

Grid Modernization Advisory Council (GMAC)

MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, September 14, 2023, 1–4 p.m.

Hybrid meeting

Councilors present: Liz Anderson (designee for Kelly Caiazzo), Sarah Bresolin Silver, Marybeth Campbell (virtual), Larry Chretien (virtual), Kathryn Cox-Arslan, Jeremy Koo (designee for Julie Curti; virtual), Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy (designee for Elizabeth Mahony), Amy McGuire (virtual), Kyle Murray, Galen Nelson (virtual), JS Rancourt (virtual), Jonathan Stout (virtual), Andy Sun (virtual), Alex Worsley, Kathryn Wright

Non-voting councilors: Carol Sedewitz (National Grid), Digaunto Chatterjee (Eversource), Kevin Sprague (Unitil; virtual)

Councilors absent: n/a

DOER staff present: Aurora Edington, Julia Fox, Sarah McDaniel (virtual), Austin Dawson, Lou Sahlu

Consultants present: Jennifer Haugh, Ben Havumaki, Tim Woolf

Other attendees: Nancy Israel (National Grid Legal Counsel), Erin Engstrom (Eversource)

1. Call to order

Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy, as Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m.

2. Welcome, Roll Call, Agenda

Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy, Department of Energy Resources (DOER): Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy welcomed all participants to the GMAC meeting. The Deputy Commissioner took roll call for voting and non-voting members. No additions or changes to the

agenda were suggested. The Deputy Commissioner walked through the proposed agenda (slide 2).

3. Meeting Minutes Review and Voting

Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy asked if there were changes to the August 10, 2023, GMAC meeting minutes; none were suggested. Councilor Kyle Murray moved to approve the meeting minutes of August 10. Councilor Sarah Bresolin Silver seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy asked if there were changes to the August 25, 2023, GMAC executive committee meeting; none was suggested. Councilor Kyle Murray moved to approve the meeting minutes of August 25. Councilor Sarah Bresolin Silver seconded the motion. The motion carried with Councilor Liz Anderson abstaining.

4. Equity Working Group Vote

The proposed Equity Working Group will meet between September 15 and October 27, ultimately to provide draft recommendations to the GMAC before the listening sessions at the end of October, then present recommendations for the full GMAC discussion by November 9 (see slide 4).

Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy asked if there were any questions about the Equity Working Group charter that had been distributed prior to the meeting; none were posed. Councilor Kyle Murray moved to approve the Equity Working Group charter as presented. Councilor Kathryn Wright seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Nominees for the Equity Working Group are as follows:

- Julia Fox, Department of Energy Resources
- Chris Modlish, Office of the Attorney General
- Larry Chretien, Green Energy Consumers Alliance (GMAC)
- Kyle Councilor Kyle Murray, Acadia Center (GMAC)
- Kathryn Wright (chair), Barr Foundation (GMAC)
- Mary Wambui, Planning Office for Urban Affairs (external)
- Rev. Vernon Walker, Clean Water Action (external)
- Erin Engstrom, Eversource (EDC)

Discussion and Vote:

Councilor Sarah Bresolin Silver moved to appoint the working group as presented. Councilor Kyle Murray seconded. The motion carried unanimously. Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy thanked the group for nominating themselves to participate.

5. Key Updates on ESMP Review Period

Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy reviewed slide 6, which discussed the coordination of the Clean Energy Transmission Working Group (CETWG). Councilor Liz Anderson pointed out that the AGO appointee is the same for both the CETWG and the GMAC. Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy thanked Liz for the flag, and noted that it should not pose an issue. Councilor Kyle Murray asked whether there were concerns about having a quorum at the CETWG. Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy responded that the groups will be held as a joint public meeting to avoid violating public open meeting law.

Listening sessions have been scheduled for Monday, October 30, 6–7:30 p.m.; and Wednesday, November 1, noon to 1:30 p.m. There is no requirement to participate, but GMAC members are encouraged to listen. Councilor Larry Chretien asked for a calendar invite; DOER staff Julia Fox will make sure everyone has received the invitation. Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy reviewed slides 7–11.

