



MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, December 16, 2021
Virtual Meeting via Zoom

Voting Councilors Present: Greg Abbe (for Jennifer D Maddox), Cindy Arcate, Jo Ann Bodemer (for Maura Healey), Kyle Murray (for Amy Boyd), Justin Davidson, Jerrold Oppenheim (for Elliott Jacobson), Paul Johnson, Deirdre Manning, Cammy Peterson, Robert Rio, Dennis Villanueva, Mary Wambui, Sharon Weber, Commissioner Patrick Woodcock, Charlie Harak

Voting Councilors Absent:

Consultants Present: Eric Belliveau, Adrian Caesar, Gretchen Calcagni

DOER Staff Present: Rachel Evans, Maggie McCarey, Emily Webb

1. Call to Order

McCarey, as Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:04 PM.

2. Public Comment

Michelle Buchannan (NEEECO)

Buchannan was grateful that the home performance contractor (HPC) pricing issue was being addressed since the home energy assessment (HEA) fee has not changed in ten years, while costs have increased substantially. Buchannan noted that HPCs account for 50% of audits and weatherization jobs performed in the program, but they have not been appropriately compensated. Buchannan suggested providing marketing reimbursement fees for bringing in customers, or even conversion fees for installation of deep energy savings measures. Buchannan stated that HPCs have higher weatherization conversion rates than lead vendors, but HPCs are excluded from lead vendor-generated weatherization projects. Buchannan recommended immediate emergency HPC funding increase of \$250 to the existing home energy assessment fee to compensate for lost lighting revenue and increasing costs. Buchannan also said the RFP process should be put on hold until the HPC platform is addressed.

McCarey requested that Buchannan share written public comment.

Martjin Fluereen (HomeWorks Energy)

Fluereen appreciated the Council's consideration of HPC concerns, as well as the ambitious goals included in the 2022-2024 Plan. Fluereen commented that HPCs have successfully implemented community-based marketing and customer education, and they comprise the workforce that needs workforce development attention. Fluereen stated that HPCs are a clear path to help Massachusetts achieve targets, but program economics have become unsustainable for contractors due to stagnant pricing. Fluereen said that HPCs will resort to other business streams if the expected program structure does not change. Fluereen said the development of a reasonable compensation model will take time, but the impending removal of LEDs from the program requires an immediate solution as Buchannan suggested. Fluereen also recommended an additional \$250 fee for each energy assessment to mitigate cost impacts until a sufficient long-term solution is achieved. Fluereen said the current \$175 assessment fee has remained static, but marketing and labor costs have risen substantially over the past decade.

John Lanzi (Revise Energy)

Lanzi supported Buchannan and Fluereen's comments, and added that the collective HPC community is concerned by a lack of perceived actionable efforts by the PAs. Lanzi said the PAs have expressed unwillingness to commit to a reasonable timeline and indicated a solution would take months to finalize, which would be too late for many HPCs given the removal of LED bulbs. Lanzi noted that HPCs are direct competitors with each other, but the dire nature of the situation has caused consensus agreement that an immediate solution is needed while a long-term solution is determined. Lanzi predicted that many HPCs would transition to other work areas and downsize operations without immediate financial relief. Lanzi said many HPCs are well over 100% of pre-COVID operation capacity, but are receiving about 75% of pre-Covid Mass Save work. Lanzi advocated for a 10% material cost adder and an additional \$250 for assessment fees beginning in January 2022.

Hank Keating (Passive House Massachusetts)

Keating felt that the 2022-2024 Plan includes important steps forward, but still lacks detail to evaluate projected effectiveness. Keating indicated that many Plan commitments are to make future program plans, such as the Language Access Plan and mixed income protocol. Keating urged the Council to accelerate development of programs and hold public hearings to solicit comments. Keating said the Plan commits to launching deep energy retrofits for C&I buildings and affordable housing units in 2022, which need to be implemented as early as possible to meet climate goals. Keating suggested that the Plan include aggressive deep energy retrofit pilots, like the \$35k per unit NYSERDA offering. Keating said that weatherization and heat pumps need to be co-delivered as opposed to installing heat pumps without weatherization or as backups to fossil fuel systems. Keating also noted that the Climate Act shifted workforce development funding to the Mass Clean Energy Center, but there are no details for these important workforce development efforts. Keating emphasized the need to formulate and disseminate important Plan details to the public.

