**Net Metering and Solar Task Force Meeting**

**April 16, 2015**

Task Force members in attendance: Angie O’Connor, Dan Burgess, Liam Holland, Janet Besser, Amy Rabinowitz, Paul Brennan, Larry Aller (alternate for Geoff Chapin), Camilo Serna, Bob Rio, Jonathan Wienslaw (alternate for Lisa Podgurski), Eric Krathwohl, Fred Zalcman, Christina Fisher, Bill Stillinger, Charlie Harak, David Colton (arrived late).

9:07 a.m.

Dan Burgess – Good morning, we have quite a bit to get through today. We’re going to vote on the minutes from 4/6/15.

Amy Rabinowitz – On page 11, where I am speaking, that should say: the cap sets a ceiling for the utilities’ non-net metering customers.

Dan Burgess – With that change, is there a motion to accept the minutes?

Eric Krathwohl – So moved.

Dan Burgess– Second.

Minutes accepted by Task Force members (14-0). One abstention.

Dan Burgess - Ok, the minutes are approved. On to the Task 3 summary from the consultants.

Bob Grace (Consultant) – We’ve been very busy. During the presentation, I’d ask that everyone hold their questions until we get toward the end when I will ask people for their input and suggestions.

**Task 3 Report Outline**

The Task 3 Report will include an executive summary, an introduction, a review of cases (SREC, policy path A & B, NM capped and uncapped, to 1600 MW and 2500 MW), cost and benefit components, intermediate results of interest, cost and benefit results, discussion and observations on scenarios, and limitations and/or areas for possible further study. The methodologies and key assumptions will be included in the report appendices.

**Tweaks to Prior Draft Methodology**

Review Allocation of targets to Paths A and B large versus small and split to subsectors within small – based on projected, not historic, SREC II.

Review Path A (large) – 25% to each of A/B/C/Other to match the Path B approach. We had agreed on this but we didn’t update the methodology in the powerpoint.

Review changing Path A and Path B from netting “realized” retail revenue to netting “typical” retail revenue – consistent with philosophy, necessary to make results calculable (otherwise circularity in supply curve analysis).

Review the cost/benefit components. We added the Massachusetts and Federal income taxes. Avoided losses may be applied to applicable individual line items rather than as a freestanding quantity. The virtual net metering administrative costs were added to the stack but will only be addressed qualitatively.

**Modeling Costs and Benefits**

Review of analysis structure.

Review of policy paths modeled and status report – SREC I, II; SREC III; new policy; new policy solar target.

Review of total emissions reductions, total fuel usage reductions, energy market price effects, production-weighted solar avoided energy cost (wholesale value of solar production), solar peak impact, solar PV impact on avoiding generation, transmission and distribution capacity, avoided electric losses due to solar distributed generation, avoided transmission investment from remote wind, avoided transmission and distribution investment.

**Preliminary Results – SREC I & SREC II**

Review of hidden economy of Massachusetts SREC market.

Review of preliminary build out of current policy and preliminary SREC III model with current net metering caps and with net metering uncapped. The model is likely to be revised before the final results.

Review of SREC I/II policy price comparison (projected SREC prices) – spot prices with current net metering caps vs. uncapped net metering; revenue to generator vs. cost to ratepayer.

Review of SREC II distribution among types of supply (sectors and installation types – capped).

**Preliminary Results – Projected Retail Rate Components.**

Review of projected retail rate components by electric distribution companies (for 2015, 2020, and 2025).

Review of illustrative trajectory over time for National Grid’s projected retail rate components (2014 through 2025). This reflects projections. Investors in these projects will not look at these projects as a sure thing. I would like to discuss to what degree the retail rate forecast should be discounted for the purposes of estimating required incentives. How should we view the risk associated with net metering or avoided retail rate revenue streams? How big of a cut is merited? The models will be rerun based on the decisions made here. We propose to cut 50% of growth after the valley from generation and distribution escalation and update the SREC analysis. For paths A and B, what is the Task Force’s intent for setting a “combined” incentive?

