



**REGIONAL EVALUATION,
MEASUREMENT & VERIFICATION FORUM**

**Quarterly Project Committees Meeting
April 27, 2010, Teleconference Notes and Action Items**

Participants:

Name	Organization	Name	Organization
Kim Oswald	Consultant to Connecticut ECMB	Kathryn Mammen	New York Department of Public Service
Gene Fry	Connecticut Light & Power/WMECO	Mary Cahill	NYPA
Earle Taylor	Consultant to CL&P/WMECO	Victoria Engel-Fowles	NYSERDA
Brian Gallagher*	Consultant to Delaware SEU	Jennifer Meissner	NYSERDA
Andrea Maucher	Delaware DNREC	Larry Pakenas	NYSERDA
Dan Cleverdon*	District of Columbia Public Service Commission	Chris Neme	Vermont Energy Investment Corporation
Laura Magee*	PEPCO	Michael Li*	US Department of Energy
Kristy Fleischmann*	Baltimore Gas & Electric	Niko Dietsch*	US EPA
Mary Straub*	Baltimore Gas & Electric	Robyn Kenney*	US EPA
Sheldon Switzer*	Baltimore Gas & Electric	Cynthia Veit	US EPA - Region 1
Dennis Hartline*	Maryland Energy Administration	Don Gilligan	NAESCO
Dan Hurley	Maryland Public Service Commission	Allison Reilly-Guerette	NESCAUM
Huilan Li*	Maryland Public Service Commission	Steve Waite	Consultant
Crissy Godfrey*	Maryland Public Service Commission	Steve Schiller	Consultant
Stacy Sherwood*	Maryland Public Service Commission	Dottie Conant	Consultant
Ralph Prah	Advisor to MA EEAC	David Filiberto	NMR Group, Inc.
Mike Sherman	Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources	Tom Franks	KEMA
Alexey Cherniack	Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities	Liz Hicks	KEMA
Marilyn Ross	Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities	Cecily McChalicher*	NEEP
Gail Azulay	NSTAR	Julie Michals*	NEEP
Dave Jacobson	National Grid	Elizabeth Titus*	NEEP
Kim Bregenzer	LIPA		
Stacey Harwood	New York Department of Public Service		

*Denotes in-person

This meeting was digitally recorded.

Meeting Action Items:

1. For the A2 Common EM&V Methods project:
 - a. Three documents will be posted for Steering Committee review: 1) preface and guidelines, 2) full report, 3) executive summary only.
 - b. NEEP to add language about secondary data to the Preface, tweak language about transferability of data, and note the Forum's completed loadshape study as precedence for use of secondary data.
 - c. The changes discussed today will be incorporated, and a final report will be posted by May 3 before it is presented to the Steering Committee in late May.
2. NEEP to update the Forum's Glossary of Terms and Definitions in the next several months, incorporating key terms from A2, A3 and A5 completed projects.
3. Forum participants to email Elizabeth Titus if they are interested in joining the project subcommittee for the Net Savings project, Codes and Standards project, and/or Incremental Costs project.
4. Forum participants to send nominations for SEE Action EM&V Work Group participants to Michael Li, US DOE (michael.li@hq.doe.gov) or Denise Mulholland, US EPA (mulholland.denise@epa.gov).
5. NEEP to send out information about the NAESB meeting scheduled for May 20 in Holyoke, MA - see: <http://www.naesb.org/dsm-ee.asp>.
6. For the A3 Common Reporting Guidelines project:
 - a. NEEP/NMR to develop language for the executive summary that addresses the issue of timing.
 - b. NEEP/NMR to address definitions of gross savings.
 - c. NEEP/NMR to modify reporting templates for savings tables to clarify totals.
 - d. NEEP/NMR to correct formula for levelized cost/kWh, and reference different sources of real discount rates for the levelized cost/kWh formula.
 - e. NEEP to add a reference to the appropriate usage of information reported in the jobs impact template.
 - f. NEEP to modify Section 7 - Air Emissions after discussion with air regulators to incorporate key comments/changes.
 - g. Forum participants to send comments on the project to NEEP by Monday, May 3. NEEP will incorporate comments and send out revised final guidelines (aiming for May 10).
 - h. NEEP to discuss project budget overrun with subcommittee and bring recommendation to Forum participants on use of contingency funds.
7. NEEP to provide Forum participants with information about the 2010 budget without New Jersey's participation.
8. Forum participants to contact Elizabeth Titus with any feedback, questions, or comments about the Incremental Costs project or the Codes and Standards project.

