



STATE OF CONNECTICUT

PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY

DOCKET NO. 22-08-07

INNOVATIVE ENERGY SOLUTIONS PROGRAM CYCLE 01

INNOVATION ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING – AGENDA

(April 25, 2023, 1:00pm - 2:30pm EST)

The sixth meeting of the Innovation Advisory Council (IAC) was held on Tuesday, April 25, 2023. All participants joined via a Teams conference call.

Agenda

1:00 p.m. Councilmember Attendance & Motions

* indicates designated representative

Agency/Party	Representative	Attendance
CT PURA	Julia Dumaine*	x
	Patrick Fryer	x
CT DEEP	Lidia Ruppert*	x
	Dino Pascua	x
	Sabrina Xie	x
	Ashley Marshall	
CT Green Bank	Sara Harari*	x
	Laura Sobocinski	
CT OCC	Bill Dornbos*	
CT Innovations	Konstantine Drakonakis*	x
	Pauline Murphy	x
	Drew D’Alelio	x
	Matt McCoee	x
Eversource	Amy Findlay*	x
	Steve Bruno	
	Jennifer Schilling	
United Illuminating	Ted Novicki*	x
	Sean Sullivan	x
CTNext	Onyeka Obiocha*	
Yale Carbon Containment Lab	Anastasia O’Rourke*	

Others Present: Eli Asher (Strategen), Micah Feigelson (Strategen)

1:02 p.m. Call to Order

- Julia Dumaine, the co-chair of the Innovation Advisory Council (IAC) called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m.

1:05 p.m. March Meeting Minutes

- The IAC voted to approve the minutes from the March IAC meeting.

10 Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 06051

An Equal Opportunity Employer

www.ct.gov/pura

1:10 p.m. Review of Phase 2 Application Process and IAC Review Process

- Eli Asher, a Manager at Strategen Consulting, which is serving as the Program Administrator for the Innovative Energy Solutions Program on behalf of Connecticut Public Utilities Regulatory Authority, presented the current evaluation process for the 33 Phase 2 applications deemed eligible.
- Mr. Asher provided an overview of the Phase 2 timeline, with the following proposed dates:
 - May 1 – Phase 2 Applications are sent to applicants.
 - May 12 – Public Webinar for applicant questions about Phase 2.
 - June 15-16 – Phase 2 applications are due and received applications are provided to the Program Administrator and IAC members.
 - July 5 – Program Administrator sends its scores and rankings of Phase 2 applications to IAC.
 - July 11 – IAC Meeting to discuss Program Administrator Phase 2 scores and rankings.
 - July 21 – IAC members complete their review and send their recommendations to the Program Administrator.
 - July 25 - Program Administrator presents final Phase 2 applicant recommendations to the IAC for feedback.
 - July 31 – PURA Decisional Staff receives a complete package of recommended Phase 2 projects, based on Program Administrator and IAC member review.
- Mr. Asher provided an overview of the Phase 2 application questions, which evolved from the Evaluation Framework to develop a targeted set of granular criteria with 1-5 grades defined in each criterion.
 - Mr. Asher clarified that the IAC members could use the Program Administrator’s granular criteria for their internal reviews, PURA’s Evaluation Framework, or could use their own criteria if preferred.
 - Mr. Asher mentioned that Phase 2 applications will be sent to applicants via email, rather than by webform, to ease the application process.
 - Mr. Drakonakis asked if “supporting Economic Development” is considered in the Phase 2 Application.
 - Mr. Asher replied affirmatively and specified that Economic Development benefits would be captured within the “Project Benefits” grading criteria.
 - Ms. Dumaine further noted that the criteria terminology was taken from the Decision.
- Mr. Asher noted that IAC members can recommend up to \$23.2 million in Cycle 1 projects in their Phase 2 review to accommodate the PURA Commissioners’ budget ruling. The IAC would vote by member organization, rather than by individual.
- Ms. Findlay and Mr. Novicki asked if IAC members could recommend projects with a lower collective budget than the \$23.2 million limit.
 - Ms. Dumaine clarified that IAC members could recommend project portfolios less than and up to the \$23.2 million limit, and further noted

that the original IES Decision did not specify the amounts and would need to be clarified in the Cycle 2 iteration.

