



EEB Evaluation Committee Monthly Meeting - MINUTES

Monday June 12, 2017 – 10:00-11:00

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/27kd6iysijkfoel5i06k6yitasyf14cd>

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: Jacobson, Skumatz, O'Connor*, Oswald, Lewis(*), Chiodo, Swift, Prahl, Melley*, McCree, Gorthala*

Guest: Franks

1. Public Comment
2. Approval of Minutes from May meeting – (O'Connor / Gorthala) Moved and passed later in meeting after additional voting members arrived (in favor O'Connor, Gorthala, Melley).
3. Non-Project Updates and Issues (Skumatz, all):
 - a. Review Interim progress / highlights;
 - Interim e-votes and meetings and report review / schedule. Interim e-votes June mini-RFP results; May minutes and April invoice only got 2 votes, so they were recently re-circulated for the additional needed votes.
 - b. Non-Project –
 - PSD report in progress – discussing needs /format with users.
 - c. SERA team invoice – (Gorthala / O'Connor). Explained the expenditures are not proportional with year expended because of extra work on RFP process. We hope to move toward even, but additional contractors will mean additional calls. We will keep the committee posted. Moved and passed later in the meeting after additional voting members arrived (in favor O'Connor, Gorthala, Melley).
4. Mini-RFPs –Status (asked guest to get offline for this discussion). Skumatz thanked utilities for trying to keep the process moving. UI / Alfred called about needed forms; Swift also on the issue, sending requests for forms over the weekend. Sent UI SOW specialized form sent out to all selected contractors to begin work on that paperwork. Status is moving paperwork forward asap. Reminded all that data requests and up-front data meetings are a clear part of the projects and will begin as soon as we can, with the goal to have all understand which data will and won't be available, and when, and in what form, etc.

5. Data Cost Issues Memo – Discussion and possible action- Skumatz presented a summary of this memo, versions of which have been presented at previous meetings. This version separates costs by utility, summarized on first page of the memo and supported by later pages of the memo. Recommendation is that the costs be assessed, be added to the project budgets, and that the funds are not derived from the evaluation budget. How to provide a bigger “stick” to incentivize the utilities. The dollars are a stick, and we need to be more prompt about pointing out data deadlines that have passed. Another suggestion was to discuss the motivating tool of incentives/ other sources of funds. Question about the next steps on how to make this happen in adding the \$116K. O’Connor will check; UI may know as they were involved last time, not Eversource. Issues relate to storage of both backup material and program materials; has been significant problem (e.g. suggest asking about 90-day reports for all commercial reports). EA Team also suggests that another motivation is that officially, if the evaluation team is not supplied data to conduct an evaluation on a utility’s program, the savings should not be able to be claimed, affecting utility performance indicators. Committee discussed / in general agreement with recommendations. Decided to wait to issue an e-vote until utilities have another opportunity to comment on this. If nothing is heard, the e-vote will be sent around.
6. Discussion of Projects / Status (and data) – *see Gantt & Project summaries*
 - a. Walk-through of Projects / Monthly Status Report – focus on Gantt “changes” and status of new projects; update on results of call / meeting on “new” steps for projects
 - Chiodo (C&I) – Largest savers project is moving rapidly forward on on-site metering. Working on data and site-specific reports; progress is good.
 - Jacobson (C&I) – Small business process evaluation is working on documents / integrating comments. Site work progressing. Billing analysis only got data from 50% of the customers, and it is likely it doesn’t make sense to do the billing data analysis and that is an issue. Tradeoffs being considered. PRIME program evaluation has some challenges but it moving along.
 - Skumatz (Res) – R1606 received and incorporating comments; R1615 received feedback on the report, and conducted follow-up all on some of the issues raised, and clarifications will be incorporated not the final report. (Prah) Clarifying that the NTG figures are not “placeholders”, and are the values expected going forward/ not planning additional studies on this issue. R1602 draft was sent for review and is being revised. Working on baseline and billing reports to be released within a few weeks. R1613/14 is doing analysis on individual measures and the best results available will be provided in a memo for consideration into the planning process. R1617 they are working on developing the survey to support the modeling work. Expecting fall report.
7. Data Status update
 - a. Residential – not currently behind.
 - b. Commercial – Jacobson sending out request for 6 sites of 90-day reports (PRIME project); have info they expect to get for the remaining projects.
8. Other items –
 - a. Update on DEEP / NEEP M&V 2.0 Grant – There was a Partner meeting last week – providing an overview of project. LBNL provided more detail on design; utilities discussed current evaluation methods and possible projects to include, and NEEP involved in regional communication. They are at the end of completing contracting process. On track now / expect to pick up progress.

