



**EEB Evaluation Committee
Monthly Meeting**

Monday October 7, 2013 – 10:00 -11:30 am

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

MINUTES¹

Present: Amy Thompson (Chair), Diane Duva, Jamie Howland, Taren O'Connor, Shirley Bergert (phone) [EEB]; Geoff Embree, Paul Gray, Joe Swift, Donna Wells [Utilities]; Scott Dimetrosky, Lori Lewis, Lisa Skumatz [Consultants], Tim Cole [Scribe]

1. Public Comment – There were no public comments.
2. Approval of Minutes – August 12 & September 9, 2013 Evaluation Committee meetings
 - Diane Duva moved approval of the August 12 Evaluation Committee minutes as presented. Taren O'Connor seconded the motion. All members voted in favor, except Shirley Bergert who abstained.
 - Diane Duva moved approval of the September 9 Evaluation Committee minutes as presented. Taren O'Connor seconded the motion. All members voted in favor, except Shirley Bergert who abstained.
3. Update on Status of Projects
 - Lisa Skumatz facilitated the “walk-through of Projects / Monthly Status Report, with the focus on “changes”.
 - Lori Lewis reviewed a series of project descriptions needing agreement in order to move forward –
 - Project C12 – Phase 2 SBEA Limited English and Low Income Research: The project is now starting up immediately, having been taken off “hold” status. Phase I – the contractor has interviewed community organizations about how best to proceed with phase 2. The objective is to come up with an approach which will help companies determine how to reach the target populations, possibly through working with the organizations. By mid-December there will be a determination whether focus groups are needed and whether they should be conducted either through partners or self-conducted. A mid-way progress report will be available. The intent of the focus groups is to provide information about the customer groups. Four of them will focus on Limited English populations, four on low income groups. The final report is expected in April if the focus groups are held, in February if they are not.
 - Project C11 – Barriers to Commercial and Industrial Program Participation with a Focus on Financing and Cancellations – Some changes have been made to the planned market assessment. It will now include not only the Small Business Energy Advantage

¹ Meeting Materials Available at Box.net folder <https://app.box.com/s/d1cj04irnduoj5pz4uqg>

customers, rather customers ranging from 75kw to 750 kw. CATI [Computer Aided Telephone Interview] surveys will be conducted. The study will include customers who dropped out. The companies are being asked to provide access to the whole program database in order to develop understanding of cancellations as well as successes.

- Project C17 - Connecticut C&I Market Research Summary – This is the first comprehensive study done in the state in some time. The project will consist of standard market research, drawing on secondary data as well as customer data. The plan is first to gain an overall view of the market and then to conduct three focused studies on specified market segments, which will be defined in such a way as to be helpful to the program administrators. One option under consideration is to break things up according to end uses – lighting, motors, etc. – and then to see how they compare in the different market segments.
- Ms. Skumatz directed the Committee's attention to a proposed reallocation of budget laid out in an Excel document showing budget and actuals relative to the originally adopted 2013 plan.² It was agreed that the proposed changes need the Committee's approval but do not need to go before the whole Energy Efficiency Board. Jamie Howland moved approval of the reallocation. Ms. O'Connor seconded the motion. Ms. Duva noted that she viewed this as an important step in the process, insofar as it demonstrated that it is indeed possible to make changes as circumstances warrant. All members who were present voted in favor of the motion, which was thereby approved.
- Ms. Skumatz provided a quick review of the project progress Gantt chart. Regarding Project C10 – Small Business Data Mining – she noted that the contractor is obtaining the data from the companies. Errors in the Gantt chart on this project will be fixed. Project C 13 – Large C&I Trends Analysis – has been completed. Project C 14 – Energy Opportunity impact and process study – is now out in the field. Some adjustments are being made. Approximately a one month delay is foreseen.
- Scott Dimetrosky reported on the following Residential Projects –
 - Project R3 – Regional Lighting Hours of Use study – The loggers have been pulled from the participating residences. NMR is currently analyzing data, including breaking out data on multi-families, differentiating between 2 – 4 units and those with five or more.
 - Project R6 – Housing Characterization study – has been completed and posted. Because it was a very small study, Mr. Dimetrosky proposed holding off on a presentation, in favor of folding it into a presentation on the Weatherization Study when it is done. Ms. Thompson concurred with the proposal on behalf of the Committee.
 - Project R7 – Ground Source Heat Pump impact study and market assessment – The study was delayed but is now back on track, with a draft due by the end of the week. Mr. Howland asked if CEFIA was being kept up to date as well, since it is sharing in the cost of the study. Mr. Dimetrosky agreed to touch base later in the week, after seeing if the draft is actually provided at that time.
 - Project R8 – Central Air Conditioning – The loggers have been removed and the data is now being analyzed. A draft report is expected in early December.

