

**Draft Minutes
Clean Energy Development Board
Quarterly Meeting October 18, 2017**

In Attendance (*Meeting held at Public Service Department, 112 State Street, Montpelier, VT*):

Board Members:	Attending	Absent
Jared Duval (JD)	X	
David Farnsworth (DF)		X
Ken Jones (KJ)	X (<i>by phone</i>)	
Janice St. Onge (JS)	X	
Sam Swanson (SS) <i>Chair</i>	X	
Johanna Miller (JM)	X	
Gaye Symington (GS)	X	

State Employees:

Andrew Perchlik (**AP**), Fund Manager, Clean Energy Development Fund, Public Service Department (PSD)

Members of the Public: None

Meeting brought to order at 2:08 with Sam Swanson presiding.

- I. **Agenda.** The draft agenda was discussed and agreed to.
- II. **Minutes.** The minutes of 7/19/17 had been presented to the Board via email prior to the meeting. AP presented a revised version that included a short paragraph regarding the update AP had provided the Board at the end of the 7/19 meeting regarding the results of the 2012 business solar tax credits funds the CEDF transferred to the State's General Fund. Board members read the new paragraph and after a brief discussion **JD** moved to accept the revised draft minutes as presented and **JM** seconded the motion. The motion passed with all in favor except an abstention from **KJ**.
- III. **New Board Members.** **Ken Jones**, newly appointed to the Board by Senate Energy Chair Chris Bray gave a brief introduction on his background and experiences related to clean energy.
- IV. **Board Officers.** **SS** brought up the fact that with the Linda McGinnis' departure from the Board (due to her four year term ending) he was the only Co-Chair. He suggested that the Board elect a new co-chair. The other Board members agreed and **SS** nominated **Jared Duval** to be a Co-Chair of the Board. **GS** seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

- V. **Manager's Report.** AP gave a brief overview of the CEDF's programs/grants, recent activities, and financial report. Board members had a few questions and there was a discussion about the CEDF's effort at market transformation for renewable energy technologies and what metrics the Fund was using to determine if markets were being developed/transformed.

Board members said they would like to see progress on developing a better database of the CEDF activities/awards. Having better access to all the data would allow the CEDF to tell the story of its accomplishments over its 10 year history. Board members also said they wanted to see a two page version of all the accomplishments of the CEDF.

This led into a discussion of the 5 year Strategic Plan and the need for the CEDF to develop a theory of the market transformation for the markets it will target in the plan.

- VI. **Five Year Strategic Plan.** AP gave an overview of the two page handout that listed key changes to the overall VT energy landscape affecting the CEDF that have happened since the last plan was written and the strategic thinking that CEDF staff regarding planning for the next five years. Included in the handout was a suggestions that, in addition to continuing to promote advanced wood heating at a priority, the CEDF make a strategic effort to support the electrification of VT's transportation sector – if there were additional funds available to the CEDF to do so.

There were questions about the strategic planning process and how the CEDF staff chose transportation as the next area to work in. Board members wanted to know if an analysis of Fund's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) was done that is helping to guide the planning process. AP explained that a SWOT analysis was not done, but that a scanning of the energy landscape was done to look for the opportunities that would allow the Fund to make the most progress towards its goals, and the strategic electrification of the transportation sector was seen as the best area to focus on.

Board members questioned this and asked that if the CEDF has going to move away from only funding renewable generation of energy that it should also consider thermal efficiency as an area with great potential and need.

Concern was also expressed about the CEDF staff's suggestion that the Fund make a pronounced shift away from promoting renewable electrical generation. Board members felt it would be better to focus on what the CEDF is choosing to work on instead of what it isn't, and that the Fund shouldn't preclude working in that area as things could change and there could be a greater need to support renewable electricity generation than there is presently.

There was discussion about how a CEDF transition to the electric transportation sector could be done while still supporting CEDF Goals to support the most vulnerable and low-income Vermonters. Several ideas were brought up, like working with schools on electric school buses, or working on electric vehicles that are used as demand response public transportation.

There was a discussion on where CEDF funding would come from to support activities over the next five years covered in the plan. AP said the plan would not include a discussion of where CEDF funding could come from but it could include language that the CEDF is creating the plan

with the assumption that the State will provide funding of a certain amount per year. In recent annual plans, created when it was known that Entergy VT Yankee money would end soon, the expectation was that the State would provide \$3-5 million/year after Entergy VY funds ended.

Note: JM and KJ left the meeting.

- VII. **Unsolicited Funding Request.** AP gave a brief overview of the request in a handout detailing the request from Vermont Energy Investment Corporation for a \$5,000 grant to fund a solar PV system on net zero model modular home that is a demonstration home at a trailer park in Burlington. AP informed the board that there was \$7,400 available in the SSREI Program that had been budgeted for PV systems on high performance (i.e. net zero) homes for low-income residents. The \$7,400 had previously been reserved for a project through the SSREI Program. The applicant canceled the incentive/project making the money available again, but it wasn't enough to re-open the high performance low income PV incentive.

There was a discussion on the proposal and while there was general support for the project there was concern about awarding a grant without notification to others that there was funding available. It was suggested that notice be given by the SSREI Program and CEDF to the general public and directly to the low-income housing groups that had participated in the program before, that the \$7,400 had become available and that anybody could apply for it.

AP said he would work with the SSREIP contracted administrator to provide notice on availability of the \$7,400 using the same process and qualifications of the SSREIP's past incentive for PV on low-income high performance homes. The four Board members present approved of the CEDF taking this action.

- VIII. **Scheduling Next meeting.** There was a brief discussion on the need for a special meeting before the regular quarterly meeting in January. AP agreed to see if he could schedule a time in early December that would work for all the Board members.

-- With no objection the meeting was adjourned at 4:10 --