

Massachusetts Energy Efficiency Advisory Council
 Meeting Minutes (DRAFT)
 Tuesday, October 8th, 2013

Councilors Present:

Voting	Present (designee)	Non-Voting	Present (designee)
Nancy Seidman	X	Elizabeth Cellucci	X
Martha Coakley	Matthew Saunders	James Carey	Trish Walker
Penn Loh	X	Tilak	X
Mark Sylvia	Tina Halfpenny	Subrahmanian	
Debra Hall	X	Michael Ferrante	X
Charles Harak		Maggie Downey	X
Elliot Jacobson	X	Cindy L. Carroll	
Christina Dietrich	X	John Ghiloni	X
Rick Mattila	X	Paul Gromer	
Robert Rio	X	Andrew Newman	Robert Gyurjan
Deirdre Manning	X	Michael Sommer	X
Brian Swett	Brad Swing	Carol White	X
Michael McDonagh		Eric Winkler	
Paul Johnson	X		
Larry Chretien	X		

DOER: Steve Venezia

Consultants: Eric Belliveau, Jeff Schlegel, Gabe Arnold, Sam Huntington

Present:

Jodi Hanover	Natalie Treat	Jennifer Turnbull
Matt Nelson	Margaret Song	JoAnn Bodemer
Lynn Westerlind	Melanie Coen	Katherine Soverel
Bikash Agaswal	Dave Gibbons	Ian Springsteel
Frank Gundal	Beth Lonergan	Sue Reid
Beth Newhall	Joel Wool	Alex Papali
Kim Dragoo	Shaela Collins	Peter Shattuck
Wendy Todd	Annete Tran	Amy Vavak
Thomas Page	Marie Abdou	

Halfpenny called the meeting to order at 1:08pm and welcomed everybody.

Public Comment

Joel Wool from Clean Water Action, and on behalf of the Green Justice Coalition, spoke about access to efficiency programs and MassSave data. He explained that he had listened to communities throughout the state about the need for a clean energy future. He emphasized the need for transparent data reporting to meet the goals in the Green Communities Act, requesting that program data be made available by zip code or census tract so that it could be understood who had, and had not, been served by the programs.

Jeremy Sherk from Community Labor United, and also representing the Green Justice Coalition, spoke about expanding the Efficient Neighborhoods program and tackling landlord-tenant barriers. He urged the utilities to expand the Efficient Neighborhoods program outside of the current communities, and to not limit the program to the summer months. He also requested to be part of the evaluation design. He added that he was looking forward to working with the PAs on landlord-tenant engagement at the residential barriers working group, and about bringing community engagement best practices to other aspects of the portfolio. Lastly, he urged the PAs to develop marketing materials in multiple languages.

Sue Reid from the Massachusetts chapter of the Conservation Law Foundation spoke about the concern she had about the programs meeting their savings targets, especially in the C&I sector. She highlighted the importance of the state's GHG reduction goals, and how energy efficiency is the least cost path to meeting them. She noted the great work the PAs are currently doing but called on them to redouble their efforts to hit goals.

Natalie Treat of the Northeast Energy Efficiency Partnerships shared a personal story about buying a new home. She explained how expensive it would be for her to build a home with a low HERS rating and urged everyone who works in the energy efficiency industry to do all they can to help the market build more super-efficient homes.

General Updates

Technical Consultant RFR Update

Halfpenny announced that the RFR for a technical consultant to the EEAC would be going out on Oct 15th on Comm-Pass.

September 10th EEAC meeting minutes

Halfpenny introduced the minutes from the September 10th Council meeting. Venezia and Winkler both noted a few corrections. Seidman motioned to approve, and Saunders seconded the motion. No one opposed or abstained, though both McDonough and Harak were absent. The minutes were approved as amended.

September 25th Executive Committee meeting minutes

Halfpenny introduced the minutes for the September 25th Executive Committee meeting. A correction to a meeting date was noted. Saunders motioned to approve. No one opposed but Jacobson abstained. The minutes were approved as amended.

Councilor Terms

Halfpenny noted that every councilor has been offered another five year term on the council. She also noted that Matilla would be leaving the council when his current term was up, and thanked him for his good work.

