

GSEP Working Group

Meeting Date: October 2, 2023 (held virtually)

Minutes

Final Minutes – Approved at October 20, 2023 Meeting

Attendees:

- Jamie Van Nostrand, Chair, Department of Public Utilities (“DPU”)
- Carol Pieper, Senior Counsel, Legal Division, DPU
- Representative Jeffrey Roy, House Chair, Joint Committee on Telecommunications, Utilities, and Energy
- Audrey Horst, Research Director, Senator Michael Barrett’s office
- Mary Gardner, Assistant Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General (“AGO”)
- Sharon Weber, Deputy Division Director, Air & Climate Programs, Department of Environmental Protection (“MassDEP”)
- Amy Smith, Director, Gas Division, National Grid
- Kevin Kelley, Vice President of Gas Operations, Eversource Energy
- Tatiana Roc, President, Liberty
- Kristen Jardin, Director of Rates and Regulatory Affairs, Liberty
- R.J. Ritchie, Attorney, Liberty
- Robert Hevert, President, Unutil
- Christopher Leblanc, Vice President, Gas Operations, Unutil
- Sue Kristjansson, President and Chief Operating Officer, Berkshire Gas
- Alex Soter, Berkshire Gas
- Jenifer Bosco, Senior Attorney, National Consumer Law Center (“NCLC”)
- Jonathan Buonocore, Assistant Professor, Environmental Health, Boston University
- Nicole Horberg Decter, Attorney, United Steelworkers, Local 12012 (“USW”)
- Pete Dion, General Manager, Wakefield Municipal Gas and Light Department

- Heather Takle, President and CEO, PowerOptions
- Audrey Schulman, Co-Founder and Co-Executive Director, HEET

Moderator – **Carol Pieper, DPU** - Welcome. Noted that meeting is likely being recorded via Zoom by member of public. Discussed procedural matters, including notice publication. Took roll call. Approving draft minutes from September 19 meeting.

Per agenda, we will start with discussion regarding written report that is required from Working Group and recommendations for regulatory and legislative changes with respect to:

- Safety and reliability
- Equity and affordability
- Public health and meeting greenhouse gas emission limits
- Opportunities for utility-scale non-pipeline alternatives
- Cost recovery component, including embedded costs, potential stranded assets, and opportunity costs and benefits

Compiled all redlines into one document to pull up and discuss. Opened it up for suggestions for how the group should handle writing the report. No suggestions offered at this time. Proceeded to pull up the redlines to go through as a group.

Group discussion on compiled redlines:

Audrey Schulman, HEET Schulman, HEET – Noting there is a fair amount of difference of opinions in the group. Concern regarding getting all to agree to redline suggestions or the same direction forward. Wonder if there’s a way to include all the different ideas and potentially allow for people to look at redlines and revise them given all the information received so far.

Carol Pieper, DPU – The redlines are posted to the website. Notes there is quite a bit of big picture consensus, with only one or two suggestions where there may be some argument on. But overall there is a good amount of consensus.

Jenifer Bosco, NCLC – Suggests identifying areas of commonality where we have consensus, then including another section highlighting where consensus remains to be achieved and ideas for those topics.

Carol Pieper, DPU – Anyone else have ideas? Noting none. We’ll move on to compiled redline, and I will share my screen.

Representative Roy, House Chair – Is the same available on the online link?

Carol Pieper, DPU – Yes, it is on the website and is called ‘compiled redlines.’

Carol Pieper, DPU – I want to point out a few things. Several people proposed edits to section G.L. c. 25 section 1A, but I didn't include those in the redlines because that is not just GSEP but governs everything DPU does. So, changing that would be outside the scope of our directives. With respect to changes to GSEP itself, I'll start with the suggestions related to repair and retirement.

Audrey Schulman, HEET – Believes there are some edits to GSEP statute outside of this compilation. Suggests including an appendix to the report to cover things outside of GSEP law and beyond for what other people might have covered to make sure it's all captured.

Carol Pieper, DPU - We did include your redlines. Notes there was lots of commonality. Where there was consensus, we used Senator Barrett's edits. We also used broader edits rather than the more refined edits. We did not attempt to put comments in because it was not feasible.

