

Regular Meeting
Board of Public Works
Water Warehouse
May 12, 2026

The regular meeting of the Board of Public Works Commission was held at the BPW Water Warehouse, 330 E. Washington, Tuesday, May 12, 2026. Chairperson Boerman called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Commissioners – Chairperson Boerman, Vice Chair Cooney, Query, VanAst

ABSENT: Commissioners – Walters

Staff Present: BPW General Manager Boatright; Power Supply & Market Operations Manager/Utilities Manager Designee Mulder; Water Operations Manager Postma, Electrical Transmission & Distribution Manager Coots, City of Zeeland ACM/Finance Director Plockmeyer, City of Zeeland Clerk DeVerney

Guests: Power Plant Employee Josh Mulder, Lakeshore Advantage Director of Business Retention & Attraction Ryan Ferrier

Motion was made by Commissioner Cooney and seconded by Commissioner Query to approve the minutes of April 14, 2026, Regular Meeting. Motion carried. All voting aye.

Public Comment

None.

Safety Minute

Don't overload your home caused by electrical failure or malfunction.

Lakeshore Advantage Update

Ryan Ferrier, Director of Business Retention & Attraction, gave an update on Lakeshore Advantage's Core Focus which includes the following:

- Grow – Includes primary employer retention, attraction, expansion assistance
- Plan – Includes entrepreneurial development & startup support
- Solve – Includes Strategic Initiatives & Long-Term Planning

Board members encouraged Lakeshore Advantage to communicate with the Career Line Tech Center future engineers as the pool for engineers is getting slim.

26.029 Approve Cash Disbursements and Recommended Cash Transfers

Motion was made by Commissioner Query and seconded by Commissioner VanAst to approve the March 2026 cash disbursements and the regular monthly transfers for the month of February 2026 as follows:

Cash and Investments as of: March 31, 2026

	<u>Electric</u>	<u>Water</u>
Receiving	\$ 4,122,358	\$ 533,043
Accumulated Debt Service (In Receiving Fund)	-	-
Plant Improvements and Contingencies	12,631,784	12,166,419
Bond and Interest Payment Reserve*	-	-
Totals	\$ 16,754,142	\$ 12,699,462

*Reserve required per electric and water revenue bond ordinances.

Recommended Transfers for the Month:

March-26

	<u>Electric</u>	<u>Water</u>
Receiving	(380,045)	(60,900)
Accumulated Debt Service	-	-
Plant Improvements and Contingency	322,400	60,900
General Fund (per charter provision)	57,645	-

Notes on Recommended Transfers:

1. The annual operating transfer for FY 25-26 from the Electric Fund to the General Fund is a combination of 1% of net fixed assets as of June 30, 2024, and 1% of gross sales, less sales tax, for the year ended June 30, 2024, less any franchise payments. The annual operating transfer is divided into twelve monthly payments.
2. Assumed carrying amounts (minimum) in Receiving accounts are established at approximately 10% of budgeted operating expenses, before depreciation.

Electric = 10% of \$ 37,423,451 or approximately \$ 3,742,345

Water = 10% of \$ 4,721,757 or approximately \$ 472,176

3. Further surpluses of \$322,400 in the Electric Fund and \$60,900 in the Water Fund are recommended for transfer to the Plant Improvements and Contingencies Reserve.

Motion carried. All voting aye.

Accounting, Finance & Customer Service Report

ACM/Finance Director Plockmeyer updated the Board on current operations status, activities and projects which include:

March 2026 Customer Metrics

- Overdue/Disconnect Notices = 217
- Active Accounts = 8,018
- Total Bills Sent = 8,087
- Paperless Bills = 2,818
- Pre-Authorized Payment Customers = 2,231
- Invoice Cloud = 3,116
 - Credit Card = 2,332
 - EFT = 784

February 2026 Customer Metrics

- Overdue/Disconnect Notices = 223
- Active Accounts = 8,002
- Total Bills Sent = 8,034
- Paperless Bills = 2,783
- Pre-Authorized Payment Customers = 2,258
- Invoice Cloud = 3,132
 - Credit Card = 2,351
 - EFT = 781

C&I Electric Meter Read Dates – We are continuing to move our C&I meters to an end of month billing date. We are hoping to have all the customers transitioned by the end of the month of May.

