



**REGIONAL EVALUATION,
MEASUREMENT & VERIFICATION FORUM**

**Quarterly Project Committees Meeting
December 18, 2009, Teleconference Notes and Action Items**

Participants:

Name	Organization	Name	Organization
Mike Sherman*	MA Department of Energy Resources	Dorothy Conant	Consultant
Dave Jacobson*	National Grid	Helen Eisenfeld	NYPA
John Moskal*	US Environmental Protection Agency	Mary Cahill	NYPA
Paul Gray	United Illuminating	Lynn Hoefgen	NMR
Chris James	Synapse Energy Economics	David Filiberto	NMR
Brian Gallagher	Consultant to Delaware Sustainable Energy Utility	Dan Barbieri	KEMA
Ralph Prah	Consultant to MA Energy Efficiency Advisory Council	Liz Hicks	KEMA
John Zabliski	Rochester Gas & Electric	Victoria Engel	NYSERDA
Andrew Cottrell	Rutgers University - for NJ Board of Public Utilities	Larry Pakenas	NYSERDA
Frank Felder	Rutgers University - for NJ Board of Public Utilities	Laura Magee	PEPCO Holdings, Inc.
Sheldon Switzer	Baltimore Gas & Electric	Kim Oswald	Consultant to CT ECMB
Bill Saxonis	NY Department of Public Service	Paul Horowitz	PAH Associates
Stacey Harwood	NY Department of Public Service	Jeff Schlegel	Consultant to CT ECMB and MA EEAC
Julie Niedzialkowski	NY Department of Public Service	Pam Stonier	Vermont Public Service Board
Matthew McCaffree	Institute for Electric Efficiency	Marilyn Ross	Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities
Crissy Godfrey	Maryland Public Service Commission	Colleen Orsburn	Efficiency Vermont / VEIC
Huilan Li	Maryland Public Service Commission	Julie Michals*	NEEP
Calvin Timmerman	Maryland Public Service Commission	Cecily McChalicher*	NEEP
Taresa Lawrence	DC District Department of the Environment	Elizabeth Titus*	NEEP

*Denotes in-person

This meeting was digitally recorded.

Meeting Action Items (and follow up actions as of January 4, 2010):

1. KEMA/NEEP will revise the Summary of Draft KEMA Recommendations table for Project A2 Part B in the *December 11 Memo to Forum Participants* by adding columns that will elicit more comprehensive feedback from Forum participants about the proposed recommendations.
2. NEEP will post the complete draft report for Part B of Project A2 to the Forum website the week of December 21, 2009.

3. NEEP will provide Forum participants with a revised schedule and timeframe to comment on materials for Project A2, with the understanding that the current schedule may not be feasible.

Follow up to Action Items 1-3. Project A2 - Common EM&V Methods and Survey of Savings Assumptions. Given Project Committee feedback that more time is needed to comment on Project A2 draft materials, NEEP has extended the comment periods. Part B Draft report has been posted for review since Dec 11, and Part A draft report will be posted January 11. We request comment on both Parts A and B by January 26. We invite your careful and timely review, and note that Part B is quite technical compared to Part A, and therefore will likely take more time to review. Please also note that NEEP/KEMA decided not to pursue Action Item #2 (fill in Part B table of recommendations). Rather we will seek your comments on the full draft report (including recommendations) for both Parts A and B, and we'll address what recommendations may ultimately be included in Part C (EM&V Guidelines) when we get to that phase of project (mid February). Given we will not have recommendations prepared for Steering Committee review in late February, we will instead aim to brief the Steering Committee on project status and comments to date.

