

Massachusetts Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Coordinating Council

Wednesday, June 4, 2025 | 1:00 – 3:20 p.m.

Via Zoom

EVICC Members Present:

- 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
- Chris Aiello, Department of Transportation
- Hank Webster, Department of Environmental Protection
- Audrey Horst, Research Director, Office of State Senator Michael Barrett (representing Senator Mike Barrett, Chairman of the Joint Committee on Telecommunications, Utilities and Energy)
- Andrea Bolduc, Research Analyst, Joint Committee on Telecommunications, Utilities and Energy
- Rachel Ackerman, Massachusetts Clean Energy Center
- Mark Fine, Executive Office of Administration and Finance
- Kat Eshel, Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority
- Eric Bourassa, Metropolitan Area Planning Council

EVICC Members Absent:

- None

Additional attendees and presenters:

- Katie Gronendyke, EEA
- Mark Scribner, EEA
- Elisa Guerrero, Planning Communities
- Yuna Choi, EEA
- Ethan Raye, Office of State Senator Michael Barrett
- Scott Seigal, Department of Public Utilities
- Al-Azad Iqbal, Department of Public Utilities
- Vyshnavi Kosigi, Department of Energy Resources
- Nicole Lepre, Department of Energy Resources
- Crystal Johnson, Assistant Secretary, EEA Office of Environmental Justice and Equity (OEJE)
- Krishana Abraham-Petrie, OEJE
- Ida Weiss, Synapse Energy Economics
- Aidan Glaser Schoff, Synapse Energy Economics
- James Tamerius, Center for Sustainable Energy

All meeting attendees participated remotely.

Agenda and Minutes

1) Call to Order

Assistant Secretary Ryor called the meeting to order at 1:05pm and took roll call of EVICC Members present. All EVICC members attended the meeting virtually.

2) Approval of Meeting Minutes

Rubin requested the dates for the Department of Public Utilities (DPU) technical sessions mentioned at the May meeting be corrected from 6/17 to 6/27 in the minutes.

Rodriguez motioned, Eshel second, to pass the May minutes with Rubin's edits. All present members voted in favor. The motion passed.

3) Review of Meeting Goals and Agenda

Ryor presented the slide deck reviewing goals and agenda for the meeting.

4) Administrative Updates

a. Second Assessment Public Comment Period

Ryor shared that the July EVICC meeting would be moved from 7/1 to 7/9, to accommodate the 4th of July holiday weekend, be held in a hybrid format, and would be extended to 4:00. The meeting's main agenda item would be review and discussion of the draft Second EVICC Assessment.

b. Energy Star

Ryor shared an update on the potential closure of the Energy Star Program. EEA is still evaluating the implications internally and firmer answers will be presented to the group if and when available.

5) Public Comment

None

6) Updates

a. EJ Siting Resource Guide Update and Vote

Assistant Secretary Crystal Johnson presented the final EJ Siting Resource Guide, which was originally presented at the March EVICC public meeting. The guide was circulated to EVICC members and other EJ organizations within OEJE's network before being finalized.

Ryor thanked OEJE for their work on the guide and asked what recommendations there were for smaller, resource-constrained municipalities to implement the guidance. Johnson responded that municipalities should engage early and often with EJ-related stakeholders, and that OEJE can be a resource.

Rubin commended OEJE for their work on the guide and said that a good next step would be to discuss how flexible payment options that don't rely on credit cards or smartphones could be explored for charging. Johnson mentioned that OEJE could start to think about how to operationalize the recommendations. Ryor said the technical committee could discuss the idea.

Rubin motioned to approve and adopt the EJ Siting Resource Guide, seconded by Ackerman. All present members voted in favor. The motion passed.

7) Presentations

a. Managed Charging Follow-Up Presentation and Discussion

Aidan Glaser Schoff and Ida Weiss, from Synapse, gave a summary presentation of the results of the unmanaged and managed EV charging analysis that was conducted for the Second Assessment that had previously been presented to EVICC. The presentation showed the potential impacts that managed charging could have on grid capacity and constraints. Ryor added that the presentation showed the potential for managed charging to help avoid the necessity for grid upgrades.

Edington mentioned that the Department of Energy Resources is working on a different but similar study where the utilities are also engaged and asked where the feeder constraint data came from. Weiss stated that the data came from the utilities.

