

**DRAFT**  
**Massachusetts Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Coordinating Council**  
Wednesday, February 7, 2024 | 1–3:30 p.m.  
Via Zoom

**EVICC members**

- Undersecretary Michael Judge, Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs, EVICC Chairperson
- State Senator Mike Barrett, Chair, Joint Committee on Telecommunications, Energy, and Utilities
- Eric Bourassa, Director, Transportation Division, Metropolitan Area Planning Council
- Undersecretary Layla D'Emilia, Executive Office of Economic Development
- Aurora Edington, Department of Energy Resources
- Brian Ferrarese, Department of Environmental Protection
- Sean Donaghy for Laura Gilmore, Director of Strategic Transit Planning, Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority
- State Representative Jeff Roy, Chair, Joint Committee on Telecommunications, Energy, and Utilities
- Commissioner Staci Rubin, Department of Public Utilities
- Conor Simao, Assistant Budget Director, Executive Office of Administration and Finance

**EVICC member designees**

- Audrey Horst for State Senator Mike Barrett, Chair, Joint Committee on Telecommunications, Energy, and Utilities

**Additional attendees and presenters**

- Eric Friedman, Executive Director, Leading by Example, Department of Energy Resources
- Daniel Gatti, Director of Clean Transportation Policy, Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
- Jennifer Haugh, Vice President of Planning and Customer Engagement, GreenerU
- Scott Seigal, Hearing Officer, Department of Public Utilities

**Agenda and minutes**

**1. Call to order**

Judge called the meeting to order at 1:08 p.m. He introduced new EVICC member Conor Simao, Assistant Budget Director, Executive Office of Administration and Finance.

**2. Approval of meeting minutes**

Edington requested a change to the November 30 meeting minutes, page 9, to reflect that the AMI stakeholder group had developed a framework.

Bourassa moved and D'Emilia seconded to approve the meeting minutes from October 5, 2023, and November 30, 2023. Edington and Aiello abstained from voting on the October 5, 2023, meeting minutes but approved the minutes of November 30, 2023.

**3. Update: Charging Infrastructure Deployment Fund**

Dan Gatti of EEA shared slides on plans for spending the Charging Infrastructure Deployment Fund.

Bourassa expressed appreciation for all the effort, particularly curbside charging, which was identified as a need earlier in the summer. Gatti indicated that MAPC had identified 10 communities that have expressed an interest in curbside charging already.

**Donaghy:** I noticed MBTA is absent from this list of funds and wanted to make sure that wasn't an oversight.

**Gatti:** For this pot of funding, MBTA funds were not as much of a priority because they should be eligible for the utility make-ready fund. We were looking for places where funding wouldn't be duplicative, though we recognize the importance of EV charging in MBTA parking lots.

#### 4. NEVI and public highway charging

Christopher Aiello of MassDot provided a brief update on NEVI. As promised, procurement went live in the second half of December. Initial responses were due January 11. We received a robust response. Jan 19 selection committee narrowed that to eight to move to a second stage; ultimate selection will be up to five vendors to develop pre-development services agreement with MassDOT. Deadline for the shortlisted respondents to respond will be March 12, then we will conduct interviews with respondents after that. Of the eight remaining, we have a strong pool of candidates.

#### 5. Proposed legislation in the works

Judge went through slide 3: recommended EVSE standards and regulations.

**D'Emilia:** Businesses want clarity on standards and to avoid the bad actors. We don't know where this public infrastructure is today; our hope is to create and set up a system with a cadence. We can't just have compliance officers walking around the state observing what's working and not; we need a system. There are new EVSEs coming online every day, and we need to figure out what we'll need to get these online and registered.

*From the chat:*

**Anna Vanderspek:** Clarifying question: Does the legislative language propose standards for the sale of charging services itself, or does it direct the division of standards to develop those standards?

**D'Emilia:** Anna—the language creates a uniform inspection and testing system for public EV charging stations.

Judge went through slide 4: EVICC recommendations in one bill.

