



DEMAND REDUCTION SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday December 7, 2016
100 Cambridge St., 10th Floor
Boston, MA 02114

Attendees: Donald Boecke, Amy Boyd, Jonathan Goldberg, Michael Goldman, Lyn Huckabee, Craig Johnson, Paul Johnson, Richard Malmstrom, Matt Rusteika, Jeff Schlegel (via phone), Arah Schuur, Eric Winkler (via phone)

1. Call to Order

Schuur called the meeting to order at 12:40 PM.

2. Welcome, Introductions and Updates

Schuur began the meeting by noting that DOER had hoped to give an update on their Peak Demand Reduction Demonstration Grant but that they were not quite ready. She did, however, note that they have received a lot of responses to the RFP and that they are in the process of narrowing them down.

3. Resolution Commitments and Key Milestones

Goldberg began by reviewing the key work areas for the current 2016-2018 Plan, which included developing the analytical framework, proposing and implementing demonstration projects, planning for and evaluation of the projects, and planning for the 2019-2021 Plan.

Goldman and Goldberg went through the planned activities by quarter for 2017 and 2018. For each quarter, Goldman noted the major activities planned, which included quarterly Subcommittee meetings, themed Council meetings, possible workshops, implementation and evaluation of demonstration project implementation, and the Avoided Energy Supply Cost (AESC) study.

Goldman noted that they have had conversations with potential vendors so that they can have as much in place as they can so that when summer events are finished they can get cleansed data as soon as possible.

Goldberg noted that the date for the next Subcommittee meeting would likely be finalized by the end of January. Schuur added that the hope is to have DPU approval by then, but if not a subcommittee meeting would be scheduled at that time anyway.

Schuur noted that at a certain point, Eversource and Unitil would not be able to move forward on their demonstration projects until they receive DPU approval. Goldman noted that they did not want to give the impression that they are not doing anything in the meantime. He indicated that while waiting for DPU approval they have been working to get their sales team ready, vet vendors, engage with potential customers, and other similar tasks.

Boyd asked if the Eversource and Unitil's evaluation plans were contingent on DPU approval by a certain time. Goldberg noted that the only way they would be able to make their current timeline is to get their EM&V plans developed under the assumption that DPU would approve their projects.

Boecke asked if the PAs had a sense of at what point with no DPU approval would the summer initiative be lost. Goldman indicated that it would depend on the technology. For example, he said demonstrations involve batteries take longer to get up off the ground and running whereas commercial demand response can be done in a relatively short amount of time.

Boyd asked how long the PAs expect it to take to get approval from the DPU. Goldberg noted that this is a busy time of year and that the DPU has many orders that must be heard by the end of the year.

2017 Schedule

Schuur noted the plan was to have quarterly Subcommittee meetings that are aligned with key deliverables. She also indicated that they would plan to update the full Council twice during the year, once in the spring and again in the fall.

Boyd noted that she felt quarterly meetings would be fine, but stressed that anything fewer than that would be unacceptable. Johnson agreed.

Lyne noted that the Cape Light Compact wanted to give the full Council an update on their work and asked when it would be appropriate to do that. Schuur suggested that they could make time for that at the December meeting.

Schuur asked if the usual time for Subcommittee meetings would work for everyone. Goldberg indicated that aligning the Subcommittee meetings with Executive Committee meetings is difficult because the PAs have some internal meetings that conflict.

4. Matrix of Research Questions and Technologies

Eversource Update on Selection of Demonstration Projects

Goldman gave the Subcommittee an update on the selection of demonstration projects. He reviewed their process for selecting projects, which types of projects were selected, and what types of solutions were considered but not selected.

Schuur asked why phase change materials were considered an option for large C&I customers but not for small and medium ones. Goldman noted that they chose to do it for large customers because that is where they can get the most value.

Johnson asked if Goldman could elaborate on how they narrowed down to the projects they eventually picked. Goldman noted that over the last six to eight months they have had extensive conversations with industry experts and as they have done that certain technologies were funneled out while others remained. Malmstrom indicated that he was happy to see that they spent a lot of time narrowing it down to just a handful of projects.

Johnson asked what value streams they are focused on. Goldman noted that they are focused at the ISO-level, the distribution level, and the custom level. Boyd indicated that she was pleased with those streams and encouraged them to focus on the distribution level.

Statewide PA Reference Document

Goldberg noted that the PAs had put together a memo to serve as a single reference document that highlights all of the PAs demonstration project plans.

5. Adjournment

Schuur adjourned the subcommittee at 2:00 PM.