others would fully support. However, ratepayers are actually paying a monthly premium to RMLD for this "green" power as it costs substantially more to acquire than power from traditional sources. So we have accomplished a sound goal of being responsible to renewables. However, the RMLD could help offset a portion of this extra renewable power cost by now selling the REC's. Somehow this vote to let them expire does not make a lot of sense to me. There has been substantial coverage of the issue in the Reading Patch but only recently has there been some coverage in the other communities. One board member is attempting to modify the prior motion at tonight's RMLD meeting to allow an annual review of whether to sell or retire these REC's.

It is unfortunate (surprising) that a significant issue such as this may not have been vetted by the CAE representatives to the Boards of Selectmen in some or all of the communities serviced by RMLD. One member of the RMLD Board did bring this to the attention of the Reading Selectmen and I have no idea if Wilmington or Lynnfield were also advised. The RMLD meets tonight at 7:30 and all are welcome to come to express their feelings.

Sincerely,  
Frederick Van Magness, SR  
Reading, MA

## Vincent Cameron

---

**From:** William Gustus [william-gustus@town.lynnfield.ma.us]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 25, 2012 4:36 PM  
**To:** Vincent Cameron  
**Subject:** Retiring vs Selling of RECs

Hi Vin,

I am writing to ask you to convey to the RMLD Board that the member communities that make up the Reading Municipal Light District be given an opportunity to be heard on the issue of whether the RMLD Board should retire or sell the RECs available to it.

I learned today for the first time that the Board had voted to retire the RECs rather than sell them. I am sure my Board of Selectmen have no idea that this has been voted and I am sure that they would have had an opinion on this very important matter.

I have been told that these RECs have real value and that the sale of them could generate significant proceeds that could be used by our member communities for green energy project

## Vincent Cameron

---

**From:** William Gustus [william-gustus@town.lynnfield.ma.us]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 25, 2012 4:49 PM  
**To:** Vincent Cameron  
**Cc:** Arthur Bourque; Bob MacKendrick; Al Merritt  
**Subject:** RECs retirement vs sale

Vin,

I am writing to ask you to convey to the RMLD Board that the member communities that make up the Reading Municipal Light District be given an opportunity to be heard on the issue of whether the RMLD Board should retire or sell the RECs available to it.

I learned today for the first time that the Board had voted to retire the RECs rather than sell them. I am sure my Board of Selectmen have no idea that this has been voted and I am sure that they would have had an opinion on this very important matter.

I have been told that these RECs have real value. It is my belief that the sale of them could generate significant proceeds that could be used by our member communities for green energy projects locally.

Please let the Board know that we would appreciate discussing this matter with them before the RECs are formally retired. I am not saying that the Board has made a bad decision. We would just like an opportunity to understand the Board's initial decision and maybe have a chance to weigh in on a decision that will undoubtedly have an impact on our community.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Bill Gustus  
Lynnfield Town Administrator

**Vincent Cameron**

---

**From:** Town Manager [manager@town.wilmington.ma.us]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 25, 2012 4:50 PM  
**To:** Vincent Cameron  
**Cc:** Tom Ollila; George Hooper; Gustus, William; Hechenbleikner, Peter; Greg Balukonis; Donna D; selectmen@town.wilmington.ma.us  
**Subject:** Renewable Energy Certificates

Dear Mr. Cameron:

Having read the recent commentary from Donna Dudley, a resident of Reading, I am writing to seek clarification on the issue pertaining to the sale of renewable energy certificates (RECs). I am requesting that the RMLD Board justify their decision to retire rather than sell RECs associated with two long-term contracts, notably Swift River and Concord Stream. Was that decision made consistent with the RMLD's fiduciary obligation to its ratepayers and member communities. I believe further discussion on this issue is warranted and toward that end, I am extending, on behalf of the Wilmington Board of Selectmen, an invitation to you and the members of the RMLD Board to attend the Selectmen's meeting of February 13, 2012. Certainly any decision to forfeit substantial revenue in exchange for an environmental designation deserves a fully justified explanation. Please advise me as soon as possible if you and the Board members are available to meet with Selectmen. Thank you.

