



DRAFT Meeting Summary

November 10, 2020
Virtual Meeting via Zoom

Participants: Over 100 people attended the workshop including 21 Councilors. A list of attendees (not including the public attendees) is included in the Appendix. The workshop background material and presentations can be found at <https://ma-eeac.org/november-10-workshop-2-income-eligible-services/>

WORKSHOP OVERVIEW

Maggie McCarey, DOER Energy Efficiency Division Director and EEAC Chair, welcomed participants. She shared the revised Energy Efficiency Advisory Council workshop schedule for the 2022-2024 cycle, which will include 6 or 7 workshops through fall 2020 and early 2021, concluding around January 2021. The schedule was revised based on feedback requesting more time focused on commercial and industrial (C&I) in existing buildings. She explained that there will not be an item for public comment at this workshop, as there are six dedicated public listening sessions. The protocol is for all public comments to be posted to the EEAC website. The goal of the workshop series is to develop a set of consensus recommendations for PAs to address in the development of their next 3-year plan. She then conducted roll call.

Dr. Scott McCreary, facilitator at CONCUR Inc, provided an overview of the ground rules and the approach to making recommendations, which can be found on the meeting materials at the link above (“MA EEAC 2020 Workshop Protocols and Groundrules”).

BACKGROUND PRESENTATIONS ON INCOME ELIGIBLE SERVICES RECOMMENDATIONS

To provide Councilors with background and frame the context, responses from program administrator (PAs) and the main program implementer gave short presentations. Amanda Formica (National Grid) and Margaret Kelly (Eversource) presented on behalf of PAs. John Wells presented on behalf of the primary implementer, the Low Income Energy Affordability Network (LEAN). The slides are available on the meeting page (linked above).

APPROACH TO RECOMMENDATION FRAMING AND DISCUSSION

The same approach to recommendation review and discussion was employed throughout the meeting. First, the EEAC Consultant Elizabeth Chant presented a slide describing the recommendation. Then, facilitator Scott McCreary guided Councilors through each recommendation, one at a time, displaying the Consultant Team slides (linked above) for reference. He organized the conversation around each recommendation by breaking the discussion into two categories: clarifying questions and comments, and suggested improvements. At the conclusion of each of the five topic areas (e.g., heat pumps, adequate budget, and equitable service), Scott elicited ideas for potential additional recommendations beyond those listed in the briefing document. Note that this document uses the recommendation summary text from the agenda; refer to the Consultant slides and Briefing document for the full text.

TOPIC 1: Measures: Increasing Heat Pump Installations and Introducing New Measures

Note that some clarifying questions, comments, and suggested improvements listed under recommendation 1 apply to recommendation 2 and vice versa. Councilor comments on the recommendations were discussed somewhat interchangeably.

1. Increase heat pump installations, including by identifying and prioritizing cost-effective applications, developing protocols to standardize decision-making, identifying and addressing barriers to installation, and working to increase customer satisfaction post-installation through customer education and support for operation and maintenance.

Clarifying Questions (Councilor questions. PA and Consultant responses in italics. Note some questions relate to the PA presentation rather than the draft recommendations).

- What is meant by the term “widgets”? Can someone expand on the “new opportunities” mentioned in the briefing document? What is the determination for “structures not up to code” on page 5 of the briefing doc? Finally, is this recommendation focused on cold climate heat pumps?
 - a. *PA response: “Widgets” is a general term for mechanical measures, for example heat pumps and light bulbs. “New opportunities” is intended to be general and gives PAs opportunities to add measures and update program design.*
 - b. *Consultant response: As for “structures not up to code,” when auditors do assessments, they can look for building code issues. And yes, the focus is on cold climate heat pumps given the climate in Massachusetts.*
- What, if anything, is LEAN doing for these installations and to exceed goals? Are there protocols to standardize decisions? Is there anything LEAN proposes changing in 2021, including in their assessment methods and choices of interventions?
 - a. *Consultant response 1: 660 heat pumps were installed through the income eligible program, so it’s not that things aren’t being done well, it’s more about how to increase attainment of the goal. We believe that by looking closer at protocols and standardizing where possible (recognizing that these measures are mainly custom), we hope community action agencies can up the goal.*

