

DRAFT

April 30, 2014 EEAC Executive Committee Meeting Notes

Attendees: Christina Halfpenny (DOER), Matt Saunders (AG), Alex Pollard (DOER), Paul Johnson (Greentek), Elliot Jacobson (LEAN), Lisa Shea (NU), Lynn Westerlind (National Grid), John Howat (LEAN), Jeff Schlegel (EEAC Consultant), Lawrence Masland (DOER), Nathan Peyton (Barr Foundation), Shaela Collins (Rich May Law – PAs), Emmett Lyne (Rich May Law – PAs), Christina Dietrich (ENE), Ian Finlayson (DOER), Eric Belliveau (EEAC Consultant),

Meeting began at approximately 10:11am

EEAC CONSULTANT BUDGET

- (Belliveau) 1st quarter budget report. 11% through year and consultants are 10% through their budget. Annual report and other budgets items like the Database are being watched. Deeper dives not part of original budget and consultants will monitor to determine how much time they take. Starting the Q2 2014, there will be more defined consultant budget tracking.
- (Saunders) Asked if the consultant team was on budget and if resources could be shifted to come in on budget.
- (Belliveau) In Q2 it will be possible to look at the budgets and reallocate resources if needed.

ENERGY PLATFORMS BUDGET

- (Halfpenny) Energy Platforms (EP), the EEAC Database consultant, is asking for a \$24,600 budget increase
- (Finlayson) EP had increased scope in the stakeholder engagement process through April 2014 and did more work than was in the contract scope. DOER was able to negotiate with EP to agree on a level of effort.
- (Saunders) Will this complete the database specifications? When would their contract end?
- (Finlayson) EP contract would end April 30. The specification is final, and after this increase there would be no further participation by EP, they have completed their scope of work. The vision statement can be iterated without EP.
- (Saunders) No objection to increase, EP put in the work, if this means EP is done.
- (Dietrich) When the resolution comes to council, clarify the additional work areas and hours allocation, not just a budget number.
- (Halfpenny) There will need to be an EEAC resolution to increase the budget.
- Jacobson, Saunders and Dietrich agree to approve \$24,600 increase and bring it to the council.

EEAC LOGO

- (Halfpenny) the EEAC logo was designed as part of the website redesign project.
- (Johnson) Asked if multiple logos were presented
- (Halfpenny) Multiple were presented, and this is the logo that was chosen
- (Jacobson) Suggests removing the triangles from around the logo
- (Halfpenny) Triangles will be removed from around the logo. Logo is approved and website will begin development.

DEPTH OF SAVINGS

- (Belliveau) The Implementation Update (IU) was cooperatively developed with PAs and presented in March to look at actual changes and how to move forward. Then 3-5 deeper dives were selected based on the IU. Three deeper dives were agreed on; C&I retrofit, Multifamily and residential lighting. The next question is what data would be needed to look in to these topics further? Consultants sent a memo to the Executive Committee and to the PAs last Friday. This is Consultants version on what a deeper dive may look like. PAs are reviewing the memo and have not signed off yet
- (Schlegel) There has been some significant discussion about the topics for the deeper dives. Agreement on 3 areas, but not on specifics. Still being discussed.
- (Lyne) Agrees with Eric and Jeff's assessment. The PA's Planning and Analysis group did a good job agreeing on 3 deeper dive areas and on IU template. PAs don't have a response on the memo at this time, they are working through memo.
- (Lyne) PAs are trying to meet the schedule for these topics, but can't be sure that all information that is being requested is available. Some of the requests for information will be ok. Some data may not be available or will be problematic to obtain. PAs will keep apprised of problems. PAs are working to try to resolve problems, and only bring up intractable problems.
- (Jacobson) LEAN had reservations of some of info requests and sent comments to PAs and Consultants. Some of the DOE funding and prescriptive nature of the work makes some of the information that is requested not relevant.
- (Jacobson) LEAN uses ratepayer and tax payer funds. We work in a house until it is done and because no participant cost share, cost efficiency is not a relevant question. There is an ongoing dialog and discussions about this information.
- (Lyne) Confirms there is an ongoing dialog and discussions
- (Halfpenny) The May meeting will focus on segmentation and the deeper dives. The IU is a process and the deeper dives are the result of that process. There will probably need to be another Executive Committee meeting before the next EEAC meeting to finalize the deeper dives resolution and the database resolution. We also need to decide if it will be a resolution or a vote to confirm the sense of the council.

- (Saunders) Resolutions are used for more high level issues like approving term sheets, and the council needs to be careful not to water down the importance of resolutions.
- (Belliveau) It is important to have the council support for the IU process.
- (Halfpenny) Best to keep the resolution simple and focus on the steps as a result of the IU process.
- (Dietrich) A sense of the council minimizes the importance of the IU process.
- (Halfpenny) It sounds like we are moving toward a resolution as opposed to a sense of the council
- (Johnson) Agreed
- (Halfpenny) The resolution should focus on the IU process and that the council supports and endorses the process and endorses the process to be conducted by the consultant team.
- (Lyne) For the PAs, it just depends on the substance of the resolution. If the depth of savings memo has issues, then the substance of the resolution will be important.

