



## **AD-HOC COMMUNITY POWER COMMITTEE MEETING**

### **AGENDA**

Friday, March 5, 2021, 8:00 AM

Virtual Zoom Meeting\*

#### **Members:**

Peter Hansel, Chair  
Councilor Mike Giacomo  
Dr. Ann Shedd  
Paul Roth  
Dan Belluscio

#### **Staff:**

Rhett Lamb, Community Development Director  
Mari Brunner, Planner

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
2. Approval of Meeting Minutes
  - a. January 15, 2021
  - b. February 3, 2021
3. March 30, 2021 Community Power Public Hearings
  - a. Meeting Agenda
  - b. Outreach and Promotion
4. Draft Community Power Plan Feedback
5. Update on status of HB 315, “Relative to the aggregation of electric customers”
6. New Business
7. Upcoming Meetings:
  - a. Tuesday, March 30, 2021 at 12:00 pm and 6:30 pm (public hearings)
  - b. Friday, April 2, 2021 at 8:00 am
8. Adjourn

#### **\*To Join the Meeting:**

The public may join the meeting online by visiting [www.zoom.us/join](http://www.zoom.us/join) or by calling the toll-free # (888) 475-4499 and entering the Meeting ID: **858 5592 8244**. If you encounter any issues accessing this meeting, please call (603) 209-4697 during the meeting.

City of Keene  
New Hampshire

**AD HOC COMMUNITY POWER COMMITTEE**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

**Friday, January 15, 2021**

**8:00 AM**

**Remote Meeting via Zoom**

**Members Present:**

Councilor Mike Giacomo  
Dr. Ann Shedd  
Paul Roth  
Dan Belluscio

**Staff Present:**

Rhett Lamb, Community Development  
Director  
Mari Brunner, Planner

**Members Not Present:**

Peter Hansel, Chair

**Guests:**

Daria Mark, Good Energy  
Patrick Roche, Good Energy  
Robert Hayden, Good Energy

Mari Brunner read a prepared statement explaining how the Emergency Order #12, pursuant to Executive Order #2020-04 issued by the Governor of New Hampshire, waives certain provisions of RSA 91-A (which regulates the operation of public body meetings) during the declared COVID-19 State of Emergency.

**1) Call to Order and Roll Call**

Mari Brunner called the meeting to order at 8:03 AM. Roll call was conducted.

Paul Roth motioned to have Dr. Ann Shedd act as temporary Chair in the absence of Chair Peter Hansel. Councilor Mike Giacomo seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**1) Approval of December 4, 2020 Meeting Minutes**

Paul Roth moved to approve the December 4, 2020 minutes as presented. Councilor Mike Giacomo seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**2) Preliminary Survey Results**

Daria Mark, a representative from Good Energy, reviewed the results that had come in over the past month from the Community Power survey. These results helped inform what should be included in the draft Community Power Plan. The survey began on December 8, 2021 and was disseminated online as well as in print in the Monadnock Shopper newspaper. It ran for approximately one month, ending on January 7, 2021, and rendered 126 total responses, mostly from the online version.

Daria Mark paused and asked the committee if they had heard any conversation or mentions of the survey out in the community. Dan Belluscio replied that he hadn't but reasoned that everyone is fairly isolated during the pandemic, so not a lot of external conversations are taking place. Councilor Mike Giacomo stated that he shared the survey with the neighborhood groups in his north central region, reaching about 100 people.

Daria Mark continued with the review and stated they saw a predominantly residential response, with 82 percent of survey takers owning their home, and 6 percent already generating electricity with solar panels.

To help the public understand what the survey asked about, they created two videos. The first explaining Community Power, and the second answering how it impacts the City of Keene. Daria Mark encouraged the committee to take a look at those videos, which are located at [KeeneEnergyPlan.com/CommunityPower](http://KeeneEnergyPlan.com/CommunityPower). She mentioned these would be great resources to share if people are wondering what the program is all about.

The following data from the survey results was presented by Daria Mark.

**Demographics:** The survey asked two demographics questions to measure diversity of responses. Results showed a good spread on age and income.