**Horst:** We've heard some concerns about pole charging and wonder whether that might fit under this statute proposal?

**Judge:** The insight I've gotten is there are a couple pole-mounted charging manufacturers certifying to the 1.2 standard; I think we can do more due diligence on that and write language to be flexible enough to allow DOER to deploy these facilities easily. There was an article in the Globe written about pole-mounted chargers not reaching standards, so we're looking to work with you on getting this right.

**Sen. Barrett:** This is an important equity issue to make sure that whatever update we make can facilitate the rollout of chargers to tenants and urban neighborhoods.

**Judge:** I completely agree. There is a risk that it will undermine funding if we don't get it right.

Judge went through slide 5: deleting duplicative aspects of the public EVSE statute.

**Ferrarese:** what's an example?

**Judge:** It's generally multi-family situations where there's dedicated parking. It's not applicable for on-street parking in a triple-decker, for example. But in a much bigger apartment complex with a dedicated parking lot/spot, they would not be able to restrict you completely unreasonably from attempting to install something on their property. We would have to look at provisions and share specific language, but it's not completely like tenants can do whatever they want. But landlords can't completely restrict.

**Gatti:** Also the landlord doesn't have to pay for it but can't unreasonably interfere with it.

**Sen. Barrett:** Thanks for this. I want to raise another issue pertinent to historic districts and neighborhood conservation districts, which is the promotion of solar in those geographic areas. Sen. Julian Cyr proposed a bill, S.1289, in regard to this. The concern in the Senate is that an EV charger can go into these districts; I'm posing the question as to whether somehow this language can be coordinated—EV charging for sure, but solar within these boundaries as well.

**Judge:** It's possible. I was aware of that bill and some restrictions that apply there. It may not be perfectly compatible. With respect to renters, it probably doesn't apply as clearly there. But with homeowner associations affecting property owners, there could be some synergies there. I can get the specific bill that's filed where we modeled this off of; we looked at that, modified it a bit, and looked at existing law on the books for City of Boston to see what might work statewide for EV charging.

**Sen. Barrett:** I think the Senate would be interested in seeing where those synergies would be effectuated.

**Judge:** For renters, there was a pretty natural spot we saw in Massachusetts General Law in landlord and tenant provisions and tractions. We didn't see a specific area in the general law that corresponded as neatly to the property owner piece of it, so we wrote it as the session law.

**Sen. Barrett:** You're right regarding the rights of tenants; however, it is also likely that the right to charge and the right to solar should both touch on state statutes that set up and govern the operations of historic district commissions and neighborhood conservation districts. One could imagine needing to touch on those statutes to effect both things and one could conceivably imagine them being in the same sentence.

**Judge:** You could be right there. While there is a law on the books for Boston, it only applies to homeowner and condo associations to date.

Judge went through slide 6: EEA proposed alternative language for right-to-charge.

**Judge:** This is intended as an interim solution. We're looking at potentially other changes; amending power options statute to allow them to do this? Would you want to amend c. 25a, DOER's enabling statute, to include section specifically related to this as well? Expand beyond electric school buses? Still something we're discussing internally. But school bus issue could be addressed through empowerment act.

Judge went through slide 7: school bus procurement.

**Rep. Roy:** Thank you for these great recommendations. Let me share with you some good news that yesterday, with cooperation and coordination with Sen. Barrett. We worked together to get some bills out yesterday. One reported to the House is H.3218, §§ 15–17, 22–23, 26, 33, 34, 35, and 38–40, a building decarbonization anchor bill, which includes almost all of the EV provisions that you outlined today. Your work is timely.

**Judge:** This is greatly appreciated; we're looking forward to working with you as the session continues.

**Sen. Barrett:** Thank you, Chair Roy; we worked well together, and the House is moving first to advance some particulars. He's done a heroic amount of work and will be putting a number of consolidated bills before the House. We have a number of bills going into the Senate. So that bodes extremely well for 2024 and the omnibus climate bill. I want to acknowledge the tension between equity and EV adoption; I think the plain thrust of these particular proposals is to advance the cause of equity, even though it will be fewer EVs purchased in the state. Because as you indicate in your first bullet, right now the uptick is within that \$50–\$55,000 range. If you kill that, the overall number goes down. Certainly the purchase of EVs nationwide is tailing off; Toyota et al. are already announcing that they're shifting production from EV to hybrids, which are more polluting, because at the moment there's been a dip in consumer interest—whether it's driven by failure to deploy or cost of EVs, it's unknown, but likely both. This proposal will drive down total penetration of EVs in Massachusetts at a time when we are looking to drive sales. So very tough to propose redistricting the subsidy when it's almost a certainty that it will disincentivize purchases in that \$50-55K range. We can talk about whether price of EVs will come down to suit the subsidy ceiling; those kinds of effects are partial. We can assume folks currently buying EVs will be less incentivized to do so. That's a big policy tradeoff; we don't know where in a perfect world we should come out. Disrupting a subsidy that's only been in place for 12 months, constant interruption of policy that people can remember is another issue, so this question of predictability, stability, clarity, consistency, and incentivizing the part of the market where there's actually consumer activity, difficult to walk away from that.

**Judge:** I hear you; we can gather data from DOER and from what they're seeing in the implementation of the program and some statistics. Concerns are the rate at which we are giving out rebates are unsustainable, and we may run out of money altogether, and if that funding isn't stable, we run the risk of stopping and starting. It has been a bit of a moving target. One thing we have discussed internally is the efficacy of these rebates; how much does it play into a consumer's decision at \$55K, were they going to do that whether they get a \$3500 rebate or not? It's hard to quantify a consumer's decision.

**Gatti:** Just one piece of feedback; we're doing some analysis right now about the cost projections into the future of this program. Obviously as we see EV adoption escalate in that S curve, it does a number to our programming expenses. Some of what we're proposing is based on the kind of budget that we see available in recognizing all the different priorities we have here. As we do that analysis, we'd be happy to share with the Legislature budget impacts and program changes.

**Sen. Barrett:** 99% of the state executive branch is funded on an annual basis; I'm not persuaded by the funding argument. The solution to running out of money is to appropriate more money. That's the typical solution and the challenge that almost every other executive branch activity faces and meets successfully every 12 months. One could envision meeting the challenge by asking for appropriations. Also, there's a lag to data. The most recent data suggests that EV purchases is dropping off. This is frustrating to all of us; that's going to conserve this money and extend it longer, even if you don't ask for an additional appropriation. We all agree we need to drive EV adoption among low-income folks, etc., but high-income folks are there too. Plenty of uncertainty so you don't want to change policy. Penetration of the market for EVs in the next two years is likely to continue to be centered on higher-income purchasers. The Legislature is doing its best. We innovated, insisted, that there be a subsidy for low-income purchasers added to the subsidy at the time. Added another subsidy for the purchase of used EVs, again aimed at moderate-income purchasers. It's startling to see a dramatic change after just 12 months when the data indicates that the market is plummeting; bad time to monkey with subsidy for purchaser who exists in that \$50-55K bracket. But I certainly am interested in continuing that conversation.

**Judge:** We can prepare more data.

**Eric Friedman:** Thanks; I totally agree with Sen. Barrett's comments that we need to be really careful about how we target our rebates and work on EV adoption overall. We're trying to be data-driven here. Part of these suggestions are based on trends we're seeing for MOR-EV; more than half of the rebates are going to that \$50-55K segment, and three-quarters are going to a particular model of a particular manufacturer. So we are

working with a consultant to do an analysis around what would happen to the program under different scenarios to see what extent those program changes would have effects, which might help discussions moving forward.

**Judge:** Again, we'll work to provide some of that data to the legislature. We are also proposed adding MassCEC formally to this body; I think they're doing a lot of work in the transportation space and are a frequent participant in this body, and they are distributing \$38 million of the EV charging fund, so we think it would be valuable to have them as a formal member of this council.

