#	1. Respondent		2. Select a preferred policy path for subjecting to cost and benefit analysis, or create your own path by selecting "other", identifying the policy path closest to your preferred policy path, along with your proposed modifications to that approach.	
	Name:	Company:	Response	Custom Policy Path (please specify one of the above paths as well as preferred modifications to the approach)
15	Charlie Harak	National Consumer Law Center	3. Orderly Market Evolution	
14	Liam Holland	N/A	Custom Policy Path	Primarily the "sustained growth adapting to market changes" model for rooftop/smaller systems associated with onsite load. The "competitive solicitations" model for "large" projects, especially those unaffiliated with load at or near the facility. Modifying both to some degree in order to capture benefits of federal tax incentives. Modifying both market segments in order to incentive solar development where they support and enhance needs of distribution system.
13	Amy Rabinowitz	National Grid	Custom Policy Path	National Grid fully supports competitive solicitations for large-scale solar installations within a defined budget in order to contain costs for electricity customers. Such an approach will automatically allow the price paid for solar output to adjust to the market conditions and tax incentives available. This could be paired with either a Declining Block Incentive or cost-based standard PBI (with variations as appropriate by size and location) for smaller solar installations, as consistent with the models in Rhode Island and New York. Other aspects of a preferred policy path would be to enable and appropriately incent solar owners to provide grid support services (such as voltage support or load relief), when possible, and a rapid, orderly transition to the new model.
12	Christina Fisher	State Sen. Ben Downing	No Opinion	
11	Katie Rever (stand in for Fred Zalcman)	Solar Energy Industries Association	Custom Policy Path	A combination of 'sustained growth adapting to market changes' and 'orderly market evolution' with the following characteristics: a MW block program with medium to long-term visibility on future incentive levels that generally decline overtime but are able to react (up or down) to market signals based on known and transparent formulas.
10	Janet Gail Besser	New England Clean Energy Counc	Custom Policy Path	A combination of 'sustained growth adapting to market changes' and 'orderly market evolution' with the following characteristics: a MW block program with medium to long-term visibility on future incentive levels that generally decline overtime but are able to react (up or down) to market signals based on known and transparent formulas.
9	Camilo Serna	Eversource Energy	Custom Policy Path	Eversource continues to emphasize that any selected policy path needs to accomplish the following goals: * Ensure existing net metering and virtual net metering rules are replaced with a new rate design that properly recognizes today's environment and ensures the principle of rate equity among customers. * Ensure solar incentives are set through competitive and transparent processes. * Ensure Massachusetts is not paying above market costs for solar, especially compared to other states in the region. * Set budgets to provide transparency regarding the investment in solar development in Massachusetts.
8	Paul Brennan	Office of MA Attorney General	2. Competitive Solicitations	
7	Robert RIo	AIM	Custom Policy Path	If i had to chose of the paths it would be 2 - Competitive Solicitations and 6 - Prioritize Distribution. However a far more preferred approach is to return to a market where solar is valued exactly what it is worth. For instance, ideally, solar customers would only get credit for the kWh they are avoiding at the time they are avoiding, while still paying for T&D. There would be variable rates throughout the day based on how much power the competition would be - which is the marginal cost of power. This could be done with smart meters or based on some averages until smart meters become common. It is odd that the DPU is moving to TVR when a basic service customer purchases power, but when it comes to selling power back to the grid, the person gets basic service rates no matter the time of day. Eliminating the T&D from the net metering would avoid minimum bills since the person would be paying for T&D and would still have an incentive to use less. There could still be some variation with regards to locational pricing. In absence of that however, 2 and 6. The proponents keep saying the costs have come down but the subsidies still remain high

#	1. Respondent		2. Select a preferred policy path for subjecting to cost and benefit analysis, or create your own path by selecting "other", identifying the policy path closest to your preferred policy path, along with your proposed modifications to that approach.	
	Name:	Company:	Response	Custom Policy Path (please specify one of the above paths as well as preferred modifications to the approach)
6	Larry Aller	Next Step Living	Custom Policy Path	Similar to #4, with the following modifications: A combination of 'sustained growth adapting to market changes' and 'orderly market evolution' with the following characteristics: a MW block program with medium to long-term visibility on future incentive levels that are able to react (up or down) to market signals based on known and transparent formulas, with the goal of eventually declining to establish a self-sustaining market, with no incentives. -Different definitions for small vs. large solar segments, with no distinction based on behind the meter or not, just a delineation based on size: <1MW AC: Small, Over 1MW AC: Large -Virtual net metering is not changed from existing policy -Minimum bill is sent to DPU for consideration as a rate case, with limitation of maximum value being no more than $10 at any point in the future -Any "value of solar" analysis drives a "value of solar credit", rather than a "value of solar tariff" - perhaps a minor point, but may be important for tax purposes
5	Eric Krathwohl	Senator Tarr Appointee - Ipswich - Rich May	5. Maximize federal incentives w/ Managed Growth Boost + Sustainable Growth	
4	Lisa Podgurski	IBEW 103	Custom Policy Path	A combination of 'sustained growth adapting to market changes' and 'orderly market evolution' with the following characteristics: a MW block program with medium to long-term visibility on future incentive levels that generally decline overtime but are able to react (up or down) to market signals based on known and transparent formulas.
3	David Colton	Town of Easton	4. Sustained Growth Adapting to Market Changes	
2	William Stillinger	PV Squared (SEBANE rep.)	Custom Policy Path	A combination of 'orderly market evolution' (3) and 'sustained growth adapting to market changes' (4) with the following characteristics: a MW block program with medium to long-term visibility on future incentive levels that generally decline overtime but are able to react (up or down) to market signals based on known and transparent formulas. In addition I ask that the consultants consider the merits of the proposal submitted by a number of solar advocates to the task force on February 20, 2015 titled "Fair Solar Policy Framework".
1	Angie O'Connor	MA DPU	Custom Policy Path	Orderly Market Evolution - declining block, modified as indicated by the responses to the remaining questions in this survey ***The Department seeks to promote solar growth while protecting the interests of ratepayers. The Department's choices for modeling preferences in this survey do not reflect the Department's preferences for any particular option as a final recommendation to the legislature. Rather, the options chosen have been selected in order to compare diverse policy elements that differ from the base case model. Furthermore, the selection of "Top Choice" and "Second Choice" does not indicate the Department's preference of one option over the other. Rather, these are the options among those presented that the Department suggests be considered in modeling to compare diverse policy elements.*** ***(this disclaimer was included in DPU's response to all questions, but has been repeated here once for readability)***

Summary for Top/Second Questions

Top Choice	
Second Choice	
Not of Interest	
Additional Not Of Interest (from Comments)	
2nd Scalar Factor	50%
1st or 2nd (weighted 0.5)	
Not of Interest	

Summary for 'Consider' Questions

Strongly Consider	
Consi	
der	
Don't Consider	
Consider Scalar Fa	50%
Strongly Consider or Consider (weighted)	
Don't Consider	

#	1. Respondent		3. Type of Incentive (Small Solar Market)				
	Name:	Company:	Tradable SRECs	PBI	Up-front Payments	No Opinion	Comments
15	Charlie Harak	National Consumer Law Center	Not of Interest	Top Choice	Second Choice		
14	Liam Holland	N/A		Top Choice		Second Choice	Strongly consider a continued up-front rebate for small residential systems like the commonwealth solar program in addition to the PBI.
13	Amy Rabinowitz	National Grid	Not of Interest	Top Choice	Second Choice		National Grid favors PBI implemented through a tariff, and not through a long term contract. In addition, an incentive such as up-front payments should be borne by taxpayers, and ideally implemented through tax policy, rather than adding costs to electricity customers' bills.
12	Christina Fisher	State Sen. Ben Downing				Top Choice	
11	Katie Rever (stand in for Fred Zalcman)	Solar Energy Industries Association		Top Choice	Second Choice		please examine an incentive for residential and small commercial solar projects that is structured as an up-front payment to the system owner that would be based on the estimated generation of the system over its initial years of operation (e.g. ten years).
10	Janet Gail Besser	New England Clean Energy Counc		Top Choice	Second Choice		Please examine an incentive for residential and small commercial solar projects that is structured as an up-front payment to the system owner that would be based on the estimated generation of the system (PBI) over its initial years of operation (e.g. ten years).
9	Camilo Serna	Eversource Energy		Top Choice			
8	Paul Brennan	Office of MA Attorney General		Top Choice			
7	Robert RIo	AIM	Not of Interest	Top Choice	Second Choice		This is complicated - technically I am preferring a performance based system. However, it is more of a hybrid. I believe small solar should be paid at power rates, not including T&D. This would eliminate the need for any real program changes and eliminate the need for minimum bills. However, to the extent there may be short term need for additional money, the ACP money can be used as kind of a floater, to give money when needed on short term (upfront), but be removed as needed.

