



**EEB Evaluation Committee
Monthly Meeting**

Monday July 8, 2013 - 10-11:30 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]; Cindy Jacobs, Diane Duva [DEEP]; Vicky Hackett [OCC]; Paul Gray, Joe Swift, Donna Wells* [Utilities]; Scott Dimetrosky*, Lori Lewis, Lisa Skumatz* [Consultants]; Tim Cole [Scribe]

The meeting began at 10:05 AM with Lori Lewis facilitating.

1. Public Comment – There were no public comments.
2. Approval of Minutes – The minutes for the May 6, 2013 Evaluation Committee meeting were approved on a motion by Taren O’Connor seconded by Amy Thompson. Jamie Howland abstained. The minutes for the June 10, 2013 Evaluation Committee meeting were approved on a motion by Ms. Thompson seconded by Mr. Howland.
3. Review of Presentations and Technical Meeting schedule – Conducted by Lisa Skumatz and Lori Lewis.

Session	Date/Time	Topic	Consultant
Presentation - During C&I Meeting	July 9 – <i>Ms. Lewis noted that this date is contingent on whether the C&I Committee meets as scheduled.</i>	Large C&I Participant Trend study (C13)	EMI, phone
Presentation - 11:30 after July 12 Residential Committee Meeting	July 10 – <i>Ms. Skumatz confirmed it will be held at 11:30. Mr. Howland asked that notice of the presentation be sent to the Marketing Committee along with the report.</i>	HES Performance Measures and Financing Focus Groups study / Results (posted web 2012)	NMR, phone

¹ Meeting Materials Available at Box.net folder <https://www.box.com/s/q9feljngcve55ckmjbm1>

Supporting Materials in Box folder, include:

- Updated Gantt Chart and Updated Project Status Summary
- List of ranked projects for 2014-2016 Evaluation Planning Process
- Memos on Residential and C&I research area planning budgets leftover before new process
- Evaluation Presentation from June 26 Board Retreat

4. Update on Projects and Decisions (20 min)

- a. Walk-through of Projects / Monthly Status Report – Focusing on changes since the last report, the consultant team reviewed the projects on the list.
- Ms. Skumatz –
 - Project R2 (CL&P Behavior Pilot Year 2) and Project R4 (HES Persistence and Process evaluation) are moving along as planned. It is expected they will be completed by the end of the year.
 - Project R5 (Weatherization Baseline study) – A draft early report shows around 26% of existing stock has been weatherized based on the current draft definition. Joe Swift noted that that definition is not yet final and it is expected that the final definition will be informed by the results of the study. Vicky Hackett suggested that this would be a good reason to schedule a technical meeting. Ms. Skumatz remarked that draft report is still at the review stage and not yet ready for public discussion. Concurring with Mr. Swift, Mr. Howland remarked that it would prudent to be cautious about affirming the validity of the 26% finding at this early stage.
 - Project R15 (Oil/Gas/Electric baseline “potential” study) is at this point delayed pending data issues clarification. Mr. Howland noted that a new Regional Avoided Cost study is about to be released. The potential study should make use of the most current data now available. Diana Duva commented that the project is less time sensitive now because of DEEP’s decision to delay work on the next big integrated resource procurement plan.
 - Project R16 (HES impact evaluation) – The project scoping is nearly complete, pending final refinements regarding sample size and other detail. Ms. Hackett inquired whether the committee will have a chance to review the scope particularly regarding current discussions of non-energy benefits/non-energy impacts. Ms. Skumatz responded that it is not expected NEB/NEIs will be included in this scope unless, as discussed elsewhere, it can be added at minimal cost to the planned surveys. Mr. Howland emphasized the importance of making sure the project draws on everything already available through other surveys in the field. Ms. Hackett noted that OCC wants to ensure that evaluation specifically addressed the goals set forth in legislation – namely energy and demand reduction.
 - Scott Dimetrosky –
 - Project R3 (Regional Lighting Hours of Use study) – The contractor is currently scheduling the removal of loggers from participating homes. Approximately one third have been removed, with all of them planned to be removed by the end of August. Analysis of data collected will take place in the fall, with publication of final results expected by the end of the year. Mr. Swift suggested it would be useful to look at room type recommendations and compare them to the Program Savings Document, with an eye to seeing how the data align. The data collected should not be less granular than what is already being used for the PSD.
 - Project R6 (Housing Characterization study) – The final report is in and is ready to post.
 - Project R7 (Ground Source Heat Pump impact evaluation and market assessment) – The final report is expected by the end of July or early August. A technical meeting will then be scheduled. Mr. Howland asked the consultants to be sure to coordinate with Dave Ljungquist at CEFIA, which co-sponsored the project.
 - Project R8 (Central Air Conditioning impact and process evaluation) – All the loggers have now been placed in the field and metering is ongoing. Results are expected to be collected at the end of summer, with analysis to be completed during the fall.

