

Bennington Energy Committee
Minutes
August 02, 2017

Attendance: Peter Martel, David McKenzie, Mike Munhall
Guest: Cath Joly of Wapack Sustainability

Meeting started at ~7:05.

The Minutes from July 05, 2017 were approved as presented.

Peter indicated he had asked Dee for the draft selectmen minutes and she replied she did leave them in the conference room but we could not get in there as no one was around to let us in. Peter will get a copy to share with the committee.

Mike asked why the minutes for the Energy Committee weren't posted to the town's website. It was suggested we send a copy of the minutes to Dee as well as directly to Melissa Searles at her website admin address. Peter M said he would do this and confirm this process was OK.

Prior to the meeting David shared several documents via email (attached below). Based on his notes from the hearing, he reworked the numbers on various possibilities.

We discussed what to do going forward given the hearing. We still agree with using our original criteria with Peter M suggesting the selectman modify the criteria if they feel a change needs to be made rather than selecting individual lights based on individual opinions.

We acknowledge the selectmen are in a tough position but encourage them to use justifiable criteria. We also noted that the police chief toured the lights during the day instead of at night, where one can see the effect of the lights as well as which lights are not working.

We talked about specific lights:

- The cross walk lights, are indeed 180 watt LEDs, based on information from Eversource and NHDOT.
- #17 seemed as much a daytime issue, and was not going to be helped by lights, with lights making it worse as no lights makes it easier to see cars coming at night. This sentiment is true for many locations.
- #7, 8, and 24-27 are examples of lights hindering evening visibility of oncoming cars, and may make pedestrian safety worse.

- It seemed the only argument we heard related to #37 & 38 were subjective aesthetic reasons. Our reasons are only based on real safety, and some folks have expressed aesthetic reason for less lights.
- David said he would draft a letter to BOS best reflecting our position.

We adjourned at ~8:25.

Respectfully submitted

Peter K. Martel

These minutes are unreviewed and unapproved. See future minutes for approval and any corrections.

Included:

New tables reflecting costs and saving given different scenarios, provided by David M. Prior to our meeting

EXAMPLE #3: INSTALLATION OF 40 BULBS WITH LEDS

- Total Replacement Cost: $37 \times \$150.40 = \5564.80 + Installation of 3 new Luminaires
- Removal Cost of 9 Luminaires: $9 \times \$175$ (max) = \$1575
- Total Project Cost Estimate: $\$7139.80$ + Installation of 3 new Luminaires
- Electricity Annual Cost Savings: $2846.62 + 1282.32 - 3 \times \$84.26 = \$3876$
- With 50% Cost-Sharing Grant, Payback is Approximately One Year

Fixtures to be Replaced with LED: After Hearing 170726						
Number	MTH Watts	Annual Cost	LED Watts	Annual Cost	Annual Savings	
2	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	
3	100	\$196.67	40	\$84.28	\$112.39	
4	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	
6	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	
7	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	
8	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	
9	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	
10	100	\$196.67	40	\$84.28	\$112.39	
11	100	\$196.67	40	\$84.28	\$112.39	
12	175	\$226.47	40	\$84.28	\$142.19	
13	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	
14	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	
15	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	
16	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	
17	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	
19	100	\$196.67	40	\$84.28	\$112.39	
21	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	
23	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	
25	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	
26	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	
27	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	
29	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	
31	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	
32	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	
33	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	
35	175	\$226.47	40	\$84.28	\$142.19	
36	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	
37	100	\$196.67	40	\$84.28	\$112.39	
38	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	
39	100	\$196.67	40	\$84.28	\$112.39	
40	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	
42	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	
43	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	
44	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	
45	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	
46	175	\$226.47	40	\$84.28	\$142.19	

47	175	\$226.47	40	\$84.28	\$142.19	
48	70	\$142.48	40	\$84.28	\$58.20	To be added
50	0	\$0.00	40	\$84.28	-\$84.28	To be added
53	0	\$0.00	40	\$84.28	-\$84.28	To be added
Following does not exist and will not be added, but town i						
5	70	\$142.48	0	\$0.00	\$142.48	
		Total Annual Savings			\$2,846.62	
		Excluding Added Lights			\$2,956.98	

Fixtures to be Eliminated (Preliminary)				
Number	MTH Watts	Annual Savings		
1	70	\$142.48		
18	70	\$142.48		
20	70	\$142.48		
22	70	\$142.48		
24	70	\$142.48		
28	70	\$142.48		
30	70	\$142.48		
34	70	\$142.48		
41	70	\$142.48		
Total Annual Savings:		\$1,282.32		

EXAMPLE #4: INSTALLATION OF 40 BULBS WITH LEDS

- Total Replacement Cost: $37 \times \$150.40 = \5564.80 +
Installation of 3 new Luminaires
- Electricity Annual Cost Savings: $\$2846.62 - 3 \times \84.26
 $= \$2593.84$
- With 50% Cost-Sharing Grant, Payback is
Approximately 15 Months