DATABASE RESOLUTION

- (Halfpenny) In the Database subcommittee meeting there was a discussion of next steps and that a resolution on the database should go through the executive committee and then to the full council. Collectively, the subcommittee, including the PAs, believed that the next step was to engage the DPU. The DPU wants a concise request to engage in the next steps. The EEAC is not moving forward with an RFP for the database, the engagement of the DPU is needed first. The intent of the resolution is to document the work that has been done and document the engagements.
- (Westerlind) DPU wanted a specific question to give a quick answer.
- (Jacobson) John Howard has been attending on behalf of LEAN. Has a vision statement that all agree on been produced?
- (Saunders) Not all are agreed on the vision statement
- (Halfpenny) The subcommittee has been asking for edits before this goes to the council. The vision statement has been out for comments for four weeks, and some comments have been submitted.
- (Lyne) Have not had time to digest the draft resolution. As Elliott noted, if there is not final agreement on vision statement and specs, how is that framed in the resolution? Likes idea of going to DPU. Needs to think about Site, Project, Measure, and Usage as data to be collected and if that follows intent.
- (Howat) Not all are in agreement on the purpose of the database, may need to be more explicit if this tool will be used for EM&V.
- (Belliveau) A key mandate is if the DPU can rule on if all cost effective EE is being met through the database.

- (Howat) The DPU raised the question of the purpose of the database. By detailing the data types in play to Site, Project, Measure, and Usage, it could be useful to drill down in what is needed in the oversight of all cost effective. There was disagreement in the subcommittee.
- (Halfpenny) The vision statement has the detail about the database
- (Collins) There is not agreement on vision statement
- (Dietrich) Concerned that there would be a 7 page redlined document as the appendix to a resolution.
- (Saunders) Concerned if council agrees with resolution, but may not agree with appendix. Concern about separating the documents. If there is not agreement on vision statement and specs and here are PA comments. May not be fair to attach document that are not agree upon.
- (Howat) There is a lack of agreement, but there is a lot of common ground too. Communicate where points of disagreement are on key point to DPU in order to move forward.
- (Jacobson) Important to get a resolution to the DPU to get resolution in issues
- (Halfpenny) There are complex issues and long paper trail. Difficult to try to summarize issues in resolution, it would be too long.
- (Howat) Suggests attaching all comments with vision statement and specification. LEAN can submit comments in the DPU process.
- (Lyne) The PAs are not sure what is best approach with the attachments. Will send comments on resolution.
- (Halfpenny) Question to Saunders, Dietrich and Jacobson. Subcommittee has design specification and was tasked to make database specifications. There has never been an EEAC issue on less than a full consensus vote. This may be the first issue where this is not the case. The database is of significant value to DOER and others, and we understand where some come from on this topic. We should take the database issues to council for consideration, with subcommittee input, and vote on vision doc and spec.
- (Jacobson) The vote tally should be part of that goes to DPU. The vote will tell the DPU a lot.
- (Johnson) Have all parties made a good case?
- (Finlayson) All in the subcommittee believe it should go to DPU.
- (Dietrich) Concerned that councilors are going to vote on vision statement and specs, not just DPU request. LEAN will submit comments on vision statement, so comments need to be attached to the statement because if they are not attached, they may vote against resolution because their comments are not included in appendix.

- (Saunders) There is not full consensus in the database subcommittee on the attachments. This resolution suggests that the database committee wants to pass along these documents to the DPU. Not opposed to going to DPU, and can share specification even though there is not agreement. Not comfortable with vision statement going to the DPU. This draft resolution could go, but specification is attached. We need to acknowledge that agreement has not been reached, but these are the topics under discussion.
- (Jacobson) Important to get information to DPU so they can start working on it.
- (Saunders) Some members had issues with the vision statement, there is disagreement on specifics, and the DPU will help sort that out.
- (Finlayson) The subcommittee members thought the issue was resolved, the comment period on the vision statement may need to be reopened.
- (Halfpenny) The vision statement was issued for final comments.
- (Howat) Vision statement is a statement of common ground and disagreements, but it may not completely shared vision among all parties. Coming up with consensus will be unlikely. Attaching comments to the draft revised vision statement may be the most expeditious way to get the document to the DPU. All questions about the use of the database that are addressed in vision statement is where disagreements lies. Another database subcommittee meeting to reach a consensus vision statement may not be way to go.
- (Belliveau) Possible to put out vision statement as is and vote. Those that have comments can comment in a DPU setting.
- (Halfpenny) Need to move to DPU, need to know position of council. If majority vote, that would be helpful.
- (Finlayson) Room to provide comments if people can clarify position. Good to know objections to the vision statement. We have heard from the PAs, but not articulated from others about issues.
- (Johnson) Maybe Ian can present in May to do summary of vision statement.
- (Finlayson) Can do that, but can't say where areas of disagreement are. PAs have laid out their disagreement. But subcommittee members more nuanced in their disagreement
- (Halfpenny) Will send vision statement to all council. Will send to Subcommittee members for feedback by next Monday 5/5/14. Will try to work on resolution and vision statement. Cost estimate and spec are finalized. Comments on database resolution needed by Monday. Leaning toward keeping in spec and cost estimate, and keep as part of request to DPU.
- (Saunders) Less concerned with spec and estimate. More concerned with vision statement, and trying to represent that people may have opinions on the statement. Uncomfortable putting out statement that subcommittee has not endorsed. Does not think it is representative because the database subcommittee has not endorsed it.
- (Halfpenny) This endorsement can happen in the council meeting. Vision statement needs to go out again. Wants to verify positions from subcommittee members.

- (Howat) LEAN will discuss internally and may submit comments
- (Lyne) Database and Energy Platform Specs are final. PAs have concerns with specification and are on the record with that.
- (Halfpenny) Confirms above.

NEXT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

- Next meeting was agreed to be 10:00am on Wednesday May 7th.

MAY EEAC AGENDA TOPICS

- Energy Platforms resolution
- Segmentation presentation
- Database resolution
- Commercial Real Estate Working Group update
- Q1 update – 15-20 minutes
- IU Deeper Dives. Scope and focus of the 3 deeper dives are.
- The updated topic schedule and IU.

Later topics will discuss winter power cost issues raised in last EEAC meeting, and targeted energy efficiency as a result.

Meeting adjourned at 12:12pm.