



**REGIONAL EVALUATION,
MEASUREMENT & VERIFICATION FORUM**

**Project Committees Quarterly Meeting
September 17, 2009 Meeting Notes and Action Items**

Participants:

Name	Organization
Michael Cassella	Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Coop
Andrew Cottrell	Rutgers University - For New Jersey Board of Public Utilities
Jim Cunningham	New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission
Niko Dietsch**	US Environmental Protection Agency
Helen Eisenfeld	New York Power Authority
Gene Fry**	Connecticut Light & Power
David Jacobson**	National Grid
Huilan Li	Maryland Public Service Commission
Teri Lutz	Allegheny Power
Matthew McCaffree	Edison Foundation - Institute for Electric Efficiency
*Jeremy Newberger	National Grid
*Colleen Orsburn	Efficiency Vermont/VEIC
Kim Oswald	Consultant to Connecticut Energy, Conservation Mgmt Board
*Larry Pakenas**	New York State Energy Research Development Agency (NYSERDA)
David Pirtle	PEPCO/Delmarva
Ralph Prah**	For Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources and Non-Utility Parties
Allison Reilly-Guerette	Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management (NESCAUM)
Marilyn Ross	Massachusetts Dept Public Utilities
Lisa Shea	NSTAR Electric and Gas
Pam Stonier	Vermont Public Service Board
Mary Straub	Baltimore Gas & Electric
Sheldon Switzer	Baltimore Gas & Electric
Steve Waite	Consultant
John Zabliski	NYSEG, Rochester Gas & Electric
Elizabeth Titus**	NEEP
Julie Michals**	NEEP
Cecily McChalicher**	NEEP

* Denotes Project Committee co-chair

** Denotes in-person

Meeting Action Items:

1. NEEP will continue to send out monthly Project Committee updates that highlight recent project activities. Project Committee members should let Forum staff know if more frequent updates are desired.
2. Project Committee members should contact Elizabeth Titus if they are interested in participating in the B3 Subcommittee.
3. Gene Fry & David Pirtle will be added to the B3 Subcommittee.
4. NEEP will determine how CEE is involved in NAESB and will provide the Project Committee with feedback as to what the Forum's role in NAESB should be as compared to CEE's.
5. NEEP will revise the Forum 2010 Projects Estimated Budgets spreadsheet and send it to Project Committee members the week of September 21. The revisions will include breaking out any remaining 2009 project funding from new 2010 project funding, incorporating Project Committee recommendations, and moving several projects to 2011.
6. At the Steering Committee meeting on October 27, NEEP will report on the projects that the Project Committee considered for 2010 but decided not to pursue. This will allow Steering Committee members/policymakers to comment on the value of pursuing these projects.
7. NEEP will put forth the discussed recommendations regarding state reporting practices to the Steering Committee at the October 27 meeting.
8. NEEP will schedule a demonstration of the new EM&V Forum public and private website after the new site is launched on October 2.
9. NEEP will follow up with the Project Committee via email on the agenda items not covered, including the nominating process for co-chairs.

Part of this Meeting was Digitally Recorded

1. Forum Project Updates

Julie Michals opened the meeting at 9:05am and introduced the meeting agenda and objectives. She reminded participants that NEEP will be looking for feedback from participants throughout the meeting, particularly during the Forum 2010 Project Agenda and Forum Operational Updates portions of the meeting.

For Project A2: Julie Michals reviewed the current status of this project. She reported that phone interviews with key stakeholders will proceed this fall. No Project Committee action is needed at this time. Participants were advised to keep in mind that the next phase of this project may be part of the 2010 project agenda.

For Project A3: Julie Michals reported that the A3 Subcommittee has selected Nexus Market Research (NMR) as the contractor for this project. She reported that the Forum also received proposals from Itron, KEMA, and Summit Blue. NEEP has confirmed that EPA will contribute \$75,000 for this project. Julie Michals reviewed the three main tasks that comprise the project schedule. The potential 2010 project to scope a regional online database could be the next phase for this project.

Discussion turned to whether to pursue a project to develop a regional online database in 2010.

Niko Dietsch, EPA, asked if the people being interviewed for the A3 project will be asked for their opinions about the value of a regional online database. Julie Michals reported that the project A3 interviewees will be asked about the value of an online database and what they believe to be an appropriate timeline for developing such a database.

