



**Energy Efficiency Board Evaluation Committee
Monthly Meeting**

Monday, February 4 2013, 10:00 – 11:30 am.
Department of Energy and Environmental Protection – Public Utilities Regulatory Authority
Office of Consumer Counsel Conference Room
10 Franklin Square, New Britain, Connecticut

MINUTES¹

Present: Amy Thompson (Chair), Jamie Howland, Taren O'Connor [EEB]; Tracy Babbidge (phone), Cindy Jacobs [DEEP]; Kim Oswald [Evaluation Consultant - phone]; Geoff Embree, Paul Gray, Joe Swift [CL&P and UI]; ; Tim Cole [EEB Executive Secretary / Scribe]

The meeting began at 10 am, with Committee Chair Amy Thompson presiding.

1. Public Comment – There was no public comment.
2. Approval of January 9, 2013 Meeting Minutes – It was agreed that the draft minutes as presented required further review. Kim Oswald and Tim Cole agreed to work on this with the Chair.
3. Northeast Energy Efficiency Partners (NEEP) Evaluation, Measurement and Verification Forum Project Participation – Ms. Oswald reported that she had met with Paul Gray of UI and Joe Swift and Geoff Embree of CL&P to go over the list of the Forum's planned studies. They had arrived at a general consensus about what would be valuable for Connecticut's programs.
 - Mr. Swift stated that they agreed the Incremental Cost of Load Shape study would not be helpful because Connecticut does not use the Total Resource Cost test as Massachusetts does. Furthermore, our program administrators do not need the level of accuracy that the planned study will produce. Mr. Embree commented that there will be three or four phases to the study, and they have more interest in looking at additional measures not included in first phases of study, especially concerning the place of heat pumps and chillers in both C&I and residential programs. Connecticut's share of the study cost will likely be in the \$50,000 – \$60,000 range.

¹ Meeting Materials Available at Box.net folder <https://www.box.com/s/18b8qkrcd54rkkv9m1o5>

- Regarding the planned Emerging technologies study, Mr. Swift and Mr. Gray stated that they did not see much value in studying such things as smart power strips, pellet stoves, and ductless heat pumps, for which the market is not limited to the Northeast. It does not appear to be a task for NEEP to take on, especially since other national groups are studying these technologies.
- With respect to the broader question how Connecticut should participate in the EM&V Forum going forward –
 - Ms. Oswald noted that New York and Massachusetts are also raising questions. She noted that four of the 10 member states have been providing funding to all of the studies. Other states take a more selective approach.
 - Jamie Howland proposed that the Committee should adopt an interactive approach and communicate specifically what Connecticut wants to see studied and what would be most useful. Ms. Thompson proposed also communicating to the Forum the Committee’s reasons for not participating in proposed studies.
 - Cindy Jacobs pointed out that the Forum’s work involves the development of protocols as well as conducting studies. Ms. Oswald added that NEEP would like to see regulators require the use of standard protocols, however the protocols are not yet ready for codification, and there is the problem that drafting protocols does not ensure there is agreement that they represent best practices.
 - Summarizing the discussion, Ms. Thompson proposed that the Committee send a letter stating which studies it is prepared to support. Tracy Babbidge suggested the letter also invite the Forum to respond with explanations what value there may be to Connecticut arising from studies they are undertaking. Ms. Oswald agreed to draft a letter including these points, which will be circulated to the Committee before the end of the week, in time for review before EM&V Forum Director Julie Michals comes to Connecticut to make a presentation to the EEB at its February 13, 2013 meeting.

4. Project status discussion

- Update on current studies – Ms. Oswald provided a review of the projects listed on the Monthly Status report.²
 - Behavioral pilots – The CL&P Year 1 study is the only active one now. A draft final report is ready for circulation for comment. Mr. Cole will be asked to post after Ms. Thompson and Taren O’Connor have had a chance to review. The Year 2 pilot, which started in June, is ongoing. The report not expected until October. This study will compare a sample of high use consumers with an average use sample.

