

**DRAFT**

**Massachusetts Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Coordinating Council**

Thursday, December 11, 2025 | 10:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.

100 Cambridge Street, Conference Room A and Via Zoom

**EVICC Members Present In-Person:**

- Assistant Secretary Joshua Ryor, Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA), EVICC Chairperson
- Commissioner David Rodrigues, Division of Standards
- Nicole Lepre, Department of Energy Resources
- Hank Webster, Department of Environmental Protection
- Chris Aiello, Department of Transportation
- Rachel Ackerman, Massachusetts Clean Energy Center

**EVICC Members Attending Virtually:**

- Commissioner Staci Rubin, Department of Public Utilities (DPU)
- Deputy Undersecretary Helena Fruscio Altman, Executive Office of Economic Development (EOED)
- Assistant Secretary Mark Fine, Operational Services Division, Executive Office for Administration and Finance (ANF)
- Katherine Eshel, Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)
- Eric Bourassa, Metropolitan Area Planning Commission (MAPC)
- Timothy McAlister, Counsel (participating on behalf of Senator Barrett)
- Andrea Bolduc, Research Analyst, Joint Committee on Telecommunications, Utilities and Energy
- Sarah Kalish, Executive Office of Economic Development (participating on behalf of Helena Altman)
- Alison Felix, Metropolitan Area Planning Commission (participating on behalf of Eric Bourassa)
- Scott Seigal, Department of Public Utilities (participating on behalf of Staci Rubin)

**EVICC members absent:**

- Assistant Secretary Mark Fine, representing ANF, left the meeting at 11:41 and did not assign a designee.

**Additional attendees and presenters:**

- Mark Scribner, EEA
- Adele Andrews, EEA
- Gavin Tullis, EEA
- Alyssa Randall, Planning Communities (virtual)
- Chris Porter, Cambridge Systematics
- Zach Jenkins, Department of Energy Resources
- Vyshnavi Kosigi, Department of Energy Resources
- Sharon Weber, Department of Environmental Protection
- Alison Felix, Metropolitan Area Planning Council
- Rhys Webb, Massachusetts Clean Energy Center
- Kari Hewitt, Planning Communities

- Nicole Voudren, Better Together Brain Trust

## **Agenda and Minutes**

### **1) Call to Order**

Assistant Secretary Ryor called the meeting to order at 10:02am and took roll call of EVICC members present.

### **2) Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Rachel Ackerman moved to approve the November meeting minutes, Chris Aiello seconded. All present members voted in favor with the exception of Fine, Rodrigues, and Bolduc who abstained. The motion was carried.

Deputy Undersecretary Helena Fruscio Altman, Executive Office of Economic Development, approve

Assistant Secretary Mark Fine, Operational Services Division, abstain

Commissioner David Rodrigues, Division of Standards, abstain

Commissioner Staci Rubin, Department of Public Utilities, approve

Nicole Lepre, Department of Energy Resources, approve

Hank Webster, Department of Environmental Protection, approve

Chris Aiello, Department of Transportation, approve

Katherine Eshel, Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority, approve

Eric Bourassa, Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, approve

Rachel Ackerman, Massachusetts Clean Energy Center, approve

Timothy McAlister, Office of Senator Barrett, approve

Andrea Bolduc, Research Analyst for the Joint Committee on Telecommunications, Utilities and Energy, abstain

### **3) Administrative Updates**

#### **a. MassEVIP Application Form Procedure**

Sharon Weber provided updates on changes to the MassEVIP application process. She explained that the program is transitioning to a Grant Management System (GMS). During the interim period, a revised application form is being used. The updated form is substantively the same as the previous version, with similar questions and requirements.

Sharon noted that a full transition to the GMS platform is anticipated next year. She also stated that applications for municipal EV programs have already moved to the GMS system.

Josh Ryor asked where applicants can find support resources on the website if assistance is needed. Staff indicated applicants should email, [massevip.massdep@mass.gov](mailto:massevip.massdep@mass.gov), with any questions, concerns, or issues about the new application process.