- Slide 7: Timeline of GMAC agenda items.
- Slide 8: GMAC members are encouraged to use the template to record their recommendations so it's possible to consolidate all recommendations.
- Slide 9: Process for review and general format for today's and upcoming agendas for GMAC meetings.
- Slide 10: Process for questions and information requests. There is not time for the EDCs to vocally respond to questions that come up, as there is limited time during GMAC meetings. Meeting minutes will include a list of questions that summarize for the EDCs' response. Councilor Liz Anderson clarified that this is separate than the information request process; Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy confirmed.
- Slide 11: General format of agendas for ESMP review. Each section is roughly the same: 10 minutes of consultant presentation and 30 minutes of discussion.

6. Consultant Overview

Tim Woolf, consultant from Synapse, introduced the consulting group (slide 2 of consulting section of the deck).

Woolf shared an overview of initial impressions of the electric sector modernization plans (ESMPs). Given the differences in the way each electric distribution company (EDC) presents information, assumptions and inclusions in the data presented will vary across utilities. Projected capital spending over a ten-year period varies greatly: National Grid projects 190%, Eversource 107%, and Unitil 91%. Distribution rate base projections are covered in Section 7 of the ESMPs and will be discussed at a future GMAC meeting.

Slide 11 highlights non-wires alternatives (NWA) and virtual power plants (VPP)—EDCs shared how they use these options currently, but it was hard to tell whether future applications of these affect their numbers. May need to wait and see how VPPs influence ESMPs for 2030–2034.

Slides 12–14 highlight DER hosting capacity. Eversource shows the big picture and current capacity through 2035. These calculations are also done a little differently across the three utilities. National Grid shows on its website of hosting capacity in place today on an interactive map, but we didn't see as much about how proposed investments will affect that. Woolf would

hope to see that all these investments will lead to increased hosting capacity as per the goals. Unutil's DER hosting capacity is more granular, though it focused on current installed generation (kVa); there is not a lot of information about how current investments will maintain that kind of hosting capacity over time.

Slide 15 covers key items missing from ESMPs, including:

- **Net benefits to customers** in a way that can be monetized and quantified in such a way to be reviewed. These will be filed with the DPU in January 2024; the GMAC will not have much of an opportunity for review.
- **Metrics.** It would be helpful to see explicit metrics year by year to see whether the plans have met or exceeded metrics. Detailed metrics will be submitted in October, which will come before the GMAC for feedback.
- **Rate impacts.** These build off net benefit analyses. There is no estimate of impact on low-income customers. There is discussion about how particular measures will keep rates low, but there is no documentation to support this.

Slide 16 offers high-level questions to consider.

Woolf summarized that there is a lot to balance here, and all are important, but you can't have them all—at least not right away. He suggested the GMAC approach all of this with balance. He reiterated that the GMAC doesn't approve or reject plans; it just makes recommendations and suggestions. Its role is to identify elements GMAC members supports or disagree with. There is a role for providing guidance on how utilities should conduct ESMPs.

7. Section 3: Stakeholder Engagement

Jennifer Haugh, GreenerU, presented slides 20–26.

Discussion:

Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy: Her initial reaction to the Community Engagement Stakeholder Advisory Council (CESAG) is that we're very working group heavy—we have an equity working group with this and several other groups. We have some concerns about creating a new working group and wanted to explore options to utilize the GMAC structure itself.

Councilor Kathryn Wright, Barr Foundation, representing the environmental justice community: She acknowledges time management constraints of groups invited to participation of CESAG. There is a lot of time expected, but with no compensation. Other equity groups have a co-chair structure where the state or other public organization is part of leadership. She also had questions about engagement vs. education. With this scale of community engagement, how are EDCs going to staff that function? Will you be working with professional facilitators to manage that? Where is the staffing and professional development that will come with this outreach?

Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy: There is accountability in putting a working group together. She finds it very helpful to have either a deadline or a list of objectives. Those objectives almost always change, but one takeaway she had was what is the impact of this

working group going to have on changing the way ESMPs are done in the future? There does need to be more engagement and stakeholders to make a better process, but it's not well defined how accountability will be maintained within this structure.