Dave Jacobson, National Grid, asked if the A3 project subcommittee has strong representation from State Energy Offices and Public Utility Commissions since these entities set the guidelines as to how they want data reported. He spoke about Massachusetts' electronic reporting system, which has very precise requirements.

Julie Michals replied that all of the states are represented on the A3 Subcommittee. She stated that ideally the subcommittees would include all of the right people, but this is not easy. She added that the Nexus Market Research will ask the SEOs and PUCs about their reporting requirements/practices. NMR will identify reporting categories at a fairly high level. The goal is to come up with a common way to report certain high level impacts, using consistent definitions. Julie Michals stated that NEEP and the A3 Subcommittee will be sure to identify key people who should participate in this project. Niko Dietsch added that the right people for this project also include those involved with air quality issues.

Colleen Orsburn, Efficiency Vermont, asked if NEEP should communicate more frequently with Forum participants as projects are developed. Julie Michals stated that the monthly Project Committee updates are intended to keep participants apprised of project activities. If more updates/info is needed, NEEP can provide this to Forum participants, but NEEP is sensitive to balancing updates and too many emails to Forum participants from NEEP staff.

Action Item:

1. NEEP will continue to send out monthly Project Committee updates that highlight recent project activities. Project Committee members should let Forum staff know if more frequent updates are desired.

For Project A5: Julie Michals reviewed the project status and schedule. The RFP was released on September 2, and the winning bid will be selected on October 2. New Jersey was initially going to be involved in the project, but did not participate since they were updating their own TRM. New Jersey may join a second phase of this project next year.

Elizabeth Titus reported that even though the bidder question and answer period is closed, she recently received two questions about the RFP. First, she was asked why the budget specified for this project is considerably lower than others recently issued and was asked to provide insight into how the budget was developed, particularly as it relates to expectations on the scope of work. Elizabeth will respond that the budget was revised downward because one of the larger sponsoring organizations decided to withdraw from the project after the Forum's 2009 agenda had been established. Second, she was asked to confirm that the RFP is focused on measures for which "deemed savings" assumptions will be established - i.e. it excludes custom measures for which custom savings assumptions need to be developed. She will respond that it is fair to assume that the RFP requests a TRM focused on measures for which deemed savings assumptions will be established, given the limited budget available for this 2009 project and the urgent need of sponsors for common savings assumptions. Julie Michals added that custom measures from the A2 project may feed into the A5 project. Discussion turned to the scope of project A5.

Dave Jacobson asked if specific measures are defined in the A5 RFP. Elizabeth Titus replied that specific measures were not defined in the RFP; one project task is to establish a list of measures.

Niko Dietsch asked for a clarification of the A5 project scope. Elizabeth Titus replied that the goal is to determine which assumptions are candidates, select common assumptions where appropriate, collect information from available secondary sources, and make a recommendation in consultation with the subcommittee and sponsors.

Julie Michals summarized the discussion about project A5. NEEP recognizes that the project budget is low. Elizabeth Titus will work with the subcommittee to decide how best to proceed. The results of this project will be used to help states update their TRMs.

For Project B1: Elizabeth Titus reported that Phase 1 of the project is complete. The final report is being reviewed by the subcommittee and will be posted on the website in October. KEMA provided a suite of recommendations in its report, broken into near-term, mid-term and long-term recommendations.

Gene Fry, Connecticut Light and Power, asked about the purpose of loadshape/savings data and asked who the primary consumers are. Elizabeth Titus replied that there are multiple consumers of this data,

including air regulators and program administrators. She stated the data can be used for program planning, to support verification, and for air regulatory policy needs.

Discussion turned to Phase 2 of the B1 project.

Elizabeth Titus stated that the project goal is to meet Forum participants' priority needs for loadshape data as cost-effectively as possible, and that scoping this effort has many challenges. The technical advisor and NEEP polled Forum participants on priority needs. The two needs identified as priority were C/I Lighting and Unitary HVAC.

Ralph Prahm noted that C/I Lighting comes out on top and stated that this is problematic for Massachusetts because it already has a lot of C/I loadshape data. He asked if anyone who rated C/I lighting high could comment on their rating.