## 6. Managed charging and performance metrics

**Commissioner Rubin:** I have fairly limited updates on managed charging. National Grid does currently have a managed charging program, an off-peak rebate charging program. Eversource does not have a program. We indicated support for an appropriate EV load management offering, but agency disallowed Eversource's proposal because it wasn't specific enough. We still have not received a proposal from Eversource regarding managed charging. Unitil does not have a managed charging program and no plans to propose one that we're aware of. But Unitil has created a time-of-use rate proposal.

On December 15, the DPU approved a proposal from the EDCs regarding EV performance metrics. All companies will track the following EV program implementation data and report them beginning in May 2024 to the Department:

- Total number of residential make-ready rebates distributed
- Total number of EV supply equipment deployed by network provider and EVSE manufacturer
- Total number of residential low-income EVSE rebates distributed.
- Total number of projects that received outside funding by market segment
- Total amount of third-party funding deducted from utility incentives
- Total number of new and existing site hosts enrolled in EV charging infrastructure programs
- Total number of charging sites and ports deployed
- Total number of EV customers participating in each managed charging program
- There are additional company-specific implementation metrics.

For performance metrics, NSTAR Electric and National Grid will report:

- Total annual charging events per port
- Total monthly charging events per port per venue type
- Average duration of charging events by venue type
- Average kWh delivered per port per year by market segment and total annual kWh by market segment
- Average and total kWh delivered per charging session per port per market segment
- Daily load profile by venue type and market segment
- Timing and size of peak EV charging load by market segment
- Percentage of active charging time per port
- Percentage of kWh shifted off-peak and percentage of charging sessions shifted off-peak resulting from customer enrollment in the off-peak charging rebate program or other managed charging program
- In addition, all EDCs, including Unitil, will report: Percent of on-peak to off-peak charging per port on weekdays and weekends by venue type and market segment

For equity metrics, all companies will report:

- The amount and percentage of EV program spending by charging port type (i.e., Level 2 and DCFC) and market segment in environmental justice (“EJ”) populations that meet the EJ criteria based on income, EJ populations that meet and EJ criteria, and non-EJ populations.
- The number and percentage of charging ports installed by port type and market segment in EJ populations that meet the EJ criteria based on income, EJ populations that meet any EJ criteria, and non-EJ populations.

NSTAR Electric and National Grid will also report:

- The number and percentage of EV ready site plans in EJ populations that meet the EJ criteria based on income, EJ populations that meet any EJ criteria, and non-EJ populations.
- The number of charging ports installed per-capita in each category of EJ populations (i.e., income, people of color status, English proficiency, income and race status) and in non-EJ populations, as calculated by the number of ports in a census block group divided by the population of that census block, summed across each category of EJ population and for non-EJ populations.

*From the chat:*

*For information on the National Grid's off-peak charging rebate program, see <https://fileservice.eea.comacloud.net/FileService.Api/file/FileRoom/11262053> at 387-392 and <https://fileservice.eea.comacloud.net/FileService.Api/file/FileRoom/16827694> at 149-152.*

*For information on the Department's findings on NSTAR Electric's EV load management program proposal in 2022, see <https://fileservice.eea.comacloud.net/FileService.Api/file/FileRoom/14509751> at 116-118 and <https://fileservice.eea.comacloud.net/FileService.Api/file/FileRoom/14845977>.*

*For information on Unitil's optional electric vehicle time-of-use rates, see <https://fileservice.eea.comacloud.net/FileService.Api/file/FileRoom/16827694> at 269-270.*

*For more information on electric vehicle performance metrics and annual reporting requirements, see <https://fileservice.eea.comacloud.net/FileService.Api/file/FileRoom/18334894>.*

**Edington:** I know it's in the order you released, but what is the annual filing date for that data?

**Scott Seigal (DPU):** May 15 each year.

**Judge:** That will be a critical piece of information we can point to is how those programs are performing in their first year, so I look forward to seeing that.

**Edington:** On managed charging, I know you said Eversource's proposal was disallowed due to lack of detail, and I just wanted to clarify: did you say that they have an open window to refile in the 21-90 docket if they have one at any time?

