

CLEAN ENERGY TRANSMISSION WORKING GROUP (CETWG)

MEETING MINUTES

Friday, December 15, 2023

Virtual Zoom Meeting

Members Present:	Jason Marshall, Jamie Van Nostrand, Jeffrey N. Roy, Johannes Pfeifenberger, Doug Howgate, Hilary Pearson, Liz Delaney, Sheila Keane, Barry Ahern, Dave Burnham, Ashley Gagnon, Joseph LaRusso, Michael J. Barrett
Members Absent:	Ron DeCurzio, Brooke Thomson
Member Designees:	Matthew Ide for Ron DeCurzio, Magdalena Garncarz for Brooke Thomson
DOER Staff Present:	Paul Holloway, Sarah McDaniel
EEA Staff Present:	Mary Nuara
DPU Staff Present:	Shirley Barosy, Gregg Wade, John Slocum
Public Speakers:	Lilli-Ann Greene

1. Welcome, Agenda, Roll Call

Holloway called the meeting to order at 09:10 AM. He reviewed the meeting agenda and stated that the CETWG welcomes written comments at any time. Holloway conducted roll call and confirmed a meeting quorum.

2. Review and vote on Meeting Minutes

Holloway introduced the draft Meeting Minutes for the December 6, 2023, CETWG meeting. Joseph LaRusso offered an edit to the discussion portion of the meeting minutes. Delaney motioned to approve the edited Meeting Minutes. Burnham seconded the motion. By roll call vote the members present voted unanimously to approve the edited Meeting Minutes.

3. Public comment

Holloway invited Lilli-Ann Greene of the Wellfleet Assembly of Delegates to address the working group. Greene noted that she spoke in her capacity as a delegate, but not on behalf of the assembly itself. She noted her continued opposition to any recommendations that would erode local control and regional oversight over siting of transmission infrastructure. She said she was particularly concerned about CETWG members' recommended changes to the document concerning the development of land-based renewables. She stated that land-based renewables like wind resources are not appropriate for Massachusetts and could present potential health problems to nearby residents. She further stated that industry representatives should not set policies or make official recommendations to the legislature. Marshall invited other members of the public to address the working group. No other members of the public elected to comment.

4. Review second draft report and discussion of final review and voting process

Marshall indicated that the group should discuss the best way to finalize the draft report and utilize the meeting to resolve as many issues as possible before voting on the report at the next meeting. Marshall requested that if working group members submitted any additional redlines, they be highlighted in yellow and sent to staff by the end of day Friday. Staff could then prepare a final redline and highlight in yellow any issues not been agreed upon during the meeting. Van Nostrand thanked the working group members and staff for their help drafting the report. Marshall also highlighted the need to discuss the process for addressing disagreement among working group members about the recommendations of the report as a whole or specific sections. Marshall brought up proposed approaches for handling this, including inserting language in the introduction, or adding footnotes in specific sections, potentially identifying members that did not support a given recommendation. Marshall said neither he nor Van Nostrand had a preference for either approach, but sought the group's feedback. Barrett said that the report should clarify that consensus means absolute consensus (as opposed to a mere majority), but that either option would work for him. Marshall said that they could change the language from consensus to "full support." Marshall also said that he anticipated the need for additional non-substantive edits after the CETWG voted on the report. He flagged for the group proposed language for a motion that could enable staff to do such clean-up work.

Holloway then displayed the draft report on the zoom feed. Marshall indicated that he would walk through the draft page by page and asked members to interject where they had any edits or points of discussion. Marshall also clarified that the objective of the page turn was to discover any remaining issues relating to the report's wording or recommendations.

Discussion

Working group members flagged additional edits and areas where they intended to provide additional feedback after the meeting. Barrett said that legislators would utilize the report to reference specific sections of interest, so each chapter should be self-contained with respect to acronyms. He referenced the Grid Enhancing Technologies ("GETs") section, and asked whether additional technologies should be added. Barrett explained that portions of report appeared similar to marketing materials circulated by an industry trade group, and that the CETWG should discuss whether this was appropriate and, if so, how the report should address this. LaRusso said that he appreciated Barrett's concern, agreeing that nothing in report should highlight proprietary technology. He said he helped to write the section on GETs, that he worked for a non-profit organization, and that the section captured the three most mature types of GETs according to the industry consensus. He was aware of the industry group that Barrett referenced, but noted that not all of the companies in that group share ownership interests. LaRusso invited other working group members to make their own assessment about whether the descriptions of the GETs technologies were generic descriptions and not proprietary, and said he welcomed edits that would add descriptions of other technologies. Barrett clarified that he had no problem with the report including GETs, but the report should also discuss advanced reconditioning and superconducting technologies. Barrett further stated that the report must be above reproach and not favor certain technologies or companies because it will function as a reference document for legislators. Pfeifenberger stated that the report's description of GETs is consistent with general industry understanding. He said that FERC has considered the issue of which

technologies should be included in transmission planning, and recognized that while there are other novel technologies, FERC should not mandate their consideration at this time. He indicated that the report as written focuses on those technologies with enough commercial development to merit more robust discussion, but the report could note other technologies that might be beneficial once they become commercially available. Pfeifenberger also clarified that, in his understanding, reconductoring normally comes up in context of right sizing. Barrett stated that he wasn't convinced that GETs should get their own chapter at the exclusion of reconductoring or super conducting. Pfeifenberger suggested adding a section on potential new technologies. Van Nostrand asked whether there was a term for technology that includes both GETs and reconductoring and other new technologies. Barrett said that "advanced transmission technologies" was suggested to him as a broader term. Marshall suggested the term "optimizing transmission." Ide said that he had seen an ISO-NE presentation on GETs that narrowed the definition based on technologies that were most applicable to New England. Van Nostrand reiterated that the section title and substance could be revised to reflect broader range of technologies.

Gagnon suggested adding language to the executive summary to address future approaches for right sizing transmission equipment, and that she would also propose additional language about considering consumer costs in future clean energy procurements. Working group members also discussed edits about greater transparency and accountability relating to asset condition projects.

Returning to the GETs section, Burnham suggested that the section recognize that there are a wide variety of costs and benefits associated with various technologies and that the section could be less conclusory regarding potential benefits. LaRusso agreed that the section should include an introductory paragraph that addressed a broader array of technologies.

5. Close and Next Steps

Marshall suggested extending the next meeting on December 21 beyond the initially scheduled one hour. Multiple members indicated that they would likely have a conflict if the December 21 meeting were to be extended past 9:30, owing to a NEPOOL meeting. Marshall then suggested the December 21 meeting could begin earlier, at 8:00 AM. Gagnon asked whether redline edits to the draft report could be submitted on Saturday. Holloway indicated that she could send edits by noon on Saturday and noted that staff would circulate an updated version of the report on Monday. Several members had to leave the instant meeting at 11:00 AM, owing to another conflicting meeting. Marshall said that the meeting would have to adjourn since the group would no longer have a quorum. Marshall adjourned the meeting at 11:03 AM.

Meeting Materials:

- Agenda
- Notice of Public Meeting
- Draft December 6, 2023 Meeting Minutes
- CETWG Second Draft Report
- ISO-New England Feedback on the CETWG First Draft Report
- Public Comment

Draft Meeting Minutes – for approval by CETWG

- RENEW Northeast, Inc.
- Berkshire Regional Planning Commission