



MEETING MINUTES

October 26, 2015

MassHousing Board Room
One Beacon Street, 4th Floor
Boston, MA 02114

Councilors Present: JoAnn Bodemer (for Maggie Downey), Donald Boecke (for Maura Healey), Amy Boyd, James Carey (for Trish Walker), Cindy Carroll, Larry Chretien, Betsy Glynn, Paul Gromer, Charles Harak, Paul Johnson, Judith Judson, Emmett Lyne (for Elizabeth Cellucci), Richard Malmstrom, Deirdre Manning, Michael McDonagh, Alana Murphy (for Chrystal Kornegay), Jerrold Oppenheim (for Elliott Jacobson), Bob Rio, Nancy Seidman (for Martin Suuberg), Michael Sommer, Tilak Subrahmanian, Brad Swing (for Austin Blackmon), Carol White, Eric Winkler

Councilors Absent: Michael Ferrante, Andrew Newman

Consultants Present: Jeff Schlegel, Craig Johnson

DOER Staff Present: Ian Finlayson, Alex Pollard, Arah Schuur, Steven Venezia

Others Present: Dave Gibbons, Amanda Helwig, Jodi Hanover, Lyn Huckabee, Mark Liu, Vick Mohanka, Matt Nelson, Alex Papali, Amy Vavak

1. Call to Order

Judson called the meeting to order at 1:11 PM

2. Public Comment

Alex Papali and Mark Liu spoke on behalf of the Green Justice Coalition. Papali began by thanking the Council for a strong year of hard work to get the 2016-2018 Three-Year Plan (“the Plan”) to where it is. He also noted that many of the recommendations that they have asked for have been addressed, but that there were a couple of items that still need work.

Liu spoke about language access for the programs. He acknowledged that the program administrators (PAs) have taken a good first step in expanding language access and to get people

to do efficiency work. He noted that once a contractor comes to do work there may be roadblocks such as pre-weatherization issues, scheduling of work, and financing that might be difficult to communicate to non-English speaking participants. He recommended that this is something the EEAC should work to address in the long-term. He also suggested that the PAs should translate basic program materials and have a multi-lingual introduction when someone calls in to MassSave in the near-term.

Papali spoke about further addressing the moderate income population. He recommended that the PAs commit to presenting an assessment of the options for providing access to moderate income ratepayers in the 61-100% and 100-120% SMI segments who wish to participate in the program, but can not afford to do so because of household financial limitations. He suggested that the PAs do this by the Q2 in 2017 as a follow up step to the 61-80% SMI Moderate Income Initiative in the Plan that is scheduled to roll out in 2016.

3. General Updates

October 16th and 21st EEAC Meeting Minutes

The Council decided to move review and vote on these meeting minutes to the November 18th EEAC meeting.

4. Presentation on Plan Updates

Matt Nelson presented an update on the Plan on behalf of the PAs. He highlighted high-level changes in the term sheet through the draft phases between April, September, and October. He also noted where the Plan accepted language proposed in the draft of the Council's resolution on the Plan.

Schlegel noted that the PA's presentation was an accurate representation of what they actually changed between drafts. He also indicated that the consultant team (C-Team) reviewed the numbers and noted that they were better than what they were before and that they are consistent with the term sheet.

5. Resolution Discussion and Vote

Process to Discuss and Approve the Resolution

Judson began by reviewing the process for voting on the Council's resolution on the Plan.

Motion to Approve the Resolution

Rio motioned to approve the Council's resolution on the Plan. Oppenheim seconded.

Motion to Amend the Resolution

Chretien motioned to include language in the resolution to split the performance incentive between residential and commercial, proportionate to their projected savings added up over the three years, and to raise the threshold from 75% to 80%. Johnson seconded.

Discussion on the Motion to Amend the Resolution

Johnson noted that he supported the motion because he was disappointed with the process and felt that the Council was never really able to discuss the performance incentive.

McDonagh asked the PAs to inform the Council on how they felt about the motion. White noted that the goals proposed in the Plan would not be at the level they are if the performance incentive was split between the residential and commercial sectors. She also noted that it is important to not have it split as it gives the PAs more flexibility in working towards achieving the portfolio goals.

Boecke noted that Chretien's concern about under-performance in the commercial and industrial (C&I) sector is one that most Councilors share. He also noted that he thought changing the performance incentive would have negative consequences and that he thought that the Council has better tools to push the PAs to achieve their savings targets in the C&I sector. Judson agreed that the proposed language could have unintended consequences. She also noted that the DPU has strong guidelines with respect to the performance incentive and that they are clear that they support the flexibility in the portfolio approach.

Glynn reiterated from previous meetings that she thought the Council should discuss this over the next three years so that the possible impact of splitting the performance incentive could be well understood going into the next planning phase.

Vote on the Motion to Amend the Resolution

Judson asked Councilors to vote on Chretien's motion to amend the resolution. Chretien and Johnson voted in favor, Boecke, Boyd, Glynn, Harak, Judson, Malmstrom, Manning, McDonagh, Murphy, Oppenheim, Rio, and Swing voted against, and Seidman was not present at the time of the vote. The motion failed with 2 votes in favor and 12 against.

Discussion and Comments on the Resolution

Johnson emphasized his concern that the PAs did not respond well enough to the list of councilor recommendations and noted that he was disappointed with how the process ended up. He also noted that he appreciated the PAs participating in the workshops and the overall high savings goals.

Boyd noted that she thought the Plan and the council's resolution on it were both good and thanked everyone who participated in the workshops and everything that led up to the final draft of the Plan. Swing agreed with Boyd and noted that he was ready to support the Plan. Gromer added that he thought the resolution and the Plan were both excellent.

Winkler noted that he supports the resolution despite not being a voting member of the Council. He asked the PAs to clarify what is meant when the Plan mentions peak demand reduction. Specifically he wanted to know if that meant implementing dispatchable load control or passive measures simultaneous to the peak hour. White indicated that it referred to both.

Judson noted that DOER supports the Plan and is proud that it will represent nation leading savings levels. She also thanked the Council, the PAs, and the C-Team for their hard work during the planning process.

Vote on the Motion to Approve the Resolution

Judson asked Councilors to vote on Rio's motion to approve the resolution. Boecke, Boyd, Glynn, Harak, Johnson, Judson, Malmstrom, Manning, McDonagh, Murphy, Oppenheim, Rio Seidman, and Swing voted in favor. Chretien voted against.

The resolution was approved by the Council with 14 votes in favor and 1 vote against.

6. Adjournment

Judson adjourned the meeting at 2:15 PM.