

Sinclair and Turner said there is a landfill site called Hickory Ridge near Atlanta that has a flexible TPO plastic cap with flexible solar panels laid down on top. It cost \$7 million (\$5 million with a \$2 million grant). This would be a possible solution as it would not cause settling and it would flex with the settling the might occur. The efficiency of the panels is less than for the rigid panels. More exploration is needed to ensure that the plastic cap would be durable enough to walk/drive on, and to make sure it would not be susceptible to damage by animals.

There are several ways to pay for and develop solar power systems. Third party sales are prohibited in NC. The owner of the panels cannot sell the electricity generated. "Use-all" or "Sell-all" (sell all energy generated to Duke Power) or net metering (use as much power as you can and then sell the remainder to Duke Power) arrangements are all possible. The use can be changed in the future based on need if more facilities are developed out there. The EAB is uncertain whether there are facilities nearby that could take advantage of this power (Orange County Animal Shelter might be one).

A developer could also lease the land from the County and then operate his or her own system. This is the most straightforward way to go as all the risk goes to the developer.

Community solar is also possible, where individual investors buy into and own the system, and lease the land or roof space to install it. This was done on the Carrboro Farmers Market (~\$40-\$50,000). This can be done less formally by allowing the panels to be sponsored by community members, but owned by the property owner. These options are sometimes desirable for those who want to invest in solar, but whose land or roof space is shady or otherwise inappropriate for solar development.

Sinclair and Turner said the EAB is interested in taking the appropriate next steps in exploring the possibilities for landfill solar development with Orange County. Their presentation is available upon request.

Brennan Bouma offered some of the history of Orange County staff's exploration into solar development on the landfill and other sites including the previous interests of Cypress Creek Renewables, Strata Solar, and UNC. Bouma offered to continue conversations with the EAB on this issue.

- V. **CFE Facebook Page** – Gronback and O'Connor provided an overview and demonstration of how Facebook and other social media sites could work in practice to communicate with the public and other stakeholders about CFE activities, and how these sites can be used to share information about environmental issues of interest to residents of Orange County.

CFE members feel social media (not just Facebook) is an important communication tool to make the work of the Commission more visible, especially to the young residents of the county. There is also an interest in hearing from county residents since many people do not have time to attend meetings.

The CFE discussed the need for some internal protocol (or code of conduct) for structuring and using these media, reflecting the Orange County Social Media Policy. It was explained that creating and maintaining an official social media presence as an appointed Orange County commission, implies that statements made on the site are officially sanctioned. This can be difficult to manage if the site is structured so that anyone can post comments. The Orange County Social Media Policy guides the creation of these sites so that they avoid any foreseeable issues.

The merits of several possible structures were discussed, including the thought of “piggybacking” our comments on an existing County social media site such as the one set up for DEAPR. It was decided that Gronbeck and O’Connor would succinctly summarize the options that the Social Media Policy allows for a future CFE meeting and would reach out to David Hunt to learn more about what levels of response are allowed to comments or emails received through the site. This would allow everyone on the CFE to make the decision about the best way to move forward including the possibilities of making on overall media and outreach strategy and/or subcommittee.

- VI. **Committee Meetings** – Gronbeck suggested no committee meetings and CFE members agreed.

- VII. **Updates and Information Items** – Information on the following subjects was provided in the meeting package; selected items were discussed: a) tri-county conservation plan proposal, b) Hollow Rock Nature Park opening, c) NC regulating renewable energy, d) state senate eyes mussels for cleaning Jordan, Falls lakes, e) coal ash pond closures update, f) solar farm field trip, and g) woman tackling her city’s food waste problem.

- VIII. **Adjournment** – Cada motioned to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Ray. Gronbeck adjourned the meeting at 9:15 pm.

Summary by Brennan Bouma, AMS Staff