4. NEEP will revise the Energy Efficiency Reporting Elements Policy Priority Table for Project A3 by splitting the Air Quality (SIP) and Climate Change column into two separate columns.
5. NEEP will post the draft Unitary HVAC RFP (Project B1.2) to the Forum website for review during the first week of January. Forum participants should direct questions or comments on the draft RFP to Elizabeth Titus.
6. Forum participants who would like participate in the subcommittee for Project B3.2 (Scoping Paper on EE Savings from Building Codes) or the subcommittee for 2010 Project RE1 (Incremental Costs Assumptions) should contact Elizabeth Titus. The subcommittee for RE1 will form in January - volunteers are needed ASAP.
7. NEEP will share subcommittee member lists with Forum participants in January to provide them with an opportunity to review their level of participation.
8. Forum participants should provide Elizabeth Titus with contact information for at least one person in their organization/company that deals with program implementation to assist with 2010 Project RE1 (Incremental Cost Assumptions).
9. NEEP will post a revised Terms and Conditions document to the Forum's website for review. NEEP would like feedback from participants on this document by the end of December.
10. Forum participants to send nominations for three new Project Committee co-chairs to Julie Michals by January 8, 2010.
11. NEEP will poll Forum participants about their availability for a Project Committee teleconference on or around February 12, 2010.

Meeting Overview:

A. Review Meeting Agenda

Julie Michals (NEEP) opened the meeting at 9:00am and reviewed the meeting agenda and objectives. The meeting objectives are to: 1) receive feedback from participants on Projects A2, B3, and A3, 2) review the 2010 project agenda and process, and 3) test 2010 meeting dates.

B. Project A2: Common EM&V Methods

Julie Michals introduced Project A2: Common EM&V Methods. Liz Hicks and Dan Barbieri from KEMA, the contractor for the project, participated in the meeting to present an update to Forum participants on the status of the project.

Liz Hicks summarized the three main parts of the project: 1) Part A - Interviews, 2) Part B - Research Savings Assumptions and Algorithms, and 3) Part C - Synthesis of Parts A & B: Develop Recommendations and Guidelines, and then described the programs/measures covered by the project.

Liz Hicks described KEMA's progress on Part A - Interviews. KEMA predominantly interviewed program administrators, along with some evaluators. KEMA has shared high level findings from Part A with the

A2 subcommittee. KEMA is now in the process of analyzing data at the measure level and will produce draft findings and a draft report.

Dan Barbieri described Part B of the A2 project, which is a technical review and comparison of savings assumptions and algorithms. He explained that the 14 measures that Liz Hicks described for Part A are the same measures/program areas that were considered for Part B. In its draft Part B report, KEMA developed a table for each measure that lists the technical program/measure documentation by state that they reviewed and a comparative table of savings assumptions. The Part B draft report is posted to the Forum website for review.

Julie Michals stressed that it is important for each state and program administrator to review the draft Part B report to ensure that KEMA has appropriately reflected the savings assumptions that are currently used. She added that KEMA could not document sources in some cases and asked Forum participants to let her know if the lack of documentation needs to be specifically addressed in the recommendations.

Julie Michals summarized her December 11 memo to Forum participants that accompanied KEMA's draft report. This memo is also posted to the Forum website for review. The memo summarizes the status of Part B of the project. Attachment 1 to the memo is a summary of KEMA's draft findings and recommendations. It identifies high level prevailing themes and includes a table listing KEMA's recommendations. NEEP requested needs feedback from participants by January 12, 2010 to help prioritize KEMA's recommendations.

Dan Barbieri reviewed the table listing KEMA's recommendations and described the five prevailing themes that cut across the 14 measures. The themes are: 1) combine coincidence factors, 2) develop localized assumptions, 3) standardize or expand dimensions, 4) eliminate or utilize loading factors, and 5) stipulate or calculate. He added that the draft Part B report provides the full information/research that produced KEMA's recommendations listed in the table.

Julie Michals reviewed the A2 project schedule. NEEP would like to present A2 project results/recommendations to the Forum's Steering Committee at its next meeting at the end of February. NEEP is requesting feedback on Part A by January, 21, 2010, feedback on Part B by January 12, 2010, and feedback on Part C by February 11, 2010. NEEP would like to schedule a Project Committee call on or around February 12, 2010 to discuss the A2 project recommendations.

Kim Oswald (Consultant to CT ECMB) asked for clarification on what it means to prioritize the recommendations.

