

**Massachusetts Energy Efficiency Advisory Council**  
 Meeting Minutes  
 Tuesday December 9, 2014

**Councilors Present:**

<b>Voting</b>	<b>Present (designee)</b>	<b>Non-Voting</b>	<b>Present (designee)</b>
Greg Bialecki		James Carey	Patricia Walker
Martha Coakley	Donald Boecke	Cindy Carrol	X
David Cash	Nancy Seidman	Elizabeth Cellucci	X
Betsy Glynn	X	Maggie Downey	X
Charles Harak		Michael Ferrante	
Elliott Jacobson	X	Paul Gromer	X
Deirdre Manning		Andrew Newman	
Richard Malmstrom	X	Michael Sommer	X
Amy Boyd	X	Tilak Subrahmanian	Frank Gundal
Robert Rio	X	Carol White	Marie Abdou
Larry Chretien	X	Eric Winkler	X
Paul Johnson	X		
Michael McDonagh	X		
Brian Swett	Brad Swing		
Meg Lusardi	Tina Halfpenny		

Consultants: Eric Belliveau, Jeff Schlegel, Margie Lynch, Jennifer Chiodo, George Lawrence, Craig Johnson

DOER: Maggie McCarey, Ian Finlayson, Alex Pollard, Aimee Powelka

**Present:**

Wesley Couture

Brenda Hunt

Larry Masland

Jodi Hanover

Greg Krantz

Sam Milton

Natalie Hildt Treat

Emmett Lyne

Jerrold Oppenheim

Lyn Huckabee

Halfpenny called the meeting to order at 12:10 pm and welcomed everybody. She noted that public comment would be moved to the end of the meeting.

## **EEAC Assessment Report:**

### *EEAC Role*

Halfpenny began by giving a high level review of the recommendations that came out of the process assessment report, which included identifying the role of the Council during planning and implementation phases, what process the Council should take during the implementation phase when goals are not being met, and defining the role and purpose of documents put forth by the Council as either a sense of the Council or resolution. She noted that clarifying the roles and responsibilities is a broad topic and so she recommended that the Council not try to reach a resolution at the meeting, rather identify next steps for the planning process of the Council.

### *Executive Committee Structure*

Halfpenny noted that Executive Committee (EC) membership needs to be renewed and the Charter needs to be revised. She asked for Council input on whether or not residential and commercial and industrial (C&I) seats should be added to the EC.

#### 1. Adding Seats to the Executive Committee

Jacobson noted that he did not see the need to add seats to the EC because a smaller group works more efficiently which is important in the context of why the EC exists. Halfpenny noted that the point of the EC is to efficiently go through the issues that the full Council does not have time to deal with, and then report back to the Council so it can determine which issues need to be worked on. Boyd agreed with this, noting that adding more seats to the EC would risk turning it into a small Council which would effectively take power away from the Council as a whole. McDonagh added that he would need to be convinced of a reason to add more seats to the EC and Rio noted that the Attorney General's EC seat is already in a position to represent all ratepayers.

Chretien noted that he did not feel strongly either way if there were more or less seats on the EC, but that residential and C&I would be good additions. He also noted that he felt that EC membership could rotate with one year terms, as long as the chair of the full Council is continuously on the EC. Glynn agreed with this statement, adding that the role of EC membership needs to be formalized.

Johnson noted that he thought it is essential to have a full representation of the Council which would include adding dedicated residential and C&I seats to the EC. Malmstrom noted that C&I has struggled the most out of any sector and that he would be in favor of adding a C&I seat to the EC so that its sector specific issues can be more appropriately resolved.

#### 2. Role of the PAs in the Executive Committee

On the topic of the PAs role on the EC, Jacobson noted that they should have some role, such as an ex officio membership, as they are tasked with the responsibility of spending ratepayer money. McDonagh, Glynn, and Boyd all agreed that the PAs should have an ex officio role on the EC. Boyd added that this role needs to be clarified and clearly stated.

Johnson noted that he was unsure about adding a PA seat to the EC given that their voices are already heard through the presence of Emmett Lyne, counsel.

### 3. Nominations for New Executive Committee Seats

Halfpenny requested an informal vote to determine what seats may be added to the EC. Of the 12 Councilors present, 8 voted in favor of adding a C&I seat, 3 voted in favor of adding a residential seat, and all voted in favor of the PAs having an ex officio seat.