If the intent is that the actual solar incentive nets out retail rates as they change from time to time, providing generators with a reliable retail rate hedge akin to a contract for differences, no haircut is needed.

If the intent is that the actual solar incentive is based on a projected or fixed or infrequently-adjusted estimate of retail rates, leaving a generator exposed to having a risk of revenues lower than forecasted, then a haircut is needed.

Fred Zalcman- I think that in terms of declining block, that forecast would be done administratively.

Janet Besser – If you define the incentive as 5 cents on top of a varying retail rate, a solar customer generator may get more than 23 cents as the retail rate goes up?

Bob Grace (Consultant) – We start here with a forecast that is risk independent. No banker is going to use that forecast. When it comes to deciding what incentive is needed, they are going to be more conservative.

Janet Besser – So, I am confused as to which is which for your (a) and (b).

Bob Grace (Consultant) – For (a) generators are hedged and for (b) generators are not hedged.

Camilo Serna – I would vote for (a). Let’s assume that they will get the 23 cents over time. We can go back later to make adjustments. The decision over what kind of haircut to do is too subjective.

Fred Zalcman – You may be overstating the risk to developers. It really goes more to the underlying contract between the developer and the customer.

Amy Rabinowitz – I would also vote for (a).

Angie O’Connor – I am a little stunned that there would ever be the possibility that we will see federal cap and trade in our lifetime. The possibility of that happening is crazy. I don’t understand why we would include that.

Bob Grace (Consultant) – Effectively, it’s a placeholder for something like clean power plants or an assumption that there is some policy that reduces the carbon prices.

Angie O’Connor - I was not involved in those discussions, I find it a little crazy. I am not saying that we shouldn’t get to something. I just think that’s the political reality.

Bob Grace (Consultant) – This was consistent with what a lot of other analysts do in the region and what was discussed when we started this.

Larry Aller – It sounds like we would be modeling (b) for the large solar segment and (b) for the small solar segment. I think that it is important because on the residential side, it’s important for people to protect themselves from rate changes.

Bob Grace (Consultant) – Thank you for your input there.

**Review of model capabilities for policy paths A&B.**

**Policy A & B – Preliminary Thoughts**

Competitive solicitation leads to a relatively controllable build-out.

The declining block incentive (DBI) can be very volatile for some sectors (large path B).

There is much more to come. We’re happy to take on questions at this time.

Larry Aller – Can we provide comments on the model via e-mail to the chairs?

Dan Burgess – Yes. I am not sure how we will deal with comments, but you can send them to the e-mail address.

Larry Aller – On the last page, I would be interested to hear how the dynamics of the model are driving this result.

Bob Grace (Consultant) – We’re attempting to capture the constraints on how much can be done over a period of time. We are divvying up a market that is smaller than what we have now.

Larry Aller – Based on what you see in the market, you don’t tend to see this. That’s a red flag.

Bob Grace (Consultant) - This is just one illustration of the modeling which includes a random combination of starting prices and rate of decline. That’s the fine-tuning we haven’t done yet. We’re a little limited in terms of how much time we have to play with this, but at the end of the day, the declining block structure is potentially volatile compared to an RFP. Your point is well taken. We will try to pick a combination that will not be terribly volatile.

Charlie Harak – The SREC I/II dollar comparison stood out to me. I was wondering what was the length of the timeframe that you were looking at?

Bob Grace (Consultant) – This was through 1,600 MW capped. Basically, all the SRECs are paid for. This does not net out the avoided Class I REC prices. This is compared to no policy. This is between 2010 and 2029 when the last SREC is paid for.

Camilo Serna – I am concerned that we do not have all of the information that we need. I thought that today we would be looking at results, which would inform the policy discussions and our dialogue. I am concerned as to how we will fit this into how we are doing things on this Task Force. We will send you detailed comments.

