



MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, June 21, 2017
100 Cambridge St, 2nd Floor
Conference Rooms B & C
Boston, MA 02114

Councilors Present: Eric Beaton (for Chrystal Kornegay), Don Boecke (for Maura Healey), Cindy Carroll, Larry Chretien, Monica Cohen (for Elizabeth Cellucci), Maggie Downey, Paul Gromer, Frank Gundal (for Tilak Subrahmanian), Elliott Jacobson, Paul Johnson, Judith Judson, Richard Malmstrom, Deirdre Manning, Jeremy Newberger, Robert Rio, Victoria Rojo, Peter Shattuck (for Amy Boyd), Michael Sommer, Brad Swing (for Austin Blackmon), Trish Walker, Sharon Weber (for Martin Suuberg)

Councilors Absent: Michael Ferrante, Charles Harak, Michael McDonagh, Andrew Newman

Consultants Present: Eric Belliveau, Craig Johnson, Ralph Prah

DOER Staff Present: Ian Finlayson, Matt Rusteika, Arah Schuur

1. Informal Session – Baselines

Prior to the start of the full Council meeting, Ralph Prah gave attendees an overview of baselines as they relate to evaluation, measurement and verification (EM&V) activities.

2. Call to Order

Commissioner Judson, as Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:10 PM.

3. Public Comment

Alex Papali, on behalf of Clean Water Action and the Green Justice Coalition, offered support in finding suitable candidates for the open residential seat on the Council. He added that the performance of the newly implemented residential moderate-income and renter specific

initiatives has been less than inspiring and that the participation of a committed and motivated person on the Council could help to resolve some of those issues.

4. Council Updates and Business

Fall Planning Workshops

Rusteika informed the Council that DOER was working on planning activities for the fall planning workshops. He noted that they were currently in the process of procuring a facilitator for the workshops. He added that in addition to the workshops, they were planning on holding a number of listening sessions across the state so that members of the public could talk about their experiences with the programs.

EEAC Executive Committee Meeting Minutes – May 3, 2017

The approval of May Executive Committee minutes were moved to the July Council meeting because there were not enough Executive Committee members present.

EEAC Meeting Minutes – May 17, 2017

Weber motioned to approve the minutes as submitted. Manning seconded. All were in favor, with none opposed. Beaton abstained. Swing was not present at the time of the vote. The minutes were approved, as submitted, by the Council.

EEAC Executive Committee Meeting Minutes – June 7, 2017

Malmstrom motioned to approve the minutes as submitted. Shattuck seconded. All were in favor, with none opposed. Boecke and Jacobson abstained. The minutes were approved, as submitted, by the Executive Committee.

5. June Data Dashboard

Steve Menges, on behalf of the PAs, presented the statewide data dashboard through the end of April 2017. The presentation included updates on the electric and gas year-to-date achievements as a percent of the annual plan; as a percent of the three-year plan goal; and in comparison to 2016 by month.

Schuur asked why C&I gas performance was so low. Menges indicated that 2016 had a lot of carryover from the previous year whereas 2017 did not. He added that the results so far are in line with where they were in 2015, which he indicated was a typical year. He also noted that the PAs are still optimistic that they would hit the annual target.

6. Overview of Evaluation Study Results

Ralph Prah, on behalf of the EM&V team, gave the Council an overview and update on the status of recently completed, on-going, and upcoming studies. He began by noting that over 50 studies had been completed since his update to the Council last year. He indicated that he wanted to focus on two themes.

The first theme was why it is getting harder to sustain current high energy savings levels. He noted that increases in baseline efficiencies are eroding savings across the board. The second theme was focused on how recent EM&V findings can help to sustain high savings levels. In addressing these two themes, Prahl covered a variety of residential and C&I specific topics, including lighting, new construction, cross-sector results, and peak demand reduction. His primary conclusion was that it is going to get harder to sustain high savings levels, but that it is still possible. He indicated that innovation would be critical and EM&V results could help point the way.

Technology/Program Discussion

Commissioner Judson asked if Prahl could clarify why savings resulting from LEDs could not be claimed for as long as their useful life. Prahl noted that the baselines would be changing and that in six years the baseline for most lighting measures would be LED. As a result, he indicated that LED measure lives are down to just six to eight years for claimable savings.

