

**EEB Evaluation Committee  
Monthly Meeting**

Wednesday, December 12, 2012, 8:30 – 10:00 a.m.

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

Meeting Materials Available at Box.net folder <https://www.box.com/s/mq9aiet5m72r7geqi4c0>

**MINUTES**

Present: Amy Thompson (Chair), Jamie Howland, Taren O'Connor [EEB]; Tracy Babbidge, Cindy Jacobs, Rick Rodrigue [DEEP]; Kim Oswald [Evaluation Consultant]; Geoff Embree, Joe Swift [CL&P]; Lucy Charpentier [CEFIA – phone]; Denise Rouleau, Afroz Khan [Rouleau Consulting Group – guests]; Tim Cole [EEB Executive Secretary / Scribe]

1. Evaluation Consulting Team RFP – Process discussion

- Tim Cole reported that 47 firms and individuals had requested and received the RFP. Two firms sent in inquiries regarding potential conflicts of interest. It was agreed that Amy Thompson and Tim Cole will prepare a response asking respondents to explain why a relationship that might be perceived as a conflict of interest does not in fact constitute a conflict in the terms stated in the RFP and the Evaluation Roadmap. The response will also explicitly convey the Committee's expectation that a member of the selected team will be personally present at all regular meetings. Because of the need to provide these clarifications, the response will finally state that the deadline for responses to the RFP will be extended to December 21, 2012 at noon.
- To address other issues regarding the selection process, it was agreed to convene a special meeting to establish review criteria the following week. Proposals received will not be circulated to Committee members until after the selection criteria have been finalized.

2. Discussion of budget – The Committee discussed a series of issues regarding details of the evaluation budget to be recommended to the Board.

- It was noted that \$4.3 million in new money is being proposed for 2013. the Committee is looking at an effective budget of \$6.1 million, of which \$500,000 is already committed. Kim Oswald has provided a matrix that shows studies and assessments currently contemplated in order of priority.
- With the prospect of a \$10 million evaluation budget for 2015 on the table if the expanded plan is approved and implemented, questions arise whether as the scale of programming increases the budget for evaluation needs to increase

proportionately. There may be need for more market assessments to discover how to motivate consumers how to make full use of the increase in programming offered, however such studies may be less costly than impact studies, the number and scope of which may not need to be scaled up at the same rate.

- The sense of the discussion was that the Committee would recommend a lower version of the budget to the board, using a 3.5% percentage of program spending as the basis for the amounts. The Committee noted that the budgets can be revised upward in the out years of the 2013-15 planning cycle if needed. Ms. Thompson and Ms. Oswald were to prepare a revised draft of the letter that will also include projects that could be added to the 2013 slate of studies with additional funds should they become available. The letter was to be submitted to the afternoon's meeting of the Board.

3. Public Comment – There were no public comments.

4. Weatherization Project

- The Committee discussed glitches that have arisen in coordinating the work of NMR's evaluators with HES vendors. It was noted that there have been cost implications for vendors if their scheduled visits are not synchronized with the evaluators'. Joe Swift has contacted some vendors and solicited input from them to address these issues. Ms. Oswald will follow up with him and communicate with NMR about the results of their conversation. There was concern that not as many participants are able to receive HES services as hoped, due to the lack of HES availability. Currently about 70% are receiving HES services. Approximately 100 audits have been done so far.

5. DEEP procedures for Technical Meetings

- The Committee discussed how to further standardize the review process once studies are formally filed. Ms. Oswald noted that standard practice now as spelled out in the Roadmap is that evaluators always make presentations to the Board and interested parties whether or not technical meetings are requested. The companies are required to respond to evaluators' recommendations within 30 days of filing and she in turn files a recommendation based on independent review and also reacting to the companies' statements on behalf of the Committee within 14 days of the companies' response filing. The scheduling of technical meetings however does not always run smoothly. It was agreed that it would be helpful to have a standard protocol for scheduling technical meetings from the date evaluations are filed and for determining in advance which types of studies will automatically entail technical

meetings with or without a formal request. The Bureau of Technology and Energy Policy (BETP) agreed to draft a protocol for review by the Committee and will reference the Roadmap in doing so.

- The Committee further discussed the desirability of providing opportunities to review Scopes of Work before studies begin. OCC and BETP stated an interest in providing input at this stage. It was agreed that a deadline that would not unnecessarily slow project initiation would be set for commenting when each draft scope is circulated. Because the planning process before studies launch is often time sensitive it was agreed that approval would not be dependent on the timing of monthly Committee meetings. BETP was tasked with providing a draft protocol.

6. Other – The next monthly meeting will be held at OCC on January 9, 2013, starting at 8:30 am.