Amy Rabinowitz – I didn’t hear a lot about costs versus benefits to the system. My question is how are you proposing to factor in costs to the analysis? What you’re doing is different than how we typically do our analysis for the system.

Bob Grace (Consultant) – Again, this is not the whole picture. Some cost components from a ratepayer perspective are policy-dependent, so we will have costs rolled up in the cost benefit analysis to come.

Fred Zalcman – I too have a lot of questions. An overarching question – could you amplify a bit on how your model gets us to the 1,600 MW goal with the capped net metering scenario.

Bob Grace (Consultant) – The SREC model is not adjusted to account for the ITC going away. If you have different segments of the marketplace building because they are not subject to the cap and then segments not building as much, we have looked at the distribution of cost function based on databases available in Massachusetts. We have broken the model up into moderate versus high cost projects in varying segments. You get to 1,600 MW slower with current net metering caps than uncapped. You’ll get there with a different mix of supply.

Janet Besser – On slide 31, you talk about net metering availability and unavailability. I take it that net metering dependent projects will not move forward. Do you take into account at all that we have talked about additional incentive for preferred categories of projects?

Bob Grace (Consultant) – No, that has not been included. You may decide later on to make adjustments for certain categories of projects. The one thing that we have done is where (because of the cap) these large sector A projects are not viable, we have reallocated that target to the other category.

Janet Besser – On slide 22, if you have the information for which categories are getting built with caps versus without caps, it would be helpful if you could provide some more detail on this so that we can decide which policy decisions make sense.

Bob Grace (Consultant) – Yes, we can do that.

Bill Stillinger – What we are looking for is some insight so we can do what we’re supposed to be doing. I don’t think that the insight is coming across as much as I had hoped. I am hoping that outside of the meeting process there could be an e-mail question and answer.

Bob Grace (Consultant) – I am not sure that is realistic given how much time we have left.

Dan Burgess – We can discuss that.

Eric Krathwohl – We have been deferring positions to see the guidance, but as a process matter, if you could make an effort to try to simplify the results and conclusions as they would inform our task of making decisions for making recommendations.

David Colton – From my point of view, it would be very helpful if we could get information on the consequences of each for net metering caps versus no caps.

Bob Grace (Consultant) – If we are fully hedged under an uncapped world, you’d get to some scenarios where the level of incentive in some areas would be low or zero. Effectively, we’re challenging these assumptions as we do quality control, but we are already seeing in some places where there are projects surviving at near retail rates. It is our intention to try to tease out the important takeaways and we understand the objectives of everyone around the table.

Dan Burgess – We appreciate the work that you are doing and the complexity. We will try to come up with a process for a question and answer. We are going to take a 10- minute break and we will start again at 11:15am.

BREAK

Dan Burgess – Moving on to review the recommendation statements. We are strict on time, so we have 10 minutes for each topic. Our goal for the next few weeks is: by Tuesday to circulate an updated draft and then to get your redlines by Thursday and the circulate an updated draft back to you by April 24 for our discussion on Monday April 27. Let’s see where we have consensus and where we need continue to refine. With that, let’s start with general principles.

**General Principles**

Fred Zalcman – Team was Bob Rio, Amy and myself . We have 5 consensus recommendations. The first reiterates our mandate and framework (reaching 1,600 MW and beyond of solar). We had a fair amount of discussion on the second point. We initially had specific outcomes (environmental, economic, etc). In the end we recognized the fact that if we do achieve a goal then the rest will follow. We also recognized subsidiary goals such as diversity, etc.. The third was the most challenging. There was general recognition within the group and maybe within the Task Force that we want a better grip on the costs and benefits of solar. Where there is work to be done is how that investigation is pursued. Some have voiced support for a value of solar study, but others are concerned about how that would get used. The fourth point picked up on the minimum bill section. This is a general statement that everyone who uses the grid should contribute their fair share to maintaining the grid and public policy programs supported through rates. Lastly, there were a number of other issues raised that weren’t within our narrow charge, but we agree that there may be opportunities to cut costs in those areas (permitting, etc.).