Julie Michals replied that NEEP needs Forum participants to indicate whether or not the recommendations make sense from each state's perspective. Feedback might include whether the recommendations are important, if they are they straightforward, if they are doable, or if they would be hard to implement.

Ralph Prah (Consultant to MA EEAC) stated that the recommendations in general will be most useful if state processes are taken into account. For example, New York is completing a nine month process to develop Technical Resource Manuals for the state, so New York will not likely want to update its TRMs right away.

Frank Felder (Rutgers University - for NJ BPU) agreed with Ralph Prah's comment. He added that New Jersey has just finished up a nine month process to develop its TRM. The recommendations coming out of the A2 project could feed into the next process to update New Jersey's TRM. He suggested that the goal at the next Steering Committee meeting could be for each state to go back and seriously consider the recommendations that KEMA has pulled together. He advised that NEEP should not expect immediate action by the states.

Dave Jacobson (National Grid) stated that the benefit of KEMA's draft Part B report is that it pulls together what all of the states are doing. He added that the recommendations may not be incorporated right away, but they will be taken into consideration when states revise their TRMs.

Elizabeth Titus (NEEP) asked if KEMA has suggestions to guide Forum participants in their attempt to prioritize the recommendations. Dan Barbieri replied that Forum participants can help KEMA gauge how practical the recommendations are. He added that KEMA's report is technical and blind to the reality of what it will take to actually implement the recommendations. KEMA does not know the history of the TRMs in each state, and thus does not have a good grasp of what is politically realistic.

Colleen Orsburn (Efficiency Vermont/VEIC) questioned what it means to prioritize the recommendations by 1, 2 or 3 as requested in the table. She asked if the table of recommendations can more clearly indicate what type of feedback is needed from Forum participants. She added that there are several dimensions of "priority" that are important, and all of those dimensions should be more explicitly called out in the table of recommendations.

Kim Oswald suggested adding columns to the table that ask for more specific feedback, for example "do you agree with this," "to what extent do you agree," and "is this doable." She added that the table in its current form does not push Forum participants to provide a full range of information/feedback. She stated that adding columns to outline certain dimensions of priority and importance will make it easier for participants to provide feedback about the recommendations, and it will make the work easier for KEMA.

Ralph PrahI agreed with Kim Oswald's suggested approach.

Julie Michals stated that KEMA will add columns to the table of recommendations. She also explained Attachment 2 to the December 11 memo, which is a preliminary example of what will be included in guidelines. She explained that the final product for Project A2 will be a measure by measure look at the savings assumptions algorithm and preferred method.

Julie Michals asked how NEEP should deliver the recommendations from this project to the Steering Committee. She added that the recommendations delivered to the Steering Committee will not be detailed. NEEP recognizes that the recommendations will feed into each state's individual cycle and may not be incorporated right away into state TRMs. If the Steering Committee agrees to support these recommendations, each state will consider the recommendations as they update their TRMs. She asked how NEEP should follow up and ensure that these recommendations are pursued.

Frank Felder stated that New Jersey would give these recommendations serious consideration in its process to update its TRM if the Steering Committee supports the recommendations. He added that NEEP should not force New Jersey to do anything or check with New Jersey to make sure the recommendations are incorporated. He suggested that NEEP should encourage uniformity but not force uniformity.

Julie Michals replied that she is not suggesting that there be an enforcement role. She added that perhaps there should be some kind of reporting to see what recommendations were actually adopted.

Dave Jacobson suggested that the best the Forum can do is to develop the recommendations and check back in with the states periodically to see how useful the recommendations are.

Mike Sherman (Massachusetts DOER) suggested that KEMA add a feasibility estimate on any major recommendations. He added that technical issues as well as process issues will dictate how hard it is to implement a recommendation. He added that the recommendations that have a big impact will be the most difficult to implement.

Elizabeth Titus stated that greater consistency resulting from the Project A2 recommendations will help in forecasts of efficiency as a capacity resource in the region. She suggested focusing more heavily on one or two measures that are the largest source of savings.

