

Massachusetts Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Coordinating Council

Meeting 6: review of draft initial assessment

Thursday, August 3, 2023 | 1–3:30 p.m.
via Zoom

EVICC members

- **Undersecretary Michael Judge**, Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs, EVICC Chairperson
- **Undersecretary Monica Tibbets-Nutt**, Department of Transportation
- **Aurora Edington**, Department of Energy Resources
- **State Senator Mike Barrett**, Chair, Joint Committee on Telecommunications, Energy, and Utilities
- **Eric Bourassa**, Director, Transportation Division, Metropolitan Area Planning Council
- **Laura Gilmore**, Director of Strategic Transit Planning, Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority

EVICC member designees

- **Cobi Frongillo** for State Representative Jeff Roy, Chair, Joint Committee on Telecommunications, Energy, and Utilities
- **Audrey Horst** for Sen. Mike Barrett, Chair, Joint Committee on Telecommunications, Energy, and Utilities
- **Christine Kirby** for Brian Ferrarese, Department of Environmental Protection
- **Clinton Dick** for Secretary D’Emilia, Executive Office of Economic Development

Additional attendees and presenters

- **Daniel Gatti**, Director of Clean Transportation Policy, Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
- **Jennifer Haugh**, Vice President of Planning and Customer Engagement, GreenerU
- **Daniela Miranda**, Project Coordinator, GreenerU

Meeting goals

- Approve meeting minutes from July 27 meeting
- Review and discuss draft initial assessment
- Provide time for public discussion / comment

Agenda

1. Call to order

- a. Judge called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m.

2. Review and approve meeting minutes of July 27, 2023

- a. Proposed changes:
 - i. Remove “Housing and” from the Executive Office of Economic Development in D’Emilia’s title
 - ii. Section 3.e.ix.: change first three sentences to “The GMAC had an equity-focused discussion recently as well. We’ve talked about overlaying EJ maps with grid infrastructure maps. In this venue, has anyone seen any maps that

Massachusetts Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Coordinating Council

overlap EJ with EV infrastructure?”

- b. Rubin moved to adopt the revised minutes. Bourassa seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Discussion: draft initial assessment

- a. The bulk of today's meeting is hoped to cover the recommendations, with the suggestion of “rebucketing” them into three categories: (1) to the legislature, (2) to GMAC, and (3) next steps moving forward.
- b. Judge asked for suggestions on the most efficient way to go through the recommendations. Bourassa suggested going through the different buckets. Are there things we should be doing with this funding source to create incentives? And then there are some other government coordination issues to discuss later as well. This group can kind of create the space to have those conversations. Judge agreed. He thinks EEA can take a lead in proposing some things and getting some reactions, but would like to hear suggestions, too. This could be the topic for the next meeting. This also came up at the public hearing last night was a suggestion or acknowledgment that we may not have spent as much time talking about medium- and heavy-duty vehicles as we did on light-duty passenger vehicles, and doing a little bit more specific analysis on that topic going forward to and addressing the needs of those types of vehicles may be a little different. We still have Synapse and the rest of the team on board to continue doing this initial assessment.
- c. Gilmore appreciated the overview and wants to be clear on the next steps. For this assessment that we go through today, you are going to package that up, and we'll wrap it up and submit it on the 11th? Judge said that's the plan. Today we want to identify any major concerns or feedback. We are getting comments from the public. We'll have two versions: a Word redlined version with changes tracked, and a polished, near-final designed version.
- d. Kirby asked for clarification, for review, when will we see the next draft? Judge said Monday. We'll compile any changes by tomorrow, review over the weekend, and get that out as soon as possible on Monday so folks can see any further changes that have been made. Gatti said that making sure we have all the recommendations up front and having it be clear what we're recommending is going to be a focus in the next setting.
- e. Barrett wanted to raise an issue that would touch on the recommendations that would be included. Barrett would be concerned as a policy maker if he received a report that appeared that the private sector track took precedence – want to hear from all angles. Barrett suggested creating a forum that brought in a more diverse set of voices, not just Tesla but Ford, GM, etc. so that we can strategically understand marketing from the private sector and how to incorporate their priorities and models into policies and legislation. We have a good handle on the public sector side of things, but we don't want to miss out on the private sector.
- f. Gatti responded that he's interested in understanding how to allocate funding within the private sector. He doesn't think this report is an either-or consideration. It's

Massachusetts Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Coordinating Council

important to get OEM perspectives and dealership perspectives.