Codes update

Halfpenny discussed the IECC 2015 conference that was underway in Atlantic City. She noted that many of her staff were attending the conference, and that Massachusetts had

sixteen voting representatives in all. She proceeded to read a letter from one of her staff members, Ian Finlayson, who was at the conference. The letter noted that the Residential code had survived multiple attempts to weaken it, with the result that the 2015 version would look very similar to the 2012 version. The only significant addition to the code would be a new optional HERS rating compliance path. The commercial code debates had begun the night of October seventh and would continue for two and a half days. Gyurjan asked if any federal representatives were participating given the government shutdown. Halfpenny said she did not believe so, but given that building codes were a state issue, federal representatives would not necessarily have voting power.

AESC Update

Abdou updated the council on the potential impacts of, and process for adopting, the avoided costs from the 2013 AESC study. She began by summarizing the study, noting that it was completed this year and included some new components of avoided costs that previous studies had not. She showed a couple slides comparing the key components of the 2011 study to the 2013 study.

Halfpenny interjected to ask if councilors understood the difference between gas-DRIPE and cross-DRIPE. Some answered that they did not, and Halfpenny proceeded to explain.

Abdou explained that the PAs had modeled a set of scenarios where different components of the avoided cost study were adopted. She showed a slide comparing the effect on the portfolio of the different scenarios. The key takeaway, she noted, was that, in general, none of the scenarios resulted in programs failing cost-effectiveness screening. She noted one outlier where a single program failed screening under a single scenario. She concluded by showing a slide laying out the steps for adoption, as well as the consultant team's recommendations.

2014 Implementation Updates

Halfpenny introduced the topic of implementation updates, noting that the council was still awaiting an agreement between the PAs and the consultant team about the structure and content of the updates. Schlegel explained that the team had met with PAs last Thursday and made progress by clarifying their different approaches. He continued by noting that they were in agreement that the updates were necessary, but disagreed on the type and amount of information. He said they were expecting to finish negotiations in a few weeks, and would have something for the council to consider at the November meeting. Halfpenny reminded everyone that the process had been going on for many months and that they needed to reach conclusion soon. She said she anticipated drafting a resolution for the council on how to deal with implementation update, and expected to hear from the consultants and the PAs at the next Executive Committee meeting.

Consultant report

Beliveau updated the council on the consultant team's activities since the last council meeting. He emphasized that it had been a data-heavy month, between monitoring achievement, EM&V, and working on interim solutions to the statewide database. He noted the tremendous effort from the EM&V team to put together a strategic plan. He also noted the efforts to monitor the progress on the statewide database scoping phase. He

concluded by noting the various DPU hearings that the team would be attending, as well as the continuous monitoring of the programs' performance.

Halfpenny commented that the structure of the written consultant update was difficult to read, specifically the structure was disjointed. Schlegel explained that the structure was a legacy from when the report was first designed, but that it could be easily modified.

Database Consultant

Leo Steidel updated the council on the statewide database scoping effort. He noted that he had already conducted multiple interviews with PAs. He explained that their data tracking systems were generally in good shape, but that there was value to add by having a central data repository. He noted that the working group sessions were coming up, and that he would require all stakeholders to attend the first meeting to ensure that everyone was viewing the issues through a common lens.

Halfpenny noted that since only one voting councilor would be attending the working group meetings – not enough to constitute a quorum – the meetings would not need to abide by open meeting laws.

Monthly Dashboard

Coen presented the monthly data dashboard for the PAs. She reviewed key metrics for the electric sector, noting that they were tracking closely to the prior year. She added that the data was from the end of August.

Winkler asked if the goals had changed this year. Coen responded that they had gone up. Winkler noted that when the year to date achievements were compared on an absolute basis to the prior year, the performance was quite good. He emphasized the importance of looking at achievements on an absolute basis in addition to the performance relative to the targets. Halfpenny concurred that the absolute figures were indeed impressive. But the programs did have goals, she reminded everyone, and thus the performance relative to goal was an important metric.

Coen moved on to the gas programs, again reviewing key metrics including annual and lifetime savings, participants, and spending. She noted that, similar to the electric sector, they were tracking very close to the prior year.