Chiodo attended and noted there is a C&I focus for start for LBNL / looking for current evaluations to compare. M&V 2.0 (project level) – they seem to be looking at largest savers and RCx projects – considering screening, historical data access, and they are looking at 20-30 projects. A Tool is to be made available to evaluators – open source tool available to industry to help advance M&V techniques. Melley noted she was not clear if it will be based on existing evaluations or new projects. There was a discussion of what was meant by “Traditional methods” - definition / question. The feedback from attendees seems to be that their definition is “desk review” more than true / full evaluation and they (LBNL / Project) should use industry language for better clarity. Swift noted that it would be preferable to compare 3 data points (including evaluation), not just against desk review. LBNL cares most about new projects and desk review called Plan A (Swift’s preference is called Plan B, and brings in the third comparison/not new projects). Chiodo noted that the most participants / parties would likely be much more interested in the larger context – desk reviews haven’t been great performers / predictors and comparison to a poor performer isn’t very meaningful. Oswald asked about which round of evaluations was being considered – there is about a 2 year period for their C&I work – wondered if they would have site level results possibly for EO sites within that timeframe. Melley said she is still working it all out. Chiodo suggests they try to have them use same language as the industry – concept of traditional M&V – desk review does not equal traditional M&V – it is a very low level of rigor and is not acceptable as “evaluation”... desk review is usually consider more a 2nd round of *ex ante*. Prah asked what would the meaning of results be comparing a 2.0 vs. a desk review (a process acknowledged to be a poor substitute for real evaluation)? If this is supposed to be a model that would provide good evaluation results within a timely timeframe, desk review isn’t slow and isn’t good and if we’re comparing to that...? So is this demonstrating something valuable / is this new step really an evaluation? Isn’t is measurement, not evaluation? General agreement with the point and problem expressed by multiple attendees. Still not clear what the interpretation of the results would mean? People thought the objective was to see whether we can get good site level M&V results for less time and less money – If you’re trying to figure out if the underlying (new) results are “good” – absent independent assessment of those results using an acceptable / typical level of evaluation rigor, it is not possible to determine if the results they are getting are “good” with that design. Concerns.

*** Supporting Materials in Box folder and attached, including:

- Updated Gantt Chart & Project Status Summary
- E-votes / call notes (attached)
- Minutes from last meeting
- Data memo
- Mini-RFP progress report
- Invoice

Summary of 2017 Votes To Date

Minutes & Invoices Approvals

2017	Minutes for the month	SERA Invoice
June	For e-vote after July meeting	For e-vote after July meeting
May	PASSED-in meeting O’Connor, Gorthala, Melley (6/12/17)	PASSED-in meeting Gorthala, O’Connor, Melley (6/12/17)
April	PASSED-Evote Oconnor, Gorthala (5/31/17); re-sent 6/9; in favor Dornbos, Melley (6/12/17)	PASSED-Evote Oconnor, Gorthala (5/31/17); re-sent 6/9; in favor Dornbos, Melley (6/12/17)
March	PASSED-Evote O’Connor, Dornbos, Melley, Gorthala 4/13/17	PASSED-Evote O’Connor, Dornbos, Melley, Gorthala 4/13/17
February	PASSED-Evote O’Connor, Melley, Gorthala 3/9/17	PASSED- Evote O’Connor, Melley, Gorthala (3/9/17)

January	E-vote O'Connor 2/6, Gorthala 2/6; re-sent out for third vote 7/10/17	PASSED- Evote O'Connor, Melley, Gorthala (3/9/17)
---------	---	---

Other Votes

June 2017

- Approved / Passed – Memo Summarizing Mini-RFP Results (in favor O'Connor, Dornbos, Gorthala, 6/5/17)
- Approved / Passed – 2 parts / both approved: Approving Memo identifying extra costs to evaluation projects because of data issues from utilities and identifying the assessment to each utility and recommending addition to each of the project budgets, with the money to be pulled out of funds that are not evaluation funds. (in favor O'Connor, Dornbos, Gorthala. 6/22/17)

May /June 2017

- None additional.

April 2017

- Interim Meeting -1617 DHP Working Group – 4/10/17

March 2017

- None additional

February 2017

- Approved/passed Evaluation Plan Update (votes in favor 2/8/17: O'Connor, Dornbos, Gorthala)

January 2017 Interim votes and interim committee meetings – not final

- Votes in favor of evaluation plan (in favor O'Connor & Gorthala 1/9/17; Dornbos 1/12 – passed). 1/24 DEEP votes against.
- December 2016 minutes passed (In favor 1/9 O'Connor, Melley, Gorthala, Dornbos).