



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, September 1, 2021
Virtual Meeting: Zoom

Executive Committee Members Present: Greg Abbe, JoAnn Bodemer, Amy Boyd, Jodi Hanover (for Emmett Lyne), Maggie McCarey

Other Attendees: Sagal Alisalad, Eric Belliveau, Adrian Caesar, Joe Dorfler, Maggie Downey, Frank Gundal, Elliott Jacobson, Paul Johnson, Hank Keating, Audrey Eidelman Kiernan, Nina Mascarenhas, Sarah McDaniel, Jerrold Oppenheim, Bill Stevens, Emily Webb

1. Call to Order

McCarey, as Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:05 AM.

2. October EEAC Resolution Drafting and Council Meeting Schedule

McCarey reviewed the September-October Council meeting schedule, core agenda topics, and key deliverable dates related to the 2022-2024 Plan. McCarey noted that updated Plan data would be discussed during the September 22nd Council meeting, while the updated Plan narrative would be reviewed during the October 13th Council meeting. McCarey also raised the potential for an additional Executive Committee meeting in October to refine the Final Resolution prior to the Council vote on October 27th.

Hanover was unsure that key programmatic updates and commitments was a focus for the program administrators (PAs), but would confirm. Hanover still anticipated the PAs would have updated Plan data tables prepared for the September 22nd Council meeting.

Johnson asked what the updated Plan narrative review would entail during the October 13th Council meeting. McCarey replied that updated savings, spending, and benefits data would be the focus the September 22nd Council meeting, while the updated Plan narrative would be discussed during the October 13th Council meeting.

Eidelman Kiernan asked if Cape Light Compact (CLC) could present a brief overview of Planned incentive levels, consistent with a Department of Public Utilities (DPU) requirement to

review any CLC incentive levels that vary from statewide incentives. Eidelman Kiernan asked if the Council could then include language in the Final Resolution, or come to a general consensus of approval at the September 22nd Council meeting since the DPU requirement seemed vague. McCarey agreed that it should be added to the September 22nd Council meeting agenda, and Eidelman Kiernan should draft language to include in the Final Resolution. Boyd and Bodemer agreed with this approach.

Boyd requested that CLC report any incentive enhancements that have yielded favorable results and the other PAs describe whether they have considered replicating said enhancements. Eidelman Kiernan said the evaluation team was still in the process of comparing incentive levels across PAs and determining the degree to which any enhanced incentives have had positive impacts. Eidelman Kiernan hoped a memorandum summarizing the results would be available by September 17th. Bodemer supported Boyd's request on CLC incentive enhancements.

Johnson asked if the updated Plan narrative would be available for the September 22nd Council meeting, as the PAs suggested an update would be provided in September to allow for sufficient Council review time. McCarey responded that the full updated Plan narrative would not be available in September, but key programmatic updates and commitments were included on the September 22nd Council meeting agenda to compensate. McCarey indicated the greenhouse gas reduction targets have been at the center of the Plan revisions.

Abbe, Bodemer, Boyd, and Villanueva indicated that they would be comfortable with an additional October Executive Committee meeting between October 13th and 27th.

3. Mass Save Program Update – Implementation Efforts During COVID-19

Hanover announced that, pursuant to Center for Disease Control and state guidelines, contractor health and safety protocols were updated in mid-August. Hanover indicated that mask requirements were adjusted on Monday, August 16th to reduce risk of COVID-19 transmission. Hanover added that five contractors tested positive for COVID-19 in August, but vendors have been diligent reporting positive cases.

4. September 22nd EEAC Meeting – Agenda Finalization

McCarey indicated the September 22nd Council meeting agenda would include votes on the August Executive Committee and full Council meeting minutes, updated 2022-2024 Plan data review, and program implementation updates.

Villanueva indicated that there were still pending data requests related to the Eversource mid-term modifications. Gundal indicated that Eversource staff was still processing the data request.

5. October 13th EEAC Meeting – Draft Agenda Topics

McCarey announced that the October 13th Council meeting draft agenda included votes on the September Executive Committee and September full Council meeting minutes, 2022-2024 Plan

narrative review, additional discussion on Plan data, and discussion of the Draft Council Resolution.

6. October 27th EEAC Meeting – Draft Agenda Topics

McCarey noted the October 27th Council meeting would focus on Final Council Resolution discussion, and a Council vote on the Resolution.

Belliveau asked how likely it was that the September Plan data would be final given ongoing EM&V and incentive updates. Hanover said the objective is to present numbers as close to final as possible, but there would definitely be updates before the Plan filing based on quality control and evaluation.

Villanueva asked if the PAs could list what key areas were expected to change before Plan filing. Hanover was unsure, but indicated any major data changes prior to Plan filing would be flagged for the Council.

Abbe asked about Ralph Prah's role in the existing evaluation framework. Abbe noted that most adjustments to incentives or cost-effectiveness screening inputs are unilaterally approved or rejected by Prah. McCarey clarified that EM&V decisions were all based on consensus, and Prah was not the sole decision-maker. Belliveau said Prah is the Council representative within the full EM&V team that collaborates with the PAs and other evaluators, and the PAs could bring any disagreements before the Council.

Hanover indicated it was written in the Plan that the EM&V consultant has an oversight role, but no EM&V disputes had ever been brought to the Council or DPU. Abbe felt the EM&V consultant essentially has control over all EM&V decisions and the appeal process had no use. McCarey said the appeal process had never been used because the EM&V group works well together. McCarey added that Prah's role is deliberate since an independent party should oversee the evaluation process. McCarey said any specific concerns about an evaluation issue could be brought to the Council. Abbe believed that adjustments to cost-effectiveness screening in pursuit of additional GHG and energy savings, assuming the PAs had a different interpretation than the precedent, might be hindered by the current process. Belliveau indicated that the PAs can propose different screening inputs, which would only be rejected by substantive evaluation data that contradicted proposed PA assumptions.

7. Adjournment

McCarey, as Chair, adjourned the meeting at 10:42 AM.