



## MEETING MINUTES

**Thursday, September 27, 2018**

100 Cambridge St, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor

Conference Rooms B & C

Boston, MA 02114

---

**Councilors Present:** Cindy Arcate, Eric Beaton (for Chrystal Kornegay), Don Boecke (for Maura Healey), Amy Boyd, Cindy Carroll, Steve Cowell (for Paul Gromer), Maggie Downey, Frank Gundal (for Tilak Subrahmanian), Charlie Harak, Elliott Jacobson, Judith Judson, Richard Malmstrom, Deirdre Manning, Laurie Pereira (for Trish Walker), Cammy Peterson (for Rebecca Davis), Chris Porter, Robert Rio, Victoria Rojo, Michael Sommer, Mary Wambui, Sharon Weber (for Martin Suuberg)

**Councilors Absent:** Elizabeth Cellucci, Michael Ferrante, Paul Johnson, Michael McDonagh, Andrew Newman

**Consultants Present:** Eric Belliveau, Gretchen Calcagni, Craig Johnson, George Lawrence, Margie Lynch

**DOER Staff Present:** Rachel Evans, Ian Finlayson, Emily Powers, Maggie McCarey

---

### 1. Call to Order

Commissioner Judson, as Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:05 PM.

### 2. Public Comment

#### *Paul Dale – Sierra Club*

Dale began by noting that the Sierra Club would be submitting extensive comments in a letter to the EEAC. He noted that the Sierra Club did not support the strategy of providing incentives for conversion from one carbon emitting fuel to another. He added that the expected life of a new heating system is twenty to thirty years and that that is too long considering the Global Warming Solutions Act (GWSA) requirement of carbon dioxide emissions reductions of 80% of 1990 levels by 2050. He recommended the elimination of incentives for conversions to gas or biomass and instead have major incentives offered for air or geothermal heat pumps.

***Samantha Caputo – NEEP***

Caputo referenced the recent legislation that allows innovative technologies such as energy storage, active demand management, and strategic electrification to be included in the energy efficiency plans. Given the recency of the legislation, Caputo suggested that the plans do what they can to incorporate new approaches in 2019 and allow the opportunity to revisit the plans in 2020 and 2021.

***Yve Torrie – A Better City***

Torrie noted that she appreciated additional details provided in the updated draft of the plans, but that she was still concerned about certain aspects. First, she noted that the savings goals are too low and that they remain below the assessment of potential provided by the Council's consultants. She added that the commercial and industrial (C&I) savings goals should be revised. Second, she noted that the plan did not adequately address the existing issue of limited data transparency. Finally, Torrie noted that a commitment to increased building operator certificate training would be important to see.

***Alex Papali – Clean Water Action and the Green Justice Coalition***

Papali noted that he felt strongly that the state's communities are under climate and economic threats and that energy efficiency is the tool to respond to those threats. He added that the draft plan provided vague promises to communities that have largely been ignored for the past decade. He urged Councilors to vote against the plan until it adequately addresses people who have been underserved.

***Maria Fortes –Green Justice Coalition***

Fortes noted that she had opportunities to speak with non-English speakers and found that they have major barriers to participating in the programs and that improvements made in the draft plan are promising. She did note, however, that she found it odd that Russian was being offered before French and French Creole. She urged that the PAs give special attention to increased linguistic options.

***Mariama White-Hammond – Green Justice Coalition***

White-Hammon noted that she and her community felt like they have not been heard. She added that renters, low- and moderate-income people, and non-English speakers have not been heard for the better part of a decade. She noted that the plan did not communicate the urgency needed to address the issue.

***Caitlin Peale Sloan – Conservation Law Foundation***

Peale Sloan noted that the Conservation Law Foundation submitted written comments on the draft plan to the Council. She added that they echo the concerns raised by members of the Green Justice Coalition. Lastly, Peale Sloan noted that they strongly recommend that the GWSA avoided cost of compliance be included in the final plan.

***Emily Jones – LISC***

Jones noted three specific issues with the current draft of the plan. First, she noted that the plan should adjust its definition of low-income to be 80% of state median income to be in alignment with HUD's definition, and that budgets should be increased accordingly. Second, she noted that

what was proposed in the plan for energy storage was incomplete. She indicated that battery storage should be added as a measure to the low-income programs. Third, she requested that the plan provide specific and sufficient incentives for its passive house initiatives.

***Kai Palmer-Dunning – Mass Climate Action Network***

Palmer-Dunning noted that they have four primary concerns with draft plan. First, he noted that moderate income no-cost weatherization plan needs more detail, including a definition of moderate-income, plans to address barriers of verification and implementation. Second, he noted that the savings goals need to be increased to at least match the consultant team's recommendations. Third, he recommended that enhanced incentives for gas conversions need to be eliminated and that more beneficial electrification should be included. Finally, he noted that the goals for passive house efforts need to be more robust.

