EEB Evaluation Committee Monthly Meeting Minutes

MONDAY APRIL 8, 2019 – Meeting ran 10:00-11:15

Department of Energy and Environmental Protection – Public Utilities Regulatory Authority, Commissioner’s Conference Room, OCC, 10 Franklin Sq., New Britain, CT

Meeting Materials in Box folder: https://app.box.com/s/lqt6h4szim7gg3of291grihbpw55fo90

Call-In Number: 303/900-3524; WEB Access: www.uberconference.com/skumatz
(Backup number – only if primary # doesn’t work – 720/820-1390 Code (1st caller) 8296#
www.join.me/SkumatzEconomics)

COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Attendees: O’Connor*, Duva*, Wells, McLean-Salls, Oswald, Ingram, Reed, Jacobson, Chiodo, Wirtshafter, Prahl, Skumatz,

1. Public Comment - none

2. Approval of Minutes from March 2019 - EVOTE

3. Non-Project Updates and Issues
   a. Review Interim progress / highlights;
      • Interim e-votes and meetings – last February minutes vote received from Wells
      • Upcoming meetings – No upcoming meetings March or April.
      • Follow-up items – Project data storage / retention issue – Planning a meeting with utilities and Diamond to identify an approach to address storage, security / confidentiality, access, etc. Complex to identify best place for the data. (Data from various projects - Res 400KB, 4MB, 7 MB, 1GB, 3GB; Com’l 1GB)
      • Discussion of membership / voting status of McLean-Salls – not quite yet a member yet.
      • Status of Data requests and deliverables – Timeline report discussion and memo. David Jacobson NTG (C1644) continuing to work with the utilities to get help completing the NTG surveys. Made a lot of progress, and need just 17 more. A little more assistance is needed from the utilities in getting customers to agree to survey, especially UI.
      • Legislative Report update – draft went to EA Team; being edited and should be

   b. March SERA team invoice – 75% of year remaining and 75% of budget remaining. Expect the next couple months to be more than proportionally expensive because contracting and project start-ups. EVOTE.

4. Discussion of RFP memo. Lisa walked committee through it. Checked no guests were on the call. Review of memo and recommendations. Reviewed process and where we are on that process. National distribution of the RFP, which included 12 specific projects that start in 2019, and research area pools, issued January 28. Built off the previous RFP document and forms, criteria, etc. because vetted by
committee and process. Committee reviewed RFP / edits incorporated. After issuing, we received immediate questions clarifying teaming rules. Responded to the list of firms receiving RFP. Received and responded to Q&A process; gave 2 extra days for due date. Received proposals from 15 teams, 44 individual project proposals to score. Pools will be scored after the contracting is underway – pools don’t come into play until 2020 project RFPs are released. Multiple bidders on all but 2 projects; up to 8 on one. 3 evaluators used identical scoring matrices, and scored their set of proposal on 3 criteria using a 1-10 scale (10 is highest). Scoring on cost was not on lowest cost or most hours but best value, relating rates to years of experience, most appropriate mix of senior / junior staff, experienced staff on project. Reviewed all issues related to conflicts of interests from EA team – all team know the various players and have / have had relationship or working relationships of various kinds. Skumatz subbed to some submitters in past / not now. Prime to one submitter on project ending in about a month/before projects start. Chiodo and Wirtshafter are each on a team with one bidder in another state; didn’t score projects they were involved in. Process was to review proposals, initial discussion on internal questions, then final scoring. Issued one clarifying question to a firm that had a merger and change in staff, so they were asked for a revised staffing plan. Two projects with only one bidder. One had very strong respondent from very credible firm, with recommendation to award. Another with weak submittal and limited qualifications, with recommendation to not award and consider another process (possibly re-bid next year). Projects will have jump start over the older one-pager process because more detailed scopes to start for developing the projects, and projects can come up to speed and kickoff fairly quickly after contracting. Pools will be scored after contracting underway.

Budgets are lower than the Evaluation plan budget for two reasons. 1) After the committee reviewed the RFP, it was suggested to reduce budget caps because it would be impossible for bidders (especially new firms) to accurately estimate how much it will cost for the CT process, and data request issues. 2) competitive project proposal process. Another budget-related issue relates to contracting process and the multi-month delay experienced last time because project totals exceeded a threshold (over $1 million). The memo specified phases for each project based on timing, priority and trying to stay under $1 million. The 11 projects total to $4 million. Phases not envisioned to be months apart, but a week or two apart. We could also phase by firm, depending on feedback from utilities (although one firm’s total exceeds $1 million).

Next steps after today’s discussion for the EA team: Notify winners, assure they agree to terms, get agreement two firms will agree to split one project, then deliver all the documentation for the process and contracts. EA Team is asking committee to approve the results an ability to move forward in contracting.