MPIA Insurance Renewals – We are continuing to work with Ken Bush on our 2027 Insurance Renewals through MPIA. As we have previously discussed with the Board, we are working with Ken to make sure we have the proper coverages for both the BPW and City recognizing that our structure is a bit different than that of Grand Haven Board of Light and Power.

Sprypoint – We are continuing to work through a few outstanding issues with the Sprypoint system, but overall, we feel that the transition has been a success. During the month of June, we will start to develop the backup for the monthly billing process as we only have one person on staff that can perform the billing functions for the organization. We feel that this is a vulnerability and we were waiting until we felt confident in the Sprypoint system before developing this internal backup. UFS is still working through the Electric Budget but, at first glance, did not identify any red flags. We will continue to update the Board on any future feedback from UFS.

Water Department Report

Water Operations Manager Postma updated the Board on activities, current operations status, and projects which include:

- Meter replacement program
- Galvanized Service Line Replacement Program
- Other work projects
- Water Administration Projects

Transmission & Distribution Department Projects Update

Electrical Transmission & Distribution Manager Coots updated the Board on current activities including:

- City of Zeeland CWP Transformer Replacement
- Fairview Circuit Breaker Replacement
- City Undergrounding Projects
- Residential Subdivision Projects
- Outage Statistics
- American Public Power Association DEED Grant Award – GIS Intern
 - o Staff recommended that the \$4,000 plus up to \$1,000 in travel funds, to attend an applicable conference grant offered by the American Public Power Association's (APPA) Demonstration of Energy & Efficiency Developments (DEED) program, be accepted by the Board which it was.

Power Production and Buildings & Grounds Department Report

Power Supply & Market Operations Manager/Utilities Manager Designee Mulder updated the Board on activities, current operations status, and projects which include:

- Operations & Power Supply – March 2026
- Renewable Energy Credits (RECS): March 2026
- Projects & Department Updates
 - o Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) Update & Stakeholder Engagement Project
 - o MPPA BTMG Initiative
 - o Power Plant Natural Gas Main Replacement Project
 - o New Electric System Operator
 - o Seasonal Buildings & Grounds Staff
 - o Other Project – Capital Improvement Projects & Initiatives
- Buildings & Grounds
 - o BPW Office Remodel & Expansion Project
 - o General Facilities Work

26.030 Power Plant Units 9 & 10 Motor Control Center Replacement Project

The proposed project consists of replacing the Motor Control Centers (MCCs) for Units 9 and 10. The MCCs were installed with each generating unit, in 1971 for Unit 9 and 1974 for Unit 10. Replacement parts for these MCCs are becoming difficult to source, and the existing equipment does not provide the same level of safety

as modern gear. The proposed project includes replacement of the MCCs for both Units 9 and 10 in FY2027, whereas our CIP budget plan anticipated completing engineering in FY2026, Unit 9 in FY2027, Unit 10 in FY2028, and Unit 11 in FY2030. After meeting with contractors and discussing the project internally, staff determined that extensive engineering was not required, as this is primarily a like-for-kind replacement. Based on the bids received and the interconnected nature of Units 9 & 10, staff believe it is prudent to combine that work into a single project to avoid material cost escalation. There is presently less urgency regarding Unit 11 as it is the newest and upgrading the MCCs for Units 9 and 10 will provide an assortment of spare parts.

Description:

The scope of work includes removal and disposal of the existing MCCs, installation of the new MCCs, reconnection of the wiring for each motor controller, and replacement of the power distribution panel mounted adjacent to Unit 9 MCC. The incoming power for MCC 9 and 10 are presently connected to a common bus, so shutting down one MCC impacts both. Staff would like to install a main breaker in each MCC so that each generating unit can be independently isolated for maintenance activities. A quote to replace Unit 11 MCC was also requested for future planning purposes.

Bidder Name	Quote	Meets Specification	Comments
Parkway Electric	Unit 9: \$105,257 Unit 10: \$61,860 TOTAL: \$174,685 Factory startup included	Yes	Factory startup services included in price. Unit 11: \$88,555 will have a 15-30% increase if done later due to expected material cost increases.
Polarity Electric	Unit 9: \$94,785 Unit 10: \$58,270 TOTAL: \$153,055 Factory startup <i>NOT</i> included Est. \$168,975 w/ factory startup	Yes	Factory startup services quoted as optional \$23,880 for 3 MCCs (estimated at \$7,960 per MCC). Unit 11: \$77,115 will have a 13-26% increase if done later due to expected material cost increases. RECOMMENDATION
Town & Country Electric	No Bid		

Staff do not believe the additional cost for factory startup services (*estimated at \$7,960 per MCC*) is necessary based on the simplicity of the equipment, hard-wired NEMA motor starters. Staff recommend deferring that optional service to reduce costs.