Meeting Overview:

A. Review Meeting Objectives

Julie Michals (NEEP) introduced the meeting objectives and reviewed the agenda. .

B. Review and Discuss Final Draft Guidelines and Recommendations for Steering Committee Consideration - Project A2: Common EM&V Methods and Savings Assumptions

Julie Michals reported that the final draft report and set of draft guidelines for the Common EM&V Methods and Savings Assumptions project is complete. She thanked everyone who participated in this challenging project to move the region towards increased consistency in evaluating energy efficiency. She added that the long term goal of the project is to develop a common currency that will ensure the credibility of energy efficiency as a resource.

Julie Michals provided an overview of the structure of the report and explained that the final draft report reflects subcommittee input and comment received to date. Clean and redline versions of the draft report are posted to the EM&V Forum website for review. The KEMA report is complete, and the budget has been expended. NEEP has developed a separate Forum product titled "Regional EM&V Methods and Savings Assumptions Guidelines." This document consists of a preface and guidelines and will be presented to the Steering Committee for adoption in late May. The preface makes clear that the guidelines are voluntary and recognizes that EM&V requirements and practices vary across the region. The guidelines attempt to strike a balance between being flexible and not overly prescriptive, and still provide enough detail to be useful. The guidelines are intended to be updated in the future.

Julie Michals stated that the executive summary of the report presents several key themes/findings: 1) *Confusion* - there is inconsistency in the use of terms and definitions. She added that NMR has inserted references to the Forum's Glossary of Terms and Acronyms to address confusion over terms and stated that NEEP is planning to update the Glossary in the next few months by incorporating key terms from Projects A2, A3 and A5. 2) *Consistency* - there is an inconsistent application of tools across the spectrum of measures, and 3) *Frequency and Focus* - frequency and focus varies across measures and individual measure parameters.

Julie Michals stated that the report concludes that there are several benefits to the use of common EM&V methods in the region. She added KEMA's first draft report reviewed by the project subcommittee focused only on benefits, but the revised draft report also focuses on challenges to achieving regional consistency, including different state priorities, variation in EM&V life cycle, and different implementation of the guidelines in each state.

Julie Michals stated that the report also includes several caveats: 1) It is common to do in-depth studies of individual parameters, but this may be inconsistent with the basic level of rigor in the guidelines since this approach ignores other parameters, 2) It is important to focus on the sources of uncertainty bearing on the overall program portfolio (not necessarily the individual components), and to strategically allocate EM&V resources accordingly, and 3) The guidelines do not make recommendations with regard to evaluation timing or transferability of evaluated results in different applications. To this last point, KEMA recommended that the EM&V Forum undertake additional research about the transferability of existing data.

Julie Michals stated that some subcommittee members questioned if it is appropriate to address caveats in the report rather than simply being clear on the scope/application of the guidelines.

Ralph Prah (Consultant to MA EEAC) stated that all three caveats are important to include in the report. He added that he has provided a great deal of comment on the draft report and is generally fine with the report at this point. He questioned providing only the Forum product (preface and guidelines) to the Steering Committee and suggested that the Steering Committee should also review the Executive Summary.

Julie Michals replied that there are important topics in the Executive Summary that may be appropriate for the Steering Committee to review. She asked how the report and guidelines should be packaged for Steering Committee review.

