

## **Massachusetts Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Coordinating Council**

Wednesday, July 9, 2025 | 1:00 – 4:00 p.m.

Hybrid Via Zoom and in person at 100 Cambridge Street

### **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
- Commissioner Staci Rubin, Department of Public Utilities
- Aurora Edington, Department of Energy Resources
- Hank Webster, Department of Environmental Protection
- Senator Mike Barrett, Chairman of the Joint Committee on Telecommunications, Utilities and Energy
- Kat Eshel, Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority
- Chris Aiello, Department of Transportation

### **EVICC Members Present Online:**

- Alison Felix, Metropolitan Area Planning Council (participating on behalf of Eric Bourassa, in a non-voting capacity)
- Helena Fruscio-Altman, Executive Office Economic Development
- Andrea Bolduc, Research Analyst, Joint Committee on Telecommunications, Utilities and Energy
- Rachel Ackerman, Massachusetts Clean Energy Center

### **EVICC Members Absent:**

- Mark Fine, Executive Office of Administration and Finance

### **Additional attendees and presenters:**

- Katie Gronendyke, EEA
- Mark Scribner, EEA
- Adele Andrews, EEA
- Elisa Guerrero, Planning Communities
- Nicole Voudren, BT2 (online)
- Audrey Horst, Research Director, Office of State Senator Michael Barrett
- Yuna Choi, EEA (online)
- Scott Seigal, Department of Public Utilities (online)
- Al-Azad Iqbal, Department of Public Utilities (online)
- Vyshnavi Kosigi, Department of Energy Resources (online)
- Nicole Lepre, Department of Energy Resources (online)
- Krishana Abraham-Petrie, OEJE (online)
- Katie Weber, Department of Public Utilities (online)
- Scott Siegal, Department of Public Utilities (online)
- Devan DiLibero, MassCEC (online)
- Vyshnavi Kosigi, DOER (online)



## **Agenda and Minutes**

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

Assistant Secretary Ryor called the meeting to order at 1:03pm and took roll call of EVICC members present. Eight EVICC members attended the meeting in-person and four attended the meeting virtually.

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

Barrett motioned, Rubin seconded, to pass the June minutes with no edits. All present members voted in favor. The motion passed.

### **3) Administrative Updates**

#### **a. Second Assessment Public Comment Period**

Ryor encouraged attendees to provide comments on the Second Assessment by July 11, 2025, noting that the online survey on the draft Second Assessment would be unavailable after this date, and encouraged people to share feedback either during the meeting or online afterwards.

#### **b. DPU Pole Attachment Docket Docket DPU 25-10**

Rubin spoke about the deadline extension for additional comments and requested them electronically by Friday August 8, 2025.

### **4) Updates**

#### **a. MassCEC updates**

Devan DiLibero presented updates on On-Street Charging, Medium-Heavy Duty (MHD) Mobile Charging, and the Vehicle-to-Everything (V2X) Demonstration project. The On-Street Charging program is in the process of accepting applications, has already chosen 21 of 25 municipalities to receive feasibility studies, and 15 to receive implementation and installation for up to 3 sites completed by January 2026. The MHD Mobile Charging Solutions program has selected 4 applications for participation, with 2 fleets fully signed on. The V2X Demonstration project, which will deploy up to 100 charging systems across vehicle class and use cases with applications open through the end of the month.

Senator Barrett: Can you give a layperson's definition of mobile charging?

Devan DiLibero: It is varied. Spark chargers are an off-grid solution that bring charging to you, and some are on pallets or semi grid tied and require less infrastructure. The technology inventory report can better explain it, and identified around 18 solutions that fall into those categories.

Christopher Aiello: Can you give a description of the vehicles in the MHD Fleets?

Devan DiLibero: Cero has a truck with another vehicle on the way and 5C energy has large vans.

Josh Ryor: Please update the slides with the types of vehicles.

Aurora Edington: How many V2X applications were from school districts?

Rachel Ackerman: We can add the numbers into the slide. I believe there were 8 applications for the school bus cohort, because of ARPA (American Rescue Plan Act) money and the timeline that greatly constrained the cohort. We have non-participants who are interested in the lessons learned.

## **5) Presentations**

### **a. Draft EVICC Second Assessment**

#### *Introduction and Background*

Josh Ryor introduced the presentation, set ground rules for engagement, and reviewed the initial assessment and progress in the interim. He emphasized the increase of public chargers, Massachusetts' place as the leader in EV charging for comparable states, and MassCEC's Clean Energy Lives Here website as the one stop shop for all EV charging information. Work since the initial assessment has included allocating \$50M in ARPA funds to EV charging programs, the signing of the 2024 Climate Act, and the release of two public EV charging resources. The four main takeaways for moving forward from the assessment are that the Commonwealth should be more strategic, improve the efficiency of current programs, be proactive in planning for charging and grid upgrades, and significantly improve the EV charging experience.