#	1. Respondent		3. Type of Incentive (Small Solar Market)				
	Name:	Company:	Tradable SRECs	PBI	Up-front Payments	No Opinion	Comments
6	Larry Aller	Next Step Living		Top Choice	Second Choice		Please examine an incentive for residential and small commercial solar projects that is structured as an up-front payment to the system owner that would be based on the estimated generation of the system over its initial years of operation (e.g. ten years).
5	Eric Krathwohl	Senator Tarr Appointee - Ipswich - Rich May	Top Choice		Second Choice	Not of Interest	as applicable to this and following questions, i like a policy path yielding increased certainty in the PV market to allow participants to be able to plan and implement which in turn will faciltat achievement of the MW target and provide the benefits associated with increased solar development including more jobs. Ultimately this must be done at a cost that is not unreasonable, but more work must be done to see how the numbers fall out
4	Lisa Podgurski	IBEW 103	Second Choice	Top Choice			Under Policy Alternative #3, Orderly Market Evolution, please examine an incentive for residential and small commercial solar projects that is structured as an up-front payment to the system owner that would be based on the estimated generation of the system over its initial years of operation (e.g. ten years).
3	David Colton	Town of Easton	Top Choice	Second Choice		Not of Interest	
2	William Stillinger	PV Squared (SEBANE rep.)		Second Choice	Top Choice		Under Policy Alternative #3, Orderly Market Evolution, please examine an incentive for residential and small commercial solar projects that is structured as an up-front payment to the system owner that would be based on the estimated generation of the system over its initial years of operation (e.g. ten years).
1	Angie O'Connor	MA DPU		Second Choice	Top Choice		

Summary for Top/Second Ques				
Top Choice	2	10	2	1
Second Choice	1	3	7	1
Not of Interest	3	0	0	2
Additional Not Of Interest (from C	0	0	0	0
2nd Scalar Factor 50%				0
1st or 2nd (weighted 0.5)	2.5	11.5	5.5	0
Not of Interest	3	0	0	2

Summary for 'Consider' Questio
Strongly Consider
Consi
der
Don't Consider
Consider Scalar Fa 50%
Strongly Consider or Consider (we
Don't Consider

#	1. Respondent		4. Means of Setting Price (Small Solar Market)						
	Name:	Company:	Cost-based price	Competitive Benchmark	DBI	ABI	Competitive Solicitation	No Opinion	Comments
15	Charlie Harak	National Consumer Law Center		Top Choice	Not of Interest	Second Choice			
14	Liam Holland	N/A			Second Choice	Top Choice	Not of Interest		
13	Amy Rabinowitz	National Grid	Top Choice		Second Choice				These options are all variations on a theme, and elements of one could be supported in another. In addition, any of the options above can and should be adjusted based on the amount of market response received, thus ABI does not seem like a separate price option. However, the goal should be to choose a means of lowering prices over time to limit the added costs to electricity customers' bills. Even the small solar market could become a competitive one, and a competitive market solicitation could inform the price that will be set by the government agency.
12	Christina Fisher	State Sen. Ben Downing						Top Choice	
11	Katie Rever (stand in for Fred Zalcman)	Solar Energy Industries Association	Not of Interest		Second Choice	Top Choice			Also not of interest: competitive benchmark and competitive solicitation
10	Janet Gail Besser	New England Clean Energy Counc			Second Choice	Top Choice			
9	Camilo Serna	Eversource Energy	Not of Interest	Top Choice	Second Choice				
8	Paul Brennan	Office of MA Attorney General					Top Choice		Unclear about what the "distinct competitive event" would be -- would need additional information.
7	Robert RIo	AIM	Top Choice		Not of Interest		Second Choice		same answer as Q3 - The price should not be "set" at all - the risk of solar should be on the owner - someone this program has turned into a risk-free proposition. The backstop could be the ACP, however, there is not legitimate reason why being a solar owner should be equivalent to printing money - the risk is on all the other ratepayers and the solar owner is not paying his ro her share. the owner of the solar should receive power rates that are variable based on the need at the time - This could be done using a smart meter when they are available or could be done using some averages. it is completely unfair for a homeowner on basic service to be required to pay TVR (as some have proposed) while solar people get basic service rates at all times - using TVR for solar would force people to install the panels in a way they are maximizing benefit to the system not maximizing benefit to their pocket.

#	1. Respondent		4. Means of Setting Price (Small Solar Market)						
	Name:	Company:	Cost-based price	Competitive Benchmark	DBI	ABI	Competitive Solicitation	No Opinion	Comments
6	Larry Aller	Next Step Living		Not of Interest	Second Choice	Top Choice			For small solar, competitive solicitation is not cost effective or feasible, and linking the incentive level to the values determined by competitive solicitation for large-scale solar has several risks: -There are several major cost drivers for small projects, especially residential, where costs would evolve differently than large projects: customer acquisition, permitting, inspection, and interconnect, and materials required by local electric code that drive large additions to the cost stack. -Even if an incentive multiplier is set accurately at the start, which is by no means easy, costs for residential/small and large projects do not evolve in a linked manner over time. -If the multiplier is set up to be adjusted regularly, that creates a policy and advocacy burden for participants in the small solar segment, which is of significant cost and risk as they are generally not set up to do this. For these reasons, please focus on using another incentive type for small solar, such as the adjusting block incentive discussed in other options (or SRECs), rather than linking the small solar incentive to competitive solicitation results for large solar.
5	Eric Krathwohl	Senator Tarr Appointee - Ipswich - Rich May	Second Choice			Top Choice			Although i support some administrative process to determine a reasonable price there should be some constraints on that process - probably set in the legislation to ensure that the process no matter how well-intended -- is not susceptible to getting bogged down and as a result hinders the development of the solar market
4	Lisa Podgurski	IBEW 103			Second Choice	Top Choice			
3	David Colton	Town of Easton	Second Choice			Top Choice	Not of Interest		Competive bidding should be discouraged, particularly if the distribution companies are going to be involved in the solicitation and selection process. The states uncoupling of distribution and generation shouldn't be compromised.
2	William Stillinger	PV Squared (SEBANE rep.)		Not of Interest	Second Choice	Top Choice			
1	Angie O'Connor	MA DPU		Second Choice	Top Choice				When modeling the declining block, please consider modeling the ability to respond to market conditions and the option of including market adders.