**Electricity Supply:** A majority of the survey respondents use Eversource but 13 percent have taken action to find a different supplier. The next question explored what people are looking for when they seek a different supplier. Results showed that 69% of respondents were looking for a better rate. The other respondents wanted more renewable content.

**Community Power Goals:** This multiple choice question explored what the community wanted to see from the Community Power program. The highest response was a desire to see an increase in local renewable energy. Other popular answers were lower energy bills, better rates, and creating local jobs.

**Renewables and Price:** This question was aimed to tease out community sentiments with regards to adding renewable energy versus the cost. 8% of respondents did not want more renewable electricity but 92% said they did. Breaking down that 92% further revealed that 50% of respondents are willing to pay more for renewable electricity and 42 percent want more renewable electricity if they can pay about the same amount they currently pay.

Paul Roth asked if the last 2 bars on the Renewables and Price chart were additive (the 19 and 31 percent). Daria Mark replied that if a respondent chose the option of wanting more renewable energy, they then had to choose from three options: wanting to pay the same, willing to pay a small amount more, or willing to pay more in general. Those responses are seen in the last 3 bars (42, 19 and 31 percent) and represent how much more the participants want renewable energy. Councilor Mike Giacomo stated with regards to price sensitivity that these responses seem to be cut down the middle, 50% are able or willing to pay more, versus 50% of respondents not able or willing to pay more. Maria Dark agreed

and added that the 31 percent of respondents that are willing to pay more is the demographic they'd try to target in an opt-up campaign.

Income information was asked on the survey to reveal any trends in responses based on respondent income level. The next chart showed that respondents with higher income levels are not the only ones who are interested in more renewable energy. The lightest blue category represents income under \$50,000, the next blue is \$50,000-100,000, and the dark blue is greater than 100,000. This is important because it shows representation from all different income levels in favor of more renewable energy.

Councilor Mike Giacomo commented that the chart shows there's about a 65-35 split within the under \$50,000 cohort between the 'willing to pay extra' category and the 'want to pay the same amount' category, which tells them there's willingness and actual price sensitivity to be able to afford the higher rate, which is great. There's also no question that this cohort is in favor of more renewable energy, but about 50 percent are saying they probably can't afford a higher rate, and he wants to make sure they are paying attention to all representations in the community and going about things in a cost-effective way. Daria Mark wondered if the people who said they don't want more renewable energy, in the under \$50,000 cohort, were saying it out of concern for increased prices. She and Councilor Giacomo agreed that this could be possible because it has been a narrative they've seen in the past.

Energy Efficiency: They included 3 questions to tease out how much and what has been done in the community with regards to energy efficiency. The first question asked if they had done an energy audit. Around 73% of respondents answered yes, which showed there's still a lot of potential when thinking about saving energy. The next two questions attempted to discover if there was a reason they hadn't done an energy audit. The first asked if they keep their thermostat lower than they would like to save money, and 71% of respondents answered yes. The next question asked if their home is drafty or are their energy costs high, and about half of respondents said yes. Overall, the results showed potential on improvement for reducing energy use.

The next chart used the income levels to answer if getting an energy audit had to do with finances. The results showed that it was not a matter of income, it was more about other factors like time.

Outreach Channel Effectiveness: The survey asked people how they heard about the survey with options of the newspaper (Shopper news, Keene Sentinel), online (City website, social media), e-mail, or other. Most respondents heard about the survey through a newspaper and the next highest response was one of the online options.

Conclusions – The survey results demonstrated that there is very strong support for a default product with extra renewables, an option that offers additional renewable content, and desire for the most cost-effective option.

### **3) Overview of Draft Community Power Plan**

Patrick Roche from Good Energy stated that the draft Community Power Plan starts with Keene's vision of electricity to be 100% renewable by 2030, and the 2050 goal of thermal and transportation to be 100% renewable energy. He stated the plan is meant to be a framework that spells out how they will approach their goals and noted that it leaves room for innovation so the program can evolve. The following was Patrick Roche's review of the plan.

Program Vision: The first piece of the plan is successful launch. They focused on economic value that also increases renewable energy for the community and supports the growth of new renewable energy in the region. The economic value will be critical for both short and long-term goals of the program. This had already been demonstrated in the survey results showing about half of the respondents willing to pay more for renewable energy, and half who are looking to pay about the same. The idea is to maximize environmental goals while having economic impact.

