

ENERGY EFFICIENCY ADVISORY COUNCIL

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Meeting of November 27, 2013

Attendees: Tina Halfpenny, chair, Matt Saunders (AG), Elliott Jacobson (telephonically)(Low-Income), Peter Shattuck (ENE), Lisa Shea (NU), Marie Abdou (NGrid), Emmett Lyne (RichMay), Ian Finlayson, Steve Venezia (DOER).

Halfpenny called the meeting to order at 10:07 am.

Evaluation Score-sheets:

Draft score-sheets were handed out. These are intended in aiding the committee to evaluate potential bidders on the Council Consultant RFR. RFR responses are due Tuesday, December 3, 2013. The next Executive Committee has been newly scheduled for December 4th, so that the bid responses will have come in the previous day and the Executive Committee could begin its initial discussion of respondents.

The Executive Committee proceeded to review the draft score-sheet to make sure that each task is adequately valued and evaluated.

Halfpenny reminded the Committee that the RFR has been designed so that it may be broken up into discreet tasks so that each task or category may be separately bid.

Then Halfpenny led a discussion regarding supplier diversity certification. There followed a brief conversation that perhaps within Optimal, there could be a situation where there was no sufficient billing attributed to SOMBA-type contractors (e.g. female or minority owned business partners) within the Optimal umbrella.

Halfpenny turned the discussion to weighing the various components within the 4 discreet Tasks. The 4 Tasks are: Strategic Planning, Technical Support, Oversight of EM & V, and Coordinate Technical Services. There was an explanation that each Task had 4 components. These components have been allotted a certain number of points. The total number of points indicating a "perfect" score is 20 points. The components are: Workplan Quality, Ability, Price Proposal, and Supplier Diversity.

There was considerable discussion that the initial weighted percentages allocated to each component: 35%, 35%, 20%, and 10% should be reconfigured to account for their importance with regard to the 4 Tasks.

This general conversation concluded with the following percentages and points allocated to the following respective tasks:

Task 1: Strategic Planning - 20 points maximum broken down as follows: Workplan Quality - 6 points or 30% of total points; Ability – 8 points or 40% of total points; Price Proposal (accounting for time and costs) – 4 points or 20% of the total; and Supplier Diversity – 2 points or 10% of total points.

Task 2: Technical Support on Planning and Implementation - 20 points maximum broken down as follows: Workplan Quality - 7 points or 35% of total points; Ability – 7 points or 35% of total points; Price Proposal (accounting for time and costs) – 4 points or 20% of the total; and Supplier Diversity – 2 points or 10% of total points.

Task 3: Oversight of EM & V - 20 points maximum broken down as follows: Workplan Quality - 6 points or 30% of total points; Ability – 8 points or 40% of total points; Price Proposal (accounting for time and costs) – 4 points or 20% of the total; and Supplier Diversity – 2 points or 10% of total points.

Task 4: Coordinate Technical Services - 20 points maximum broken down as follows: Workplan Quality - 6 points or 30% of total points; Ability – 6 points or 30% of total points; Price Proposal (accounting for time and costs) – 6 points or 30% of the total; and Supplier Diversity – 2 points or 10% of total points.

Future meetings:

The Executive Committee then agreed that it would meet on December 4th to have the bid responses distributed, and time permitting, then engage in a general discussion concerning the identification for the Council of priorities for 2014. The members agreed that the Executive Committee would cancel its meeting of December 18th and move that date earlier to Monday, December 16th at the same time as originally scheduled, from 10:00 am till 11:00 am. The Committee further decided to schedule an additional meeting on Thursday, January 9, 2014 from 9:00 am until 4:00 pm in order to conduct interviews of prospective candidates that the Committee decided were worthy of further consideration. Venezia was requested to make the necessary Notice filings pursuant to the Open Meeting Law. It was left to a later date whether the Executive Committee would need to add additional meetings to accommodate a high number of RFR applicants.

It was anticipated that a recommendation would go to the full Council in time for a vote to award the Consultant Contract on January 14, 2014. Discussion regarding the RFR ended.

Optimal Budget:

Eric Belliveau, the managing partner for Optimal, was then contacted so that he could participate during the rest of the meeting, telephonically at 10:55 am.

Belliveau then addressed various budgeting issues of Optimal facing the Council. He stated that there was approximately 19% of the budget remaining with only 17% of the year left and that the

17% did not take into account various consultants taking time off for the Christmas vacation period, which meant, in effect, that there was even less than 17% of the year left. He affirmed that the budget was on course and in good shape. Belliveau stated that 81% of allotted funds had been expended through October 31st.

Third Quarter Report:

Halfpenny stated that she was still not satisfied with where the PAs were coming in relative to goal: that gas PAs collectively were at 49% of goal for 2013 and that electric PAs were at 45% of goal. She stated that the shortfall was still of concern, but expressed her frustration that the Third Quarter Report gave no real explanation how to get to goal in the Fourth Quarter.

Attorney Lyne offered a rebuttal on behalf of the PAs by reminding the Voting Members of the Executive Committee that historically, these Quarterly Reports only reported activity *within* the quarter and were **not** intended to be forward looking or predictive in nature. In future, Lyne offered that the PAs could add a forward-looking component to the Quarterly Reports. Lyne stated that he would bring this suggestion back to the PAs and characterized the critique as a fair comment.

Lyne expressed his concern about the statutory requirement to publish a Quarterly Report that is filed with the DPU. Thus, he was a bit hesitant to cut back on the narrative within the Reports too much. In response, both Finlayson and Halfpenny expressed a desire that the narrative tie-in more closely to the numbers themselves.

December EEAC meeting:

The group then moved its discussion to the agenda for the December meeting of the full Council. There will be a fair number of updates; a status report regarding the procurement of consultants for the Council in 2014; a discussion of year-end results. There was further conversation regarding various presentations to be made; that the DOER may wish to present and lead a discussion about market segmentation, the ongoing backlogs in the residential sector; and the C+I sector efforts, generally. There may also be a separate presentation by the PAs concerning the residential and C+I sector efforts.

Jacobson noted that Rita Carvalho and Jerry Oppenheim would be sitting in for him at the next Executive Committee meeting on December 4th. Halfpenny restated that one of the objectives of the next Executive Committee meeting would be to try to set up the EEAC in a good position for 2014.

The meeting ended at 11:27 am.