² EEB 2013 Assigned CI Evaluation Budgets 10-4-2013

- Ms. Skumatz provided updates on the following projects –
 - Project R4 – HES Persistence and Process evaluations – The studies are underway, but the scope of work needs updating to include EUL information gathering and address some finance issues. A one-pager will be circulated either for a conference call or by the next meeting.
 - Project R5 – Weatherization Baseline study – The draft study is now available for review by the committee. Responses from the companies are due October 11th. Mr. Howland noted that the technical consultants will also have some comments on the draft.
 - Project R15 – Residential Fuel Switching Potential add-on to the Weatherization study – The consultants are waiting for information on how the cost-effectiveness piece will tie in with the regional avoided costs study. In order to fill in gaps in existing residential fuel switching and gas, electric, and oil potential the study needs to use up-to-date avoided costs data and is dependent on data in the Weatherization study.
 - Project R16 – HES / HES-IE Impact Evaluation and EUL study – The study is on track, with a draft report expected early in the first quarter of 2014.

4. Invoice & tracking update – quick check-in on status of SERA team budget

- Ms. Skumatz indicated that she planned to send an update in the next few days. She noted that in the month of September the consultant team had experienced extra demands.

5. Presentation of Recommended 2014-2016 Evaluation Plan and Budgets and Vote

- Referencing the final version of the Plan provided for the meeting,³ Ms. Skumatz noted that it included several changes to provide needed fixes and/or clarifications.
- Ms. Duva indicated her appreciation for the clarifications and view that the improvements in the final plan were very helpful.
- Mr. Howland noted that the Committee's resolutions provide a framework for making adjustments as we go along, so the Committee is not bound to the Plan budget as initially approved.
- Ms. Duva emphasized three points – 1) that DEEP appreciates clearly communicated connection between programs in C&LM plan and their cost-effectiveness in terms that can be shared with public; 2) that while there is concern about whether the Committee and the Evaluation consultants have the capacity to cover the amount of work that is required, the last few weeks have illustrated that we are not overwhelmed by the number of studies going on; and 3) that the Committee would be well served to look at the frequency of different types of studies. For instance in cases of innovations and design changes they need to be allowed some time after implementation before they are re-evaluated. Or, for established programs, might it make sense to back off frequency to free up resources for other work?
- Ms. Thompson stated her view that it was important to have the evaluation planning process happen in a limited time period, in order to be ready for the start of the 2014 program year.
- Ms. Duva thanked the Committee for the opportunity to contribute and be heard. She indicated that she would however abstain on the vote to approve the Plan because of DEEP's role in the eventual approval of the budget. Ms. O'Connor moved approval of the final version of the Plan. Mr. Howland seconded the motion. Ms. O'Connor, Ms. Thompson, Ms. Bergert, and Mr. Howland voted in favor. Ms. Duva abstained. Ms. Thompson thanked the consultants for the work they put into bringing the Plan to this point. Mr. Howland noted that this is a three-year

³ CTEEB_EvaluationPlan2014-Final100213_v6; CTEEB_EvalPlan2014_AttachmentA&B_10021013x_Final

Plan and the Committee will not have to repeat this process in the near future. Tim Cole was asked to send an email to board, reporting the result of vote and noting the changes from the draft version circulated a week ago.

6. Revisit / Update on DEEP Decision Discussion

- Ms. Duva reported that DEEP is striving to get the final decision out as soon as possible. The Department has received many comments on the draft and plans to update some sections to reflect the comments. There will be revisions on the HES section to clarify the process that is underway already. Ms. Skumatz noted that the team is on track to have preliminary HES/HES-IE data as early in the first quarter of 2014 as possible. Ms. Duva further stated that DEEP will soon announce a public meeting on HES innovations. The intent is not to duplicate evaluation work, but to ensure that all stakeholders and interested parties have opportunities to speak up and talk about how they see the future for HES. Ms. Bergert requested that a DEEP representative provide an update on this process to the Residential Committee. Ms. Duva indicated that she would be there and would do so. Ms. Bergert urged the Department to invite HES vendors to provide comments.

7. Other – There was no other business.

Submitted by: Tim Cole / EEB Executive Secretary