## Question & Answer Matrix May 6, 2025 - City Council Meeting

Log #	AB No.	Received From	Question	Staff Response
1	6677	Reynolds	Slide 12 says "net metering will not be available." Explain what this means. Does this mean we have to use the energy we generate rather than selling it back? What happens if we are generating more energy than we use? Or does it just mean we sell electricity back at less than the retail rate?	"Net metering" is when the utility will <u>pay back</u> excess power produced to the grid at the same rate that the building purchases power. Under the PSE Net Metering program, excess generation is "banked" to offset future consumption at the same retail rate. This size project is not eligible for PSE's Net Metering program, which is only for projects up to 100kW in size. Based on the size of the potential solar arrays, and how much energy we'd expect to export, the two PSE program options currently available are the Solar Export Credit program and the Distributed Renewables (Schedule 91) program. Program offerings could change in the future. Under the Solar Energy Credit program, energy generation offsets energy use in real-time and the generation that exceeds demand at any time is credited on the bill per kWh using the Schedule 667 amount shown on slide 12 - \$.06713kwh (roughly half of the current electric kwh rate for commercial customers). The other option is the Distributed Renewables program, which is a long-term power purchase agreement where all energy is exported to the grid and the City is paid a set megawatt-hour price outlined in Schedule 91.
2	6677	Reynolds	You have used a cost estimate of \$3 / KW , which I think is approximately right for a residential structure. Is it accurate for a system of this size? I would have thought there would be economies of scale.	The indicated per-watt system cost, at \$3 per watt, is an applicable high-level estimate for a system of this size. The cost would be higher for a smaller scale installation. While there may be opportunities to realize a lower initial cost based on contractor bid, system and panel manufacturer selection, and/or direct contracting with the provider, the project team has approached the analysis conservatively as is considered a best practice at this phase of design.

## Question & Answer Matrix May 6, 2025 - City Council Meeting

Log #	AB No.	Received From	Question	Staff Response
3	6677	Reynolds	Is there an interim option between the two solar options where we put solar on the south facing roof and then put the necessary structure and wiring in place for later install on the north facing roof but do not install the actual panels? What is the cost of this option?	The PSM Facility will be designed to meet "Solar Ready" requirements regardless of whether or not solar panels are included during initial construction. The Washington State Energy Code requires buildings such as these to be constructed to accommodate the future installation of solar on some portion of the project roof. Per the Washington State Energy Code (2021 WSEC Section C411.3): "A solar zone shall be provided on buildings that are 20 stories or less in height above grade plane. The solar zone shall be located on the roof of the building or on another structure elsewhere on the site." The minimum area (WSEC C411.3.1) is either 40% of the roof area or 20% of electrical service size. Photovoltaic interconnection and routes for future wiring are also required (WSEC C411.3.7).
4	6677	Reynolds	The expanded option shows no residual energy need. How can this be if there is no net metering? Are we using batteries to store electricity during bad weather or at night?	See response to question 1. The PSM Design does not include battery storage.
5	6677	Reynolds	Does the energy cost analysis allow for an increased in rates after 2038 when the current contract expires?	For the purposes of this initial analysis, PSE rates are held flat. The project team does not have the means to accurately model/forecast rate increases over the 25-year life of the solar arrays. If the City Council would like an alternative analysis prepared, staff will receive that direction at the Council meeting and return with a revised analysis for continued discussion.
6	6677	Reynolds	Am I correct that no allowance is made for non-potable water for landscape irrigation? If not, why not?	The analysis makes no allowance for rainwater-harvested non-potable water use for landscape irrigation. Simply put, the return on investment is not there due to the size of the cisterns required to make use of rainwater during the summer months.

## Question & Answer Matrix May 6, 2025 - City Council Meeting

Log #	AB No.	Received From	Question	Staff Response
7	6677	Weinberg	Why is there a north-sloping roof? Can't we have the roof between the Operations and PSM buildings also be south- sloping, with the northern facade of the Operations building acting as a vertical step-down between them? Would having a south-sloping roof over the parking area between the two buildings provide for better solar power collection and therefore enable us to achieve 100% of annual energy need with fewer solar panels than currently planned in option 2?	No, the roof cannot be re-designed to be south-sloping. The north-sloping roof design results from the site elevations, floor-level elevations at both the Operations Building and PSM Building, required vertical clearances for vehicles and hoisting, and utilizing a symmetrical structural truss geometry at the Operations Building to achieve a clear span for maximum operational and future flexibility. A south-sloping roof on the northern portion of the project would result in either 1) a bottom of structure that is too low at the southern end to accommodate necessary vertical clearances or, 2) a bottom of structure at the northern end over the PSM Building that is higher than necessary for that structure.
8	6677	Weinberg	Am I reading the agenda bill correctly that the calculation of net cost for solar options 1 & 2 assumes that energy costs will remain *unchanged* for 25 years? Energy costs have roughly doubled over the past 25 years. It is far more reasonable to assume that energy costs will continue to increase over the next 25 years than it is to assume energy costs will remain constant. What average annual energy cost increase percentage would make the net cost of option 1 equal to that of option 2? Would it be correct to assume that an average annual energy cost increase *above* that equilibrium percentage point would financially favor option 2 over option 1? At what annual energy cost increase percentage does the net cost of option 2 reach zero?	For the purposes of this initial analysis, PSE rates are held flat. The project team does not have the means to accurately model/forecast rate increases over the 25-year life of the solar array. If the City Council would like an alternative analysis prepared, staff will receive that direction at the Council meeting and return with a revised analysis for continued discussion. Additionally, rate costs are only one side of a more detailed analysis to consider – cost of equipment, evolving technology, regulatory changes, and energy use, to name just a few.