- Mr. Asher stated that IAC members must state and explain the reasons for choosing a particular project and identify any affiliation they have with projects. Projects that are not recommended in their portfolios do not need the same explanation.
 - Ms. Dumaine clarified that IAC members can internally choose their criteria and rationale for their chosen portfolios, which will help leverage the diversity of IAC viewpoints.
- Ms. Ruppert asked if IAC members could choose a number of projects beyond the \$23.2 million budget limit to increase the diversity of project selections.
 - Ms. Dumaine responded that PURA and the Program Administrator would consider this approach, and IAC members might be able to identify additional “nice to have” projects beyond the budget limit.
 - Mr. Asher concurred that the IAC could potentially vote for projects beyond the budget, which would maintain the same impact toward developing an optimal portfolio.
 - Mr. Asher clarified that several Phase 2 applicants are requesting less than the \$5 million project maximum, so the IAC portfolios are likely to exceed five proposed projects.
- Mr. Asher discussed that the Program Administration team would organize IAC voting results and related comments into a package for PURA Decisional Staff, after reviewing the recommended portfolio with the IAC for their final feedback.
 - Mr. Sullivan asked for clarification on how the final recommendation to PURA Decisional Staff would be made, following the Program Administrator and IAC portfolio tallies.
 - Mr. Asher responded that the total number of IAC votes received per project, plus the Program Administrator’s granular criteria scoring, will allow the Program Administrator to determine a recommended, optimal Phase 2 applicant package. Additionally, the Program Administrator can prioritize project diversity (via pathways and topic areas) for applicants with similar scores.
 - Ms. Dumaine clarified that the balance of Program Administrator graded criteria and the IAC’s recommendations are intended to deliver a clear and documented project portfolio for PURA Decisional Staff.
- Mr. Asher then discussed the Phase 2 Application Draft and Project Implementation Tracking Plan, stating that there would be no explicit character limit to the application questions, but that applicants would need to succinctly summarize their projects in addition to specific questions.
- Mr. Asher provided a summary of the materials that Phase 2 applicants would receive.
 - Mr. Drakonakis asked if the Phase 2 application would contain questions asking for hard numbers for project metrics and goals.
 - Mr. Asher responded affirmatively.

- Ms. Dumaine noted that several Phase 2 application questions were based on language from the Decision, and could not be altered until Cycle 2.

3:15 p.m. Pitch Fest Debrief

- Ms. Dumaine discussed receiving positive participant feedback for the April 18th Pitch Fest event and thanked the IAC members for their help and participation.
 - Ms. Harari and Ms. Sobocinski were highlighted for their help in hosting and organizing the event.
- Ms. Dumaine emailed a satisfaction survey to Pitch Fest participants after the event to find feedback for organizing and streamlining the event for next year.
 - The survey results so far average 8.4/10 satisfaction.

3:20 p.m. Overview of Coming Action Items

- PURA has tentatively scheduled a June IAC meeting

3:30 p.m. Adjourn

Upcoming Schedule (subject to change)

Meeting Date	Action Items	Councilmember General Tasks
April 25, 2023	• IAC Meeting	• Finalize consensus for Phase 2
By May 1, 2023	• Notify Phase 1 Proposals of selection for Phase 2	
May 12, 2023	• Public Webinar to answer any Phase 2 application questions	
June 15, 2023	• Phase 2 Applications Due • Strategen to begin scoring proposals	• IAC to begin reviewing proposals to prepare for voting
June 27, 2023	• (Tent.) IAC Meeting • Preliminary discussion of Phase 2 applications	• IAC members be prepared to discuss initial thoughts on applications
July 11, 2023	• IAC meeting • Discuss proposed portfolio for submission to PURA	• IAC members be prepared to discuss further thoughts on applications
July 21, 2023	• IAC members complete review and provide project portfolio recommendations	• IAC members finalize votes
July 25, 2023	• Program Admin presents draft, optimal, recommended portfolio to IAC members for final feedback	• IAC members provide final feedback on portfolio

July 31, 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase 2 Proposal IAC Recommendations Submitted to PURA 	
August	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • *Break – no IAC Meeting* 	
September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule IAC meeting • Begin discussion of Cycle 2 Theme • Review EDC Grid & Customer Need Filings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IAC members be prepared to discuss Cycle 2 themes
October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • *Break – no IAC Meeting* 	
November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IAC Meeting • Vote on Cycle 2 Theme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IAC members come prepared to vote on Cycle 2 theme
December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PURA to issue Cycle 1 – Phase 3 decision • IES Cycle 2 Info Session Webinar 	
January	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aim for January 1 application open 	