



**EEB Evaluation Committee
Monthly Meeting**

Monday August 12, 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), Taren O'Connor [EEB]; Cindy Jacobs, Diane Duva [DEEP]; Geoff Embree [Scribe], Joe Swift, Paul Gray [utilities]; Jamie Howland [ENE, phone]; Jeff Schlegel [consultant, phone]; Scott Dimetrosky, Lori Lewis, Lisa Skumatz [evaluation consultants, phone].

1. Public Comment – There was no public comment.
2. Approval of Minutes – Lori Lewis requested changes in the wording of items C14 and C17. The motion to approve as amended by Diane Duva was seconded by Taren O'Connor and approved with all in favor.
3. Review of (backlogged) presentations and Technical Meeting schedule
 - a. Two presentations were given in the month of July
 - A presentation on the Large C&I Participant Trend Study was made during the July 9 C&I meeting
 - A presentation on the HES Performance Measures and Financing Focus Groups study was made on July 10 after the Residential Committee meeting
 - The presentation backlog has now been cleared
 - b. The evaluation consulting team has tentatively scheduled an online workshop on Non-energy impacts /Non-energy benefits for 1-2:15 pm on August 21, 2013.
4. Update on Projects and Decisions
 - a. Walk-through of Projects / Monthly Status Report – focus on “changes”.² There was more detailed discussion of several studies:
 - R5 – Weatherization Baseline study – Lisa Skumatz reported that a draft of the study has been completed and reviewed by the Evaluation Consulting team. The contractor is currently preparing a final draft based on consultants' feedback. A primary question in the report is the definition of “weatherization.” Using the definition included in DEEP's draft decision, approximately 26% of single family homes may be considered “weatherized.” Noting that the project Scope does not allow for changing the definition, Ms. Skumatz inquired whether several definitions should be referenced. Amy Thompson and Ms. Duva responded that the terms of the Scope should be adhered to. Joe Swift

¹ Meeting Materials Available at Box.net folder <https://app.box.com/s/whzkqu51r9wxhuup6e7j>
Materials in the folder include:

- The monthly updated Gantt Chart of current, planned or recently completed projects
- The updated monthly Project Status summary
- A draft list of ranked projects for the 2014-2016 Evaluation Plan
- A memo on Residential and C&I research area planning budgets and amounts left over before the inception of the new project management process
- A project C13 program memo regarding completion of Large C&I Participant Trend Study

² CT_ProjAugGANTT_SERA_080813_v14; CT_ProjSumm_Aug_SERA_080813_v14

commented that guidance from the evaluator on the issue of definition would be helpful. Jamie Howland agreed that it would be desirable to get information from the evaluators that might be used to inform possible change. For instance, it would be helpful to know the distribution of homes meeting and not meeting the standard, and how far off they are. He noted that a prescriptive model is usually stricter, so that homes may not pass the prescriptive checks and thereby fail a modeling approach.

- C11 - SBEA Barriers: Ms. Skumatz reported that the scope is being modified but the budget remains the same. Interviews currently underway to prepare the C17 – C&I Market Assessment will be used to help inform the revised C11 scope.
- C12 – SBEA Barriers: Limited English & Low-Income – Early interviews indicate that this is a larger population than expected and that Hispanics are not the only Limited English speaking population to be considered. This suggests that multiple community partners may be desirable for programming as well as study purposes.
- C13 – Large C&I Trend Analysis: In response to an inquiry from Ms. Skumatz, Ms. Thompson suggested that the final version of the report presented by EMI should be viewed as definitive and ready for filing, in line with a recommendation from Lori Lewis.³ It was a small study and is being followed up with a larger process and impact evaluation. In this case it does not seem at this point a valuable use of funds to go through the normal stages of presentation and commenting usually called for by the Roadmap, especially since a presentation has been made to the C&I Committee at its July meeting. Ms. Duva moved approval of the recommendation. Taren O'Connor seconded the motion. It was noted that implementation issues raised by the companies regarding some of the recommendations will be addressed in greater detail in the study in the pipeline for 2014. The new process study will have more data to base its recommendations on. It was agreed that the final report of the study would be allowed to stand as is. Geoff Embree stated that the companies will communicate their responses to the recommendations after the report is formally filed. The motion passed with all in favor.
- R16 – HES / HES-IE Impact Evaluation: Ms. Skumatz reported that the project is moving forward with some delays finalizing the scope, and is still on track for a final report in the first quarter of 2014. Noting recent discussions about timing relative to the March 1 deadline for filing the Plan update, Jeff Schlegel inquired when the first numerical results might be available, even if only in memo format. The data will be needed for making decisions about modifications in the HES program. Ms. Duva agreed that the results need to be available in February to support revised plans and budgets from the companies. Ms. Skumatz agreed to check with the evaluator and report back.
- Residential and commercial contract expirations for research areas: As requested at the last meeting, Ms. Skumatz informed the Committee that the Large C&I research area contract will end in December 2014, Small C&I will end in September 2014, and the two Residential contracts will end in August and November 2014. She suggested that for the time being, the team recommends staying with the same firms except when it makes sense to bid projects out in terms of the consultant time that will be required. Ms. Thompson responded that the Committee should take this under consideration after work on the Evaluation Plan is completed, given that there is ample time before fall of 2014.

