

NMTF Policy Path Survey

Introduction and Instructions

Task Force Members: We'd like some additional input from you regarding which policy paths you would like the consulting team to model.

In the first section below, you will be asked to indicate which complete policy path you would most like to see modeled. You will be able to do this by either

- a) selecting one of the seven paths offered at the February 12 meeting, or
- b) creating your own path.

In the next section, you will be asked to provide your opinions about some of the individual potential policy elements (which correspond to the options within each dimension as presented on February 12).

This information will be used to provide Task Force members with a narrowed and refined slate of options for consideration in advance of the Task Force's upcoming March 4th meeting to select policy options for cost/benefit modeling. Thank you for your cooperation in using this survey platform, which will allow for rapid compilation and analysis of results.

Note: As you respond, please keep in mind that the purpose of the modeling is to develop information regarding a policy to get Massachusetts to the 1600 MW goal and beyond. The Task Force might ultimately decide to recommend to the legislature that we move to that new policy in stages, first a transition step and then the final policy. For this exercise, please provide your recommendations for the final (long-term) policy rather than on any possible transition policies.

Instructions: You may page through and answer questions; if you need to interrupt your responses and return later to complete, you may. **Please respond and submit by no later than February 27 at 12 noon**, to allow the consulting team sufficient time to compile results and provide you with timely feedback.

NMTF Policy Path Survey

Identification

***1. Please provide the following identifying information so that we can identify who provided the response and can ensure that nobody's perspective is counted more than others (i.e. by multiple respondents from same organization).**

Name:

Company:

Email Address:

Phone Number:

NMTF Policy Path Survey

Preferred Policy Paths

2. Please refer to the consultants presentation from the February 12, 2015 Task Force meeting, posted at <http://www.mass.gov/eea/docs/doer/renewables/consultant-status-update.pdf>, and the Table of Policy Options distributed at February 12, 2015 Task Force meeting, posted at <http://www.mass.gov/eea/docs/doer/renewables/nms-policy-options-table.pdf>.

Select a preferred policy path for subjecting to cost and benefit analysis, or create your own path by selecting "other", identifying the policy path closest to your preferred policy path, along with your proposed modifications to that approach.

- 1. SREC Program Modifications incl. LT Contracting Pilot
- 2. Competitive Solicitations
- 3. Orderly Market Evolution
- 4. Sustained Growth Adapting to Market Changes
- 5. Maximize federal incentives w/ Managed Growth Boost + Sustainable Growth
- 6. Prioritize Distribution System
- 7. Maximize Installed MW within Defined Budget
- No Opinion
- Custom Policy Path (please specify one of the above paths as well as preferred modifications to the approach)

NMTF Policy Path Survey

Preferences for Policy Elements

The following questions seek your preference for each of the dimensions introduced in the February 12, 2015 consultant presentation found at:

<http://www.mass.gov/eea/docs/doer/renewables/consultant-status-update.pdf>.

Please identify your preferences to each of the following. In the event you have no opinion on a question, please mark "No Opinion" as your top choice.

Finally, in questions with a "top choice" and "second choice", the survey will only allow selection of one of each column per question. This limits the ability to select "Not of Interest" to one selection per question. Please reserve "Not of Interest" for any choice for which you have a strong, or the strongest, aversion, if any. If there is no strong aversion to an option, there is no need to check any button for that row. Rows may be left blank if not a Top Choice, Second Choice or Not of Interest. These will all be treated as if a third or lower preference.

*3. Type of Incentive (Small Solar Market)

	Top Choice	Second Choice	Not of Interest
Tradable SRECs (if selected, in Q4, select "no opinion" and add any commentary desired in comments field)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Performance Based Incentive (i.e., per-kWh payment via long-term contract or tariff, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Up-front Payments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
No Opinion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

NMTF Policy Path Survey

*4. Means of Setting Price (Small Solar Market)

	Top Choice	Second Choice	Not of Interest
Cost-based periodically price set using transparent administrative or adjudicatory process	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Competitive Benchmark (price set based on result of distinct competitive event)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Declining Block Incentive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Adjustable Block Incentive (can go up or down based on market response)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Competitive Solicitation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
No Opinion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

*5. Type of Incentive (Large Solar Market)

	Top Choice	Second Choice	Not of Interest
Tradable SRECs (if selected, in Q4, select "no opinion" and add any commentary desired in comments field)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hybrid, with Long-Term Performance-Based Incentive for Part of Targets within an SREC Market	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Performance Based Incentive (i.e., per-kWh payment via contract or tariff, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
No Opinion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

NMTF Policy Path Survey

*6. Means of Setting Price (Large Solar Market)

	Top Choice	Second Choice	Not of Interest
Cost-based price periodically set using transparent administrative or adjudicatory process	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Declining Block Incentive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Adjustable Block Incentive (can go up or down based on market response)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Competitive Solicitation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
No Opinion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

*7. Geographic Distribution

	Strongly Consider	Consider	Don't Consider
Uniform statewide incentive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Separate pools (or targets) for each utility	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Higher incentive for projects supporting distribution system	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
No Opinion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

NMTF Policy Path Survey

*8. Differentiation of Incentives by Market Sector

	Top Choice	Second Choice	Not of Interest
SREC-II Market Sectors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Undifferentiated (head-to-head for all installations)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Stratified by size only (sub-tiers of specified size)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Differentiation by project type (provide details in Comments field below, i.e. what favored? how favored?)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
No Opinion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

*9. Sized-to-Load Net Metering

	Top Choice	Second Choice	Not of Interest
Keep current framework and rates	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduce net metering credit values	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Shift to Value of Solar Tariff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
No Opinion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

NMTF Policy Path Survey

*10. Virtual Net Metering Credit Structure

	Top Choice	Second Choice	Not of Interest
Keep current framework and rates	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduce credit values	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Shift to Value of Solar Tariff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
No Opinion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

*11. Virtual Net Metering Project Type Limitations

	Strongly Consider	Consider	Don't Consider
Keep current framework	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Narrow eligibility, but maintain for public projects	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Narrow eligibility, but maintain for community shared solar	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Narrow eligibility, but maintain for common ownership	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Narrow eligibility, but maintain for low/moderate income	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Narrow eligibility, but maintain for landfills/brownfields	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Eliminate virtual net metering altogether	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
No Opinion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

NMTF Policy Path Survey

*12. Virtual Net Metering Size Limitations

	Strongly Consider	Consider	Don't Consider
Maintain current caps and limits	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cap all projects at 2 MW per parcel (per Green Communities Act)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Differentiated Caps for different types of projects (please specify in comments)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduce cap for certain types of projects (please specify in comments)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
No Opinion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

*13. Net Metering Caps

	Top Choice	Second Choice	Not of Interest
Keep existing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Remove entirely	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Align caps to meet 1,600 MW goal	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increase to accommodate more than 1,600 MW	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
No Opinion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

NMTF Policy Path Survey

*14. Timing of Transition

	Top Choice	Second Choice	Not of Interest
As early as possible (assumed to be by 1/1/16 for modeling purposes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Post-ITC (1/1/17)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
After 1,600 MW is reached	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
No Opinion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

*15. Targets and Timeline

(Note: this dimension is intimately tied to means of setting price, see examples below)

	Top Choice	Second Choice	Not of Interest
MW Target with Firm Timeline (examples: RI Renewable Energy Growth, VT SPEED)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
MW Target with Soft Timeline (examples: MA SREC, Adjustable Block Incentive/CA ReMAT)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
MW Goal without Timeline (examples: Declining Block Incentives in CA, NY)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Budget constrained (quantity moves inversely with price) (example: CT ZREC)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Unconstrained (examples: Value of Solar Tariff, Uncapped Standard Offer)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
No Opinion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

NMTF Policy Path Survey

* 16. Minimum Bill, defined as follows:

A minimum dollar value threshold under which a customer's monthly bill cannot be further reduced through the application of net metering credits or consumption reductions. Ratepayers whose bills exceed the minimum bill threshold would see no increased costs as a result of the adoption of a minimum bill. Ratepayers whose monthly bills are below the minimum bill threshold would be required to pay the minimum bill and any unused net metering credits would be carried forward for use in future months. Minimum bill rates would be established for each rate class in each utility territory through a DPU process.

	Top Choice	Second Choice	Not of Interest
None	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
For all customers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
For DG customers only	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
For certain customers only (please specify in comments)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
No Opinion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

The End

Thank you for your input. We'll provide feedback to you once we've compiled and analyzed your responses.

The Consulting Team.