Councilor Kathryn Cox-Arslan, New Leaf Energy, representing the distributed generation renewable energy industry: Section 3.7 talks about future stakeholder community engagement process, forecasting and solution alternatives; didn't see that fully described in there. How are we informing those elements of the ESMP going forward? How would this specific group of stakeholders would help inform that process?

Councilor Sarah Bresolin Silver, ENGIE North America, representing transmission-scale renewable energy: She liked seeing the technical sessions mentioned and look forward to hearing about which stakeholders are expected to be there with professional moderation. She is curious about how technical they're going to be—there are a lot of specific issues that industry groups talk about. She's also interested in hearing from the utilities about how they're engaging with their developer customers. CESAG is a great way to engage with the community and other stakeholders, but there isn't a lot of whether and how the EDCs are building relationships with developers going forward.

Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy: Speaking to technical vs. community—they are significantly different stakeholder groups with very different needs. There is some mention of translation, but we wanted to flag the need for a “plain English” translation as well. These are two very separate efforts.

Councilor Amy McGuire, Highland Electric Fleets, representing the electric vehicle industry: Another useful role between industry developers is educational: as we enter into the fleet electrification space, we spend a lot of time talking to customer base and utilities. There is a role for multi-directional stakeholder engagement to ensure that we are proactive about ensuring that upgrades are affordable and reliable.

Councilor Kyle Murray, Acadia Center, representing the environmental advocacy community: Pointing out “input from the GMAC” for CESAG membership, he hopes that they will take our recommendations, but he's concerned that EDCs are too much in the driver's seat.

Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy: Would anyone from GMAC be willing to take this on in partnership with the EDCs?

Councilor Kathryn Wright: She would have to think about it, but one of the primary drivers was thinking about accountability and engagement practices. She feels a little bit better when something is EDC-led when there is accountability built in and metrics are factored in.

Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy: She is hoping to see that such metrics are associated with this, which is tied to accountability. How do we measure the success of a group like this? Is the next ESMP better because of this group, and how does one figure that out?

Councilor Andy Sun, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, representing engineering expertise in interconnecting clean energy: He echoes that—important to have metrics and that

will help coordinate some competing priorities with multiple stakeholder groups. The metrics might integrate that together.

Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy: Metrics measure benefits—she is hoping to define that better; increasing hosting capacity to further the ability of EJ communities to electrify, but are there other direct benefits that could be measured and quantified? We would like to see that definition to communities be measured. Community members will expect that there will be other benefits.

Councilor Kyle Murray: He would also like to see some regular reporting to the GMAC, maybe quarterly, on the whole process and metrics, as opposed to an annual or every three years.

Councilor Liz Anderson, Massachusetts Office of the Attorney General, representing the Attorney General: Someone on staff flagged affordability metrics with all these investments. Connecticut is exploring this now, and it's something we can investigate further.

Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy: The EEAC working group and other groups have a lot of overlap with those. A lot of this has to do with large infrastructure; the fact that you have a smart meter is going to be the same conversation to the community members and that may not be as big a concern. There is an overload of working groups, and we have to be concerned about how these are being presented to the community. There shouldn't be a flood of flyers on multiple initiatives going out to the community; it would be helpful to unify communication to consumers. The hope with ESMPs would be to unify utilities' actions so we can anticipate docket fatigue (or phone call fatigue for consumers) when they want to be making only one decision.

Councilor Liz Anderson: Who would be responsible for coordinating all of that, given the many different working groups? DOER? A lot of work internally at the Commonwealth on equity is to make a working group of working groups—especially with EJ communities, they don't have the time to go to 12 meetings. Their input is essential, but so is valuing their time. Another option is to have the DOER coordinate, as they are members of all these working groups.

Councilor Kyle Murray: Would it be helpful for us to communicate with the Undersecretary of Environmental Justice and Equity and/or EJ working group that are out there? It would be helpful to get their input on this.

Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy: We met with her yesterday. These are all initial thoughts and reactions, but as we go back, we can go back to the raw material and come up with specific recommendations. In sum, is there a way to define this a little better, have outcome that's measured and is accountable and feeds back into the process? She encouraged everyone to think about that as they turn towards their recommendations.

8. Section 4: Current State of the Distribution System

Tim Woolf, Synapse, presented slides 28–42.

