



## MEETING MINUTES

**Wednesday, October 19, 2016**

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

Conference Rooms B & C

Boston, MA 02114

- Councilors Present:** Donald Boecke (for Maura Healey), Amy Boyd, Cindy Carroll, Elizabeth Cellucci, Larry Chretien, Maggie Downey, Betsy Glynn, Charles Harak, Paul Johnson, Judith Judson, Richard Malmstrom, Deirdre Manning, Michael McDonagh, Jeremy Newberger, Laurie Pereira (for Trish Walker), Robert Rio, Nancy Seidman (for Martin Suuberg), Michael Sommer, Tilak Subrahmanian, Brad Swing (for Austin Blackmon), Eric Winkler
- Councilors Absent:** Michael Ferrante, Paul Gromer, Alana Murphy (for Chrystal Kornegay), Andrew Newman, Elliott Jacobson
- Consultants Present:** Eric Belliveau, Craig Johnson, Jeff Schlegel
- DOER Staff Present:** Emily Powers, Matt Rusteika, Arah Schuur, Steve Venezia
- Others Present:** Nick Adams, Harold Altobello, James Bell, JoAnn Bodemer, Brian Buckley, Samantha Caputo, Brandy Chambers, Keerthana Chandrashekar, Caroline Conti, Tracy Dyke-Redmond, Shane Early, Erin Engstrom, Michael Gaiimo, Jonathan Goldberg, Michael Goldman, Jack Habib, Jodi Hanover, Riley Hastings, Kristina Kelly, Marley Kimmelman, Emmett Lyne, Maggie McCarey, Thomas Palma, Aimee Powelka, Jonathan Raab, Sailesh Ramamurtie, Lisa Shea, Sarah Smegal, Tabitha Vigliotti, Sharon Weber

## **1. Call to Order**

Schuur called the meeting to order at 1:05 PM.

## **2. Public Comment**

Subrahmanian announced that Eversource had signed an MOU with Dana-Farber and that he wanted to thank Malmstrom for his work on that.

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

Judson proposed to move the approval of the meeting minutes for the August and September Council, October Executive Committee (ExCom), and October Demand Reduction (DR) Subcommittee meetings to the November meeting. There was no opposition to this proposal.

### *Letter to DPU on 2013-2015 Plan Report*

Judson began by noting that DOER drafted the letter with input from the ExCom and had posted it to the Council website. She noted that the letter acknowledges that the Council received the report and that it expresses support on the results. She added that it also does not go as far to say that the Council has reviewed everything in the report but that it did want to provide initial comments. Judson also noted that the letter did not comment on how the results of the report should be used in the future since that would be outside the scope of what is in front of the DPU.

Glynn suggested that there be some language added to the letter to indicate that the Council and its consultants (C-Team) continue to review the report. Seidman added that added language could include the Council's intent to submit further comments after the C-Team has fully reviewed the report. Schuur noted that the Council should be careful with suggesting that they would add further comments.

Chretien suggested that the word "all" be stricken from the last sentence of the report. He noted that he was not comfortable with giving an indication that the Council believes it has delivered all cost-effective energy efficiency. Winkler agreed, noting that the metrics in use do not suggest that all cost-effective energy efficiency has been achieved. Boecke noted that he had no problem with the language as is, saying that the sentence did not imply that all cost-effective efficiency had been achieved, but rather identifying that as the framework's goal.

After discussions, there were two changes made to the letter. The first was to remove the word "all" from the last sentence of the letter. The second was to add the sentence "The EEAC and its consultants continue to evaluate the Term Reports" to the end of the first paragraph of the letter.

Malmstrom motioned to approve the letter, as amended, to the DPU concerning 2013-2015 Term Report. Harak seconded. All were in favor, with no opposed or abstaining. The letter was approved, as amended, by the Council.

## *Draft Council Meeting Schedule for 2017*

Rusteika noted that he put together a draft schedule so that the Council would have something to work from. He added that the draft was posted to the Council website and that if Councilors should let him know if they had any feedback.

### *Other Business*

Judson noted that the ExCom had discussed whether or not to hold a December Council meeting. She indicated that they had decided that it would be worthwhile to hold a shortened meeting.

#### **4. State of Charge: DOER Storage Report**

Judson presented to the Council on the recent release of DOER's energy storage report. In her presentation she began by reviewing DOER's energy storage initiative and highlighting energy storage growth and development. She also showed how storage could help meet the state's peak as well as allow for more renewables to be integrated into the grid. Judson went on to show the methods, findings, and recommendations of the study. She noted that if the recommendations were adopted, the potential would yield 600 MW of new storage by 2025, \$800 million in cost savings to ratepayers, and reduce GHG emissions by 350,000 metric tons over ten years. Lastly, she noted that the state now has an advanced energy storage procurement authorization as a result of HB.4568, "An Act to promote energy diversity." She noted that in the coming weeks, DOER would be hosting a listening session to solicit stakeholder feedback on whether or not to set an energy storage target. She indicated that the legislation requires that DOER make this decision by December 31, 2016 and that if they do decide it is appropriate to set a target, that they must do so by July 1, 2017.

Swing asked if DOER had any preliminary sense of why they would not choose to set a target. Judson indicated that she did not and that that is why they were planning on hosting the listening sessions.

#### **5. Review of Demand Priorities, Timeline Update, and Next Steps**

Michael Goldman, on behalf of the PAs, reviewed their demand priorities and gave an update on the timeline and next steps. He presented a variety of data to highlight why the PAs are focusing on summer as opposed to winter. These data included comparisons between locational marginal prices (LMPs) and system load. Ultimately, he noted that they decided that it made most sense to go after load than LMP which is why they have focused their efforts on the summer months as opposed to winter. He added that the PAs would not be ignoring winter and that many of the proposed demonstration projects would be able to give them valuable insights about winter peak. Goldman also highlighted the coordination between PAs in developing the demonstration projects. He concluded by reviewing timeline progress to date and next steps for the analytical framework.