Audrey Schulman, HEET – Doesn't know if other people have things outside of what's here?

Heather Takle, PowerOptions – Suggesting that the report should be the redlines together with the comments. We could outline the required sections of the report and have conversations with suggested points made from the group. Include where there is disagreement and incorporate the comments outside of redlines in different sections of report.

Carol Pieper, DPU – That makes sense. So, looking at the compiled redlines, many people added repair and retirement.

Chair Van Nostrand, DPU – We thought compiling these redlines was a good way to see where there is agreement. The intent was that as we go through and discuss the revisions, if there is a different view, the proponent could provide a brief explanation of what their revision intended to achieve and we would include that in the report. There appears to be a good amount of consensus, so suggests organizing by issue and providing an opportunity for people to explain any opposing views. Notes that this is all about providing recommendations to the legislature on how to update GSEP to achieve climate goals, so stating what the recommended changes are and why, and explaining any dissenting views, is a good way to structure the report to capture everyone's input to legislature.

Carol Pieper, DPU – Several people suggested adding language to minimize stranded assets in the definition of eligible infrastructure by taking language from G.L. 25 section 1A. I think it was Senator Barrett and some other who recommended this. Anyone have comments on eligible infrastructure section?

Kristin Jardin, Liberty – Are stranded assets defined later on? Unclear on how that'd be done?

Carol Pieper, DPU – Stranded assets are not defined.

Kristin Jardin, Liberty – Wondering how would we demonstrate how a company would comply?

Heather Takle, PowerOptions – Question about whether we defined cost effective. Are we taking in the whole life analyses? Do we need to if we didn't previously?

Carol Pieper, DPU – It may be that we need to define more terms.

Audrey Schulman, HEET – it doesn't say customer definition should include thermal customers.

Carol Pieper, DPU - We may need to have a bigger discussion on non-pipe alternatives before we change the definition of a customer.

Audrey Schulman, HEET – Discussion of gas utilities' option to sell non-combusting thermal energy. No one wants gas in their house, they want heat.

Carol Pieper, DPU – Those are interesting points.

Amy Smith, National Grid – Making distinction on 'increased' capacity. Sometimes we replace pipe with larger pipe when need to upsize pipe. For example, we may need larger pipe when replacing cast iron with plastic, thereby increasing capacity because the material is larger, but not necessarily increasing customers. Noting this nuance in engineering.

Christopher Leblanc, Util – Also with GSEP program, eliminating low pressure and upgrading to higher pressure increases capacity of the system.

Chair Van Nostrand, DPU – Keep in mind, the language states “for principal purpose of increasing...” So long as it's not for the principal purpose, shouldn't have problem with the language.

Audrey Schulman, HEET – It would also be great to have something about the obligation to serve being met. Non-combusting thermal and gas should be considered equivalent since otherwise gas utilities are stuck in catch 22 and are not able to provide service to meet mandate. Wonder if there should be something about not expanding gas infrastructure. All could agree about the ability to provide thermal service since otherwise in the non-emitting future, they would not be able to serve existing customers.

Mary Gardner, AGO – Looking at paragraph that mentions advanced leak repair and repair added again under definition of plan. Wants repair to be more of a priority, not just an option. Suggests changing “may” to “must” to make clear repair is a priority to avoid massive investments in infrastructure that won't be in use in 30 years.

Chair Van Nostrand, DPU –With respect to this issue about obligation to serve, and the definition of gas companies/customers, could Audrey or someone take a shot at drafting that? If we consider non-emitting alternatives as non-pipe alternatives, then how would that fit together? It raises questions of the obligation to serve as heat not necessarily natural gas. It would be nice to have definition as part of package to put in front of the legislature to consider making networked geothermal with ground source heat pumps an alternative path.

Pete Dion, Wakefield Municipal Gas and Light Department – Going back to Mary's comment to change “may” to “must” for evaluation of repair vs. replace; noting the situation where there is a section of pipe leaking in multiple locations. We use factors for the evaluation of whether to repair vs. replace such as looking at age of pipe. So yes, digging a single 4x4 hole

to repair one singular section of leak may be cheaper, but we need to look at the current and past leak history and the bigger picture when evaluating.