Motion was made by Commissioner Cooney and seconded by Commissioner VanAst to approve awarding a contract totaling \$153,055.00 to Polarity Electric for the material and labor associated with the replacement of the two (2) Motor Control Centers serving Units 9 and 10, including the addition of a main breaker in each MCC and replacement of the power distribution panel adjacent to Unit 9 MCC. Staff further request including a contingency allowance of \$15,000 (approximately 10%), resulting in a total project budget of \$168.055.00.

Furthermore, staff recommend that a budget amendment of \$83,055.00 be made to the FY2027 CIP budget, increasing the total to \$168,055.00 to allow both MCC replacements to be completed concurrently rather than separately as outlined in the current six-year CIP plan. The requested budget remains below the combined total of \$185,000.00 previously budgeted for this scope of work stretching across FY2026 (\$25,000.00), FY2027 (\$85,000.00), and FY2028 (\$75,000.00).

26.031

BPW Admin Office Overhead Door Replacement

As part of the BPW Office expansion and remodel project, staff identified the need to replace the seven (7) overhead garage doors that provide access to the warehouse truck bays, as the lower panels are exhibiting various levels of corrosion. Staff originally included funding for this expenditure during preparation of the project budget; however, it was removed from the final project scope because the need was not considered urgent. Staff anticipated that, if the overall project remained within or below budget, this expense could later be funded through a portion of the project contingency. As construction nears completion, staff anticipate the project will finish within budget, which is why this is being pursued at this time.

Quotes were requested from local commercial overhead door contractors, the results are summarized below.

Bidder	Bid Specifications	Bidder Location	Bid Amount	Notes
Compaan Door & Operator	Material & Installation for (7) Insulated Overhead Doors & Windows Removal & Disposal	Holland, MI	\$28,033.00	Recommendation Low Bidder Meets Requirements
Overhead Door Company of Grand Rapids	Material & Installation for (7) Insulated Overhead Doors with Windows Removal & Disposal	Grand Rapids, MI	\$46,090.78	Meets Requirements

As shown in the table above, the low bidder was Compaan Door and Operator of Holland. Although both proposals met the project requirements; the price spread was significant (\$18,057.78). Compaan Door previously furnished and installed the overhead doors at the BPW’s North Warehouse, and the proposed doors are the same make and series. Staff are satisfied with the appearance and performance of those doors.

The approved project budget is \$2,750,000, which includes \$240,035 in contingency. Based on current projections, staff anticipate that approximately \$100,000 of that contingency will be expended on the project including the \$28,033 cost to replace the (7) overhead doors, resulting in an overall project cost of \$2,610,000.

Motion was made by Commissioner Query and seconded by Commissioner Cooney to approve awarding a contract in the amount of \$28,033.00 to Compaan Door and Operator for labor, material, replacement, and disposal of the seven (7) existing overhead garage doors located at the BPW Administrative Office warehouse truck bays. All voting aye.

If approved, this expenditure will be allocated against the BPW Administrative Office Expansion & Renovation project contingency, consistent with the approved amended project budget, and allocated on a 75%/25% basis between the Electric and Water Departments. No additional budget amendments are requested at this time.

Other BPW Business

26.032

Fiscal Year 26-27 Wage Scales and Wage Implementation Plan

On April 16, 2026, the Personnel Committee unanimously recommended that the City approve the proposed FY 26/27 wage scales (salary ranges) and the implementation plan associated with the wage scales. These plans were subsequently presented to City Council for information at their April 20, 2026, work/study session.

At Monday's meeting, staff requested that City Council approve the FY 26/27 wage scales and the wage implementation plan outlined.

As a reminder, for FY 26–27 we performed an internal wage survey and assessment for each non-union job title. Market data was gathered from local, regional, and statewide municipalities, utilities, and similar private-sector organizations. This data established updated midpoints for each position, ensuring that the City's wage scales remain fair, competitive, and aligned with the labor market.

