



**REGIONAL EVALUATION,
MEASUREMENT & VERIFICATION FORUM**

**Project Committees Quarterly Meeting
May 21, 2009 Meeting Notes and Action Items**

Participants:

Name	Organization	Email Address
*Carol White	National Grid	Carol.White@us.ngrid.com
*Colleen Orsburn	Efficiency Vermont/VEIC	COrsburn@veic.org
*Jeremy Newberger	National Grid	jeremy.newberger@us.ngrid.com
*Mike Sherman**	MA Department of Energy Resources	Mike.Sherman@state.ma.us
Brian Gallagher**	DE Energy Office	bgallagher@e3energy.com
Cindy Jacobs	CT DPUC	cindy.jacobs@po.state.ct.us
David Jacobson	National Grid	david.jacobson@us.ngrid.com
Don Gilligan	NAESCO	donaldg@rcn.com
Frank Felder**	Rutgers University - For NJ BPU	ffelder@rci.rutgers.edu
Gail Azulay	NSTAR	Gail.Azulay@nstar.com
Helen Eisenfeld **	New York Power Authority	Helen.Eisenfeld@nypa.gov
John Zabliski	NYSEG, Rochester Gas & Electric	john_zabliski@rge.com
Josu Omaechavarria**	New York Power Authority	josu.omaechavarria@nypa.gov
Kim Oswald	CT Energy Conservation Mgmt Board	kimos@sbcglobal.net
Lisa Glover	Unitil	glover@unitil.com
Marilyn Ross	MA Dept. Public Utilities	marilyn.d.ross@state.ma.us
Mark Sciafani	Central Hudson Gas and Electric	spwaite3@comcast.net
Mary Straub	Baltimore Gas & Electric	Mary.M.Straub@bge.com
Matthew McCaffree**	Institute for Electric Efficiency	MMcCaffree@edisonfoundation.net
Paul Gray	United Illuminating	Paul.Gray@uinet.com
Ralph Prah	for MA Dept of Energy Resources	prahl@email.msn.com
Stacey Harwood**	NY Dept of Public Service	stacey_hardwood@dps.state.ny.us
Steve Schiller	Consultant to EM&V Forum	steve@schiller.com
Steve Waite	Consultant to EM&V Forum	spwaite3@comcast.net
Victoria Engel**	NYSERDA	vse@nyserda.org
Elizabeth Titus**	NEEP	etitus@neep.org
Julie Michals**	NEEP	jmichals@neep.org
Vivian Myers	NEEP	vmyers@neep.org

* Denotes Project Committee co-chair ** In person

Meeting Action Items:

1. Forum RFPs to include standard/generic language that ensures availability of underlying data and information, where applicable, including deliverables.
2. Frank Felder and Kim Oswald to provide standard language used in the CT and NJ contracts.
3. Additional Project Committees comments on Forum Confidentiality Policy are due by June 18, prior to June 19th Steering Committee meeting.
4. NEEP to provide one week notice in scheduling Forum teleconference calls, consistent with timeframe for review/comment of Forum draft materials, and reflect this in Forum review/comment procedures.
 5. NEEP to tighten up Sept 16, 2009 Annual Public Meeting agenda for Panels 1 and 2.
 6. NEEP to look into a webcast option for EM&V training session as alternative to in-person training.
7. Project A2 work scope to be revised to: include review of ESCO EM&V protocols; add more details on number of interviews to be conducted, etc. so as to better inform contractors on project budget. The cost/budget to be removed from the RFP. *Completed*
8. NEEP to clarify process (per Operational Guidelines) of how differences of opinions between Forum participants are resolved.
9. NEEP to post the Excel spreadsheet with a list of studies KEMA identified in the Phase I Loadshape study in the project subcommittee area on the Forum website.
10. NEEP to issue survey to Forum participants to obtain further feedback on 2010 project agenda.
11. NEEP to develop an outreach plan for the Glossary of terms.
12. Forum members to please respond to the Project B2 Commercial Lighting Measure Life and Persistence project survey.

This meeting was digitally recorded.

1. Intro and Updates

Julie Michals opened the meeting at 9:35 am and welcomed participants. The meeting objectives were reviewed.