The second piece of the vision emphasizes using a variety of tools and innovations over time, such as optional products that help achieve higher renewable percentages for those that can afford it, and strong incentives to support more local renewable energy in Keene.

The next component is harnessing the community and making sure there's space to regularly revisit goals and planning. To help get to 100% renewable energy they want to include community input, creativity and ideas with regards to steps in the plan and distribution of benefits.

Next is removing barriers to program goals which means operating the program within the regulations that exist, but also working to change rules and expand and create new opportunities.

Lastly, is leading by example and collaborating. This is the idea of allowing the program to have a greater impact by helping other communities start and launch their own programs and collaborating with other communities to expand buying power.

Patrick Roche then touched on renewable energy and NH Class 1. He stated that renewable energy means we are focused on extra renewable energy, above and beyond what the state minimums are. This is NH Class 1, "new renewable energy," and the sources have to be located in New England, NY or Eastern Canada to be on their regional electricity grid. Wind, solar, small hydro, methane, and biomass are the primary sources.

Renewable Portfolio Graph: the light green box is the NH Class 1 section which has increased every year and is part of what drives the growth of renewable energy in our region. Keene would accelerate this growth if they purchase extra renewable energy. For the year of 2021 we are at about 10% Class 1 and the NH Renewable Portfolio Standard plateaus at about 20%.

Electricity Products: In the plan there are 3 different electricity products included. The first is the default product that people would be automatically enrolled in, unless they take action. This first product is designed to have some savings or cost parity with Eversource and some extra renewable energy. They estimated starting at 5-10% extra renewable energy with this default product, so there's flexibility to be able to remain economically competitive.

Councilor Mike Giacomo asked if the 5-10% is added to the 30% from the prior slide. Patrick Roche replied yes and stated he would show this in a graph shortly.

The other two products are optional. One would be 100% focus on extra renewable energy, so they'd match 100% of extra renewable energy on top of what the state is offering. The other would be the basic product at 0%, for people who want as much savings as possible and would meet the state's minimum portfolio standards. Patrick Roche mentioned that they will need to do a considerable amount of promotion and education to get people in the 100% option, as past programs have demonstrated that most people stay in the standard product.

A NH Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) and Keene Community Power graph was then shown, with the dark green representing the voluntary Class 1 in Keene, using 5% extra renewable energy on top of the NH RPS percentage. It illustrated that, if starting in 2021, they'd already be higher than the state's RPS. In other words, that 5% would be increasing the Class 1 requirement by half. They felt these product options aligned with the survey and would be a good place to start, allowing for room to add more renewable energy and keep economic value.

Rhett Lamb asked, when talking about the percentage increase over the RPS, if somebody is opting up to that 100% product, are they getting 100% renewable energy or 100% over the RPS? Patrick Roche answered that 100% NH Class 1 renewable energy would be purchased on their behalf. The percentage for the RPS and 100% of additional NH Class 1 energy would be put onto the grid. In other words, they'd be helping the rest of the grid/their neighbor because one can only physically use 100% renewable energy. Rhett Lamb suggested that they keep the message as simple as possible moving forward and Patrick Roche agreed.

Patrick Roche went on to highlight other keys for Keene's goals:

- Net metering – They don't have the price or term for paying for electricity yet, this will be figured out when they go to bid and they'll lock in rates and terms based on what they know about the market. Net metering is similar to this, they can define how they provide net metering benefits. The options are somewhat limited based on the billing system that Eversource has but there is some flexibility that they can look at in the competitive bidding process. The goal will be to see if they can offer as good or better incentives than default service. This will include education and outreach to communicate any differences between default service and what the Community Power program offers.

- Energy efficiency – The plan highlights that, to start, the main focus will be cross promoting the NH Saves program. Overtime, they are hoping to more directly support energy efficiency.
- Buying groups – Being a regional leader they state that the City of Keene is interested and open to their program and that they make their own choices about their products; however, everyone goes up to bid on the same day at the same time so they are benefiting from collective buying power, while keeping autonomy with the program.
- Opt up campaigns – Education, outreach and opt-up campaigns are run to support general program awareness and recruit participation into the 100% product.
- Planning and evaluation – There is a big emphasis on this as a part of reaching goals. They need to get the program up and running and then look at evaluation and innovations.