Nicole Decter, USW – Building on what Pete was saying, noting concerns with the definition of repair. Often on one street there could be multiple serious leaks and for public safety, we need to either repair immediately or replace, and replacing winds up being more efficient in the long term. So, we feel there needs to be definition in the statute of what repair means in this context. Because repair has not been included traditionally in the GSEP statute but is just part of the LDCs' everyday duties to keep infrastructure in good working order.

Carol Pieper, DPU – Noting a list of definitions needed.

Kevin Kelley, Eversource – Those were good points regarding repair. I'm nervous about making decisions for the operator with respect to replace vs. repair for public safety reasons. Would like clarification on new pipe for customer growth. Was the comment made around increasing pipe size for future expansion, or supplying gas to new customers?

Carol Pieper, DPU – Always considered statute to say can't be principal purpose to serve new customers; same goes for increasing pipeline capacity.

Jenifer Bosco, NCLC– I go back to what Chair Van Nostrand said about duty to serve and non-pipe alternative language. I'm wondering if there should be specific mention of electrification. Thermal can't replace every use of gas. Or say including but not limited to non-emitting thermal infrastructure?

Carol Pieper, DPU – Some people gave a much more specific definition of non-pipe alternative and we left it more broad as to what should go in.

Amy Smith, National Grid – I agree we should have a definition of repair vs. advanced leak repair. I note that some federal regulations mandate replacement. Actively corroding steel is required to be replaced within a 3-year time period to be in compliance with federal rules. The concept of risk must be a part of evaluation, and we take into account the various requirements of the GSEP statute when we make decisions.

Audrey Schulman, HEET – I was talking about not expanding infrastructure past where it's currently at. It's difficult to keep the discussion to just the GSEP statute because it's all interconnected so if we are going to try to get GSEP to meet state emissions mandates and not impose radical energy burdens on customers, we'll have to look more at the machinery of whole thing. We'll need to come up with an integrated energy planning method and come up with an algorithm with the maximum synergies to reduce costs; otherwise it will be more difficult. Also, can we say non-gas pipe alternatives instead of non-pipe alternatives? Noting that cast iron is most unsafe type of pipe and has been cut almost in half by the GSEP program; so safety has been increased since the program started.

Carol Pieper, DPU – There should be a non-gas pipe alternatives edit, as several people had suggested this.

Mary Gardner, AGO – I liked Audrey’s point on the question of repair vs. replace. I think this is an area where it feels like disagreement but maybe not to the extent it seems. I’m not suggesting repair instead of replace where it’s not the safest option, and I’m not asking to not be in compliance with federal law. I’m concerned with stranded asset costs for consumers and am suggesting we make repair be a focus, while understanding sometimes it’s not going to be the most appropriate course of action.

Audrey Horst, Senator Barrett’s Office – Question for Amy Smith: does repair of pipe not mitigate risk? Is there a statute addressing this?

Amy Smith, National Grid - Repair does not reduce risk because cast iron pipe is subject to breakage, and the rate is unpredictable. Sealing does nothing to prevent pipe from breaking during freeze thaw systems. Repairs leave in place the risk of breaking pipe. There is a history of cast iron breaks. I can send links if people want. And there is no specific statute regarding that risk reduction. We’re required indirectly through the federal pipeline safety rules to have a gas distribution pipeline integrity management plan (“DIMP”) and execute work in alignment with DIMP, which is part of the GSEP statute. The DIMP requires risk evaluation.

Nicole Decter, USW – One thing that is critical from the steel workers’ perspective. Workers are working on pipes and if they’re not safe, it’s an occupational hazard and hazard to the public. Failure to properly retire pipeline is extremely hazardous to the public and workers. Safety is served by responsible replacement; piecemeal doesn’t work here. Really reinforces what Amy Smith said because we’re going to be working on pipeline until it’s retired; so we need to make sure it’s safely operating and retired as members of public will be using it in some form for the next 30 years.