Dan Burgess – Great. Do you want to touch on areas of potential compromise?

Fred Zalcman – Sure. The value of solar study was already touched on, but more discussion is needed. Then, we also discussed how the solar value is compensated.

Amy Rabinowitz – In addition, when we talk about a value of solar study, there are a lot of places that could get value from solar (distribution system, markets, citizens of the Commonwealth). We may want to reflect the idea that there are many places that get value, but now we are taking it one step further. Whoever is capturing the value should pay for it. Moving on, some Task Force members felt that once that was determined, the grid should not be paying more than it could otherwise (so if energy efficiency and solar provide the same benefit, than the least costly option should be chosen). The last question is about nuances regarding policy goals – minimizing ratepayer contributions and eliminating cross subsidies, etc. With some of these, I was quite pleased with the amount of consensus that we had in one week. With more work, we could get further along.

Dan Burgess – Could someone please explain how a value of solar study would differ from what we’re doing here now? Could folks that have been involved in other value of solar studies in other states comment?

Janet Besser – Some of what we are doing is similar to a value of solar study, but there are different methodologies used for the value of solar study. If you look at recent studies, the key issue for a value of solar study that we are recommending is that it is an open and transparent process. This was a very fast modeling process, and only Task Force members could provide some input. A key element would be that DOER and DPU set an open process for everyone to have input. We want this to be a consensus recommendation.

Camilo Serna – In addition, the value of solar looks at it things independently, not in the context of a particular policy option. I also want to be sure that we understand how the number is used if we do a value of solar study. I believe that with more discussion we could come to a consensus.

Paul Brennan – Another difference is where the value of solar study plays out. It should be more open and transparent at either DPU or DOER.

Eric Krathwohl – Another observation is understanding who benefits and who then should pay is important.

Fred Zalcman – I agree. Can you use the value of solar study as a way to eliminate cross subsidies? The value of solar study would let us set an unsubsidized electricity tariff.

Janet Besser – I have a few comments on the draft, should I offer them now or is there another way?

Dan Burgess – I want the group to continue on this. A lot of work had been done, but I want to make sure others have a chance to give input, so please go ahead.

Janet Besser – We need to take into account benefits and costs. That language was somewhere in another draft but I’d like to see it in there.

Amy Rabinowitz – I think that was an editing oversight, but we’d need to talk more so I understand what you are getting at.

Janet Besser – Ok.

Dan Burgess – Other issues?

Larry Aller – We have discussed policy priorities around certain market segments. I think that it would be helpful if we could provide clarity on that here. Maybe this is a topic for further discussion.

Dan Burgess – We do get to that in another segment.

Janet Besser – We mention diversity here, so maybe we could clarify.

**Small Scale Distributed Solar Incentives**

Dan Burgess – Ok, moving on to small scale solar.

Camilo Serna – A lot of similarities with large scale solar in terms of structure and themes. [Review of consensus recommendations, areas of potential compromise, and areas for further discussion]. Further discussion goes back to the model – does SREC make sense or does a DBI make sense? For the others, Bill or Larry could you elaborate on 2-5?

Larry Aller – Sure. These are additional design principles that have been proposed to facilitate the market. [Reviews areas for further discussion 2-5].

Camilo Serna – One last note, some of these came up late in the process so we haven’t had a chance to discuss them much but wanted to put them in there.

Amy Rabinowitz– On the defining a size limit, what we have to think about is that even something that is small could have a major impact on the system. I think it’s too simplistic to set a kilowatt (kW) limit, because it really depends on location.

David Colton – I have two questions. First, is there any discussion on the impact on low income communities? Second, maybe this is the wrong place, but I thought that we talked about size definition as more based on proximate to load?

Camilo Serna – We didn’t really spend too much time on the sizing. On the low income communities, we thought that was in another section.