Universal Access and Equitable Treatment: Patrick Roche highlighted that this is a key statutory requirement. Universal access means anyone can join the program and equitable treatment means they have to treat similarly situated customers the same. The plan makes a few different distinctions on treating customers the same based on their circumstance:

- Product option – This includes the opt-up options or the basic/default option.
- Rate class - large commercial versus residential versus small business
- Joining via the opt-out process or actively opting in. The distinction here is mostly for large commercial entities. If opting in as residential or small business you are guaranteed the program rate; however, they reserve the right to charge market price for large commercial entities. The reasoning behind this is that it's a way to protect the rest of the participants due to risk premium.
- Switch options any time without penalty

Dan Belluscio asked if the larger commercial entities are negotiating a lower rate outside the system anyway, which is normally better than residential rates. Patrick Roche answered that most large commercial entities will be doing a more complex rate and probably won't be enrolling in the program. Dan Belluscio stated that everything looked amazing and wondered why people wouldn't do this and what could go wrong? Patrick Roche answered that on the economic side they can't guarantee savings. When they are recommending the default 5 or 10% they are giving themselves some buffer to account for variability because they only know the utility rate 6 months out. The track record for programs that they've run is that they do deliver savings, so that is a plus. Patrick Roche states this is why the education and outreach plan is essential. A lot of people aren't familiar with electricity and don't think about it all that much. They don't want people to feel confused or feel the city is doing something without their knowledge or buy-in, so the process typically goes better with community preparation.

Daria Mark announced that everyone could contact [communitydevelopment@ci.keene.nh.us](mailto:communitydevelopment@ci.keene.nh.us) for questions, and they will answer them in the meeting on January 26, 2021. The survey outreach identified that people wanted to hear about this program via email and she showed how the public can sign up on the City of Keene website. Community outreach will include email, flyers, social media, radio, etc.



The meeting on January 26, 2021 will consist of presenting the survey results and explaining the draft Community Power plan.

**4) January 26, 2021 Public Hearings – 12:00 PM and 6:30 PM**

Dr. Ann Shedd requested that the committee hear about proposed HB315 and how it could impact the Community Power plan if passed. Guest Robert Hayden stated that the bill is restrictive and they do not want restrictions. They want to be able to use more renewables anywhere they can. He stated that he has had many conversations with other concerned entities in regards to planning strategies. At worst case, they would create a strategy to water down HB315 so they don't lose as much flexibility. The preferred strategy would be to completely eliminate HB315 with a large effort of business and community folks commenting against it. They are in the developmental stage of what their strategies will be and are very aware of the situation and looking to maintain the flexibility they now have.

Mari Brunner stated they have a meeting scheduled for Friday, January 22 and asked if the committee would like to hear more about this bill then. Dr. Ann Shedd replied yes and stated maybe the committee members could read a little bit about the bill beforehand. She inquired on whether or not there's a more formal version of the Community Power plan available to circulate to committee members. Mari Brunner responded that there will be and the goal is to send it out next week before the meeting to give committee members time to review it. Rhett Lamb added that they have a meeting set up with city managers and the city attorney as soon as their time allows, and will do their best to get the plan out to the committee as soon as possible.

Councilor Mike Giacomo stated he submitted a question for Daria Mark in the chat about how many people they would need to opt-up in order for them to reach 100% goal, and requested that they obtain that estimation at some point in the near future.

**5) New Business**

There was no new business. Dr. Ann Shedd requested that everyone contact the Community Development Department if they have questions from today.