Ralph Prah suggested providing the Forum product and a separate file with the Executive Summary.

Laura Magee (PEPCO) suggested providing the full report to the Steering Committee as well.

Dan Cleverdon (DC PSC) stated that that Steering Committee should have easy access to the materials.

After some discussion, it was decided that three documents will be posted to the Steering Committee website for review, 1) Forum product with the preface and guidelines, 2) Full KEMA report, and 3) Executive Summary from KEMA report.

Julie Michals provided a detailed overview of the cross-cutting guidelines and measure specific guidelines in the report. She added that NEEP will be reaching out to states as needed, to ensure all states have provided feedback in preparation for the Steering Committee meeting in May. NEEP will ensure that any substantive issues raised will be addressed at the Steering Committee meeting.

Gail Azulay (NSTAR) stated that she needs NSTAR's C&I group to review the document but believes that NSTAR is satisfied with the results of the project.

Julie Michals presented the language that was used when the Steering Committee adopted the Forum's Glossary of Terms and Definitions and indicated that the Steering Committee reviewed this language in their last meeting in February and confirmed that they were comfortable using this language for all Forum products, including the Common EM&V Methods project.

Kim Oswald (Consultant to Connecticut ECMB) suggested that a clear statement should be incorporated to the effect that states should consider their individual needs and objectives in determining which, if any, of these guidelines they wish to adopt. She added that such a statement would reduce the potential problem that Commissions may order people to follow the methods in report even if they are not appropriate. She suggested that this statement should be included in the report and be part of the language/criteria to adopt a Forum project.

Gail Azulay agreed that including this type of statement would be appropriate. She added that the Glossary was a different type of project and therefore different Steering Committee adoption language may be needed in this case.

Dan Cleverdon stated that Commissions issue orders that are absolutes, so Commissions need to be made aware of the context of this project so as not to lead to misguided Commission order. He suggested that the Steering Committee language did not need to be modified.

Sheldon Switzer (Baltimore Gas & Electric) stated the he believes the existing language has enough flexibility.

Crissy Godfrey (MD PSC) stated that she does not think the Maryland Commission would adopt the guidelines in their entirety or adopt them through an order. She suggested that she would provide the guidelines to Maryland's evaluation contractor for review and consideration in their work.

Kim Oswald stated that particular techniques have been ordered for all future impact evaluations in Connecticut. She added that it is difficult to argue that particular methods are not appropriate once they have been ordered.

Julie Michals stated the she would hope that Commission's language to consider the guidelines would include "where applicable and appropriate" or similar language, and recognize the context and caveats identified in the Guidelines (preface).

Dan Cleverdon added that Commission orders are often used to fix loopholes and eliminate discretion, so it would be difficult to include "where appropriate" language. He added that it is important not to weaken the language too much so that adopting the guidelines is meaningless.

Steve Schiller stated that he believes the existing language provides enough flexibility. He suggested another approach is for stakeholders to actually endorse the guidelines and encourage their use.

Marilyn Ross (Massachusetts DPU) suggested asking Massachusetts Commissioner Woolf to have the guidelines endorsed by NARUC.

Julie Michals replied that the Forum plans to bring the guidelines to NARUC in the future, but that there will need to be coordination with the NAESB process which is currently developing guidelines, and intends for PUCs to be its primary audience.

Kim Oswald suggested changing the term “challenges” to “other considerations.”

Julie Michals highlighted the ‘Use of Guidelines’ section of the Preface that addresses Kim Oswald’s concerns: “The Guidelines are not intended to be mandatory, as it is recognized that identical EM&V requirements and practices may be difficult to implement for the entire Forum Region given states or jurisdictions can have different program and EM&V objectives, budgets, and uses for their EM&V analyses. As such, these guidelines attempt to capture an appropriate balance of being flexible and not overly prescriptive, while providing sufficient detail so as to be meaningful and useful so that the Region can move towards greater consistency in how energy efficiency savings are determined.” She suggested that this language could be tweaked if Forum participants believe it is not adequate.

