

Meeting Type: Regular Meeting

Meeting Location: Meeting Room #1, City of Lebanon, City Hall

51 N Park Street, Lebanon, NH 03766

Meeting Date: Thursday, March 17, 2022

Meeting Time: Noticed for 10:00 AM on CPCNH.org and at Lebanon

City Hall

1. Call to Order Roll Call & Verification of Meeting Quorum

April Salas called the meeting to order at 10:05 am

Member	Director	Present / Absent	Alternate	Present / Absent
Cheshire County	Terry Clark	Present virtually	Chris Coates	Absent
Dover	Chris Parker	Present virtually	Jackson Kaspari	Absent
Durham	Mandy Merrill	Present	Nat Balch	Present virtually
Enfield	Kim Quirk	Present	Jo-Ellen Courtney	Absent
Exeter	Nick Devonshire	Present virtually	Julie Gilman	Absent
Hanover	April Salas	Present virtually	Peter Kulbacki	Present
Harrisville	Andrea Hodson	Present virtually	Andrew Maneval	Absent
Hudson	Craig Putnam	Present virtually	Kate Messner	Absent
Lebanon	Clifton Below	Present	Greg Ames	Absent
Nashua	Doria Brown	Present virtually	Bob Blaisdell	Absent
Newmarket	Toni Weinstein	Absent	Steve Fournier	Absent
New London	Jamie Hess	Present virtually	Tim Paradis	Absent
Pembroke	Matt Miller	Present virtually	Jackie Wengenroth	Present virtually
Plainfield	Evan Oxenham	Present	Steve Ladd	Present Virtually
Rye	Lisa Sweet	Absent	Howard Kalet	Absent
Walpole	Paul Looney	Present	Dennis Marcom	Absent
Warner	Clyde Carson	Present virtually	George Packard	Absent
Webster	Martin Bender	Absent	David Hemenway	Present virtually

The Directors and Alternates attending virtually noted that it is not reasonably practicable for them to attend in person due to the long travel times.

Document Created by: Evan Oxenham 2022-03-17-CPCNH-Board-Minutes-APPROVED.docx Document Posted on: May 3, 2022 Page 1 of 14



Meeting Type: Regular Meeting

Meeting Location: Meeting Room #1, City of Lebanon, City Hall

51 N Park Street, Lebanon, NH 03766

Meeting Date: Thursday, March 17, 2022

Meeting Time: Noticed for 10:00 AM on CPCNH.org and at Lebanon

City Hall

The following guests were present.

Name	Affiliation	
Dori Drachman	Monadnock Sustainability Hub	
Samuel Golding	Community Choice Partners – present in person	
Julia Griffin	Hanover Town Manager	
Todd Selig	Durham	

Five board members were physically present, so the meeting quorum was met

2. Proposed Agenda, Meeting Minutes

Approve Meeting Minutes.

The Board was asked to approve the meeting minutes of the February 17 Board meeting. Clifton Below remarked that he had some substantial changes that needed to be made to the minutes, and he presented those changes to the Board. Evan Oxenham committed to making the changes documented by Clifton and will make them available for the next Board meeting.

Kim Quirk moved to table the minutes of the Feb 17 meeting of the Board. Doria Brown seconded the motion which was approved 13-1 by a roll call vote, with Mandy Merrill abstaining since she was not present at the meeting.

3. Membership Votes - Portsmouth, NH

April reported that Portsmouth, NH has voted to join CPCNH but she had not received their signed JPA and there was no Portsmouth representative present so we will table voting to approve their membership until the April Board meeting.

4. Executive Committee Actions & Updates (Attachment 2)

April Salas summarized the Executive Committee actions.

