

Renewable Energy Committee Meeting

August 9, 2011

CSG Office - Iselin, NJ

1:00 pm to 3:10 pm

Call-in number: 1-866-740-1260 -- Meeting ID: 2183408#

Meeting Called to Order at 1 pm

Introductions

Regulatory Update and update on EMP hearings (M. Winka)

MW: The orders that were adopted last agenda, nothing too much new, an EE Contract modification and NJ Natural Gas has filed a petition. Eliabethtown Gas has also filed the extension. PSEG has just received their extension for hospitals, multi family, municipalities, and direct install. On Augusts agenda, there are a number of items. The revised budget for 2011 (mostly EE), fuel cell is being added for \$1/watt and \$2/watt with heat recovery. Pay4Performance we're looking for a standalone program. In effect it could be up to \$2/watt. Also building a financing program for fuel cells.

CG: To be clear, that's all EE.

MW: It's Clean Energy Program. The September agenda should have a proposal for financing a multi family program. The financing program is taking after a NYSERDA program. That financing option goes to them directly, then there's some loan guarantee. Take EDA out of that process of the revolving loan fund. Then we'll roll that into other programs. That's with keeping with the Energy Master Plan, replacing and/or supplementing. As for EMP hearings, we've had two, and next Thursday there's a hearing in Stockton. There's several work groups, one on renewable, one on natural gas, etc. Those work groups were selected by the Board, and will be developing recommendations, hopefully by September. You can find out the members on the website. Those reports will get into the EMP and will get into the transition documents. We have been working with Treasury and issued an RFI to receive information from potential bidders and with that we will finalize the RFP which will go out to bid after September. We're talking with Treasury about current contracts for extensions into 2012. That contract extension would be a 6 month extension (to middle of July). Treasury will discuss an extension, provided we're in the process of putting the RFP out. The RFP will have a transition component.

EDC Update: We asked for a submittal of data so we could put it into one apples to apples comparison. It went to all utilities, so that's been returned, we're putting it into a readable form. One of the first things we'll discuss is Solar Alliance's response. When solar advancement act changed, it changed the allocation from percentage to gigawatt hours. We never changed that. We started that discussion with the extension. The Rate Council said that should be a separate discussion. The Rate Council was OK with the

proposal from JCP&L and other utilities on how those extensions happen. There will two meetings for the next step in the SREC structured market, and then if we true up. Our goal is to have a recommendation by the end of that next solicitation; hopefully by the third week of August.

George St Onge: Is PSE&G ending its solar loan program?

MW: There is a time frame for the loan program...

SH: That will be discussed later.

MW: It's about what's most cost effective. If it continues it would have to be a filing.

Q: The Stockton College EMP hearing is the 11th?

MW: Yes, and the return on RFI's is due to us on the 11th as well

Q: What is the status of the filing from PSEG to move 10 mw to the other section?

MW: That was approved. There's been some meetings about the solar panels that are on hold. We first talked to PSE&G about locations, and PS threw it over to our side of the fence, the request was to take all those panels and put in one location, but they are separate panels and we couldn't do that. There has been no decision about what to do on the formal requests.

Phone Q: Was the EMP working group made public?

MW: I don't know I can find out.

Q: I would encourage it; the stake holder meeting is not conducive to an open process.

MW: The OCE is not in charge of the EMP, but I will circulate the info.

Update on status of rules re-adoption (S. Hunter)

The Ch. 8 rule re adoption: Since we proposed those rules for re adoption the law changed on how rules can be re adopted. There's some flexibility in the process, it's now called rule proposal. The proposal was approved in March, and comments were due by July 2nd. Staff is reviewing, and then they need to come to the Board. It should be September or October; net metering and interconnection were also part of those rules.

SACP: There is a public meeting being set up. In regards to the 15 yr schedule, we have a proposal that was discussed in the EMP, and we got comments from the Advisory Council. Those comments have been circulated. Staff will develop a proposal for the Board consideration around September or October as well.

Phone Question: In terms of rule adoptions, if you present them in September, when would they go into effect?

SH: Should be when the Board adopts them.

MW: They have to be published in the Registry, but they would be effective the date they're accepted by Administrative Law. Final rule is with comment response. It becomes effective once it's accepted by Administrative Law office. There's no Board meeting to review the comment response document. Whatever the publication date is after the Board meeting that it's made effective.

Q: My main concern is the six month time frame for the meters to be installed.