Residential Update

Lonergan presented to the council on the residential programs. Regarding the residential barriers working group, she noted that while their responsibility to the DPU had been fulfilled when they filed their report, the work by the group would continue nonetheless. She explained that they were currently in the midst of collecting information for the evaluation of the efficient neighborhoods program, whose findings would be shared with the council in quarter one of 2014. Other residential highlights included the lighting market lift pilot with Costco, the lighting and products summit, the annual GasNetworks conference, and the HES statewide sales and marketing. Another highlight was the recent 'Light the Pru Pink' – a joint marketing initiative with the Ellie Fund.

Johnson asked for a clarification of the difference between market lift and the other lighting programs. Arnold responded that the market lift model incentivizes sales above a certain level, instead of providing rebates for individual products.

Ten minute break.

Achieving the C&I Goals

Arnold delivered a presentation on developments in the C&I programs and potential strategies to help the sector meet its goals. He began by commending the PAs for their hard work in attempting to meet the state's aggressive goals. He showed a slide listing some of the recent program enhancements, including a better CHP program, market segmentation strategies, deeper savings in small business, and the introduction of new technologies. He also noted the multiple efforts aimed at positioning the PAs for long term success, including the focus on strategic energy management plans, hiring new staff, streamlining internal processes, and internal management restructuring. He said that despite all these positive developments, the PAs are expected to miss this year's goals, which will make next year's goal even harder. He showed some graphs illustrating C&I's significance within the overall portfolio.

Arnold explained why, due to the state's position as a national leader, they do not have the luxury of borrowing effective program designs from other states. Rather, Massachusetts had to innovate if they wanted to reach the ever-higher goals. He showed a slide of specific recommendations aimed at moving the programs beyond the 'old models' that were proving insufficient for meeting the new targets. Halfpenny asked how long the recommendations would take to implement. Arnold pointed out that the PA's were already working on many of them, but that they needed to do more. He said no one had mapped out a timeline, but that they were working with the PAs to try to understand it.

Arnold continued to briefly describe each recommendation, which included greater use of upstream models, greater market segmentation, engagement with trade allies, and better selling of energy efficiency, among others. Gromer noted that it was a long list and asked if Arnold could provide a sense of prioritization. Arnold deferred to the PAs, though noted that he believed market segmentation was especially crucial. Chretien suggested the consultant team develop a method for tracking progress on each recommendation so that they could demonstrate to the council where and how the programs were improving.

Arnold showed a slide about the differences between PAs. He explained that some differences were valid and acceptable, but that the programs needed to learn from them. He noted a new evaluation study that would attempt to do answer those questions by relying on data from the EM&V database. Swing asked for clarification on the EM&V database. Schlegel explained that it was created each year by the evaluation contractors to ensure that they were using the same dataset. Swing asked how it related to the statewide database. White explained that it did not relate.

Arnold moved on to a slide describing the consultant team's role of providing strategic and tactical support to the programs. He concluded by noting that the high goals would continue to be a heavy lift for everyone involved, and that tremendous changes were already underway at the PAs to align with the goals. Johnson asked why any of the recommendations would work. Arnold explained that many of the recommendations were grounded in evaluation studies.

EM&V Strategic Plan

Westerlind, the chair of the evaluation management committee, delivered a presentation describing the new EM&V strategic plan. She noted that one of the reasons for developing the plan was a desire by council members to understand the process for selecting evaluation topics. She also noted that it was developed collaboratively between the PAs, the consultant team, and evaluation contractors. The result of the plan, she explained, was that EM&V cycles were now more aligned with program planning.

Winkler asked why the evaluation contractors helped to develop the plan. Westerlind explained they were only involved to help document assumptions and ensure that sufficient resources would be available. She assured him that they were not involved in decision making.

Westerlind showed slides laying out the evaluation team's budget and resources, as well as slides describing the planning principals behind their topic selection. She reviewed the studies completed since 2010 and explained that over fifty studies were either planned or currently in progress. Winkler asked if they would be developing a template for reporting results. Westerlind replied that they had indeed developed templates for both planning and reporting.

Adjournment

Halfpenny adjourned the meeting at 4:12pm