



**EEB Evaluation Committee
Monthly Meeting**

Monday February 10, 2014 – 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 - Phone), Diane Duva, Jamie Howland (Phone), Taren O'Connor [EEB]; Lori Lewis, Lisa Skumatz [Consultants – Phone]; Geoff Embree, Paul Gray [Utilities]; Tim Cole [Scribe]

1. Public Comment – There were no public comments.
2. Data Discussion and Update on Status of Projects²
 - a. Review list of Review Draft Reports currently or soon to be posted for comments by Lisa Skumatz:
 - R3 – Regional Hours of Use study – Scott Dimetrosky is working on this.
 - C12 – SBEA Low-income / Limited English Barriers
 - C14 – Energy Opportunities Impact and Process Evaluation
 - C9 – SBEA Impact study to be released soon
 - R2 – CL&P Behavioral Study – Year 2. Contractor currently working on consultant comments
 - b. Data Discussion
 - Ms. Skumatz introduced at discussion of memo on data issues concerning the R4 HES/HES-IE Impact Evaluation³, which spelled out results of consultations with UI and progress with issues, the impact on the contractor budget and the completion timetable, proposal of a Whole House Billing Analysis as a provisional solution, and longer term recommendations. Ms. Thompson inquired whether the contractor NMR has the data needed for the WHBA. Ms. Skumatz responded that NMR may in fact have more data, but the problem is to come up with a solution to meet DEEP's first quarter deadline. For this purpose the WHBA is doable, however there will be an additional cost because it is a different type of analysis than required for the Impact Evaluation. In response to a question from Taren O'Connor about the consequences of staying with the original plan, Ms. Skumatz indicated it would take an extra six weeks at least. Regarding the proposed augmentation of \$52,000 to complete the project as suggested, she noted that \$26,388 is to cover the costs already incurred by the contractor dealing with the existing data issues. The balance is to cover the additional cost of the WHBA to meet the deadline. Diane Duva commented that from DEEP's perspective the deadline is an important piece of the process for releasing additional funds for HES as laid out in the Department's decision on the 2013-15 C&LM Plan. She noted that it is looking to the evaluation report to confirm the cost effectiveness of the HES program enough to justify additional funding. Lori Lewis affirmed that a WHBA would indeed provide what the department needs to know for planning purposes, and that it in many programs such as

¹ Meeting Materials Available at Box.net folder <https://app.box.com/s/woaayuvi3dre8orqgumc>

² CT_ProjSumm_SERA_020514_v21.pdf

³ CTEvalMemoOnDatafor021014_v1.docx; updated after the discussion to the following:
CTEvalMemoOnHESBillingAnalysisDatafor021014_v2.docx

analysis is standard practice. Measures level evaluation is often not done at all. Ms. Duva raised the question of who should bear the cost, in light of the fact a significant part of the problem is due to UI's inability to provide the data required in satisfactory form. Jamie Howland responded that unless the company were required to take the money from shareholders it will simply use other rate payer dollars, which may not be worth the trouble. Mr. Howland then asked the consultants to put together a memo justifying a decision based on standard practice to be added as a cover for adhering to the March 31 submittal date. He also asked for a commitment from DEEP and OCC to support moving forward with the HES funding process if the results of the WHBA are positive. The memo should also reflect that the additional funding of around \$25,000 can reasonably be expected to yield usable results by March 31.

- Ms. Thompson turned the discussion to possible next steps. She proposed that the committee send a letter to UIL underscoring the importance of resolving the data issues. The issues have implications not only for Phase 1 of the current study but also Phase 2 and then of other projects down the road. Ms. Duva inquired what might be the most effective approach, such as recommending increased IT investment at company or funding for data quality management. She asked who at UIL has to make the decision. Paul Gray responded that the C&LM EnerNet system is involved. The system is managed by one vendor, so there is one bottleneck there because changes have to go through them. There are also internal budget issues. It might be possible to get a quote from the vendor for what it would cost to meet the expectations, but getting approval inside UIL would be a challenge as well. As the electric and gas companies are being merged, getting usable data in the future should not be a problem. but retroactive data will always be a problem. Ms. Thompson responded that she would talk with Ms. Skumatz about preparing a memo to UIL outlining what the issues are and focusing on the doable in terms of looking for best possible solutions. She would ask UIL and the vendor to present a plan for working with SERA.
 - Ms. Skumatz noted that she sensed a consensus to go forward with recommendations in memo, and agreement that the additional funding will come from contingency fund included in the 2014 evaluation budget. Ms. Duva moved that an additional \$25,000 be approved to cover the costs of the WHBA report to be delivered by March 31, 2014. Ms. Thompson seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Ms. Duva then moved that the funds be taken from the contingency fund. Ms. Thompson seconded and all again voted in favor.
- c. Walk-through of Projects / Monthly Status Report – Gantt chart and Project Summary updates⁴
- C&I – C10 (SBEA Data Mining Study), C11 (SBEA Participation Barriers Study), and C17 (C&I Market Assessment) are on hold waiting for data, back up behind the HES/HES-IE data request. Ms. Lewis emphasized the need to ensure this information is shared beyond the committee. C11 and C17 are both market research, calling for collection of new data. Mr. Gray reported that his request for this data was submitted to IT a month ago. IT is now pulling together all C&I data they can possibly provide.
 - Residential – R7 (Ground Source Heat Pump) – A revised draft will be released in February for comments. R3 (Regional Hours of Use study) – Comments have been received and will be incorporated into the latest draft.
 - Other – R5 Weatherization Baseline – Have been submitted. A final report is due within the next few weeks.

⁴ CT_GanttFeb2014_SERA_020514_v21.pdf; CT_ProjSumm_SERA_020514_v21.pdf

3. SERA Budget / Invoice & tracking update –

- Referencing the memo on proposed budget, options, and recommendations prepared by Ms. Skumatz, Ms. Thompson suggested the committee should vote either on option E or option F rather than taking both to the full board. Ms. O'Connor agreed that it would lessen confusion if the committee came to an agreed upon recommendation. Ms. Thompson commented that the maximum numbers should be understood to be limits, dependent on whether lines 4 (Project Development, Management, Oversight and Representation) and 5 (Study Completion Steps) in fact reach 100% if there are no delays. . She noted that the budgets reflect what the committee is beginning to see with respect to the limits of current capacity. They now more closely reflect what actual capacity is each year and come closer to meeting what we plan. Ms. Duva moved that the committee recommend Option E, with a budget of \$364,444. Ms. O'Connor seconded the motion. Ms. Thompson asked that Mr. Howland's vote be secured via email. All present voted in favor. Ms. Thompson finally asked the consultants to develop an estimate of what the impact on the overall evaluation budget might be, based on the assumptions underlying Option E for the SERA workplan. Ms. Skumatz agree to provide such an estimate.

4. Other items

- Legislative Report schedule / process – Ms. Skumatz directed the committee's attention to her memo outlining the working timetable for completing and delivering the 2013 evaluation report to the legislature's Energy and Technology Committee.

5. Adjourn – With no further business to conduct, the committee adjourned at 11:30 am.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Cole, Scribe