Dan Cleverdon suggested that it is important that the Steering Committee knows that the report and guidelines have been thoroughly reviewed by many Forum participants.

Mary Straub (Baltimore Gas & Electric) asked if there is language in the preface that refers to the use of secondary data.

Julie Michals replied that there is no language regarding secondary data in the preface, but it is included in the executive summary of the report and in the guidelines themselves.

Several Forum participants suggested that language regarding secondary data should be included directly in the preface.

Huilan Li (Maryland PSC) stated that it is important to address secondary data and when it is appropriate to use it.

Julie Michals asked if it would be possible to incorporate high level guidelines into the report about what it means to transfer and use secondary data. She suggested an alternative would be for the preface to explicitly note that the Forum will work to provide guidance on data transferability in the future.

Several Forum participants replied that developing guidelines about the use of secondary data would be an ambitious undertaking more suited to a separate project.

Elizabeth Titus (NEEP) stated that the Forum has completed Phase 1 of the Loadshape study, which identified secondary data with the assumption that using secondary data would be encouraged. She added that the Steering Committee has not been asked to adopt that report, but suggested that a paragraph or note acknowledging this study should be added to the report.

Julie Michals stated that NEEP will add language about secondary data to the Preface, tweak language about transferability of data, and note the Forum’s completed Loadshape study as precedence for use of secondary data.

Julie Michals provided an overview of the next steps in the process for completing Project A2. The changes discussed today will be incorporated, and a final report will be posted for review before it is presented to the Steering Committee for review and adoption in late May. She asked Forum participants to contact NEEP if they have any additional comments/suggestions.

Action Items:

1. For the A2 Common EM&V Methods project:
 - a. Three documents will be posted for Steering Committee review: 1) preface and guidelines, 2) full report, 3) executive summary only.
 - b. NEEP to add language about secondary data to the Preface, tweak language about transferability of data, and note the Forum’s completed loadshape study as precedence for use of secondary data.
2. NEEP to update the Forum’s Glossary of Terms and Definitions in the next several months, incorporating key terms from A2, A3 and A5 completed projects.

C. Other Forum Project Briefings

Project A5: Mid-Atlantic TRM

Elizabeth Titus stated that the final draft mid-Atlantic TRM was recently completed and will be posted to the Forum website for review. The TRM will be presented to the Steering Committee at its late May meeting.

Chris Neme (VEIC) provided an overview of the project. He stated that it was a challenging project due to its modest budget and mid-Atlantic participants' need for timely results. The key considerations in developing the TRM were credibility, accuracy, transparency, and cost-efficiency.

Chris Neme explained that the project included four main tasks: 1) Prioritizing 30 measures for inclusion in the TRM, 2) Establishing deemed assumptions through research and comparative analysis and proposing recommendations for mid-Atlantic, 3) Developing recommendations for TRM updates, and 4) Producing the final report.

Chris Neme reviewed the 30 measures that are included in the TRM, which account for 90% of electricity savings. He added that incidental gas savings were included for some measures, but the focus was on electrical measures. He also showed an example of the data that was compiled for the measures and the format of the TRM.

Chris Neme shared that the TRM relied on data from sources outside the mid-Atlantic since efficiency programs are not yet well established in the mid-Atlantic. He added that climate-sensitive measures were not well transferrable. VEIC incorporated local data where possible, but it will be important to update the TRM with local data from future evaluations.

Chris Neme explained VEIC's recommendations for updating the TRM. He closed by thanking project subcommittee members for their hard work and commended them for working together very well.

Elizabeth Titus thanked the VEIC team for its work on the project. She added that the TRM has been placed in the EM&V Forum format and now includes an introductory section developed for this document by NEEP and VEIC; she asked the subcommittee to review this section carefully. The next subcommittee meeting will be the final review of the TRM and will also address how to use the 2010 allocation of funds to continue this work.