Bill Stillinger – #4 areas for further discussion seems like a good place to add low income.

Larry Aller – I just wanted to say that I’ve maintained close contact with other solar community members and put some of their feedback in here as well.

Charlie Harak – Amy, back to your comment, how do we get a better handle on this and understanding the system impacts? I’d like to better understand the factors that contribute to impact. Maybe the utilities could help us understand this?

Bill Stillinger – The Interconnection rules looks at this and the safety and impact of interconnection.

Janet Besser – I second what Bill just said. My other comment is that the statement about fair compensation for small scale solar, this was part of the monthly minimum contribution section. It got moved from consensus to an area for potential compromise, but I think it should be somewhere in the recommendations.

**Differentiation by Market Sector**

Dan Burgess – Next, differentiation by market sector.

Amy Rabinowitz – Janet, Larry, David and I worked on this. We wrote this generally. We support diversity and understand that there are a variety of ways to achieve it.

Janet Besser – Our view during the discussion is that the details are addressed in other places, but that there is general agreement in supporting diversity.

Larry Aller – We were also waiting a bit to see what was going to come in from other sections.

**Large Scale Solar**

Dan Burgess – Moving forward, large scale solar.

Fred Zalcman – Camilo and I worked on this. [Reviews consensus recommendations, areas for further discussion]. Areas for further discussion again goes back a bit to the model in terms of what incentive structure is preferred. We tried to take a step back in our consensus and list attributes we’d like to see in whatever incentive program is developed.

Camilo Serna – These are similar themes to small solar (with some specifics relative to large solar). I don’t think that we can come to much consensus of which model is preferred but we’ll see what happens once we have the results.

Paul Brennan – Do you have a definition of large scale?

Camilo Serna – We didn’t discuss a cut off. That’s something for the Task Force to consider.

Eric Krathwohl – I have a question for Camilo. If it were to be competitive solicitation, how could you provide differentiated incentives for different types of installations (refers to 3d in consensus)?

Camilo Serna – We haven’t gotten to that level yet, but there are ways to set it up. For example, you could define tranches.

**Net Metering**

Dan Burgess – Moving on to net metering.

Janet Besser – You’ll notice that there is no consensus. We were working very hard on this. [Reviews first half of areas of potential compromise].

Amy Rabinowitz – I’m sensing a general consensus for a long-term vision of a value of solar and contribution by everybody toward the grid (the details to be worked out). So other members understand, this description was about the long-term, but we need to think about net metering now and in the interim to make sure we are sustainable and can get to the future that we envision.

Dan Burgess – I don’t want the lack of comments to indicate that this isn’t an important issue. It seems like we might have some areas that we could reach compromise on.

Janet Besser – I have a process question. It may be useful for us to have further discussion before we have you compile a document for comments.

Angie O’Connor – That would be great.

David Colton – Just a suggestion on some of the thornier issues given our short time. Perhaps we could add members to this group, and I would ask that the co-chairs take this on.

Amy Rabinowitz – That’s a good idea, but if we add one more, we have quorum.

Janet Besser – We can have 8 people, so we have room for one more.

Dan Burgess – Maybe we could provide staff. We can discuss more.

**Net Metering Caps**

Moving onto net metering caps.

Camilo Serna – Again, no consensus. [Reviews areas for further discussion, reviews 1 and 2].

Janet Besser – [Reviews 3, 4 areas for further discussion].

Charlie Harak – It seems that #4 is consensus. Is there a contrary view?

Camilo Serna – Those are two big “ifs” (getting the value of solar right and getting payments to the distribution system right). We haven’t really come to the incentive model to use, etc. So in that sense, we think caps provide some protection since we don’t have those “ifs” resolved.

Amy Rabinowitz – I agree with Camilo. I would add that if net metering is the rough justice version of compensation, it means that distribution customers pay more than the value of the services provided to the grid. Raising the cap would increase the cost of these cross subsidies. The devil is in the details.

