

COMMUNITY POWER COALITION OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
Member Operations & Engagement Committee
Minutes 2/15/22, 10am - 11:30am
City Hall, Council Conference, Dover NH 03820

Committee Members in Attendance:

Member	Town	present/virtual
Lisa Sweet	Rye	present
Nat Balch	Durham	present
Howard Kalet	Rye	present
Chris Parker	Dover	present
April Salas	Hanover	virtual
Jackie Wengenroth	Pembroke	virtual
Paul Looney	Walpole	virtual
Craig Putnam (pending member)	Hudson	virtual

Non-voting Advisory Members:

Dori Drachman	absent
Julia Griffin	absent
Henry Herndon	present

Guests:

- Mandy Merril, Durham
- Clifton Below, Lebanon Director

Lisa Sweet calls meeting to order at 10:07am.

1. Housekeeping (10)

Nat Balch introduces Mandy Merril, former state senator from Durham, who is interested in CPCNH and attending the meeting as a guest.

- a. Consensus on agenda (posted to CPCNH and Rye)
- b. Craig Putnam's position on MOEC to be officially voted on at next full board meeting 2/17/22
- c. Approval of [2022_1_11_MOEC Minutes DRAFT](#)

Chris Parker moves to approve January 11 minutes. Howard Kalet seconds. Unanimously approved (6-0-1). April Salas abstains.

2. **Activity Updates** (20)

a. [EAP Group Review](#)

Member Ops committee members have had the opportunity to provide comments on the template EAP and have made a number of suggestions/comments that can inform a revision of the template for future members.

Clifton Below notes that there is a public hearing on the proposed CPA rules on Monday March 7. Public comment is due by March 14. It may be worth waiting to see how utilities and other stakeholders weigh in on proposed rules before completing the EAP revision.

Paul Looney asks if the Walpole EAP heading to town meeting in 1 month should be revised.

Clifton notes that the core issues in the plan are not impacted by PUC rejection of [Lebanon \(DE 21-143\)](#), [Harrisville \(DE 21-141\)](#) and [Hanover \(DE 21-136\)](#) EAPs – PUC rejections of EAPs are mostly to do with the rules not being finished yet. The law states that the governing body (not the full legislative body) can approve changes to an approved EAP once it has been approved by the legislative body (with the exception of making an opt-in program and opt-out program). The main regulatory hold up on state approval of EAPs is that the rules have not been completed yet

April Salas notes that it would be worth addressing the 2-3 items flagged by the PUC in their rejections of the three EAPs.

Lisa notes that for the towns going to Town Meeting now, you need to decide if putting in revisions at the 11th hour, or, is it better to discuss the issue and prepare for minor governing body changes if needed post-town meeting. CPCNH Members should hold off submitting additional EAPs to PUC for the next month or so to see where things are with the rule-making.

ACTION ITEM: For the March Member Ops Committee meeting, the agenda can include establishment of a sub-group tasked with working with Clifton to revise the EAP template for the next wave of Members.

Lisa will share the PUC rejections of other EAPs.

- [Lebanon \(DE 21-143\)](#); [Harrisville \(DE 21-141\)](#); [Hanover \(DE 21-136\)](#)
- Also available in CPCNH Drive → Committees → Member Ops → [EAPs Submitted to PUC](#)

b. Member recruitment sub-group report (Nat, Julia, Henry)

Henry Herndon reports that on 1/13, he met with Julia Griffin and Nat Balch to discuss recruitment. The group was tasked to “continue plotting our process, presenting to new groups, defining roles for future CPCNH staff.” The group compared the current approach to recruitment (reactive, ad-hoc, volunteer-based) with the role for future CPCNH staff to manage active recruitment, intake, and referral to CPCNH “Speakers Bureau” for engagement with prospective members.

Lisa introduces the concept of a recruitment “hot list” of member candidates (towns that have recently expressed interest in CPCNH). Nat notes that it is important to meet each member candidate where they are at, and tailor engagement to their needs. Current Hotlist (inquiries from the past week or two) includes Portsmouth (voting on JPA 2/22), Bradford, Sunapee, Windham. Since incorporation, numerous other communities have inquired and 40+ communities have expressed interest in the past 6-12 months.

Clifton notes he has been actively communicating with Peterborough, which has deferred its decision about joining CPCNH until after Town Meeting in May.

ACTION ITEM: Recruitment sub-group should create the Recruitment “Hot List” and “Radar List”. And review “Folder 1 - Recruitment,” Roadmap to Community Power, other resources.

Paul Looney asks if the Committee and sub-group are reaching out to all candidates. Lisa Sweet replies it is more about the Committee and sub-group minding the inquiries, tracking them and supporting where it can according to each town/cities circumstances. Focus on coordination.

c. Streamline data and analysis/[Member Characteristics](#) sub-group report (Lisa, Paul, Henry)

Henry Herndon reports that on January 19, Lisa Sweet, Clifton Below, Peter Kulbacki, Peter Nelson, Paul Looney and he met to discuss standardization of data requests and analysis across CPCNH membership. The group evaluated the following four questions:

- Who should request aggregate data?
 - Answer: Municipality (staff, EAC, etc.)
- How do we get from the data set provided to useful numbers? Who is responsible for assisting members in this?
 - Answer: Unanswered

- Option: Have someone (an expert, staff, contractor, volunteer) designated by CPCNH to receive and analyze the data in a standardized way.
- What exactly are the numbers we need to track?
 - Total Default load, Number of customer accounts, #residential, # non-residential
 - Annual usage (in megawatt-hours [MWh])
 - Number of accounts on default service and aggregate annual usage
 - Number of accounts on competitive supply and aggregate annual usage
- How will next individual account data requests be handled?
 - Answer: by vendors partners selected through competitive RFP process

The group discussed the following potential action items / needs: (1) create standard request format; (2) create standard delivery format; (3) Meet with each utility to agree on what this is (who from CPCNH will do this?); (4) Develop “explainer” for the different rate classes for each utility

April Salas notes that different Members may be bringing loads / rate classes to CPCNH and notes that the “Member Characteristics” document simplifies to “residential” and “commercial” without specifying “municipal” or other load/rate classes.