Barrett: appreciates acknowledging the omission of the right to charge for renters, and looks forward to more necessary discussion. On public charging, how would you characterize hospitals and educational institutions charging for people using those institutions?

Ryor: We would consider it public if it is open 24/7 and there aren't barriers to public access. There may be implicit barriers, but good signage would help make it public.

Barrett: We are seeking a census-style count of chargers and if you miscategorize public chargers as private you are undercounting and may distort information for future planning.

Ryor: It's difficult to have a clear definition on public versus private chargers, and warrants more discussion.

Webster: Many chargers I consider public are on private property, so they could be restricted at some point even though it is unlikely.

Ryor: Any public incentive funds provided for public charging should come with access requirements.

Eshel: Paywalls are also a factor, especially depending on how long that parking is necessary for that kind of charger. It can be a point of contention or an opportunity to use public property in a new way. Commuter rail stations are another example of paid parking. Park and rides where standing happens might be appropriate. It needs careful consideration.

#### *Chapter 3 - Incentive Programs*

Josh Ryor summarized chapter 3, which outlines the types of incentive programs available. Key themes are that programs are difficult to navigate and there is desire for more Direct Current Fast Charging (DCFC) funding, more technical assistance, and a centralized location for resources. Main recommendations are more coordination and customer communication

between EVIP and utilities. Incentive stacking would not be part of the discussion, as that is being considered in front of the Department of Public Utilities at the moment.

Elisa Guerrero explained the Mentimeter tool for gathering feedback and how results are shared in real time.

Ryor: I would like to hear from folks in the room or online about what alignment for program eligibility entails.

Anna Vanderspek: Align the application process and the rest of the docket prioritizing where future funding will go. How will prioritization happen? Utility programs and the state should all agree about how to prioritize funding.

Ryor: We don't want people to have to apply twice and information should be transferred between programs.

Webster: This should be as streamlined and coordinated as possible for applicants and others. Efficiency is a key outcome and EVICC has discussed possible changes. We will likely move forward with some of those.

Ryor: There will always be slight differences but we're interested in hearing how to minimize friction points. We understand the desire for one application portal.

Webster: We have coverage for every kind of charging, which is a success as long as we don't complicate things unnecessarily.

Guerrero: There has been a lot of mention (in Mentimeter comments) of operating costs and demand charges, which EVICC has been discussing.

Ryor: It may make sense to put out a survey on a list of potential resources to be created, like demand charges, so people could help pick what would be the most impactful to focus on.

Scribner: We want to help people be proactive in engaging in rate design and other relevant discussions with the utilities and at DPU, like through utility rate cases, and to make the right choices when selecting which rate for an EV charger to take service under.

Josh: We need to make resources more publicized and accessible. For operations costs, as we look to regulate uptime requirements, what resources should we provide site hosts to minimize the added burden of these new requirements? To achieve more frequent and direct communication, what is the most impactful information from program administrators? The amount of funding in a program is something we've heard is important, but would it be okay just to know that we aren't going to run out of money? I don't want to speak too much on behalf of utilities, but a customer facing dashboard is being discussed as a possibility, though it will take significant time and money.

Edington: The theme is that it is hard to understand programs. What is EVICC's role in solving this? The table in the assessment is helpful for program administrators, but MassCEC is the only resource for any member of the public. Should we just delegate there or should EVICC help with this more directly? An example could be a one pager twice a year about existing programs.

Rodrigues: EOED's Business Front Door program could be a model on how to do this. It is a portal where you can go if you are starting up a business with grant and incentive programs, permitting and licensing guidance, and other answers.

Ryor: This is similar to what MassCEC is trying to create, but it is about creating a recognizable brand so everyone knows where to go regardless of who it is. What are the right digestible bits for EVICC versus MassCEC to take on?

Scribner: Branding focus should be accessible and we need to interlink it with what EVICC puts out, the Recharge Massachusetts marketing, and extend resources beyond individual entities.

Ackerman: We are already thinking about additions to the MassCEC website.

Jim Frey (2050 Partners): My work is supporting California but Massachusetts is my home state. The workflow sometimes involves scheduling time out between utility application, access to grant money, and permitting. Between building permits, approval, and money you can end up in a scheduling gray zone. To keep money flowing you need to debug timeout windows. If you want service date "x" but that project gets delayed and you are at the end of the queue there may be structural things to double check. Do we have money for concierge service for pinchpoints so you can rescue projects where they fall off the rails and dedicate human capital to help understand what went wrong, make it better on the fly, and learn how to fix the process?

Ryor: Program administrators should look at longest sticking points and talk about the right next steps to repair that. MassCEC does have a call center to walk people through the programs, but something may be needed once people get into the program.

#### *Chapter 4 - Current Charger Deployment*

Josh Ryor summarized chapter 4, which showed current charger deployment and projections based on future needs. There is no right number for projections given uncertainties, so state priorities for highest value charging are critical for when funding is available. Gaps include DCFC on secondary corridors, scaling on-street charging, and MHD charging near fleet uses. About 70% of public chargers have received state funding, which we will break out by charger type for the final report.

Eshel: Do we have this data over time? It would be nice to see changes.

Ryor: We might have the data, and can commit to tracking it going forward. I am unsure if we'll have time to include it in the final report

Aiello: Will we know the locations so we can see what places can support themselves financially?

Ryor: Great question. That data is likely available, but might not be disclosed publicly.

Mentimeter questions and discussions began.

Eshel: This shows that it is even more important to know what locations incentives have gone to. Popular locations are highest, but they may be able to fund themselves. Does MHD include transit?

Ryor: Where demand is the highest, we would hope the private market would take over.

Ilan Guthertz: I don't see an option that speaks to increasing the density along major travel routes. We have seen fast charging deployment there, but we want to ensure that travelers are not encountering lines and that we continue to get ahead of that. "Popular destinations" doesn't quite show that to me.

Ryor: The Center for Sustainable Energy provided a presentation 3-4 months ago on the pace of adoption versus need. We could think through gaps, map out the network of fast chargers, and have it at every car dealership. The pace of adoption in key areas is something we've started to think about but can add it to the list of future analysis.

Gutherz: This (DCFC charging in primary corridors) is higher to me than any of the priority cases listed.

Ryor: The next question is are there any gaps you feel were not identified, use case and site specific first.

Mentimeter comments from the audience are in support of workplace charging.

Eshel: There are workplace incentives so what is the gap?

Ryor: How do we make sure we are getting the most value out of workplace charger incentives? EVIp has been a requirement for at least 15 employees. Some have challenged this as an administrative burden, but we are also trying to ensure that incentives help deploy chargers that provide the most value to the most people.

Jim Frey (2050 Partners): Is there a tenants rights act to force landlords to put in a charger? Could we create an employee charging rights act?

Ryor: The climate act included the right to charge for homeowner's associations and condos, but it could be worth it to consider adding employees to that conversation too.

Aiello: Where we are prioritizing on street charging, if there's transit parking in a dense neighborhood we should make sure it's eligible for those incentives. In a dense part of Eastie, parking at an MBTA lot is filled during the day and could get a lot of utilization from the neighborhood in off hours for those without off street parking. Co-location is a great option.

Gutherz: Why was there not more emphasis on major traffic corridors? We already have a program dedicated to that, but nothing dedicated to secondary or destination charging. Connections to destination charging can help reduce range anxiety. It is not really captured but important if you know you can charge where you're going you're not as anxious. DCFCs are a huge strain on the grid. If you can reduce demand on fast charging with charging at a hotel or state park, you probably don't need to top-off on the way home.

Eshel: Clarity on what kinds of charging are concentrated where would be great. It helps to show when there are two programs focusing on the same people or places, to identify overlap.

Webster: End user experience considerations are a great focus. People will avoid DCFC if they have options where they are going. I would like to hear about why workplace charging is considered a gap because I help run that program. MassEVIP has a workplace and fleet charging program, and I am interested in how that can be used.

Ryor called for a break at 2:53, reconvened at 3:00pm

### *Chapter 5 - Grid Impacts*

Katie Gronendyke summarized chapter 5, which covers grid impacts and potential solutions. Solutions for grid related challenges include active and passive managed charging programs, advanced rate design, demand response, and long term V2X. The consultant team analyzed 4 different unmanaged to managed charging scenarios and identified the feeders and substations most likely to need upgrades.

Mentimeter questions and discussions began.

Ryor: (Responding to comment on minimizing grid impacts) Transportation electrification bringing in revenue to lower fixed rates is a good point, we can add in a narrative around that. How could we best go about pairing battery storage systems with DCFC or Level 2?

Dalton Ling (Inovis Energy): We've done one DCFC project with battery storage. In my experience, batteries don't always solve the problem where there's grid capacity constraints. Utilities see them as an additive load and not a buffer. Utility side upgrades aren't always required at that point and batteries are a really great way to offset demand.

Ryor: Utilities tend to take a conservative approach in modeling how storage systems will interact with the grid out of concern for reliability and safety.

Webster: Assuming that it would be within the business model, do you want to export energy from the battery on hand to serve charging customers or did the utility consider the battery part of a peak shaving program?

Ling: For this specific site, we had not planned on exporting, but the utility reconfigured for export after 6 months, despite site host objections. The real business model is for charging only, not export.