- April has been working with Henry Herndon to finalize his contract and is expecting to complete negotiations with Henry soon.
- April has been working with other Executive Committee members and the chairs of the Risk Management and MOE committee on a NH Charitable Foundation grant to CPCNH for \$75000. The NH Charitable Foundation has requested that CPCNH document two budget scenarios, the first being how the money from the \$75,000 grant would be used and the second was how the money from a total fundraising budget of \$300,000 would be used. The \$300,000 budget includes the \$75,000 grant and an additional \$225,000 raised from a variety of other philanthropic donors, either locally in the state of New Hampshire or nationally. We are working on the application, which needs to outline who is CPCNH, our leadership team, our priority activities, our work plan, and is it sustainable. One new development is that CPCNH no longer

Document Created by: Evan Oxenham 2022-03-17-CPCNH-Board-Minutes-APPROVED.docx Document Posted on: May 3, 2022 Page 2 of 14



Meeting Type: Regular Meeting

Meeting Location: Meeting Room #1, City of Lebanon, City Hall

51 N Park Street, Lebanon, NH 03766

Meeting Date: Thursday, March 17, 2022

Meeting Time: Noticed for 10:00 AM on CPCNH.org and at Lebanon

City Hall

needs to get approval from the NHCF bord of directors since we have Hanover as a Fiscal agent. Andrea walked through the budget (documented in Attachment 2a of the Board Packet) to show where the money will be used. April reported that the Executive Committee is working to complete this application as soon as possible, with a drop-dead deadline of March 25.

Chris Parker moved to recommend that April Salas finalize the grant application and submit it to the NH Charitable Foundation on behalf of CPCNH. Kim Quirk seconded the motion which was approved unanimously by a roll call vote.

5. Shared Learnings on California Community Choice Aggregators Educational Meetings

April explained that we intended to have three educational meetings, each with a different CCA based in California. She thanked Julia Griffin, Town Manager of Hanover for assisting CPCNH with the scheduling of these meetings. Of the three proposed meetings, only the meetings with Marin County Clean Energy and Redwood Coast Energy Authority were able to be scheduled. The intention behind this discussion was to present highlights of what was learnt, which will be followed by a longer meeting where the Board can deliberate on how this information affects CPCNH decisions on our operating policies and the business plan.

April noted that the report had been prepared by Matt Miller and Andrea Hodson. This report and the data on which it is based is available for review in the shared CPCNH Google drive. Andrea presented the briefing.

Marin County Clean Energy

- One of the founding CCAs in California. There are now 23 CCAs in operation.
- o Formed one JPA in 2008 with 8 of the 12 towns in their territory and two years later started supplying power. They launched with 8,000 customers and nine months later had 50,000 customers.
- The launch with a smaller set of customers worked well for them as they needed less capital and it enabled them to work out the bugs in the system.
- o They did not guarantee that their rates would be less than the utilities default service rates.
- O They focused on fixed price rates and sought to double the default renewable energy mix compared to that offered by the utilities.
- They maintain one reserve fund for paying expenses and aimed for 46 months of operating costs in their reserve.
- There were 9 member directors, plus an accounting sustainability director, who at launch they promoted to a CEO position, and added a 1.5 head count initially for marketing and communications positions.
- o They manage their contracts internally and now have about 70 staff members.
- O They have a strong credit rating, with 500 million dollars in revenue and 100 million dollars in reserve.

• Redwood Coast Energy Authority

- o Smallest of the 23 CCA's in California
- Started as an organization providing energy programs before they started to supply power.
- O They had already been established in Humboldt County as an energy program administrator for the cities and organizations in the county, with about 30 employees.

o Launched their CCA 13 years later.

Document Created by: Evan Oxenham 2022-03-17-CPCNH-Board-Minutes-APPROVED.docx Document Posted on: May 3, 2022 Page 3 of 14



Meeting Type: Regular Meeting

Meeting Location: Meeting Room #1, City of Lebanon, City Hall

51 N Park Street, Lebanon, NH 03766

Meeting Date: Thursday, March 17, 2022

Meeting Time: Noticed for 10:00 AM on CPCNH.org and at Lebanon

City Hall

o They pool their revenues and they pay their expenses out as directed by the membership.

- O Their operating priority at the beginning was rates lower than the default utility rate, so they manage their rates by varying the renewable energy content of the power that they supply, and by managing how much they allocate to their reserve fund.
- o They needed \$750,000 in startup costs and leveraged \$150,000 from their general fund.
- They had a core team of 4 in areas of procurement and data management support staff, and they leveraged many of the other preexisting positions, such as accounting, HR, finance and legal counsel in the county structure.
- The internal staff oversaw the RFP and they leveraged deferred compensation for services such as outreach and marketing, and services through organizations such as TEA (for power procurement and portfolio management) and Calpine (for data management and customer billing services).