Winkler offered as a comment that from an industry standpoint, demand response is envisioned as more than peak load reduction. He noted that the Supreme Court recently upheld FERC order 745 which mandates wholesale markets fully integrate demand response into energy and reserve markets. Winkler also noted that starting in 2018, the ISO would no longer be dispatching demand response resources for reliability purposes, rather it will be based on energy offers.

Johnson asked if the gas PAs had any plans. Goldman indicated that they had not been involved in the subgroup meetings and have not found any technologies yet. He also noted that that was not to suggest that they were not considering doing any demonstration projects. Schlegel added that the subcommittee planned to look into gas at their December meeting.

## **6. EEAC Approval of 2017 Demonstration Plans and Budgets**

Judson began by noting that Eversource and Unitil would be presenting on what they are proposing for demonstration projects and budgets to the DPU for approval. She added that they are seeking approval and support from the Council on their proposals.

### *Eversource Proposal*

Goldman presented Eversource's plans for demand demonstration projects and budgets. He began by noting that in developing the proposed demonstrations, the PAs worked together to make sure there are solutions for all customer classes. For each solution that Eversource was proposing, Goldman gave a description of the technology, the customer types it would be designed for, the reasons for testing the technology, and the questions that they were trying to answer by doing the demonstration. He also previewed planned budgets, testing timelines, anticipated customer participation, and a range of the level of savings that they were anticipating from the demonstrations.

Boyd noted that she felt the presentation was helpful and did a good job of addressing many of her previous comments. She also asked if their proposed solution to test active demand response for large commercial and industrial (C&I) customers would include a broader group than what is already enrolled in their demand response programs. Goldman noted that they would be partnering with those already participating and that they would add in strategies to pay those customers beyond their current obligations.

Johnson indicated that he was pleased with the metrics that Eversource developed for evaluating the proposed demonstrations. He also asked how Eversource was planning on developing their incentive structure for the proposed demonstrations. Goldman indicated that they would not be charging customers for the demonstration projects because Eversource has a lot of unanswered questions about the technologies and that they do not want to make promises that they are unsure if they can commit to.

Seidman noted that the presentation gave a sense of the MW impact of the projects but not the MWh impact and asked if they had that information. Goldman noted that the corresponding MWh impact could be found in the narrative.

Harak asked if they had an estimate on the system-wide impact of the demonstration projects. Goldman noted that the impact of the projects themselves would have little impact. He did suggest, however, that if the technologies work and are extrapolated to a larger percentage of the customer base, the impact would be significant.

### *Unitil Proposal*

Palma presented Unitil's plans for demand demonstration projects and budgets. He began by noting that their primary considerations in developing projects were demand reduction potential, customer acceptance, projected performance, reliability, cost-effectiveness, bill impacts, and the potential ability to bring the concepts to scale in the next planning phase. Palma noted that the two solutions that they were proposing were to shift demand via operations changes for C&I customers and battery storage with solar PV for residential customers. For each solution, he described the purpose and the primary question to be answered, number of customer participants, budget, deployment and assessment schedule, as well as the anticipated impact.

Boyd noted that the life of the C&I project was three to four years and questioned whether or not that would mean they would have usable data before the next planning phase. Palma indicated that they would because they would have annual data.

Seidman asked why they were proposing to only have two customers in the demonstration project. Palma noted that they have a limited number of large customers and that they want to find compatible customers to test the proposal before introducing it to others.

For the residential project, Boyd asked if Unitil was planning on having participants use the battery storage on a daily basis to test the durability of the battery technology. Palma suggested that they would likely have customers using it on a daily basis.

### *Resolution Regarding the Proposed Demand Reduction Demonstration Offerings*

Schlegel noted that the C-Team had been involved in providing input during the development of the proposals and that they had reviewed them thoroughly. He indicated that they thought that the proposals were good and were focused on the right things. Furthermore, he added that they have the right research questions and that it is crucial to learn from these projects and to build on them for demand management and peak demand resources in the future. Schlegel reminded the Council that the timing of approval of these projects is important so that data and results can inform the next plan. Schlegel concluded by noting that the resolution expresses the support of the Council on the projects and that it has expectations that the PAs will track and report back on the demonstration projects. Schlegel indicated that the C-Team recommends the Council approve the resolution.

Schuur indicated that DOER had received a number of comments on the draft resolution and that they had incorporated those comments in a redline version.

Boyd suggested that the PAs collectively produce a document that acts as a single resource that summarizes things like the process of selecting projects, information about the projects, similarities and differences between like-projects, and other relevant information. Goldberg

indicated on behalf of the PAs that they felt like they could do something like that for the December Council meeting.

Rio motioned to approve the Resolution of the Energy Efficiency Advisory Council Regarding the Proposed Demand Reduction Demonstration Offerings of Eversource Electric and Unitil Electric. Johnson seconded. The resolution was approved by the Council with 13 votes in favor, none opposed, and none abstaining.

## **7. Other Council Business**

The Council had also planned to hear presentations from National Grid and the Cape Light Compact on the preliminary results of their demonstration projects from 2016 as well as their plans for 2017. In addition, the PAs also had planned to present on their monthly data dashboard. As a result of the meeting running late, Schuur and Judson recommended to postpone those items to either the November or December meetings.

## **8. Adjournment**

Judson adjourned the meeting at 4:01 PM.