Asked again whether there were guests on the line. Scores for each project was presented in a table from the memo, and each project was discussed, including number of scorers, scores, rationale for winner, budget, and winner. In total, $4.4 million of “plan” budget for the 12 projects, but recommending award of $3.9 million with savings due to held back for data costs, non-award of one project, and bids being less than maximum. Winners were discussed verbally – not written down until contracting is underway. Also discussed the distribution of projects and dollars across firms. Recommending awarding 11 projects with 12 selected winners (splitting one project), a total of 7 winning teams, and not awarding one project. One firm wins 3.5 projects, one wins 3, and the rest win one (or one-half) each. Comments and questions about whether the respondents discussed survey incentives, question about phasing on another projects and other discussion.

Phasing was discussed. Asked committee whether contracts should be for “Plan total” or “proposal total”. DEEP recommends “Plan” budget, with clarity they don’t have authority to spend beyond
proposal total. Cannot spend up to the contracted “cap” without justification / agreement by EA Team and committee.

EA Team asked utilities to let us know if bundling will address the contracting delay issue. UI notes that multiple levels of approval are needed for high total budgets. Question of whether it is a threshold of $1 million total dollars vs. $1 million of UI dollars that represents the threshold. UI will check. Skumatz asked for forms to be sent and Skumatz will check for firms with any exceptions in the proposals.

**MOTION:** Requested a motion to approve memo, the recommended awards, and permission to proceed: Motion by O'Connor, seconded by Duva, Passed (O’Connor, Duva in favor). Motion Passes. McLean-Salls provided informal approval.

5. Discussion of Projects (Gantt, Project Summary Reports Provided monthly w/spend)
   a. Chiodo: C1634 ECB Impact Evaluation 2017-18. Most recent focus is getting data for sampling customers. Cadmus is drawing sample, and will conduct final round of on-sites late spring through summer. One budget issue is that in October, the committee approved a budget increase for this project (additional scope / baseline work) but are having trouble getting paid. Perhaps the utilities need additional information or a clarifying memo to clarify the votes approving this budget change. Minutes called it project R1634 by accident. EA Team will provide memo to clarify.
   b. Jacobson – C1635 EO impact evaluation. Gas metering installed in time for some of the winter heating season; have majority of non-upstream electric metering installed to try to catch upcoming summer loads. Anticipate all metering completed by end of summer. Then upstream data needed from utilities and working on metering plan for that work. Complicated for that kind of program. C1644 NTG study made much progress since last time, with only 17 more project interviews needed, and appreciate help from the utilities in getting contacts and encouraging completion of interviews. Hope data collection complete in next few weeks, so project can start analysis.
   c. Skumatz – Noted change in Gantt Chart, clarifying little “d” (draft to EA Team) vs. Big “D” (draft to Committee); noted in revised key at top of chart. Three projects as a group (R1706 RASS, R1616 Residential lighting, R1705 MF) are linked and are all applying the weights and are expecting to get EA Team reports by early May. Many drafts will, consequently come out about the same time. R1617 delivered report to EA Team and consultants are addressing comments and report being edited. Will be released asap.
   d. R1603 virtually done with first impact stage and making final changes on the report. Leaves a second phase of the drill-down/ sensitivity analysis. Expect that one strong candidate analysis for this phase will be MF, and there is sufficient data to support this analysis. Decision on drill down yet to be determined / input from committee after review of report.

6. Other items –
   a. Update on DEEP / NEEP M&V 2.0 Grant or other projects. Melley sent this report out for comment; EA team will assemble their comments and send to Melley – need a little more time.
   b. DEEP noted a bill in this session. CT legislators introduced a bill similar to other states that would push back on government’s rollback of lighting standards (based on model bill from VT, WA, and elsewhere). Will know by June 5 when legislature ends. Will distribute a one-pager on this. Suggests sending it to the firm that is being awarded the retail products project.

*** Supporting Materials in Box folder and attached before meeting, including:
- Updated Gantt Chart & Project Status Summary & data timeline report
- Minutes – Feb-on way
• E-votes / call notes (attached / bottom of agenda)  •  SERA Team Invoice
• Memo on RFP recommendations