• Comparisons – CCA Membership Structure

- Marin Clean Energy
 - One JPA (and one CCA) serving four contiguous counties of 37 communities.
- Redwood Coast Energy Authority
 - One JPA, administering Humboldt County's CCA for cities within the county.
- CPCNH
 - A coalition of CCAs each with own Energy Aggregation Plan
 - Need to consider policy for rates, financial reserves and cost allocations.

• Comparisons – Start-Up Resources

- Marin Clean Energy
 - Started with their 9 member directors and the county sustainability director, and a couple of interns.
 - Secured a \$500,000 loan from Martin County at 0% interest and had two angel investors who provided loans for \$750,000 at a 7.5%. They repaid their loans using cash flow over 12 months of operation.

Clifton Below commented that Marin Clean Energy apparently spent close to a 1 million dollars before they got into the startup phase, over a course of approximately a decade working on feasibility analysis, and also said that it wasn't a loan from the County but a bank loan that was guaranteed by Marin County. **Andrea** responded that she thought the cost of the feasibility study was \$150,000.

Redwood Coast Energy Authority

- Redwood began operating within an existing structure and expanded services to include energy supply.
- They used \$150,000 from their general fund as well as a \$750,000 development loan to finance the first 1.5 years of operation.
- They also used a few 100,000 dollars of deferred expenses accumulated from service providers pre-launch, all of which was paid back out of the cash flow from operations over the first 18 months.

CPCNH

• Starting with \$58,000 in donations with a likely \$75,000 grant.

Document Created by: Evan Oxenham 2022-03-17-CPCNH-Board-Minutes-APPROVED.docx Document Posted on: May 3, 2022 Page 4 of 14



Meeting Type: Regular Meeting

Meeting Location: Meeting Room #1, City of Lebanon, City Hall

51 N Park Street, Lebanon, NH 03766

Meeting Date: Thursday, March 17, 2022

Meeting Time: Noticed for 10:00 AM on CPCNH.org and at Lebanon

City Hall

 Leveraging our board members on the highly engaged and productive Executive, Risk Management, Member Operations and Finance Committees, and our volunteers.

• Have a deferred payment contract in place for general counsel, and for us ahead is to consider internal program, staffing and other deferred payment contracts.

• Comparisons – Start-Up Costs Allocation

Marin Clean Energy

- Started up with loans and investments, which they repaid from pooled revenues.
- They did not allocate costs to members and their members did not receive dollars.
 They have just one JPA and one reserve fund.

o Redwood Coast Energy Authority

- Start-up loans and deferred payments were repaid from pooled revenue, similar to Marin Clean Energy.
- Members don't contribute money and so don't receive money. There is one JPA and one reserve fund.
- What is different is that the revenue flows to their vendors then to Redwood, so they are leveraging their vendors' credit. This is easier to operate but may create risk for Redwood when they negotiate contracts.

o CPCNH

Legal counsel cost allocation options presentation, February 24, 2022

Comparisons – Initial Services

Marin Clean Energy

- Focused on power supply.
- Outsourcing the customer service, which consisted of ratepayer billing, enrollment and account management.
- The financed loans and credits were repaid within a year and they then began bringing services in house over time, which strengthened their negotiating power and controlled their costs.

Redwood Coast Energy Authority

 Engaged TEA and Calpine and worked under a deferred payment contract during the pre-launch period, which lasted about a year, and then TEA provided them with credit support and collected the revenue first.

CPCNH

• We are considering all of this in our approach to contracting for initial services, our needs to consider cost and control in the initial contracting and what services we outsource and in what order, and then eventually, what do we bring in house.

• Advice to CPCNH

Marin Clean Energy

- Increased the number of customers in four phases which gave them the opportunity to work out bugs and it reduced the startup capital that they needed.
- They cautioned about guaranteeing lower rates than the utility default supply rate.
- The advised that we should maximize control over contracts and revenue, and that building up the reserve fund is absolutely critical.

Document Created by: Evan Oxenham 2022-03-17-CPCNH-Board-Minutes-APPROVED.docx Document Posted on: May 3, 2022 Page 5 of 14



Meeting Type: Regular Meeting

Meeting Location: Meeting Room #1, City of Lebanon, City Hall

51 N Park Street, Lebanon, NH 03766

Meeting Date: Thursday, March 17, 2022

Meeting Time: Noticed for 10:00 AM on CPCNH.org and at Lebanon

City Hall

They suggested that the risk oversight committee consist of internal staff and what was essential was finding a high caliber management team and advisors, which they did through RFPs, in addition to having their great member leaders.