Charlie Harak – I agree that if we don’t get it right, then we need caps, but if we do get it right, then I would think we don’t need caps.

Amy Rabinowitz – But if distribution customers are paying not only for the benefits to the distribution system, emission reductions, benefits to transmission, etc., then there is a lot of cross subsidization going on.

Janet Besser – They are two big “ifs” but it strikes the solar community that there is a recognition that if you get the price right than the decision is: is there some other vehicle for the incentive to support further development? I understand the distribution companies’ concerns, but what language would you need in here to move this to a consensus?

Charlie Harak – Once you get the price right, you can remove the caps. It would be a miracle if the full retail price happens to be right, because we didn’t get there analytically.

Larry – I have one thought. Focusing on the value of solar, there are several components to the value of solar (how should they be paid to customer generators? Is net metering the right process?) There are then transactional costs there. We should continue to have this discussion.

Fred Zalcman – Maybe a variant on Larry’s comment is if the issue is that through net metering what the utility collects is not what they are paying, then let’s solve that issue and not necessarily throw out net metering. Net metering is useful for engaging customers as a simple and understandable tariff. If the issue is commodity related, let’s solve that.

Amy Rabinowitz – It seems like it might be definitional. Perhaps we have the same vision and we are calling it different things. To Larry’s comment, I recognize that decreasing transaction costs for others may increase our administrative costs. But I want to make sure that we don’t lose sight of the fact that doing things through the utility is still seen by customers as a charge on their bill. So it does matter what does and doesn’t get included on the bill.

Dan Burgess – We definitely need to continue discussion on this.

**Geographic Distribution**

Moving onto geographic distribution.

Bill Stillinger – [Reviews consensus recommendations]. We contemplated but did not include ideas like providing site maps to developers for best areas to develop but we understand that may expose the utility in terms of confidential and/or critical information.

Amy Rabinowitz– [Reviews area for potential compromise]. This has come up in other areas – who benefits should pay.

Janet Besser – Two things. First, the area for compromise could be addressed in a value of solar study. Second, in #3 consensus, we support the development of a capability for the distribution companies to provide information on where solar would benefit the system.

Camilo Serna – We discussed that at our grid modernization stakeholder session. For us to provide this information we need more tools in place to get the right visibility that we don’t have now, but the goal makes sense.

Paul Brennan – On consensus 3, had you discussed how this should be explored and/or where?

Janet Besser – It related to the distribution systems having the capability to do this. This language was in a previous draft. I don’t know why it’s not here.

Paul Brennan – OK, but could we provide more guidance to the legislature on how to address this?

Amy Rabinowitz – Camilo and I will think about this. Grid modernization and cyber security are important for this.

**Transition Timing and Targets**

Dan Burgess– moving onto transition timing and targets.

Larry Aller – [Reviews consensus recommendations, areas of potential compromise and areas for further discussion]. For #1 on areas for further discussion, we didn’t spend a lot of time trying to pick a number. We focused our discussion more on getting the process right.

Camilo Serna – I would add that the area for compromise just seems like we were making assumptions on the legislative process, so that’s why it’s not a consensus. The solar goal statement should probably move to general principles.

Janet Besser – Somewhere we should make a clear statement about grandfathering projects that came in under the existing regime. Maybe it belongs here or in the general principles (and I’m making the dangerous assumption that we all agree).

Amy Rabinowitz – I’m not agreeing on grandfathering. We did do a study on whether cross subsidies are happening or not. That happens in rate design.

Dan Burgess – We’ll talk about that at the end.

Camilo Serna – The issue with caps is also to ensure that investments are being made at the right level. It’s not just about the cross subsidization. At some point, a lot of this falls to ratepayers, so having the checks and balances is important.

**Monthly Minimum Contribution**

Dan Burgess – I’d like to keep this moving. Monthly minimum contribution.

