

RES / CES Technical Analysis:

Minutes from October 17 Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG)

Meeting #5

Attendees:

Sustainable Energy Advantage (SEA): Jason Gifford, Stephan Wollenburg, Po-Yu Yuen, Toby Armstrong, Mary McMahon, Sahil Bakht

VT Public Service Department (PSD): TJ Poor, Anne Margolis, Adam Jacobs, Claire McIlvennie, Cameron Berube, Lou Cecere

SAG: Amber Widmayer, Anna Bowler, Annette Smith, Billy Coster, Casey Lamont, Danielle Laberge, Dan Potter, Doug Smith, Heather D'Arcy, Jess Neubelt, Jim Hall, Jonathan Dowds, Larry Satcowitz, Sam Lash, Steve Crowley

Other: David Cressy, Joyce Manchester, Julia Richter, Nate Abercrombie

Agenda:

- SEA planned model revisions for feedback
- Discussion on various slides and topics
- Questions and suggestions from the participants
- Closing Remarks
- Terminology Discussion

Meeting Minutes:

Item 1: Presentation of Planned Revisions

Jason presented planned revisions and sought feedback from the SAG, referencing specific slides. Key points discussed:

Slide 3:

- Discussion regarding assumptions related to nuclear eligibility and the contribution of existing contracts to Renewable Energy Standard (RES) up to 25% load.
- Emphasized that this contribution would be at no incremental cost.
- Incremental changes relative to Business as Usual (BAU).

Slide 4:

- Discussed regional tier eligibility, including MA Class 1, biomass ineligibility, and post-2010 solar and wind.
- Assumption that existing contracts would be retained.

Item 2: Discussion on Various Slides and Topics

- Clarification on comparing Ratepayer Impact Measure (RIM) incremental costs by scenario.
- Anna Bowler:
 - Inquired about the distinction between Clean Energy Standards (CES) and RES, focusing on nuclear eligibility.
- Steve Crowley:
 - Expressed concerns about including nuclear in a CES and its environmental impact.
- Jonathan Dowds
 - Expressed a preference for a cumulative comparison over an incremental one.
- Sam Lash:
 - Inquired about incremental costs and why scenarios appeared costlier than BAU.
 - Response: there are slides comparing costs and benefits.
- Jess Neubelt:
 - Suggested looking at cost and benefits together for better understanding.
- Doug Smith:
 - Inquired about a presentation format comparing costs and benefits, similar to the societal view in Slide 8.
 - Response: SEA agreed to do this.
- Steve Crowley:
 - Emphasized the importance of understanding the impact on monthly expenses for the public.
- Discussion about transportation cost savings from electric vehicle (EV) adoption.

Item 3: Questions and Suggestions from Participants

- Annette:
 - Requested a comparison between Scenario 1 and Scenario 6, particularly regarding greenhouse gas (GHG) benefits.
 - Response: Jason explained the role of regional tier eligibility criteria.
 - Toby highlighted that in Scenario 1, a significant gap is filled by Tier 1, but it is not monetized due to the existence of these resources.
 - Discussion about the reliability benefits of solar and the requirement for storage/controls to enable resilience during outages (solar alone would trip offline).
- Concerns were expressed from multiple participants about the accuracy and relevance of the land use slide (Slide 13) and the need to refine net-metering assumptions.
- Questions about the origin of acreage totals and the inclusion of existing in-state wind energy projects.
- Annette:
 - Concerned about impacts of opposition to wind energy projects.
- Jason outlined plans to provide additional information as the discussion progresses. Two aspects on the wind side: 1. Changing the assumed eligibility for the regional tier, which will cause us to assume more regional wind/solar is retired. 2. Explicitly assuming that all of the supply under

contract is retained in-state (that's the way SEA would capture the Class I type wind that has already been built). We've talked about the load-ratio-share of incremental from now, but need to capture what is already in operation and eligible for regional tier.

Item 4: Closing Remarks

- TJ:
 - Discussed the intersection with the legislative working group and the expected societal benefits and costs associated with reducing emissions. The analysis has set out a framework for discussion of changes to the RES, for example, looking at ways to reduce costs associated with a particular scenario through changes to programs that support achieving RES goals (e.g., net-metering).
 - Mentioned that the analysis will provide input for the legislative working group's econometric analysis.
 - Opened the floor for comments from the public, but none were received.
- Anna:
 - Discussed how the findings would be presented to the legislative working group.
- Doug:
 - Expressed a need for more time to digest the information and asked if questions about tables and data interpretation could be raised between meetings.
 - Response: yes, feedback is requested in the next week or two.
- Dan:
 - Had sent some questions by email.
 - Response: Jason will respond.
- Jason:
 - Addressed a hydro-related question in the chat, emphasizing the importance of specifying the relevant tier. Land use slide includes Tier II and Regional Tier, neither of which includes large hydro from HQ (which is a Tier I resource).
- Sam:
 - Emphasized the significance of framing decisions related to energy infrastructure. Relying on infrastructure far away also has land use impacts.

Item 5: Terminology Discussion

- Annette:
 - Expressed concerns about the term "NIMBYism" and its potential derogatory connotations, advocating for more respectful discourse, which will help advance efforts like this and acknowledge efforts of local people working to protect natural resources.
- Sam:
 - Clarified that the term wasn't meant to be derogatory but rather described a small subset of individuals with a disproportionately loud voice.
- TJ:
 - Expressed willingness to continue discussions and adapt the process as needed. Starting to get to crunch time, however. Everyone's continued participation is appreciated.
- The meeting concluded with an invitation for further input and a potential follow-up meeting, given the approaching deadline for final results.

- A workshop scheduled for late November/early December will encompass all engagement work, and suggestions for process improvements are welcome.