Elizabeth Titus replied that the existing data for Massachusetts and Connecticut would need to be adjusted to reflect the Mid-Atlantic's peak coincidence time periods. Julie Michals added that it may be difficult for PJM states to use data from Massachusetts or Connecticut in order to satisfy PJM reporting needs. Elizabeth Titus commented that she will reach out to Mid-Atlantic members of the subcommittee and ask about their needs. She confirmed that nobody is objecting outright to including C/I Lighting as one of the project objectives.

Elizabeth Titus reported that the subcommittee would like to issue two RFPs. The first RFP covering non-residential lighting will be issued by mid-October and will use the 2009 budget allocation. The second RFP covering non-residential unitary HVAC will be issued early in 2010. The second RFP will use some 2009 budget allocation and will require some 2010 funding as well.

For Project B2: Elizabeth Titus explained that the project goal is to develop estimates of C/I Lighting measure persistence and measure life based on secondary sources and on-site surveys. Three proposals were submitted, and KEMA was selected as the evaluation contractor. The subcommittee is concerned about the scope of the project. Sampling on-site is expensive, and the subcommittee is unsure if the 100 samples the budget allows are appropriate. KEMA will do this project in phases, which will address the uncertainties about sampling. We need to determine who can get us the data, how hard it will be, and what the population will look like.

Gene Fry asked if the on-site data will survey survivorship curves. Elizabeth Titus replied that the results will estimate measure life, which effectively models survivorship.

Dave Jacobson commented that you can look at measures of varying vintages to get survival curves. He stated that it is difficult to resurrect 4-6 year old data. Elizabeth Titus replied that one task in this project is for KEMA to look at secondary source data that looks at ratings and develop measure lives accordingly; this task is another way of providing measure life estimates, and is a contingency that in the event that the subcommittee and KEMA decide that sampling and survivorship modeling is not feasible or reliable.

Elizabeth Titus reported that this will be a phased project. Up to four phases are planned, with checkpoints at which the subcommittee can decide whether and how to proceed. Phase 1: Information Gathering; Phase 2: Data Request & Sample Design; Phase 3: Primary Data Collection; Phase 4: Secondary Research & Reporting. This is one project where we need to reach out to all participants in New York and New England if we want the project to work.

Ralph Prahm asked if anyone proposed a nested approach with on-site visits nested within large sample of phone surveys. Elizabeth Titus replied that this approach is partially embedded in KEMA proposal. KEMA will do high level phone surveys and then turn to on-site visits.

Dave Jacobson noted that some people will have better data than others. He asked if we will do the project if only 30% of participants have appropriate data. Elizabeth Titus replied that the 30% that have data would be representative enough if we're strategic about how we develop the sample.

Steve Waite commented that the purpose of phase 1 of project B2 is to provide subcommittee members and sponsors with information about what is feasible in terms of data collection and geographic scope in order to support a decision about whether it is worthwhile to proceed. The decision should be informed by the deliverables from phase 1.

For Project B3: Elizabeth Titus described the B3 project to develop a Net Savings white paper. She commented that the net savings panel at the Annual Public Meeting was a lively discussion that shows the need for this project. Participants are advised to look at the power point presentations from this panel once they're posted on the EM&V Forum website. The purpose of white paper is to flesh out the debate and chart a course towards regionally consistent definitions and measurements. We want to determine how to encourage regulators and policymakers to align from one state to another. The subcommittee has not yet been formed. It will include the people who participated in the panel, as well as some others who are involved in all of the subcommittees. Anyone who is interested is invited to be on the subcommittee. Participants should email Elizabeth Titus if they are interested in being on the subcommittee. Gene Fry and David Pirtle asked to be added to the subcommittee. Elizabeth Titus noted that another Project B3 white paper related to codes is still on the drawing board.

Action Items:

2. Project Committee members should contact Elizabeth Titus if they are interested in participating in the B3 Subcommittee.
3. Gene Fry & David Pirtle will be added to the B3 Subcommittee.

2. Forum 2010 Project Agenda

Julie Michals noted that this is an important part of the meeting agenda. NEEP needs feedback from participants to come up with a 2010 project agenda that can be presented to the Steering Committee at its quarterly meeting on October 27. We will determine after today if we need another call or if we can address and finalize the proposed 2010 project agenda and budget through email communications.