SH: Yes you have six months after the rules become affective.

GSO: Has anyone done an analysis of how many meters are going to be needed?

SH: All the SREC projects had a requirement to install the meter and 80% of projects are SRP.

Q: So now it's recommended that all REIP and CORE projects have meters?

MW: it's not a recommendation, it's a law.

SH: The date that the rule proposal is presented to the board. So once the rules are adopted we'll be sending out communication that all projects without a meter have six months to put a meter in.

Charlie Garrison: We understand some addresses might not be the same but we'll mail to addresses, installers, post to the website. Ultimately it's up to the customers to get this done.

Scott Schultz: Any rough idea about how many meters? Is it even feasible?

SH: SRP and REIP over 10 kW already have meters though.

CG: At the next meeting I'll have something together.

Q: Do you think the average home owner really knows that this has been talked about for 3 years. It has to be in English not "legalese."

CG: We'll make it clear.

SH: The more effective communication is through GATS. A lot of them are working through aggregators and brokers.

Q: Most of the residential projects are on estimated production.

SH: I think there has been a good share of people that felt their estimates were lower so then put in a meter.

Chuck Forbes: What's the mechanism that you'll know the meter was installed?

SH: Code inspection to install a meter.

SS: Let's just say its 2,500 meters to install. That's 21 meter changes a day. This is not a 5 minute swap out. This is 2-3 hrs. The question I have is if it's feasible, these people also have to do their day to day jobs as well.

MW: We've been saying this for years. We've talked about that deadline. You all had the chance to make these comments by July 2nd.

SS: We're just the developers, not the client. You may be opening yourself up to some challenges.

CF: Also, SREC's are low and it's \$500 to do this.

MW: That is not an argument really, SREC prices just dropped.

Janja Lupse: Maybe we can communicate with the customers now?

MW: Until the Board adopts it, we can't say it it's the law. You can say it's the proposed rule change.

SH: It's really through GATS that this needs to be communicated.

MW: You should be getting to your customers now about the changes going on.

Phone Question: Does this replace the net meter for the EDC installs, and is the cost the burden of the customer? Is there an average price of the equipment?

Lance Miller: The SACP schedule, there was no opportunity for the public to comment?

SH: We followed the SACP schedule.

Q: The advisory committee- is the recommendation of staff as a rule?

MW: That's a rule proposal.

Q: Is the public going to see that proposal before it's in the register? Because once it's in the register you can't change it.

SH: It's in the EMP.

Q: So it's just a possible schedule?

SH: Rate Council is representing the rate payer.

MW: We'll take that under consideration. I don't see it changing the process much.

2012 Program Planning (C. Garrison, R. Reisman)

RR: This started in June when Charlie presented how we wanted to allocate the RE budget. Then in July, David Hill presented and essentially posed a series of questions of where we want to go with the program in the future. What we're doing now is taking the next step. We want to continue the two way communication, and we asked for written comments to get your input and use in the program development. We got one comment, but we're looking for more input still after this presentation.

Policy Priorities:

- Continue transition of solar market from rebate-based programs to long-term financing options and power purchase agreements
- Continue market/financial analyses to determine appropriate incentives for addressing market barriers and gaps
- Gear program activities toward developing projects of a specific size, location or customer class based on EMP policy priorities
- Streamline processes to continue stimulating investment with lower costs
- Integrate EE and RE programs in both residential and C&I markets (Examples: Solar contractors distributing information on HPwES and vice versa; incorporating biomass into Pay for Performance CHP)

Expanding the Reach of the SRP:

- Extend solar into low-income housing, multi-family urban housing and community renewable through financing solutions (discuss with HMFA)
- Evaluate other state's models to create strategies for bringing down costs
- Explore potential for Group Net Metering and Solar Gardens
- Inclusion of Solar Thermal for SREC eligibility

FH: Why just low income/HMFA?

RR: We find that segment of the market to be underserved.

FH: I don't think you should put all your focus there.

CG: Well we're looking for those suggestions in comment form; these are all just ideas right now.

MW: Part of the EMP was to look for areas that would benefit from Clean Energy programs.

Lyle Rawlings: I think we would want to discuss going a step further than low income.

MW: As far as community renewables, it won't move without having a discussion about who pays those distribution charges.

LR: I don't think that's high on our radar right now.

MW: We've already had models for that.

GSO: The EMP in Trenton was one of the few times with the senate bill (2371) that directs the government. Are you going to recommend to the Government what the program money should be spent on?