Schuur asked if it would be possible to take into account the fact that investments in LEDs as a result of the programs have accelerated the baseline shifts. Prahl indicated that they could give credit to the programs to the extent that that was defensible.

Chretien asked how the baseline is determined for air source heat pump (mini-split) measures when it has been documented that they are not always being installed correctly. Prahl indicated that the baseline for mini-splits is often assumed to be a standard efficiency mini-split. Gromer asked what can be done to address this issue. Belliveau indicated that more training for equipment installers would help make sure that equipment is installed correctly.

Commissioner Judson noted that there is still plenty of opportunity in the building and heating sectors. She asked if there has been any research on the potential for fuel switching and opportunities to move away from heating fuels that are less efficient. Prahl indicated that the PAs feel that there are legal obstacles to aggressive pursuit of fuel switching. He added that he thought that point was debatable.

Johnson asked why behavior savings have only a one year measure life. Prahl indicated that he thinks they could probably have a two year measure life. Gundal agreed, but noted that if it was claimed that way then the programs would only be able to claim those savings every other year.

EM&V Process Discussion

Johnson asked if retroactive savings are ever taken into account. Prahl indicated that savings can be retroactively adjusted for about a year, but not beyond that because the DPU requires that the book be closed a certain point.

Johnson asked about the impact of measures that may have been paid for through the programs and then taken to another state. Prahl indicated that they did not understand the magnitude or drivers of that issue, but that he expected they would have a better understanding in a few months.

Johnson noted that Prah1 discussed the concept of EM&V 2.0 at the EM&V Council meeting in 2016 and that the essence of that was to speed up studies. He asked if Prah1 could give an update on that. Prah1 indicated that EM&V 2.0 products are being marketed towards implementers and not evaluators.

Weber asked about how EM&V is coordinated across states. Prah1 indicated that Massachusetts and California are the two states leading the charge and so there really is not an opportunity to collaborate with other states in the region.

Moving Forward Discussion

Rio suggested that in the light of the possibility of program decline, the Council should review the Green Communities Act to see how it defines energy efficiency. He indicated that it is possible that the programs could do more under the definition of energy efficiency.

Newberger noted that the PAs are considering the possibilities for program modifications and areas of new emphasis as they review the evaluation studies. He added that modifications and new areas of emphasis will help replace the loss in lighting savings, but that the PAs did not feel that they would replace it completely.

Shattuck asked if Prah1 could point to a specific area that the Council should think about going into the next three-year planning phase. Prah1 suggested that the slides in the second part of his presentation (“How EM&V Can Help”) represent a condensed version of what he thought were the most important and actionable items.

7. Strategic Evaluation Study Results

Michael Goldman, on behalf of the PAs, gave an update on the 2016-2018 Strategic Evaluation Plan. In his presentation, Goldman gave an overview of the original plan as well as updates on key research areas for the residential, C&I, and cross-cutting sectors.

8. 2016 Program Year Report Review

Belliveau, on behalf of the consultant team, gave an update on the 2016 evaluated results and demand impacts.

2016 Evaluated Results

Belliveau began by explaining the differences between planned, Q4, preliminary, and evaluated numbers. In highlighting the results, Belliveau noted that the evaluated results are similar to those that were presented in the Q4 report. He also indicated that the major impact of evaluated savings was lower residential lifetime savings driven by reduced lighting lifetimes.

Demand Impacts

Belliveau noted that the 2016 summer demand savings exceed planned savings. He also noted that these savings have grown over time, and have outpaced planned savings since 2014. In his presentation, Belliveau highlighted relative contributions of demand savings to total demand savings by sector, technology and by measure. He noted that C&I accounts for the largest portion

of the demand savings. He concluded by discussing opportunities for increased demand savings in each of the sectors.

Johnson asked why lighting controls were not accounted for. Belliveau indicated that controls do not have a demand impact because they are used for daylighting and occupancy purposes.

9. Adjournment

Commissioner Judson, as Chair, adjourned the meeting at 3:56 PM.