- b. *Consultant response 2: Although the 2019 goal was met, the 2019-2021 goal is 6,082 units. COVID has put a crimp in 2020 progress, but there's still a lot of room between 2019 results and the 3-year goal.*
 - c. *LEAN response: confirmed the impact of COVID on meeting heat pump installation goal; also mentioned that each CAP will have a heat pump specialist and that each CAP will have goals for heat pump installations in 2021.*
- What percentage of the installs are primary heat source as opposed to supplemental heat source pumps?
 - a. *LEAN response: The goal is primarily whole house, but sometimes the blended option is the best way to go*
- What's the cap on home improvements?
 - a. *LEAN response: there's a general cap of \$10,000 per structure. We try to make a judgment call about the appropriateness of the amount of what's going to be installed in relation to the repair, but in general, that would be the cap. Major repairs are beyond scope. The idea is to have a reasonableness test to allow the efficiency to move forward.*
- What was the intent behind the language “barriers to installation”? Does it include “barriers to participation”?
 - a. *Consultant response: this refers all types of barriers from wiring to asbestos to participation barriers that are separate from the structure of the home – anything that would dissuade customers from installing a heat pump*

Councilor Comments/Suggested Improvements

- Increase heat pump installations – this is needed to meet the state's climate goals.
- Included non-energy benefits like comfort and public health in cost effectiveness analysis.
- Identify appropriate heat pump installations
- Focus on equitable access
- Foster greater price transparency
- Include workforce development and addressing supply chain barriers to increase installations; these should be reflected in budget accordingly
- Collect data on the number, type, and location of barriers including those related to installation (e.g., building code violations) as well as those related to participation so we can make good decisions, especially with respect to equity. Use data on installation and participation barriers to better understand what is preventing heat pump installations to inform the planning process.
 - a. *PA response: addressing building code violations is out of PA control – the property owner or landlord would need to volunteer that information and often doesn't want to. PAs would like to partner with others to resolve this issue*
- In the recommendation, clarify that “barriers” includes both barriers to installation and barriers to participation
- Add cold climate in front of "heat pump"

2. Increase opportunities for participation in active demand reduction, including developing protocols for determining appropriate households for installation of WiFi thermostats for energy efficiency and demand reduction. Include follow-up, when necessary to provide customer support.

Clarifying Questions (Councilor questions. PA and Consultant responses in italics).

- Is there a specific protocol that would allow for greater data sharing? And is there a specific agreement signed between agencies?
 - a. *PA response: PAs share data with the Department of Health & Human Services; that's how we're able to automatically add many customers to our discount rates and then in turn, reach out to them about our income eligible energy efficiency services. SNAP, WIC, certain veterans benefits among others automatically qualify people for our discount rate and then our income eligible services. And yes, there is a fairly long standing agreement in place for the data exchange.*

Councilor Comments/Suggested Improvements

- Consider collecting demand response data, even if customers do not express interest in participating
- Identify barriers and develop protocols to determine when it may be appropriate for households to install Wifi thermostats (so as to not bias towards an assumption that they're always appropriate); recognize that in the low-income sector in particular, there are a lot of people who lack access to broadband and computers, and many seniors who aren't fluent in or comfortable with the use of the technology
- Active demand in IE program should also be part of recommendations related to active demand more generally

TOPICS 2 AND 3: Adequate Budgets and Equitable Service

Ensuring Adequate Budgets

1. Income eligible budgets should increase to reflect expected increases in the number of low income households due to COVID. IES budgets should also increase as needed to reflect revised measure mixes and improved protocols. The Plan should incentivize additional spending on income eligible programs.

Clarifying Questions (Councilor questions. PA and Consultant responses in italics).