**Rubin:** There is no time window and that would be filed in a new separate docket. Seigal was our hearing officer.

**Seigal:** Eversource's load management program was filed in 21-90 through DPU 21-29. There was no separate EV load management proposal, so to clarify that in terms of parameters, we did set some for Eversource's load management program in a hearing officer memorandum which I'll share in the chat. There are some parameters there. But there is no deadline to file. Will just add that Eversource and National Grid have filed EV TOU rate proposals which are not the same as load management, but serve similar purposes, so we are currently adjudicating.

**Edington:** My update is later, but there is a hint of potentially something coming from Eversource in the ESMPs.

## 7. ESMP updates

**Edington:** I won't go into great detail because it's still quite new, but I did want to provide an update. The electric sector modernization plans (ESMPs) were filed with the DPU on January 29, so it's been just over a week. As you know, and as I've briefed this group about before, the GMAC reviewed draft ESMPs and provided a list of 88 recommendations to the EDCs to either accept, accept with modifications, or reject in their filed plans. We have received updated ESMPs, so the final versions have been filed along with testimony in six topic areas (policy and solutions, forecasts, stakeholder engagement, bill impacts, metrics, and net benefits). There are supporting documents as well as responses to GMAC recommendations broken out in those areas. It's a lot of material, so I'm not going to try to summarize that here. The schedule is fast: the discovery period has opened and will close on March 25. The Attorney General's Office issued its first set of discovery inquiries today. There will be technical sessions on March 8, 11, and 13, and three public hearings on March 5, 7, and 12. Evidentiary hearings are set for April 8–26, and a briefing schedule is TBD. There are a number of intervenors, including the DOER, along with a number of other entities that were approved earlier this week. It will be a lot of activity in short order. By the next EVICC meeting (April 3), discovery will have come and gone.

## 8. Climate Pollution Reduction Grant (CPRG)

**Gatti** presented CPRG slides regarding an EPA grant application process. This is a complicated grant format pushing states to do a lot of planning and analysis in identifying key climate priority actions, as well as submitting implementation grant proposals in specific areas where we've identified a need for federal funding support. If you're interested in the full process, we just had a couple of public hearings, and there's more to come. There will be a Justice 40 working group meeting on February 13 to talk more about CPRG opportunities and priorities. In Massachusetts, we're allowed to lead one coalition application to submit one implementation grant that is just state-based and one in participation with other coalitions. Our stated coalition priorities are heat pumps and offshore wind, then in-state we're focusing on medium- and heavy-duty fleet electrification. The application is due April 1.

## 9. Discussion and feedback

- a) What additional analysis might be helpful?
  - i) **Gatti:** happy to invite comments here too: we do have additional funding for analysis such as what Synapse started. Impact of managed charging on MHD vehicles; saw impact of peak load and efficiency on grid. Haven't done depth of analysis, so that's something we're looking at. Getting into more depth on grid management in general is something we're thinking about. Open to feedback on that point if there are places where more analysis could be helpful.
  - ii) **Judge:** We have a lot more time between now and our next assessment, so we won't be as rushed. But as we approach summertime, we'll probably go into a planning exercise of what issues we want to address in next assessment and will identify any additional technical analysis that we would want to complete that wasn't the last time around; could supplement assessment. We have \$396,000 reserved for future consulting and analytical needs of the EVICC, but it has to be encumbered by end of this calendar year or it reverts back to federal government. Any other thoughts, bring to our attention and we'll discuss at upcoming meeting.

**Edington:** It occurred to me that Commissioner Rubin and Scott Seigal mentioned this lightly, but for the group's awareness, there are these EV time-of-use rate dockets open where initial filings were late August and there is an ongoing stakeholder session process. The first session happened last week, and the next is next Friday. Stakeholder sessions addressing three questions the DPU provided in a memo with intent for a

report mid-summer (June) from the EDCs to provide outcomes for the stakeholder sessions and commenting period (week after utility reports due). So just to bring all the different elements going on, that's also happening.