#### **b. Change in Meeting Schedule for January**

Members were informed of a scheduling conflict with the regularly scheduled EVICC Public meeting on the first Wednesday of January. As a result, the January meeting will be rescheduled to Monday, January 12, 2026, at 1:00 p.m.

The January 12, 2026 meeting will be held virtually. Members were advised that any existing calendar invitations reflecting a meeting on the first Wednesday in January are incorrect and should be disregarded.

Staff noted that updated calendar invitations and a separate email notice would be sent to ensure awareness of the schedule change. A tentative hybrid meeting is planned for June 2026.

#### **4) Public Comment**

Steve Letendre, representing the Vehicle Grid Interaction Council (VGIC), stated that the organization is available as a resource to Council members.

A member of the public identifying as an all-electric household commented on their family's exclusive use of electric vehicles and asked how many members of the Council personally drive EVs.

In response, Josh Ryor noted that he drives an electric vehicle and has had discussions with many EVICC members about their experiences driving their own EVs. Ryor also noted that the perspectives and lived experience that EVICC members bring as EV drivers are regularly brought into the Council's work, informing policy development and efforts to improve the consumer charging experience including the EVICC Assessment released in August 2025.

#### **5) Presentations**

##### **a. EVICC Technical Consultant Overview for 2027 EVICC Technical Analysis**

Chair Ryor presented an overview of the proposed approach for procuring a Technical Consultant in advance of the EVICC 3rd Assessment, due August 11, 2027. He emphasized the importance of conducting this work early to ensure the scope and request for quotes (RFQ) are well aligned with the needs of the next assessment.

Members discussed potential analytical areas to include in the scope of work. Key themes raised included the need for a long-term roadmap for charging infrastructure, including projections for charger quantity, location, power requirements, and port types over 5-, 10-, and 15-year horizons, particularly for service plazas and primary transportation corridors. Members noted challenges in modeling EV adoption rates and accounting for technological change while avoiding overbuilding infrastructure that may not be utilized.

Several members emphasized the value of phased planning approaches tied to utilization thresholds, with defined metrics and periodic reassessment intervals. Discussion also highlighted the importance of right-sizing infrastructure, including consideration of Level 1 charging opportunities in appropriate contexts to diversify charging mixes, reduce grid stress, and manage costs.

Members discussed incorporating analyses related to capacity utilization, pricing structures, ancillary fees, and their impact on utilization, access, and consumer protection. The relationship between pricing practices and charger usage was identified as an area warranting further study.

Additional discussion addressed scenario-based planning to better align charging levels with dwell time and use cases, including commuter parking, job access routes, and non-traditional work hours. Members noted the importance of considering broader system impacts, coordination with utilities, and interactions with other electrification and decarbonization efforts.

Vehicle-to-grid (V2G) and managed charging were discussed as emerging opportunities, along with the need to document potential barriers, interconnection standards, regulatory considerations, and market readiness. Members cautioned against creating unnecessary permitting or administrative hurdles for participation.

The Council discussed the potential value of developing practical guidance and planning resources for municipalities, including best practices for siting, ratios based on community characteristics, permitting considerations, and coordination with developers and utilities. Members noted that such resources could complement the assessment and improve implementation.

Equity considerations were raised throughout the discussion, including challenges related to Environmental Justice (EJ) communities, multi-family housing, curbside charging, residential electrification barriers, and the need to align analysis with existing equity-focused guidance.

Members also discussed how the assessment could be structured to maximize impact, including producing actionable outputs beyond a written report, such as guides, tools, phased roadmaps, and targeted outreach to relevant stakeholder groups. Early engagement, clear ownership of recommendations, and mechanisms for prioritization were identified as important to successful implementation.

Chair Ryor invited feedback on gaps in the proposed approach and on ways to ensure the assessment results are actionable and aligned with state goals. He noted interest in early procurement of a consultant to allow sufficient time for engagement and refinement of recommendations.

#### **b. Section 103 Charging Hub Framework**

Chelsea Petrenko of Energy + Environmental Economics (E3), a consultant to EVICC, presented a slide deck outlining the proposed Section 103 Charging Hub Framework. Members were advised that written feedback should be submitted to Adele Andrews of EEA following the meeting.