Audrey Schulman, HEET– The problem is not material of pipe, the problem is the gas. If we can replace gas with something safer that helps us move forward in a safer way for public health etc. When we talk about replacement, can we talk about something that is non-combusting that will be safer? I checked cast iron, which has been decreased from 4,000 miles to just over 2,000 miles by 2022. The amount of fatalities from 2003 to 2012 is 3 according to FIMSA, after that from 2013 to 2022, 2 deaths. There has been 10 billion spent so far to reduce that. Over 25 injuries also in that 2013 to 2022 timeframe, which came from Merrimack Valley gas disaster and that was from a GSEP replacement. So, a lot of injuries through GSEP. The problem is gas, so let’s move beyond it in a thoughtful way.

Carol Pieper, DPU – Looking at the definition of eligible infrastructure, DPU has always allowed repairs and retirements to be recovered because it’s part of replacing. Repair was there before, we’re just changing the location and codifying what we’ve been doing. I agree that non-gas pipeline alternatives should be changed.

Jonathan Buonocore, Boston University – Can we get definition on carbon based? Is it fuel that has carbon as part of chemical makeup or carbon as part of life cycle? Hydrogen derived from natural gas included here or no?

Jenifer Bosco, NCLC – We did not mean to include hydrogen; so we are open to a different term.

R.J. Ritchie, Liberty – with respect to first 2 romanettes, it generally seems we’re sort of straying from the intent of GSEP, especially with respect to romanette 2, consideration of targeted decommissioning. Given where we are with D.P.U. 20-80, it seems presumptuous to include language regarding decommissioning in the GSEP statute. Same thing with #1, citing “electrification.” The 3rd one is fine.

Amy Smith, National Grid – Regarding romanette #2 – the language that gives me pause is concerning the independent assessment. I recommend we remove the word independent and have it be assessment. My concern is around process and who would be doing the analysis of a non-pipe alternatives.

Audrey Schulman, HEET – I am confused by #2. There seems to be extra language of “consideration and incorporation Of of.” Is it that targeted decommissioning means partial and the other one means whole decommissioning? There is also decommissioning at the end; can the intent be described?

Jenifer Bosco, NCLC – No explanation for the extra of. In an effort to cover the whole landscape, mention targeted decommissioning. Not excluding possibility of further decommissioning. Language could be tightened. For parts 1 and 2, I support including as many suggestions we can provide to the legislature. It’s up to legislature to choose how to revise statute. Envisioning consultant or some outside party not part of utilities for the independent assessment.

Jonathan Buonocore, Boston University – Responding to point about #3, section 1A, we need to do #3 in order to meet other goals at the end of this, so I’m not sure how it’s presumptuous.

Carol Pieper, DPU – I’m not reading what you’re reading, so it may be an old version. Pointed to the website for the correct redline.

Nicole Decter, USW – I have concerns on subpart I and this notion of reasonable alternatives are to natural gas and its equivalents. Should be reasonable alternatives to status quo that enhance emissions reductions. There are many suggestions in D.P.U. 20-80 for emission reductions. This notion we’ll get there through non-combusting seems limiting. Should look at options for how plans can be created to significantly reduce emissions more efficient than status quo.

Audrey Schulman, HEET – If we don’t start now, we won’t make it. We need a plan to make it possible that works for everybody. I push back against what Nicole said. There are 2 other things I’m confused by: I thought “advanced leak repair” was allowed but not general repair paid for by GSEP. And is it possible to define non-emitting as non-combusting to make sure we don’t unintentionally do a regrettable substitute of some other combusting source to set us backwards or not meet mandates or expensive investment into infrastructure we don’t end up using.

Jenifer Bosco, NCLC – Addressing concerns about part 1 – non-combusting alternatives need to be considered.

R.J. Ritchie, Liberty – At the end of the definition of replacement, romanette 7 and 9 (new 8); “infeasible or no cost effective” language.

Carol Pieper, DPU – This is part of the disconnect, the redlines were provided by different people and we need to come to some understanding of which ones to use.

