

Final CC Meeting
DRAFT Notes
December 19, 2013

9:35am—Introductions

In Attendance:

- Pat Field, CBI
- Catherine Morris, CBI
- Jonathan Raab, Raab Associates
- Meredith Hatfield, OEP
- Brandy Chambers, OEP
- Doug Patch, Orr & Reno
- Susan Arnold, AMC
- Peter Roth, DOJ
- Mike Wimsatt, DES
- Christophe Courchesne, CLF
- Tom Getz, Devine Millimet
- Representative Smith

On phone:

- Liz Sheil, Senator Forrester's Office
- David Shulock, PUC

9:40am—Jonathan Raab presented the agenda

Today looking at a high-level comparison of the major takeaways from the Focus Groups and Citizen Workshops

Brief background on workshops:

- Presented participation numbers for citizen workshops
 - Weather did affect attendance at several locations
 - Plymouth by far the largest
- Workshops were well received—majority of participants rated them a five or six out of six
- Methodology overview
 - For workshops, some questioned used a ranking system, which is a form of acceptable choice polling, and others asked them to choose top (or bottom) 2-3 choices, which is a form of first choice polling.
 - Won't be able to do direct comparisons to focus group results, because used a slightly different methodology.
- Results on SEC Membership/Size - questions and comments from CC:
 - How are you going to package this, still concerned about value of these, you look at the language, status quo has a negative connotation, I don't know how anyone has an informed opinion about the right size, what does this tell us?
 - It tells us what it tells us, the legislature can use it as input. I disagree on status quo, I don't think it has a negative connotation,

it is what it is, and on some questions people prefer the status quo. Also, remember that people weren't filling these out blind, there was a lot of discussion among the tables before polling.

- I agree that there needs to be a framing of this that is clear about the fact that these people are not informed on these issues. A half hour briefing doesn't make them experts.
- People had to make a commitment to go to these, there was some level of self-selection and willingness to educate going into this.
- I take some exception to the idea that the only people who matter are the people who are totally wound up in the center of it and know all about it. That's not NH—everyone's opinion matters, even if they're not particularly well informed. The report should not say that only people who are really informed about it.
- The report will have a broad audience, and I think it's inappropriate and rude to suggest that the report should have a disclaimer that these people don't know anything.
- That wasn't my proposal, I'm more concerned about the process that took us down the path that got the questions in a way. I'm more concerned about how we're going to interpret the data.
- Even if we had done 'statistically significant' polling of the entire state, we'd be in the same situation—citizens have differing views.
- The mission was to identify deficits and needs, does this do that?
- The legislation required OEP to do certain things, and the team that chose the consultant did have a choice, as some other consultants did propose that a group go off in private and study this, and we chose not to do that because we thought it was important to get citizen input.
- Was 'independent' commission defined?
 - Yes, gave example of LURC in Maine
- Public Membership
 - Citizens think it's a good idea to have public member, focus groups were less convinced
 - Worth noting that when we did first choice polling, people chose the option of a public member over an 'independent' commission
 - My problem with this question is that it's muddled, this is a legislative model but the SEC is an adjudicatory body
 - This came out of our research on other states, most of the other states in New England do have public members
- Don't like average across focus groups, don't feel that the "across all participants" solves it
 - We describe what these are, but don't discuss any inherent bias, we could add that and explain more
 - I think that kind of footnote is a good idea and would really help
 - People are going to cherry pick, so we think that more information is better

- State appropriation had a lot of support, but is it realistic? At what cost (e.g., who would lose funding as a result?)
 - For the legislature to decide
- On public engagement question, really need to make clear how unhappy the public is – this question doesn't really demonstrate that
 - It will be in there, but to be fair, 52% of participants had never had any contact with the SEC process
- To follow up on that, will you be doing that kind of contextualizing or cross-referencing?
 - We will do that by sequencing, e.g. like questions together, but we will be very careful about jumping to conclusions on behalf of the reader, we want to let them get there. Connecting things can be too close to making recommendations
- Will the report make note of the confusion about whether a policy currently does or does not exist? Confusion between policies/plan/strategy
 - We can add a footnote, yes. But despite that, citizens were pretty clear that they want projects to be aligned with state energy policy. Focus groups were split... Asset owners split from NGOs/Citizens
 - We were clear about the fact that option 2 really is current practice, because even though it's not required, the SEC does it
- Does the group feel that there is a paragraph or footnote that we want to see to address the concept of need, and the difficulty of being in a connected market?
 - There is currently a very strong feeling among people in NH that we are a net exporter and why should we put in more?
 - Right, that is the perception, but that's not reality—on some days, NH does import—and so do we want to do more about education?
 - “Need” is not a meaningful question to ask... impossible to say whether individual plants are needed or not, determination done on regional level
 - This issue had the largest split, what do we do about it
 - It's a disconnect between the groups' understandings of the system
 - We heard at the listening sessions that local people need to understand the benefits to them
 - The actual statute for the SEC confuses the issue further, Section 1 has the word need
 - A need finding is irreconcilable with restructuring
 - This local problem pre-dates restructuring, and Maine studies leaving ISO frequently and always finds that it would be way too expensive to do it alone, this is why we have transmission in the first place; all it takes for NH to become a net importer is the closure of one major plant.
 - Footnote could maybe just say “Need means different things to different people”
- Group discussed the Potential Impacts Concern question—really interesting to consider how it's hard to weigh, and the way the public is split
- Make sure to mention the fact that not everyone polled on every question in the section describing the keypad polling

- Group requested that in the final comparison chapter, when saying “3 of 7 focus groups”, always spell out *which* groups

11:30am Team got input on structure of chapters for final report

11:50 CC asked about where it goes from here; Meredith explained process for posting report once finalized, and noted possible presentations to the legislature. All participants in the process will be emailed a link to the report. She also noted that the State Energy Strategy process is required to look at siting and the report will likely be an input to that.

12:00 Team wrapped up by noting that there were a lot of areas of possible changes to the SEC that received high levels of support, and it will be interesting to see where it goes from here.

CC offered thanks to the team for completing this considerable undertaking.