- How do the Consultants propose we meet the target in a cost-effective manner, taking into account the revised measure mix, improvement protocols, and income-eligible programs? In other words, what's the process for operationalizing the last two sentences in the recommendation about increasing budget, recognizing constraints like cost-effectiveness?
 - a. *Consultant response: this is exactly what will be addressed in the coming months. For example, we may look at creating incentives for going above and beyond fully spending their budgets*

- b. PA response: the focus should be on ensuring adequate budget for income eligible customers*
- I'm hearing the PAs say they have adequate budget to do the work needed in this sector, but I'm also hearing the pool of customers is larger than who is currently served. Can LEAN comment on this?
 - a. LEAN response: We serve as many families as we can with the allocated budget. It's a large group. A larger budget allocation means expanded work. But the idea that you could serve the entire population every year is not realistic; we need to assess where we are and how to prioritize so we can serve families most in need. We have a priority system that targets seniors, young families, the disabled, and other vulnerable populations. When I started in this business 40 years ago, we did 500 units a year with 20,000 families. We've always had to prioritize*
- We've received public comment in listening sessions that there are customers who reach out for services and are told there isn't sufficient budget; there seems to be misalignment between that public comment and what we're hearing today.
 - a. LEAN response: we don't run out of budget with utility funds; need to hear specific comments because public could be confusing our program with federal or other programs*
 - b. PA Response: PAs really want to hear about this through our agencies or PAs directly to ensure customers are supported in a timely fashion. Also, PAs are looking at income eligible comprehensively and regardless of income challenges due to COVID or other causes*

Councilor Comments/Suggested Improvements

- Capture and document cases where customers say they've been turned away due to budget constraints
- Determine a path for increasing budget without impacting cost-effectiveness
- Budgets may need to increase for reasons other than the increase in low-income households due to Covid.

Ensuring Equitable Service

- 1. Determine if there are differences in service by CAP territory, PA territory, or PA program (gas or electric) that are not warranted by differences in proportions of low-income households. Develop and implement strategies to correct unwarranted service differences.**

Clarifying Questions (Councilor questions. PA and Consultant responses in italics).

- Is this just a question of getting more data so we can determine if there are unwarranted differences, before we would develop and implement strategies?
 - a. Consultant response: yes*

- To establish the baseline, will we need to collect data for a year, conduct the analysis in year two, and then implement in year three?
 - a. *Consultant response: don't think so – some baselines have to do with eligible households and how service levels relate to proportions. Data from other sources inform baselines and insights into disparities*
- Do independent evaluators look at LEAN programs?
 - a. *Consultant response: the EEAC website has a section on evaluations; there is room for more EM&V in income eligible – there has been some evaluation but not conducted at the same level and breadth and depth as in C&I*
 - b. *LEAN response: LEAN works with Action and other lead vendors to compile statewide data for our own internal use of to document how our budgets are allocated and how customers are served because it ranges quite a bit based on the utility, whether you have gas or not in your territory*
- What strategies might address unwarranted service differences?
 - a. *Consultant response: this will come out of exploration and fact finding*
- How can we determine the discrepancies – an independent process evaluation, or something that the PAs and LEAN would do?
 - a. *Consultant response: best done by independent evaluator who has deep understanding of the data sources; also needs to be done through a collaborative effort between Community Action Programs (CAPs), PAs, and others*

Councilor Comments/Suggested Improvements

- Amend last sentence to include more analysis (i.e., why there are differences) and greater investment in CAP agencies
- Standardize programs across territories to reduce confusion
- Invest in CAPs to enable them to reach the targets and levels of service and standardization that we expect in these programs
- Ensure LEAN has the tools it needs to be as accountable as possible

2. Expand efforts to enroll customers newly eligible for IES services as a result of COVID

Clarifying Questions (Councilor questions. PA and Consultant responses in italics).