**Judge:** The timeline is not exactly moving at light speed; there are some obstacles to implementing some of those proposals fully.

**Rubin:** I know we have a statutory requirement to rule by 2025 and we're aware that we wanted this group to have more open and direct conversations than sometimes DPU proceedings can have, hence stakeholder sessions, potentially not having DPU employees in session to allow for DPU dialogue. We're aware that this touches on ESMPs and other pieces. It's moving, but not ruled on in 2024.

**Seigal:** These proceedings are definitely moving along; the stakeholder process running concurrently is relatively new.

**Judge:** I'll also add that there's been formed an interagency rates working group held by DOER, MassCEC, AG, and DPU that's primarily working on bringing on board a consultant to do a detailed analysis of rate design, particularly in the context of decarbonization. So how do rates need to be redesigned to promote decarbonization objectives, particularly with electrification of transportation and building sectors, but other distributed generation technology, solar and storage. There is a comprehensive study to be done with a potential end goal of filing that with the department and doing a comprehensive rate design reform that looks at all of these issues holistically. MassCEC issued an RFP closely collaborating with DOER on that. They are very close to being under contract with a consultant to perform that work; website established last week for this group with more info to come. We can share that link.

**Gatti:** The time-of-use rate proposals will both need rollout of advanced metering infrastructure (AMI) and separate meters for EVs to establish an EV-only rate—some industry stakeholders might have some takes that might be worth sharing into that process.

**Bourassa:** I just wanted folks to know that we did find out from FHA that we were not awarded the charging and fueling infrastructure grant, which would have been \$15 million with a \$3 million match. Massachusetts only received one award for \$2.5 million for EV charging in Deerfield. We're scheduling a meeting with folks who oversaw that program to get feedback. We know that it was heavily subscribed from awards across the country; they try to distribute them evenly. Now that we have this group here, we will be following another round when another notice of opportunity comes out and will coordinate and consult with EVICC to ensure that we're going after things that are in line with the EVICC's recommendations and various programs we discussed today.

**Judge:** We diverted matching money and put into curbside funding, so that'll offset loss a little bit.

**Sen. Barrett:** I'm struggling to credit the argument that a second meter would be required before time-of-use rates could be rolled out; the Senate would like to learn more. Other states have successfully implemented time-of-use rates. I haven't heard about that significant rate limiting factor having kicked in, so I have questions about whether things would be that difficult for the utilities, and it's an important question, because if they are right, time-of-use rates will be delayed until 2028-2029. I was impressed with Commissioner Rubin's report on the charging metrics that the DPU is going to be reporting on soon. What that data suggests is there's a lot of information about the kWh used for charging and data is very granular, all of which suggest we can roll out time-of-use rates in 2026 on the strength of that data and see the numbers improve as the program gains more traction. I'm very worried about the strongly implied argument that we're not going to see time-of-use rates for years; doesn't seem plausible. Hope people will be in touch with the Senate with very convincing information that the second meter is required before occupants could be granted that incentive.



**Rubin:** The issue is we're getting into substantive content that are open questions before the DPU, but we can't be in room when these conversations are happening (i.e., ex-parte conversations).

**Judge:** Maybe we can run through other items and come back to it, that might work.

#### 10. Public comment / questions

**Alistair Pim, NECEC:** I'm impressed with progress of this group; thank you for the good work. Did I hear Dan Gatti mention at the beginning that impacts trying to make with medium- to heavy-duty fleets is to reduce pollution in disadvantaged areas? How are you going to measure that, including air quality? I'm looking at the DEP map and saw that it's in Boston and not many other places.

**Gatti:** Yes, we've thought a lot about that. Air quality monitoring is getting more and more advanced every day; small sensors can produce a lot of data. If we're going to be as generous as we're proposing to be, we will need to get really granular data back from the fleets on these generous incentives to help us see where the impacts are. One of the challenges we're thinking about is added incentives for low-income and disadvantaged communities, but emissions are mobile, and it's not easy to track them. With respect to generating data to see impacts, we're thinking about in-cab emissions and occupational health impacts on truckers and mechanics; we're having conversations with public health in this arena and would like to make that very strong part of proposal. This is very top of mind.