Discussion:

Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy: Our hopes were high for this chapter, because coming from a policy perspective, the plethora has been difficult to communicate to the audience. This is a step in the right direction, but maybe not where we want to end up.

DOER staff member Aurora Edington: She had aggregated a reading list of the types of information that are pointed to: reliability reports, resilience, annual reports, tariffs, etc. These are all things coming from different locations, which has been a problem in the past trying to figure out where this information lives. What we were kind of hoping for is this chapter could create a centralized source of data sources. New York does have a joint utility website with all the data, and we were hoping that this kind of chapter in an ESMP could be focused on helping the regular consumer in Massachusetts be able to understand the current state of the distribution system.

Councilor Kyle Murray: He agrees with that. He found himself at times that reading this section was a bit of information overload but could not pick apart what the information meant. There is a lot of information offered in certain areas, e.g., aging infrastructure. But there isn't enough context to help us translate what the utilities will need to do about these challenges. A little more there would be appreciated.

Councilor Kathryn Wright: On the aging infrastructure piece, she had a broader question of when something is an operating expense vs. when it becomes a grid modernization expense. She didn't find that articulation particularly clear across any of the plans. Information such as public EV chargers and locations would be helpful for the public to see.

Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy: Context or transparency is key—evaluations are hard to follow for assessing different substations. Connecting the equipment to the purpose the distribution system has would be helpful, e.g., poles and how their age affects their current usability. For example, where is this 100-year-old pole? This is only going to create more questions.

Councilor Kathryn Cox-Arslan: She appreciated this section. Something she would find helpful is more information about DER activity and a breakdown of that DER by region. There were some aggregated numbers and pie charts, but it doesn't differentiate between rooftop and ground-mounted PV. A little more detail would be helpful; she can provide some more recommendations. The other thing is it was good information about how the utilities address capacity deficiencies. Giving an indication of what it takes to replace that asset or transformer in terms of supply chain and permitting timelines would be great context, to embellish a little more on the current state before getting to the next chapters on solutions. This is just something to think about (which could be in later chapters).

Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy: Maybe this is looking at historic timelines for replacement or upgrades. Looking at the graphs, they're probably as accurate as they can be. There are a lot of projects that should be in the queue but aren't yet; the graph doesn't necessarily capture the larger challenge of adapting solar. She's not sure how to provide that as a recommendation, but connecting the Commonwealth's energy goals—solar, electrification of buildings—would be helpful to show how the current grid doesn't allow for development that Massachusetts would like to see.

Digaunto Chatterjee, representing Eversource: This is represented later.

Councilor Kyle Murray: A note in the key saying that the graph doesn't necessarily represent all the data would be helpful.

Councilor Kathryn Cox-Arslan: Withdrawal data would be helpful as a specific historic data point.

Councilor Alex Worsley, Enel North America, representing the transmission-scale renewable energy industry: It would help to talk more about DER adoption and energy efficiency and where these aspects are in the broader context of why things are in the places they are beyond the geographic constraints including incentive structures and such. This might be useful context to help set up later sections about where things are going.

Councilor Jonathan Stout, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, representing large commercial and industrial end-use customers: He appreciated a lot of imagery re: substation capacity, but is overall underwhelmed about the quality of the metrics. Is there more data that can be incorporated, such as high-energy-using facilities coming online?

Councilor Galen Nelson, Massachusetts Clean Energy Center, representing MassCEC: This may require greater collaboration, but there are several assumptions referenced in the data system section. It would be nice to start with where those assumptions are aligned across EDCs and why some were used.

Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy: This is a tough chapter—we want way more detail, but way broader. There are two conflicting goals: to have something purely explaining the context (barriers, big aspects of tech development that might be helping or hurting growth and development) and then a specific data set, e.g., an organization or clearinghouse of details.

Digaunto Chatterjee: The beginning of chapters are summaries, but perhaps the GMAC can give some advice on the first one or two pages of the chapter. Ultimately, they could create a compiled version.

Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy: She reiterated that due to time constraints, the GMAC will be commenting generally, not redlining.

Carol Sedewitz, representing National Grid: It's good feedback for us to try and bring out explanations and definitions.

Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy: There's a challenge in determining if the ESMP is additional or the new business as usual.