Forum Participation and Funding Update. All states and/or program administrators have been invoiced for the 2009 Forum estimated costs, a request that payments or purchase orders/contracts be submitted or finalized with NEEP by May 29¹. In the case of Maryland, the Maryland Energy Administration (MEA) has offered to seek approval to fully fund Forum, but this process would take 8-12 weeks which presents timing problem for NEEP to enter into 3rd party contracts in June/July timeframe. Helen Eisenfeld inquired whether any critical RFP's that would be held up by delay in Maryland funding commitment. Julie Michals noted that no pre-approval is needed for MEA to fund up to \$100K. NEEP is working with MEA on this contract, and expects that it will ensure funding commitment for Project 2A, the first project for which a contract will need to be signed. MEA will still pursue the balance, and/or further discussions are needed with the Maryland commission.

With regard to how organizations are handling invoicing, Julie noted that each organization should talk to NEEP about how they plan to handle invoicing (e.g. setting up purchase order, other).

For Project A5 - Common Savings Assumption Project (Mid-Atlantic states), Julie Michals reported that New Jersey will not fund Project A5 this year, as it is currently updating its energy efficiency savings protocols document. New Jersey will, however, participate in as needed discussions with Delaware, Maryland and District of Columbia to inform coordination with NJ data, where appropriate.

¹ In subsequent communication with Forum participants, NEEP indicated June 15, 2009 as date by which P.O. and bills need to be submitted.

2. Information Access Committee Activities

A. Forum Confidentiality Policy

Discussion centered on ensuring that contractor work and aggregated data be made public, as part of project deliverables, as soon as the project is finished. Frank Felder (NJ) suggested that in order to avoid repeating studies over and over again, there be standard/generic RFP language that identifies, as part of deliverables, that electronic copies of reports be provided, including electronic copies of the data, e.g. excel tables. Felder inquired whether provision for collection of data should be addressed directly in Forum confidentiality policy, and/or in RFP. Without such provisions, we end up with a lot of work/research being repeated, where information really isn't confidential.

Julie Michals noted that the Forum draft Confidentiality Policy is based on the Forum's Operational Guidelines which identify/define confidential material at a high level. NEEP has drafted a more detailed confidentiality policy (distributed to the Project Committees for review), as well as language for RFP language on protection of confidential information. Vivian Myers added that language on access to underlying data could be addressed either in RFP, in 3rd party contractor agreement, and Forum Confidentiality Policy (or some combination).

Kim Oswald noted that in Connecticut, all data is owned by the Energy Conservation Management Board (ECMB), and that there is standard language in 3rd party contracts. The ECMB is in control of whether to release or not release data, though it does not necessarily take possession of all data. The contractor cannot publish it without contacting ECMB. In RFPs it states that all data belongs to ECMB and ECMB has control over whether it is released though they don't necessarily take possession of all data. The contractor can't publish it without contacting ECMB.

Julie Michals asked Frank Felder and Kim Oswald to provide standard language used in the CT and NJ contracts, and they agreed to do so.

Action Items:

- #1. Forum RFPs to include standard/generic language that ensures availability of underlying data and information, where applicable, including deliverables.
- #2. Frank Felder and Kim Oswald to provide standard language used in the CT and NJ contracts.
- #3. Additional Project Committees comments on Forum Confidentiality Policy are due by June 18, prior to June 19th Steering Committee meeting.

B. Proposed Review and Comment Process for Forum Materials

Julie Michals presented process for review/comment on Forum materials, distinguishing between at least 1-week timeframe for review/comment of materials (e.g., draft RFPs, project deliverables) prior to Project Committees discussion, and 2-week timeframe for review/comment on draft recommendations for Steering Committee recommendation.

Colleen Orsburn (VT) requested that NEEP provide more advance notice for subcommittee and other teleconference calls. NEEP agreed to aim for one-week notice.

Action Item:

- #4. NEEP to provide one week notice in scheduling Forum teleconference calls, consistent with timeframe for review/comment of Forum draft materials, and reflect this in Forum review/comment procedures.

C. Forum Public Annual Meeting Agenda

Julie Michals presented the draft Annual Public Meeting agenda, scheduled for September 16, 2009 in

Providence RI. The draft agenda was reviewed and informed by the Info Access committee. Kim Oswald (CT) suggested NEEP narrow down the scope of the discussion for Panels 1-2. In terms of process, Julie Michals noted that the Steering Committee will review the agenda at June 19 meeting.

Frank Felder inquired what the funding mechanism and budget is for the meeting. Julie Michals responded that the bulk of the meeting is funded through Forum Base Costs, on order of \$18K. There will be a small registration fee. NEEP and Info Access committee settled on Providence RI as it is the most accessible location.