Anil Navkal (Mass Save Customer/Andover Resident)

Navkal summarized personal experiences with poor delivery of program services to customers eligible for fuel assistance. Navkal indicated that his application was successfully submitted in

2019 by hand and email, but was told to resubmit an application in 2021. Navkal resubmitted the application and received a home visit, but there was only phone call correspondence with the Greater Lawrence Community Action Council (GLCAC) through unknown caller IDs. Navkal noted that since first applying in 2019, no one has come to implement any work at his home in Andover. Navkal discovered that many others in his community similarly struggled with receiving services and suggested the situation was even worse in Lawrence. Navkal urged the program administrators (PAs) to solve the problem to better serve people in low- and moderate-income communities. Navkal thanked Wambui for motivating him to bring his personal experiences to the Council.

3. Council Updates & Business

Virtual Meeting Procedure Review

McCarey reviewed the virtual EEAC meeting procedures, which included the following:

1. The Council meetings would be recorded.
2. All attendees except for Councilors and presenters would remain muted for the duration of the meeting.
3. Councilors would hold comments until the end of presentations, but Councilors and other participants should speak instead of using any chat functionality.
4. Councilors who disconnect from meetings need to announce when they rejoin.
5. All Council votes would be taken by a roll call for accuracy.

Department of Public Utilities (DPU) 2022-2024 Plan Review: Process Update

McCarey presented an update on the 2022-2024 Plan DPU review process. McCarey said the Evidentiary Hearings, which covered market potential studies, cost-effective energy efficiency savings, program implementation, equity, Social Cost of Carbon, cost-effectiveness screening, performance incentives, electrification, and other topics, concluded earlier this week. McCarey noted that record requests from the DPU would be submitted by the PAs on Friday, December 17th. McCarey added that final Plan data tables will be submitted Tuesday, December 21st to reflect quality assurance performed since October. McCarey said initial briefs are due December 29th, reply briefs are due January 6th, and the DPU has until January 30th to release an order on the 2022-2024 Plan following reply briefs.

McCarey indicated the 2022 Council Meeting schedule was posted with the meeting materials and encouraged the Council to review the schedule and draft topics. McCarey added that the public comment listening sessions in the 2022-2024 Plan process were very helpful, and proposed scheduling dedicated public comment sessions in 2022.

Abbe asked if the Council could participate in an appeal process if the DPU Order on the Plan stripped key plan elements related to climate and equity goals. Evans replied that the role of the Council is to advise the PAs and provide feedback on the proposed Plan. Evans said the PAs submit Council comments with their Plan filings, but the DPU has independent authority on how it rules on the Plan. Evans said there is an appeal process for PAs or any intervening parties to file a motion for clarification, recalculation, or make a court appeal if they believe the DPU made a legal mistake. Evans said the Council can submit a resolution with comments to the DPU, so

the Council can always contribute to the discussion within its statutory authority. Lyne indicated the PAs would work diligently to get the Plan approved, and thanked the PA staff and other contributors to briefings and hearings. Commissioner Woodcock said the DPU Plan review process is an extensive and time-sensitive process. Commissioner Woodcock thanked the Council, Department of Energy Resources (DOER), Attorney General's Office, and PA staff for their efforts. Commissioner Woodcock noted that, as public comments highlight, there needs to be a focus on successful program implementation as well.

Davidson and Manning joined the virtual meeting at 1:40 PM.

4. Draft Consultant Team 2022 Work Plan Overview

Consultant Team Presentation

Calcagni presented an overview of the Consultant Team (C-Team) 2022 Workplan, noting that a full Workplan was posted with the meeting materials. Calcagni covered the key work areas and topics including strategic planning and analysis, active demand management, sector-specific program support, program evaluation, and technical services. Calcagni indicated a heavy emphasis would be placed on supporting implementation of new program elements included in the 2022-2024 Plan, as well as supporting additional Council processes and working groups.

Council Discussion

Johnson commented that the monitoring of heat pump implementation progress, both in Massachusetts and other states, is very important. Johnson wondered why people would install heat pumps in some instances of unfavorable customer economics. Johnson said it would be helpful for the Council to review the Council website prior to launch as was done a few years ago. Johnson reiterated the need for additional Council input for commissioned evaluation, measurement, and verification (EM&V) studies. Johnson previously requested to provide guidance to the Strategic Evaluation Team, but felt his suggestions were ignored. Calcagni said achieving heat pump targets and monitoring progress will be a key focus for the C-Team. Calcagni added that the Council could receive a preview of the updated website if there is interest. Calcagni also asked if anyone from the PAs had thoughts on increasing council involvement in the EM&V process.