Chair Van Nostrand, DPU – 7 and 8 need to be combined to introduce notion that the utility has the burden to show it considered non-pipe alternatives.

Carol Pieper, DPU – The next redline for definition for project was simply to add repair and replacement as above. For putting a time limit on GSEPs, different people had different time limits and comments, so I went with comments provided by LEAN and NCLC because they gave an actual date.

Audrey Schulman, HEET – Does this mean all gas leak repairs are paid for by GSEP whether or not advanced leak repair?

Carol Pieper, DPU – Advanced leak repair was added by the legislature.

Audrey Schulman, HEET – I wonder, does this mean that all gas leak repairs would be paid for by GSEP. I don't think that was the intent of this language.

Carol Pieper, DPU – I don't think it was the intent either.

Audrey Schulman, HEET – So should we define as advanced leak repair each time?

Carol Pieper, DPU – I am adding this to the list of things that need definition.

Amy Smith, National Grid – We need to know if we're doing leak repair in lieu of replacement. Advanced leak repair can't be done on pipe eligible for GSEP because of the large diameter. Do we recover those costs? On timeline, are we putting a hard stop and after that time accelerated cost recovery is no longer an option? All accelerated recovery goes away after 2029?

Carol Pieper, DPU – I think that was the proposal.

Jenifer Bosco, NCLC – That was our position; to transition this to a planning docket without an accelerated cost recovery mechanism. But I could envision the date being moved up a bit.

Amy Smith, National Grid – Grid's version recommended no end date because to properly consider non-pipe alternatives, we may need more time. We'll need to work with customers and allow them opportunity to do work in their homes to remove them from the gas system. A hard stop date may limit this opportunity.

Audrey Schulman, HEET – I've heard throughout these meetings allowing accelerated cost recovery for utilities would be an incentive to move towards non-gas pipe alternatives. I'm thinking about how we have to annually increase the amount that must go towards non-gas pipe alternatives. Not in terms of money but a greater percentage of street segments must be non-combusting alternatives. So utilities understand how quickly they must move forward.

Carol Pieper, DPU – Are there any other comments on this section? The next redline is to add repair and leak prone, environmental justice and greenhouse gas, and requiring companies to support demonstration of non-gas pipe alternatives. Are there any comments on these?

Kristin Jardin, Liberty – for #8, will GHG only apply for non-pipe alternatives, not for all GSEP projects? For non-pipe alternatives that's doable but that would be very time intensive for all GSEP projects.

Carol Pieper, DPU – The next one is a continuation of C, adding a summary. Currently companies have to file every 5 years, and during the next 10 years they'd have to provide a summary.

Audrey Schulman, HEET – I haven't yet looked carefully through all these suggested edits. Can we offer more comments after this meeting?

Carol Pieper, DPU – Definitely. I will change the edits to all be one color so it's easier to read. Everyone can use that as a base and come back and say what they feel are nonstarters so we can see what we agree on and where there is disagreement.

Audrey Schulman, HEET – I'm stuck on the first paragraph of C. I wonder if all repairs of any kind are included in this, does GSEP end up paying for all gas leak repairs? Does leak prone meter set mean any meter connected to leak prone infrastructure?

Amy Smith, National Grid – I don't think I'd put leak prone in here for cost recovery purposes. When replacing main and associated services, if we need to put in new meter set, it may need to be replaced not necessarily because the meter is leak prone, so I suggest removing that.

Sharon Weber, MassDEP – The agencies put in leak prone. Utilities are already required to replace meter sets every 7 years. This 'every 7-year replacement' is not replacement through GSEP. So may require a fine tuning of the wording – but yes, the only ones that are replaced are because they're attached to leak prone pipe.

Amy Smith, National Grid – Clarifying meters replaced every 7 years not meter sets.

Sharon Weber, MassDEP – There is no overlap?

Amy Smith, National Grid – No, meters are not included in GSEPs, it's the piping that goes up to the meter.

Carol Pieper, DPU – Next is Section D. The redlines removed lost and unaccounted for and replaced it with emissions. Adds language for use of low carbon. Thoughts?