NEEP requested feedback on whether the Annual Public Meeting should be complemented by an EM&V training session (e.g., EM&V 101 primer), provided by an outside organization such as AESP, on the day after the Public Meeting (morning of Sept 17). General feedback was that NEEP should consider holding a training web cast option instead, as resources are strained to travel.

NEEP noted that in the interest of limiting travel for Forum participants, the next Quarterly Project Committees meeting is scheduled for morning of Sept 17, also in Providence RI at same hotel. Helen Eisenfeld inquired if Sept 16-17 meeting dates conflicted with other meetings - NEEP checked with Project Committee and Steering Committee co-chairs and is not aware of any conflicts.

Action Items:

- #5. NEEP to tighten up Sept 16, 2009 Annual Public Meeting agenda for Panels 1 and 2.
- #6. NEEP to look into a webcast option for EM&V training session as alternative to in-person training.

D. Project A2 - EM&V Methods and Savings Assumptions Survey Project DRAFT RFP

Julie Michals provided an overview of the project scope and the RFP, and introduced Steve Schiller, EM&V consultant, who worked with NEEP and the subcommittee to draft the RFP. NEEP requested any additional comments to the RFP be submitted by May 26.

Project 2A and NAPEE M&V Project:

There was brief discussion on A2 scope as it relates/compares to National Action Plan on Energy Efficiency (NAPEE) EM&V project, for which first phase scoping effort is being conducted by Itron. Mike Sherman noted that the Itron work plan has overlap with A2, in that similar questions are being addressed. Julie Michals added that the NAPEE project will be researching existing methods in 11 total states, with about 2-3 overlapping with Forum projects.

Steve Schiller commented that the NAPEE project is more general, fact-finding to inform NAPEE group, whereas the Forum scope is directed toward providing a result, implementable in short term. Julie noted that US EPA is largely supportive of the Forum work, in that facilitating agreement within a region helps the national discussion. It is expected that the Forum project will develop recommendations later this year, which puts it ahead of schedule relative to any potential national EM&V recommendations. In this regard, the Forum is in good position to inform national developments.

Steve Schiller provided an overview of the project RFP. Frank Felder inquired why the Forum decided to look at gross savings, and not net savings. Steve clarified that net savings methods will be surveyed as part of the project, but no associated guidelines will be recommended. The topic of net savings will be addressed by a separate Forum project (B3) that will scope appropriate treatment of net savings from a policy perspective, and make recommendations on next steps (e.g., recommend best practices, appropriate application, etc.).

Mike Sherman (MA) inquired whether "guidelines" refer to specific methodologies. Steve Schiller responded that it is unclear how detailed the recommended guidelines will get, that this will be established by the subcommittee and contractor. Clearly, higher level guidelines would be easier to get general agreement, but when addressing specific measures, the contractor may get into details.

Inclusion of ESCO M&V Practice Research in SOW:

Don Gilligan (NAESCO) inquired whether the scope will include reviewing standard EM&V practices by ESCOs. This is important in the context that Administrators of program might see a piece of a performance contract, e.g. lighting piece, and would use M&V procedures on that piece. Other parts of project are outside of their purview. In the ESCO world, how do protocols from ESCO and EE get integrated? To extent we can, we would like systems to be consolidated into a single protocol, since ESCOs are trying to meet standards of utility programs.

Julie Michals noted that survey of ESCO practice is listed in the RFP (2nd bullet at bottom of pg 7). Steve Schiller noted that the project purpose is to focus on program administrators as audience for guidelines, not necessarily ESCOs. Dave Jacobson (National Grid) added that ESCOs can all be doing things differently, how would contractor capture range of ESCo practices. Don Gilligan responded that there are about 10 ESCOs that do most of business in the US, where most of the protocols are based on the IPMVP protocol.

EM&V Methods for "Deep Retrofit" Projects:

Julie Michals inquired whether the RFP adequately captured looking at EM&V methods for deep retrofits? Kim Oswald noted this is an issue for CT, and Colleen Orsburn (VT) added that they are interested in c/e for deep retrofit. Gail Azulay (MA) added that NSTAR is looking into this, but recommends that it is beyond the scope of project A2.

Colleen Orsburn - identifying and proposing solutions, not solidifying methods. Gail Azulay - It is appropriate to consider for 2010, but identifying issues relating to deep retrofits.