Wambui referenced Navkal's public comments about the Income Eligible process and regional CAP complaints from 2019, but the problem was identified in a 2018 study. Wambui stated that the Council cannot spend money to complete studies without implementing solutions and recommendations that are informed by study results.

McCarey believed there was sufficient transparency on upcoming and final studies, but these results typically do not come to Council discussions. McCarey considered that the C-Team should present key study recommendations to the Council, while the Council takes a more active role in implementing the recommendations.

Villanueva supported Wambui's comments on implementing insights from EM&V studies, and said the Council should find ways to follow study results through. Villanueva believed the C-

Team should better balance the budget between C&I and Residential programs since the current distribution seemed to favor areas other than C&I.

Johnson agreed wholeheartedly with Wambui. Johnson asked if there was a report showing the extent to which study results have been implemented. Abdou believed the Term Report includes all EM&V recommendations and PA responses. McCarey said any study from 2019-2021 will be included in the next Term Report, so it should be brought to the Council's attention in 2022.

Arcate seconded Villanueva's recommendation for the C-Team C&I budget allocation. Arcate asked if the increased focus on Residential programs due to the Equity Working Group's efforts would require additional C-Team oversight. Calcagni confirmed there will be enhanced focus on Residential programs since both Market Rate and Income Eligible Residential programs are included in the scope. Calcagni said the budget distribution is similar to the past. McCarey said if the C&I budget is based on prior years, then it may need to be increased given the C&I Working Group and new program efforts.

Lynch noted that there are regular EM&V progress updates in the full quarterly reports near the end of the documents. Lynch said it is a great idea to bring studies and key recommendations to Council meetings. McCarey said there has been discussion on low-income process evaluation at Council meetings and wondered if there would be further follow-up.

Wambui was interested in practical implementation of study results and how they impact customers daily. Wambui recommended that the Council's work is linked to humans since reports and studies are meant to improve program implementation. Wambui said Council discussion needs to maintain sight of customers the programs are meant to serve. Wambui indicated that people are waiting for program support while studies, reports, and discussions transpire.

Villanueva congratulated the C-Team in strongly supporting his first year on the Council. McCarey agreed, and thanked the C-Team for their support of program planning and implementation efforts.

McCarey said the final 2022 C-Team Workplan would be posted for a vote during the January Council meeting.

5. EEAC Data Request Process: Overview and Vote

Data Request Process Overview

McCarey described legislative context around the Council's responsibilities and the mandate in the Energy Efficiency Guidelines to implement a formal data request process. McCarey summarized the process by which DOER would process Council data requests to PAs, how the PAs would respond, and how the data requests would be tracked.

Johnson disliked the proposed data request process due to cost considerations. Johnson suggested that the PAs should have enough funding to support all information requests and the cost

estimation requirement is merely a stall tactic. Johnson said the cost of data requests is irrelevant if the Council values the information. McCarey said cost estimation is required by the DPU, but DOER will work with the PAs for make reasonable cost assessments. McCarey indicated that if the PAs and DOER disagree on whether a request is worth the cost, the Council can vote, and the PAs can appeal to the DPU if they choose. Johnson recommended that the Council add a time limit on providing cost estimates to one month. McCarey believed that the deadline was to provide updates between Council meetings. Johnson said if the Council and PAs cannot come to a consensus then the DPU will decide an outcome. McCarey said the PAs can appeal, but this is already the case for most Council decisions that involve the PAs.

Villanueva recognized need to formalize the data request process, but also sympathized with Johnson's concerns. Villanueva said data required to inform important Council decisions should be readily available. Villanueva proposed that data requests related to QA/QC or key performance indicators (KPIs) should be explicitly exempt from this process in order to prevent access barriers. McCarey said those kinds of clarifications would likely not fall into the data request process. Villanueva said language in the process document should clearly state that QA/QC corrections on existing reporting are exempt. Lyne said the data request process was not meant to include regular reporting documents or any information the PAs have already agreed to provide. Lyne said this process applies only to additional data requests that are not regularly reported. Villanueva agreed, but recommended that the process document describe all parameters clearly.

Wambui felt that a mutually understood data request process has value, but only if there are fair intentions behind it. Wambui said that data guides communities in implementing strategies that address root causes of inequity. Wambui was concerned that data which could support an equity-centered approach and equitable outcomes may not be accessible with a burdensome process. McCarey wondered if language should be added stating that improving equitable outcomes would be included in the valuation of information requests. Wambui reminded the Council that different communities and entities have different interpretations of value. Wambui worried that the value of data in a distrustful environment may not be determined fairly, resulting in inequitable outcomes. McCarey proposed adding clear language describing the components of information request value calculations. Wambui said equity has always been expensive, so this needs to be considered in the language. McCarey said the equity should be valued highly in the data request process. Villanueva said the definition of value should encompass equity, program effectiveness, carbon emissions, and other components.

Abbe asked how the results of data requests would be disseminated. McCarey envisioned that updates on data requests would be provided at the following council meetings, but the language only says there will be a determination of the value of information requests by the next Council meeting. Abbe said the dissemination of data requests and request responses was unclear. McCarey said any denied data requests would be raised for Council discussion. McCarey added that the Council would not dedicate much time discussing data requests that are met successfully. Abbe was concerned that data request responses would not be shared among all Councilors freely, so the process of sharing results should be clarified. McCarey said an ongoing information request tracker could be developed to keep Councilors updated. McCarey noted that

the intent was not to post each data request with Council meeting materials, but a clear process for sharing responses could be determined moving forward.

Bodemer agreed that KPIs and QA/QC corrections should be exempt from data request process, but manipulations or variations of regularly reported data should follow the process. Bodemer suggested the language to exclude certain data request types from this process should be clear. Bodemer advised caution around the language defining valuation components since some items may be unintentionally excluded. Bodemer felt the ability for the Council to vote in the event there is disagreement on the value of information requests provided a safety net. Bodemer believed this could safeguard against equity data requests not being assigned appropriate value. Peterson agreed.

Peterson recommended language for an accelerated pathway for quicker data requests since the formal process might delay response times. McCarey said the current proposed timeline will call for the PAs to decide on data requests by the following Council meeting.

Arcate seconded Peterson's concern about delaying quick data requests. Arcate said the language should define parameters on what value means because people can disagree on the value. Arcate was concerned by the phrase "reasonable and prudent", as requested data should lead to improved program implementation or support Council program oversight. Arcate suggested including this in the language defining data request value calculations. Though Arcate agreed with Wambui's concerns, Arcate indicated that the impact of the data request process on all programs needs to be considered.

Wambui disagreed with Bodemer's comment that the Council's ability to vote on data request valuations in the event of disagreement would provide a sufficient safety net. Wambui supported language in line with what Arcate proposed.

Johnson recommended that the language distinguish between data requests and simple information updates. Johnson commented that the PAs have not been responsive many of his data requests posed during Council meetings during the past few years. Johnson noted that Gundal and Lyne have been responsive to written requests, but his comments at Council meetings typically go unanswered. Johnson encouraged the Council to delineate formal data requests and simple requests that require quick follow-up.

Data Request Process Vote

McCarey indicated a draft data request process was submitted the DPU, but there was enough feedback that warrants thorough revisions and a Council vote in January to ensure definitions are clear. Lyne stressed the importance of implementing an appropriate process, even though the data request process document is behind schedule. Lyne, in response to Wambui's comment about trust, hoped the Council and PAs could foster a trustful environment given the amount of useful data that is already provided by the PAs. Lyne doubted the data request process would become problematic, especially if time is taken to refine it now. McCarey said a tracked changes version of the data request process document would be posted for the January Council meeting.

6. Mass Save Contractor Pricing

Contractor Update

McCarey indicated the HPC Letter from November 30th was posted with the December meeting materials, but it did not include the emergency home energy assessment funding increase referenced in public comment today. McCarey said the Executive Committee worked with the PAs to make sure they coordinated with HPCs, and the PAs agreed to short-term 10% pricing increase to offset material costs. McCarey noted that LED bulbs would be removed from the Residential direct install program after December 2021. McCarey asked the PAs to provide an update on their response to HPC requests.

Peters, on behalf of the PAs, provided an update on the PA response. Peters said the PAs want to get HPC pricing right to accommodate for changes in the market, but also keep ratepayer impacts in mind. Peters noted that the PAs view contractors as critical to the programs, and the PAs look to make sure that support is reciprocated back to contractors through efforts like enhanced incentives to offset COVID-19 impacts. Peters referenced a third-party study from National Grid and Eversource on weatherization pricing being too high, and indicated the PAs tried to solicit direct feedback on prices and labor costs from contractors. Peters said legislative guidance suggests competitive procurement through RFPs should be used, but the past annual pricing review should be clarified and refined moving forward. Peters noted that there is a bonus for contractor work quality and marketing support already in place. Peters said the PAs are in conversations to improve elements of the program model. Peters said specific to HPCs, the Eversource RFP will provide market-based audit pricing levels. Peters said a component of the RFP suggests that HPCs will receive increased pricing for audits. Peters said the PAs have been working to incorporate feedback on weatherization pricing into the procurement process. Peters suggested there is a vacuum of information because the PAs cannot disclose exact procurement details yet, but feedback would be collected once details are released. Peters said this feedback will help the PAs understand how HPC business models differ from IICs so unique needs and costs are understood. Peters acknowledged that DPU hearings have been a recent primary focus for the PAs, but there would be a refocused effort to rectify the contractor pricing situation. Peters appreciated contractors who provided additional feedback and specific requests. Peters was not prepared to offer commentary on new contractor requests for a \$250 in assessment fees, but the PAs would work to determine a reasonable pricing structure.

Council Discussion

McCarey said there is clear indication of concern from HPCs regarding separate a RFP for weatherization pricing without clarity on home energy assessment compensation, marketing costs, and other issues. McCarey asked what the timing of the RFP will be without understanding the rest of the HPC revenue model. McCarey asked if the PAs would defer the RFP until these other components are sorted out. Peters responded that the PAs would defer the RFP in order to consider additional HPC requests. Peters hoped the contractor pricing would be rectified in parallel with the RFQ release to avoid deferring procurement for too long, but acknowledged the need to determine an appropriate pricing solution. McCarey urged the PAs to solicit all contractor feedback prior to continuing with procurement.

Bodemer believed that HPCs are at the core of Residential programs and a pricing solution needs to be an immediate priority until a longer-term strategy is determined, especially given the

removal of lighting from the Residential direct install program. Bodemer said if the process to sort out pricing will take time, then HPCs need an emergency solution and reassurance that they will receive compensation to sustain their businesses.

Johnson agreed with Bodemer, and urged the Council to form a resolution on contractor pricing before the end of the meeting. Johnson appreciated Peters considering HPC feedback, but felt the PAs are being facetious with HPCs regarding content of the RFP. Johnson said that Eckel, at prior meeting, did not provide sufficient information and essentially said HPCs can leave the program if they choose. Johnson said the third-party report was not shared with contractors. Johnson asked for the specific DPU mandate for procurement of services through an RFP. Johnson suggested that the RFP is a negotiation tactic to lower contractor pay. Johnson stated that HPCs are in a crisis and may leave to other states or lines of business. Johnson urged the PAs to provide increased compensation, perhaps not in the amount of \$250 per assessment, but an immediate solution today to offset lost lighting revenues.

McCarey was surprised that the post-lighting revenue model was not developed given the imminent loss of claimable lighting savings has been a known issue for years.

Gromer echoed Bodemer's comments.

Villanueva expressed admiration and support for contractors. Villanueva suggested that rising costs and lost revenue from lighting warrant a timely solution. McCarey said that at the November Council meeting when HPCs proposed a 10% price increase, the Council did not feel informed enough to vote, but Council asked the PAs to work with contractors and report back at the following Executive Committee meeting. McCarey asked if the PAs would consider the short-term audit cost increase and provide an update in January on post-lighting audit prices. Peters said the PAs would discuss the contractor request before deciding, since an immediate \$250 increase seems like a drastic request, and it is the first the PAs are hearing of it.

Johnson believed the Council should resolve to support HPCs by implementing an emergency increase of \$200 for HPC home energy assessment compensation in the month of January, which could then be adjusted based on further PA data review. Johnson emphasized the need for a pricing increase today to prevent further losses for contractors in January.

McCarey supported immediate action, but was uncomfortable recommending a specific dollar amount. Rio agreed that there needed to be immediate action on contractor pricing, but was unsure if \$200 is the correct approach.

Peterson agreed with Bodemer that a quick resolution and emergency coverage are necessary until a long-term solution is established. Peterson requested that the Council determine an interim solution today. McCarey said the current 10% materials price increase is still in place until March, but the additional \$250 is a separate request for HPC home energy assessment costs. Peterson was unsure what the appropriate temporary support should be, but supported an immediate solution.