Audrey Schulman, HEET – Low carbon is something that might be changed, I'm still reading though.

Carol Pieper, DPU – Next is Section E, where DPU determines whether reasonable, safe, and reliable. Low carbon change?

Nicole Decter, USW – Steelworkers don't agree with taking out the word "low carbon." We need to be using all available technology. This includes no carbon not just low carbon.

Carol Pieper, DPU – Next is Section F, which changed language regarding the cap from 1.5 percent to 3 percent. DPU has already found 3 percent is appropriate. Next are Sections H and I. Audrey do you want to explain.

Audrey Schulman, HEET – Can we go back to Section E, and go a bit slower.

Jonathan Buonocore, Boston University – Looking at very top of document, the section on eligible infrastructure. With respect to the goals referenced earlier, I'm concerned about equity in using low carbon or offsets. Some will have and some won't, so it seems to go against equity.

Carol Pieper, DPU – Those redlines were added by Senator Barrett, and is parroting G.L. c. 25 sec 1A.

Jonathan Buonocore, Boston University – I don't know the interplay between c. 25 sec 1A and c. 164. We need to think about the equity of who is going to get what if low and no carbon are both on the table.

Carol Pieper, DPU – c. 164 only applies to GSEP, while c. 25 1A governs the DPU's mandate for every decision. So, one is overarching, and one only applies to GSEP.

Jonathan Buonocore, Boston University – Then I'm concerned about Section D and its impact on the overarching goals. If some people have some gas and some have no gas, then it doesn't meet the definition of equity.

Chair Van Nostrand, DPU – Good catch. I think to Jonathan's point, we have a more comprehensive list above and less comprehensive list, so we need to make sure we're not missing the equity piece in Section D and be careful not to create an implication that equity doesn't flow through every subsection.

Audrey Schulman, HEET – Agreed. Given the rising energy burden, this could be catastrophic in terms of equity and safety. In terms of Section D, low carbon is not a term I can get behind. Think we should go towards non-combusting. For Section E, safe and reliable interconnection of 'what'? Fuel resources is the wrong term to use because we're moving off of combusting fuels towards renewables and energy efficiency.

Carol Pieper, DPU – I'll give everyone an opportunity to read Section H and I.

Audrey Schulman, HEET – For the point on 3 percent of revenue – does anyone want to discuss? It's supposed to be between 1.5 and 3 percent. What are pros and cons?

Carol Pieper, DPU – The statute says 1.5 percent or what DPU deems appropriate. DPU determined 3 percent is appropriate, so I plugged that in to match what we currently do.

Audrey Schulman, HEET – I note that things change, and legislative language is hard to adjust. So should 3 percent be left in as firm number or should we leave it as evaluated by the DPU. So, should we change it to “as evaluated by” or “as set by”?

Jenifer Bosco, NCLC – My question about Section H is about performance-based incentives. Are we anticipating this is on top of accelerated cost recovery through GSEP or in lieu of?

Audrey Schulman, HEET – Maybe it could be more clear, that funding of performance based incentives is not paying for non-emitting thermal energy infrastructure.

Mary Gardner, AGO – I agree with some of the concerns about additional financial incentives and that it’s a confusing paragraph. GSEP is expensive. We want rates to go down, so we are not in favor of accelerated cost recovery. Maybe we need to revisit the 3 percent revenue cap in light of climate legislation and determine if we can reduce costs to ratepayers in the energy transition and achieve the Commonwealth’s goals. We would like to see this in the statute and will suggest adding language to this effect.

Nicole Decter, USW – We don’t generally talk about cost recovery we want companies to receive. The steelworkers’ position is that without accelerated cost recovery, companies are not likely to maintain infrastructure in the way they should. It’s a costly proposition, so without the incentive, it’s easy for things to fall into disrepair.

Audrey Schulman, HEET – That language could be tightened. To Mary’s comment about decreasing costs on customers and meeting safety components, as Nicole discussed, it’s important to strongly incentivize to move off of gas in a way that costs the least amount and maintains safety. Decommissioning is a huge thing, while using non-combusting alternatives. Can we do this through incentives? Do we add in performance based revenue?