Project 2A RFP Budget - To Include or Not:

There was extensive discussion regarding whether or not to include the budget in the RFP (as proposed, a budget was included). Frank Felder inquired why the budget is included in the RFP. Steve Schiller explained that this kind of study could be done for \$100,000 to \$500,000. Putting in a budget identifies level of expectation. Also, it communicates that it will get peoples' attention. Frank Felder suggested that instead, why not describe level of detail we are looking for - money and quality do not go hand.

Josu Omaechavarria (NYPA) noted that without a budget, it's harder to negotiate with contractors. Gail Azulay (NSTAR) agreed with Frank on basis that goal is to get a quality report. If price is included in RFP, we will see bids around that price. Steve Schiller reiterated that guidance to bidders would be helpful in terms of amount of effort needed on this. Further, primary bidder selection criteria is not going to be price. Elizabeth Titus suggested we provide some parameters or range.

Frank Felder asked how do governance issues like this get resolved - how are issues resolved at this meeting in a timely way? Julie Michals explained that Operational Guidelines set forth that Project Committees..... - My hope is that we can meet consensus. Half of subcommittee isn't here today. Want what people can live with. What are you losing? What are greater risks? We can go back to subcommittee via emails. Will you get better bids from one strategy or another? Is this info generally already out there? Can't ignore that possible reality? Compare the pros and cons of the issue. Can go back to the subcommittee and discuss it with them. Do get a better bid with one strategy or the other? Is the budget information already out there? Yes, it is.

Frank Felder - Just because you have \$30,000 budgeted doesn't mean you have to spend it all on this one project. From what I hear, you are saying that we should disclose the dollar amounts. What really needs to be determined here is how we resolve this issue.

Dave Jacobson - From a contractor perspective, I would have no idea how many different program administrators, end uses, programs the contractor needs to look at to complete these tasks. If we laid out that info, e.g. might be talking to 10 ESCOs; one group per state? Etc. Put what Steve or someone thinks of as bare, bare minimum and say that, expect a higher bid. Hone in on quantity of things they

have to do it would help them come up with a price. Votes for putting a bare minimum budget in the RFP and that we are expecting a higher bid.

Julie Michals - The bid could be more specific.

Stacey Harwood - Say consultant should propose and back up there methodology.

Frank Felder - What is wrong with getting a wide variation?

Steve Schiller - The difficulty is going to be with putting much more specificity then we are going to do the work in the RFP.

Dave Jacobson - We are going to have to do work up front, of extracting info from annual reports. I'm expecting us to do more up front work in prioritizing.

Julie Michals - I lean towards providing a range to show bidders that we are serious. \$200,000 - \$350,000.

Colleen Orsburn - Provide enough specificity in RFP so they can figure out level of effort. Adding a price range doesn't inform that.

Stacey Harwood - There may be other ways to get attention of evaluators - e.g. looking for senior consultants, detail review, level of expertise long term familiarity with subject area.

Julie Michals- I hear more people not including a price; OK with not including a price?

Victoria Engel - Budget was built from ground up. I support putting something in there even a range.

Julie Michals - Elizabeth and I took a best guess at what the project budget should be back in the summer 2008. After working with Steve Schiller and discussing the tasks for the project, \$250,000 seems to be a more accurate budget. I'm not wedded to one thing or the other.

Frank Felder - Sounds like you are leaning towards putting the budget in the RFP. How do we resolve these different points of view? Doesn't know if NJ fund projects when the budget is disclosed in a competitive solicitation. Goes to deeper issue of how do we resolve things quickly and expeditiously, to reach consensus - need to address at some point, rather than defaulting.

Julie Michals - Governance is an issue that we may take to the Steering Committee. To ask when we issue bids do we need to have guidance due to State restrictions. In the interest of getting this RFP issued, I do want to make a decision today on this issue, proposed that the RFP not include a budget amount. Asked the meeting participants to weigh in. Responses recorded from: Dave Jacobson responded that he is fine without including a number. Gail Azulay (NSTAR) fine with not including a number.

Frank Felder - Is it possible to revisit without substantially delaying by providing more detail?

Steve Schiller - We can go back and put more detail in.

Steve Schiller - If it comes up in the Q&A how will that be dealt with?

Marilyn Ross - MA doesn't disclose and states that the budget hasn't been determined.

Victoria Engel - Have to be careful if a project comes in under budget and that dollars cannot be shifted to another project.

Unknown Female - Don't state that the budget is unknown but should state that it is not being disclosed.

Dave Jacobson - Would like the RFP to state that they really have to look at the details early on. Can discuss this offline.

