



**EEB Evaluation Committee
Monthly Meeting**

Monday September 9, 2013 – 9:30-11:30 am

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

MINUTES¹

Present: Amy Thompson (Chair), Eric Brown (Phone), Diane Duva, Jamie Howland (Phone), Taren O'Connor [EEB]; Geoff Embree, Paul Gray, Joe Swift, Donna Wells [Utilities]; Cindy Jacobs [DEEP]; Vickie Hackett [OCC – Phone]; Scott Dimetrosky (Phone), Lori Lewis (Phone), Lisa Skumatz [SERA Evaluation Consulting Team]; Tim Cole [EEB – Scribe]

1. Public Comment – There were no public comments.
2. Approval of Minutes – Minutes from the August 12, 2013 Evaluation Committee meeting were not yet ready for review. It was agreed they would be distributed for an electronic vote when ready for consideration.
3. Walk-through Recommended 2014-2016 Evaluation Plan and Budgets
 - a. The SERA team conducted a review of the projects included in the draft Plan and the input received in discussions in three EEB Evaluation Committee conference calls held during the preceding weeks. Projects were reviewed in order of their currently assigned priority.² Of particular interest to the Committee were the following:
 - C101 – Energy Conscious Blueprint Process and Impact evaluation – This should be done every three years. This was last done in 2011, so a new study is now due. When possible, in the course of the study data on Non-Energy Benefits (NEBs) will be collected. Cindy Jacobs inquired whether NEBs data will be included in other program evaluations. Lori Lewis responded that such data is useful mostly for marketing and will therefore only be included in process evaluations.
 - C106 – Strategic Energy Management Process evaluation. The Committee discussed the issue of timing with respect to impact evaluation following up on process evaluation. Ms. Lewis noted that regarding SEM innovations, Business Sustainability Challenge, and Operations and Maintenance programs, innovations need to be in place long enough to have meaningful data for impact evaluation, including seeing their impact on other programs they may eventually feed in to. The programs envisioned for process evaluation would be feeder programs.

¹ Meeting Materials Available at Box.net folder <https://app.box.com/s/j4sh8npf7wmiowoevw55>

Materials in folder include:

- Updated Gantt Chart
- Updated Monthly Project Status Summary
- Recommended 2014-2016 Evaluation Plan
- Excerpt from DEEP Decision (Evaluation section)
- SERA Team comments on Evaluation Section of DEEP Decision Document

² CT_EvaluationPlan2014-2016Summary_090513_v1

- C105 – SEM Evaluability Assessment – Ms. Lewis noted that this type of assessment is a new best practice in the field. It is possible to do a process evaluation even if the program is badly set up for formal evaluation, however it would not be possible to do an impact evaluation if it is determined that data and basic information is not available.
 - R86 – Residential Lighting Net to Gross evaluation – Scott Dimetrosky noted that this study will be both retrospective and prospective.
 - R111 – Residential New Construction Impact and Process evaluation – Ms. Skumatz noted that such a study has not been done in a long time. Vickie Hackett inquired whether changes called for in DEEP’s draft decision on the C&LM Plan will have affect the evaluation plan for this project. Ms. Skumatz responded that she did not foresee any difficulties, given the nature of the changes mentioned in the decision.
 - R84 – Consumer Electronic Market and Potential study – Eric Brown inquired whether the study would include appliance recycling and whether the proposed studies are aligned with an existing budget. Ms. Skumatz responded that the team was not developing the plan in accord with a given budget.
- b. Mr. Brown inquired about the NEEP EM&V Forum studies included on the list. Ms. Skumatz responded these are studies the team has been involved with NEEP in planning. Their placement on the listed is determined by their likely value to Connecticut. Our share of the budget is a fraction of the total cost of the study for NEEP. She pointed out that she and Mr. Dimetrosky had been discussing with Connecticut stakeholders the likely value of participating in the listed studies. Ms. Jacobs inquired whether program administrators and policy makers in fact make use of the results of such studies. Ms. Thompson noted that she had discussed this point with Tracy Babbidge, who was going to look into it. Diane Duva indicated that she would follow up. Jamie Howland commented that participation in the listed studies seemed worthwhile given the low cost projected. Ms. Skumatz pointed out that the NEEP project budgets on the list include the Connecticut share of NEEP’s costs, but do not account for the EEB consultants’ role. However that role is minimal after the initial planning and scoping.
- c. R46 – Energy Efficiency Financing evaluation – Mr. Howland that although it is currently ranked Low, an evaluation will be needed, possibly co-funded by CEFIA. He wished to flag this item for future discussion.
- d. Discussion / comment – Review and Finalization of Evaluation Plan: Proposed Schedule
- Evaluation Committee Review Full Draft Plan Starting Monday, September 9. Send any other comments directly to SERA during review process.
 - Any other changes will be incorporated by SERA by September 20th. SERA will send out electronically the final evaluation plan for vote on September 20th.
 - Evaluation plan vote opens for evaluation committee members on September 20th and closes 1 week later on the 27th.
 - If Evaluation plan passes by majority vote of evaluation committee members, the plan will be emailed out September 27th for full review by EEB board. This gives the full board 2 weeks to review the evaluation plan before voting.
 - Discussion and vote on the plan at the October EEB meeting.

