



MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, July 21, 2015

100 Cambridge St, 2nd Floor
Conference Rooms C and D
Boston, MA 02114

Councilors Present: Donald Boecke, Amy Boyd, Cindy Carroll, Elizabeth Cellucci, Larry Chretien, Maggie Downey, Deborah Goddard (for Betsy Glynn), Paul Gromer, Frank Gundal (for Tilak Subrahmanian), Charles Harak, Paul Johnson, Richard Malmstrom, Deirdre Manning, Michael McDonagh, Jerrold Oppenheim (for Elliott Jacobson), Robert Rio, Nancy Seidman, Michael Sommer, Brad Swing, Trish Walker, Carol White, Eric Winkler

Councilors Absent: Michael Ferrante, Alana Murphy, Andrew Newman

Consultants Present: Eric Belliveau, Jeff Schlegel, Craig Johnson

DOER Staff Present: Ian Finlayson, Maggie McCarey, Alex Pollard, Steve Venezia, Alissa Whiteman

Others Present: Marie Abdou, Larry Allen, JoAnn Bodemer, Kerry Britland, Grayson Bryant, Derek Buchler, Jessica Buno, Brandy Chambers, Shaela Collins, Matt Conway, Dave Gibbons, Harrison Grubb, Clayton Hale, Jodi Hanover, Riley Hastings, Andrea Keeffe, Emmett Lyne, Ezra McCarthy, Steve Menges, Naomi Mermin, Cara Mottola, Matthew Nelson, Ellen Pfiffer, Chris Plecs, Peter Shattuck, Lisa Shea, Amy Vavak, Tabitha Vigliotti, Sharon Weber, Kathryn Wright

1. Call to Order

Judson called the meeting to order at 1:08 PM.

She thanked everyone for their hard work and dedication on the Three-Year Plan (the Plan). She noted that she was confident that everyone in the room had the shared goal of continuing to build on success and that she did not expect any last minute changes to the resolution at the meeting. She also reminded everyone that the resolution is not the end of the process and that it reflects the Council's feedback to the PAs on their first draft of the Plan.

2. Public Comment

No public comment was received.

3. General Updates

EEAC Executive Committee Meeting Minutes – July 8, 2015

Boecke motioned to approve the executive committee (ExCom) minutes as submitted. Boyd seconded. All were in favor, with no opposed. Malmstrom abstained. The minutes were approved as submitted, by the ExCom.

4. Commercial Real Estate Working Group

Judson began by extending her appreciation to the PAs, DOER, and all the stakeholders that contributed to this effort.

Alex Pollard (DOER) began by discussing some of the background behind the working group, its mission, the stakeholders that took part, and the phases of work that it carried out. Frank Gundal (Eversource) discussed the four “Go-To Market” strategies that were tested with market actors as part of the working groups work. These strategies included pre-packaged options for the commercial real estate market, dashboards and building labeling, turn-key or direct install models, and technical assistance and outreach. Gundal also discussed some of the constraints that the sector must overcome as well as some items for continued exploration.

Johnson asked to what extent they have surveyed people who have participated and why they were successful, and conversely people who have not participated and why they were unsuccessful. Gundal indicated that they have done this. Malmstrom encouraged that there be more incentives for design engineers who can bring programs with them into renovation projects.

5. Key Drivers

Matt Nelson (Eversource) and Marie Abdou (National Grid) presented on the key drivers analysis from the PA’s perspective. Topics that they discussed included residential lighting, residential behavior programs, commercial and industrial (C&I) lighting, and combined heat and power. They also discussed potential studies, bill impacts and low-income savings goals. For each of these topics, the PAs presented their understanding of the consultant team’s (C-Team) recommendation and supporting data and compared that to their own recommendations and assumptions.

The C-Team followed the PA’s presentation where Belliveau noted that it is clear that they and the PAs have a much different view. He suggested that the PAs are making many conservative assumptions. On this point, White reminded the Council that the PAs have embraced aggressive savings goals in the past and that they have met most of those goals. Belliveau added that the big difference is in residential lighting and that the C-Team believes that all signs point towards increasing bulb sales in the program.

Boyd asked if it is possible for the market share of bulbs being sold through the program to get bigger even if the overall market of bulbs being sold to residential users is declining. Belliveau noted that the PAs can do this and that they have already demonstrated the ability to do so.

Johnson asked about how the collaborative process goes back and forth. Belliveau noted that the PAs and the C-Team are essentially looking at the same data and that that each group is just making different assumptions based on that data. White noted that the PAs are making data driven decisions in their projections about what they think can be achieved in the next three years.

The Council adjourned for a break from 2:37 to 2:52 PM.

6. Resolution

Judson asked everyone to recognize that this is not the final step and that it is a step in the process. She noted that an updated version of the resolution was posted to the website and that there were six items for the Council to discuss. From a process standpoint, Judson noted that the Council would discuss each of the six items and if a vote was needed then it would take place, otherwise they would move on to the next item. After all six items were resolved, the Council would take a final vote on the resolution itself.