Chair Van Nostrand, DPU – I see the broader issue. The objective is to align utilities’ financial interests and what’s best for customers and greenhouse gas (“GHG”) emissions reductions. Aligning incentives may be the best way to get utilities on board, but not in addition to accelerated recovery. Maybe a similar mechanism that is performance based to achieve transition more quickly. We’d need to design in a way to align financial interests with safety improvements and GHG emissions reductions. Can we put these performance incentive mechanisms in place to align these goals and financial interests?

Carol Pieper, DPU – The last one is Section I, developing standards to inform decisions by gas companies, which was proposed by HEET.

Chair Van Nostrand, DPU – In the 20-80 docket, we are looking at these kinds of things more broadly with respect to the role of gas utilities going forward and joint planning between electric and gas. Also the role of geothermal with GSEPs. So I’m wary of putting something in here that we might be addressing in D.P.U. 20-80.

Carol Pieper, DPU – I will send out the redline to everyone and we discuss at the upcoming October 20 meeting. Be prepared to look at the redline and make a list of issues and agreements for discussion at the next meeting, along with any other suggested agenda ideas. We have some

agenda items for November meetings. Sharon Weber and the gas companies will present some information once the Oct 30th GSEPs come in. Are there any other agenda ideas for Oct 20?

Audrey Schulman, HEET – I asked Dorie Seavy if she could report on her calculations on cost of GSEP from this point on if that is of interest, and she could make that timeframe.

Jenifer Bosco, NCLC – The utilities could present affordability data for residential customers, and the impact of the current system on affordability?

Carol Pieper, DPU – Anything the companies are planning on presenting will be in November.

Mary Gardner, AGO – I would also love to hear from Dorie Seavy. And to have a conversation about who will be writing the report and the logistics of that.

Amy Smith, National Grid – I reiterate the offer for utilities to present on GSEP and gas safety.

Carol Pieper, DPU – Can we do this in November?

Amy Smith, National Grid – Yes.

Audrey Schulman, HEET – The applied economics clinic will have finished its report on comparative costs of gas customer bills over time vs. networked geothermal bills over time. We could ask them to report on this in November?

Nicole Decter, USW – Would like the opportunity to present on safety issues and would talk with gas companies beforehand. Would give comparisons when thinking about repair vs replacement and the utility of GSEP for better understanding of what's happening on the ground.

Audrey Schulman, HEET – Is it possible for HEET to present after seeing the other presentations on safety to offer a viewpoint based on those presentations? Perhaps Jonathan could help with that? So, after the November presentations.

Carol Pieper, DPU – Are there any other agenda ideas? I will get back to individuals on each of these agenda items and will get the next notice out for the Oct 20th meeting.

Audrey Schulman, HEET – Does anyone have thoughts on who will write the report? I think the current assumption is that DPU will write it.

Carol Pieper, DPU – The report is supposed to be presented to the DPU and the legislature, so it seems odd for DPU to write it.

Audrey Schulman, HEET – How is it normally done?

Chair Van Nostrand, DPU, DPU – I'm on another working group where some members have volunteered to write certain sections of the report. Seems like just a brief explanation of suggested changes would be good. And we could structure the report to say what our proposed legislative changes are and the proponents of those changes would explain what the changes are intended to do. And then others who have suggested alternative paths can weigh in as well so

that each member of the group could articulate their positions. Carol has aggregated all the redlines, which does good job of outlining where the points of possible disagreement could be. And we give a summary of our takeaways for legislative changes.

Audrey Schulman, HEET – I am happy to help with the report.

Chair Van Nostrand, DPU – Going back to Mary’s point; one thing that might not be captured is ceasing expedited rate treatment on GSEP. Where that would go is Section D. This may be a place for proponents of that position to explain and any other perspectives. Stop providing accelerated treatment and it would be a rate-based recovery subject to general rate proceedings. We’d need to find where to articulate this point in the report.

Mary Gardner, AGO – Agreed.

Carol Pieper, DPU – The next meeting Friday, Oct 20th from 10 am to noon. Thanks.