Frank Felder suggested that Forum participants should explicitly identify why consistency makes sense, since this is the core question of the whole Forum. He added that the benefits and costs should be pinpointed.

Kim Oswald added that Forum participants have to provide regulatory authority with persuasive reasons for consistency.

Julie Michals wrapped up the discussion on Project A2. She reiterated that NEEP is seeking comment on the draft Part B report by January 12, 2010. The full draft report that includes all the measures will be posted on the Forum website the week of December 21, 2009. The table of recommendations with additional columns will also be posted to the Forum website.

Dave Jacobson reiterated that it is important for program administrators to ask program implementation staff to review the materials in the draft Part B report to make sure that they are accurate.

Frank Felder stated that it may take longer than January 12, 2010 to complete this review, given that it is the middle of the holiday season.

Julie Michals replied that there are a lot of Forum materials out for review right now, and NEEP understands that it is challenging to find the time to review them. She added that the Forum needs to finish projects to demonstrate that it is meeting deadlines and moving forward. The A2 project was supposed to be done by the end of 2009, but it is behind schedule by about one month. She will talk with KEMA to see if it is possible to modify the schedule to allow for more time to review the materials.

Ralph PrahI asked if there is a reason that the A2 Project needs to be completed by the end of February for the Steering Committee meeting.

Julie Michals stated that the Steering Committee meeting has already been pushed back twice. She would like to move the A2 project forward so the Forum can turn to 2010 projects and stay on track with other 2009 projects. If it is not possible to finish the A2 project by the February meeting, NEEP can put it on the agenda for the mid-year Steering Committee meeting.

Ralph PrahI stated that he is concerned about the proposed timeline given that there is not yet a draft work product for Part C of the project.

Julie Michals stated that the A2 project is informing national EM&V protocol discussions, including the North American Energy Standards Board (NAESB) M&V project, and the National Action Plan on Energy Efficiency (NAPEE) EM&V project.

Mike Sherman asked if the NAESB M&V project has a clearly defined set of goals.

Julie Michals replied that the NAESB project thus far has been driven by southern utilities, but NAESB is now seeking greater participation from utilities in the northeast. NAESB is convening subcommittees in January to clearly define the project goals and scope.

Action Items:

1. KEMA/NEEP will revise the Summary of Draft KEMA Recommendations table for Project A2 Part B in the *December 11 Memo to Forum Participants* by adding columns that will elicit more comprehensive feedback from Forum participants about the proposed recommendations.
2. NEEP will post the complete draft report for Part B of Project A2 to the Forum website the week of December 21, 2009.
3. NEEP will provide Forum participants with a revised schedule and timeframe to comment on materials for Project A2, with the understanding that the current schedule may not be feasible.

C. Project B3: Net Savings Scoping Paper - Draft RFP

Elizabeth Titus introduced the draft net savings scoping paper RFP that she, John Moskal (US EPA), and Bill Saxonis (NY DPS) drafted. The draft RFP has been posted to the Forum website, and Forum participants are invited to review and comment on the draft document. The project premise is to achieve consistency and quality in net savings definition, evaluation, and measurement in order to increase the effectiveness of energy efficiency and air regulatory policies in the region. She added that the net savings panel at the Forum's Annual Public Meeting showed that there are many different practices and perspectives with regard to net savings around the region. NEEP is hoping to issue the RFP as soon as possible, which will probably be in early January, with work to be done in the first two quarters of 2010.

Elizabeth Titus stated that NEEP suggests deferring development of a scope of work for the proposed 2010 project related to net savings until after the scoping paper is done, which will move this proposed 2010 project to 2011. This recommendation is based on the conversation at the most recent Steering Committee meeting, in which it was apparent that different states have different needs for a net savings project that can not be easily reconciled at this time.

Ralph Prael stated that the draft RFP generally looks good.

Julie Michals stated that the draft RFP was posted a week ago, and the comment period has been extended through the end of December.