MW: We don't recommend to the government, you wouldn't hear that in the testimony.

Q: Have you run this passed by the Board lawyers?

CG: We're just throwing out ideas still.

MW: Anything is on the table for the budget for renewables, so they're creating a dialogue.

SRP Modifications:

- Transition to electronic registration and processing
- New paperwork requirements for 2012
- Explore increasing rate of project verifications/inspections.

Discussion about new rules for application submission.

Q: The transition to the electronic registration, would that be relaxing the email requirements?

Tammy Gray: The portal structure is to upload those documents so we can go into the portal and see them. This is not an email function.

CG: Yes it would be PDFs.

Q: Well I was wondering if then you would accept emails.

TG: No, we would not be accepting emails.

Solar Program Outreach:

- Solar Technical Working Group
- Financing webinars
- Outreach to realtor associations (both RE and EE)

Comment on the technical working groups and topic related to fire safety training: MW: We're in the middle of an MOU that does safety training for all of this.

CF: You should go to the appraisers, not realtors.

SS: I met with realtors; they do need to know this so they know how to assess property values.

CF: He's talking about a marketing price. I'm talking about an actual price.

FH: There's a place out of Chicago that does it, which doesn't seem right.

CF: There's no assessment for solar panels, you should change that to determine value.

Q: Solar for resale, I did a study on this, over the last 8 yrs. Solar increases the value of homes in 5 years.

David Hill: Frame work in solar market, It would be helpful to manage the RPS to incentivize. The strategy we wanted to recognize is the high risk and high cost. Same applies for solar models. Legitimate concerns of the parties involved. The last thing I want to mention is the solar ACP program. So there's a lot of good information out there.

Glen Coding: With respect to incentives around loan guarantees, I would like to see that program being widened beyond. Quite a large number of families, many houses have mortgage issues. They can't meet the minimum loan values. Related to that, is there any way that provides benefits to NJ SREC solar installations? We're giving our tax dollars to developers outside of NJ. How do we keep this money in the state? The leasing companies are not paying well for jobs that are in NJ and taking all of the benefits out of state. Is there a penalty for going with installers outside of the state? One other question-at a minimum, is there any way to unlock the PDF files so we can see the documents after we create them? There are times when I have to go through everything all over again because I can't save them.

LM: The solar financing program made all market segments participate, rather than layering the incentives.

REIP Wind Program

- Program still temporarily closed due to safety concerns
- Need to assess the impact of the lengthy program shutdown and reason for failures.
- Revising 2011 program requirements- MM finalizing recommendation to OCE based on working group feedback and written comments.
- Revised 2011 program will become 2012 program recommendation.
- Want to put more focus on performance based incentives – areas with better wind speeds and open areas with fewer trees and buildings.

Question: The wind program in 2012, is that behind the meter?

MW: The end pages has preliminary funding for RE program, REIP is mostly behind the meter, then grid supply for non solar. That doesn't include the carry over, which we're in the middle of processing.

RR: And there will be a carry over because of the hold.

Wind and Biomass are the step children for the REIP Program. Wind and bio power will have more outreach done in 2012.

FH: What happened to the ratepayer that this program was designed for?

RR: That doesn't mean there's no room for the smaller projects.

Bio Power Outreach Plans:

- Program expected to remain similar to 2011 program
- Proactive outreach and industry engagement
- Target high potential industries (i.e., food processing, wastewater treatment, etc.) for project development
- Recommending more segment focus and outreach to high potential, high value industries and contractors:
- More proactive outreach to qualified contractors and manufacturers
- Align bio power efforts with NJCEP's EE programs for Industrial and Water/wastewater customers
- Highlight Rutgers' 2007 "Assessment of Biomass Energy Potential in New Jersey" Study
- Promote availability of funds for project and site-specific feasibility studies

Written comments are due by Friday, August 19. Please send to Ron Reisman at reisman@veic.org

September 20th REC Meeting: Budgeting and formalizing programs

Dennis (EMCEIA): Any retroactive plans for projects to get feasibility studies done?

RR: As of now these are all going forward plans.

Sarah (Rate Council): On the 75 million budget; is there some place that puts this into context?

MW: That's new funding in the order, not carry over.

CG: It's part of the \$219 million.

MW: It's in the Board Order that approved the funding level for the new year. We're starting the procedure for the next 4 years.

CG: It's also in the presentation that Mike Ambrosio presented at the May RE Committee meeting.