Action Items:

Project A2 work scope to be revised to: include review of ESCO EM&V protocols; add more details on number of interviews to be conducted, etc. so as to better inform contractors on project budget. The cost/budget to be removed from the RFP. *Completed*

E. Project A3 - Common Reporting Guidelines

The draft scope and next steps were discussed. The comments follow.

Julie Michals - Brief backdrop. Project identified as an important need for the Forum largely by the air regulatory and environmental community. A kW hour saved, need consistency in what is reported. US EPA will potentially fund this. They need a scope of work by end of May. Key tasks, outcomes and audience. Need loadshape data and other data for ozone attainment and NOX. This project will attempt to do is to determine what is currently reported or under consideration. Identify data needs of Pas and air regulators. This project is trying to bridge data sharing needs. Is there a better way to report efficiency impacts? Set of reporting guidelines. End outcome is consistency and everyone being on the same page.

EPA may be willing to fund \$50-100k for this project. Unique project in that it may be partially funded by both the EPA and the Forum participants. We are in the process of getting a proposal out to the EPA very quickly so they can fund it in 2009.

Don Gilligan - Thinks this is an important project.

Elizabeth Titus - Have we asked anyone to participate on a subcommittee.

Julie Michals - Anyone interested in this project?

Gail Azulay, Don Gilligan, Colleen Orsburn, and Marilyn Ross responded yes.

Frank Felder - Model for moving through projects (draft RFT, issue RFP, ...) maybe a different model would work. Maybe convening a working group of the member organization would be a more efficient model.

Elizabeth Titus - We should keep this in mind when brain storming. An example of how we use our internal resources: the Forum Glossary.

Frank Felder - Why isn't the Forum drawing on the expertise of the Forum participants?

Julie Michals - Most of the Forum participants are constrained by their current work load so this may not be a model that would work for most of the projects. Would be open to a different process and model for future projects.

F. Project A5 - Common Savings Assumption (Mid-Atlantic)

A project update was provided by Elizabeth Titus. A subset of Mid-Atlantic states are participating; Maryland, Delaware & the District of Columbia. The project is to develop a Technical Reference

Manual to support the EE efforts in these states. These states are just now gearing up and share a need and have similar enough climates that is a good opportunity to achieve consistency. Drafted a scope of work and have worked with New Jersey has a protocol that is just now being updated. NJ has a lot of information that would be quite useful to the project. RFP released in July, Draft due in the fall, hope to have the project complete by the end of the year. RFP comments due by tomorrow.

The first task is to identify what should be included in document, will include review of other resources that are available within the Forum region. Second task is to recommend protocols to include algorithms, how variables are defined within algorithms and document sources. Third task is asking for recommendations that relate to process. How would this sub-regional group update the TRM?

Looking for recommendations make the TRM accessible online or making a database like the NW Regional Technical Forum reporting and lookup.

Tasks also include expecting it to be a written document acknowledging that contractors would be required to participate in subcommittee meetings and support stakeholders in use of TRM.

Question - Have you thought about the underlying document will it be easy to update.

Elizabeth Titus - Massachusetts has heard loud and clear that the TRM should be a Word document. If you are part of the region participating in this project and would like to participate on the subcommittee please contact Elizabeth.

G. Project B1: Loadshape Study

The presentation of KEMA preliminary results for Phase I was reviewed and an overview of the Phase II draft RFP and feedback on priority measures was provided.

Elizabeth Titus - 2 parts to this project, phase 1 and phase 2. Phase I was the first RFP developed by the Forum. This project is a joint project with the Northwest Council, KEMA is the contractor.

KEMA project update - 111 studies identified as of May 11 KEMA characterized studies at a high level. Types of studies were compilation and evaluation studies. Compilation - uses of data from other studies. Evaluation studies typical end use metering, sampling strategies. The studies are equally divided between residential and C&I. CA and NW are the sources of most of the residential info and NE source of the C&I information. KEMA has shared an Excel spreadsheet with a comprehensive list of the studies. What studies are accessible and inaccessible what studies have promise versus no promise. The conclusion is that the extreme level of analysis for Phase I is not achievable because it is hard to get the information about the studies let along the studies. Having discussions about what is achievable and may be

Frank Felder - Can the list be made available to the Forum and can the data be made available.

Elizabeth Titus - The spreadsheet from KEMA will be posted in the subcommittee area on the Forum website. Any electronic copies of the studies will likely be part of the project deliverables. Another topic that is part of the project is getting expert opinion from KEMA on the next steps. Strategies for getting at Loadshape data include simulation modeling, statistical modeling, direct metering, and hybrid approaches. Roadmap - KEMA presents an idea that would build off of smart meters. We've made it clear that the Forum is looking more at the short term rather than a long term such as the smart meter idea though we are appreciative of their idea.