- g. Horst built off Barrett's comments suggesting adding the GM merger as the executive summary highlights the recent Tesla announcement of opening their charging stations to the public.
- h. Barrett stated that this isn't a public or private sector issue, reminding the council that this is an intergovernmental effort. The charge is correct and that the focus is not on the government. While the funding is from the government, the private sector will have a large impact on moving this forward. Barrett concludes by stating that the final recommendations should include the private sector. Gatti reminded the group that T&D work is core to this work and that much of the programming he sees coming from this work will be both for the public and private sector.
- i. Tibbits-Nutt highlighted some of the work that MassDOT is currently doing including having conversations with Tesla, working on procurement to replace the retired chargers on the pike, and battery storage on MassDOT property. They are thinking about and discussing opportunities with the private sector to see how these decisions can be far reaching and how to collaborate on these efforts. Judge suggested that these specific actions would be great to include in the initial assessment. Tibbits-Nutt agreed that high-level language could be written – these are still all in procurement.
- j. Edington asked when to provide another round of edits and recommendations. Judge suggested end of the day tomorrow. Edington also suggested pulling out the individual recommendations within the executive summary since they are hidden within the content. Judge affirmed that these recommendations can be called out more clearly, put into figurative buckets, and then assigned to departments. Clarity and categorization should help a lot.
- k. Gatti added that when polishing up the recommendations section, they want to identify which recommendations need statutory change and agency change. Judge added that most of the pieces are in there and it's a matter of pulling them together. Horst added that anything that needs to be done by the DOS, timelines would be very helpful.
- l. Judge added that MassDEP has required reporting from medium- and heavy-duty fleets and this should be added to the assessment.
- m. Edington suggested that we consider the inclusion of data access around EV charging infrastructure - may dovetail DOS registry of chargers.
- n. Bourassa suggested that we invite municipal planners into these conversations to understand what their challenges are from a capacity perspective. Horst seconded guidance from municipalities.
- o. Judge highlighted having multiple utilities running their own incentive programs as an issue. Suggestion to clarify this with specific language.
- p. Judge raised the question of highway signage and asked MassDOT if they had anything to add to this conversation. Tibbits-Nutts responded saying that MassDOT

Massachusetts Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Coordinating Council

thinks that the signage regulation can be changed – they are actively looking into this and will provide updates as they occur. Judge suggested for the report just stating that the state is looking into this.

- q. Judge raised that the section about the NEVI program has a lot of detail and asked Tibbitts-Nutt to review to see if anything can be streamlined.
- r. Horst raised section 89 about the status of the chargers on the mass pike and asks that it be incorporated into the assessment.
- s. Judge will work with Synapse to clean up the graphs in the assessment as some of these are not clear.
- t. Kirby brought up the need to prioritize funding and brands.
- u. Judge encouraged people to send specific feedback to Haugh individually so that the council is not in violation of open meeting law. Judge suggests that some of GreenerU's illustrations need labeling to further understand why they are included.
- v. Bourassa shared a link from the chat: US Access Board <https://www.access-board.gov/tad/ev/>
- w. Barrett mentioned that there may be a significant difference in the revenue which may make sense to flag so that you can identify the least expensive path for ratepayers. Judge agreed, stating that there is a lot of new and rising technology which would expand possibilities with minimal/no infrastructure changes. These grid modernizing technologies can be added to the report. Judge also added that we can require utilities to investigate these technologies – utilities should be pursuing alternatives to new wires whenever possible; however, we should be careful not to box in any agency.
- x. Gatti stated that any new ideas or thoughts are appreciated as there are many things that he's learning about through these conversations. Judge asked for additional comments and feedback. Gatti suggested developing a section on the MBTA and their charging efforts.
- y. Bourassa asked whether the report includes anything related to the cost of the infrastructure. Judge responded that the report includes the equipment cost and does not include the cost to the public.
- z. Barrett brought up that the cost of these chargers needs to be transparent especially if the public is expected to pay for them through socialized cost. Judge responded that he thinks several of the costs will be passed on to the ratepayer to be absorbed. For example, upgrading the grid to absorb increased demand from EV chargers will likely be the utilities responsibility which then passes on the cost. Gatti mentioned that there is a risk of overbuilding where stations are underutilized and therefore under maintained which leads to a surplus of equipment. Barrett responded that overbuilding in certain areas is important to meet forecasted demand. However, he understands that we also don't want to overbuild. Ultimately, he suggested that we identify the needs of vulnerable communities and meet their potential demand.

Massachusetts Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Coordinating Council

aa. Frongillo again brought up costs vs. infrastructure build-out and keeping that in mind.

4. Public comment

- a. Anna Vanderspek of GECA thanked EVICC for sharing the draft with the public so they could follow along today. Two things: one, pertaining to the conversation about costs, many of you were aware that there are studies showing that EVs have paid more into the system than they have required in terms of upgrades. This will likely change. Going from 0–10% will look different than going from 50–60%, but it's an important distinction to consider. Second, the end of the document indicates that it's a bit confusing about networked chargers vs. public chargers and they are not mutually exclusive. Judge asked if Vanderspek could send the report citing the data on EV drivers investing into the system.
- b. Michael Maten, GM, said kudos—really good job in general, great discussion today. One thing: the citation and the data for charger costs is from a 2015 study; NREL last month just published new data around very detailed assessments of Level 1, 2, and DCFC based on the rate for charger costs. He sent that in an email; it has better updated cost figures for various charger types. One caveat is that it's hardware only and doesn't capture the full costs of utility upgrades.

5. Wrapup and adjourn

- a. Feedback is due tomorrow, August 4. The aim is to have a new redlined draft ready by Monday. We'll review the final draft at Wednesday's meeting next week.
- b. Rubin moved to adjourn; Edington seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 3:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniela Miranda
Project Coordinator
GreenerU