**Danny Bloom, FLO:** Can someone elaborate on that curbside program that was just referenced?

**Judge:** Yes, we covered in first part of the call; \$12.5 million has been earmarked for curbside and pole-mounted charging. Part of the exercise is walking communities through the process and steps they need to take; e.g., here's who to contact and how to approach this. There will be a guide to municipalities on how to implement curbside charging. The bulk of the money is dedicated to deploying projects. We've identified highest priority areas and there will be a focus on urban neighborhoods and EJ communities as well. That's our biggest bucket of funding and expect the most bang for buck. An area where charging infrastructure has been lacking and opportunities to expand EV ownership in those communities; that's one of several programs that we'll be implementing with the \$50 million.

**Anna Vanderspek, Green Energy Consumers Alliance:** I want share some information that we've learned about the federal tax credit that we didn't expect. For passenger vehicles, it's worked for years where claiming the tax incentive is achieved by filing out a certain form. In 2024, knew that there would be a transfer to the dealership at point of sale; we didn't realize that you can now take advantage of that regardless of point of sale or taxes, but you have to purchase your vehicle from a dealership registered with the IRS Clean Energy Portal. They will have to supply you with that form and confirmation that the form has been filed successfully, and then you also have to file at tax time. There is no list of registered dealers, so it's very confusing. In better news, the IRS did release a tool to figure out if your property qualifies for a tax credit for installing charging; that had been missing for a long time, so there was no way to tell if folks qualified or not. On the suggested legislative language around school buses, I'm curious as to whether anybody on this call compared that language to that in couple of live bills this session with EV school buses and procurement to see if there's overlap there, or maybe that work hasn't been done yet?

*From the chat:*

**Anna Vanderspek:** The school bus bills to look at are S.2099, S.2288, and H.3769. They don't all directly touch on procurement but would be good to look at in any case!

Also, here's a blogpost about the federal tax credit complications:

<https://blog.greenenergyconsumers.org/blog/new-rules-for-federal-electric-vehicle-tax-credit>

**Gatti:** I wasn't aware there was pending legislation on that, but if you wanted to direct us to that, that would be helpful.

**Vanderspek:** I'd be happy to.

**Gatti:** We appreciate your advocacy on federal tax stuff too. We have only indirect influence over, but we want this program rolled out as smoothly as possible.

**Danny Bloom:** I want to comment on the work that's been done to facilitate additional investment toward curbside charging. This is an underserved market segment, one that also affects folks who want to go electric but don't have the ability to site a charger where they live because of barriers to that, especially in multi-family housing and in urban landscapes. FLO is engaged in number of these efforts. I encourage the Senator and Representative to add some edits to H.3218 regarding the permitting of EV charging stations for those in the public right of way. Something we've experienced, especially in California, when discussions arise, is that public right-of-way charging has been historically omitted. If we want to make it more accessible and ubiquitous, tackling these challenges before they ultimately arise when projects are going through the make-ready component and interconnect to the grid and are being sited and future-proofed is essential. We've got some suggested edits that we've already sent along to Alistair Pim at NECEC; we're happy to share that with your staff. Audrey Horst and Sen. Barrett and have discussed ENERGY STAR issues in past. I'm pleased to see that bill tackles that issue as well. Thank you for tackling this; it's the way I think we bring more affordable and equitably sited chargers to communities underserved.

**Rep. Roy:** You'd looked at H.3218; it's been redrafted extensively and released yesterday or today, so I would guess you haven't seen it; take a peek and share your thoughts with me, Sen. Barrett, and our staffs and we would anxiously take a look at it and see if it fits in with what it would do.

**Bloom:** I have looked, and edits to allow for right-of-way charging were not in there; this has to do with a lot of internal dialogue between FLO and Tesla to try and reach consensus. As you would imagine, we're very bandwidth-constrained. I'm happy to share edits; there is so much good content that will further enable infrastructure deployment.