Project B1: Loadshape Study

Elizabeth Titus reported that the C&I HVAC portion of the Loadshape project is moving along smoothly. The sample design is nearly complete, onsite metering will take place throughout the summer, and a report is due by the end of the year. The results of this project will help reporting for the Forward Capacity Market and the PJM's RPM and will provide valuable information to New York as they have shortage of this type of data.

Elizabeth Titus stated that a revised scope of work has been received for the lighting portion of the Loadshape project, and the project subcommittee will be reviewing it. The lighting project is based on leveraging available data. She reminded participants that the Loadshape project uses funds from both the 2009 and 2010 project agenda. She would like to start developing a scope of work in the near future for a 2011 Loadshape project.

B2: Measure Persistence Study

Elizabeth Titus explained that the measure persistence study will collect primary data to model measure lives for CFL bulbs and CFL fixtures, HIDs, T8s, and EXIT signs. This project also uses funds from both 2009 and 2010, in order to have sufficient funding for a large enough sample size for meaningful results. She also thanked Steve Waite for his work on both the B1 and B2 projects.

B3: Net Savings Paper

Elizabeth Titus reported that the net savings scoping paper project is underway. The results of this paper will be used to shape future Forum research projects. The contractor for this project has completed an interview guide and interviews will take place soon, with a draft report prepared by July. Forum participants who are interested in joining the project subcommittee should contact Elizabeth Titus.

NAPEE/SEE Action Update

Julie Michals shared that the NAPEE project, a joint US EPA/US DOE effort, is now called SEE Action. The goal of SEE Action is to capture all cost-effective energy efficiency five years earlier than NAPEE's initial goal. The SEE Action EM&V Work Group's top priorities are to improve methods used to estimate program savings, improve quality control and accuracy of reported savings, and improve consistency in terms and reporting. She added that these priorities are closely related to Forum projects.

Michael Li (US DOE) stated that work products for the EM&V Work Group are still being determined and will be proposed in the next few weeks. He added that US DOE is still taking nominations for EM&V Work Group participants. Nominations can be sent to Michael Li, US DOE (michael.li@hq.doe.gov) or Denise Mulholland, US EPA (mulholland.denise@epa.gov).

NAESB Update

Julie Michals stated that NAESB is developing M&V standards for wholesale energy efficiency and model business practices for retail energy efficiency. She added that the wholesale working group will use the ISO-NE manual and PJM manual to develop standards that will go to FERC. This process is moving slowly as NAESB does not have funding for contractors and relies on its members to participate in the working groups. The retail working group is scoping model business practices and working from the NAPEE Impact Evaluation guide. The scope of this project is still being determined. NEEP will send NAESB draft materials from Project A2.

Julie Michals shared that there is an upcoming DSM/EE NAESB meeting at ISO-NE in Holyoke, MA on May 20. NEEP will send Forum participants information about this meeting. She added that NEEP will encourage more participation in NAESB amongst Forum participants in the future, but for now will continue to monitor NAESB activities on the behalf of Forum participants.

Niko Dietsch (US EPA) added that it will be interesting to see how the NAESB process interacts with SEE Action as both efforts unfold.

Michael Li added that US DOE is committed to coordinating with the NAESB effort and making sure that everyone is informed about SEE Action activities.

Action Items:

3. Forum participants to email Elizabeth Titus if they are interested in joining the project subcommittee for the Net Savings project, Codes and Standards project, and/or Incremental Costs project.
4. Forum participants to send nominations for SEE Action EM&V Work Group participants to Michael Li, US DOE (michael.li@hq.doe.gov) or Denise Mulholland, US EPA (mulholland.denise@epa.gov).
5. NEEP to send out information about the NAESB meeting scheduled for May 20 in Holyoke, MA - see: <http://www.naesb.org/dsm-ee.asp>.

