



MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

1 Ashburton Place
Ashburton Cafe
Boston, MA 02108

Councilors Present: Donald Boecke (for Maura Healey), Amy Boyd, Cindy Carroll, Larry Chretien, Betsy Glynn, Betsy Glynn (for Richard Malmstrom), Paul Gromer, Frank Gundal (for Tilak Subrahmanian), Elliott Jacobson, Paul Johnson, Judith Judson, Briana Kane (for Maggie Downey), Lourdes Lopez (for Austin Blackmon), Emmett Lyne (for Elizabeth Cellucci and Michael Sommer), Deirdre Manning, Michael McDonagh, Alana Murphy (for Chrystal Kornegay), Nancy Seidman (for Martin Suuberg), Trish Walker, Carol White, Eric Winkler

Councilors Absent: Michael Ferrante, Charles Harak, Andrew Newman, Robert Rio

Consultants Present: Eric Belliveau, Craig Johnson, Margie Lynch

DOER Staff Present: Ian Finlayson, Alex Pollard, Matt Rusteika, Arah Schuur, Joanna Troy, Steve Venezia

Others Present: Marie Abdou, Jessica Buno, Patrick Haswell, Emily Jones, Marge Kelly, Jeff Leupold, Cara Mottola, Jerrold Oppenheim, Laurie Pereira, Lisa Shea, Bill Stack, Tyler Studds, Amy Vavak, John Wells

1. Call to Order

Judson called the meeting to order at 1:11 PM.

2. Public Comment

Tyler Studds, on behalf of the Massachusetts Clean Energy Center, gave public comment to share with the Council a few rewards that they recently announced. He noted that they held a competitive solicitation to award grant money to support programs serving low income communities in the Commonwealth. He highlighted the following awards:

- Action, Inc. - \$900,000 for funding the installation of high-efficiency air-source heat pumps for low-income residents living in single-family homes with electric baseboard heating. The heat pump installations will include comprehensive energy efficiency upgrades, including weatherization, lighting and appliance replacements.

- New Ecology, Inc. – \$600,000 for funding the installation of heating and cooling monitoring equipment in approximately 100 low-income, multi-family buildings, with the goal of reducing energy costs by 5 to 20 percent.
- Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) – \$600,000 for funding up to 30 comprehensive energy audits in affordable multi-family building approaching refinancing to demonstrate an integrated approach to systematically achieve deep energy efficiency savings and implement renewable technologies
- Cape Light Compact – \$250,000 for funding the installation of solar electricity at low-income, single- and multi-family homes, using solar renewable energy credit payments to fund additional installations.

Emily Jones, on behalf of Mike Davis and LISC, gave public comment to thank the Council for its continued work and progress towards advancing energy efficiency in the low-income and multifamily sectors. She also noted that LISC appreciates the opportunity to participate in the conversation and that they look forward to continuing the partnership.

3. Council Updates and Business

EEAC Meeting Minutes – June 21, 2016

Jacobson motioned to approve the minutes as submitted. Boyd seconded. All were in favor, with no opposed. Glynn, Johnson, and Manning abstained. McDonagh, Murphy, and Seidman were not present at the time of the vote. The minutes were approved, as submitted, by the Council.

Executive Committee Meeting Minutes – July 6, 2016

Boecke motioned to approve the minutes as submitted. Boyd seconded. All were in favor, with no opposed or abstaining. The minutes were approved, as submitted, by the Executive Committee.

4. EEAC Consultant Procurement

Judson began by noting that the Department of Energy Resources conducted a competitive procurement to retain a consultant for the Council for the next three years. She noted that the members of the Executive Committee (ExCom) had reviewed the two proposals that they received for the request for responses (RFR) and that they discussed them at their July 6, 2016 meeting. She indicated that the ExCom had reached a consensus as to which of the proposal it would recommend to the full Council. She further noted that the consensus was reached almost immediately after they began discussions and that they would choose to recommend that the contract be awarded to the Optimal Energy Inc. team, hereafter referred to as *Optimal*.

ExCom members Boyd, Boecke, and Glynn added some thoughts on the process. Boyd noted that they had worked to encourage more applicants but that they still only received two. She also noted that she was impressed that the Optimal proposal had put a lot of attention towards addressing concerns that the Council has raised and that it was very forward looking. Boecke added that the Optimal bid was far superior. He also suggested that even if the Optimal bid was the only one that he would be comfortable recommending it because it was clear that a lot of effort and attention went into it. Glynn added that one of the reasons they reached an early

consensus is that each of the ExCom members had reviewed and scored the bids individually before they came together to discuss them.

Winkler asked if the ExCom could say who submitted the other proposal. Judson indicated that it was from Optimized Systems Inc.

Johnson asked what the scoring criteria were. Rusteika indicated that the scoring criteria could be found in the RFR. Johnson asked if the Council would have the opportunity to see the Optimal proposal. He indicated that he thought it would be important for the Council to be able to give input on the work plan. Schuur noted that they are not allowed to share the proposal until a vote has been reached and the selectee is under contract. She noted that once the selectee is under contract, it would draft a work plan and budget which the Council would have opportunity to provide input on.

Judson asked if there was a motion to authorize the ExCom to enter into contract negotiations with Optimal. Johnson motioned. Boecke seconded. Boecke, Boyd, Chretien, Glynn, Glynn (as proxy for Malmstrom), Jacobson, Johnson, Judson, Lopez (as proxy for Swing), and Manning voted in favor. There were none opposed or abstaining.¹ The motion passed in favor of authorizing the ExCom to enter into contract negotiations with Optimal.

