



STATE OF RHODE ISLAND  
**ENERGY EFFICIENCY &  
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

*5.b. Discussion & Vote on the Targets*

Key Discussion Question(s):

1. Is the Target memo clear? Does it need any further detail or explanation?
2. Are the Target values appropriate, well explained, and justified?
3. Does the Target memo adhere to the current Standards and fulfill Least Cost Procurement requirements?

**Recommended vote language:**

1. WITH MINOR UPDATES: a motion to direct the Consultant Team to update the Targets Memo to show only Option # \_\_ [1 or 2: *this is a choice*]\_\_, and to direct the Council's Attorney to file the updated memo, along with a final cover letter where the currently highlighted portions have been updated appropriately, with the Public Utilities Commission by close of business on Friday, March 20, 2020.
2. WITH MAJOR REVISIONS: a motion to direct the Consultant Team to incorporate the following amendments into the Targets Memo: \_\_\_\_ [*List any necessary amendments here*] \_\_\_\_ . And to direct the Council's Attorney to file the updated memo, along with a final cover letter where the currently highlighted portions have been updated appropriately, with the Public Utilities Commission by close of business on Friday, March 20, 2020.

*5.c. Discussion & Vote on Priorities for Revising the Least-Cost Procurement Standards*

Key Discussion Question(s):

1. Do the priorities sufficiently address the concerns of the stakeholder groups represented by Council members?
2. Are any edits, deletions, or additions needed to improve the proposed priorities?
3. Are there any adjustments to the proposed priorities that should be made to better support the groups represented by council members?

**Recommended vote language options:**

1. WITHOUT AMENDMENTS: a motion to approve the priorities for redlining the standards as shown on slides 4-6 in the Consultant Team's presentation today. And to direct the Consultant Team to: 1. File these priorities with the Commission in advance of the next Technical Session on Standards; 2. Represent the Council at future meetings with the Commission on the Standards; and 3. Advocate for redlines to the Standards that would achieve these priorities.
2. WITH AMENDMENTS: a motion to approve the priorities for redlining the standards as shown on slides 4-6 in the Consultant Team's presentation today with the following amendments: \_\_\_\_ [*List any necessary amendments here*] \_\_\_\_ . And to direct the Consultant Team to: 1. File these priorities with the Commission in advance of the next Technical Session on Standards; 2. Represent the Council at future meetings with the Commission on the Standards; and 3. Advocate for redlines to the Standards that would achieve these priorities.

*6.a. Discussion & Vote on Council Priorities for the Three-Year Energy Efficiency Plan*

Key Discussion Question(s):

1. Will the proposed priorities help National Grid to create Three-Year Plans that the Council will be able to support?
2. Are the proposed priorities clear?
3. Are any edits, deletions, or additions needed to improve the proposed priorities?
4. Are there any adjustments to the proposed priorities that should be made to better support the groups represented by council members?

**Recommended vote language options:**

1. WITHOUT AMENDMENTS: a motion to approve the priorities for National Grid's Three-Year Plans as shown on slides 3-5 in the Consultant Team's presentation today. And to direct the Consultant Team to present these priorities to National Grid at the Company's next appropriate Technical Working Group meetings on behalf of the Council.
2. WITH AMENDMENTS: a motion to approve the priorities for National Grid's Three-Year Plans as shown on slides 3-5 in the Consultant Team's presentation today with the following amendments: \_\_\_\_*[List any necessary amendments here]*\_\_\_\_. And to direct the Consultant Team to present these priorities to National Grid at the Company's next appropriate Technical Working Group meetings on behalf of the Council.

*6.b. Discussion & Vote on draft Heat Pump Letters*

Key Discussion Question(s):

1. Is/Are the letter(s) clear?
2. Do(es) the letter(s) convey the appropriate message from the Council?
3. Are any edits/additions/revisions necessary to the letter(s)?
4. Do(es) the letter(s) appropriately represent the feedback the Council has received from the public?
5. Are there any adjustments to the letter(s) that should be made to better support the groups represented by council members?

**Recommended vote language options:**

1. WITHOUT AMENDMENTS: a motion to approve the letter(s) as written; to direct the Chairperson to sign the letter(s) on behalf of the Council; and to direct the Consultant Team to file the letter(s) by close of business tomorrow with the entities indicated at the top of the letter(s).
2. WITH AMENDMENTS: a motion to approve the letter(s) with the following amendments: \_\_\_\_*[List any necessary amendments here]*\_\_\_\_; to direct the Chairperson to sign the letter(s) on behalf of the Council; and to direct the Consultant Team to file the letter(s) by close of business tomorrow with the entities indicated at the top of the letter(s).