Janet Besser – There was a lot of consensus. [Reviews consensus recommendations]. We parted company though. The solar community agrees that an important corollary to this is that solar should be fairly compensated for the value that it provides. Also, back to a point that we’ve discussed is if we get this right, we don’t need caps. This was originally consensus, but then we moved away. [Reviews areas for compromise #1 and #2]

Amy Rabinowitz – On #2 for compromise, I recognize that the solar community very much wants to remove caps, and National Grid feels equally as strongly about keeping the caps. [Reviews compromises #3 and #4].

Camilo Serna - #3 for compromise provides further detail on other rate designs alluded to in consensus.

Janet Besser – This language was very problematic as it focused on distributed generation customers. If the gist is that other rate designs could be proposed that’s one thing, but it should not focus on distributed generation customers.

David Colton – I echo Janet’s thought. Some of us agreed to the minimum contribution despite some sincere heartfelt objections to minimum bills from a policy perspective. But we only agree to this if the caps issue is resolved, so it’s a consensus with an asterix.

Liam Holland – I’d be interested in another recommendation on the consideration of the impact of a minimum bill on different sectors of the solar market (ground mounted, etc.) If you don’t reform virtual net metering, a minimum bill will affect onsite net metering customers more than virtual net metering customers because they can allocate credits to more customers.

Janet Besser – I would think that we could elaborate on this in #6. I don’t recall us talking about this.

Amy Rabinowitz– It sounds like you are focusing more on the value and incentive side. When I think of a minimum bill, it’s a way to recover distribution costs in a fair way. But if you wanted to ensure a certain type of solar installation, that’s something to do through an incentive. But I’m happy to think about this a bit more.

Charlie Harak – On #3 consensus, that really depends on the actual level of the minimum bill. It could have very adverse impacts if the level is high. On #8, we only know about a fraction of low income customers (only those on the discounted rate). And lastly, on #7, something that isn’t there is energy efficiency. I don’t want to undermine that with the minimum bill.

Larry Aller – I agree with Charlie.

**Permitting and Inspection**

Dan Burgess – Moving onto permitting and inspection.

Larry Aller – Very quickly, we gathered information on efforts on this in other states. Our consensus recommendation is that this should be further explored.

Angie O’Connor – The Governor has been clear in his interest in removing bureaucratic barriers to this type of thing, but in practice I’m not sure this could become a state level process. We might have to look at a way to smooth this at the municipality level, perhaps a template.

Dan Burgess – DOER has been working on this a lot as well.

David Colton – I think that some standardization is a great idea.

**Municipal Light Districts**

Dan Burgess – Last one - municipal light districts.

Eric Krathwohl – [Reviews consensus]. There is a typo – improved should be “imposed”. We discussed at length other issues. [Reviews areas for further discussion].

Amy Rabinowitz – I would like to explore this further. I would request that we think about the issue of cross subsidization, maybe there is something to do.

Dan Burgess – We will take the task of compiling document to distribute by April 22. That should not preclude you from continuing to work on this. Please work on your positions for your dissenting opinion. On April 27th we are going to be taking votes on these. We will be meeting at DOER on April 27th.

Amy Rabinowitz – When will we get all of the chapters from the consultants?

Mike Judge (from DOER) – Soon.

Dan Burgess – I just wanted to touch on the cost request. DOER has issued some clarifying questions.

Angie O’Connor – Given the lack of time, we discussed allowing others to post questions publicly for the utilities to answer since we don’t have time to add this in during the meeting.

Fred Zalcman – What do you intend to do with this information?

Dan Burgess – My thought is this would be included in the appendix.

Bill Stillinger – Can you elaborate on the votes?

Dan Burgess – We’re still working on this based on our discussion today. We will get back to you on this.

Camilo Serna – Will we have the consultant report on April 27th?

Dan Burgess – Yes, the first part of the morning is a presentation on the results.

Angie O’Connor – We brought copies of the utility responses for anyone who wants one.

Dan Burgess – Public - please feel free to provide written comments.

12:55pm meeting adjourned.