Survey Results

- Movement from current FY 25–26 midpoints ranged from -30% to +24%.
- For midpoints lower than current FY 25–26 rates, no changes are recommended.
- For midpoints that increased, corresponding wage scale adjustments are recommended.
- A revised wage progression grid, removing the 3% across-the-board increase, is also recommended.

To ensure adjustments to wages in FY 26/27 are applied consistently, we propose the following implementation approach (per employee).

1. When applicable, a team member's wage will increase by the greater of:
 - (a) the percent increase in their wage scale midpoint, or
 - (b) the calculated wage-scale penetration point (based on twenty years of service).

As in 2022, this movement is capped at 1% per year of service in the current position.

2. A performance adjustment will be applied (if eligible) according to the updated wage progression grid as of July 1, 2026.
3. For team members with at least one year of service in their current position who, after applying adjustments #1 and #2, would receive less than a 3% increase, a retention adjustment of 2%–3% will be provided (unless performance is unacceptable):
 - (a) Team members above the maximum of their pay scale will receive a one-time payment equal to 2% of base salary after July 1, 2026. This payment will not be added to base wages.
 - (b) Team members whose pay falls within their pay scale will receive a 3% increase to base wages.
4. Any retention adjustment above 3% follows the Management Discretionary Policy.

The applicable provisions of the City's Salary Increase Plan (Appendix C of the Employee Handbook) for adjustments outlined in #3 and #4 above states *"for team members Special compensation exceptions may occur based on exceptional performance over an extended period of service, a high desire of management to retain the employee, possession of special certifications and/or qualifications beyond the requirements of the position that are of value to the City, or a limited availability of workers in the appropriate labor market possessing the necessary skills and abilities for the position."* *"Advancement of an employee above the increases listed in the updated annual wage increase chart would be at the discretion of the City Manager or BPW General Manager. The total dollars available for these purposes in a given fiscal year would be determined by the Personnel Committee and approved by the BPW Board and/or by the City Council during the budget approval process."* The dollar amounts projected under provisions #3 and #4 of this implementation approach are estimated at \$40,500 for the city and \$12,500 for the BPW and they have been included in the FY 26/27 budget.

If the recommended implementation plan is approved, it will result in projected overall wage increases (for existing team members) reflecting both wage scale adjustments and performance adjustments—of roughly 5% for FY 26–27. A summary of the combined changes from the previous fiscal year for existing employees are attached. This percentage increase amount generates projected dollar amounts that are within the overall wage budgets (including proposed new positions) in the FY 26/27 budget.

Consistent with the recommendation of the Personnel Committee, city leadership recommends that City Council moves to approve the FY 26–27 wage scale and the wage implementation plan outlined above to ensure that employees serving the City of Zeeland are compensated fairly and competitively.

Motion was made by Commissioner Query and seconded by Commissioner VanAst to approve Fiscal Year 2026-2027 Wage Scales and Wage Implementation Plan as presented. All voting aye.

Informational – 2026 Community Grant Applications

Board members were presented with a Community Grant Overview for 2026. The Board was reminded that the grant is up to \$25,000. They will review and discuss at a future meeting.

Informational – Administrative Office Building Tour

Staff have arranged an opportunity for the Board of Commissioners to tour the newly renovated Administrative Office Building, which remains under construction but continues to make steady progress toward completion. We recommend that the tour take place immediately following adjournment of the regular meeting, allowing Commissioners to see firsthand the improvements being made to the facility and the progress toward returning the building to full service.

The project represents a significant investment in the BPW's long-term operational needs, customer service environment, and employee workspace, and staff are excited to share the updated layout, finishes, and functionality taking shape throughout the building. We are even more excited about the prospect of moving back into the modernized space, which is currently slated for mid-July, and look forward to the benefits the renovated facility will provide for staff, customers, and the broader community.

Upcoming Events

- Next Regular ZBPW Board Meeting, Tuesday, June 9, 2026, 3:30 p.m., Water Warehouse Meeting Space, 330 E. Washington Ave, Zeeland
- MPPA Stakeholders Meeting, Thursday, May 14, 12:00 noon to 6:30 p.m., Frederik Meijer Gardens
- Joint meeting with ZBPW Board and City Council, June 11, 2026, 6:00 p.m., Howard Miller Library

Informational Memo: BPW IRP and MPPA Behind-The-Meter Generation Project Update

The following provides a summary of the BPW's ongoing initiative to evaluate our long-term power supply portfolio planning and the future of on-system generation.

