



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, August 15, 2018
100 Cambridge St, 10th Floor
Boston, MA 02114

Executive Committee Members Present: Don Boecker, Amy Boyd, Judith Judson, Emmett Lyne, Rich Malmstrom

Other Attendees: Marie Abdou, Sagal Alisalad, JoAnn Bodemer, Joe Dorfler, Rachel Evans, Frank Gundal, Jodi Hanover, Lyn Huckabee, Elliott Jacobson, Craig Johnson, Maggie McCarey, Vick Mohanka, Carol Oldham, Jerrold Oppenheim, Alex Pollard, Chris Porter, Emily Powers, Jeff Schlegel (via phone)

1. Call to Order

McCarey, as Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:40 PM.

2. Overview of EEAC Meeting Schedule – August through October

Powers noted that there would be a few changes to the upcoming schedule of meetings. First, she noted that the September Executive Committee (ExCom) meeting would need to be rescheduled to a date after the release of the revised 2019-2021 Plan. She indicated that DOER was considering moving it from September 12th to the 19th. Hanover noted that that date conflicted with Yom Kippur. Powers indicated that DOER would look for another date. Next, Powers indicated that they would be adding an extraordinary meeting of the full Council on October 17th and moving the October ExCom to October 10th.

3. Overview and Discussion of Performance Incentive Framework

Schlegel noted that the performance incentive (PI) currently consists of two component – savings and value. He noted that the consultant team (C-Team) would propose to continue those two components while adding an additional component to capture performance metrics that are not currently captured. He cited active demand management MWs, storage, and electrification and fuel switching activities as examples. Schlegel indicated that the framework would be developed

further with the goal of having a recommendation in place for the Council meeting at the end of August.

Lyne noted that he felt it would be a good idea to present on the history of the PI. He added that the PAs would request that time be set aside for them to co-present on topics of history and to give their views on the PI going forward. Lyne also noted that the PAs are not supportive of performance metrics. Gundal noted that the PAs would eventually need to be able to defend the PI framework in front of the Department of Public Utilities (DPU).

Boyd indicated that she felt it made sense for the PAs and the C-Team to co-present on the background and history of the PI but that the recommendation part should be presented only by the C-Team. She added that the Council, which includes the PAs, could then respond to the C-Team's recommendations.

Lyne reiterated that he felt it was important for the Council to here, directly from the PAs, what and why they are planning to propose for the PI in their plan.

Goals Framework

Schlegel reviewed the C-Team's draft goals framework for the term sheet for the 2019-2021 Plan.

Boyd asked if there would be a situation where electric savings in one place is represented as a different number than they would be in the data tables. Schlegel indicated that that would be possible. Boyd suggested that the C-Team use different terminology to avoid confusion.

Lyne noted that the PA's overarching comment was that the more goals there are the more challenging it gets for the PAs, especially if some of the goals conflict with each other. He indicated that they would engage with the C-Team once they had more time to review the draft framework.

Jacobson requested clarity on the framework as early as possible, noting that as an implementer of the objectives it takes time to do program design.

4. Key Drivers Results

McCarey began by thanking the PAs and the C-Team for their continued efforts on their key driver conversations. Lyne noted that the PAs were working on a memo that would summarize the results from each of their key drivers. He indicated that it was in draft form and shared with the C-Team. Lyne also indicated that their hope was to have a joint-presentation on the whole process. Schlegel thanked the PAs for sharing the draft with them and noted that the C-Team was working on getting comments back to the PAs.

McCarey asked if there was any sense of what the results of the process were. Hanover noted that they have not resulted in an overall portfolio change as they have not re-run all of their models yet. McCarey asked if the PAs and C-Team reached consensus on any of the drivers.

Hanover indicated that they reached some agreement on CHP, residential lighting, and electric small business.

Boyd noted that during the last plan the key drivers process resulted in clear and defined progress on the numbers. She added that she would like to see that information this time around if it existed. Hanover noted that the process was different this time and that that might not be possible. She added that impacts from the process in some cases might net each other out.

5. August EEAC Meeting Agenda

Powers reviewed the agenda for the August EEAC meeting. She indicated that it would include an update on the Avoided Cost of Compliance with the Global Warming Solutions Act study, a presentation on the results of the key drivers process, and an overview and discussion of the performance incentive framework for the 2019-2021 Plan.

Lyne and Hanover noted that the PAs would have their second quarter report completed and asked if the Council would like a presentation on it. McCarey indicated that they could fit that in and recommended it be added to the agenda.

6. Adjournment

Commissioner as Judson, as Chair, adjourned the Executive Committee at 3:38 PM.