***Hank Keating – Passive House Massachusetts***

Keating noted that he submitted written comments on the draft plans that included many specific suggestions. He noted that it costs a lot of money to achieve, document, and certify the savings associated with passive house projects, and that the incentive structure needs to reflect that. He recommended upfront payments of \$7,500 for design charrettes, \$10,000 to design teams not tied to modeling savings, and \$8,000 for modeling teams. He also recommended that the per-unit incentive should be set at about \$3,500.

***Mike Duclos – DEAP Energy Group***

Duclos began by noting that he would be submitting written comment to the Council. He thanked the EEAC and the PAs for supporting training of certified-passive house professionals. He noted that a shared understanding across all professionals involved in the design and construction of passive house is critically important to its success. Duclos added that a one million dollar investment in training would be an important step in providing the necessary training for passive house professionals.

***John Rodenhizer – JSR Adaptive Energy and Passive House Massachusetts***

Rodenhizer noted that passive house has tremendous energy savings potential and suggested that program incentives need to be revised to align with clean energy goals. He added that the low-rise blended savings design does not reflect any additional incentives for low-rise passive homes. He suggested that all single-family homes achieving passive house certification should receive incentives. He recommended that incentives in the amount of \$4,000 per-unit to the home owners or builder, \$8,000 for modeling fees, and \$350 per unit for passive house raters for quality assurance.

***Jeremy Newberger – NEEC and E4TheFuture***

Newberger began by noting that actions pursuant to the amendments of the Green Communities Act should be included in the plans to the greatest extent possible. He then noted four areas where he felt the plan could go further with respect to innovation. First, the plan should include initiatives to educate customers about solar, storage, and new technologies at the time of the home energy assessment. Second, a process to follow up with customers after energy optimization should be established to see how well they understood the point. Third, solar should be added as an eligible measure to the HEAT loan. Fourth, he recommended that the plans

should commit to a timeline for reporting on the results of the storage demonstrations in the field. Lastly, Newberger proposed that the plans include a contingency demonstration budget set aside for new and innovative technologies covered under the amended GCA that have not yet been explored.

***Eugenia Gibbons – Green Energy Consumers Alliance***

Gibbons began by noting that they would be submitting written comments to the Council. She acknowledged the work that had gone into the draft plan and recognized the improvements made. She noted that any criticisms made by her and others should not be treated as an indictment of the PA's efforts, but a call to action to do more. She cited four specific issues with the existing draft of the plan. First, she noted that the savings goals are too low and that they should be set to a level that at least matches the consultant team's recommendation. Second, with respect to enhanced incentives for oil to gas conversions, Gibbons noted that the question is not about whether it is a good service to provide, rather that the question is about whether it is a prudent use of energy efficiency dollars. Gibbons suggested that it is not a good use of efficiency dollars. Third, she noted that the GWSA avoided cost of compliance is not specifically used in the plan and that it should be used. Lastly, she noted that it did not make sense for the PA's to be seeking a larger pot of performance incentive money to achieve less.

***Christina Fisher – TechNet***

Fisher encouraged the Council and the PAs to include all electric fuel cells as part of the plan. She noted that CHP have long been supported by the plans and that all electric fuel cells deserve equal treatment.

***Vick Mohanka – Clean Water Action and the Green Justice Coalition***

Mohanka noted that the Green Justice Coalition has been advocating for some of the same policies for a decade and feel that little progress has been made in some of those areas. He added that the PA's performance incentive needs to be tied to those areas. He also noted that higher savings targets are needed and that oil to gas conversions need to be eliminated from the plan.

***Jamie Dickarson – NECEC***

Dickarson recommend that the final plan should specific some of the new innovative technologies covered under the revised legislation, including fuel cells, storage, and integrated delivery with solar. He added that plans for active demand management need greater scale and specificity.

***Kolin Loveless – Bloom Energy***

Loveless noted that his company can build systems that island from the grid, can carry a facility through an outage, and help customer reduce energy costs. He noted that they had not previously operated in the energy efficiency programs before but that they are interested in doing so now that their costs have come down. Loveless noted that he felt that their product can satisfy the programs benefit cost ratio requirements.

Commissioner Judson thanked all members of the public for providing comment.

### **3. Council Updates and Business**

#### ***Approval of Meeting Minutes***

Commissioner Judson noted that the approval of meeting minutes would be postponed to a later date.

### **4. Program Administrator Overview of Revised 2019-2021 Plan**

Frank Gundal, on behalf of the PAs, began by saying that the PAs have not backed down from energy efficiency and noted that they are looking at the same levels of investment as they had in 2018, but that the attributable savings are lower. He added that the PAs had spoken with a variety of stakeholders, including members of the Council, about how to address their concerns in an integrated plan that is sustainable. Gundal noted that the Council would not be hearing about a plan that is perfect, solves every problem that has been identified, or that dictates what the future is for energy efficiency. He did note, however, that the Council would hear about a plan that would build on previous success, pivot into the next iteration of energy efficiency, and that separates Massachusetts from other states as leaders in the industry.

Chris Porter gave a high-level overview of the PA's Plan, which included their goals, their areas of focus, and the impacts of the energy efficiency portfolio. He also highlighted challenges, including the impacts of residential evaluations and the increasing cost of achieving savings. Porter added that despite the challenges, the Plan reflects the PA's commitment to growth.