Summary for Top/Second Ques						
Top Choice	2	2	1	8	1	1
Second Choice	2	1	8	1	1	0
Not of Interest	2	2	2	0	2	0
Additional Not Of Interest (from C	0	0	0	0	0	0
2nd Scalar Factor 50%						
1st or 2nd (weighted 0.5)	3	2.5	5	8.5	1.5	1
Not of Interest	2	2	2	0	2	0

Summary for 'Consider' Questio
Strongly Consider
Consi
der
Don't Consider
Consider Scalar Fa 50%
Strongly Consider or Consider (we
Don't Consider

#	1. Respondent		5. Type of Incentive (Large Solar Market)					6. Means of Setting Price (Large Solar Market)					
	Name:	Company:	Tradable SRECs	Hybrid Long-Term PBI for Part of SREC Market	PBI	No Opinion	Comments	Cost-based price, periodically set	DBI	ABI	Comp. Solicitation	No Opinion	Comments
15	Charlie Harak	National Consumer Law Center	Not of Interest	Second Choice	Top Choice			Not of Interest	Second Choice		Top Choice		
14	Liam Holland	N/A		Second Choice	Top Choice			Not of Interest			Top Choice	Second Choice	Definition of large vs. small projects an unresolved issue although SREC-II market sectors provide a good guideline. Competitive solicitation best suited for large projects w/ no onsite load (SREC-II market sector C)
13	Amy Rabinowitz	National Grid	Not of Interest		Top Choice		Tradable SRECs & a Hybrid approach are "Not of Interest." National Grid favors PBI, as long as it involves tariff-based payments, and not long-term contracts. Up-front Payments should be an option for this market as well. In addition, an incentive like up-front pmts should be borne by taxpayers and implemented through tax policy, and not add costs to electricity customers' bills.		Second Choice		Top Choice		Any of the options above could be adjusted based on the amount of market response received, thus ABI does not seem like a separate price option.
12	Christina Fisher	State Sen. Ben Downing				Top Choice						Top Choice	
11	Katie Rever (stand in for Fred Zalcman)	Solar Energy Industries Association			Top Choice			Not of Interest	Second Choice	Top Choice			
10	Janet Gail Besser	New England Clean Energy Counc			Top Choice		Please examine an incentive for large projects that is structured as or includes an up-front payment to system owner based on the estimated generation of the system (PBI) over its initial years of operation (e.g. 10 years).	Not of Interest	Second Choice	Top Choice			
9	Camilo Serna	Eversource Energy			Top Choice			Not of Interest	Second Choice		Top Choice		
8	Paul Brennan	Office of MA Attorney General			Top Choice		Would want more information on the "hybrid" option.				Top Choice		Would want additional information on the "adjustable block incentive" option.
7	Robert RIo	AIM	Not of Interest	Second Choice	Top Choice			Top Choice			Second Choice		

#	1. Respondent		5. Type of Incentive (Large Solar Market)					6. Means of Setting Price (Large Solar Market)					
	Name:	Company:	Tradable SRECs	Hybrid Long-Term PBI for Part of SREC Market	PBI	No Opinion	Comments	Cost-based price, periodically set	DBI	ABI	Comp. Solicitation	No Opinion	Comments
6	Larry Aller	Next Step Living		Second Choice	Top Choice			Not of Interest	Second Choice	Top Choice			
5	Eric Krathwohl	Senator Tarr Appointee - Ipswich - Rich May		Top Choice	Second Choice		market certainty and financeability again are key components -- of course along with reaonable price.	Second Choice		Top Choice			see comment to #4 above
4	Lisa Podgurski	IBEW 103	Second Choice		Top Choice			Not of Interest	Second Choice	Top Choice			
3	David Colton	Town of Easton	Second Choice	Top Choice		Not of Interest		Second Choice		Top Choice	Not of Interest		
2	William Stillinger	PV Squared (SEBANE rep.)		Second Choice	Top Choice			Not of Interest	Second Choice	Top Choice			
1	Angie O'Connor	MA DPU		Second Choice	Top Choice				Top Choice		Second Choice		When modeling the declining block, please consider modeling the ability to respond to market conditions and the option of including market adders.
Summary for Top/Second Ques													
Top Choice			0	2	12	1		1	1	7	5	1	
Second Choice			2	6	1	0		2	8	0	2	1	
Not of Interest			3	1	0	1		8	0	1	1	0	
Additional Not Of Interest (from C			0	1	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	
2nd Scalar Factor	50%												
1st or 2nd (weighted 0.5)			1	5	12.5	1		2	5	7	6	1.5	
Not of Interest			3	2	0	1		8	0	2	1	0	
Summary for 'Consider' Questio													
Strongly Consider													
Consi													
der													
Don't Consider													
Consider Scalar Fa	50%												
Strongly Consider or Consider (we													
Don't Consider													

#	1. Respondent		7. Geographic Distribution				
	Name:	Company:	Uniform statewide incentive	Separate pools (or targets) for each utility	Higher incentive for projects supporting distribution system	No Opinion	Comments
15	Charlie Harak	National Consumer Law Center	Consider	Strongly Consider	Strongly Consider		
14	Liam Holland	N/A		Don't Consider	Strongly Consider		Re: Higher incentive for projects supporting distribution system: Unresolved discussion topic: How do consumers ultimately share in any savings that may be realized if targeted solar projects successfully defer T&D investments? Assuming cost recovery of solar incentive payments remains similar to the existing model, ratepayers pay immediately for cost of solar incentive payments, but will only realizing savings from deferred T&D investments once the distribution company has a mandatory rate case. Should ratepayers share in any savings from deferred investments? Re: Separate pools for each utility - if this option is meant to address the disparate rate of solar development in different utility service territories, perhaps the issue is better addressed by standardizing the utility cost-recovery mechanism statewide and by inter-distribution company payments to address recovery under and over collections.
13	Amy Rabinowitz	National Grid	Don't Consider	Strongly Consider	Consider		National Grid does not support a uniform statewide incentive unless it is to include a price cap and ensure a uniform selection process. Projects do not need further incentives, so a new incentive would require a different analysis of value - not a new layer. Essentially, National Grid supports fair compensation for distributed generation.
12	Christina Fisher	State Sen. Ben Downing				Strongly Consider	
11	Katie Rever (stand in for Fred Zalcman)	Solar Energy Industries Association	Consider	Strongly Consider	Strongly Consider		
10	Janet Gail Besser	New England Clean Energy Counc	Consider	Strongly Consider	Strongly Consider		
9	Camilo Serna	Eversource Energy	Strongly Consider	Don't Consider	Consider		For any higher incentive for projects supporting the distribution system, it is important that those incentives can be quantified, tracked and proven to benefit the distribution system.
8	Paul Brennan	Office of MA Attorney General			Strongly Consider		The incentives need to be based on quantifiable benefits with some level of oversight.
7	Robert RIo	AIM	Don't Consider	Don't Consider	Strongly Consider		This is the best thing to do. No objection to higher incentives when it can be proven that such installation helps the grid - However, this incentives should be for a short time as the benefits are likely to dissipate over time.