D. Other 2009 Projects - Updates/Status Report

Project A3: Julie Michals provided an overview of the status of Project A3: Common Reporting Guidelines. NMR has completed Task 1: Research existing energy efficiency reporting practices by program administrators and at the state level within the Forum region. Task 2: Interview air regulators and system planners to identify EE data needs to support air quality and climate change planning and reporting and system planning, is just beginning and should be completed by end of January.

Lynn Hoefgen (NMR) reviewed the project objectives: 1) identify commonalities and differences in current and evolving reporting practices by program administrators across Forum jurisdictions, 2) identify where important differences in definitions exist, and 3) develop and recommend common reporting parameters and elements to meet multiple policy and market objectives.

Project consultant Dottie Conant reviewed the energy efficiency savings summary table, expenditures summary table, and the preliminary conclusions that she and NMR have developed based on the results of Task 1.

With regard to expense category definitions, Dottie Conant noted that there are significant differences amongst the jurisdictions. She proposed that a solution to this would be to define broader categories by having some jurisdictions combine multiple currently reported expense categories.

Frank Felder suggested that the solution should be to have those who aggregate start to disaggregate instead of the other way around.

Dottie Conant agreed that is a good idea, but it may be hard to implement since it would require jurisdictions to do something different. The first step to combine categories would not require much more work.

Frank Felder replied that disaggregating could be a possibility down the road. He asked what is meant by "implementation expenses" and questioned whether that includes rebates.

Dottie Conant replied that it does not necessarily include rebates. Definitions of the expense categories in each state are included in a more detailed report.

Julie Michals added that the preliminary findings are extracted from working files that include detailed state by state information tables.

Dottie Conant reviewed the emissions reporting summary and the jobs reporting summary, and summarized the next steps for the emissions/job reporting part of the project.

Julie Michals explained the Energy Efficiency Reporting Elements Policy Priority Table for the A3 project that is posted to the Forum website for review. She added that NEEP is looking for an indication about which reporting elements are considered important to meet policy, market, and other needs. NEEP is particularly interested in suggestions about how to report this detailed information.

Frank Felder asked if there is a standard set of definitions since a common set of definitions would help him understand what kind of feedback is needed. Julie Michals replied that general feedback from participants will help NMR and NEEP understand what kind of information is useful and will help to inform the underlying definitions.

John Moskal (US EPA) asked if NMR/NEEP could split the climate change and air quality column in the priority table into two different categories. He added that all states have climate change plans, but air regulators are not involved in climate change plans, and air quality is much different than climate change. Julie Michals replied that NMR/NEEP will create two columns: one for climate change, and one for air quality. She added that Forum participants should send her any further comments about the table. NEEP will make the requested changes to table and repost it to the Forum website. Julie Michals will also provide Forum participants with a reassessment of comment period schedules for the projects, including Project A3.

Julie Michals reviewed the next steps for Project A3, which will be air regulator interviews and a synthesis of the results.

Dave Jacobson asked for clarification about how program administrators will be engaged in the next steps of the project.

Dottie Conant replied that talking to all of the 50+ program administrators is beyond the scope of the project. She added that the primary data collection effort was to contact state regulatory staff and air regulators. She has looked at individual program administrator reports when necessary.

Action Item:

4. NEEP will revise the Energy Efficiency Reporting Elements Policy Priority Table for Project A3 by splitting the Air Quality (SIP) and Climate Change column into two separate columns.

Project A4: Julie Michals reported that NEEP continues to monitor ISO-NE and PJM energy efficiency M&V activities. This project also ties into the work being done for the NAESB M&V project discussed earlier in this meeting.

Project A5: Elizabeth Titus stated that this project to develop a TRM for the Mid-Atlantic region is moving forward. The contractor, VEIC, in consultation with the subcommittee, has selected 30 measures for inclusion in the TRM. The results of this project are expected in March 2010. This project may be extended to a 2010 project that will add measures and/or convert the TRM to a wiki format.

