



**EEB Evaluation Committee  
Monthly Meeting**

Monday April 8, 2013 – 10 – 11:30 am

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

**MINUTES<sup>1</sup>**

Present: Amy Thompson (Chair), Jamie Howland (phone), Taren O’Connor [EEB]; Tracy Babbidge, Mark Quinlan, Rick Rodrigue [DEEP]; Scott Dimetrosky (phone), Lori Lewis, Lisa Skumatz (phone) [Evaluation Consultants]; Jeff Schlegel, Ellen Zuckerman [Consultants]; Geoff Embree, Paul Gray (phone), Joe Swift [CL&P and UI]; Julie Michals, Elizabeth Titus [NEEP]; Tim Cole [EEB Executive Secretary]

The meeting began at 10 am, with Committee Chair Amy Thompson presiding.

1. Public Comment – There was no public comment.
2. Approval of Minutes – Taren O’Conner moved approval of the March 11, 2013 Evaluation Committee minutes as presented. Ms Thompson seconded the motion. The motion was approved with all in favor.
3. NEEP EM&V Forum – Discussion

Ms. Thompson introduced Julie Michaels, Director of the NEEP EM&V Forum.

Ms. Michals expressed her desire to talk about what the Forum does and what the process for state involvement is / should be going forward, without going into details about specific projects. The intent is to clarify Connecticut’s participation in the fulfillment of the Forum’s 2013 agenda and involvement of planning for the 2014 agenda.

She stated that an annual survey of member states’ research interests is conducted in April. Survey results are then considered by a group of technical consultants, which develops estimated budgets for proposed projects. The Steering Committee engages in a ranking process involving discussions of shared interests and concerns. The project and budget agenda for the coming year is the outcome of the process. She emphasized that the project list is developed by the Committee and not by the Forum independently.

Ms. Thompson observed that the Evaluation Committee is concerned about timing issues – specifically when and how matters are brought to the Committee for its consideration.

---

<sup>1</sup> Meeting Materials Available at Box.net folder\* <https://www.box.com/s/y7tstrvsruspzv8oinbw> - See list of included materials at end of document.

Noting that the Committee only began discussing items on the 2013 Forum agenda only came before it in December – January, she stated that such matters should be presented no later than September. She also raised the question who should be involved in the project development process. Tracy Babbidge reported that DEEP and PURA have discussed this. Cindy Jacobs will be the staff person assigned to the Steering Committee for them. Ms. Thompson suggested that Lisa Skumatz should be the Evaluation Committee’s designated contact. Jamie Howland and Taren O’Connor agreed, with the understanding that the Committee needs to be kept regularly informed as the process unfolds.

Regarding the process now underway, Ms. Thompson stated that the Committee will take it up at its May meeting. Meanwhile, Ms. Skumatz will coordinate with Ms. Michals. Ms. Skumatz noted that she had already responded to the invitation to participate in the scheduled April 23 Forum webinar. Ms. Michals stated that she would send a summary description of the Forum’s committees, with lists of their members.

With respect to the 2013 project list and budget, Ms. Michals expressed her desire to share information about other projects beside the two listed in the Committee’s February 25, 2013 letter.<sup>2</sup> In response to a question from Ms. Babbidge about which 2013 projects might span more than one year, Ms. Michals indicated that the protocol development projects are planned to be completed during the current calendar year, as is the cost effectiveness study. The net savings study will start during the next quarter. The planned research projects on load shape and emerging technologies, as well as the incremental cost projects, will likely go over. Ms. Thompson concluded that Ms. Skumatz will be the lead contact person for the Committee, and will work with the Forum on timing and input going forward.

#### 4. Update on Consultant Transition and “To Do” list

Ms. Skumatz and Lori Lewis led the Committee through a review of the items listed in the Supplemental Materials document.<sup>3</sup> With reference to the policy statement about the automatic process by which DEEP will request technical meetings in cases of process or impact evaluations or when there is potential for an impact on rates, it was pointed out that there is a need to clarify DEEP’s role on the Committee with respect to the Evaluation Roadmap. This will be put on the May meeting agenda, along with other issues concerning the need to update the Roadmap.

