

8/30/2023

Mr. Lyle writes: “According to Ever-Green Energy, that system is being designed and engineered to be 95 percent efficient, whereas most existing district energy distribution systems operating in other cities in the United States are 85 to 90 percent efficient (due to heat losses along distribution paths and pump losses). Based on these reported calculations, BED contends that the proposed DES complies....”

This is of course hearsay. In order to substantiate this statement, the PUC should require that BED submit Ever-Green Energy design and engineering studies and cost estimates so that the PUC can evaluate the plan in light of the statute.

Mr Lyle writes: “Several commenters express concern that the DES project will not be cost effective when completed. They cite construction costs as the primary risk. The commenters worry that if the DES becomes uneconomic, BED’s customers would need to subsidize its operation, causing electric rates to increase. Such concerns are misplaced.”

Mr. Lyle misconstrues the concerns raised by the public. The exorbitant cost of the DES makes it ineligible for TEPF funding. A \$42,000,000 pipe is not cost-effective, especially when compared with alternatives such as a wood-burning boiler sited at the hospital. Because it is not cost-effective, it does not meet the requirements of the statute. As these efficiency and cost-effective concerns have been raised, BED, at the least, must submit evidence beyond hearsay to alleviate these concerns.

Pike Porter