Project B1: Elizabeth Titus provided an update about the B1 Load Shape Study project. The RFP for the C&I Lighting Load Shape study has been released. The first draft of the RFP for the C&I Unitary HVAC Load Shape study has been reviewed by the subcommittee. The next draft of the Unitary HVAC RFP will be posted to the Forum website during the first full week in January for review. Forum participants should call or email Elizabeth Titus with any questions or comments about the C&I Unitary HVAC Load Shape study RFP.

Action Item:

5. NEEP will post the draft Unitary HVAC RFP (Project B1.2) to the Forum website for review during the first week of January. Forum participants should direct questions or comments on the draft RFP to Elizabeth Titus.

Project B2: Elizabeth Titus reported that this project is not exactly on schedule, but it is moving forward as fast as possible. She added that the project was delayed because the Forum is revising its Terms and Conditions document so that it adequately addresses National Grid's stringent requirements. She thanked those who are participating in the data collection effort for this project.

Project B3: Elizabeth Titus stated that she already discussed the net savings scoping paper earlier in the meeting. The last phase of this project (B3.2) is a scoping paper that will address energy efficiency savings connected to building code upgrades. The RFP for this paper will be developed in early 2010. EPA has a strong interest in this and will fund the project. Forum participants who would like to participate in the subcommittee for this project should contact Elizabeth Titus.

Action Item:

6. Forum participants who would like participate in the subcommittee for Project B3.2 (Scoping Paper on EE Savings from Building Codes) or the subcommittee for 2010 Project RE1 (Incremental Costs Assumptions) should contact Elizabeth Titus. The subcommittee for RE1 will form in January - volunteers are needed ASAP.

EM&V Forum Library: Cecily McChalicher (NEEP) reported that NEEP has now posted its EM&V Resource Library to its website. The library includes a repository of research and evaluation studies that includes EM&V studies from each participating jurisdiction along with web pages for state, regional and national EM&V policies and activities.

Cecily McChalicher added that the Library is still a work in progress, and the Forum is still collecting information to populate the Library. Forum participants should send her any materials that should be added to the Library, along with any comments or suggestions for improvement.

EM&V Forum Website:

Julie Michals shared that NEEP is now posting Project Committee, Steering Committee, and subcommittee meeting information and materials to the private Forum website. If any Forum participants have trouble accessing the materials through the private site, they should contact Cecily McChalicher.

E. 2010 Project Agenda and Budget

Julie Michals reviewed the 2010 project agenda and budget that has been approved by the Steering Committee. She added that this does not bind the states to make a financial commitment at this time. She also showed the cost allocation framework, which is the same framework that was used in 2009, and a schedule of when the 2009 and 2010 projects will take place. She explained that many of the 2010 projects will start in the middle of 2010, with many 2009 projects wrapping up in the first quarter of 2010.

Julie Michals stated that NEEP, consultants, and project subcommittees will be working to develop scopes of work for the 2010 projects in the first two quarters of 2010. The invoicing process for the 2010 projects will be worked out on a state by state basis.

Julie Michals stated that NEEP wants to give Forum participants an opportunity to indicate which subcommittees they would like to actively participate in as "official" subcommittee members. She clarified that all Forum participants will be updated/briefed about all of the projects at the quarterly Project Committee meetings even if they are not a member of any of the subcommittees. NEEP will share current subcommittee lists with Forum participants in January.

Action Item:

7. NEEP will share subcommittee member lists with Forum participants in January to provide them with an opportunity to review their level of participation.

Incremental Cost Assumption Project: Elizabeth Titus stated that VEIC has developed a scope of work for the 2010 Project RE1: Incremental Cost Assumptions. She thanked Frank Felder for suggesting at the last Steering Committee meeting that NEEP speed up the project process by providing more fleshed out scopes of work before projects begin. The RE1 project will be ready early in 2010 thanks to this strategy. Elizabeth Titus explained that this project will include primary research to provide up to date, geographically relevant incremental cost assumption data. Forum participants who want to be on the subcommittee for this project should contact Elizabeth Titus (see action item #6 above).