Horst and Ryor asked about the assumptions underpinning the status quo and scenario 2 projections and Weiss responded that there was not much difference in substation headroom between the status quo and unmanaged scenarios and that one of the big differences between unmanaged and managed scenarios is that the managed scenario assumes 90%+ participation in managed charging, versus 15% in the unmanaged scenario. Schoff added that scenario 2 assumes 80% off-peak charging and scenario 3 assumes 100% off-peak charging

Eshel asked if there were any focus areas with more commercial vehicles and buses. Weiss reviewed the Springfield school bus scenario, with 13 school bus chargers, as an example. Weiss and Schoff explained that bus charging impacts on the grid would vary by geography and the contracted capacity for the circuit as a constraint. Ryor mentioned that EVICC will work with the utilities after the Second Assessment is released to identify the geographic areas that need grid upgrades to accommodate transportation electrification the most, as required by Section 103 of the [2024 Climate Act](#).

Fine asked how managed charging systems work and for examples. Schoff and Ryor explained that the most common example is having customers set their cars to charge at off-peak times, similar to time of use rates. There are also more active options, like in Connecticut where Eversource is looking into curtailing EV charging during times of constrained capacity.

Edington mentioned that National Grid currently has a managed charging program and that proposed programs, primarily for light-duty vehicles, for Eversource and Unitil are currently under review by the Department of Public Utilities. Scribner mentioned that about half of the municipal utilities run managed charging programs that vary between passive and active models. EVICC has had previous presentations about helping consumers navigate managed charging, like from Matcha.

b. Draft 2030/2035 EV Charging Projections Presentation

James Tamerius, from the Center for Sustainable Energy, presented a subset of the analysis included in the Second Assessment about EV charging projections across the state for 2030 and 2035.

Edington asked if the analysis distinguished between DCFC for highway travel versus at-home charging. Tamerius explained that the analysis does distinguish between the two, although there is significant geographic overlap. Weiss added that the specific numbers would be included in the draft Second Assessment.

8) Public Comment

Ilan Gutherz, from New Leaf Energy, expressed appreciation for the analysis and suggested that charging infrastructure availability would be another important factor to consider for adoption, and asked what percentage of total cars in the state EVs would make up by 2035, and if that number was an input or output of the model. Tamerius responded that the 2.4 million EVs estimate came from the CECF forecast and was added as an assumption when calculating how to reach state goals. He estimated that it was projected to account for approximately 50% of all cars in 2035.

Gutherz then asked what informed the ratio of EVs to L2 to L3 charging port in the analysis. Tamerius explained that ratios ranged from 50-200 EVs per port, depending on the power level of the port. Gutherz suggested additional analysis using a range of ratios in the final report, because results can vary widely. Ryor mentioned that they are open to feedback about what ratio makes sense for different power levels, but clarified that the state wouldn't take a position on what power levels should be used where, other than as part of specific incentive programs.

Sarah Simon, from the Global Warming Solutions Act Implementation Advisory Committee Working Group on Transportation, asked how much additional power will be needed on the grid in 2030 to accommodate the projections and what the use rates are expected. Weiss said the analysis estimated an additional 1.5 gigawatts would be necessary for the charger estimates presented by Tamerius in 2030. Simon asked what considerations were made for rural communities, where there is a higher reliance on cars and less transit. Tamerius explained that the analysis took rural adoption rates into account and the longer distances between places were accounted for in vehicle miles traveled calculations for commuter forecasting.

Richard Asirifi, from Commonwealth Engineering, asked what the impact of incentivising additional chargers and electrification would be on electric utility customers, especially for infrastructure upgrades in smaller, less resourced towns. Ryor explained that electric vehicles offer an opportunity for existing infrastructure costs to be paid by new electric utility customers, so long as the cost of new infrastructure to accommodate electric vehicles is less than the additional costs charged to electric vehicle customers.

Rubin added that DPU is always balancing progress towards climate goals with making grid upgrades affordable and equitable. A proceeding recently wrapped up for utilities to have [electric sector modernization plans](#) (ESMPs) that include electric vehicle charger upgrades, and there is a new process in the Climate Action that allows DPU to review utility plans for EV charging. Ryor added that through the Section 103 process, after the Second Assessment is published in August, the utilities will have to begin looking at grid upgrade areas.

James Frey, from 2050 Partners, mentioned that he is helping California in their EV infrastructure efforts and commented that when considering sustainable business models for charging, business plans for site operators need to be financially sustainable and allow for infrastructure upgrades. Ryor and Scribner emphasized that education about operations and maintenance costs is very important and need to be understood holistically and from the beginning when working with potential owner operators. Frey mentioned that it would be helpful to have a resource guide for tenants about how to request EV charging from their property owner.

9) Meeting Adjournment

Rubin moved to adjourn the meeting, Edington seconded. All present members voted in favor. Motion passed and the meeting adjourned at 3:11pm.

Documents and Exhibits Presented at the Meeting

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