- How do we find new eligible customers as a result of COVID? Will they walk into the CAP agency?
 - a. *Consultant response: in the 2008 crisis we learned that many of these customers have never been in this position before (of needing assistance) and don't know where to turn; need to focus on education on discounted rates*

Councilor Comments/Suggested Improvements

- Consider using a phone bank or another strategy to identify customers, especially those who do not want to leave home

- Coordinate with agencies like NCLC and the Department of Housing and Community Development to encourage cross-promotion of services

3. Develop complete detailed mapping of customer journey for those who may be isolated by limited English proficiency (LEP), from first point(s) of contact, through intake, application, assessment, installation, and quality assurance. Utilize mapping to develop and implement a strategy to improve service to LEP customers in coordination with CAPs.

Clarifying Questions (Councilor questions. PA and Consultant responses in italics).

- What is the value in mapping a customer’s journey? Why not simply appoint a single point of contact?
 - a. *Consultant response: this is a multi-dimensional issue beyond solely language-speaking abilities. This issue ties into workforce issues, i.e., whether we have the capability and capacity at the appropriate points of intervention with the customer*

Councilor Comments/Suggested Improvements

- Provide more tools and resources to LEAN to reach even greater numbers of customers than they are already successfully reaching
- Acknowledge workforce constraints, develop a single point of contact to simplify the customer journey
- Develop a workforce that is fully capable of interfacing with those that are of limited English proficiency
- Ensure the customer journey map shows potential pitfalls (not just those related to LEP customers) and how they can be addressed
- Ensure the customer journey map details all steps, including the audit and followup
- Ensure program/website materials are translated all the way through the process, not just the application (which is currently translated in six languages)
- Consider a language software system that could provide instant translation for call centers

Virtual Breakout Discussion

Scott McCreary explained that each breakout group would discuss the same three questions for the 15 minutes and asked that one Councilor from each group to volunteer to serve as reporter and report back on the main points from the breakout when the groups return to plenary. He explained there would be a roughly equal share of people assigned to each room – with Councilors, PAs, DOER representatives, and Consultants pre-assigned to ensure representation across organizations and subject matter experts. Members of the public were randomly assigned, and would remain muted, though they would be able to see and hear everything said within their assigned breakout group.

Both groups discussed the same three questions within the frame of the following topic: We expect upward pressure on budgets, both from increased eligibility due to COVID effects and increased heat pump installations.

Summary of each group's discussion:

Group 1:

1. What additional information is needed to assess adequacy of budgets?
 - a. *First, start with goal setting, then add key information, prioritizing customers to target. Intentionally saturate a sector over some pre-determined time frame. Factor solar and non-energy benefits into information that needs to be gathered. Recognize that cost-effectiveness may impact the measure mix and widgets*
2. If budgets are inadequate, what mechanisms are needed for adjustment?
 - a. *The group discussed how to allocate dollars and how to find new dollars. They also discussed how the cost/benefit test can be used; for example, expanding the cost/benefit test to better reflect social value. They also discussed the need to revise budgeting and metrics to allow for larger priced items like strategic electrification, and the need to consider budget implications of reduction in lighting.*
3. What equity considerations should be applied if there are budget constraints?
 - a. *Discussed the tension between increasing income-eligible budget and its impact on equity vs. bill impacts. Increasing income eligible budget will have equity and bill impacts. Reducing residential and commercial budgets will have equity impacts, while increasing them will have bill impacts.*

Group 2:

1. What additional information is needed to assess adequacy of budgets?
 - a. *There are a few things to consider. State mandated climate planning requires examining the number of buildings that will be touched and prioritized. Recognize that goals are built from bottom up, yet bill impacts must also be considered. Also, we need to think about rebates and incentives for solar, renewables and the resultant grid impacts. Lastly, we need to know the geographic distribution and consider the whole population in assessing the adequacy of budgets.*
2. If budgets are inadequate, what mechanisms are needed for adjustment?
 - a. *The group did not explicitly discuss this question, although they recognized that the other questions relate closely. For example, in discussing question one, a member pointed out that implementers can go to PAs and the Council to request budget increases if demand outpaces the original budget.*
3. What equity considerations should be applied if there are budget constraints?
 - a. *We need to look at how much income eligible customers are paying in versus receiving benefits. This question also relates back to question one; the same considerations apply.*

TOPIC 4: Strengthening Multifamily Pipelines and Protocols

Note that some clarifying questions, comments, and suggested improvements listed under recommendation 1 apply to recommendation 2 and vice versa. The recommendations were discussed somewhat interchangeably.

