



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

5.d. Council Discussion & Vote on the 2021-2023 System Reliability Procurement Plan

Key Discussion Question(s):

1. Does the Plan sufficiently address the concerns of the stakeholder groups represented by Council members?
2. Does the Plan adhere to the current Standards? If not, are the reasons valid and clearly described?
3. Does the Plan fulfill the requirements of Least Cost Procurement?
4. Are there any adjustments to the Plan that should be made to better fulfill Least Cost Procurement (LCP) requirements?
5. Are there any adjustments to the Plan that should be made to better support the groups represented by council members?
6. Will the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) likely approve the Plan?

Recommended vote language options:

1. **WITHOUT AMENDMENTS:** a motion to approve the 2021-2023 Three-Year System Reliability Procurement Plan as presented today by National Grid with a total budget of \$0, and to allow for non-impactful and cosmetic changes (typos, etc.) to be done prior to filing. Furthermore, the Council directs Marisa Desautel to provide a signature page to National Grid prior to November 21st as part of the Settlement of Parties for the PUC (Public Utilities Commission) filing.
2. **WITH AMENDMENTS:** a motion to approve the 2021-2023 Three-Year System Reliability Procurement Plan as presented today by National Grid with a total budget of \$0 [or other value], and to allow for non-impactful and cosmetic changes (typos, etc.) to be done prior to filing. This approval is contingent on the following amendments: [List any necessary amendments here – slide 8 of the Consultant Team’s SRP Presentation offers one particular edit]. Any amendments made to the Plan prior to filing with the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) must be reviewed and agreed to by the EERMC Consultant Team, acting on behalf of the Council. Furthermore, the Council directs Marisa Desautel to provide a signature page to National Grid prior to November 21st as part of the Settlement of Parties for the PUC filing.

5.f. Council Discussion & Vote on the Cost-Effectiveness Report

Key Discussion Question(s):

1. Does the report accurately answer the question: is the 2021-2023 Three-Year SRP Plan cost-effective?
2. Does the report make it clear why the Plan is or is not cost-effective?
3. Will the report be helpful and/or informative for the PUC?
4. Is there any information that should be added to or clarified within the report?

Recommended vote language options:

1. WITHOUT AMENDMENTS: a motion to approve the cost-effectiveness report as currently written and to direct the consultant team to update the highlighted sections prior to submitting the report to the PUC by the December 12, 2020 deadline.
2. WITH AMENDMENTS: a motion to approve the cost-effectiveness report with the following amendments: _____ [List any necessary amendments here] _____. And to direct the consultant team to submit the report to the PUC prior to the December 12, 2020 deadline.

6.a. Council Discussion & Vote on Consultant Service Proposal Selection

Key Discussion Question(s):

1. Is the Review Committee recommendation clear? Are there questions for the Review Committee?
2. What would be the most advantageous selection/contract for the EERMC?

Recommended vote language options:

1. *Make one award:* A motion to select [vendor's name]'s proposal in full, and to direct the Office of Energy Resources to begin contract negotiations with [vendor's name] before the end of the month and to work with the Council's attorney and the Acting Chair to execute a contract with an initial term length of [one or two] years before December 23, 2020.
2. *Make multiple awards by dividing the scope of work:* A motion to award [Task Numbers within the Scope of Work: i.e. Tasks 1-4] of the scope of work within the RFP to [vendor's name] and to award [Task Numbers within the Scope of Work: i.e. Tasks 1-4] of the scope of work within the RFP to [vendor's name]. And to direct the Office of Energy Resources to begin contract negotiations with both firms before the end of the month and to work with the Council's attorney and the Acting Chair to execute a contract with an initial term length of [one or two] years before December 23, 2020.
3. *Re-Issue the RFP with changes to the scope of work:* A motion to direct the Office of Energy Resources to re-issue the RFP within the next week, with the following amendments to the Scope of Work: _____.

6.b. Council Discussion & Vote on Legal Service Proposal Selection and 2020 Legal Services Budget Increase

Key Discussion Question(s): Proposal Selection

1. Is the Review Committee recommendation clear? Are there questions for the Review Committee?
2. What would be the most advantageous selection/contract for the EERMC?

Recommended vote language options:

1. *Make one award:* A motion to select [vendor's name]'s proposal in full, and to direct the Office of Energy Resources to begin contract negotiations with [vendor's name] before the end of the month and to work with OER's attorney and the

Acting Chair to execute a contract with an initial term length of __[one or two]__ years before December 23, 2020.

2. *Re-Issue the RFP with changes to the scope of work:* A motion to direct the Office of Energy Resources to re-issue the RFP within the next week, with the following amendments to the Scope of Work: _____.

Key Discussion Question(s): 2020 Budget Change

1. Is the requested budget increase necessary?
2. Does the EERMC have the funding to accommodate this funding increase?

Recommended vote language options:

1. *Approving a funding allocation increase:* A motion to approve the requested \$8,000 increase in funding allocated to legal services in 2020. If any of the \$8,000 increase is unused by the end of 2020, the remainder shall return to the unallocated pool of the EERMC's funds for 2021.