#### *EEAC Structure*

Boyd noted that she thought that ground rules are important and that she had been surprised to learn that the Council did not already have them. Halfpenny suggested that the Council review the draft ground rules that were distributed and that there be a vote on them in January.

Winkler strongly encouraged DOER to explore the option of a microphone system for meetings, noting that the cost is relatively small in order to be compliant with the American Disabilities Act. Several of the Councilors expressed support on this matter.

#### *EEAC Consultants and PAs*

Halfpenny reviewed the recommendations for the consultant team and the PAs and noted that most were either on-going or would be addressed in the near- or long-term.

#### *DOER*

Johnson noted that DOER does a good job with the resources they have for Council administrative support. He was in full support of Raab's recommendation of getting more administrative support. Boyd suggested the Council look into a consultant to manage administrative tasks, noting that this process has been successful for the Connecticut Energy Efficiency Board. Glynn, Malmstrom, and Swing supported Boyd's suggestion. Swing further supported an independent facilitator for the Council meetings. Johnson noted that the Council could experiment with using a co-facilitator for meetings. Halfpenny thought this could be tested in sub-groups during the 2016-2018 planning phase. Jacobson added that the most successful collaborative process he had ever been a part of had a professional facilitator.

#### *EEAC Meeting Changes*

Halfpenny reviewed the recommendations for EEAC meeting changes.

### 1. Identification of Voting and Non-Voting Members

Malmstrom suggested that the table cards clearly identify voting and non-voting members and that for PAs, the table cards have the attendees name rather than the company they are representing.

## 2. Presentations, Discussion Time, and Agenda Setting

In regards to presentations and time for discussion, Johnson noted that there has been time on the agenda set aside for discussion but that that has not worked in the past. He suggested that there be some sort of guideline that determines the percentage of time for discussion during presentations. Rio echoed this noting that in the past some presentations have gone over time resulting in no time for Councilors to ask questions. Seidman suggested that the Council have warning signs that would inform presenters of how much time is left so as to prevent presentations going over time. Belliveau recommended that all questions be held to the end of the presentation to further ensure that there is ample time for discussion. Malmstrom summarized four major points that he thought would contribute to more efficient Council meetings. First, lighten the agenda; second, pre-answering questions because a lack of legends on graphics; third, Councilors should prepare ahead of time if presentations are advanced for them; and fourth, require presentations to be uploaded several days ahead of time so Councilors have time to prepare. Lastly, Gromer noted that it would be helpful to have more clarity on why presentations are being held.

## 3. Frequency and Timing of Council Meetings

Halfpenny noted that Raab suggested two meetings per month, one for council business and the other for planning. She further noted the recommendation that meetings be 3.5 hours in the morning. Glynn was in favor of moving the meetings to the morning. Others wanted to be sensitive to the Councilors who have long distances to travel for the meetings suggesting that early morning meeting would not be possible. Winkler suggested that the meeting length should be set according to the content. He noted that there is a lot of content that occurs in the meetings that could be done through another medium such as a webinar. Rio and Marie Abdou of National Grid agreed with the idea that some of the presentations could be done through webinars.

### *Executive Committee Meeting Changes*

The Council discussed the meeting materials and minutes from the EC. Seidman noted that it would be helpful to have the information from the meetings in an e-mail or on the website so that Councilors who do not participate in the EC can come to the full Council meetings better prepared. Halfpenny suggested that the EC could start with sending out the agenda to the full Council.

### **EEAC Governance:**

Halfpenny welcomed nominations for C&I and residential/low-income EC seats and noted that there would be a vote in January on these nominations, their terms, and the Charter. For the C&I

seat, Chretien nominated Malmstrom. For the residential/low-income seat, Jacobson nominated himself, Johnson nominated himself, and Chretien nominated Glynn and Glynn accepted.

### **2015 Priorities:**

Halfpenny noted that there are two sets of priorities for the next year with one for 2015 to help direct the consultants with the deliverable work to the council and the other for the three year planning process. Halfpenny requested that Councilors send her an e-mail by the end of the month that describes the priorities they would like to have on the table for 2015. She noted that she would compile the responses and bring it up for discussion in the January meeting.

Belliveau noted that the consultant team would be working on its work plan during December to bring to the EC in January.

Halfpenny noted the following action items for the January meeting:

1. Review and adopt ground rules
2. Renew Executive Committee and revise Charter
3. 2015 Priorities
4. Consultant work plan and budget

Halfpenny called for a short break at 1:55 pm.

The Council reconvened at 2:05 pm.

### **Three Year Planning Process – Engagement Plan:**

#### *Overview of 2016-2018 Planning Process*

Schlegel noted that the consultant team combined short- and long-term tasks into one project summary page using a high-level plan that the PAs drafted in October and steps and pieces from the EC as sources.

Seidman asked why database is listed as just one day. Schlegel noted that it is just a placeholder for the time being.

Halfpenny noted that all of the meetings in the timeline have not been noticed and that this was just to get a sense if the schedule presented is appropriate.

#### *Sector-Level Brainstorm – Breakout Session*

Jonathan Raab and Halfpenny broke the Council out into two groups – one for C&I and the other for residential and low-income. Halfpenny noted that the first goal is to identify the objective of the group and what the deliverable might be coming out of the groups and going into the planning process. The second goal is to examine a list of topics and issues and decide if there are any that are not on the list. The final goal is to have a discussion about prioritizing the list of topics and issues.

After an hour of discussion in the breakout groups, the full Council came back together to discuss their findings

### 1. Commercial & Industrial Group

Alex Pollard began by informing the Council that the C&I group thought that the best way to work through issues would be through workshops as opposed to sub-committees. He noted that the group organized topics and issues into three groups. The first group was for policy-related issues which included regulatory or legislative barriers, performance contracting, financing for energy efficiency projects, demand response for electric and gas, gas system constraints, programs for oil customers, and zero net energy buildings and new construction. The second group was for technologies issues which included building controls, sub-metering and data analytics, retrocommissioning, and combined heat and power. The final group was for implementation issues which included ways to mitigate the hockey stick affect for C&I, serving the commercial real estate sector, behavioral programs, zero net energy buildings and new construction, segment strategy, and hospitality and small business best practices.

Pollard went on to explain a process for how these workshops might work. He suggested that before the meeting, participants would have to identify why the issues are important. Once in the meeting, the goal would be to start with a discussion of the gaps and why they exist. Following that would be a discussion of the topic itself to understand more about it. He noted that the idea would be for these discussions to be free flowing and resulting in a recommendation of how to execute these ideas as part of the three year plan.

### 2. Residential and Low-Income Group

Ian Finlayson began by explaining that the group did not decide whether or not there should be dedicated workshops or sub-committees. He did note, however, that either way the context would be to have discussions on productive partnerships, existing shortfalls, and pressing issues. He also noted that it was decided that there would be separate agendas for multifamily and low-income, but that they would be co-located so that stakeholders could take part in both. For residential areas, the group identified RCS regulation, oil and gas conversions, cold climate heat pumps, residential products, Wi-Fi learning thermostats, optimizing savings within the HES program, and educating and marketing as priorities for discussion. For multifamily, the group identified delivered fuel alternatives, refinance rehabilitation, benchmarking and labeling, and how to evaluate a multifamily as a separate sector as priorities for discussion. Lastly, for low-income, the group found a broad voting pattern for all issues areas, and also added the idea of discussing non-residential buildings that serve the low-income sector, such as community centers.

Finlayson went on to suggest that the group thought residential could be covered in two half-day meetings and that each low-income and multifamily could be covered in at least one half-day meetings.

**Next Steps:***Proposed Meeting Schedule*

Halfpenny suggested that there be two meetings in January, one to conduct normal Council business and another to host public comment. She noted that a public comment meeting held in 2012 gave the Council good feedback from different perspectives. For February, Halfpenny recommended that the regular meeting be fit into two workshops where the timing would depend on who would be participating. She further suggested that a meeting be added towards the end of February after the Fourth Quarter report is available.

Boyd and Abdou noted possible scheduling conflicts for February meetings. Halfpenny noted that once workshops are scheduled there will be a clearer idea of when the full Council will need to meet.

*Facilitation Needs*

Halfpenny asked the Council for approval to extend the existing contract with Raab to manage the engagement part of the planning process. All Councilors were in favor of this.

*Consultant Team Work Plan*

Belliveau noted that the consultant team has enough information to start building out their work plan and that it will be an iterative process.

**Public Comment:**

Wesley Couture of American Installations spoke as a representative of the best practices group for the Home Energy Solutions program. He asked the Council to consider what the workers are being compensated for as they go through the next planning process. He noted working conditions, higher standards, and more background checks as considerations.

**Adjournment:**

Halfpenny adjourned the meeting at 4:02 pm.