- Lori Lewis –
 - Project C10 (Small C&I Data Mining) – The contractor is currently pulling non-participant data from CL&P and is coordinating with KEMA. Dun & Bradstreet data will be used to extend coverage to the whole state.
 - Project C11 (SBEA Barriers to Participation) – It has been determined that the budget allows for more than the original scope required. The focus now is on the role of financing options and the effect of other barriers to program participation. Ms. Lewis is engaged in conversations with KEMA and EMI, exploring possibilities for linking this project with Project C17 (Market Assessment).
 - Project C12 (SBEA Low Income/Limited English) – A first round of interviews with stakeholders familiar with these market segments will be done sometime this week. The larger study, which will build on these interviews, is now in development.
 - Project C13 (Large C&I Trend Analysis) – The presentation on the results of this study will be held tomorrow.
 - Project C14 (Energy Opportunities process evaluation and non-lighting impact evaluation) – The project is now underway with the scheduling and placement of loggers moving along.
 - Project C17 (C&I Market Assessment) – The project is still in development. A draft initial instrument is in hand. The contractor plans to do a small number of interviews with key stakeholders to get started. Tom Franks from KEMA and Jeremy Kraft from EMI will be conducting the interviews. The first objective is to find out stakeholders' views about what the needs are, what secondary data is already accessible, etc.
- b. Residential and commercial planning budgets
 - Ms. Skumatz is in the process of preparing a memo that will discuss budget management issues, particularly with regard to how planning costs are budgeted and accounted for. Unlike past practice, she envisions a process whereby planning costs are associated with project budgets as part of the scoping cost. The aim is to ensure that the cost of project development is proportional to the actual budget for the project. A description of the new concept will be circulated next month.
- c. Reminder of decisions / activities / discussions since last meeting
 - i. A conference call on Project R16 (HES/HES-IE Impact Evaluation) was held.
 - ii. Presentations have been made on the NEEP C&I Lighting, RNC Baseline, and C&I Free-ridership / Spillover studies; along with a consultant webinar on Impact Evaluations.
 - iii. Presentation slides attached from the June 26 Board retreat are included in the meeting packet.
 - iv. Ms. Skumatz reviewed the SERA team's submitted invoices and tracking document. She noted that about one third of the 2013 evaluation plan budget has been expended, and that the team is now on track with respect to both time and level of effort. Ms. Thompson reported that she has reviewed the invoicing and finds that the billing aligns with the approved workplan. She recommended approval of the invoices and noted that past practice has been that it is up to the Committee chair to approve. That said, she invited response from the Committee on how it wished to proceed. Ms. O'Connor responded that she felt it is important for the Committee as a whole to see the invoicing. Ms. Hackett commented that concerns had been raised at the DEEP/PURA hearings on the C&LM plan about the EEB's process for reviewing consultant invoices. Mr. Howland reported that a process has now been developed for invoicing by the other consultants. Their invoices will

be reviewed by the Consultant Committee. Ms. Thompson concluded that an electronic vote should be held on the invoices submitted, with responses due by July 15. In the future, invoices received by around the 15th of the month will be circulated for an electronic vote concluded on the 21st or the first Monday thereafter.

5. Walk-through of List of Ranked Projects for 2014-2016 Evaluation Plan / Planning Process –

- Ms. Skumatz offered a quick overview of the high ranking of projects proposed for 2014 and following, and for the remainder of 2013. She noted that feedback is useful for framing questions and suggesting priority projects for the NEEP EM&V Forum.
- Regarding Res Item 111 (Residential New Construction Impact and Process Evaluation), Ms. Hackett inquired what justification there is for including non-energy benefits in the study. Ms. Skumatz responded that the way the project is envisioned, it will make for a better process evaluation. She noted that Res Item 110 (Non-energy Benefits / Non-energy impacts Assessment - Participant Beneficiaries Analysis) also addresses residential non-energy benefits / non-energy impacts, and will overlap with the contemplated impact evaluation.
- Ms. Skumatz suggested it might be helpful to schedule a conference call to address other questions in detail. Procedurally, she noted that the next step is to begin cost estimating. The team will be coordinating closely with NEEP on process. Ms. Thompson asked members to take a close look at projects listed as High (or, in some cases, Medium) priority, because those will be cost-estimated before the next Committee meeting. She urged members to provide feedback directly to the SERA team. Ms. Skumatz indicated that the team will forward any information that comes in from NEEP in the meantime about proposed EM&V projects. Ms. Hackett and Mr. Swift expressed a desire to hear about comments made by others. It was decided therefore that a conference call would be scheduled by SERA in approximately 10 days.
- As a point of information, Diane Duva inquired whether NMR was not required to go through an RFP process and wondered what the basis is for selecting them to lead on projects. Ms. Skumatz noted that the Evaluation Roadmap requires firms with area expertise. An RFP had been issued for 3 years and NMR and its group of partners won the competitive bid process two residential areas. For this first year, barring extenuating circumstances, the team is opting to use the existing firms so long as they have the competencies required. SERA has asked for flexibility as needed. A new RFP is due to go out mid-to-late 2014 (with the team to check on expiration dates for the current contracts) if the existing process remains in place. Ms. Lewis noted that national practice is now to go with big blocks when issuing these types of RFPs.

6. Adjourn – with no further business to attend to the meeting adjourned at 11:30 AM

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy Cole, Ph.D., EEB Executive Secretary