Kathleen Connors (Voltrek): Voltrek pilots with solar and storage did not move forward with utility incentives programs because of selling fewer electrons. Anything that EV chargers do to avoid demand pricing is hurting the utility business model. They did approve freewire, but the company is not in business anymore.

Ryor: Thinking about price signals, utilities can't incentivize everything, particularly if using ratepayer dollars that can have an impact on customer utility bills. Addressing those barriers that won't have a cost but unlock potential have huge effects.

### *Chapter 6 - Consumer Experience*

Mark Scribner summarized chapter 6, which discusses consumer charging experience. Influential factors on experience include reliability, data sharing, charger registration, consumer disclosure and payment, operational standards, other consumer protections, and accessibility of plug and charge.

Mentimeter questions and discussions began.

Aiello: In the short-term, with the long-term focus on plug and charge, should we focus on non-app payment models generally?

Scribner: Legacy payment options like credit card readers are important, so people can understand the easiest way to access the chargers.

Emily Kelly (Chargepoint): I am really supportive of working on permitting and model ordinances for municipalities. It is helpful if these recommendations stay in the rulemaking space, rather than getting behind specific solutions in a regulatory way since the industry changes so quickly. California is working on rulemaking payment standards.

Ryor: We will follow that CA process carefully. Roaming is an important piece, which means being able to use one app instead of many for different networks.

Aiello: For roaming, are there concerns about additional fees like phone roaming? I am curious about why accuracy of pricing info as posted is important.



Tina Carton (Chargepoint): Road signage may not be as important, since drivers tend to rely on their cars' internal navigation systems to find charging.

Emily Kelly: Roaming means being able to use one network's app to charge on a different network through business agreements. It is a good interim step to easier payment processes.

Ryor: It is a great interim step, but not practical in the long-term for each company to have a bilateral agreement with every other company.

Rodrigues: We need consumer education about the fees they're going to be charged. Dynamic pricing is something we're paying attention to, which changes prices during charging, and DOS is looking to consumer protections around disclosure.

### *Chapter 7 - Innovative Technology and Business Models*

Mark Scribner summarized chapter 7, which discusses EV Charging Tech and Business Models. Concerns include high costs, uncertain profitability, low utilization, consumer friction, and grid and tech pressure. EVICC needs to get priorities right as headwinds increase.

The final EVICC recommendations will be discussed at the 8/6 meeting.

Participants shared thoughts over mentimeter.

### **6) Public Comment**

Kathleen Connors (Voltrek): I am representing a coalition of contractors who have put together a memo. Contractor companies deploy chargers and employ lots of people. We appreciated the May listening session and subsequently convened independently to further detail our challenges. Contractor experiences vary by program. There is good progress from MassEVIP and National Grid, but Eversource has created lots of issues. We have provided recommendations for improving program performance and ask that the feedback be taken seriously and that there is continued work with EVICC to solve these problems.

Ryor: Thank you for the insight. This is important feedback. We want to do more feedback sessions like the one on May 30th. Utilities are going to be submitting new modifications for approval at DPU, likely by the end of the year, and some of these points might be good to bring up then. I appreciate the discreet recommendations. They might not be in the final assessment, but EVICC can bring them up with utilities specifically. You mentioned changing contracts, and it sounds like what happened was that the pre-approval letter was changed, not the contract, but both are problematic.

Connors: Contracts are executed with customers, and award letters are submitted to customers. It feels like Eversource was going back to adjust things that they received scrutiny on through DPU audits. On one completed project, on the last payment, Eversource wanted to review every line item again. In other cases, they wanted to stop a project we had received notice to proceed on. The requests for more transparent data and additional receipts long after the fact are difficult to comply with.

Nate Strong (Energysource): We had to cancel about 750 ports that were going to be installed because of the issues outlined in the memo in the last year. This mismanagement is a critical issue and isn't good for meeting state goals. We want to schedule a meeting on the side to talk through how we can provide oversight.

Ryor: We would like specific examples if possible.

Strong: The coalition is working on compiling a set of specific examples.

Jordan Stutt (CalStart): We are enthusiastic to see shared charging being included. We see charging as a service as critical for electric trucking. It is critical for state dollars to support that while EV truck numbers are low to bring in private capital. We should look at usage data and consider the impacts in cost per ton of particulate matter avoided. It allows us to do less building and more charging. Incentive programs that don't distinguish between public and shared charging makes this difficult. In California, the Energize program has multiple funding lanes for public and shared charging and has seen lots of uptake. We will be providing more detailed comments later.

## **7) Adjournment**

Rubin motioned, Eshel seconded, for the meeting to adjourn. All members voted in favor. The motion passed.

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

- [Meeting Slides](#)
- [June Meeting Minutes](#)