Redwood Coast Energy Authority

- Regulatory changes were an unexpected challenge and they advised us to pay close attention to regulatory and legislative affairs.
- They would have contracted with legal services right away
- Critical to build up a reserve fund to stabilize rates

Questions

- o April thanked Andrea and Matt for spending many hours to distill this information
- Nick Devonshire asked about the 7% loan. How much was that loan compared to annual revenue or perhaps to the annual operating budget. Were there any limitations on the loan and who did it come from?
 - Matt The Marin \$500,000 loan from the county was to help the CCA succeed. Then there was a \$2.1 million loan from River City bank. That loan was to start helping the cash flow in buying energy. They had to explain their case and their business model. So that was for a very specific purpose. Clifton commented that that loan was guaranteed by Marin County and perhaps one city.
 - Matt Redwood coast had resources from their general fund to help them get started, but also loans from deferred compensation payments to TEA and Calpine.
 - April One of the biggest things was that the initial loans for Marin were a really tiny fraction for the staffing cost, and this cost was about 3% of the total budget. There was no problem collecting revenue after launch, the issue was funding startup. Marin had an additional disadvantage because they were a leader in the CCA space, so that it is now easier for other CCAs to work with lenders.
- Nick Devonshire followed up by commenting that when starting up we need some credit facility and how big should that be.
 - **April** Marin's policy is 4 months cash on hand. The board policy for Redwood is \$10 million in reserves. Marin, which has a much larger service territory has a board policy of \$100 million in reserves.
- O Jamie These two CCAs have been in operation for a number of years. What has their performance been in terms of either growing the percentage of renewables in their power supply or delivering discounts relative to the default power supply rate.
 - Matt A lot of this data can be found in their documentation; I encourage people to visit their website. The website has annual budgets, startup documentation and everything. They don't always beat the utility rate. Marin's current rate structure for all their different rate classes and offerings is several percentage points higher than the PG&E, default rate. Marin focuses on renewables so most of their offerings are very high renewable content, including it up to 100% renewable (selected by 1-2% of residents). Redwood's focus was to stay below PG&E which is difficult to maintain.
 - April Launching with 25% renewables content was really important for Marin. After 18 months they were up to 60% and now the mix is 80% as the default with the opt up option to 100%. The other remarkable thing is that the rate of repayment

Document Created by: Evan Oxenham 2022-03-17-CPCNH-Board-Minutes-APPROVED.docx Document Posted on: May 3, 2022 Page 6 of 14

COMMUNITY POWER COALITION OF NEW HAMDSHIDE

BOARD OF DIRECTORS — DRAFT MINUTES

Meeting Type: Regular Meeting

Meeting Location: Meeting Room #1, City of Lebanon, City Hall

51 N Park Street, Lebanon, NH 03766

Meeting Date: Thursday, March 17, 2022

Meeting Time: Noticed for 10:00 AM on CPCNH.org and at Lebanon

City Hall

for these loans and the ability to very quickly expand into other services was really exponential, and got me personally excited about starting with a launch with power, but seeing how quickly we can pivot into some of these other services. PG&E, spent a lot of money, about \$45 million trying to smear CCAs in California.

- **Doria** said that she asked would they have succeeded if COVID had happened in the 1st year of launch. They both said that it would have been an extremely difficult situation and that they don't think that they would have been as successful.
- Clifton Following up on Nick's question about the private individual loans. There were two high wealth individuals who they connected with, who made these unguaranteed loans of around \$700,000 each for the startup cost at 7.5% interest, and those loans were repaid back fairly quickly once they had the revenue stream. I have benefited over the past two and a half years from Samuel's expertise and understanding of the distinction between the California market and the New England market as well as the business model, and just in that regard I think the business model that's been proposed for us, which does have to recognize that it's built by individual municipal EAPs is not something that California has. It is a hybrid of the California model, and the joint power agency model for public power entities.

There are about 2000 Muni electric systems, and the 70 JPAs both support their distribution, but also as a separate function do a lot of power supply, which they do for individual communities on a municipal-by-municipal basis. Our JPA accommodates the possibility of municipalities joining together and having a regional JPA. Part of this is complicated by the fact that many of our communities have more than one distribution utility.