D. Review and Discuss Draft Guidelines and Recommendations for Steering Committee Consideration - Project A3: Common Energy Efficiency Reporting

Julie Michals introduced Project A3: Common Reporting Guidelines and stated that it has not been reviewed to the extent that Project A2 has been. She added that NEEP and Forum participants will need to determine if this project is ready for Steering Committee review at the late May meeting since it still has some sections that need work.

Julie Michals reviewed the project purpose: to increase the transparency, credibility and comparability of energy efficiency as a resource to meet multiple state and regional energy and environmental policy and market goals and objectives.

Julie Michals presented a diagram to show where the guidelines fit into the existing energy efficiency reporting scheme. The guidelines focus on subset of elements that are already reported. The two-way arrow at the top of the diagram demonstrates that the common reporting elements feed into air quality reporting, and the information exchange goes in both directions.

Julie Michals added that the recommended guidelines include data either currently reported or likely available and data identified as important by subcommittee members. She stated that the draft reporting template has been shared with a variety of stakeholders for peer review.

Julie Michals shared that a project subcommittee call took place on April 14, and subcommittee comments from the April 14 meeting have been incorporated into the documents that were posted for this meeting.

Julie Michals reported that Section 7, which addresses Air Emissions, is still a work in progress; a call is scheduled with air regulators on April 28 to ensure that this section is accurate. The purpose of the Air Emissions section was to learn what energy efficiency data is needed for air quality and climate change planning, but this was not as straightforward as expected. Research and interviews with air regulators revealed a need for further dialog and process recommendations between energy efficiency program administrators and air regulators. One significant recommendation from this section of the report is the need to improve communication between air and utility regulators and program administrators.

Julie Michals stated that the project has gone over its \$130,000 budget by about \$15,000. She will discuss the project budget overrun with the subcommittee and bring a recommendation to Forum participants on the use of contingency funds. She added that this project will be packaged similarly to Project A2 as a Forum product that includes a preface and guidelines. The proposed title for the A3 Forum product is: "Regional Energy Efficiency Reporting Guidelines."

Julie Michals thanked the NMR team for its excellent work. She reviewed the preface and guidelines document, which recognizes that the guidelines are voluntary and that underlying definitions vary across the region. She added that the guidelines also reflect what most jurisdictions will find feasible to report without making significant changes to current practice. She also reminded participants that the guidelines are a living document and will be updated as needed.

Julie Michals stated that the report addresses the issue of timing, as some states report tracking data at the beginning of the year and others report ex-post data at the end of the year. Furthermore, some states report on a calendar year basis while others report on a fiscal year basis.

Earle Taylor (Consultant to CL&P/WMECO) stated that confusion arises when changes are made to the timing of reporting, and it is difficult to convey to Commissions the changes that were made and why they were made.

Consultant Dottie Conant added that there is no way to report evaluated savings in the first quarter of the year, but suggested that states could file both tracked and ex-post savings data.

Julie Michals asked of the preferred approach is to use tracking data at the beginning of year or wait to report evaluated data at the end of year.

Gail Azulay replied that Massachusetts completes its plan based on tracking data, and their annual reports draw on evaluated data. She added that NSTAR uses whatever data they have at the time they are going to file, but she would prefer to plan and file with the same data.

Ralph Prah added that the reporting process in Massachusetts is not likely to change anytime soon. Several other participants agreed with this assessment.

Participants continued to discuss the timing and process for reporting in the various states, and it was clear that there are significant variations across states.

Julie Michals stated that NEEP will craft language within the Executive Summary that highlights the issue of timing, points out when and what states currently report, and suggests that there be consideration for moving states to greater consistency.

Julie Michals presented the Forum's preface and guidelines document for the Common Reporting Guidelines project, which includes templates for reporting annual and lifetime gas and electric energy savings, net savings, electric demand savings, program expenditures, emissions reporting and job impacts. The templates also include reporting elements that are not currently recommended, but should be considered going forward.