**6) Upcoming Meetings**

- a. **Friday, January 22, 2021 at 8:00 am (tentative)** – Dr. Ann Shedd stated this meeting is scheduled to take place.
- b. **Jan 26 (noon and 6:30)** – Dr. Ann Shedd stated they will need a quorum for these meetings and Mari Brunner replied that she had heard back and they will have quorum at both meetings. Dr. Ann Shedd inquired about the format and Mari Brunner stated it would be similar to the meeting today, including at least 20 minutes for questions from the public.
- c. **Friday February 5, 2021 at 8:00 am**



7) **Adjourn**

Dr. Ann Shedd adjourned the meeting at 9:02 AM

Respectfully submitted by,  
Nicole Cullinane, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by Mari Brunner, Planner

City of Keene  
New Hampshire

**AD HOC COMMUNITY POWER COMMITTEE**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

**Friday, February 12, 2021**

**8:00 AM**

**Remote Meeting via Zoom**

**Members Present:**

Peter Hansel, Chair  
Councilor Mike Giacomo  
Dr. Ann Shedd  
Paul Roth  
Dan Belluscio

**Staff Present:**

Rhett Lamb, Community Development  
Director  
Mari Brunner, Planner

**Members Not Present:**

**Guests:**

Daria Mark, Good Energy  
Patrick Roche, Good Energy  
Robert Hayden, Standard Power

Dr. Ann Shedd read a prepared statement explaining how the Emergency Order #12, pursuant to Executive Order #2020-04 issued by the Governor of New Hampshire, waives certain provisions of RSA 91-A (which regulates the operation of public body meetings) during the declared COVID-19 State of Emergency.

**1) Call to Order and Roll Call**

Dr. Ann Shedd called the meeting to order at 8:06 AM. Roll call was taken.

Paul Roth motioned to make Dr. Ann Shedd pro-tem Chair. Dan Belluscio seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mari Brunner realized the approval of minutes was not listed in the agenda and stated she will add them to the agenda to be approved at the next meeting.

**2) Discussion: Draft Community Power Plan**

Mari Brunner stated that during the previous committee meeting, Daria Mark and Patrick Roche from Good Energy gave a presentation on the Community Power Plan and survey results. This meeting they wanted to see if anyone had any questions since the committee had some time to review the plan.

Patrick Roche from Good Energy first addressed a question from the previous meeting regarding what kind of opt-up program participation it would take to get the overall program to 100% renewable energy. He stated they would need almost everyone to opt

up to the 100% product to get there, which demonstrates that opt-ups are likely not the way to get the whole program to 100% renewable energy. Instead, they will have to increase the renewable energy in the default option over time. However; he wanted to show how impactful having opt-up campaigns can be to the total percentage of program renewables.

Patrick Roche showed a graph with percentage of participants who are opting up for more renewables on the horizontal axis, demonstrating the impact on total program renewables of the y-axis. Background details of the graph: They assumed that 2% of people would opt down to the basic product and that the ratio of people who choose the opt-ups would be at a 2 to 1 ratio, meaning more people opting-up to the 100% product than the 50%. They also assumed the default product had 5% extra renewable energy. The Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) in 2021 is shown at 21.6%.

Patrick Roche explained that if the program launched and no one opted-up, they'd add about 5% additional renewable energy, because that's what the default product is adding. If 5% of participants opted-up that would put them at a little over 30% total renewable energy for the entire program, 10% of participants opting up would put them at 35% renewable energy, and so on. In summary, 5% participation in opt-ups adds 5% to the total program renewables, thus doubling the extra renewable energy they are getting in the program. This demonstrates how opt-ups are impactful. Patrick Roche clarified that this wouldn't be a way to get to 100% renewable energy, but it's important in increasing overall percentage of renewable energy for the program.

Patrick Roche mentioned again that they could also increase the default, but keeping that product competitive will maximize people who stay in the program, so that's not something they'd do right out of the gate.

Councilor Mike Giacomo asked if there is a way to help supplement others who have opted for the basic service or who can't afford to upgrade. He wondered if that would be legal and something that's possible with their program to be able to get to 100% renewable energy as a city. Patrick Roche stated the plan as currently written would allow participants, for both opt-up products, to have the amount of extra renewable energy purchased go up to 100% of their usage, on top of the RPS. However, they would still need to get 60-75% of participants into the 100% group to reach that 100% total renewable energy mark, and typically they've seen rates of around 5% opting up. Mike Giacomo stated the city has a tough goal with this program. He suggested they include in program promotion the percentage of residents needed to opt-up, the extra amount they'd need to pay, in order to reach the goal of 100% program renewables.