BPW Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) Update Over the past year, the Zeeland Board of Public Works (BPW) has engaged nFront Consulting to update the power supply portion of our Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) and facilitate a stakeholder engagement process. The purpose of the IRP was to evaluate resource options that most effectively meet customer needs while balancing critical objectives, including system reliability, economics, regulatory compliance, and responsible implementation of sustainability initiatives. The culmination of these efforts is summarized in nFront's final report, which was recently received by staff and is presently under review. As anticipated, the IRP identified the need for additional capacity in the coming years due to anticipated economic load growth and customer expansions, increasing from 30 MW in 2030 to as much as 125 MW by 2050 with the anticipated retirements of existing generation resources. While those findings were not unexpected, determining the most effective strategy for addressing these open capacity positions remains paramount.

nFront's evaluation provided the following general conclusions and near-term actions:

- Zeeland's open capacity positions provide flexibility to shift strategy as economics and policies evolve.
- Participation in larger, shared thermal generating resources is the key driver of economic value.
 - o Prioritize participation in these resources as early as possible
 - o Make near-term decisions that preserve future ability to participate
 - o The IRP modeled a scenario whereby participation is not available until 2035, as anticipated.
- Reliance **exclusively** on local generation is consistently identified as the higher cost portfolio strategy.
 - o Local generation provides the greatest level of local control, but results in the highest overall system costs and is less responsive to changes in load growth and other future conditions.

- Power supply portfolios designed to fully meet the renewable and clean-energy requirements of PA235 result in an estimated 30-40% increased cost over the 2026-2050 study period.
- Delaying aggressive implementation of PA235 may provide the lowest incremental cost exposure, particularly given the uncertainty of its future implementation.

Staff intend to release the final report on or before June 5, 2026, and are planning a special meeting in mid-June of the BPW Board and City Council for staff and nFront to present the report and facilitate a discussion regarding the findings and next steps.

In addition to these efforts, BPW staff have already initiated a preliminary environmental assessment of several sites, kicked off a generation interconnection study, and have discussed fuel supply and the necessary infrastructure upgrade costs with SEMCO, our natural gas local distribution company (LDC).

MPPA Behind-The-Meter Generation Project Update The Michigan Public Power Agency (MPPA) strategic behind-the-meter generation (BTMG) initiative has been in process for over a year and has been discussed at prior Board meetings and as part of the BPW's IRP update initiative. Zeeland has been actively participating in these discussions as a potential project participant, and host site should this endeavor move forward. MPPA's power supply planning models forecast a capacity shortfall in the amount of power supply resources required to meet customer demand beginning in 2030. This coincides with Zeeland's open capacity position, but is true for MPPA Members as a whole, with an estimated 215MW of capacity that must be filled by 2035. Historically, MPPA has been able to purchase capacity from other power supply resource owners, but as load grows and power supply resources are retired, purchasing capacity has become increasingly difficult and costly. Michigan law requires that electric utilities, including MPPA on behalf of its members, submit an annual compliance filing with the State demonstrating that sufficient power supply resources have been secured to meet the projected needs of its customers' four years into the future. With new power supply resources requiring 3-5 years to study, procure, permit, finance, deliver, and construct, MPPA must execute a decision to develop new power supply resources by the first quarter of 2027 in order to have resources built and operational by 2030.

MPPA believes that new power supply resources that provide high levels of reliability, such as natural gas fired generation and battery storage, are necessary to meet resource adequacy needs in 2030. As part of MPPA's strategic plan, a multi-year, phased strategic objective was established to explore and potentially develop power supply resources located in Member communities. MPPA endeavors to achieve lower costs and reduced financial risk by researching, planning, financing, and building projects collectively across multiple Member communities. MPPA has focused on siting resources in Member communities due to the following:

- **Resiliency:** Local resources improve Member's abilities to recover from unexpected events (i.e. outages)
- **Local Control:** Siting and operating power supply resources is challenging; executing those at the local level provide a host of advantages
- **Interconnection:** Connecting power supply to the transmission system is expensive, complex, and time consuming. Connecting to Member utilities systems as a behind-the-meter resource is far easier, less expensive, and much faster.
- **Execution Speed:** Coordinating development of a local power supply resource with local community stakeholders significantly reduces the timeline to build.
- **Cost:** Municipal electric utilities have lower costs compared to large investor-owned utilities. Locating resources in Member communities enables those utilities to fully leverage cost advantages.