1. Develop and implement a strategy for increasing and improving service to multifamily buildings, including naturally occurring affordable housing (NOAH). This should include:

- Working with the Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD), the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and public housing authorities to identify and reach out to owners and managers of small multifamily buildings that are part of the certificate-based Section 8 program.
- Utilizing PA account data to identify multifamily buildings.

Clarifying Questions (Councilor questions. PA and Consultant responses in italics).

- Do you know the demographics and reasons for participation, and why some demographics choose not to participate?
 - a. *Consultant response: There were some useful learnings from the nonparticipant study. One of the goals of this measure is to broaden the net beyond an investigation of large multifamily buildings, for which LEAN has a strong record of service, to include smaller buildings that may have a Section 8 certificate. Related to the customer journey mapping recommendation, we're proposing exploring a single point of contact. We need to explore the customer journey from the perspectives of all the different stakeholders: building owners, managers, maintenance staff, residents, and others.*
- Can the whole building qualify for the Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP) if there are some residents who are income eligible?
 - a. *LEAN response: yes, if a majority of households in a multi-unit building are eligible.*

Councilor Comments/Suggested Improvements

- Consider expanding the nonparticipant study; need to understand why people participate as well as why they don't. Also need to understand the customer journey for multifamily owners and multifamily residents
- Develop a specific strategy to reach naturally occurring affordable housing (NOAH)
- Pay “closers”—dedicated staff to speak to owners of smaller buildings after the audit to encourage participation and help overcome objections to the split incentive issue
- Retain and pay staff who might be considered “openers” to visit smaller properties and initiate education on program offerings
- DOER should encourage the appropriate peer state agency to revise the sanitary code to leverage a requirement for a higher level of efficiency, especially for small multifamily buildings
 - a. *PA response: such a strategy of changing code will raise attribution and incentive issues*
- Engage a legal team to explore green leases (first commercial then residential) to appropriate benefits across owners and tenants
 - a. *PA response: need to think through how green leases put the burden on the owner vs. renter for paying for upgrades*

- Consider a mandated level of efficiency for multifamily buildings, as some cities like New York and Boston are doing for certain large multifamily buildings
 - a. *PA response: note that changing code will raise attribution and incentive issues*
- Lower the threshold percentage to qualify for income eligible whole building treatment, i.e., lower the threshold from 50% to 30%

2. Develop and implement strategies to provide more flexibility for multifamily building owners undergoing scheduled rehabilitation, renovation, or refinancing, to enable installation of deeper energy-saving measures.

Clarifying Questions (Councilor questions. PA and Consultant responses in italics).

None

Councilor Comments/Suggested Improvements

- Track when buildings are up for refinancing or rehabilitation and seize the opportunity to discuss equipment replacement; consider developing a database to track private housing data points
 - a. *PA response: Check out the LEAN Multifamily website for information on the work that's been done since the last 3-year plan on integrating with the refinancing process for affordable housing*
- (see recommendation 1, above, for additional ideas, as the two recommendations were discussed in tandem)

TOPIC 5: Improving Data and Systems for Program Assessment and Improvement

1. Strengthen regular reporting in order to identify areas of improvement and resources needed to support comprehensive and equitable service to all submarkets. Reporting should provide insight into specific program activities and buildings served, as well as identify where program designs are working well or need modification. Reporting to the EEAC should allow differentiation of program activities by more granular parameters, including:

- PA and CAP territory
- Program (gas, electric)
- Service type (Appliance Management Program (AMP), weatherization, heating system)
- Building size (number of units)
- Resident status (owner or renter)

Clarifying Questions (Councilor questions. PA and Consultant responses in italics).