#	1. Respondent		7. Geographic Distribution				
	Name:	Company:	Uniform statewide incentive	Separate pools (or targets) for each utility	Higher incentive for projects supporting distribution system	No Opinion	Comments
6	Larry Aller	Next Step Living	Consider	Strongly Consider	Strongly Consider		Differences in electric rates should be taken into account when setting incentives - less incentive is needed where electric rates and associated production credits are higher, for example. However, it is also important that separate pools be structured in a way that does not create complexity for developers, and that enables solar to be developed in a balanced way across the state, rather than being much more feasible in one area than another.
5	Eric Krathwohl	Senator Tarr Appointee - Ipswich - Rich May	Strongly Consider		Consider		though i recognize there are differences between utilities and operating realities must be considered, the simplicity of a uniform approach across the Commonwealth should be more beneficial and workable ultimately
4	Lisa Podgurski	IBEW 103	Consider	Strongly Consider			
3	David Colton	Town of Easton	Strongly Consider	Don't Consider	Consider		
2	William Stillinger	PV Squared (SEBANE rep.)	Consider	Strongly Consider	Strongly Consider		
1	Angie O'Connor	MA DPU	Consider	Consider	Consider		

Summary for Top/Second Ques				
Top Choice				
Second Choice				
Not of Interest				
Additional Not Of Interest (from C				
2nd Scalar Factor	50%			
1st or 2nd (weighted 0.5)				
Not of Interest				

Summary for 'Consider' Questio				
Strongly Consider	3	7	8	1
Consi der	7	1	5	0
Don't Consider	2	4	0	0
Consider Scalar Fa	50%			
Strongly Consider or Consider (we	6.5	7.5	10.5	1
Don't Consider	2	4	0	0

#	1. Respondent		8. Differentiation of Incentives by Market Sector					
	Name:	Company:	SREC-II Market Sectors	Undifferentiated (head-to-head for all installations)	Stratified by size only (sub-tiers of specified size)	Differentiation by project type	No Opinion	Comments
15	Charlie Harak	National Consumer Law Center	Second Choice		Top Choice	Not of Interest		
14	Liam Holland	N/A	Top Choice	Not of Interest			Second Choice	Community Shared Solar/Low Income Solar within SREC-II market sector A may need to be closely examined to ensure sustainable solar growth
13	Amy Rabinowitz	National Grid		Not of Interest	Second Choice	Top Choice		Because a large, stand-alone project costs less to develop, on a $ per watt basis, it needs less of an incentive than a "behind-the-meter" net metering project. Such "behind-the-meter" net metering projects, when sized correctly and when actually offsetting load, should be encouraged.
12	Christina Fisher	State Sen. Ben Downing					Top Choice	
11	Katie Rever (stand in for Fred Zalcman)	Solar Energy Industries Association	Second Choice			Top Choice		Our Top Choice builds on the SREC-II Market Sector framework, and further segments the market based on (a) whether the owner benefits from depreciation tax deductions, and (b) the scale of the facility (e.g., stratification by size). This approach incorporates both social objectives and economic differences. Addressing low income populations should also be considered.
10	Janet Gail Besser	New England Clean Energy Counc	Second Choice			Top Choice		Our Top Choice builds on the SREC-II Market Sector framework, and further segments the market based on (a) whether the owner benefits from depreciation tax deductions, and (b) the scale of the facility (e.g., stratification by size) and ensures low income category. This approach incorporates both social objectives and economic differences.
9	Camilo Serna	Eversource Energy					Top Choice	Any differentiation shouldn't be arbitrary. It should be structured to lead to a minimization of costs and maximization of benefits to customers.
8	Paul Brennan	Office of MA Attorney General			Top Choice	Second Choice		Policies should reflect support for favored developments (i.e., brownfields, low-income, distribution system upgrade offsets)
7	Robert RIo	AIM				Top Choice		I think the small solar leads more to TVR than the large solar, therefore the incentives should be different. The larger systems also will likely have more of an impact on the geographic issues. However, the costs of these programs need to be known. While this may be sold as a boon to low-income people, the laws of economics tell me that the other low-income people are paying the cost -

#	1. Respondent		8. Differentiation of Incentives by Market Sector					
	Name:	Company:	SREC-II Market Sectors	Undifferentiated (head-to-head for all installations)	Stratified by size only (sub-tiers of specified size)	Differentiation by project type	No Opinion	Comments
6	Larry Aller	Next Step Living	Second Choice			Top Choice		Our Top Choice builds on the SREC-II Market Sector framework, and further segments the market based on (a) whether the owner benefits from depreciation tax deductions, and (b) the scale of the facility (e.g., stratification by size). This approach incorporates both social objectives and economic differences.
5	Eric Krathwohl	Senator Tarr Appointee - Ipswich - Rich May	Top Choice		Second Choice			As recognized in the public comment, further support for low income and community shared solar is desirable (within reasonable cost parameters) and the differential support built into SREC-II (which presumably can be adjusted as market conditions suggest from time to time) is desirable
4	Lisa Podgurski	IBEW 103	Second Choice			Top Choice		Top Choice builds on the SREC-II Market Sector framework, and further segments the market based on (a) whether the owner benefits from depreciation tax deductions, and (b) the scale of the facility (e.g., stratification by size) and ensures low income category. This approach incorporates both social objectives and economic differences.
3	David Colton	Town of Easton					Top Choice	
2	William Stillinger	PV Squared (SEBANE rep.)	Second Choice		Not of Interest	Top Choice		The top choice above builds on the SREC-II Market Sector framework, and further segments the market based on (a) whether the owner benefits from depreciation tax deductions, and (b) the scale of the facility (e.g., stratification by size). This approach incorporates both social objectives and economic differences.
1	Angie O'Connor	MA DPU	Top Choice	Second Choice				

Summary for Top/Second Ques					
Top Choice	3	0	2	7	3
Second Choice	6	1	2	1	1
Not of Interest	0	2	1	1	0
Additional Not Of Interest (from C	0	0	0	0	0
2nd Scalar Factor 50%					
1st or 2nd (weighted 0.5)	6	0.5	3	7.5	3.5
Not of Interest	0	2	1	1	0

Summary for 'Consider' Questio
Strongly Consider
Consi
der
Don't Consider
Consider Scalar Fa 50%
Strongly Consider or Consider (we
Don't Consider

#	1. Respondent		9. Sized-to-Load Net Metering				
	Name:	Company:	Keep current framework & rates	Reduce net metering credit values	Shift to Value of Solar Tariff	No Opinion	Comments
15	Charlie Harak	National Consumer Law Center	Not of Interest	Top Choice	Second Choice		
14	Liam Holland	N/A	Top Choice	Not of Interest		Second Choice	Consider a net metering tariff that expires after a certain long-term period after solar installation followed by value of solar tariff after long-term period. Consider immediately shifting to value of solar tariff for very large industrial electric users (such as WMECo T-5 rate class) and prohibiting net metering or receipt of net metering credits by such users, limiting their facilities to value of solar tariff + additional incentive, but also exempting such customers from paying for any cost-recovery surcharge for net metering lost revenue recovery applicable to the other customer classes (except for grandfathered net metering cost recovery)
13	Amy Rabinowitz	National Grid	Not of Interest				All of these options are "Not of Interest." We need a new framework, similar to energy efficiency incentives, that acknowledges that solar is an important policy goal and identifies the subsidy to the cost of solar that is needed to encourage the installation of solar. We hope for an evolution from net metering to a "value-of-services" two-way rate structure, as described in our earlier written comments to the consultants.
12	Christina Fisher	State Sen. Ben Downing				Top Choice	
11	Katie Rever (stand in for Fred Zalcman)	Solar Energy Industries Association	Top Choice	Not of Interest			We have concerns over implementation details with regards to a Value of Solar Tariff.
10	Janet Gail Besser	New England Clean Energy Counc	Top Choice				Shift to VOS could be considered for the long term as more experience and information becomes available.
9	Camilo Serna	Eversource Energy	Not of Interest	Top Choice	Second Choice		Choice of reduction of net metering credits as the first choice, assumes that the net metering credits will be set at the wholesale price of energy. Any value of solar tariff will need to be set in a regulatory proceeding and focus on quantifiable electric system benefits.
8	Paul Brennan	Office of MA Attorney General		Top Choice			This assumes that there is an alternate, transparent support framework in place as necessary.
7	Robert Rlo	AIM		Top Choice			