An overview of MPPA's timeline for this initiative is as follows:

- **2025 (Completed):** Initial feasibility review of potential sites in interested Member communities
- **2026 (Phase 2):** Evaluate technologies and providers/developers; model site-specific costs, engage Member governing bodies
- **2027 (Phase 3, if approved):** Contracting, permitting, financing, and detailed development
- **2028-2029 (Phase 4, if approved):** Infrastructure upgrades and construction; resources are built and operational by 2030.

The next steps for Zeeland and other Members that have been identified as potential host communities are:

1. **Mid-2026:** Provide directional input (non-binding), on whether MPPA should continue advancing Phase 2 work for a local resource in our community
2. **End-2026 / Q1 2027:** Review MPPA's formal recommendations and determine whether moving forward with building a local power supply resource is in the best interest of our community.

Discussion Items

As BPW evaluates the challenges and opportunities associated with future resource planning, staff would like to initiate a conversation with the Board regarding the importance of on-system generation to the community, as well as the various ownership models that exist to facilitate that. Zeeland's electric load continues to grow and is forecasted to do so for years to come, and we have legacy assets that will also reach retirement during that time. While Zeeland is one of the few MPPA members with the capability to independently develop and operate on-system generation, doing so exclusively at the local level to cover our entire needs poses concentration risk and would likely result in higher long-term ownership and operating costs as identified in the IRP.

With regards to ownership structure, three distinct ownership models are apparent although variations may be possible: locally owned (Zeeland), jointly owned, and MPPA-owned. A summary of these models is presented below.

Locally / Member-Owned

Zeeland would be the sole owner and off taker of the local generation project. Under this model, Zeeland would assume all costs and receive all associated benefits from the project and have full control for local reliability and distribution / transmission system planning needs. Zeeland would finance the resource, carry all associated debt, and be solely responsible for operating and maintaining the resource long-term. This approach is consistent with how Zeeland BPW operates its local generation portfolio today, where the utility owns, operates, and maintains generation assets located within the community to support reliability and peak demand needs. While this provides greater local control, it also creates increased risk compared to a jointly owned project as a greater concentration of generation assets would be located on our system.

Joint Ownership (i.e. Tenants in Common)

MPPA and Zeeland would each own a portion of a local generation project; Zeeland would own a percentage share of the host project and MPPA would own the remaining share. Under this model, Zeeland would receive the costs and benefits associated with our share of the project, while retaining control of the entire generation project for local reliability and distribution / transmission system planning needs. MPPA and Zeeland would collaborate regarding who performs operations and maintenance, or contract directly with a vendor for those services. Under this model, both MPPA and Zeeland would each issue debt for our percentage shares of the project, which would likely result in higher borrowing costs than an MPPA owned asset. This model would also create additional administrative complexity compared to a member-owned or MPPA-owned asset, resulting in higher administrative costs for both parties. Like a locally owned project, this model creates additional concentration risk compared to an MPPA-owned project, as a larger portion of BPW's capacity would come from a single local generation project. Variations of this ownership model are possible, including increased separation between Zeeland and MPPA-owned assets.

MPPA-Owned

MPPA would own and finance the local generation project sited in Zeeland, along with several similar projects sited in other Member communities. Under this model, all participating generation projects would be aggregated into a master MPPA asset project. All participating Members would have an entitlement offtake percentage from the project, receiving that offtake from all local generation projects. Under this model, Zeeland would have control of the generation project for local reliability and distribution & transmission system planning needs, although we would not directly own the facility. MPPA would be responsible for operations and maintenance, although the specific implementation details need to be determined. MPPA would finance the resource and carry all associated debt, likely enabling lower cost

financing than the other models. This model also creates reduced concentration risk, as multiple MPPA members will be participating in a host member project, enabling a larger project to be built than Zeeland might otherwise build on our own. A variation to this ownership structure might include a host participant receiving a larger portion of their project offtake from the local project built in their community, although that increases concentration risk and complicates the joint-ownership structure.

Key discussion topics include the advantages and disadvantages of these ownership models and the importance to the community of directly owning versus having the right to operate on-system generation.

Motion was made and supported that the regular meeting adjourned at 6:43 p.m. Motion carried. All voting aye.

Kristi DeVerney, City Clerk

DRAFT