

**EEB Evaluation Committee  
Monthly Meeting**

Wednesday, November 7, 2012, 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

**MINUTES<sup>1</sup>**

Present: Amy Thompson, Jamie Howland, Vickie Hackett / Taren O'Connor [OCC]; Tracy Babbidge / Cindy Jacobs [DEEP BETP]; Paul Gray [UI]; Geoff Embree, Joe Swift [CL&P]; Kim Oswald [Consultant]; Tim Cole [Scribe]

1. Public Comment – No public comments were received.
2. Long Term Evaluation Plan
  - a. Review of Filed Plan – After circulation of a draft, the final version of the 2013 Evaluation Plan<sup>2</sup> was filed concurrently with the 2013-15 Conservation and Load Management Plan on November 1, 2012.
  - b. Budget Discussion – There was extensive discussion of the question what level of funding should be budgeted for evaluation over the three years of the submitted C&LM plan. In the course of the discussion there was agreement on the following points:
    - It is the responsibility of the Evaluation Committee to recommend what it believes to be the appropriate levels of funding. In this respect the numbers included in the C&LM plan filed by the companies should be viewed as place holders.
    - There is a desire to raise the percentage of the budget allocated for evaluation to the 3.5 – 4% range, comparable to the levels found in other leading states in the energy efficiency field. For 2012 Connecticut budgeted less than 2.5%.
    - In light of the significant programmatic expansion envisioned by the C&LM plan, there will be a clear need for both more evaluations and more market assessments and research.
    - Mindful of the fact that the C&LM plan as filed includes both a base plan and an expanded plan, which will be procedurally dealt with separately by DEEP's Bureau of Energy and Technology Policy (BETP) and by the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority, the Committee asked technical consultant Kim Oswald to prepare a revised budget for presentation to the Energy Efficiency Board. The revised budget will call for approximately \$5.6 million, allowing for adjustments for year to year carryover and for delays in when the proposed budgets are finally approved, to be allocated at the base plan level for each of the three years from 2013-15. To allow for the ramping up envisioned by the proposed expanded plan, if the plan is approved as presented the evaluation budget will be set at \$7 million for the first year, \$9 million for the second year, and \$10.5 million for the third year. A motion endorsing these revisions was made by Jamie Howland, seconded by Tracy Babbidge, and approved by all voting members present.

---

<sup>1</sup> Meeting Materials Available at Box.net folder <https://www.box.com/s/s/0k3fkxol4n722sfuivq5>

<sup>2</sup> 2013 Annual Evaluation Plan 11-1-12.pdf

- c. On behalf of BETP, Cindy Jacobs expressed the Bureau's wish to see changes in the protocols set forth in the Evaluation Roadmap to allow market assessments to be treated differently than program evaluations. Ms. Babbidge noted that some studies yield data that could be used for other purposes. Recognizing that there could be confidentiality concerns regarding what study participants agree to, it was agreed that there should be further discussions with Kim Oswald about how workable language might be formulated and that the matter would be revisited at the next Committee meeting. It was also agreed that revisions of the Roadmap would be developed to allow for different treatment of market assessments and evaluation studies.
3. Consultant Work Plan/RFP for January 2013: Process discussion – It was agreed that the goal is to have the RFP process concluded by early January. A draft RFP will be circulated among Evaluation Committee members, with November 14 as the target release date. In the meantime, the Executive Secretary will publish a notice in appropriate places and send copies to firms that might potentially be interested. Envisioned is a three-year agreement, with a one-year contract renewable for two more years. Given the volume of work expected in light of budget increases, bidders will be expected to propose teams large enough to handle the workload.
4. Other – No other topics were brought forth for discussion.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Cole  
Executive Secretary