



Energy Efficiency Board Monthly Meeting

Wednesday, August 9, 2017, 1:00 – 3:30 PM
10 Franklin Square, New Britain, CT (Hearing Room 1)

MINUTES¹

In Attendance

Voting Board Members: Taren O'Connor (EEB Chair), Bill Dornbos (EEB Vice-Chair), Adrienne Houel, Ravi Gorthala, Eric Brown, Mike Wertheimer, Diane Duva, Neil Beup, Jack Traver, Amanda Fargo-Johnson (phone)

Utility Board Members: Chris Plecs, Pat McDonnell, Ron Araujo

Board Members not in Attendance: Will Redden, Roddy Diotalevi

Board Consultants: George Lawrence, Les Tumidaj, Glenn Reed, Jeff Schlegel, Craig Diamond, Lisa Skumatz (phone)

Others: Sean Condon, Vinay Ananthachar, Guy West, Pam Penna Verrillo, Walter McCree, Therasa LaVoie, Mark Thompson (phone)

Process

Minutes

The Board considered whether to approve the minutes from the June 14, 2017 Retreat and the minutes from the June 14, 2017 Board meeting. Mr. Wertheimer moved to approve both sets of minutes. Ms. Fargo-Johnson 2nd. All present voted in favor, except for Mr. Brown who abstained. **The June 14, 2017 Retreat minutes and June 14, 2017 Board meeting minutes approved.**

Public Comments

None.

Vote: Memorandum on Board Operations and Process

Ms. Amanda Fargo-Johnson moved to adopt the recommendations in the memorandum discussed at the June 2017 Board Retreat. Mr. Wertheimer 2nd. All present voted in favor. **Board operations and process recommendations adopted.**

Evaluation Data Issues

Ms. Skumatz provided a presentation. Ms. O'Connor said she wanted the Board to focus on the specific issue at hand, which was the payment issue. Mr. Plecs said that Eversource's position on the issue was that the additional costs were driven by: 1) projects that were mis-scoped; 2) unreasonable expectations regarding turn-around times; and 3) data analysis work that was

¹ Meeting materials available in Box.com: <https://app.box.com/s/61an5sbosq73h47m66gi8wcs44dq0ydc>

normally in-scope for Evaluation projects. He said that additional discussion was necessary to resolve this issue. Mr. McDonnell said his assumption was that billing data vs. programmatic data was the issue. He noted that there were five Companies with five different information systems, so it was not reasonable to expect identical billing data across the five Companies. He said that some of the delays were due to Company staff illnesses and lack of follow-through from Evaluation vendors. Ms. Duva said that DEEP had not to approve the Evaluation Committee memo because there had not been insufficient attention paid to data collection issues before studies begin. She noted that DEEP had provided recommendations on this issue in the past, and that we needed to develop realistic up-front expectations of what it takes to obtain data. Ms. Duva said that DEEP took this issue very seriously. She said that DEEP did not think that asking the Companies to pay the data cost overruns was the right approach, and that investment in information technology at the Companies was a better use of rate-payer dollars. Mr. Wertheimer asked why there was so much disagreement on the basic facts after 10 months of the existence of the issue. He said that the Board should accept the recommendation of the Evaluation Committee. He suggested that a cost-coverage proposal should be put forward, or that the Board Consultants should make a proposal for the Board's consideration. Mr. Brown said he voted no on the Board vote because the full Board had not been given the opportunity to hear from the Companies on the issue. Mr. Beup said he did not think the Board should have been asked to take an electronic vote on an issue such as this. He said that he thought the electronic vote was biased in nature (e.g., saying funds could not come out of Evaluation budget). Mr. Beup said that more discussion was needed before the Board could take action. Mr. Traver said that he wanted to abide by the deadline of vote, but he would have preferred more time to understand the issue. He said that the incurred costs are both with the Evaluation contractors and the Companies. Ms. O'Connor said that the Evaluation Committee had been working on the data issues for months, and had discussed the cost numbers many times. She said that she had decided to do the electronic vote because there was no scheduled Board meeting in July, this was an issue that required attention in the short term, and based on committee meeting discussion, the Evaluation Committee members were all in agreement on the issue. She said she still would like the Companies to develop a payment proposal by a certain date. Mr. Plecs said the Companies wanted to explore further options with the Evaluation vendors. Ms. Fargo-Johnson said she voted yes because her understanding was that the Companies were aware of the difficulty of obtaining data through up-front scoping discussions held for each evaluation study. She said that perhaps that process needed to be clarified. Mr. Dornbos said he was not sure what the Evaluation Committee could have done differently, since there had been so many steps taken previously to address this issue. Mr. Gorthala said that although he was on the Evaluation Committee, the vote was difficult for him. Mr. McDonnell said that there was collaboration on the Evaluation Committee, but that the collaboration was not working effectively, and that there had been some break-downs in communication. He also said that he thought the Companies were not at fault in this situation. Ms. Duva said that recovering the data costs from rate-payer dollars needed to be carefully justified. Ms. O'Connor said that this issue needed to be resolved in a timely way. It was decided that Companies would schedule a conversation with SERA, and that the Companies would then develop a proposed path forward for payment.