Peter Hansel joined at 8:20am.

Chair Hansel asked why we tie rate to RPS and stated it might make more sense for people to talk about the program without having to bring up the RPS, and instead just use a flat number. Patrick Roche stated that the reason for discussing the program in relation to the RPS is because the RPS can change. For example, if the legislature slashes the RPS

that would mean this program would have to increase the amount of renewables in the default rate to make up the difference, which would decrease cost competitiveness, and that's why they refer to the RPS – to ensure the default rate will be cost-competitive. However, he stated it's a good point for marketing and educating outreach to focus on total renewable energy instead of RPS plus additional. Chair Hansel asked if the RPS is slashed, will the amount of renewables stay the same. Patrick Roche stated the amount of renewables on the grid will stay the same, but the cost connects with the RPS because of the following: When you're buying power supply there's a purchase of the power and also the renewable energy credits. If you want to claim the use of an hour of renewable electricity you need to have a renewable energy certificate saying you own that hour of renewable energy production. If the RPS goes down, default service would have to purchase fewer renewable energy credits, which would mean they would have less cost. For the RPS, and any additional renewable energy they are going to include, they need to make sure they also purchase renewable energy credits to match up for the quantity.

Paul Roth asked if that information is based on the assumption that dirty energy is cheaper than renewable energy. Patrick Roche answered that you need to hold the renewable energy certificate if you want to claim the renewable electrons, but for dirty energy you don't have to hold a certificate.

Dr. Ann Shedd asked, in terms of process for the plan, the energy supply agreements are 1, 2, or 3 year contracts and she wondered if it would be advisable to go with shorter term contracts. This way the City can determine if they are meeting interim targets and then with each new contract they can have a higher expectation of renewable goals. Patrick Roche answered yes, they'd like to move closer to the 100% goal with each contract and they will be asking for a range of different time periods when the bids come in. Dr. Ann Shedd then asked if they have an approximate delta in cost of the 50% or 100% renewable offerings above either the utility default or program default pricing. Patrick Roche stated often they are looking at around a 3, maybe 4, cent increase to get to 100%. Dr. Ann Shedd stated that it would be helpful to frame that information to the public at some point. Patrick Roche agreed and stated it would be good to put it in terms of average household use and understanding cost. Mari Brunner added that in Greenfield, MA they have a calculator on their website where residents can enter in their electricity use data and see how much they'd pay, and then compare that to the default rate. She spoke with Daria Mark who stated they could do something similar on their website. Patrick Roche stated he thinks Greenfield even added in a greenhouse gas emissions calculator, which they could also look at adding on their website to demonstrate impact beyond dollars.

Paul Roth stated it's important to remember they are talking about a subset of all the other electricity being used in the community, so it would be good to keep this in mind, that 100% within the Community Power Program is part way to their goal.

Chair Hansel asked if they've done a "what if" analysis if some of the legislation goes through relating to Community Power Programs. Dan Belluscio agreed that would be a good thing to do. Patrick Roche answered that the plan is to stop that bill entirely but they

have identified “showstoppers” or aspects of the bill that would most negatively impact the program, and they did join a call with Eversource to voice concerns but haven’t yet seen amendments on those.

Bob Hayden commented that having interim goals, as far as purchasing features early on, is extremely important to generate revenue or greenness into the program. He mentioned that one of their extended teammates, Bob King, pledged one of his hydro-facility’s monetary benefits to the Community Power Program, so they’ve been working on that. Bob Hayden reiterated that having clear definitions going forward, as to what the benchmarks are in time, is critical and also a great thing to publicize. He assured them that Good Energy is already working on the things that will become the next steps with launch of the plan, both long and short term.

Bob Hayden urged everyone to vote against HB213 and stated everyone is welcome to call him if they need help with that. He explained that HB213 is the reduction of the RPS from the 20% range down to about 9%, by eliminating biomass. It also significantly reduces solar. This would cut the RPS in more than half and is one of the building blocks for this plan, and renewable objectives across the state. Chair Hansel reminded everyone to register their opposition for the hearing at 2:00pm that day. Rhett lamb added that the City of Keene’s opposition had been expressed regarding HB213.