Lisa Sweet suggests detailed understanding of Member loads and load classes is part of “Phase 3: Implementation” process.

Clifton Below notes that it is helpful to have small vs. large C&I (Commercial & Industrial) broken out. Utilities may have 3 types of commercial, and it could be worth distinguishing between small C&I, large C&I, and industrial. Large Commercial customers have demand meters, Small Commercial don’t. The vast majority of small are on default, and vast majority of large are on competitive supply.

Paul Looney notes that it is the default load that we need for our estimating during “Phase 2: Authorization”.

April Salas notes that Hanover is organized around “Phase 3: Implementation.” Hanover has 6 large users and the strategy is to talk to those users and try and convince them to bring their load into CPCNH.

Paul Looney asks when we will begin to talk about rates?

April Salas notes it will come down the road and we should keep it in mind, but it is a separate situation from trying to get large users into CPCNH. Conversations with the large users in Hanover are happening long in advance of knowing what the rates are going to be to get the users familiar with the idea.

Craig Putnam notes that having resources Hudson can go to to make sure there is consistent interpretation across all communities with regard to load will be really important. Need to have someone who is focused on standardizing data analysis across all communities is really important.

Howard Kalet notes that we need to understand what the individual large users have for energy contracts and when the contracts expire so that CPCNH is in the discussion of options when contract terms expire.

Lisa Sweet agrees that each municipality should think about engaging large users.

Clifton Below notes that rate setting won't happen until (1) rules; and (2) vendors are in place to develop energy portfolios.

Craig Putnam notes that the municipal load in Hudson has been contracted out on competitive supply. Whether that could be brought in, that could be, but will have to be explored because they are currently on competitive supply.

Lisa Sweet notes that there **should be a role for a person who receives the data from the Member, analyzes it, breaks it into a consistent format along customer classes, etc., and standardizes the format so all Members are understanding their loads better and in a standard way.**

April Salas notes that this should be prioritized in the Member Ops need request.

Craig Putnam agrees, it could be a staff function, but in the interim it could be a person or two with the right skill-set.

d. [EAP Approval Tracker](#)

April Salas suggests adding a "state/PUC approval" column.

3. List: what worked well for the first batch of member approvals? (10)

For first set of EAP approvals: What worked well? What could have gone better?

Nat Balch notes that the EAP template worked well for drafting the EAP. The Town of Durham administration's deep dive into the EAP feels like it is resulting in a stall.

Would it be possible for Samuel Golding to meet with the Town Administration to answer the questions and explain how it meets the town's needs?

Lisa Sweet notes that the EAP is very open-ended. The implementation-minded folks, the Durham administration, wants specifics and hard answers to the questions. But the EAP is more a broad authorizing and guiding document, as opposed to specifics on exactly how implementation will go. Once programs have launched, we can point to specifics.

Lisa Sweet raises issue of Rye's legal review of the EAP and other expenses to towns pre-implementation. Everything after implementation is paid for by rates, saving towns money. But there are incidental expenses, such as legal review, incurred by the town pre-launch. At Rye's deliberative session, the public amended the warrant to suggest that the participating ratepayers would cover incidental costs if they could be tracked.

Howard Kalet notes that, so long as there was no time-limitation on the recovery of incidental costs, it is not a problem.

April Salas notes that an upcoming priority is talking about cost-allocation and cost-structure. CPCNH attorneys have outlayed a memo that breaks down costs and scenarios for cost allocation and cost recovery. Next steps are to have DWGP present at a virtual meeting to the Board (and because it is with counsel, it need not be public as typical Board meetings are) to talk about cost allocation and recovery.

Paul Looney asks, for example, if Rye has a lawyer review contracts and it costs x or y, Rye is saying they want that cost paid for by the rate payers. This is a good point for discussion with the lawyers during that meeting.

Clifton Below notes that the Rye warrant is specific to Rye, and those costs could be specific to Rye ratepayers, not all CPCNH rate-payers.

Howard Kalet notes that the Select Board accepted the vision of Rye Community Power, which is a little different from the detailed level that Durham administration is getting into. The fact that rates are going up in big steps can bring attention to what Community Power is trying to do and work in our favor because we can provide relief.

4. Refine goals (make them SMARTer) (20)

MOEC 2022 Goals

- 1) Support 2022/23 EAP Approvals
- 2) Recruiting/Onboarding
- 3) Develop post-Approval through Implementation Process
- 4) Develop prioritized list of CPCNH services (recruitment → implementation)

https://jamboard.google.com/d/11d4m5_MN-Aribio_yFS1PDcTFgizFi4OTX8PoB1ubJ0/edit?usp=sharing

5. **Create action items for each** (20) (did not do)
6. **Report to Board 2/17/22** - Looking back, moving forward
7. **Next Meeting** - second Tuesday @10:00 am, March 8th in Dover
8. **Adjourn** [VOTE]

Chris Parker moves to adjourn. Nat Balch seconds. Unanimously approved 7-0
Meeting adjourned at 11:33