Dave Jacobson (National Grid) stated that there were three levels of savings discussed in Project A2: Common EM&V Methods, gross savings, evaluated gross savings, and savings adjusted by a net to gross ratio. He questioned why the templates for Project A3 collapse savings back into two levels.

Julie Michals replied that NEEP/NMR will address definitions of gross savings in the A3 report.

Julie Michals asked if NMR's recommendation to move towards consistent definitions of peak demand savings may not be possible since what is being reported from one region to the next varies. She added that the best they can do is be clear about the definition that is used.

Earle Taylor commented that with regard to the definition of peak demand, air regulators are primarily interested in High Electricity Demand Days (HEDDs). He added that attainment hours may be different from HEDDs, and suggested that this distinction should make its way into the report. He added that a visualization of an 8760 loadshape with a dimension for time could be very helpful for air regulators.

Julie Michals replied that it is still not clear what to include in the reporting template and what should be shared through another venue. She added that demand savings in the reporting table may not meet air regulatory data needs, and suggested that this data may be better provided through a different mechanism. NEEP needs more direction from air regulators on what is needed.

Dave Jacobson asked for clarification about the distinction between the programs in the reporting templates that are listed in black versus those listed in blue.

Julie Michals replied that the ones listed in black are those being proposed for reporting, and the ones in the blue are those that may be included in the future.

There was some additional discussion about the 'totals' line in the reporting templates. It was decided that NEEP/NMR team will modify the reporting templates for savings tables to clarify totals.

Julie Michals stated that a levelized cost/kWh formula is included in the A3 preface and guidelines for the program expenditures template. She asked for recommendations for the levelized cost/kWh formula.

Huilan Li stated that participant costs are difficult to collect, but they are real costs.

Dan Cleverdon stated that some may use real discount rates to calculate levelized cost/kWh while others use nominal costs.

Crissy Godfrey added that Maryland uses lifecycle cost/kWh in its plans.

Niko Dietsch asked if participants believe that it is appropriate to promote one way to calculate levelized cost/kWh rather than laying out possible options.

Julie Michals suggested that this is an opportunity to draw Commissioners' attention to important inconsistencies. She asked if this particular issue should be brought to the Steering Committee's attention or if a definition should be provided in the reporting template.

Huilan Li suggested providing discount rates from different sources and allow each commission to make a judgment on which particular discount rate to use.

After some discussion, it was determined that NEEP/NMR will correct the formula for levelized cost/kWh, and reference different sources of real discount rates for the levelized cost/kWh formula.

Julie Michals stated that she will not address the air regulator section on this call and will be discussing key comments/changes with air regulators on April 28.

Julie Michals introduced the job impacts reporting template and asked for recommendations for streamlining the template. The template recommends job impacts reporting guidelines that are similar to the ARRA guidelines and recommends the use of an ACEEE job calculator.

Niko Dietsch stated that it is important to be clear about how the information in the jobs impact template will be used. He also brought up the issue of whether it is more important to report the information consistently or accurately.

NEEP will add a reference to the appropriate usage of information reported in the jobs impact template.

Julie Michals stated that she will also reach out to state energy offices to see if the jobs impact reporting template is workable.

Larry Pakenas asked if the reporting template addresses net jobs or gross jobs. He added that New York reports net jobs because it is a better indication of the effect of programs.

Julie Michals replied that the template reports gross jobs, but that we can add net jobs along with definition and sources of tools used to estimate net jobs.

Julie Michals reported that sections addressing 'Coordination with US DOE on EIA data collection,' and 'Coordination w/ System Planners on EE data Needs' will be added to the preface and guidelines document. Dottie Conant reported that none of the three system planners she interviewed are interested in state energy efficiency data at this time.

Julie Michals stated that the comments received today will be incorporated into the report, and Section 7, Air Emissions, will be reworked. She asked Forum participants to send NEEP comments on the Common Reporting Guidelines project by Monday, May 3. NEEP will send out revised final guidelines before the late May Steering Committee meeting.