Councilor Amy McGuire: It would be helpful to understand how certain energy efficiency investments have made a difference in some areas, and it would be helpful to see how that has impacted reliability, etc. It is a lot of information to layer in as we go.

9. Section 5: Five- and Ten-Year Demand Forecast

Ben Havumaki, Synapse, presented slides 44–60.

Discussion:

Councilor Sarah Bresolin Silver: The utilities had sections related to battery energy storage; she fully recognizes the complexity of storage. She thought it was interesting to see that in the Eversource plan they do not make any downward forecasts if batteries are customer-owned; it would be easier for them to analyze that if they were utility-owned. There will hopefully be a lot of batteries developed in Massachusetts that are customer owned. This might be an interesting discussion at one of the technical sessions to put a little more thought into that. The EDCs are currently adopting different technologies to improve operations, so she understands that the technology might not be there yet. Thus, maybe this is something to discuss further in a future plan, but she still thinks it's a missed opportunity not to consider all of the storage.

Councilor Kyle Murray: He appreciates the concept of adding in sensitivities. Some of the targets on adoption of technology don't seem particularly ambitious. For example, National Grid heat pump adoption numbers don't hit about 100,000 total until about 2029. This is in line with the CECP phased electrification scenario, but National Grid bounces back and forth between the all-options and phased scenarios—the former is more ambitious, the latter less so. He would appreciate the all-options scenario and more consistency there.

Councilor Larry Chretien: He hopes it's possible for the EDCs or consultants to pull together cost drivers and savings, as EEAC has; what are the key drivers, assumptions we can make across the EDCs for where the capital expenses must be. This gets back to sensitivities. Based on what he's read, the plans are not as ambitious or aggressive as he'd like to see regarding managed charging and EVs. There will be some sticker shock when these EVs come online. He also saw some questions about demand response, so he would like to look more at that. There is not a lot of discussion about rate impacts in the plans; these things tie together. He wants to point out that the load is going to increase, and the EVs and heat pumps will pay for themselves. Who's going to look at whether load is increasing as revenue is increasing as well? What is the net effect? The cadence matters, strategy matters, so we may be in a situation where we can do this. But key is whether we can at least shift demand on the EVs to get through this.

Councilor Kathryn Wright: She seconds the comments on sensitivity. There are some potential gaps between ESMPs: Unutil didn't account for electrification of appliances, but these were factored into other ESMPs. District geothermal wasn't accounted for in the demand forecast. She wants to make sure that all the other drivers for demand forecasting is accounted for.

Councilor Jonathan Stout: Eversource was the only EDC that mentioned City policy, specifically BERDO. Are EDCs factoring in the retirement of combined heat and power (CHP) plants? On National Grid's demand response, there was a small note on the use of generators for demand response—he thinks this conflicts with the state's goals of eliminating fossil fuels.

Councilor Amy McGuire: Looking at EVs, bidirectional charging, managed charging, and the light-duty residential sector, there's a huge opportunity across all manufacturers to enable that. Virtual power plants (VPPs) are not expected until the 2030–2040 timeframe and feels very far

afield. Would like to see that considered in the 5–10-year timeframe. Other states are moving much more quickly, and Massachusetts is in a good place to keep up with that.

Councilor Andy Sun: In terms of certainty and forecast, would the EDCs consider putting a description of confidence level of forecast? Maybe more to the previous section, more here about bidirectional flows would help. Do EDCs see barriers in terms of their current facilities to achieve more bidirectional flows? Would solar PV pose more challenges to the grid?

Jeremy Koo (designee for Julie Curti), Metropolitan Area Planning Council, representing municipal or regional interests: Echoing some of the comments about looking at increasing sensitivities; he appreciated that there was a good bit of detail. There is a section in Eversource's plan that he found interesting where there is an acknowledgment that there's a bit of a tension between the state and Mass Save's push for broader market electrification and the paced, targeted, and sequenced approach. Looking at more aggressive scenarios, it would be concerning for the plans to not take those into account, given that we don't want to see the level of electrification needed to meet the Commonwealth's objectives and be stonewalled because this wasn't considered in certain regions to accelerate more rapidly than the sensitivities modeled here.

Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy: She would love to see so much more, but not in the next two months. It would be helpful to think about qualitative scenarios here. Non-utility storage could help charge on peak, and if not, it could have impacts on data. Returning to the recommendation of what the GMAC can do in future ESMPs, is there a way we can acknowledge them in this ESMP? That one of our takeaways is that this is a conservative forecast, which it should be, but it helps us from a policy perspective to understand where those pressure points are for future policy. Again, this is the chicken and egg problem—are we forecasting policy or trying to build a grid to develop policy? Which comes first? This is complex and there is no easy answer.

Digaunto Chatterjee: There are a lot of details on impacts on managed charging and demand response in Sections 8 and 9, conversations on specific scenarios of what that will translate to. In general, it's maybe qualitatively not that difficult at this point to make assessments of 10% managed charging would result in X changes. We can speak on that high level and make qualitative assessments. But later chapters have more detail on demand response on heating electricity, etc.

Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy: There is a challenge of where information belongs—may need to balance that with having a reference to another chapter as needed.

Tim Woolf: He would have liked to have seen information about how the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) may change these technologies.

Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy: Policy models (e.g., the Clean Energy and Climate Plan, or CECP) aren't econometric models. They may require some mixing and matching.

Councilor Kathryn Cox-Arslan: She would envision for future ESMP iterations that the GMAC would be instrumental in determining the targets that the EDCs want to see, and what are the

sensitivities, and then what are the stakeholder impacts on this. Would be helpful to incorporate stakeholder feedback on those forecasts based on local knowledge.

Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy: This is consistent with our 2075 ideas as well.

Digaunto Chatterjee: The econometric forecast for solar in Eversource is only as it relates to spatially allocating where the land is best suited for an IRR analysis—cost of land, permitting, interconnection, for instance. But it is directly in alignment with the CECP as it relates to how much needs to be built to accommodate those goals all the way out to 2050.

10. ESMP Review Process Check: Did This Work Today?

Discussion on Process:

Councilor Kyle Murray: He thought it went well for what we're doing. Time constraints are unfortunate; we would have liked to read the whole thing and comment, but it's starting well. He appreciated the context that the consultants provided; that was exceptionally helpful.

Councilor Sarah Bresolin Silver: She agreed that getting the consultants' perspectives to confirm what we're thinking through or highlight what we're missing. We're doing the best we can. It's given us the opportunity to say what we needed to say. Even if we are making comments that are addressed somewhere else in the plan, hopefully it's less work for the EDCs if that's the case.

Councilor Amy McGuire: She agreed that it was helpful to have consultants and appreciates that the EDCs are listening in and getting to absorb it all. One thought is to the extent that we have GMAC members representing different areas, if there is something consultants could squeeze into their presentations regarding these particular sectors, it would be interesting to specifically reflect solar, large storage, etc.—though granted it's the council members' roles to represent those different perspective.

Discussion on Goals:

Councilor Kathryn Cox-Arslan: What does the adjudicative docket ultimately look like?

Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy: That is a very good question and is not yet addressed. It may be helpful to talk through this a bit more. What does an approval of the ESMP look like?

This may be a good conversation for the GMAC in terms of developing policy recommendations and stakeholder outreach. This may also impact the makeup of the GMAC.

Carol Sedewitz: She appreciates the GMAC reading this.

Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy: Thanks to EDCs for putting these together. GMAC is trying to help make these better; we are hoping to be a policy driver instead of a policy barrier.

The next GMAC meeting is Thursday, September 28, 1–4 p.m. All GMAC members are encouraged to input their comments into a template prepared by the DOER. Questions about that

should be directed to Julia Fox. Comments will be consolidated and organized, and utilities will be informed after that along with the public on the website.

11. Close

Deputy Commissioner Joanna Troy, as Chair, adjourned the meeting at 3:56 p.m.

Meeting materials:

- Meeting agenda
- Meeting presentation slides
- Draft minutes from August 10, 2023, GMAC meeting
- Draft minutes from August 25, 2023, GMAC executive committee meeting
- Equity Working Group charter
- GMAC flyer
- EEAC final resolution 10-27-21

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer A. Haugh

GreenerU