Amendment Item #1

The amendment item for discussion was to the third paragraph of the introduction. The amendment was to remove the word “consensus” from the last sentence and to add “and may not embody the views of all who have provided input as part of this comprehensive engagement process” to the end of that sentence.

Councilors discussed at length how to approach this amendment with some Councilors feeling that consensus should remain in the language while others agreed with it being dropped. Judson noted that the language came from the intent that some non-voting members might not agree with everything in the resolution. Winkler added that the GCA does not distinguish Councilors with respect to participation in the process and that it may be the case that some of the non-voting Councilors at the table wish not to be part of the consensus despite having a lot to do with the development of the plan. Winkler had suggested using a footnote that reads “Only voting members of the EEAC may vote to approve this resolution, therefore this resolution does not necessarily represent the views of all the parties who have participated in the 2016-2018 Draft plan development” to capture this point. Harak recommended that the last sentence of the third paragraph be removed entirely, and that the footnote originally submitted by Winkler be incorporated in its place.

Chretien motioned to remove the last sentence of the third paragraph. Harak seconded. Oppenheim motioned to amend Chretien’s motion by adding the footnote submitted by Winkler. McDonagh seconded. Chretien and Harak accepted Oppenheim’s motion to amend their amendment. All were in favor, with no opposed. LaRusso (for Swing) abstained. The motion passed.

Amendment Item #2

The amendment item for discussion was to the final paragraph of the introduction. The amendment was to change the date of when the Council expects a revised Plan from the PAs from September 8th to September 18th, per recommendation from the PAs.

Judson noted that DOER is inclined to go with the judgement of the PAs of when they are confident they will be able to deliver the next draft. Lyne confirmed that this date is good for the PAs. Boyd noted that she was pleased to have a date locked down. Seidman noted that she was okay with the date change as long as everyone is comfortable with how it may change the scheduling of other things.

A sense of the Council indicated that this change was appropriate and so the amendment was accepted.

Amendment Item #3

The amendment item for discussion was to the second to last paragraph of section A. The amendment was to insert a sentence after the first sentence of the paragraph that would read “The PAs hard work in overcoming sector level challenges to achieve these nation-leading levels of savings is appreciated.”

A sense of the Council indicated that this change was appropriate and so the amendment was accepted.

Amendment Item #4

The amendment item for discussion was to the first paragraph of the EEAC Recommendations. The amendment was to insert a sentence after the first sentence of the paragraph that would read “The recommendations in this section may not represent the opinion or position of every Councilor on certain issues, but on the whole, the EEAC has determined that the recommendation should be considered and addressed in the Revised Plan.”

McDonagh and Rio noted that they appreciated this language being included.

A sense of the Council indicated that this change was appropriate and so the amendment was accepted.

Amendment Item #5

The amendment for discussion was to section “A.c” under the Commercial and Industrial Recommendations. The amendment was to add “or other segment strategy” to the language.

Johnson noted that this was a good addition.

A sense of the Council indicated that this change was appropriate and so the amendment was accepted.

Amendment Item #6

The amendment for discussion was to “F” under the Commercial and Industrial Recommendations. The amendment was to add an additional point (F.e) that would read “Commitment to implement analytics-based behavioral energy efficiency demonstration projects for small and medium C&I customers.”

Downey noted that using the words “analytical-based behavior” can have different meanings to different people. The proposed amendment was amended to read “Commitment to implement and evaluate behavioral demonstration projects for small and medium C&I customers.”

A sense of the Council indicated that this change was appropriate and so the amendment was accepted.

Council Discussion and Vote on the Full Resolution

Seidman motioned to approve the resolution. Harak seconded.

Rio noted that he was anxious to see cost driven data and that he really would like to see the cost and bill impacts. McDonagh agreed with Rio and also noted that both presentations by the PAs and the C-Team were well done and helpful. He noted that reasonable people can differ in their interpretation of data.

Winkler noted that the ISO does not take a position on types of resource reliability and that he tends to defer to the PAs for potential and to the C-Team for the art of projecting forward. He noted that he does not feel the Council should be putting numbers on resolutions like this.

Boecke noted that he supports the resolution and that he is comfortable with the resolution because it is not the final piece. He indicated that he would feel less certain about this if it were the final step.

Lyne noted that the PAs are not supportive of specific savings goals in this resolution but that they are gratified by the conversation around the table and the consideration of edits. Harak added that he thought it was somewhat premature to pick a particular number.

All were in favor of the motion to approve the resolution, with no opposed or abstaining. The motion passed.

7. Demand

Judson noted that the Council was just about out of time and that it would best if this topic was moved to the next meeting so that the presenters would have ample time to discuss the topic.

White noted that this was okay and informed the Council that she would be giving an update on a working group that has been talking about demand response efforts.

8. Adjournment

Judson thanked everyone and adjourned the meeting at 4:02 PM.