5. Low Income Sector Progress Report

John Wells of Action for Boston Community Development, Inc. (ABCD) gave an overview to the Council on the Mass Save Low-Income Energy Programs. His presentation included information about current and historical statewide performance, a review of low-income requirements in the Green Communities Act, and information about eligibility requirements and program aspects of the low-income single and multifamily initiatives.

Johnson asked why multifamily buildings only needed 50% of residents to be low-income to qualify the entire building. Wells indicated that it is a DOE standard for eligibility that the Mass Save program adopted and that it would be complicated to structure the program in any other way.

Glynn asked how vendors are procured. Wells indicated that they hold a competitive procurement every two years for single family and that multifamily is bid on a project by project basis.

Glynn asked about the program now going into oil heated building and how that works in the portfolio. Wells indicated that they have been doing oil heat buildings for single family for many years, but that this is the first year they would be doing oil heat buildings for multifamily. He noted that these have to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis as some buildings might not be cost-effective.

¹ Councilors McDonagh, Murphy, and Seidman arrived at the meeting after the vote. They were given the opportunity later in the meeting to indicate how they would have voted had they been present at the time of the vote. All three indicated that they would have voted in favor of the motion had they been there.

Glynn asked what the breakdown was between services in the multifamily sector. Wells indicated that the multifamily committee had suggested that the breakdown should be about one-third each for public housing, community development corporations (CDCs), and owners of affordable housing. He further noted that that is the protocol they use and is what they try to achieve. He added that there is usually some variation in different geographic areas of the state.

Seidman asked how the program determines high energy users and where that information comes from. Wells noted that they prioritize high energy users and vulnerable populations and that the energy use data comes from the fuel assistance information. Seidman followed up by asking if that meant they had access to PA data and how that works. Wells indicated that they have contract agreements with the PAs.

Seidman asked if the Low Income Programs had any plans of how to make up for lighting when it eventually goes away. Wells indicated that they do not have an answer to that question at the present time.

Johnson asked if the Low Income Programs do anything that is uniquely different from the Home Energy Savings Program. Wells noted that they occasionally do repairs to buildings in order to remove barriers to participation.

Gromer praised Wells, Jacobson, and their colleagues for the work they do and noted that the Commonwealth and the low income community is well served by their efforts. White added that the partnership between the PAs and the low income network is a unique model that is unlike any other in the country.

6. Low Income Multi-Family Refinancing Events

Amy Vavak and Marge Kelly, on behalf of the PAs, presented to the Council on leveraging low income multi-family refinancing events. In their presentation, they began by reviewing the PAs commitment from the 2016-2018 Plan and highlighting the partnership process and their priorities. They then discussed their research and analysis tasks, including participation and the size of the pipeline, and the potential to improve owner participation and identification of savings. Lastly, they discussed their recommendations for addressing partner priorities, exploring opportunities to secure savings, and for ongoing collaboration between partners.

Glynn referenced a slide from their presentation that indicated a market penetration of 71% had suggested that building owners are aware of and accessing program resources. She asked what that percentage referred to. Kelly indicated that the percentages were in reference to the 97 projects that the PAs have in their pipeline for the three year plan. Glynn added that these building might represent an opportunity for more savings and noted that there is research out there that suggests that deeper retrofits can be achieved at the time of refinance for multifamily housing. Glynn suggested that it may be advantageous to coordinate program opportunities with refinancing events.

Glynn referenced another point from the presentation that indicated that LEAN would accept 3rd party audits with in-field verification to determine program incentives for projects going through

refinance. She asked if that meant that building owners would need to coordinate another site visit. Vavak indicated that they would likely have to coordinate another site visit. Jacobson added that audits are often not specific enough and tend to be a bit different when they arrive to do the work. Wells added that they encourage comprehensive audits if the building owner has the means to do them as they can use that information as a guide to see if there is cost-effective work to be done.

7. Affordable Access to Clean and Efficient Energy Initiative Update

Alana Murphy and Joanna Troy gave an update to the Council on the Affordable Access to Clean and Efficient Energy Initiative (AACEE). In their presentation they gave an overview of the AACEE, including its key components, goals, and funding. They also discussed aspects of the working group that was created in response to AACEE, including its structure, participants, scope of work, and high level recommendations.

Judson noted that AACEE is not just aimed at energy efficiency in that it is also aimed at clean energy resources.

8. Low Income NEI Opportunities

Jerrold Oppenheim of LEAN gave a presentation to the Council on the non-energy impacts (NEIs) of energy efficiency in the low income sector. Oppenheim began by defining NEIs and giving examples of typical NEIs as well as health NEIs. He also highlighted how health NEIs would increase the NEIs of certain measures in current programs. He closed by discussing some of the implications on measure, program operations, and program funding if health NEIs were incorporated into current programs.

Glynn noted that increase in health impacts was intriguing and that she wondered how programs would change in terms of partnerships. Specifically, she asked if the Council should be coordinating with health agencies.

Johnson indicated that he was fascinated by the information presented and that he excited that health NEIs may lead to more measures becoming cost-effective. He also asked if the consultant team had any further thoughts on this topic. Belliveau noted that health NEIs may allow for more measures to be installed, but cautioned that the cost that the PAs are paying per kWh or per therm has to make sense for them. Chretien added that if health NEIs allow for deeper savings, then it should absolutely be considered.

Lynch noted that the results of the study applied to single family homes. She asked if the results could be extrapolated and applied for multifamily. Oppenheim suggested that the results could be applied to a portion of multifamily homes, but not all. He noted that about a third of multifamily projects are collections of buildings such as duplexes or row houses that are functionally similar to single family buildings and that the results of the single family study might apply to this portion of multifamily. Ultimately, Oppenheim suggested that a similar study should be conducted on multifamily buildings.

9. Adjournment

Judson adjourned the meeting at 4:02 PM.