Sarah: Are you asking for comments on this power point? Is this the only place where comments are being requested?

RR: Yes, and this is the only request

CG: Typically the MM puts suggestions out there. There will be additional comments later once this gets into a straw proposal.

MW: We've been talking about this since June with the 7 and 5 report. We'll finalize it with a compliance filing.

Sarah: I don't think the general public would have any idea about this.

CG: The time line was at the last REC meeting

MW: There will be five more meetings on this.

2011 Program Update (C. Garrison)

The preliminary installed solar capacity as of 7/31/11 is approximately 399.5 MW.

The preliminary solar capacity project pipeline as of 7/31/11 is over 465 MW.

CF: I have to explain this to customers why SREC prices have dropped.

SH: It's in balance actually. We said this would happen in February.

LR: These numbers are out of balance.

MW: Not when we were under balance. This is an open market, it's going to be under supplied and over supplied.

LR: We disagreed then and we disagree now.

CF: You're not going to have anyone here in a few months.

MW: We've said that.

LR: A crash is bad, SREC's are in oversupply.

MW: We're going to take the low market with the high market. It's not our recommendation to change the current system. The current administration doesn't want to stay high. It won't be staff recommendation.

LR: When it was high we did make a recommendation to change the system.

GSO: You have to keep a lid on these 5 mw projects.

MW: We said that was a way to control capacity. That wasn't what happened.

LR: This association never said that no limits.

MW: We said don't give them that capacity, that wasn't what that committee said.

LR: It was irresponsible. It slid considerably.

MW: We don't have the authority.

GSO: If it was evident there was a potential for a problem – and you see we have 20 applications for 5 mw or more, maybe we just don't approve that.

MW: Under what authority would we do that?

CF: Well someone has to be in charge...

MW: We kept saying this is what the pipeline is going to look like.

CF: Mike you said it's your job to bring the SRECs down to 0.

GSO: Nothing is going to get built

FH: We need to go back to the legislature to get them to change this.

MW: If you want to change the policy go to the EMP hearings.

LR: We were happy with the EMP changes, but we need more.

MW: There were six committee meetings. Once it gets conditionally vetoed we don't have the authority. We supported that bill.

LR: We were on board with you but that's not enough now. We are the market and we can't take care of it.

CF: None of your slides showed any of this.

MW: If you think that way we don't need to go to the meeting. That said, we put a lot of time into putting these changes together.

MS: What changes?

MW: A2529 was the bill the board supported until it was conditionally vetoed.

SH: What would that do in this projection?

LR: We asked Charlie about the capacity and he said he didn't know.

GSO: Dec 31st depreciation goes down. If SRECs are \$200 you can probably get 2/3rds of that back.

Q: We can all look at the NJCEP for where that guidance is. The applications that are going in aren't of the same quality that they used to be because they lost some quality control. Then we can talk to our legislators.

SH: Is there a requirement for when you can apply for that grant?

GSO: We had the opportunity to step on the gas, now we have a few problems.

Everything will change in 2012. 2013 will be better.

LR: I completely disagree, PA SRECS are down to \$12-\$15 and people are still building over 1 mw projects. The market can't self regulate.

Installer in audience: Are you going to scale project on your 15 mw project?

LR: No. I'm proving my own point. We're going to keep doing business.

MW: So the 80 mw from PS that we weren't very approving of. That was a way to regulate the market. Nobody wanted to regulate the market at that time.

LR: That's not regulating it, that's just taking a piece out of it.

GSO: We'll find out next year.

MW: I agree, I think it's too soon. You need to have a meeting with President Solomon because I can't set that legislation.

CS: Can we send the minutes of this dialogue too?

MW: I will tell him what happened in this dialogue.

LR: Just don't wait until NJ becomes PA.

SH: They'll still be constructing those panels.

CS: No way, not unless they have the panels already.

MW: If you're going to have a discussion where you're raising the cost to the rate payer, you're not going to do it, the rate payer is strapped.

GSO: Michael Flett had a comment at the EMP hearings that the cost was way overstated.

System Add On Eligibility :

Eligibility for Systems Installed at the Same Site:

- Project developers have the flexibility to install projects in one or more phases.
- Customers that previously participated in the REIP program for the same utility meter must wait one year before they can submit a new project to the SREC Registration Program (SRP).
 - 1 year after the installed system has passed program inspection

- Past participants in the SRP do not have a waiting period for the submittal of a new project.