Ms. Thompson reported that the SERA team’s Scope of Work and budget had been approved by vote of the Committee. She asked Tim Cole to circulate the results, including comments received from OCC and DEEP.

#### 5. Update on Projects

Ms. Skumatz led the Committee through a discussion of current and planned projects.<sup>4</sup>

In response to questions about why the recent communication about the Housing Characterization study was presented as a memo, Ms. Skumatz confirmed that formal communications requiring or inviting response from the companies would be presented as reports going forward.

---

<sup>2</sup> Evaluation Committee Letter re EMV Forum Project Planning 2-25-2013.pdf

<sup>3</sup> EEB\_Evaluation\_Committee\_April2013AgendaSupportDocsR.pdf

<sup>4</sup> CT\_EEBEvalProjInfoPart1StatusApril2013\_8x11.pdf

Ms. Babbidge asked that the difference between the Weatherization Baseline study and the Housing Characterization study be clarified. She noted that the latter is an add-on, intended to provide a deeper analysis of the 180 home sample than can be achieved through the standard in-home assessment. Ms. Skumatz responded that Scott Dimetrosky would follow up on communications about this received from Ms. Jacobs and United Illuminating.

Regarding NMR's request for an additional \$25,000 above the amount budgeted in the Ground Source Heat Pump project Scope to cover cost overruns, Mr. Dimetrosky reported that NMR has found that at over 6000 s.f. a number of the homes studied are considerably bigger than the 2500-3000 s.f. expected. He noted that NMR is committed to complete the work. Responding to Committee concerns about precedents and the exact terms of the contract, Ms. Skumatz and Mr. Dimetrosky agreed to provide the memo received from NMR in response to Kim Oswald's request for documentation along with an analysis and recommendations. It was noted that CEFIA is also involved in the matter, because it is sharing the costs for the study with the CEEF.

Regarding the proposed Low-Income and Limited English small business study now on hold, Ms. Lewis reported that the proposed Scope will be rejected. A well-targeted step by step process will be developed to replace it. This may take some time.

Regarding the Energy Opportunities process and impact evaluation, Ms. Lewis reported that the consultants are coordinating with EMI and New Buildings Institute on the EMS aspects of the project and therefore receiving some work from them for free.

Mr. Schlegel raised the question about what might be learned from the weatherization baseline study that could be of use to the assessment of energy efficiency potential now contemplated to support the 2014 Integrated Resource Plan. IRP requirements have not yet been clearly defined. He noted that single family homes will be done in any case. Ms. Skumatz noted that the consultants are working with the companies on the piece of the project that has been approved for single family / all fuels. Ms. Babbidge commented that DEEP is leaning toward requesting an update on the previous potential study, in consideration of what is actually doable in available time. The basic requirement is that they have access to the right data to feed the IRP, CES, and C&LM planning processes.

6. Walk-through of Consultants' Proposed 2014 Project Prioritization Process and "next steps" and discussion / input from Evaluation Committee

Due to lack of time, it was agreed to schedule a conference call in the next two weeks to consider this item. Ms. Skumatz noted that besides the Evaluation Consultants and the companies, the two entities mentioned in the Roadmap, she is proposing to include the other members of the Committee and the EEB technical consultants to the list of those from who input should be solicited regarding future project priorities. She hopes to circulate the first round solicitation by April 29.

With no further business to attend to, the meeting adjourned at 11:40 am.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Cole / EEB Executive Secretary

\* Supporting Materials in Box folder, including:

- Updated Gantt Chart
- Updated Project Status Summary
- Approved technical meeting recommendations email voted last meeting
- Upcoming meetings / presentations schedule
- Proposed prioritization / project selection process for 2014 efforts
- Summary of status on “to do” list (simplified)
- Evaluation Committee letter to NEEP / EM&V Forum on 2013 participation