Dan Belluscio asked how price competitive they are against those on the outside of the program. Bob Hayden stated he works in the NH marketplace on energy every day with a variety of customers on third party supply in Keene. He noted that a large customer might use 30 or 40 million kilowatt hours, which might be a couple of companies in town. Medium sized businesses use 1-5 million kilowatt hours. Both often get very good rates; however, they believe participation in Community Power Program will create a bid that will be based on 70 or 80 million kilowatt hours (per year) for the residents only. So it’s likely that the initial price will be extremely competitive compared to what some of the businesses are now enjoying with third party services, in a declining market. They will need to be sure to reach out to folks who are being served as well as those who are not being served.

### **3) Keene Community Power Website (KeeneCommunityPower.com)**

Daria Mark from Good Energy reviewed the new website launch. She stated their goal is for the website to be a resource for all information about the Keene Community Power program, so the website will be growing and changing at different stages of the plan, and they welcome and encourage ongoing feedback. Dan Belluscio asked if they’d be tracking the progress on total energy usage for the community to be able to track against city goals. Daria Mark stated they will add an impact page once the program has launched and they have that information to be able to show how they are doing compared to basic service. This will also include the percentage of participants in each program category. Rhett Lamb added that the entity that has all that information is the default utility and they don’t necessarily share that information readily, but they are trying to work with them.

Paul Roth asked if Eversource had given any numbers about what they currently supply as far as volume of power. Rhett Lamb and Mari Brunner stated they have spreadsheets for 2019, but they are very high level, there's not much information on how much energy is being used and when, and Eversource's categories for electricity customers don't match with how the average person would think about uses such as residential, commercial, and manufacturing or industrial. They do have interconnected solar data for 2020.

Yves Gakunde from the community asked what the difference is between the website for the Sustainable Energy plan and this Community Power website. Mari Brunner responded that the Keene energy plan is a project website and there is a page about Community Power on there but it is not meant to be a program page. The Community Power website will be a program website which will be managed by consultants and be more sophisticated. The Keene website is a low cost website managed by staff. The Community Power page on the Energy Plan site will direct people to the Community Power website.

**4) HB 315, "Relative to the aggregation of electric customers"**

- a) **Public Hearing: Friday, February 12, 2021 at 3:00 PM** – Bob Hayden stated it's very important to participate in the hearing process and anything they can do to encourage others to register against HB315 would be great. It might be appropriate to watch proceedings as well. Dr. Ann Shedd agreed that it's very important to register opposition and wanted everyone to recognize the community impact that the bill could have. Rhett Lamb commented that HB315 includes an element of state oversight and approval of locally drafted community power plans, which defies the principal of the original legislation that allows for communities to draft their own plans. He added that there is no other statute where a municipal plan requires review and approval from a state agency, so this really takes away local control.

Chair Hansel stated they've had good coverage in the Keene Sentinel on this issue so hopefully the public will see it and participate. Councilor Giacomo stated while everyone was talking he was able to get in and register against both bills and it took about a minute, so very easy to do. Chair Hansel asked about possible amendments to the bill. Bob Hayden stated the amendment should be made available soon but they may not know what the amendments are until the meeting occurs. Rhett Lamb responded that this should be mentioned to the committee because they didn't have a chance to look over the amendments in advance. Bob Hayden agreed and Chair Hansel stated he would raise that comment if needed.

**5) New Business**

Chair Hansel stated the Community Power Plan is now available to the committee and the public. Mari Brunner stated there will be public hearings on Tuesday, March 30th at

noon and 6:30pm. The committee can bring up any comments or concerns about the plan at the next meeting on Friday, March 5, or send comments or questions directly to Mari Brunner, Rhett Lamb, or the consultants. Comments and questions can also be submitted via the Community Power website.

**6) Upcoming Meetings:**

- a) **Friday, March 5, 2021 at 8:00 am (regular meeting)**
- b) **Tuesday, March 30, 2021 at 12:00 pm and 6:30 pm (public hearings)**

**7) Adjourn**

Chair Hansel adjourned the meeting at 9:12 AM.

Respectfully submitted by,  
Nicole Cullinane, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by Mari Brunner, Planner