- How much of this data is already being collected?
 - a. *Consultant response: We're assuming the relevant data is there; it's a question of whether the data is being managed in real time so that the Council has access to the information it needs to see how programs are performing and if improvement is needed*

- b. *LEAN response: There are so many towns; it will be challenging to get standardized data on a state-wide basis*
- Which entity will implement this recommendation – who will identify the best practices, and has anyone sorted out best practices thus far?
 - a. *Consultant response: There are accepted best practices for WAP, but what we’re proposing here is a state-wide computerized audit to help in the consistency of application. It’s not just about standardizing the best practices, it’s also about standardizing the underlying data systems. As for who will implement, LEAN does this through their best practice meeting each month.*

Councilor Comments/Suggested Improvements

- Add another sub-bullet to provide for more granular marketing information
- Strong support for regular reporting; need to set concrete reporting timelines
- Target assembly and analysis of data at the Census tract level
- Collect data on whether income eligible participants live in public housing, subsidized affordable housing, or naturally occurring affordable housing. (This would provide insights into whether housing authorities are better served)

2. Develop and implement a statewide computerized audit that can provide regular, timely, and consistent information to support identification of best practices and needed continuous improvement as well as reporting to the Council and providing data for EM&V.

Clarifying Questions (Councilor questions. PA and Consultant responses in italics).

- Which entity does this already, and are there best practices we can glean?
 - a. *Consultant response: There are some accepted best practices for income eligible and WAP; the goal with this recommendation is to provide consistency through a computerized audit to be used state-wide. In other words, we’re proposing standardizing the underlying data systems in addition to employing best practices.*
- Does “audit” refer to assessment of the building, or to or computerizing the assessment of the group of assessments of buildings?
 - a. *Consultant response: In this case, audit refers to assessment of building*

Comments/Suggested Improvements

- *LEAN comment: We received a DOE grant about 15 years ago and they tried to do this; the problem is that each utility has a different software format, so while I support this recommendation in principle, it’s a fools’ errand in practice*
 - a. *Councilor response: The different requirements and software of utilities shouldn’t fall entirely on LEAN’s shoulders*

- *PA comment: PAs have made a lot of improvement over the last couple of years on the market rate side in coordinating a lot of different vendors; we welcome more best practices and greater integration of data and process improvement*
- For context, this recommendation came out of the process evaluation of the income eligible programs a year or two ago; let's work with LEAN to find barriers and develop an implementation timeline
- Pinpoint federal and state requirements and how to address them
- Attach a timeline to this recommendation
- Recast the term “computerized audit” to “computerized building assessment”
- Collectively define best practices and computerized assessment

TOPIC 6: Additional Recommendations

This portion of the agenda included two parts: 1) briefly reviewing the two “Other recommendations” listed in the briefing document. 2) creating a time to brainstorm potential additional recommendations for income eligible services more broadly.

1. **Realize program savings from investment in benchmarking, providing building owners and managers who have participated with information on building energy performance over time.**

Comments & Suggested Improvements (PAs and Councilors)

- Strong support for realizing program savings from investment in benchmarking
 - a. *LEAN response: benchmarking has been used to prioritize buildings but not as an implementation tool*
- For greater clarity, consider revising recommendation from “realize program savings from investment in benchmarking” to “support or fund benchmarking”
- Leverage benchmarking to track and maintain energy savings, and to support target setting and continuous efficiency improvements

Ideas for New Recommendations

- Install solar as part of a measure strategy
- Transition away from fossil fuels: add non-energy impacts, climate and equity inputs into cost-effectiveness screen; Need to re-vamp the cost effectiveness test to include electrification benefits, social benefits
- Provide a special offer for electrification and foster greater integration of renewables. Also utilize the quarterbacking model for electrification, storage, solar.
- Increase funding for electrification and renewables integration, to foster increased equity for income eligible customers
- Provide an offer for electrification with integration of renewables; utilize quarterbacking model