² Monthly Status Report January 2013.docx

- Lighting Hours of Use study – This is a multi-state project involving Massachusetts, New York, Vermont, and Rhode Island. The project was set up by Ms. Oswald, not by the NEEP Forum. The recruiting of participants is going well. Lighting loggers have been installed on eight lamps per house in the locations people use most, such as living rooms, bedrooms, and kitchens. Useful results are expected, especially because Connecticut has the advantage of having done a previous lighting study to compare to.
- HES-Income Eligible Persistence of Savings study – Ms. Oswald reported that the budget has not yet been finalized, while awaiting approval of the contractor’s proposed scope of work. The study will take a comprehensive look at the HES-IE process. This is the first the Income Eligible program is being studied separately. An HES-IE impact study is planned for next year. In response to a question from Ms. Thompson, Ms. Oswald stated that timing of the launch is not crucial. It was agreed to wait until the new evaluation consultant team is on board before getting underway.
- Weatherization Baseline Study – The data from all 180 sites in the sample has now been collected and the contractor is getting ready to begin work on modeling and analysis. It is expected that the data and final report will be ready by June, however because of the linkage to proposed Energy Savings Potential study, the contractor NMR does not have complete control of the process and the delivery of the final report may be impacted.
- Housing Characterization study – An initial draft has been done but there is not yet a draft final report.
- Ground Source Heat Pump study – Mr. Swift inquired whether the contractor is doing any spot metering among the sample to identify 10 good prospects for further long-term study. Ms. Oswald was not able to confirm this.
- Residential Central Air Conditioning study – The fielding surveys are ready. CL&P data has been received, but not yet UI’s.
- Small Business studies – There is concern about the fact the impact evaluation consultant has been slow to respond, so the may deadline may not be held. The data mining study is moving along. For the Limited English study, Ms. Oswald has provided lists of community contacts to the contractor. The scope of work for the study is still in development. The scope of work for the Barriers to Participation study has been finalized. Ms. Thompson indicated that completing the scope of work for the Limited English study should wait for the transition to the new team, as should launch of the Barriers to Participation study.
- Energy Savings Potential Study Scope of Work – Mr. Swift expressed concern about the methodology proposed by NMR, questioning whether developing a subset of the 180

homes in the Weatherization Baseline study as prototypes will not sufficiently allow for the differences and diversity among sampled homes. He also stated his concern about the proposed cost. He suggested that REM/rate files collected for the weatherization study could be used to develop modeling scenarios to analyze the potential impact of possible upgrades. CL&P therefore recommends that NMR look again at the prototype methodology. He agreed to put these concerns in writing by the next day. Ms. Thompson suggested that Ms. Oswald should ask NMR to explain the justification for the proposed approach and what the results will be. Ms. Jacobs inquired whether the initial sample size of 180 is enough to allow for analysis of a subset of prototypes. Ms. Oswald noted that increasing the sample size would have an impact on cost. Ms. Thompson concluded that the Committee may need to hold on taking action, depending on NMR's response. However, because DEEP wants to see results from the study in time to aid its work on the next Integrated Resource Plan, the process needs to move as quickly as possible.

5. Presentations and Tech meetings –

- Regarding the scheduling of technical meetings and presentations, Ms. Thomson noted that she had reviewed the Roadmap process. The current issue is whether an opportunity for public input, including possibly a technical meeting, which might involve a presentation by the contractor, between when a draft final report is released and when the final report is issued. It has been proposed that the Committee would have seven days to request a presentation on the final draft, which would occur during the 14 day comment period between draft final release and issuance of the final report. Ms. Babbidge suggested that such an opportunity be characterized as a briefing, effectively a conversation with the evaluators, which might be done by conference call. Ms. Thompson proposed that there should also be a seven day window for commenting on draft scopes of work before they are released. Mr. Gray indicated that he generally needs some time to consult with the company's program administrators when scopes of work are proposed. Ms. Thompson concluded that these questions should be taken up with new team during the transition. Meanwhile, she will write up a process description that assumes seven days as the standard for commenting on scopes of work and requesting meetings with evaluators after draft final reports are put out for comment.
- Scheduling of Lighting Saturation Study Presentation – Noting that the Evaluation Roadmap currently calls for presentations on concluded studies, when technical meetings are not held, Ms. Thompson stated her wish to set up a regular time for presentations each month. Since the 11:30 – 12:30 time slot before monthly board meetings seems a good option, she plans to talk to Shirley Bergert and Glenn Reed about moving the regular Residential Committee meeting forward half an hour.

Meanwhile, Ms. Oswald and Mr. Cole will work on scheduling the presentation on the Lighting Saturation study for March 13.

6. Transition Planning Procedures – With respect to the transition of responsibilities from outgoing evaluation consultant Ms. Oswald to the newly selected team, Ms. Thompson invited the companies’ representatives to communicate freely with her and Ms. Oswald about any matters of concern. She expressed her expectation that the transition will begin February 13, after the full Energy Efficiency Board votes to approve the team recommended by the Committee. Ms. Oswald asked Committee members and company representatives to make suggestions about how to make the handoff happen smoothly. She plans to upload her files to an online storage site, where they can be accessed by the new team and others.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy Cole, Ph.D.

Executive Secretary, Energy Efficiency Board