The other point that I wanted to draw on was we don't have some of the options the California CCAs had, which include spending taxpayer funds or guaranteeing loans. That was why the suggested business model was to look particularly to vendors building on what Redwood Co successfully did in getting vendors engaged who are willing to upfront the cost between selection and operations.

- o **Kim** One thing that occurred to me is the amount of capital needed to start and we're still talking about 75,000 dollars so we are in a Pre-Pre launch and it seems like, when we're really getting closer to launch, we need to be planning how we're going to raise that \$700,000, or for us maybe it's \$500,000 or something that will get us the needed financing. That is even before we start offering energy supply. I just feel like that discussion needs to be how to get up to the next notch in financing
 - April That is such an important distinction and that is certainly something that's a part of how we decide on this operating model, and finalizing the business plan. Having this information to begin to inform that approach and really building off what Clifton said, which is we assume there's going to be a high degree of leveraging our vendors for this, but we have to be able to make those decisions. Also, Redwood coast is on the order of magnitude that we could be with all of our current members and Marin County is more on the order magnitude of the entire state of New Hampshire.

Document Created by: Evan Oxenham 2022-03-17-CPCNH-Board-Minutes-APPROVED.docx Document Posted on: May 3, 2022 Page 7 of 14

COMMUNITY POWER COALITION OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

BOARD OF DIRECTORS – DRAFT MINUTES

Meeting Type: Regular Meeting

Meeting Location: Meeting Room #1, City of Lebanon, City Hall

51 N Park Street, Lebanon, NH 03766

Meeting Date: Thursday, March 17, 2022

Meeting Time: Noticed for 10:00 AM on CPCNH.org and at Lebanon

City Hall

• Andrea – we have a deliberative session next week so I suggest that the data points that we have just provided in answer to Nick's question about the loans can be synthesized and added to the slide deck so that we have those in hand as we go into our deliberative process.

O Samuel – CCAs in CA are very diverse. I have a bunch of clarifications. Both Redwood and Marin implemented the lockbox, the payment waterfall secured revenue account mechanism. Redwood utilized the credit sleeve, where they trade on the credit of the energy authority, a portfolio manager they hired, which is owned by public power, and operates as a transparent nonprofit. Marin did take out loans, but one thing to drill down on is how much went to the power collateral versus all of their other pioneering overhead costs, because they were the first ones. They entered into a supply deal with Shell for about 6 years, and then transitioned to the portfolio manager approach and grew their own staff capacity as well.

a. CPCNH Staffing & Technical Support - Consultant Agreement, Golding (Attachment 4a)

- In order to move forward with the discussion of the contract with Samuel Golding, several motions tabled at the last meeting of the Board needed to be dealt with.
- Clifton proposed that all the tabled motions specific to contract option 2 be withdrawn, so that the Board could proceed with a clean slate. He then stated that he was withdrawing the main motion. Evan, as second of that motion, agreed to the withdrawal of the motion. Kim agreed to withdraw her amended motion, **Doria** agreed to withdraw all her amended motions and **Andrea** agreed to withdraw her motion.
- April reported that we are close to agreement with Samuel on the base contract, but are still working on a scope of work to take us through August. Samuel will be supporting the Risk Management Committee in completing the RFP. He will also support legislative and regulatory affairs activities and MOE activities. The primary focus is the RFP and we have \$20,000 in cash to finance the contract. The remainder of the funding will be through deferred compensation, with perhaps some funding from the New Hampshire charitable foundation grant. April asked for the Board to authorize extending the Samuel's contract by using deferred compensation.
- Clifton explained the proposed motion and noted that it would that would create the potential for about \$120,000 worth of work totaling 600 hours, which would result in a maximum of \$50,000 in deferred compensation.
- Matt said that the motion appears to be sensible and has some flexibility in it which allows for the request for additional work and to provide additional compensation subject to Board approval.
- **Doria** cautioned that the urgency to launch in order to begin generating revenue may lead to a situation where we are being urged to launch when we are not ready.
- April agreed that this is a potential problem which should be considered as a risk.
- Andrea asked why the Executive Committee is not involved on the negotiation phase.
- Clifton responded that involving the Executive Committee was an option but he had the impression from April that we wanted to get to closure as quickly as possible, and that there is some urgency to support the administrative rules process. We were intending to have another Executive Committee meeting the following week.