Summary of 2018-19 Votes To Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minutes for the month</th>
<th>SERA Invoice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2019</td>
<td>Passed (O’Connor, 4/1/19, Wells 4/5/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2019</td>
<td>Passed (O’Connor 4/1/19, Wells 4/5/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2019</td>
<td>Passed evote? (O’Connor, Wells in favor 1/19; Dornbos abstain 1/19); Wells, correct spelling Bebrin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2018</td>
<td>Passed (Duva, O’Connor, Dornbos e-vote 12/10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2018</td>
<td>Passed (Duva, O’Connor, Dornbos e-vote 12/10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2018</td>
<td>Passed (O’Connor, Dornbos e-vote 11/16, Wells 12/10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 2018</td>
<td>Passed (O’Connor, Dornbos e-vote 11/16, Wells 12/10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2018</td>
<td>PASSED: O’Connor 9/25; Duva 9/28; Dornbos 10/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2018</td>
<td>PASSED: (Dornbos 9/6, O’Connor 9/7 AYE); Gorthala 9/7 abstain; DEEP approve 9/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2018</td>
<td>PASSED: (O’Connor &amp; Gorthala 7/9; Melley 7/31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2018</td>
<td>PASSED: (O’Connor Abstained 6/18; Gorthala in favor 6/18; Melley in favor 6/26; Dornbos 7/6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2018</td>
<td>PASSED – (O’Connor 5/17, Melley 5/22, Dornbos 5/31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2018</td>
<td>PASSED – (O’Connor 5/17, Melley 5/22 with edit to add her attendance, Dornbos 5/31 abstain)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Votes / Meetings / Tracking – UPDATED

April 2019

March 2019

February 2019
• 2/4 Final presentation on NEI study
• 2/7 Intent to bid and questions due
• 2/14 Q&A responses issued, along with 2-day extension on proposal deadline
• 2/28 Proposal responses received
January 2019
- 1/28 RFP issued, with due date of 2/26/19

December 2018
- 12/7 Evaluation Plan follow-up call
- 12/10 Evaluation Committee passed 3-year Evaluation Plan by e-vote (Duva, O'Connor, Dornbos e-vote 12/10)
- 12/12 EEB Board passes 3-year Evaluation Plan in meeting
- 12/18 Evaluation Committee approves plan for steps in RFP process (12/18 O'Connor, Dornbos); also in favor (Oswald)

November 2018
- 11/30 Evaluation Plan Meeting with Committee / stakeholders

October 2018
- 10/31 data meeting C1634
- 10/15 Data call re R1603
- 10/17 Data meeting R1706 RASS
- 10/12 – R1617 HVAC Presentation
  - E-vote / Passed: Original Language - R1634 revised scope/budget: in favor Dornbos 10/2; recirculated 10/9; in favor O'Connor 10/9. 2-0-1 (no response DEEP) (passes).
  - Recommend revision/ clarification to read: E-vote / Passed - **C1634**: "This is a scope of work adjustment to add baseline research to the scope with a budget of $39,332 as described in the memorandum from the Evaluation Administrators to the Committee. The memo regarding the scope/budget change for C1634 was dated 9/7/18 and revised 9/25/18. in favor Dornbos 10/2; recirculated 10/9; in favor O'Connor 10/9. 2-0-1 (no response DEEP) (passes).

September 2018
- 9/14 – C1641 Presentation
- 9/13 – R1617 Working group meeting
- 9/12 – EEB reapproval of SERA contract
- 9/11 – C1641 posted final
- 9/5 – Review Draft of R1709 NEI study circulated for comment – 2 week review period
- 9/5 – Final report for R1613/1614 HVAC posted

August 2018
- 8/9 - R1707 RNC NTG Review Draft circulated for comment – due 8/30

July 2018
- 7/18 – Technical presentation on R1702 Codes & Standards

June 2018
- 6/28;7/5 – R1702 Codes and Standards Finalized report issued
- 6/13 – data call C1634
- 6/6 – Kickoff C1644

May 2018
- Data call UI – R1603
- 5/15 – Data call, C1635
• 5/10 – R1702 Codes and Standards Draft report for committee review

April 2018
• 4/2 – Presentation C1639 SBEA
• 4/10 – Data Call C1634 Request #1
• 4/23 – HES & IE Impact Data and program discussion
• 4/25 – C1630 report posted

March 2018
• 3/20 – HES & IE Impact Kickoff
• 3/21 – Kickoff for SF and MF On-site Studies (R1616, R1705)

February 2018
• 2/6/18 – EA Team memo on viable project / oversight combinations
• 2/15 – Data Request #1 call C1635
• 2/27 – DHG Working Group meeting R1617

January 2018
• 1/25/18 – Review draft C1630 distributed
• 1/19/18 - EA Team Sent note to contractors on project status
• 1/17/18 – PASSED – Add $70K to budget for R1641 (discussion & memo in eval committee meeting). Votes via email: O’Connor 1/8/18; Dornbos 1/9/18; Melley 1/17/18; Gorthala abstain 1/9/18 (not at meeting).
• 1/9/18 – one pager for EEB Board summarizing Eval Rec’m for sweep prepared; delivered / discussed with EEB by Skumatz.
• 1/9/18 – Motion / Memo on Sweep Passed. EA Team memo on Eval Rec’m for sweep – Projects and EA team budget recommendation – BOTH PASSED by committee (O’Connor, Dornbos, Gorthala with clarifications, 1/9);
• 1/4/18 – Review draft R1613/14 distributed