Programs and Planning

Quarterly Financial/Performance Highlights

Mr. Plecs said that Eversource's performance was on track for both its electric and gas programs. Mr. McDonnell said that the UIL companies' performance was on track, with the exception of SCG's C&I budget which was behind goal. He said that SCG would be re-opening its Residential boiler program this September.

Review and discuss draft Comprehensive Energy Strategy

Ms. Duva provided a presentation. She noted that most of the negative feedback DEEP had received so far on the draft CES is on the proposal to collect a conservation charge on fuel oil. Mr. Schlegel said the plan was for the Board to discuss the draft CES at the September Board meeting. He said the Board consultants would prepare draft Board comments for review at the September Board meeting. He said that the comments would be specific to efficiency, and would be broad enough so that all/most Board members could agree on the comments. Mr. Brown expressed concern about Board being able to agree on most/all of the comments, particularly in a timely fashion. Mr. Schlegel said some individual Board members might need to vote no, or vote no on individual sections of the comments. Or, the Board might need to remove comments that cannot generate enough level of consensus. Mr. Wertheimer said he agreed with Mr. Brown's concern about the amount of time that would be needed for the Board to reach consensus on the comments. Ms. Houel asked about the comments being general vs. specific. Mr. Dornbos said that scope of the comments should be fairly narrow.

Co-Funding for University of New Haven (UNH) Project on Fault Detection and Diagnosis (FDD) Tools for HVAC and Refrigeration

Mr. McDonnell provided a presentation. Mr. Gorthala stepped out of the room for this agenda item because the discussion was about a potential project at UNH where he is a professor. Mr. McDonnell proposed that the CEEF provide a cost share of \$150,000 per year over three years. He said the cost share would come out of the C&LM Plan RD&D existing budget. It was clarified that any intellectual property coming out of the project would be public property. It was also clarified that the results would be published in an academic/industry journal. Mr. Dornbos asked about the timing of the decision needed. It was clarified that a vote would be needed soon – possibly an electronic vote. Mr. McDonnell mentioned that the Neighbor To Neighbor project had received Board support without a solicitation. Mr. Dornbos and Mr. Wertheimer expressed concern that there could be a perception issue if the Board were to approve funding for a project that was managed by a Board member. Mr. Schlegel suggested that Program Administrators could bring forward the proposal.

3. Other

Ms. Houel (as Residential Committee chair) reported on the HES co-pay situation that had been discussed at the Residential Committee meeting that morning. She provided an overview of the issue and noted that there was a short period of time to address the issue. She also said that the Residential Committee and full Board may need to take action on a

short timeline later in the month (and before September 1) after the Residential Committee received information and a recommendation from the Companies (expected on August 16). Subsequent to the meeting, on August 30-31, an electronic vote with the full Board was held to approve the recommendations of the Residential Committee on this issue. The vote resulted in the Board not approving the recommendations because there was not a majority of yes votes out of a quorum of 10 (vote: 5 yes, 2 no, 3 abstain).

4. Closing Public Comments

None.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm.