



Energy Efficiency Board

Evaluation Committee Monthly Meeting

Wednesday, January 9, 2013, 8:30– 10:00 am.

Department of Energy and Environmental Protection – Public Utilities Regulatory Authority
Office of Consumer Counsel Conference Room
10 Franklin Square, New Britain, Connecticut

MINUTES*

Present: Amy Thompson (Chair), Jamie Howland, Taren O'Connor [EEB]; Tracy Babbidge, Cindy Jacobs, Rick Rodrigue [DEEP]; Kim Oswald [Evaluation Consultant - phone]; Geoff Embree, Paul Gray, Joe Swift, Donna Wells [CL&P and UI]; Lucy Charpentier [CEFIA - phone]; Tim Cole [EEB Executive Secretary / Scribe]

1. Public Comment – Paul Gray from UI suggested that the Evaluation Committee should consider reviewing the EEB's involvement with the Northeast Energy Efficiency Partnership's NEEP EM&V Forum, with an eye to determining what value is obtained from the Forum's projects that are supported with CEEF funds. He proposed the Committee might want to adopt a more selective approach to what studies the EEB should support. Kim Oswald agreed that the Committee should pursue Mr. Gray's suggestion. In 2012 many studies had limited applicability for Connecticut. Joe Swift concurred. Geoff Embree noted that there are two aspects to the question – what value do the companies get out of EM&V participation with respect to how they administer the programs vs. what value regulators and other stakeholders get out of it. Mr. Swift proposed that there be a conversation between Ms. Oswald, the companies and others, and that they would then report back to the Committee with recommendations. Ms. Oswald agreed to convene a meeting with the intent of prioritizing which Forum studies to participate in.
2. Approval of December 12, 2012 Minutes – The minutes were approved on a motion by Ms. Babbidge seconded by Taren O'Connor.
3. Consultant RFP Update – Ms. Thompson announced the subcommittee plans to meet Friday January 11 to review proposals. Members' inputs regarding their initial reviews are due today (January 9). They should be sent to her, with copies to Tim Cole.

* Meeting Materials Available at Box.net folder <https://www.box.com/s/xa177mwhzpgc9v83t94f>

4. Weatherization Project – Ms. Oswald reported that 139 site visits had been completed as of January 6. She projects that site visits will be completed the last week of January or first week of February. The volume of HES vendor audits connected with site visits has improved, thanks to increased efforts by several vendors and the companies. The goal for completion of the project is June 30. Results will be made available as soon as possible so results can be used for program planning.
5. DEEP Procedures for Technical Meetings – Ms. Babbidge addressed the need to standardize and clarify the process by which studies are drafted, reviewed and finalized. In the course of a lengthy discussion the Committee took note of the following points:
 - Ms. Babbidge indicated that transparent procedures for project completion be developed that offer provision for publication of a draft report, solicitation of public comment including through public meetings, consideration of input received, and concludes with publication of the final report.
 - Ms. Oswald noted that the Evaluation Roadmap lays out a process to study completion that includes submission of a draft final report for public review, incorporation of comments as merited, and public presentation including, when called for, transcribed technical meetings after the final report is filed. That process was developed to comply with requirements spelled out in PA 11-80 and pertinent DPUC decisions.
 - While the Roadmap process does not currently include a public meeting (briefing) after the draft report is released, Ms. Oswald did not see any reason that such a meeting could not be part of the process going forward.
 - Ms. Oswald also noted that the evaluations are third-party assessments and, while all comments are considered, the evaluation contractor is the only entity that can determine the studies' conclusions.
 - PA-11-80 requires that transcribed technical meetings be held if requested within 14 days after each report is filed. Consideration should be given to adopting a practice whereby holding a technical meeting especially for impact studies would be standard practice unless specifically agreed that it was not needed.
 - The Evaluation Roadmap requires that if a technical meeting is not requested, a public presentation of study results will be provided.

The discussion concluded with agreements that: 1) Ms. Oswald would review whether presentations are still outstanding for any studies completed in 2012; 2) Ms. Thompson will work with Ms. Oswald and Mr. Cole to draft a study finalization process to meet the needs identified, which will be circulated for comment by the Committee.

6. New Projects Scopes of Work – Ms. Oswald informed the committee that proposed scopes of work for two studies were available in the box.net folder for the meeting. These included

an electric savings potential study and an HES-IE persistence study. She urged members to provide comments as soon as possible so that work on the studies could proceed promptly. Ms. Thompson suggested that the process for Committee review of scopes of work still needs clarification. It was agreed that comments should be forwarded to Mr. Cole by Friday January 11. It was noted that the meeting folders are publicly accessible, but that scopes frequently contain confidential budget information. It was agreed that Mr. Cole would set up a limited access on-line folder accessible only to Committee members to serve as a repository for scopes under review.

7. Criteria for Fast Track Projects – Ms. Oswald proposed that it might be helpful to designate a research area among the Committee’s categories of studies. It would include projects that are designed to go quickly, such as focus groups (example the EISA lighting study). For the concept to work, some thresholds would have to be specified in advance such as the dollar value of the project or the complexity of the scope. The Committee agreed to take the proposal under consideration.
8. Monthly Status Report – The monthly status report is available in the dedicated meeting folder on box.net.
9. Reschedule Regular Monthly Evaluation Committee Meetings – The Committee agreed to move its regular monthly meetings to 10 AM second Mondays, with the understanding the time may be changed on an as needed basis. Meetings will continue to be held in the conference room at the Office of Consumer Counsel.
10. Other – Ms. Babbidge requested that a Gantt chart be created that would allow the Committee to track all projects throughout their process.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy Cole, Ph.D.

Executive Secretary, Energy Efficiency Board