³ Memo- Completion of C13 Large C&I Part Trend study v2

- b. Residential and commercial planning budgets requiring approval: Ms. Skumatz reported that the team recommends rolling project-related planning costs into project budgets.⁴ She noted that no C&I planning budget will be needed, because no planning took place in 2013 before Lori Lewis got the procedures changed. The Residential budget experienced some 2013 expenditures before the new team took over, and also had costs associated with backlogged presentations, and has between \$15,000 and \$25,000 in unallocated funds. These expenses need to be approved. In response to a question from Mr. Howland about where the money comes from, Ms. Thompson stated the funds are from the \$200,000 planning budget. In response to a question from Paul Gray about whether new purchase orders would be required if the recommendation is approved, Lori Lewis stated that new POs would not be needed. Ms. Skumatz also noted that due to the new team's changed approach, in time such funds will no longer be an issue. Mr. Howland moved approval of the recommendation to move up to \$25,000 in planning funds to project budgets. Ms. Thompson seconded the motion. The motion passed with all in favor.
- c. Invoice & tracking update – discussion on status of SERA team budget⁵: Ms. Skumatz reviewed the breakdown of time and costs through June and noted some areas where there miscalculations on where time would be needed, especially relating to getting up to speed with administrative and organizational tasks for the Committee. Ms. Thompson agreed that there were some understandable errors in forecasting where time would be needed, but expressed her deep satisfaction with the team's performance and the effectiveness of the efforts to improve the quality of the Committee's deliberations and decision-making. Ms. Skumatz commented that July invoices would be coming soon, which would provide a current update on time allocations.
5. Discussion of Evaluation Plan Draft: Ms. Skumatz reported that conference calls had been held to discuss tentative rankings. Referencing the documents provided for the meeting, she noted the following:
- Projects ranked as high priority have now been listed with high-low budget estimates.⁶
 - A Year 2 Behavioral Persistence study has been added to the list as Sheet 32.
 - Total budgets \$4.6-\$7.9 million for the 2014-16 three year plan are forecast, not including Connecticut's cost share on NEEP projects. Projects Connecticut wants to take part in should not run to more than 20% of NEEP's budgets, but those budgets have not been finalized. Final numbers are expected from NEEP in a week or so.
 - Scott Dimetrosky has reported that Glenn Reed wants to see a literature review of refrigerator recycling ASAP before deciding whether it should be included in the final plan. A decision on this has not yet been made.
 - Regarding Sheet 86 on CFL Net-to-Gross ratios, the team is working with NMR to see if the project can be coordinated with Massachusetts's study, which would allow for some cost sharing. Until this is clarified, the budget estimate will remain soft.
 - Regarding NEEP projects, Ms. Skumatz referenced the list circulated previously, noting that it will be updated when NEEP budget numbers become available.⁷ A conference call will be scheduled after the budget numbers are received from NEEP and can be factored into the whole Plan.

⁴ CT_PlanningBudgetMemoProcedures_v3

⁵ Invoice0713v4decimals

⁶ EEBEvalPlanHighRankwithBudgetNoNEEP_v19

⁷ CTEEB_EvalPlanRankingNEEPDraft_v1

- Responding to a question from Ms. Thompson about next steps, Ms. Skumatz asked the Committee to review the list of projects ranked high priority and to provide feedback on any projects that they feel could be delayed and any projects not ranked high priority that should be bumped up. The goal is to have a new version of the Plan ready for the September meeting. One or two conference calls will be scheduled between now and then once the NEEP numbers are in hand. She noted that the list of C&I projects may be considered complete. The Residential list is not yet complete, because a number of prospective NEEP projects may be added to the list.

6. Other – The Committee thanked Geoff Embree for taking notes in Tim Cole’s absence.

Compiled and submitted by:

Tim Cole
EEB Executive Secretary