Good morning Jo Ann,

I am reaching out regarding Wednesday's RFQ presentation by the PA's. Needless to say the presentation was twisted in a way that made this RFQ seem beneficial and the best possible option moving forward for the Mass Save Weatherization Program.

It was brought to my attention that Paul did not submit any written comment prior to the meeting, leaving the IIC's in the program voiceless.

I want to be clear and make sure that you and the council members have an accurate understanding of this RFQ and the devastating effects that it will have.

Kate Peters stated that this RFQ was "not a race to the bottom" with regard to pricing and that "the PA's asked contractors to bid how they needed to for their businesses to be successful". That is an absolutely false statement as the PA's created the RFQ stating that "the lowest bidders would be in the allocated pool of contractors that will receive program work and that those bottom bids would create the new program pricing moving forward". That meant that all IIC's had a difficult choice to make, bid absolutely rock bottom pricing to hopefully ensure allocated work flow or risk a higher much needed pricing bid to also try and keep our businesses alive and profitable.

The program was designed with two components, IIC's who receive work from the program and HPC's that bring their own work into the program.

Kate pointed out that IIC's that are not in the allocated group can bring in their own customers. It sounds so simple but it is not. IIC's rely on work from the program to stay in business. This includes all of the IIC's not just a handful. This model was created by the PA's back in 2010 and this is how all contractors have adapted and molded their business models by. The IIC's were specifically asked time and time again by the PA's to grow our businesses, add trucks and hire more people.

Do you understand that once the group of non allocated contractors get removed they will most likely be closing their doors?

Chris Porter stated that work quality is very important to the program but in actuality work quality means nothing in this RFQ process because it is lowest bidder wins first and then once the allocated group is determined then work quality scores will come into play. He also stated that 80% of contractors have an 8 out of 10 work quality score.

An 8 for work quality is poor work quality in case you were not aware. Additionally, Chris stated that anyone who doesn't have 9 out of 10 work quality score will not be in the allocated group. The question begs, why would they allow contractors that they know are less than a 9 work quality score currently to even put a bid in, only to remove them after the RFQ is completed? And why are those contractors even allowed to do program work?

The PA's with the help of the Lead Vendors, designed this RFQ with absolute intent to arrive at the pricing they want, knowing full well contractors will be forced to bid low to continue to receive work.

This is a lose-lose for all contractors and for the rate payers of Massachusetts. Mass Save has billions of dollars but due to the budget cut, the PA's decided that we are no longer needed nor valuable enough

due to electrification priorities. We are now being discarded with no regard for the commitment and resources we have all poured into the program for years.

There were many questions that were asked of the Lead Vendors. For example, if you remove half the contractors from the program and no contractors in the allocated group do aluminum siding, asbestos siding, third floor wall insulation, particularly in Boston, who is going to do that work? They said they haven't figured that out yet.

This RFQ is going to be the down fall of the Weatherization Program and will ensure contractors lose their livelihood.

The devil is in the details of this RFQ and those details are extremely important. Your committee, although an advisory board, is the steering wheel of Mass Save therefore the committee members have a responsibility to ensure they understand how our program works and can engage in thoughtful and reasonable advising to the PA's.

I am strongly encouraging you and your fellow council members to advise the PA's to revamp this RFQ in a more appropriate and "equitable" manner. If any council members need clarification or has any questions, I am happy to engage.

Best,

Christine McEachern

McEachern Insulation Inc. (IIC)