Next usability definitions, interviews, and preparing a data catalogue which is a deliverable that will look somewhat like the Excel spreadsheet previously mentioned. The catalogue will be updatable over time.

We will be reviewing a revised scope of work

Phase II - The Forum has been laying the groundwork for Phase II. The plan had been to do metering this summer. For a variety of reasons that plan has been abandoned. Steve Waite is on the phone and is a consultant to the Forum on this project. New England priorities unitary HVAC end use metering and residential central air conditioning and C&I chillers was tabled. Recognize input from PAs is very important to the RFP process. Priorities have to be reset for this project would like more input from New York. Will be thinking about how to meet needs, some metering, some modeling, etc. When we look forward like to think plan for what we do for RFP and what we do for the future considering our relatively small budget and we would like to coordinate with the Northwest. We are looking for feedback either today or by the end of the month.

Frank Felder - Is there a list of measures that KEMA is interested or capable of evaluating.

Elizabeth Titus - KEMA product is a list of end use analysis groups, they came up with a list of priorities base upon a CA study. **It will be posted on the Forum website subcommittee area as well?**

Cost estimates were put into the Phase I RFP and it was helpful and the cost was shared 50/50 with the Northwest.

H. 2010 Forum Project Agenda

Julie Michals introduced the process for developing the 2010 agenda, beginning with an initial brainstorm with Project Committee participants. What have we learned since last year? The process is to get some initial feedback here and take it to the steering committee and use the September 2009 PC meeting to tighten up the 2010 projects and budgets to take to the SC in October/November.

Projects for 2010 in the Three Year Plan include:

- Building from 2009 project Common Savings Assumptions
- Should something like this turn into an online database?
- Consistency and measure life study -
- Continuing Loadshape studies
- Update meter compliance
- Free ridership spillover study -
- Commercial program planning
- Market characterization
- Residential program planning - research on baselines

Elizabeth Titus - Heard some additional suggestions for increasing need for gas program evaluations. Cost effectiveness, approaches, incremental costs for EE measures. Whole house evaluation strategies. Follow up on codes and standards. White paper proposed on codes and standards. Forum has a side venture, CSG is preparing a proposal for stimulus funding replacement of old oil furnaces before any further repair. Evaluation of feedback systems. Job impacts. Use the KEMA Roadmap to scope a project.

Frank Fielder - Consider issues of governance, consider different business models for procuring data, make sure everything is public available, and could try to change the ratio of coordination to content. Understanding what other states are doing is important but is less valuable to get consensus between states not necessary until federal regulations are required. Doesn't see the value in developing a standard TRM across the region.

NYSERDA is interested in the oil furnace project.

Mike Sherman - Impacts of codes and code enforcement.

Gail Azulay - Ran a pilot program - very little savings - customer behavior evaluation underway - other studies available too.

Helen Eisenfeld - Net savings important see also EAG 3 year plan.

Feedback systems - pilot systems in Vermont - customer behavior - blue line monitors in residential sector.

I. Project B2: Commercial Lighting Measure Life/Persistence Study RFP

The RFP was reviewed, the discussion and comments follow.

Elizabeth Titus - New England New York project - retained Steve Waite as a contractor for this project. He has drafted the scope of work and the draft RFP.

Steve Waite - The conception of the project identified 2 objectives 1 - compile and review secondary data regarding the basics rated equipment life. That measure is the type of data that manufacturer provides. Common practice is to take those assumptions and adjust them based upon based upon annual operating hours to calculate life of measure. That is what we are calling persistence. 2 - Measure persistence of the equipment from the time it is installed to the time it fails or is replaced. Does not take into account remodeling, curtailment of use due to performance factors or the building becomes vacant. In terms of the work plan of the study - secondary data research, estimation of persistence. There are a number of data issues - especially with the broad scope of the study. The scope of work is drafted in such a way to allow for flexibility in how the final estimates what the contractor feels the data will support.

Next B2 subcommittee meeting is June 3, 2009.

The data collection process - tried to collect as much information as we could up front so it could be reflected in the RFP.

9. Action Items and Next Steps

The action items were reviewed. The next quarterly Project Committees meetings are scheduled for September 17, 2009 and December 10, 2009.

10. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 2:38 pm.