**Sen. Barrett:** If I could build on Chair Roy's invitation, please do that; thank you for interfacing with us. We haven't discussed this; define for me the public right-of-way space? I'm not sure I understand the distinction.

**Bloom:** Curbside charging is unlike other charging deployments incorporates other factors that could impact the public because it's sited along the curb in areas where there's often a lot of foot traffic, with probably retail establishments or various housing complexes adjacent to these. FLO piloted a program of 100 chargers with New York and Con Edison; 1,700 chargers in Montreal in the public right of way in concert with HydroQuebec; and a number of chargers in Los Angeles. There tend to be unique challenges here because other existing infrastructure in public right of way that you have to be mindful of. Depending on each jurisdiction and circumstances, it may be important to scope in the application for the public right of way charger. There are different ways to do it: utility poles, lighting, etc. The City of Boston chose FLO as a vendor for EVSE deployment. We have lessons learned in concert with Rivermore in Boston. I'm happy to meet with you offline, but just knowing that where these chargers ultimately get sited is unique compared to other types of deployment, so there might be considerations.

**Sen. Barrett:** Is public right of way synonymous with curbside, or is it a subset?

**Bloom:** They are technically interchangeable, but it's depending on where you orient charging on the curb itself. There may be implications for that.

**Judge:** If you can send that to EEA as well, would be helpful to us.

**Bloom:** I actually just sent it to Dan Gatti. Thanks for opportunity to speak and putting more resources behind this effort.

**Gold:** I wanted to share something regarding the utility public stakeholder session on EV time-of-use rate proposals that took place last week. We will be working with Eversource to put together additional stakeholder sessions in the next couple months and want to invite everyone who's interested in learning more with those two dockets to join. There will be an email going out to our intervenors to check in about availability and interest in presenting. I want to make sure everyone who's listening today knows that we're having public stakeholder sessions are happening and welcome participation. Sen. Barrett and Rep. Roy, we're looking to get more insight into what's going on with those dockets and input from utilities on what we're investigating through our various offerings, so hope that you or your staff will be able to join as well, because there's lots of collective learning in those sessions as well.

**Seth Gadbois, Clean Transportation Attorney, CLF:** I attend almost all these meetings, or someone from CLF does for me. When considering consumer behavior, especially for low-income communities and individuals of EJ communities, I think that this group does a lot of good work talking about initial procurement, access, and funding one can receive through getting that EV and an ability to charge it. But I would encourage this group and any consultants that the research should consider the long-term costs of maintaining that asset. Each year EVs are more expensive to maintain; AAA estimated \$11,000 per year. Most EJ communities can't afford sudden unanticipated repairs on a car, and those factors should be taken into consideration when determining equity and ultimately any efficacy of the rebates. How is the planning process for determining where to put charging locations in the right of way being managed with other plans happening in the space? The MBTA bus network redesign had a task meeting, and they're doing a lot of stakeholder engagement, getting feedback that more bus lands means removal of parking. How is that planning and reconciling happening on an active basis?

**Gatti:** Those are great questions, and to some extent we're figuring them out? Especially this question about the land use aspect of curbside charging is a complex question that we're going to want to get stakeholder feedback on.

**Bourassa:** These are all really good points, and that's the hard work of planning for electric for curbside in addition to planning right places to put it, utility infrastructure, what are other uses of the street, and the same folks in Boston working on bus improvements. A lot of them are also involved in the EV discussions. The same is true for Cambridge. The good news is that at the local level, there is a lot of good coordination and that's the hard work of siting this stuff. There is definitely a strong desire in urban core municipalities that want to make sure that apartment dwellers have good public transit service first and foremost and walking. It's not mutually exclusive, but the issue is very top of mind for us.

## **11. Next steps on the above**

Judge indicated that April 3 is the next EVICC meeting. We ask this group to think about analyses we might be performing. We'll make sure to send out materials we discussed.

## **12. Adjourn**

Bourassa moved and Sen. Barrett seconded a motion to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 3:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
*Jennifer A. Haugh*  
GreenerU, Inc.