Cheryl Harrington gave updates on strategic enhancements to the residential new buildings model and the residential coordinated delivery model. Ezra McCarthy reviewed updates to the commercial and industrial (C&I) programs, including new buildings, major renovations, and existing buildings. Harrington and McCarthy concluded by reviewing updates to cross-sector incentives and training, active demand response, and municipal and community partnerships model.

### **5. Consultant Team Review of Revised 2019-2021 Plan**

Belliveau, Lawrence, and Lynch presented on the C-Team's review of the revised Plan. They began by noting that the Plan was well written and addressed many of the Council's recommendations, had small increases in savings over the April draft, and had savings that were too low with costs that were too high. The C-Team then reviewed cross-cutting observations on areas such as training, evaluation, and energy optimization. They then covered their observations on the C&I, residential, and low-income sectors.

### **6. Council Discussion on Revised 2019-2021 Plan**

Commissioner Judson began by noting that she felt that the Plan's narrative was clearer and that proposed savings goals should be higher.

Boyd commended the PAs on providing a revised Plan that exhibited innovative pieces that responded to many of the Council's thoughts and suggestions. She did, however, express that she

wished that had come in the April draft. Boyd also echoed Commissioner Judson on the savings goals being too low, and added that from a legal perspective, the Plan did not meet the all cost-effective efficiency mandate. On the topic of energy optimization, Boyd stressed that any language allowing strategic gasification should be removed from the Plan. Boyd also noted that she was pleased to see the inclusion of the full Global Warming Solutions Act (GWSA) cost of compliance included in the plan. Lastly, Boyd recommended that the performance incentive should be lower because the benefits being delivered are lower.

Wambui echoed Commissioner Judson's and Boyd's comments about the readability of the Plan and its response to comments made by the Council and other stakeholders. She added that she appreciated Eversource's effort to diversify vendor and supplier base, noting that it would help increase participation. Wambui also noted that she thought the Plan needed more information on how community partnerships would become a reality and that it needed to have commitments for measuring and reporting on expanded efforts in the residential program. Lastly, Wambui noted that she would not support the Plan if it did not include a performance metric to track and report on the progress of expanded residential program efforts.

Peterson began by echoing previous Councilor's comments about savings goals and the inclusion of the avoided cost of GWSA compliance. She added that she was pleased to see incentives for beneficial electrification but not happy to see incentives for gasification. Peterson also noted that she was happy to see the strides made on municipal community partnerships, but that they still required more work. She referenced the City of Lowell submitting a plan as evidence for the need for more partnerships with communities. Peterson added that she would like to see incentives for C&I fuel switching, noting that local governments would benefit from that. Lastly, Peterson requested that the final draft of the Plan have a commitment to a timeline for implementation of the community partnerships initiative.

Arcate asked why the budget increased by one-hundred million dollars but that savings only increased slightly. Abdou, on behalf of the PAs, noted that they are still planning on doing the same amount of work, but that they can only claim about a third of the savings on residential lighting. She added that the bulk of the budget is for incentives to drive customer participation. Abdou also noted that the sales, technical assistance, and training budget category increased due to increases in vendor costs. Arcate requested that the PAs more formally respond to her question by providing a breakout of what was attributable to the one-hundred million dollar increase in the budget. With respect to active demand response, Arcate recommended that the PAs put the whole program out to bid and to let the market respond so that the full costs and availability can be fully captured.

Harak expressed his concern about the level of savings and the costs. He noted that the PAs had met or exceeded savings goals for the prior three years and that the C-Team's proposed numbers were closer to what the PA's actuals were. Harak added that he hoped the targeted community approach would include some level of filtering so that partnerships with communities that have a lot of renters, low- and moderate-income, and non-English speaking groups are emphasized. Lastly, he noted that he felt strongly about including a rental units served metric into the Plan and that he hoped to see it included in the final draft.

Weber noted that energy efficiency is the single largest measure in the state's climate plan and so it was important that goals be as strong as possible. She indicated that she felt the savings goals were too low. She added that she expected to see the GWSA avoided cost of compliance included in the final filing. Weber also recommended that the final Plan include metrics and deadlines to track progress on key areas.

Boecke expressed his support for several of the other Councilor's comments. He stressed that the Plans need to do a better job with serving the hard-to-reach population and that the Attorney General was convinced that metrics were the only way to address that issue.

Rio noted that other agencies are doing work on similar topics such as storage and solar. He noted that it would be helpful to see a chart of how other agencies and programs may interact with energy efficiency plans.

Malmstrom noted that having hard data tied to a portion of the performance incentive would be important and allow the Council to see who has and has not been served. He supported Arcate's idea of putting the active demand response programs out to bid.

Boyd asked when the PAs would have new numbers to share with the Council and its C-Team. Lyne indicated that he did not know. He added that it was incumbent on the PAs to listen to all the Council's and public's comments and that they have a lot to synthesize.

## **7. Adjournment**

Commissioner Judson, as Chair, adjourned the meeting at 5:00 PM.