Staff noted that the analysis covers the entire state and includes a ranked selection process. If an area (defined as a census tract) is determined to be infeasible during subsequent evaluation, the next area in the ranking may be considered. It was noted that the Section 103 process occurs following each EVICC assessment, and that the framework is intended to be reusable in

future assessment cycles. Upon completion, the tool will be maintained by EEA.

Members discussed challenges associated with defining medium and heavy-duty (MHDV) charging hubs, noting the limited number of existing examples, particularly for publicly accessible, “in front of the fence” sites. The proposed criteria were reviewed, and the Chair invited discussion on priorities, weighting, and potential gaps.

Discussion included whether proximity to existing charging infrastructure should be treated as a disqualifying factor. Some participants noted that co-location or clustering near existing direct current fast charging (DCFC) can reduce congestion, provide redundancy, and improve trip planning, particularly for corridor travel. Members discussed adjusting ranking or weighting to reflect this nuance where appropriate.

Members discussed the importance of incorporating electric distribution company (EDC) hosting capacity data, including feeder and circuit availability, as well as differentiating short-term and longer-term site readiness. Managed charging potential and load management capabilities were identified as important considerations, particularly for MHDV hubs and grid impact mitigation.

Additional discussion addressed corridor-focused planning, including long-distance travel needs, pull-through charging configurations, and ensuring a minimal statewide backbone along major routes such as I-90 and Route 2. Members noted that such sites may initially serve more light- and medium-duty vehicles than long-distance freight.

Input was provided by non-EVICC attendees representing adjacent organizations, including perspectives on fleet charging hubs, corridor planning, regional consistency, and examples from other states. Participants noted that criteria such as proximity to population or employment centers may not be predictive of suitability for MHDV charging hubs, and that emerging multi-fleet hub models in other regions may be informative.

Funding constraints were identified as a recurring barrier, along with questions regarding baseline and target numbers of sites needed to provide confidence in network availability. Members discussed opportunities for shared-use hubs serving fleets, microtransit, and other mobility services, particularly where capital and operational constraints exist.

Members discussed how amenities, visibility, safety, and nearby services can drive utilization and improve the charging experience, especially for DCFC. Charging hubs were also noted as potential economic development opportunities that can support nearby businesses.

Land use, zoning, and development feasibility were discussed, with members noting that zoning compatibility is generally a binary requirement and may be less useful as a differentiating criterion. Public-private partnership potential and opportunities for future expansion were identified as important but challenging to quantify due to data limitations.

Equity, community, and environmental impacts were discussed throughout the conversation, including the ability to serve EJ communities, improve air quality, and address gaps in rural areas. Members noted that rural and EJ considerations are not mutually exclusive and that lower utilization and higher costs in certain regions may warrant public investment where private investment is less likely.

Members discussed the need to balance utilization-based metrics with broader public benefits, including resiliency, access, and statewide coverage, and the role of public policy in supporting deployment where market forces alone may not deliver infrastructure.

The Chair summarized next steps, noting that E3 will revise the site selection framework based on feedback from this meeting. A follow-up survey soliciting additional input on the same questions will be distributed shortly after the meeting, with a requested turnaround of approximately one week.

Helena Altman from EOED left at 11:00 and assigned Sarah Kalish as her representative, Eric Bourassa from MAPC left at 11:04 and assigned Alison Felix as his representative, Mark Fine from ANF left at 11:41, and Staci Rubin also left at 11:41 and assigned Scott Siegal as her representative.

## **6) Public Comment**

Public comments were provided throughout the discussions on the substantive presentations. No additional public comments were provided at the final opportunity for comment at the end of the meeting.

## **7) Adjournment**

Rachel Ackerman moved to adjourn the meeting. David Rodrigues seconded. All members present voted in favor. The motion was carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 12:32 pm.

## **Documents and Exhibits Presented at the Meeting**

- [Meeting Slides \(including all presentations mentioned above\)](#)
- [November Meeting Minutes](#)