#	1. Respondent		9. Sized-to-Load Net Metering				
	Name:	Company:	Keep current framework & rates	Reduce net metering credit values	Shift to Value of Solar Tariff	No Opinion	Comments
6	Larry Aller	Next Step Living	Top Choice	Not of Interest	Second Choice		Please consider any "value of solar" approach as calculation of the appropriate bill credit, rather than a tariff. While a value of solar credit approach has strengths, operationally it must be set up to limit the risk of policy-making market inefficiencies, such as utilities' ability to be reimbursed by ratepayers for their legal advocacy costs, and the associated imbalance in ability to fund balanced advocacy by other parties. There is also the necessity of clear data about the functioning and cost of the distribution grid to inform accurate analysis of the costs and benefits to the grid.
5	Eric Krathwohl	Senator Tarr Appointee - Ipswich - Rich May	Top Choice		Second Choice		Certainly pricing on the basis of economic benefits is sound, but i am concerned about what it would take to determine the value of solar. Net metering and virtual net metering especially from the public comments seem critical to continuing the solar market much less achieving the established goals and establishing a supportive framework thereafter.
4	Lisa Podgurski	IBEW 103	Top Choice		Not of Interest		
3	David Colton	Town of Easton	Top Choice	Not of Interest		Second Choice	
2	William Stillinger	PV Squared (SEBANE rep.)	Top Choice		Second Choice		Careful study needed for the second choice (VOST); not likely to be done in the task force's term. The implementation details are crucial here.
1	Angie O'Connor	MA DPU		Top Choice			The reduction of net metering credit values can be size based and/or location based.

Summary for Top/Second Ques					
Top Choice	8	5	0	1	
Second Choice	0	0	5	2	
Not of Interest	3	4	1	0	
Additional Not Of Interest (from C	0	0	0	0	
2nd Scalar Factor 50%					
1st or 2nd (weighted 0.5)	8	5	2.5	2	
Not of Interest	3	4	1	0	

Summary for 'Consider' Questio
Strongly Consider
Consi
der
Don't Consider
Consider Scalar Fa 50%
Strongly Consider or Consider (we
Don't Consider

#	1. Respondent		10. Virtual Net Metering Credit Structure				
	Name:	Company:	Keep current framework & rates	Reduce credit values	Shift to Value of Solar Tariff	No Opinion	Comments
15	Charlie Harak	National Consumer Law Center	Not of Interest	Top Choice	Second Choice		
14	Liam Holland	N/A	Top Choice	Second Choice			See below
13	Amy Rabinowitz	National Grid	Not of Interest				All of these options are "Not of Interest." Virtual net metering projects should not be provided with net metering credits that are almost equal to retail rates because they increase customer costs and do not ensure that solar generation is co-located with an appropriate amount of load. Such projects should be provided only credits equal to the cost of supply. With the shift to a "value-of-services" model (see response to # 9, above), large virtual net metering units will appear as what they are, which is stand-alone generators, and would need to compete in general solicitations with like-sized units to garner any subsidy support, if available under a new program.
12	Christina Fisher	State Sen. Ben Downing				Top Choice	
11	Katie Rever (stand in for Fred Zalcman)	Solar Energy Industries Association	Top Choice	Not of Interest			We have concerns over implementation details with regards to a Value of Solar Tariff.
10	Janet Gail Besser	New England Clean Energy Counc	Top Choice				
9	Camilo Serna	Eversource Energy	Not of Interest	Top Choice	Second Choice		Choice of reduction of net metering credits as the first choice, assumes that the net metering credits will be set at the wholesale price of energy. Any value of solar tariff will need to be set in a regulatory proceeding and focus on quantifiable electric system benefits. For virtual net metering, Eversource also strongly recommends ensuring any credit assignment be handled by another party and not the distribution company.
8	Paul Brennan	Office of MA Attorney General		Top Choice			This assumes that there is an alternate, transparent support framework in place as necessary. There may need to be additional consideration for unique, low-income customers who utilize virtual net metering.
7	Robert Rlo	AIM		Top Choice			VNM is where all the costs are as I understand it. Therefore, this is an area that needs to be tackled. A lot of these issues can be dealt with by doing a fair and honest accounting of what it actually costs to install these systems and who is making the money. it is extremely difficult to answer these questions without knowing the exact economics of these systems.However, based on what I know the these systems are being overused and overcompensated

#	1. Respondent		10. Virtual Net Metering Credit Structure				
	Name:	Company:	Keep current framework & rates	Reduce credit values	Shift to Value of Solar Tariff	No Opinion	Comments
6	Larry Aller	Next Step Living	Top Choice	Not of Interest	Second Choice		Same points as question 9 about value of solar - while in an economic-theory view, a value of solar credit has many strengths, the ability to implement such an approach faces many real world challenges. As such, the current approach is a better and more cost effective way to move forward. For one, it avoids loading rate payers with the advocacy costs related to value of solar.
5	Eric Krathwohl	Senator Tarr Appointee - Ipswich - Rich May	Top Choice		Second Choice		see comments to #9 above
4	Lisa Podgurski	IBEW 103	Top Choice		Not of Interest		
3	David Colton	Town of Easton	Top Choice	Not of Interest			
2	William Stillinger	PV Squared (SEBANE rep.)	Top Choice				
1	Angie O'Connor	MA DPU		Top Choice			For the reduction of credit values, the Department would be interested in modeling the current framework for low income customers and community shared solar and decrease credit values for all other customers.

Summary for Top/Second Ques				
Top Choice	8	5	0	1
Second Choice	0	1	4	0
Not of Interest	3	3	1	0
Additional Not Of Interest (from C	0	0	0	0
2nd Scalar Factor 50%				
1st or 2nd (weighted 0.5)	8	5.5	2	1
Not of Interest	3	3	1	0

Summary for 'Consider' Questio
Strongly Consider
Consi
der
Don't Consider
Consider Scalar Fa 50%
Strongly Consider or Consider (we
Don't Consider

#	1. Respondent		11. Virtual Net Metering Project Type Limitations								
	Name:	Company:	Keep current framework	Narrow but maintain for public projects	Narrow but maintain for community shared solar	Narrow but maintain for common ownership	Narrow but maintain for low/ mod. Income	Narrow but maintain for landfill/ brownfield	Eliminate virtual net metering altogether	No Opinion	Comments
15	Charlie Harak	National Consumer Law Center	Don't Consider	Consider	Strongly Consider	Strongly Consider	Strongly Consider	Strongly Consider	Don't Consider		
14	Liam Holland	N/A	Don't Consider		Consider	Consider			Don't Consider		Maintain VNM in current framework for res. properties where host customer account & customer account receiving credits share a common meter bank (or something along those lines) to ensure that condos, triple-deckers & other types of similar properties are not disadvantaged only because their property contains multiple electric meters/accounts. Consider maintaining VNM for excess credits associated with res.l or small comm. on-site projects sized larger than load to maximize solar energy production on a particular rooftop, provided that most load (perhaps at least 67% over a year) is used on-site. Consider maintaining eligibility for common ownership/community shared solar projects, but modifications to credit structure may be appropriate. In order to send correct price signals and encourage the benefits associated with development on-site, a customer considering building a project off-site should receive a lower credit value to reflect some of the cost of delivering his energy across the network. Concerns for low-income customers may be legitimate, but may be better addressed and less discriminatory by broader reforms to rate structure that benefit all low-income or moderate income ratepayers.
13	Amy Rabinowitz	National Grid	Don't Consider	Don't Consider	Don't Consider	Don't Consider	Don't Consider	Don't Consider	Strongly Consider		Notwithstanding our selection above, National Grid supports providing low income customer with greater access to solar opportunities developed consistent with the framework that we envision. In addition, a "campus" approach to virtual net metering may be appropriate.
12	Christina Fisher	State Sen. Ben Downing								Strongly Consider	
11	Katie Rever (stand in for Fred Zalcman)	Solar Energy Industries Association	Strongly Consider		Consider				Don't Consider		Any review of narrowed eligibility should be justified and the impacts on the market sector of that narrowing be reviewed.
10	Janet Gail Besser	New England Clean Energy Counc	Strongly Consider	Consider	Consider	Consider	Consider	Consider	Don't Consider		Consultants should analyze impact of narrowing eligibility on solar development, benefits and costs to customers, and broad economic development, energy and environmental benefits to Commonwealth as a whole.
9	Camilo Serna	Eversource Energy	Don't Consider						Strongly Consider		For virtual net metering, Eversource also strongly recommends ensuring any credit assignment be handled by another party and not the distribution company.
8	Paul Brennan	Office of MA Attorney General		Consider	Consider	Consider	Consider	Consider	Don't Consider		
7	Robert Rlo	AIM	Don't Consider	Don't Consider	Don't Consider	Consider	Don't Consider	Strongly Consider	Don't Consider		The problem with allowing VNM for some installation and not others is that we end up with one group of people (even within the same class) subsidizing others for absolutely no benefit to the system. At some point the best sites for VNM are going to be taken and the system will be left with a group of have and have nots. low income people who come off the system are not helping the low-income population as others are picking up the tab for all T&D and social programs. the basic model is unsustainable. therefore, solar installations should not be granted to anyone as a right - it should be done methodically as a benefit tot the system - and that means as a means of diveristy as well as a means for reliablity. VNM should be subject to a higher standard - it is expensive and if we can get a better bang for the buck somewhere else it should not be first come first serve or a matter of right. That is why I support brownfields - these are areas where the money spent on solar can be put to good use - that si a double benefit and those areas should be encouraged. .