Dave Jacobson asked if the project has a substantial enough budget to include both commercial and residential.

Elizabeth Titus replied that the project will either pick a few priorities or ask the contractor to determine what can be done given the budget. Right now she is thinking the project will include one residential and one commercial and industrial.

Dave Jacobson stated that it is very hard to determine incremental costs. He stressed that it will be important to go outside the evaluation community and talk to program implementation staff.

Elizabeth Titus agreed that program implementation staff are important and will help NEEP to figure out what should be prioritized in this project. She also thanked Ralph Prah for the information he provided about incremental cost assumptions in the Midwest.

Ralph Prah stated that he would like to be on the subcommittee for the RE1 project.

Elizabeth Titus asked Forum participants provide her with contact information for at least one person in their organization/company that deals with program implementation to assist with this project.

Action Item:

8. Forum participants should provide Elizabeth Titus with contact information for at least one person in their organization/company that deals with program implementation to assist with 2010 Project RE1 (Incremental Cost Assumptions).

F. Forum Operations Updates

Terms and Conditions: Julie Michals reported that NEEP had planned to have a new draft Terms and Conditions document posted to the Forum website by now for review, but the process has been delayed. NEEP has been working with National Grid to make extensive revisions to the Forum's Terms and Conditions document that will adequately incorporate National Grid requirements. This morning, NEEP received the final version from National Grid. This version will be posted to the Forum website for review. She added that the revised document provides specific terms and conditions related to accessing tracking systems data and on-site visits. The document also includes National Grid requirements for background checks, safety requirements, and other environmental considerations. National Grid will need to directly enter into contract with the contractor for projects that involve certain elements. Julie Michals added that National Grid's terms seem to be the most stringent, so NEEP is hoping that the revised Terms and Conditions document meets everyone's needs. NEEP would like Forum participants to review the document once it is posted and provide their feedback by the end of December.

Action Item:

9. NEEP will post a revised Terms and Conditions document to the Forum's website for review. NEEP would like feedback from participants on this document by the end of December.

Project Committee Co-Chairs: Julie Michals thanked all of the Project Committee co-chairs that have served in 2009 and stated that NEEP is requesting nominations for new Project Committee co-chairs. The current co-chairs are:

- Carol White (National Grid), Larry Pakenas and Jennifer Meissner (NYSERDA) - Protocol Development
- Jeremy Newberger (National Grid), Chris Neme and Coleen Orsburn (VEIC) - Research & Development
- Mike Sherman (MA Department of Energy Resources) - Education & Information Access

NEEP will be replacing three co-chairs at the beginning of 2010. Forum participants should send nominations for co-chairs (self or others) to Julie Michals by January 8, 2010.

Julie Michals added that the role of the Project Committee co-chairs is provide leadership/steering by participating in monthly calls with NEEP staff and guiding NEEP staff in Forum agenda development. NEEP staff also brings subcommittee issues to the Project Committee co-chairs.

Action Item:

10. Forum participants to send nominations for three new Project Committee co-chairs to Julie Michals by January 8, 2010.

G. 2010 Project Committee Meeting Schedule

Julie Michals shared the preliminary Project Committee meeting schedule for 2010. NEEP would like to hold a Project Committee call on or around February 12, 2010 to address: 1) A2 Common EM&V Methods and Assumptions Guidelines Recommendations to Steering Committee, 2) A3 Proposed Reporting Guidelines and Templates, and 3) RE1 Incremental Cost Assumption Study draft RFP.

Julie Michals asked participants if the AESP conference the week of February 8, 2010 presents a conflict. No one replied that this would be a conflict. NEEP will poll Forum participants about their availability for a Project Committee teleconference on or around February 12, 2010

The quarterly Project Committee meetings in 2010 are tentatively scheduled for:

- Late April - Baltimore, Maryland
- Late June - Teleconference
- September - New York state
- December - New England

Action Item:

11. NEEP will poll Forum participants about their availability for a Project Committee teleconference on or around February 12, 2010

The meeting concluded at 12:15pm.