Harak directed the PAs to develop and implement a proposal for increasing assessment pricing before the end of 2021. Harak was uncomfortable voting on a dollar amount before the C-Team or DOER could review, but recognized the need for an immediate solution before January. Harak requested that the Council vote on a motion to this end.

Arcate asked what lighting revenue comes from each house audit. Peters said it is \$4.50 per bulb depending on the bulb type, but the additional \$250 requested by HPCs likely includes other considerations in addition to lighting.

Couture noted that contractors assembled real pricing data and the previously requested 10% price increase was for weatherization items that spread across IIC contractors. Couture indicated that in 2017, 55% of contractor revenue was from LED bulbs, which was reduced in 2019 and 2020 to about 30% due to capping each home to 25 bulbs each. Couture said lighting revenue will essentially be 0% beginning in 2022.

Arcate said there should be immediate emergency relief tied to lost lighting revenue. Couture said lost lighting is a primary component, but the HPC letter reiterates the lack of change in audit fees for 10 years. Couture said labor costs, commodity costs, marketing costs, and others have increased over the years. Arcate replied that the Council's current focus is on an immediate relief for contractors, not a long-term pricing strategy.

Abbe said the Council, PAs, and HPCs should have further discussion. Abbe indicated that if being an energy efficiency contractor in the Commonwealth is so dependent on PA reimbursement and incentives such that a failure to adjust over time would inhibit contractor businesses, then the marketplace is not healthy. Abbe hoped to gain a better understanding of the marketplace.

Johnson supported Arcate's point was about lost revenue from bulbs. Johnson estimated that the revenue per bulb multiplied by the 25 bulb per home limit should be used to determine the immediate cost increase to offset lost lighting revenue. McCarey noted that this would result in an amount much lower than the requested \$250 increase per audit. McCarey said the Council can request that the PAs review lost lighting revenue to determine an appropriate increase. Johnson said the Council needs to make a resolution that results in a home energy assessment fee increase by January 1st.

Villanueva commented that it seemed unreasonable to only compensate for lost lighting revenue. Villanueva said the Council should consider increased cost of labor as well.

Bodemer reiterated McCarey's desire to determine the appropriate emergency increase amount before making a resolution. Bodemer said the PAs should then take time to determine a more accurate number with the HPCs and propose an emergency increase that will be implemented January 1st. Bodemer said the proposal from the PAs could be reviewed at the January 5th Executive Committee meeting.

Harak supported Bodemer and McCarey's comments that PAs should be directed to work with HPCs and provide a proposal by the end of 2021, and the C-Team should be included in this

discussion since the HPCs and PAs will likely need mediation by a neutral party to determine an agreement.

Peters said the PAs have tens of thousands of different prices across programs, but the HPCs are bringing up a process issue that is causing them concern. Peters said the PAs will definitely follow up with the HPCs to address their worries. McCarey wanted to trust the PAs to improve programs and treat contractor pricing as an urgent issue.

Johnson recommended leaning on the C-Team's expertise to determine a reasonable interim solution, but implement a \$100 increase in audit fees as a first step. Johnson supported a motion similar to what Harak initially proposed.

Harak motioned to direct the PAs to provide a proposal regarding an increase in home energy assessment reimbursement by December 31st, and implement the increase as early as possible in January. Villanueva seconded.

Abbe wanted to confirm that when talking about an increase in assessment prices it would be an increase in price per home energy assessment. Harak clarified that this would be an increase in home energy assessment reimbursement fees received from PAs. Harak said the motion should read home energy assessment reimbursement instead of prices.

Arcate clarified that this is a temporary solution. Harak said the motion is for a temporary solution, but it should leave further solutions up to negotiation between the PAs and HPCs. Harak was willing to amending the motion.

Lyne was unsure it was within the Council role to set specific contractor pricing, but acknowledged the desire for the PAs and HPCs to determine a solution. Lyne anticipated the PAs would work hard to address resolution, and the PAs would be transparent with the Council about the decision. Lyne understood the Council motion was not meant to actually set prices.

McCarey interpreted Harak's motion as requesting the PAs and HPCs to work on an immediate price increase proposal. McCarey said the PAs successfully worked with the HPCs to implement the 10% material price increase, and believed Peters and PAs would work to the same end again.

Harak moved to vote on the motion as written. Johnson seconded. All were in favor, with none opposed or abstaining. The motion was approved, as amended, by the Council.

7. Adjournment

McCarey, as chair, adjourned the meeting at 3:44 PM.