#	1. Respondent		11. Virtual Net Metering Project Type Limitations								
	Name:	Company:	Keep current framework	Narrow but maintain for public projects	Narrow but maintain for community shared solar	Narrow but maintain for common ownership	Narrow but maintain for low/ mod. Income	Narrow but maintain for landfill/ brownfield	Eliminate virtual net metering altogether	No Opinion	Comments
6	Larry Aller	Next Step Living	Strongly Consider	Don't Consider	Don't Consider	Don't Consider	Don't Consider	Don't Consider	Don't Consider		
5	Eric Krathwohl	Senator Tarr Appointee - Ipswich - Rich May	Strongly Consider	Strongly Consider	Strongly Consider	Strongly Consider	Strongly Consider	Consider	Don't Consider		public comments strongly support the need for virtual net metering - especially for community shared solar and for low income customers. Any policy path followed must consider cost impacts on customers but also the benefits -- short and long term -- from support of solar installations.
4	Lisa Podgurski	IBEW 103	Strongly Consider	Don't Consider	Don't Consider	Don't Consider	Don't Consider	Don't Consider	Don't Consider		
3	David Colton	Town of Easton	Strongly Consider	Consider	Consider	Consider	Consider	Consider	Don't Consider		Virtual Net Metering is beneficial to municipalities and low income communities. It should be expanded to capture rental housing, private non-profit institutions such as hospitals and universities.
2	William Stillinger	PV Squared (SEBANE rep.)	Strongly Consider								VNM is especially important for low/moderate income, community shared solar, and small "common owner" situations (e.g. farms, churches, campuses, etc.). Consultants should analyze the impact of narrowing eligibility on solar development, benefits and costs to customers, and broad economic development, energy and environmental benefits to Commonwealth as a whole.
1	Angie O'Connor	MA DPU	Consider	Consider	Consider	Consider	Consider	Consider	Consider		

Summary for Top/Second Ques								
Top Choice								
Second Choice								
Not of Interest								
Additional Not Of Interest (from C								
2nd Scalar Factor	50%							
1st or 2nd (weighted 0.5)								
Not of Interest								

Summary for 'Consider' Questio								
Strongly Consider	7	1	2	2	2	2	2	1
Consider	1	5	6	6	4	5	1	0
Don't Consider	5	4	4	3	4	3	10	0
Consider Scalar Fa	50%							
Strongly Consider or Consider (we	7.5	3.5	5	5	4	4.5	2.5	1
Don't Consider	5	4	4	3	4	3	10	0

#	1. Respondent		12. Virtual Net Metering Size Limitations					
	Name:	Company:	Maintain current caps and limits	Cap all projects at 2 MW per parcel (per GCA)	Differentiated Caps for different types of projects (please specify in comments)	Reduce cap for certain types of projects (please specify in comments)	No Opinion	Comments
15	Charlie Harak	National Consumer Law Center	Don't Consider	Strongly Consider	Strongly Consider	Don't Consider		Different (more generous than for other sectors) caps for community shared solar, projects serving low/mod income, muni sector.
14	Liam Holland	N/A	Don't Consider				Strongly Consider	See comment #11.
13	Amy Rabinowitz	National Grid	Don't Consider	Don't Consider	Don't Consider	Don't Consider		See the responses to #10 and # 11, above.
12	Christina Fisher	State Sen. Ben Downing					Strongly Consider	
11	Katie Rever (stand in for Fred Zalcman)	Solar Energy Industries Association	Strongly Consider	Consider	Consider			
10	Janet Gail Besser	New England Clean Energy Counc	Strongly Consider	Consider	Consider	Don't Consider		Consultants should analyze impact of 2 MW size cap and differentiated caps on solar development, benefits and costs to customers, and broad economic development, energy and environmental benefits to Commonwealth as a whole.
9	Camilo Serna	Eversource Energy		Strongly Consider				Project size limitations should consider ISO-NE wholesale market rules and aggregate thresholds for settlement only generating units.
8	Paul Brennan	Office of MA Attorney General	Consider	Consider	Consider	Consider		This would depend on the level of payment, and whether virtual net metering is restricted to certain types of projects.
7	Robert Rio	AIM			Don't Consider			I see no reason to limit projects to some arbitrary size PROVIDED they meet criteria of benefitting the system and the cost has been rationalized. I don't really understand the reason for the caps in the first place, other than perhaps to limit costs. Get the costs and process under control and we can eliminate caps.

#	1. Respondent		12. Virtual Net Metering Size Limitations					
	Name:	Company:	Maintain current caps and limits	Cap all projects at 2 MW per parcel (per GCA)	Differentiated Caps for different types of projects (please specify in comments)	Reduce cap for certain types of projects (please specify in comments)	No Opinion	Comments
6	Larry Aller	Next Step Living	Strongly Consider	Strongly Consider	Don't Consider	Don't Consider		
5	Eric Krathwohl	Senator Tarr Appointee - Ipswich - Rich May	Don't Consider	Consider	Consider	Don't Consider		differentiated caps ala SREC 2 might be a good approach
4	Lisa Podgurski	IBEW 103	Strongly Consider	Consider	Don't Consider	Don't Consider		Consider caping at 2 MW or differentiated caps, but only for studying
3	David Colton	Town of Easton	Strongly Consider	Don't Consider	Don't Consider	Don't Consider		
2	William Stillinger	PV Squared (SEBANE rep.)	Strongly Consider	Consider				
1	Angie O'Connor	MA DPU					Strongly Consider	Possible size limitations for virtual net metering was not previously discussed in the Consultant presentations. Absent a discussion of the various options presented here and their possible impact on modeling, the Department is not able to indicate any preference.