- Provide residents and occupants ways to manage costs over time, recognizing electricity is currently more expensive than gas. Provide funding for utility and maintenance costs.
- Conduct blower door tests on multifamily structures both to calculate savings and to ensure that efficiency improvements do not have the unintended consequence of creating an unhealthy environment; ensure the same level of care to multifamily and income eligible despite program costs
- For measures that don't emerge from the screen as being cost effective (e.g., adding insulation when existing level is R30), connect LEAN with other entities who can bridge the gap
- Consider funding remote monitoring and optimization to ensure savings are maintained; leverage existing tools in this monitoring effort.
 - a. *PA response: PAs have been exploring technologies and welcome specific ideas on market-ready companies*
- Install electrical charging stations in larger multifamily buildings – expand beyond the work of MassCEC, Eversource, City of Boston, Roxbury Community College and others (who are opening the state's first low-income EV car sharing program)

One process idea was to consider whether EEAC should incorporate an inquiry into specific recommendations on data topics into the agenda for each workshop, or potentially use the last workshop to gather centralize the data and reporting recommendations in one place (to be completed alongside broader objective of finalizing recommendations).

WRAP UP & NEXT STEPS

Scott McCreary and Katie Abrams thanked participants for their engagement and attention. In closing, Maggie McCarey reminded participants of upcoming workshops and public listening sessions and invited participants to provide feedback via email.

APPENDIX: Meeting Attendees (not including the public attendees)

Nov 10, 2020 Attendance - EEAC Workshop #2		
Voting Councilors		
Maggie	McCarey	DOER
Greg	Abbe	DHCD
Joann	Bodemer	AGO
Amy	Boyd	Acadia Center
Tim	Costa	ISO-NE
Steve	Cowell	E4theFuture/Peregrine Energy
Justin	Davidson	MA Association of Realtors
Mike	Ferrante	MEMA
Charlie	Harak	NCLC
Elliott	Jacobson	Action Inc.
Paul	Johnson	Greentek
Cammy	Peterson	MAPC
Bob	Rio	Associated Industries of MA
Dennis	Villanueva	Partners MGH
Mary	Wambui	Planning Office for Urban Affairs
Sharon	Weber	DEP
PAs – Non-Voting Councilors		
Cindy	Carroll	Unitil
Maggie	Downey	Cape Light Compact
Frank	Gundal	Eversource
Jane	Lano	Berkshire Gas
Stephanie	Terach	Liberty Utilities
Presenters (Consultants and PAs)		
Elizabeth	Chant	EEAC Consultant Team
Margie	Lynch	EEAC Consultant Team
Marie	Abdou	National Grid
Brandy	Chambers	Eversource
Kim	Dragoo	Liberty Utilities
Amanda	Formica	National Grid
Ruth	Georges	Eversource
Riley	Hastings	Eversource
Shane	Henegan	Liberty Utilities
Marge	Kelly	Eversource
Steve	Menges	National Grid
Meredith	Miller	Cape Light Compact
Kevin	Parse	Unitil

Mike	Rossacci	National Grid
Linda	Soucy	Eversource
Liz	Anderson	Rich May
Audrey	Eidelman	BCK Law, PC
Rachel	Evans	DOER
Jodi	Hanover	Rich May
Emmett	Lyne	Rich May
Ashley	Wagner	Keegan Werlin
LEAN/ABCD		
Jerry	Oppenheim	LEAN
John	Wells	ABCD, Inc./LEAN
Brian	Beote	Action Inc.
Rita	Carvalho	Action Inc.
James	Collins	ABCD, Inc./LEAN
Jonathan	Daley	Action Inc.
Brendan	Delaney	Action Inc.
Billierae	Engelman	ABCD
Orest	Manzi	ABCD