Michael A. Caira  
Town Manager

2/27/2012

## Vincent Cameron

---

**From:** William Gustus [william-gustus@town.lynnfield.ma.us]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 25, 2012 5:15 PM  
**To:** Town Manager  
**Cc:** Vincent Cameron; Tom Ollila; George Hooper; Hechenbleikner, Peter; Greg Balukonis; Donna D; <selectmen@town.wilmington.ma.us>; Arthur Bourque; Bob MacKendrick; Al Merritt  
**Subject:** Re: Renewable Energy Certificates

Hi to All,

I concur completely with Mike's comments on this. I have sent a similar email expressing our concern that we have not had an opportunity to be heard on this issue.

I have also suggested that the sale of these credits could generate significant resources that may help all member communities to carry out local green initiatives that could result in long term energy cost savings for member communities. This would seem to me to be a far more productive use of these credits than just being able to say we are green.

Thanks,  
Bill

On Jan 25, 2012, at 16:50, "Town Manager" <[manager@town.wilmington.ma.us](mailto:manager@town.wilmington.ma.us)> wrote:

Dear Mr. Cameron:

Having read the recent commentary from Donna Dudley, a resident of Reading, I am writing to seek clarification on the issue pertaining to the sale of renewable energy certificates (RECs). I am requesting that the RMLD Board justify their decision to retire rather than sell RECs associated with two long-term contracts, notably Swift River and Concord Stream. Was that decision made consistent with the RMLD's fiduciary obligation to its ratepayers and member communities. I believe further discussion on this issue is warranted and toward that end, I am extending, on behalf of the Wilmington Board of Selectmen, an invitation to you and the members of the RMLD Board to attend the Selectmen's meeting of February 13, 2012. Certainly any decision to forfeit substantial revenue in exchange for an environmental designation deserves a fully justified explanation. Please advise me as soon as possible if you and the Board members are available to meet with Selectmen. Thank you.

Michael A. Caira  
Town Manager

2/27/2012

## Vincent Cameron

---

**From:** Tony Capobianco [tony.capobianco1@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 26, 2012 2:35 PM  
**To:** Vincent Cameron  
**Cc:** Jane Parenteau; Paula O'Leary  
**Subject:** Re: Green Choice Question

Awesome. Thank you very much for your response.

On Thu, Jan 26, 2012 at 2:34 PM, Vincent Cameron <[vcameron@rml.com](mailto:vcameron@rml.com)> wrote:

The RMLD purchases RECs for the amount of RECs required for customers in the Green Choice Program. The RMLD pays for these RECs from money the RMLD receives from the customers in the Green Choice program. These RECs are then retired.

---

**From:** Paula O'Leary  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 26, 2012 2:07 PM  
**To:** Vincent Cameron  
**Subject:** FW: Green Choice question

Vinnie,

Just received this question from Tony, and I don't know the answer. Will you please respond, and I will send to Tony.

Thanks.

Paula

---

**From:** Tony Capobianco [mailto:[tony.capobianco1@gmail.com](mailto:tony.capobianco1@gmail.com)]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 26, 2012 1:41 PM  
**To:** Paula O'Leary  
**Subject:** Green Choice question

Hi Paula,

It's my understanding that the money from the Green Choice program goes towards the purchase and retirement of REC's. Is this correct?

Thanks.

Tony

## Vincent Cameron

---

**From:** William Gustus [william-gustus@town.lynnfield.ma.us]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 31, 2012 2:51 PM  
**To:** Richard Hahn; 'Town Manager'; 'Hechenbleikner, Peter'; Vincent Cameron; 'Greg Balukonis'  
**Subject:** RE: Meeting Tuesday

Dear Mr. Hahn,

I wanted to report on the outcome of our meeting today. It was informative and Vin Cameron presented what I thought to be a very balanced view of the situation. He gave us copies of the minutes for all of your meetings that have been released by the RMLD Board for dissemination along with a number of reports on the issues, including two documents written by you in support of your position in this matter. In response to questions from our group, he outlined the case for retiring the certificates as well as the case for selling them.

It was decided that our next step should be to consult with our individual representatives on the CAB to gain their insight into this matter. After gathering this additional input, we agreed the next step would be to schedule your Board to meet with our Boards of Selectmen. It is our expectation that we will be ready to schedule these meetings in March.