Document Created by: Evan Oxenham 2022-03-17-CPCNH-Board-Minutes-APPROVED.docx Document Posted on: May 3, 2022 Page 8 of 14

BOARD OF DIRECTORS – DRAFT MINUTES Meeting Type:

POWER COALITION

Regular Meeting

Meeting Location: Meeting Room #1, City of Lebanon, City Hall

51 N Park Street, Lebanon, NH 03766

Meeting Date: Thursday, March 17, 2022

Meeting Time: Noticed for 10:00 AM on CPCNH.org and at Lebanon

City Hall

Mandy Merrill said that the proposal should come back to the full Board for approval.

- April responded that the Board had seen versions of the contract several times and that the full scope has been discussed by the Board. She pointed out the precedent set by the Board giving authority to finalize and execute the contract with Herndon Enterprises, and we were hoping to get the same authority to finalize and execute the Community Choice Partners contract.
- Dave Hemenway asked what was left to complete the negotiations, and whether it was just minor changes to the contract as opposed to significant content changes.
- April responded that there is not broad misalignment on the content, the negotiations are more concerned with finishing the details, polishing it and signing it.
- **Clifton** agreed with April that there is a final agreement and the contract is 95% there.
- **April** said that the concern is that we not delay this contract any further.
- Chris Parker said he supported letting the executive committee do its job and finalize the contract and he trusts that if there is an impasse that the committee decides needs the full board's attention, then it should come back to the Board.
- Kim Quirk said that she agreed with Chris, and Dave also supported Chris.

Clifton Below moved to direct the Chair to:

Complete negotiations with Community Choice Partners, Inc. in conjunction with the Vice Chair, the Chair of the Risk Management Committee, and legal counsel for a consulting contract to provide subject matter expertise and services on an asneeded basis for up to 300 hours of work that provides up to \$20,000 compensation from current funds and up to \$40,000 of compensation on a deferred compensation basis or from future appropriations, at CPCNH's discretion, with options for CPCNH to request additional work and provide additional compensation, subject to future Board approval;

And 2) to enter into the agreed upon contract subject to Executive Committee final approval.

Chris Parker seconded the motion which was approved unanimously by a roll call vote.

b. Program Support (Attachment 4b)

Refer to attachment 4b which is available at the end of these minutes (unfortunately a technical glitch led to it being omitted from the Board packet).

April talked about attachment 4b. She stated that this document summarizes discussions that have occurred in Executive Committee meetings which included the Chairs of the Risk Management Committee and the Member Operations and Engagement Committee. It lists tasks that need to be worked on between meetings, staffing needs, and gaps that we have as an organization since we don't have the benefit of internal staff yet. The tasks in the document are grouped under Project Manager headings because at this point assigning a title to these positions was found to be distracting.

April noted that as Chair she is spending an inordinate amount of time, performing tasks that should be done by an internal staff member and other Board members are doing the same. She stressed that we

Document Created by: Evan Oxenham 2022-03-17-CPCNH-Board-Minutes-APPROVED.docx Document Posted on: May 3, 2022 Page 9 of 14





Meeting Type: Regular Meeting

Meeting Location: Meeting Room #1, City of Lebanon, City Hall

51 N Park Street, Lebanon, NH 03766

Meeting Date: Thursday, March 17, 2022

Meeting Time: Noticed for 10:00 AM on CPCNH.org and at Lebanon

City Hall

need more support staff. She suggested that when Directors report back to their towns that they could use attachment 4b as a guide to explain what the Board is working towards.

Andrea said that what is in front of the Board is a request to shape this outline into some of these preliminary positions, identify a budget for them and bring it back next month.

Dave Hemenway commented that with the IT services administration in the first section and the website maintenance and press release in the third section typically, your website maintenance will be done with IT and your content management portion of that would be the press section. So, you may want to distinguish those slightly.

Doria said that this approach is what will get us towards that next step of the hiring process and really figure out what our actual needs are when it comes to asking for grant money and eventually finding. loans to help us with startup.

Samuel said that Redwood coast used a turnkey approach, similar to our RFP approach. They were able to scale up their grant funding and the loan that they got during that process, so what they ended up doing was choosing to bring in house some of the tasks that otherwise would have been done on a deferred compensation basis, and these were primarily marketing and community engagement, and the kind of internal administrative positions that they were positioned to quickly fill. This wound up being cost effective. We are going through a very similar process at the at the moment and many of these functions can be covered by vendors, if need be, but it sounds like the grant funding, and the staffing decisions are really going to crystallize in the same time period before we finalize the negotiations in the RFP process, so they will be coordinated and all the bases will get covered one way or another.

Matt said that it is really important for CPCNH in the near future have a permanent internal staff. As a collection of volunteers nobody is actually accountable for delivering results, but when you have employees that draw a paycheck and have objectives, deliverables and appraisals they become accountable for delivering results and quality, and being on time and on budget. So, starting to create these roles and recognize what are the things that we have to deliver is critical, and without having some actual employee staff that accountability will never be assigned in a responsible way, and therefore we put a lot of deliverables at risk.

April asked if any Board member was hesitant with us continuing along with this path. No members expressed any further concerns.

6. Annual Membership Meeting & Board Meeting

April said that in planning for the Annual Membership Meeting and the full Board meeting there are several important topics:

- Election of officers
- By-law and JA amendments
- Determining the physical location of the meeting

Document Created by: Evan Oxenham 2022-03-17-CPCNH-Board-Minutes-APPROVED.docx Document Posted on: May 3, 2022 Page 10 of 14



Meeting Type: Regular Meeting

Meeting Location: Meeting Room #1, City of Lebanon, City Hall

51 N Park Street, Lebanon, NH 03766

Meeting Date: Thursday, March 17, 2022

Meeting Time: Noticed for 10:00 AM on CPCNH.org and at Lebanon

City Hall

Clifton said that he was not aware of any need to amend the by-laws or the JPA. Matt responded he hoped that the bylaws could be changed so that committees don't have to have a physical quorum and they can substitute a virtual quorum. Clifton replied that we did pursue that, but there is no good way to do it. There was a bill in the Senate that would relieve that burden, but this may not pass. We thought about reducing the quorum requirement for committees but that itself has complications because it could shut down communication between a minority of the committee members outside of a noticed meeting. April suggested asking our legal counsel to investigate possible solutions and Clifton agreed with that approach.

April reviewed the proposed process for the election of officers (as described in attachment 5). Andrea asked anyone who is interested in working on the Executive Committee to send a candidate statement to the Secretary (Evan Oxenham). Evan will compile these statements into a single document that will be distributed prior to the Annual Membership Meeting. April said that the nominations should be submitted to Evan by April 7 and the officer positions are those of the Executive Committee, which are: Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary, Treasurer and Member at Large. The outgoing Chair always holds the Member at Large position (if there is an outgoing Chair). Officers are elected by a majority vote of the Board of Directors attending the meeting, either in person or virtually. Only those attending a meeting in person may vote to break a tie.

April said that the meeting date is April 21 in person at 10:00 am. The Board will elect officers at the Annual Membership meeting and the Board meeting will follow the Membership meeting. April said that we needed to decide on the location of the meeting, which Clifton said should be more central than Lebanon. Doria said that Nashua could provide facilities, Clifton suggested meeting at the NHMA facilities in Concord, then Dave Hemenway remarked that Webster could also provide a meeting facility that may be more central.

Andrea suggested authorizing April to select a site based on feedback from those who had proposed locations.

Clifton Below made a motion to establish April 21 at 10 am as the date and time, with the place to be determined by the Chair, for the Annual Membership meeting of CPCNH. Kim Quirk seconded the motion which was approved unanimously by a roll call vote.

7. Committee Updates

April asked the committee chairs to provide brief updates on the work that their committees had been doing.

- Andrea Hodson said that the Finance committee needed permission from the Board to approve the expenditure of \$2571 dollars on Google digital accounts through the end of the calendar year. The line item can be seen in Attachment 2b in the line for digital accounts.
- Doria Brown reported on IT administration. She, Matt Miller and Craig Putnam have been working
 on IT needs and folders. Matt and Craig have put a lot of work into determining how to do virtual
 polling so that we can record exactly who voted for what. Doria said that we desperately need full
 time IT support.
- April noted that there is a conflict-of-interest policy, as proposed and amended by our attorneys, that has been reviewed by the Finance Committee, as well as a draft volunteer handbook that's been

Document Created by: Evan Oxenham 2022-03-17-CPCNH-Board-Minutes-APPROVED.docx Document Posted on: May 3, 2022 Page 11 of 14



Meeting Type: Regular Meeting

Meeting Location: Meeting Room #1, City of Lebanon, City Hall

51 N Park Street, Lebanon, NH 03766

Meeting Date: Thursday, March 17, 2022

Meeting Time: Noticed for 10:00 AM on CPCNH.org and at Lebanon

City Hall

drafted and shared with the Executive Committee. This outlines what it means to be a volunteer, a welcome packet, and the same sort of controls that we have for any other member director.

Andrea Hodson made a motion to authorize the Treasurer to pay the digital account invoices over the year. April Salas seconded the motion and the motion was approved unanimously by a roll call vote.

- Matt Miller reported on the Risk Management Committee work. The committee has escalated the
 risk of a delayed RFP and the challenge of achieving the April 2023 launch of service. This is the task
 of going through the entire RFP process and selecting vendors, going through contract negotiations
 successfully with vendors, implementing their services, and then launching services. The committee
 started to look at how to mitigate the risk and the mitigation options include:
 - O What tasks can we parallelize in this process.
 - O Staggering the award of services with the focus on making sure that the power procurement contract is awarded early so that the contractor can begin determining how to get competitive rates for electricity.

April asked Matt to explain at the next Board meeting the decisions that go into how the RFP is issued.

• Clifton Below reported on the work of Legislative and Regulatory Affairs committee. Clifton noted that the big issue before CPCNH right now is the PUC administrative rules. Fortunately, the attorney for the Department of Energy, when we realized in the public comment period one week ago that the utilities were not showing their hand, asked for an opportunity to reply to comments. Initial comments were filed on Monday and a week from Monday reply comments are due. There will be a stakeholder session on Wednesday to discuss the comments and replies. The utilities are resisting providing all the requested data. We consider this data to be important.

Clifton added that there will soon be some bills before the house that we may be calling on members to act on and support.

8. Other Business

Andrea Hodson reminded the Board that the next meeting is next week.

9. Adjournment

Andrea moved to adjourn the meeting which was seconded by Evan Oxenham and approved unanimously by a roll call vote.

April declared the meeting adjourned at 12:37 pm.



Meeting Type: Regular Meeting

Meeting Location: Meeting Room #1, City of Lebanon, City Hall

51 N Park Street, Lebanon, NH 03766

Meeting Date: Thursday, March 17, 2022

Meeting Time: Noticed for 10:00 AM on CPCNH.org and at Lebanon

City Hall

Attachments

Attachment 4b

Program Support

What tasks and activities do we need people to work on in between meetings?

- 1. RFP drafting (can be supported by a consultant)
- 2. Vendor assessment and selection
- 3. Vendor contract negation
- 4. Vendor management
- 5. IT administration
- 6. Cost sharing agreement
- 7. Operating model definition
- 8. Admin support
- 9. Business plan revision
- 10. Marketing and outreach/communications, including website maintenance, press releases, etc.
- 11. Internal communications—member engagement and management
- 12. Technical support (this can be a consultant)

How might these tasks and activities be allocated amongst future CPCNH staff?

Project Manager

- 1. Admin support
- 2. IT Services/admin
- 3. Internal Communications
- 4. Cost sharing agreement
- 5. Operating model definition
- 6. General council management

Project Manager

- 1. RFP
- 2. Vendor assessment and selection
- Vendor contract negation
- 4. Vendor management
- 5. Business plan revision

Project Manager



Meeting Type: Regular Meeting

Meeting Location: Meeting Room #1, City of Lebanon, City Hall

51 N Park Street, Lebanon, NH 03766

Meeting Date: Thursday, March 17, 2022

Meeting Time: Noticed for 10:00 AM on CPCNH.org and at Lebanon

City Hall

1. Marketing outreach and communications

- 2. Regulatory affairs
- 3. Website maintenance and press release



Document Created by: Evan Oxenham Document Posted on: May 3, 2022 $2022\hbox{-}03\hbox{-}17\hbox{-}CPCNH\hbox{-}Board\hbox{-}Minutes\hbox{-}APPROVED.docx$

Page 14 of 14