# 2. Approval of Council Meeting Minutes

Key Discussion Question(s):

- 1. Are the minutes clear and accurate?
- 2. Are there any outstanding Council members questions that should be added to the bottom of the minutes?

## Rec

commended vote language:	
1.	NO AMENDMENTS: A motion to approve the draft <u>June</u> meeting minutes as written and to and to direct OER to post them as approved minutes on the Secretary of State's website.
2.	WITH AMENDMENTS: A motion to approve the draft <u>June</u> meeting minutes with the following amendments: And to direct OER to post them as approved minutes on the Secretary of State's website.
3.	NO AMENDMENTS: A motion to approve the draft <u>July</u> meeting minutes as written and to and to direct OER to post them as approved minutes on the Secretary of State's website.
4.	WITH AMENDMENTS: A motion to approve the draft <u>July</u> meeting minutes with the following amendments: And to direct OER to post them as approved minutes on the Secretary of State's website.

#### 5.b. Discussion & Vote on Updated K-12 Energy Curriculum Training Proposal

Key Discussion Question(s):

1. Is the updated proposal the most advantageous proposal for the EERMC?

### Recommended vote language:

- ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL: A motion to direct OER to work with the Council's attorney to establish a contract between the EERMC and GBRI with a scope of work based on the updated GBRI proposal and a budget limit not to exceed \$45,000.00.
- 2. REJECTING THE PROPOSAL: A motion to direct OER to reject the updated GBRI proposal and to re-issue the K-12 Energy Curriculum Training RFP with a clear budget limit of \$45,000.00 and \_\_\_\_[list any other necessary edits to the RFP]\_ the Council does not wish to re-issue an updated RFP, the second half of this recommended motion can be eliminated}

6.a. Council Discussion & Vote on National Grid's Requested Approval for 2021 Overspend in Energy **Efficiency** 

Key Discussion Question(s):

- 1. Would the requested overspend still comply with Least-Cost Procurement requirements (i.e. less than the cost of supply and cost-effective)?
- 2. Does the requested overspend align with EERMC objectives and priorities?
- 3. Are the benefits of supporting an overspend greater than the costs of not supporting it?

### Recommended vote language:

- 1. OVERSPEND SUPPORT WITH CONSULTANT TEAM RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS: A motion to support National Grid's requested overspend at an amount of up to \_\_[15 %]\_\_\_ above the PUC-approved gas portfolio budget to support weatherization measure installation and delivery through the EnergyWise Single Family gas program, contingent on the following: 1. The Company provides ongoing updates on their gas portfolio spend, participant, and savings forecasts at all future 2021 EERMC council meetings; 2. The Company provides the PUC with a courtesy notice of the overspend within 30 days of this vote.
- 2. OVERSPEND SUPPORT WITHOUT STIPULATIONS: A motion to support National Grid's requested overspend at an amount of up to \_\_[percent %]\_\_\_ above the PUC-approved gas portfolio budget to support gas weatherization measure installation and delivery through the EnergyWise Single Family gas program.
- 3. NOT SUPPORT OVERSPEND: A motion to not support National Grid's requested overspend and to direct the Company to manage the energy efficiency programs to their PUC-approved budgets.