Sincerely,  
Bill Gustus

-----Original Message-----

From: Richard Hahn [mailto:rhahn@lacapra.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, January 31, 2012 7:17 AM  
To: William Gustus; 'Town Manager'; 'Hechenbleikner, Peter'; 'Cameron, Vinnie'; 'Greg Balukonis'  
Subject: RE: Meeting Tuesday

I respect your decision regarding who you wish to meet with, as I would hope others would respect our decisions. However, The RMLD General Manager has publicly opposed the majority position of the RMLD Board of Commissioners. If no one attends that voted with the majority position, it is unlikely that the majority position will be adequately represented.

Dick Hahn

-----Original Message-----

From: William Gustus [mailto:william-gustus@town.lynnfield.ma.us]  
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2012 12:54 PM  
To: 'Town Manager'; 'Hechenbleikner, Peter'; 'Cameron, Vinnie'; 'Greg Balukonis'  
Cc: Richard Hahn  
Subject: RE: Meeting Tuesday

Hi,

I agree with you both. I think we need an opportunity to review the issue among ourselves and come to some consensus on how we would like to proceed before engaging with the RMLD Board. I am sure Vin Cameron can fill us in on what has happened to date and the implications related to the sale or retirement of these credits.

It is my understanding that the RMLD Board has already agreed to make a presentation to the various Boards of Selectmen on their decision. In the case of the Town of Lynnfield, we view this as a policy decision. As such, I just want to be in a position to competently advise the Board of Selectmen of the issues so they will be prepared to engage the RMLD Board at that time.

Thanks,  
Bill

-----Original Message-----

From: Town Manager [mailto:manager@town.wilmington.ma.us]  
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2012 11:52 AM  
To: Hechenbleikner, Peter; Cameron, Vinnie; William Gustus; Greg Balukonis  
Cc: Richard Hahn  
Subject: Re: Meeting Tuesday

I agree with Peter.

Mike

----- Original Message -----

From: "Hechenbleikner, Peter" <phechenbleikner@ci.reading.ma.us>  
To: "Cameron, Vinnie" <vcameron@rmlld.com>; "William Gustus"  
<william-gustus@town.lynnfield.ma.us>; "Wilmington-Michael Caira"  
<manager@town.wilmington.ma.us>; "Greg Balukonis"  
<GBalukonis@northreadingma.gov>  
Cc: "Richard Hahn" <rhahn@lacapra.com>  
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2012 11:46 AM  
Subject: RE: Meeting Tuesday

I think it would be better to just have the 5 of us, but I am only one person.

Peter I. Hechenbleikner  
Town Manager  
Town of Reading  
16 Lowell Street  
Reading MA 01867

Please note new Town Hall Hours effective June 7, 2010:  
Monday, Wednesday and Thursday: 7:30 a.m - 5:30 p.m.  
Tuesday: 7:30 a.m. - 7:00 p.m.  
Friday: CLOSED  
phone: 781-942-9043  
fax 781-942-9071  
web www.readingma.gov  
email townmanager@ci.reading.ma.us

Please let us know how we are doing - fill out our brief customer service survey at

Here are the results to track for the new survey Jan - June 2012:

<http://readingma-survey.virtualltownhall.net/results/sid/ccc2f035993bd3c0/>

-----Original Message-----

From: Cameron, Vinnie  
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2012 11:47 AM  
To: William Gustus; Wilmington-Michael Caira; Hechenbleikner, Peter; Greg Balukonis  
Cc: Richard Hahn  
Subject: RE: Meeting Tuesday

Would it be possible for RMLD Board Chairman Hahn to attend this luncheon? He could explain the RMLD Board majority vote on retiring the RECs.

-----Original Message-----

From: William Gustus [mailto:william-gustus@town.lynnfield.ma.us]



Sent: Saturday, January 28, 2012 1:14 PM  
To: Wilmington-Michael Caira; Peter Hechenbleikner; Greg Balukonis; Vincent Cameron  
Subject: Meeting Tuesday

Hi to All,

I've heard back from everybody and Tuesday at lunch will work for everyone.

We will be meeting at Lynnfield Town Hall at noon on Tuesday. I'll have sandwiches brought in. Any preferences? See you then and thanks for making some time to talk about this.

Bill