Existing System with a Meter:

- Registrants will have two options regarding the NJ SREC generation when installing additional capacity at a site that has an existing system with a revenue grade meter recording the system output.
 - 1) Registrant may elect to add the capacity to the existing NJ Certification number utilizing the existing meter.
 - Additional capacity will be subject to the remaining qualification life that is applicable to the original NJ Certification number.
 - 2) Registrant may elect to develop their project in phases with each phase eligible for a unique 15 year qualification life.
 - A unique SRP registration and output meter is required and a NJ Certification number will be issued for each SREC generation meter with its own 15 year qualification life.

Existing System without a Meter

- Registrants will have two options regarding the NJ SREC generation when installing additional capacity at a site that has an existing system with a revenue grade meter recording the system output.
 - 1) Registrant may elect to add the capacity to the existing NJ Certification number utilizing the existing meter.
 - Additional capacity will be subject to the remaining qualification life that is applicable to the original NJ Certification number.
 - 2) Registrant may elect to develop their project in phases with each phase eligible for a unique 15 year qualification life.
 - A unique SRP registration and output meter is required and a NJ Certification number will be issued for each SREC generation meter with its own 15 year qualification life.

2011 Operations Update (T. Gray)

679 applications submitted in July

Approved 601 projects in July

732 Final As-Built Paperwork received (SRP 595/REIP 137)

581 NJ Cert #'s assigned

EDC SREC Based Financing Program

SRP Registrations together with a written cover letter noting the project is intended for participation in the SREC Based Financing Program solicitation MUST be submitted to

the NJCEP staff on or before 4 pm on Monday, August 15th. No exceptions will be given on this deadline.

The Expression of Interest (EOI) documents are required to be submitted to NERA no later than 12 pm on Monday, August 29th

If the EOI's are deficient because the NJCEP # is missing (pending SRP approval), bidders have up until 5 pm on Thursday, September 1st to cure the deficiency on the EOI.

Bid Date 12 pm on Friday, September 2nd

The SREC Based Financing Program

Website: www.njedcsolar.com

Email: njsolarinfo@nera.com

Contact: Benjamin Chee

Telephone: 212-345-0091

SRP Registration Packet must include:

- A written cover letter identifying the project as a participant in the SREC Based Financing Program solicitation
- Include cover letter as the first page of the SRP Registration packet
- If there is no cover letter, NJCEP will assume the project is not intended for the solicitation
- Ensure the SRP Registration packet is complete
- All documents must be mailed or hand delivered

Note:

ESFI incentive of \$.50/Watt will not be available for SRP projects that participate in the EDC solicitations planned for September and December 2011

Any SRP Registration packets that were previously submitted prior to this notice without a cover letter must submit a cover letter to let NJCEP staff inform that you have previously submitted a registration for the solicitation

CORE projects are NOT eligible to participate

Other Topics / New Business

MW: MCEIA to borrow funds for balancing the budget in other areas that is determined by MCEIA.

GSO: How much money is that?

MW: They would get payments from all 7 utilities and then transfer. It would be a couple hundred million dollars. Over the next 12 months the calendar year would be \$379 million dollars.

CF: The utility companies say they are setting up a procedure for EDC approval, it's been 90 days for some. The inspection sheet on mine says it would be sent to the customer. I called PSEG they didn't know.

TG: We have posted that contact info on the website.

RR: Don Cook?

CF: I called him and left 5 voice messages for him as well.

SH: What's the complaint form status?

CG: It's ready to go, I've tested it.

MW: We wanted some tracking and response. So if you're calling them 5 times, you can say that. They also have the opportunity to defend themselves.

Angela Sehein: About the new meters, what is the procedure for letting customers know or the paperwork process. You're saying September/October, what's the procedure?

SH: Change out the meter and tell GATS.

AS: You can tell them anything though.

MW: We don't endorse lying or cheating.

SH: We have a meter form online, change the meter, use that, supply it to GATS.

TG: We should probably reach out GATS to see how they want to know.

SH: It's not uncommon for them to get meter change forms. We won't need any new information

CF: So GATS has the right to change our procedures?

SH: They have a policy neutral platform.

MW: They follow whatever the states rules are.

Meeting adjourned at 4 pm.

The next meeting is scheduled for September 20, at 1 pm.