Action Items:

6. For the A3 Common Reporting Guidelines project:
 - a. NEEP/NMR to develop language for the executive summary that addresses the issue of timing.
 - b. NEEP/NMR to address definitions of gross savings.
 - c. NEEP/NMR to modify reporting templates for savings tables to clarify totals.
 - d. NEEP/NMR to correct formula for levelized cost/kWh, and reference different sources of real discount rates for the levelized cost/kWh formula.
 - e. NEEP to add a reference to the appropriate usage of information reported in the jobs impact template.
 - f. NEEP to modify Section 7 - Air Emissions after discussion with air regulators to incorporate key comments/changes.

- g. Forum participants to send comments on the project to NEEP by Monday, May 3. NEEP will incorporate comments and send out revised final guidelines (aiming for May 10).
- h. NEEP to discuss project budget overrun with subcommittee and bring recommendation to Forum participants on use of contingency funds.

E. Review of 2010 Project Agenda and Budget

Julie Michals stated that New Jersey has confirmed that it cannot fund the EM&V Forum in 2010, but is committed funding 2009 funds that are still ongoing. New Jersey represented 18.5% of project costs and 12% of base costs for 2010, which reduced the 2010 budget by nearly \$300,000.

Julie Michals reported that NEEP staff and Project Committees co-chairs recently revisited the 2010 budget to determine how to address the budget shortfall given New Jersey's lack of participation. Two of the 2010 projects, one to address emerging technologies and one to address system planning, have been moved to 2011, but this still does not fully address the funding shortfall. She shared that NEEP is developing a revised budget allocation for 2010 given these changes. NEEP will not increase each funder's share above the amount that NEEP communicated in its 2010 funding confirmation letters. She added that Pennsylvania may still become involved in a couple of Forum projects this year. NEEP will provide Forum participants information about the 2010 budget without New Jersey's participation in the next few weeks. She added that NEEP is now turning its attention towards scoping 2010 projects.

Elizabeth Titus introduced the two 2010 projects that are now being scoped: one addressing energy efficiency savings attributable to codes and standards activities and one addressing incremental costs.

With regard to the codes and savings project, Elizabeth Titus stated that the project addresses two main points: 1) How to estimate what savings are attributable to codes, and 2) What the process should be to get regulatory approval to claim those savings. She invited Forum participants to join the project subcommittee for this project.

Elizabeth Titus added that this project uses funds from the 2009 and 2010 budget, and may be supported by federal funding. The current idea is to hold a 1-2 day workshop to review what has been done with this issue in California and the northeast and to brainstorm next steps. The workshop's focus will be on residential new construction with some consideration of commercial and industrial codes, and it is expected that a white paper discussing extensions to savings from efficiency standards would be an additional phase of the project. A more specific scope of work will be developed next month.

With regard to the incremental costs project, Elizabeth Titus shared that a scope of work for this project will be completed within the next few weeks and will be posted to the Forum website for participant review. She also invited Forum participants to join the project subcommittee for this project. The purpose of this project is to perform primary research to estimate incremental costs for a few priority measures. Elizabeth Titus added that she is accepting feedback, questions, or comments on the two 2010 projects.

Julie Michals reviewed the Forum's meeting schedule for the rest of 2010. The next Project Committees teleconference will take place in June. There will be a quarterly meeting in September and December, and the EM&V Forum Annual Public Meeting will also take place in September.

Julie Michals closed the meeting at 3:05pm and stated that NEEP will distribute meeting action items via email and post meeting notes to the EM&V Forum website.

Action Items:

- 7. NEEP to provide Forum participants with information about the 2010 budget without New Jersey's participation.
- 8. Forum participants to contact Elizabeth Titus with any feedback, questions, or comments about the Incremental Costs project or the Codes and Standards project.