



**EEB Evaluation Committee
Monthly Meeting**

Wednesday, September 5, 2012, 9:30 – 11:00 AM

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

MINUTES¹

Present: Amy Thompson (Chair), Jamie Howland, Taren O'Connor, Rick Rodrigue (Members)
Others: Kim Oswald [phone], Tim Cole (Consultants); Geoff Embree, Paul Gray, Joe Swift (Companies); Lucy Charpentier (CEFIA), Cindy Jacobs (DEEP)

1. Public Comment – There was no public comment.
2. Long Term Evaluation Plan.
 - Status
 - Review of Evaluation Decision Matrix
 - Addition of Studies
 - Discussion of Priorities

Ms. Oswald presented a an evaluation decision matrix as well as a first cut of an evaluation plan using a selection matrix and the articulated evaluation needs suggested earlier by the PAs and the EEB technical consultants. The Committee and others present discussed the various studies presented. Following that discussion, the Evaluation Committee decided to allow additional input to the studies being considered and requested that Ms. Oswald collect and categorize those additional studies. Ms. Oswald also suggested that she provide a reorganized matrix that would make the individual studies easier to identify.

3. Evaluation Roadmap
 - Advisability of Revision –

Ms. Oswald noted that in DEEP's Final Determination on the Expanded Plan published on July 19, 2012 the revised Program Evaluation and Market Assessment Roadmap filed in March had been approved. Recent experience suggests, however, that it would be beneficial to clarify the distinction between evaluation studies and other market-oriented assessments. Different rules of

¹ Meeting Materials Available at Box.net folder <https://www.box.com/s/k2knpqe5p37p8d3r01o6>

interaction apply in the two instances however the classification is not always clear. For now the Committee is erring on the side of defining a study as an evaluation, with very clear firewalls regarding who may communicate with whom, how, and when. She further noted that she and Mr. Howland have done some preliminary work of possible revisions to achieve the desired clarification. She asked the Committee first to address the question whether it makes sense to undertake a revision just a month after the current version was accepted. Ms. Jacobs suggested that first it needs to be understood what the difference would be between the existing roadmap and any proposed changes. Why are such changes needed? Mr. Howland responded that the revisions would be small and technical, specifically designed to address how market assessment studies should be defined and addressed. Ms. Jacobs noted that the Office of Consumer Counsel will be interested in the matter. Ms. Oswald pointed out that if revisions are contemplated, they should be done in time to be included when the C&LM plan is filed. Ms. Jacobs remarked that the roadmap is certainly a document that can be revised, with Committee and EEB approval, and agreed that the annual plan filing would be a good process. Mr. Howland noted that there is a little more time to deal with this, since the filing date has been moved back to November 1. He also noted that the Roadmap could be submitted at any time as it is not a part of the Evaluation Plan. Ms. Thompson summarized that since the question is now whether revisions should be proposed and if so, should they be included with the annual plan filing, the consensus appears to be that this should go forward. Ms. Jacobs indicated that she would check to see if there is any concern at DEEP with proceeding this way.

4. Reports out for Review – Ms. Oswald reminded the Committee that the following studies are out for comment.

- Residential New Construction Revised Draft - Comments due September 11, 2012
- Revised Efficient Lighting Saturation and Market Assessment Report – Comments due September 20, 2012
- Home Energy Solutions Financing Focus Groups – Response to recommendations due September 11, 2012. She asked the companies to separate these required responses out from their comments already submitted early on the draft version of the study. She will then respond to their responses as required by the roadmap.

For the companies, Mr. Swift confirmed that all three are on the radar screen.

5. Other

Ms. Jacobs mentioned her concern about the ongoing HER study, continuing what was started with the UI Behavioral Pilot Program. She wondered what value there is in continuing. Ms. Oswald responded that CL&P set up the the second year pilot because it wanted to examine the possibility of providing the program to all customers. Therefore the pilot included average usage customers as well as the high-use customers from the first year pilot. She explained that average usage customers may have a different reaction to the program as they have more opportunities to

receive positive reports than did high-usage consumers. She also noted that, whether people like the program or not, savings realized from behavioral programs may be considerable. She also noted that 1.5% savings is a substantial achievement at the company-level, if not for individual customers. In her view, this justifies continuing study of HER savings.

Ms. Jacobs also noted that as part of DEEP's involvement in technical meetings on evaluation studies, the department has developed a final review of the UI BPP that will be sent to Tim Cole today for posting and distribution. It represents the final outcome of the technical session held to review the pilot. Publication of a final review like this will be standard practice going forward.

Ms. Jacobs further reported that there were continuing concerns at DEEP about the methodology and cost of the weatherization study NMR is undertaking for the committee, and mentioned that a meeting with Amy Thompson and Kim Oswald was planned for September 12 to discuss the concerns. She raised the possibility of having NMR meet to discuss methodology. Ms. Thompson expressed her concern about Roadmap permitting this, given the sharp lines drawn regarding communications between contractors conducting studies for the committee and other interested parties. Ms. Jacobs questioned to what degree it would be possible to generalize from a sample of 180 homes, and what degree of precision could be expected. Ms. Oswald responded that the sample size is designed to provide 90/10 precision. It will be a random sample developed following normal statistical procedures. It will be sufficient to cover the whole state and the study sample selection is developed following the same statistical approach used in all studies. Ms. Thompson recommended that further discussion of cost and scope be held until the September 12 meeting. Ms. Jacobs suggested discontinuing the study until all issues have been resolved and noted that Tracy Babbidge has raised the concerns she mentioned. Jamie Howland noted that trying to pause the study at this juncture would raise major problems. Joe Swift noted that NMR is ready to roll and will be actively working already next week. NMR has begun to schedule appointments with customers and contractors. Ms. Jacobs inquired whether the meeting could be moved up. Mr. Howland noted that he, Deputy Commissioner Katie Dykes, Ms. Babbidge, Ms. Thompson, Ms. Oswald, and Jeff Schlegel need to be included and it may not be possible to coordinate so many schedules to change the scheduled meeting. Ms. Thompson concluded that for now the meeting would remain as scheduled, at 11 am Wednesday September 12. If changes were contemplated she would work with Tim Cole to try to find a workable time.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Cole, EEB Executive Secretary