Renewable Energy Committee Meeting

Attendees

Tuesday, August 9, 2011
Conservation Services Group

1:00pm - 3:30pm

Initial	Name	Company	Phone	E-mail
	Chen, Bin	Certified Pure Energy	(201) 820-8483	bin@certifiedpureenergy.com
	Corkedale, Olivia	Gabel Associates	(732) 296-0770	olivia@gabelassociates.com
	Daniels, Kwesi	NJHMFA	(609) 278-7370	kdaniels@njhmfa.state.us
	Davey, Matt	Petra Solar	(732) 429-6461	matthew.davey@petrasolar.com
	Drexinger, John		(732) 496-2781	johndrexinger@yahoo.com
	Ferraro, Joanne	Solar & More	(973) 810-0936	iferraro@solarandmorestore.com
	Ferraro, Tom	Solar & More	(973) 810-0937	tferraro@solarandmorestore.com
	Flett, Michael			mflett@flettexchange.com
	Forbes, Chuck	Highlands Solar	(973) 865-1592	chuck@chforbes.com
	Fried, Michael	Solus Energy.com		mike@solusenergy.com
	Garrison, Charlie	Honeywell	(973) 890-9500	charlie.garrison@honeywell.com
	Gray, Tammy	VEIC	(732) 218-3418	tammy.gray@csgrp.com
	Hauber, Fred	Eastern Energy Services	(609) 801-1990	fhauber@verizon.net
	Heller, Theresa	VEIC	(732) 218-3415	theresa.heller@csgrp.com
	Hendricks, Mahogany	BPU		mahogany.hendricks@bpu.state.nj.us
	Hoff, Kimberly	CSG	(732) 218-3410	kimberly.hoff@csgrp.com
	Hourican, Mary Kate	DPR Electric		kaity.ales@yahoo.com
	Hunter, Scott	OCE/NJBPU	(609) 777-3300	
	Jackson, Ronald	BPU-OCE	(609) 777-3199	ronald.jackson@bpu.state.nj.us
	Jacobs, Thirza	PSEG		thirza.jacobus@pseg.com
	Kennedy, Alexis	Gabel Associates		alexis@gabelassociates.com
	Kuehn, Al	Solus Energy	(908) 276-1594	solarinc@gmail.com
	Lalla, Gail	Greener by Design	(732) 253-7717	galla@qbdtoday.com
	Lupse, Janja	CSG		janja.lupse@csgrp.com
	Margolin, Dave	Certified Pure Energy	(732) 236-4406	dave@certifiedpureenergy.com
	McAleer, Jim	Solar Electric NJ, LLC	856-220-7070	jim@SolarElectricNJ.com
	McCarthy, Melissa	Ecological Systems		melissa@ecologicalsystems.biz
	McCauley, John	Petra Solar	(732) 476-4218	john.mccawley@petrasolar.com
	Mitchell, Allison	BPU		allison.mitchell@bpu.state.nj.us
	Noweski, Tony	Sodons Energy	(732) 872-4014	tony@sodonsenergysolutions.com
	Patel, Sunil	Patel Builders Inc.	(732) 429-3990	sunil.patel@pbsolar.us
	Patnaude, Suzanne	Solyndra	(908)331-2598	suzanne.patnaude@solyndra.com
	Peracchio, Anne Marie	NJ Natural Gas	(732) 938-1129	aperacchio@ning.com
	Peters, Christopher	Acadian Consulting Group	517.518.1294	cpeter9@gmail.com
	Price, Josh	Gabel Associates	(732) 296-0770	josh.price@gabelassociates.com
	Rawlings, Lyle	ASP	(609) 466-4495	lyle@advancedsolarproducts.com
	Reisman, Ron	VEIC		roneisman@nyc.rr.com
	Schaal, Gary	Solar Electric NJ, LLC	(609) 929-1746	gary@solarelectricnj.com
	Schultz, Scott	Advanced Solar Products		scott@advancedsolarproducts.com
	Sehein, Angela	Corbin Solar		angela@corbinsolar.com
	Steins, Ed	The Solar Center	(973) 627-7730	esteins@thesolarcenter.com
	Thanjai, Benoy	Vanguard Energy Partners	(732) 302-3708	bthanjai@vanguardenergypartners.com
	Thompson, Howard	Russo Tummulty for PPL	(973) 993-4477	hthompson@russotummulty.com
	Winka, Michael	NJBPU-OCE	(609) 777-3335	michaelwinka@bpu.state.nj.us
	Zislin, Neal	Renu Energy	(908) 371-0014	nzislin@renuenergy.com