Ms. Skumatz elaborated on the schedule presented here. The goal is to get the final slate of projects out to the Committee by Friday, September 13, with the aim of allowing the Committee to approve the Plan two weeks in advance of the October 9 Board meeting. This would give Board members a good amount of time to review the Plan before the meeting. In response to a question from Mr. Brown about what level of detail will be included in the Plan that is circulated, Ms. Skumatz stated that a summary will be provided. Ms. Thompson responded to a question from Mr. Brown about how this process compares to past practice and whether it is aligned with DEEP

guidance and an approved budget. She noted that the goal this year is to develop a better process based on much input from stakeholders. This was designed to be a bottom up process, resulting in a list of studies known to represent the needs of programs and planners. She commented that it appears the first year will be more costly than expected, but the higher cost will be offset in the out years when costs will be less. The SERA team has worked closely with evaluation contractors to get solid estimates, so these numbers are considered to be more accurate. Mr. Schlegel noted that the group has done a good job of prioritizing and leveraging NEEP studies, which is a very cost-effective approach, which should yield good studies at relatively low cost. It was agreed that if Board members have two weeks to review the Plan, at the October 9 meeting 45 minutes should be allotted on the agenda, allowing for a 15-20 minute presentation followed by discussion.

4. DEEP Decision Discussion

Ms. Thompson directed the Committee's attention to pertinent documents in the meeting materials folder, including an excerpt from the draft decision on the topic of evaluation and a memo prepared by the SERA team in response.³

Ms. Duva reported that DEEP has taken note of SERA's inputs and will likely make some changes in the language in now in the draft to address redundancy issues SERA has identified. Regarding the memo, Ms. Skumatz stressed that it represents the team's response and they will submit these submit comments on their own behalf. Ms. Thompson raised the question whether the Board will submit its own comments reflecting on the issues of concern to the Committee. Ms. O'Connor indicated that OCC will be presenting its own comments. Therefore she must abstain from voting on comments prepared by the Committee or the Board. However, she raised the question whether SERA's comments reflect what Committee is thinking.

Ms. Duva noted that they appear to be helpful comments, however the question is what does the Committee want to see the final decision say? Mr. Howland indicated that in his view the Committee needs to comment on the language in the draft decision. Ms. Thompson responded that she expects she, Mr. Howland and Mr. Brown will have comments they wish to see included in the Board's comments. Her comments will also include issues Shirley Bergert has shared with her. Overall, there is a general concern that the evaluation process remain independent of DEEP, especially regarding what is studied and how. The current process involves the team gathering input from all stakeholders and then reviewing with their own professional expertise. If the Committee were to become just advisory, DEEP could work directly on with the EDCs and committee's role in shaping and implementing process would be much less significant.

Mr. Brown expressed his concern about accountability and who is the process accountable to, whether to the Board or to DEEP, and asked what the Committee's role is now. Ms. Thompson responded that the process spelled out in Roadmap underscores the independence of evaluation process relative to programs and even state agendas. If the Committee wishes, language could be added to the comments about working cooperatively with DEEP and others. She agreed to try to have revised language to Ms. O'Connor, Ms. Bergert, Mr. Brown, and Mr. Howland for their review later today in order that it can be shared with Mr. Schlegel before Wednesday's Board meeting. Donna Wells noted that the companies will also be looking at relationship to legislation and roadmap in framing their own comments on these issues.

5. Quick Review of Status of Projects and (backlogged) Presentations – For the record Ms. Skumatz directed the Committee's attention to the following updates:
 - a. Non-energy impacts /Non-Energy Benefits: The team delivered a workshop on this in August

³ CTEEB_DEEPDecisionEvalExtractLAS 0905;

CTEEB_ResponseToDEEP082313DraftDecisiononPlan_EvalConsultants082813_v2

- b. Skumatz Projects:
 - R5 Weatherization Report – Edits have been completed. The report will be sent to the Committee for review by Tuesday 9/10.
 - R15 Potential study – Technical potential memo has been delivered and edits are now underway. Cost-effectiveness will be dealt with as a later task.
- c. Dimetrosky Projects:
 - R3 Regional Hours of Use study – The loggers have been removed and analysis of the data collected is now underway.
 - R6 Housing Characterization study – The study is complete and has been posted.
 - R7 Ground Source Heat Pump study – The analysis is underway; however the lead analyst is in the hospital so there have been delays in the schedule.
 - R8 Central Air Conditioning study – The loggers will be removed this fall.
- d. Lewis Projects:
 - C9 Small Business Energy Advantage Impact Study – The final loggers have been removed and a preliminary billing analysis is now being reviewed.
 - C10 Data Mining – The contractor is currently receiving CL&P definitions, with the UI data request to follow.
 - C11 Barriers to Program Participation with a Focus on Financing and Cancellations – The Scope of Work/Work Plan is currently being drafted.
 - C12 Small Business Limited English and Limited Income Study – Revisions of the Work Plan for Phase 2 are currently underway.
 - C14 Energy Opportunities Process & Impact Evaluation – The analysis is currently underway.
 - C17 C&I Market Research – Discussions with stakeholders have been occurring. An outline of the Scope of Work/Work Plan is now being drafted.
 - C18 SBEA Process Evaluation – The drafting of the Scope of Work/Work Plan has been initiated.
- e. SERA team budget check-in: Ms. Skumatz reported that –
 - As of end of July, 41% remaining of budget and 48% of year remaining, tracking well relative to plan.
 - Transition & planning tasks are mostly done. Scoping for 2014 projects & delivery and finalization of 2013 reports remain outstanding.
- f. Reminder of decisions from last meeting: Residential Planning Budget; C13 Large Participant Trend Study is complete.

Mr. Schlegel commented that he thought GSHP study was completed in June and wondered about the hold up. Mr. Dimetrosky noted that the revised report was due in August. He will look into the hold up. Geoff Embree inquired about the budget status for the study. Mr. Dimetrosky reported that the contractor is over budget already. He will lean on them to get a definitive deadline and will report back to the Committee.

Submitted by: Tim Cole / EEB Executive Secretary