Summary for Top/Second Ques						
Top Choice						
Second Choice						
Not of Interest						
Additional Not Of Interest (from C						
2nd Scalar Factor	50%					
1st or 2nd (weighted 0.5)						
Not of Interest						

Summary for 'Consider' Questio						
Strongly Consider		6	3	1	0	3
Consi der		1	6	4	1	0
Don't Consider		4	2	5	7	0
Consider Scalar Fa	50%					
Strongly Consider or Consider (we		6.5	6	3	0.5	3
Don't Consider		4	2	5	7	0

#	1. Respondent		13. Net Metering Caps					
	Name:	Company:	Keep existing	Remove entirely	Align caps to meet 1,600 MW goal	Increase to accommodate more than 1,600 MW	No Opinion	Comments
15	Charlie Harak	National Consumer Law Center	Not of Interest		Top Choice	Second Choice		
14	Liam Holland	N/A		Top Choice				If caps needed, consider a cap based on non-participating customer rate impact instead of existing even-more arbitrary cap structure.
13	Amy Rabinowitz	National Grid	Top Choice	Not of Interest				Except for "Keep Existing" net metering caps, the other choices are "Not of Interest." Notwithstanding our response above, any further increases to the net metering caps should be accompanied by changes to credit values for virtual net metering projects. Please see the responses to # 10, #11, and #12, above
12	Christina Fisher	State Sen. Ben Downing			Top Choice			Sen. Downing asks that I answer no opinion to all with the exception that he would like to make sure that aligning the cap to meet the 1600MW goal remains in the discussion.
11	Katie Rever (stand in for Fred Zalcman)	Solar Energy Industries Association	Not of Interest	Top Choice		Second Choice		
10	Janet Gail Besser	New England Clean Energy Counc	Not of Interest	Top Choice		Second Choice		If not removing caps entirely, should look at increasing to accommodate more than 1600 MW to ensure smooth transition (i.e., don't create a cliff or "gold rush").
9	Camilo Serna	Eversource Energy	Top Choice					Eversource will continue to recommend to keep the existing caps as long as the net and virtual metering model leads to rate inequity and above market costs.
8	Paul Brennan	Office of MA Attorney General		Top Choice				With adequate rate design (via DPU rate case) and adjustment for the net metering payment in place, the cap could be removed entirely.
7	Robert RIo	AIM	Top Choice	Not of Interest				Same answer as above - the caps are arbitrary - we keep fighting over them because of cost issues. Clearly they are too rich. If the cost and net metering is done right, the market can decide the right trajectory - currently the system is being manipulated and therefore we need to maintain caps

#	1. Respondent		13. Net Metering Caps					
	Name:	Company:	Keep existing	Remove entirely	Align caps to meet 1,600 MW goal	Increase to accommodate more than 1,600 MW	No Opinion	Comments
6	Larry Aller	Next Step Living	Not of Interest	Top Choice		Second Choice		Keeping existing caps would reduce the amount of federal money coming to MA, by reducing the speed of solar development before the end of 2016.
5	Eric Krathwohl	Senator Tarr Appointee - Ipswich - Rich May			Second Choice	Top Choice		removing caps is certainly an idea that found significant support in the public hearings. If the consultant ran some models on this path and the economic burden was not excessive, this might be a way to go.
4	Lisa Podgurski	IBEW 103		Top Choice	Not of Interest	Second Choice		
3	David Colton	Town of Easton		Top Choice		Second Choice		
2	William Stillinger	PV Squared (SEBANE rep.)	Not of Interest	Top Choice		Second Choice		
1	Angie O'Connor	MA DPU	Second Choice	Top Choice				

Summary for Top/Second Ques					
Top Choice	3	9	2	1	0
Second Choice	1	0	1	7	0
Not of Interest	6	3	3	2	1
Additional Not Of Interest (from C	1	1	2	2	1
2nd Scalar Factor 50%					
1st or 2nd (weighted 0.5)	3.5	9	2.5	4.5	0
Not of Interest	7	4	5	4	2

Summary for 'Consider' Questio
Strongly Consider
Consi
der
Don't Consider
Consider Scalar Fa 50%
Strongly Consider or Consider (we
Don't Consider

#	1. Respondent		14. Timing of Transition					15. Targets and Timeline (Note: this dimension is intimately tied to means examples below)					
	Name:	Company:	ASAP (assumed to by 1/1/16 for modeling purposes)	Post-ITC (1/1/17)	After 1,600 MW is reached	No Opinion	Comments	MW Target with Firm Timeline (ex: RI REG, VT SPEED)	MW Target w/ Soft Timeline (ex: MA SREC, CA ReMAT)	MW Goal without Timeline (ex: DBI in CA, NY)	Budget constrained (ex: CT ZREC, MW moves inversely w/ price)	Unconstrained (ex: Value of Solar Tariff, Uncapped Standard Offer)	No Opinion
15	Charlie Harak	National Consumer Law Center	Not of Interest	Top Choice	Second Choice			Not of Interest			Top Choice	Second Choice	
14	Liam Holland	N/A	Top Choice	Second Choice					Second Choice	Top Choice			
13	Amy Rabinowitz	National Grid	Top Choice	Not of Interest			Except for "As early as possible (01/01/2016)," the other choices are "Not of Interest." Immediate action is necessary in order to contain the costs of the SREC and net metering programs for electricity customers.	Second Choice	Not of Interest		Top Choice		
12	Christina Fisher	State Sen. Ben Downing				Top Choice							Top Choice
11	Katie Rever (stand in for Fred Zalcman)	Solar Energy Industries Association	Not of Interest	Top Choice	Second Choice					Top Choice			
10	Janet Gail Besser	New England Clean Energy Counc	Not of Interest	Top Choice	Second Choice				Top Choice	Second Choice	Not of Interest		
9	Camilo Serna	Eversource Energy				Top Choice				Second Choice	Top Choice		
8	Paul Brennan	Office of MA Attorney General				Not of Interest	Transition should consider existing commitments/projects - but this requires additional discussion and flexibly on how that is achieved.	Top Choice	Second Choice				
7	Robert RIo	AIM	Top Choice									Top Choice	

#	1. Respondent		14. Timing of Transition					15. Targets and Timeline (Note: this dimension is intimately tied to means examples below)					
	Name:	Company:	ASAP (assumed to by 1/1/16 for modeling purposes)	Post-ITC (1/1/17)	After 1,600 MW is reached	No Opinion	Comments	MW Target with Firm Timeline (ex: RI REG, VT SPEED)	MW Target w/ Soft Timeline (ex: MA SREC, CA ReMAT)	MW Goal without Timeline (ex: DBI in CA, NY)	Budget constrained (ex: CT ZREC, MW moves inversely w/ price)	Unconstrained (ex: Value of Solar Tariff, Uncapped Standard Offer)	No Opinion
6	Larry Aller	Next Step Living	Not of Interest	Top Choice	Second Choice		A transition before 2017 would have massive costs to the state in both jobs & dollars - solar businesses would cut back due to uncertainty, & business looking to use solar to gain predictability into their energy costs, as we heard at the task force mtg. 2/25, would lose that ability. Furthermore, this would reduce the Fed. money coming to MA by delaying solar development before the Fed. ITC expires for residential & steps down 66% for commercial.	Not of Interest	Top Choice		Second Choice		
5	Eric Krathwohl	Senator Tarr Appointee - Ipswich - Rich May	Top Choice	Second Choice	Not of Interest		A more sustainable, supportive yet balanced structure should be implemented as soon as possible in order to take advantage of the Federal ITC		Top Choice	Second Choice			
4	Lisa Podgurski	IBEW 103	Not of Interest	Top Choice	Second Choice				Top Choice				
3	David Colton	Town of Easton	Not of Interest	Top Choice					Top Choice	Second Choice			
2	William Stillinger	PV Squared (SEBANE rep.)		Top Choice	Second Choice				Top Choice	Second Choice	Not of Interest		
1	Angie O'Connor	MA DPU	Second Choice		Top Choice		The Department would prefer not to tie the transition to any potential incentive changes at the federal level.	Second Choice		Top Choice			
Summary for Top/Second Ques													
Top Choice			4	7	1	2		1	6	3	3	1	1
Second Choice			1	2	6	0		2	2	5	1	1	0
Not of Interest			6	1	2	2		2	1	1	2	1	0
Additional Not Of Interest (from C			0	0	1	1		0	0	1	0	1	0
2nd Scalar Factor	50%												
1st or 2nd (weighted 0.5)			4.5	8	4	2		2	7	5.5	3.5	1.5	1
Not of Interest			6	1	3	3		2	1	2	2	2	0
Summary for 'Consider' Questio													
Strongly Consider													
Consi der													
Don't Consider													
Consider Scalar Fa	50%												
Strongly Consider or Consider (we													
Don't Consider													

