

CLEAN ENERGY TRANSMISSION WORKING GROUP (CETWG)

MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, December 6, 2023

Virtual Zoom Meeting

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

1. Welcome, Agenda, Roll Call

Holloway called the meeting to order at 09:02 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 November 17, 2023 CETWG meeting. Howgate motioned and Ahern seconded the motion to approve the draft Meeting Minutes. By roll call vote the members present voted to approve the Meeting Minutes.

3. Public comment

Holloway invited Lilli-Ann Green of the Wellfleet Assembly of Delegates to address the working group. Green noted that she spoke in her capacity as a delegate, but not on behalf of the assembly itself. Green expressed her disappointment that the CETWG report will not be available for public comment for at least one month as she believed her organization, Roy, and Barrett previously requested. She said the report is very important and should provide ample opportunity for comment, while recognizing that there is a legislative deadline for the group to file the report. Green stated that Barnstable County has some of the highest electricity prices in the nation. Her initial reaction to the first draft of the report was that it will be hugely important to have safeguards to ensure that transmission development does not impact individuals, businesses and municipalities in an undue way. Green said that such safeguards against adverse impacts should extend to transmission developed along existing corridors like railways or roads. Marshall invited other members of the public to comment. No additional members of the public elected to comment.

4. Review draft report

Van Nostrand introduced the draft CETWG report for the working group’s review and expressed his appreciation to all who had contributed to the draft. He provided an overview of the report, summarizing each chapter and key takeaways. Van Nostrand noted that conclusions relating to the eighth chapter of the report, which covers siting and permitting, will be handed over to the Commission on Energy Infrastructure Siting and Permitting for its consideration. Van Nostrand stated that chapter nine contains the draft report’s recommendations, and that the bulk of the meeting would focus on this chapter.

Discussion

Burnham asked if the slides summarizing the report would be posted to the CETWG webpage. Van Nostrand said yes. Delaney praised the draft report, but said there may be a gap in that the draft report does not address intraregional transmission development, including that driven by onshore renewable development. Van Nostrand asked Delaney whether this could also be worked into the discussion of ISO-NE’s 2050 study. Delaney said yes. Marshall said that her edits will be captured. Burnham echoed Delaney’s perspective. Slocum encouraged Delaney to send staff any edits that she would like incorporated into the next draft of the report. Gagnon said that she noticed a gap in the discussion of consumer costs, particularly relating to asset condition projects, and that she had also indicated this in her written edits. Slocum said that staff received Gagnon’s comments and they will be reflected in the second draft of the report. LaRusso said that he had the opportunity to remotely attend the ISO-NE End User Sector/ISO Staff Meeting in Westborough on November 30th, attending remotely. He suggested that the report could include a recommendation relating to the timing of an ISO-NE RFP period, as well as a statement that any asset condition project that improves equipment in existing right of ways should include GETs, in order to maximize capability in those rights of ways. Marshall said that his understanding was that LaRusso was referring to ISO-NE’s near-term needs carveout, which does not necessarily relate to clean energy but rather to reliability projects and noted that the states are currently working with ISO-NE on new procedures specifically targeting clean energy procurements. Delaney said that it may be worth enhancing the report by highlighting the shortcomings of the region’s current processes.

Holloway shared the redline of the draft report via Zoom for the meeting attendees to see. Marshall said that the group would walk through the redlines of chapter 9. Burnham asked whether edited drafts would be posted. Marshall said yes, and that a second draft incorporating edits and discussion would be circulated by the following Monday. Slocum indicated that the presentation on November 17, 2023, meeting included summaries of the draft sections, and that numerous people provided feedback and edits to those summaries. He said staff then incorporated the feedback and edits into the draft sections and issued the draft report that noted which members provided which edits and comments. Slocum further clarified that staff plans to incorporate additional edits and feedback in the second draft of the report. Marshall led the group in reviewing redlined edits and comments to the report.

Discussion

Ide asked whether the recommendations directed towards actions taken through NESCOE might limit actions that Massachusetts could take unilaterally. Marshall and Gagnon said they would consider adjusting the relevant language.

Ahern said that the working group should be aware of jurisdictional limitations in crafting recommendations, including limitations on the ability of the Massachusetts legislature to direct transmission to act in the area of interstate transmission.

Gagnon said that she would like to flesh out recommendations about managing supply chain risks of long-lead time bulk power system infrastructure but frame those recommendations in terms of exploring potential solutions. Burnham and Delaney echoed this.

Regarding GETs, Burnham suggested the report focus more on principles and higher-level recommendations because there are still open questions about the applications of GETs. Pearson said since FERC is studying GETs in an ongoing NOPR, the report could keep recommendations at a high level and potentially include reference to any forthcoming FERC action in this area. Marshall said that the report may be able to combine recommendations about GETs and transmission planning that might overlap.

Marshall raised the potential need to avoid recommendations on certain interconnection issues that might be under consideration by the DPU in open dockets.

Ahern asked whether ISO-NE would have the opportunity to review any recommendations directed at the organization. Marshall said that ISO-NE listens in to most of the meetings and has the opportunity to provide comments, but we'd consider outreach. Howgate said that, overall, the report could be a vehicle that provides a formal reason to make requests.

Regarding workforce development, Marshall said he does not have direct visibility in this area, but is aware of ongoing efforts, so the recommendations on workforce development should reflect this reality. He also asked whether the scope of the workforce development recommendations should be broadened to include both the private and public sector. Delaney said that the recommendations should cover both private and public workforce development.

Marshall asked whether there were any substantive edits to the first eight chapters that might benefit from a discussion. Slocum indicated that staff had incorporated into the draft all substantive edits to those chapters submitted by working group members. He drew the group's attention to page 15 of the draft, which included the Gagon's suggestions regarding asset condition projects.

5. Discussion of CETWG report drafting process

Marshall said that the group has two more meetings. Per the schedule that the group released earlier, he said staff would endeavor to incorporate the meeting's discussion into edits to a second draft that would be released on December 11. Marshall asked whether there were any questions about the drafting process. Ashley asked whether members would have the opportunity to redline the draft. Marshall said yes, members would have the opportunity to review and make additional edits. Gagnon and Roy thanked the group for their work on the draft report.

6. Close and Next Steps

Holloway noted that the redline version of the report discussed during the meeting would be posted to the website. Van Nostrand thanked the team for its work on the draft and adjourned the meeting at 11:00 AM.

Meeting Materials:

- Agenda
- Draft Meeting Minutes for the November 17, 2023 Meeting Minutes
- CETWG First Draft Report
- CETWG First Draft Report with markup
- First Draft Report Overview