#	1. Respondent		of setting price, see
	Name:	Company:	Comments
15	Charlie Harak	National Consumer Law Center	
14	Liam Holland	N/A	Applicable to incentive payment, not net metering.
13	Amy Rabinowitz	National Grid	Except for "Budget constrained" & "MW Target w/ Firm Timeline," the other choices are "Not of Interest." The policy framework should require the PV development community to work within a defined budget & increase cost efficiencies. Experience has shown that incentives are much higher than necessary to encourage PV development, & esp. large PV projects.
12	Christina Fisher	State Sen. Ben Downing	
11	Katie Rever (stand in for Fred Zalcman)	Solar Energy Industries Association	
10	Janet Gail Besser	New England Clean Energy Counc	
9	Camilo Serna	Eversource Energy	
8	Paul Brennan	Office of MA Attorney General	Targets and timelines need to be focused on getting to a point where you are supporting the market to self-stabilization.
7	Robert Rlo	AIM	If the program is aligned right, I believe we can get more and better sytsems installed.

#	1. Respondent		of setting price, see
	Name:	Company:	Comments
6	Larry Aller	Next Step Living	An adjustable block incentive where each block is a known dollar amount, and what varies based on market signals is the per-unit incentive should be considered.
5	Eric Krathwohl	Senator Tarr Appointee - Ipswich - Rich May	
4	Lisa Podgurski	IBEW 103	
3	David Colton	Town of Easton	
2	William Stillinger	PV Squared (SEBANE rep.)	
1	Angie O'Connor	MA DPU	

Summary for Top/Second Ques	
Top Choice	
Second Choice	
Not of Interest	
Additional Not Of Interest (from C	
2nd Scalar Factor	50%
1st or 2nd (weighted 0.5)	
Not of Interest	

Summary for 'Consider' Questio	
Strongly Consider	
Consi	
der	
Don't Consider	
Consider Scalar Fa	50%
Strongly Consider or Consider (we	
Don't Consider	

#	1. Respondent		16. Minimum Bill. Minimum bill rates would be established for each rate class in each utility territory through a DPU process.					
	Name:	Company:	None	For all customers	For DG customers only	For certain customers only (please specify in comments)	No Opinion	Comments
15	Charlie Harak	National Consumer Law Center	Second Choice	Not of Interest	Top Choice			
14	Liam Holland	N/A				Top Choice		For solar customers or those receiving virtual net metering credits. Grandfather existing net metering customers. For residential customers, consider limiting to existing customer charge and furthermore delaying any minimum bill until an agreed-upon non-participant net metering rate impact.
13	Amy Rabinowitz	National Grid		Top Choice	Second Choice			National Grid would support a minimum bill for distributed generation customers only if it were designed correctly. National Grid seeks an opportunity to explore and elaborate on what the correct design would involve.
12	Christina Fisher	State Sen. Ben Downing					Top Choice	
11	Katie Rever (stand in for Fred Zalcman)	Solar Energy Industries Association	Second Choice	Top Choice	Not of Interest			also not of interest: for certain customers only
10	Janet Gail Besser	New England Clean Energy Counc	Second Choice	Top Choice		Not of Interest		If DPU finds that a minimum bill is necessary, it should be nondiscriminatory across all customers (adjusted by rate class or size with provisions to protect low income customers taken as second step if needed).
9	Camilo Serna	Eversource Energy					Top Choice	Eversource supports a greater amount of cost recovery through fixed charges as it more properly assigns costs to customers thereby reducing both intra- and inter-class subsidization of costs. The transmission and distribution system is largely a fixed cost in which volumetric usage does not have a direct bearing on the costs incurred by any particular customer. Greater fixed cost recovery should be considered as part of an overall rate design approach to replace net metering. Rate design should be addressed in a fully adjudicated rate proceeding before the DPU. Such investigation should explore the proper rate design needed to ensure that the Department's rate-making goals continue to be met in light of the rapid growth of distributed generation.
8	Paul Brennan	Office of MA Attorney General				Top Choice		This is an important issue, but the question as framed is difficult to answer. The parameters of the minimum bill "credit" need to fleshed out in a DPU process. The concept of a minimum bill applying across the board could considered, but then different classes/customers who use the grid differently should have minimum bills that reflect the costs associated with their classes. Any minimum bill discussion must include an evaluation of impacts on low income and low usage customers before implementation.
7	Robert Rlo	AIM			Top Choice			If the program is aligned right, with customers only receiving power rebates, minimum bill goes away since the customer is still contributing T&D and social programs. if the system stays as is then minimum bills based on a true analysis of the cost must be implemented for DG customers. the key is to do a true analysis to see what it is.

#	1. Respondent		16. Minimum Bill. Minimum bill rates would be established for each rate class in each utility territory through a DPU process.					
	Name:	Company:	None	For all customers	For DG customers only	For certain customers only (please specify in comments)	No Opinion	Comments
6	Larry Aller	Next Step Living	Top Choice	Second Choice	Not of Interest			
5	Eric Krathwohl	Senator Tarr Appointee - Ipswich - Rich May	Top Choice	Second Choice				This seems to be quick a tricky issue. Certainly the general ratemaking goal of rates reflecting costs imposed on the system is good and if applied correctly that is what a minimum bill would do. One concern is, as noted above, the process of setting the minimum bill getting in the way of the solar market development, which is a condition to be avoided. Another concern made clear through the public comments concerns seasonal customers and small farms and other businesses for whom a minimum bill could distort their economics. Those concerns need to be considered though it might require a more refined costing analysis than has often occurred in utility ratemaking over the years.
4	Lisa Podgurski	IBEW 103	Top Choice	Second Choice				
3	David Colton	Town of Easton	Top Choice	Not of Interest				If one applies the minimum bill concept to the extreme, i.e., Rate payers who reduce use to zero would pay a minimum bill...in my view this make the minimum bill a tax, rather than a fee or user charge. Taxes should not be levied by anyone other than the Legislature. ANY minimum bill is regressive and would adversley affect low income users and municipalities. It is not a door that I would willingly open.
2	William Stillinger	PV Squared (SEBANE rep.)	Second Choice	Top Choice	Not of Interest			It comes as no surprise to anyone that this is a politically explosive issue. Any min. bill must be capped for residential and other small-scale users. This is one way to ensure that all customers pay fairly and equitably for their use of the "grid".
1	Angie O'Connor	MA DPU	Second Choice	Top Choice				The Department understands that consideration of a minimum bill is part of the mandate of this task force. However, the Department views a minimum bill and the policy paths as separate issues and therefore recommends that any policy option modeled consider two scenarios: one in which a minimum bill is applied, and one in which it is not.
Summary for Top/Second Ques								
Top Choice			4	5	2	2	2	
Second Choice			5	3	1	0	0	
Not of Interest			0	2	3	2	0	
Additional Not Of Interest (from C			0	0	0	1	0	
2nd Scalar Factor		50%						
1st or 2nd (weighted 0.5)			6.5	6.5	2.5	2	2	
Not of Interest			0	2	3	3	0	
Summary for 'Consider' Questio								
Strongly Consider								
Consi								
der								
Don't Consider								
Consider Scalar Fa		50%						
Strongly Consider or Consider (we								
Don't Consider								