Julie Michals thanked everyone who participated in the online 2010 project agenda survey. The winner of the prize drawing is Laura Magee from PEPCO. She will get a kilowatt meter to measure energy consumption of electric appliances in her workplace and home!

Potential 2010 projects were ranked based on a compilation of survey scores. Julie Michals and Elizabeth Titus have discussed the results with the Project Committee co-chairs. Gas research didn't rank highly, but is still included in discussion given low representation of gas companies in Forum, yet an important priority for policymakers based on 3-year Forum Plan. 2010 projects must meet the following criteria: 1) the project makes sense to do regionally; 2) if adopted by states, the results of project will improve the credibility of EE savings, reduce barriers to participation of EE resources in wholesale capacity markets, improve state and regional demand-side resource and energy planning, implementation and evaluation by having readily available and consistent inputs, protocols and reporting format and tools; and 3) project results can inform/guide national EM&V efforts, and bring a single regional voice to national dialog. There was a clear message at the Annual Public Meeting that the Regional EM&V Forum can play an important role.

Julie Michals summarized her discussion with the Project Committee co-chairs. The co-chairs have advised developing a 10% contingency fund for the entire Forum. The 2009 budget lacked flexibility since it worked 10% into each individual project. In 2010, the Forum would like to create a separate 10% fund that is available to support different projects on an as needed basis. The 2010 budget will be restricted to a 5% increase over 2009 budget because that's how the multi-year contracts with NYSERDA and MEA have been structured. NEEP needs feedback from participants as to whether funding sources will be the same in 2010. Pennsylvania may join the Forum in 2010.

Julie Michals noted that there are 2009 funds for certain projects (A2 and A3) that will carry over into 2010. The proposed 2010 budget assumes these extra funds from 2009 (about \$180k) will be carried over to the next phase of relevant projects in 2010. Alternatively, the funds could move to other

projects if desired. Participants were reminded that there might be some fluidity in the budget numbers for 2010. Julie Michals described the budget spreadsheet listing project descriptions and rankings.

Gene Fry corrected a math error in the spreadsheet. Julie Michals explained that she added a 10% overall contingency at the last minute (instead of by project), which resulted in calculation error. She stated that we need to make sure that the budgets reflect what is realistic and determine if we can tap into a contingency fund if a project goes over budget. Many of the estimated budgets reflect a range.

Dave Jacobson asked how the leftover funds from 2009 will be used in 2010, using project B2 as an example where there will be leftover funds. An unidentified phone participant asked if the budget could be reworked to break out the 2009 funding from the 2010 funding. Julie Michals confirmed that she would break out the funding in this manner. Colleen Orsburn suggested that NEEP redo the budget and send out a new draft to Project Committee members. Julie Michals agreed and asked participants to focus on the projects rather than the numbers. She asked if there are any projects in the proposed budget that people don't think should be a 2010 project. She also asked if there are any projects on the original list that should be considered for 2010.

Larry Pakenas, NYSERDA noted that many of the proposed 2010 projects are carryover projects from 2009. His colleagues will ask for results from 2009 to show that the projects are worth continuing to fund in 2010. He asked how he can satisfy his colleagues' interest in knowing what the results are thus far. Elizabeth Titus stated that the monthly project updates will at least in part answer that question for them. Julie Michals added that NEEP will tell Commissioners at the upcoming Steering Committee meeting that we didn't release RFPs until July and that we're moving as fast as we can to complete projects. We will brief the Steering Committee on draft deliverables and should have a final report from one or two projects. That's the best we can do.

Potential Project PD1: Establish Guidelines and Common Approaches to Address Net Savings.

Dave Jacobson stated he was uncomfortable with spending money on this project before we have the initial scoping project done. He asked if the project would be large in scope or simply survey what other people are doing, and stated that a \$225,000 budget is less than what is needed for a large project and more than what is needed to survey what others are doing.

Elizabeth Titus replied that NEEP is grappling with the issue of project scope. Flexible funding would help us to develop an appropriate scope. She stated that this could be a 2010 or 2011 project, but we would like to get started in 2010.

Ralph Prah noted that it is hard to move forward without a budget in place. He stated that it is important to have contingency.

Niko Dietsch asked if we have a sense of what participants are interested in pursuing, whether it is a white paper or data collecting and gathering. It is important to determine the key interests of participants. Elizabeth Titus replied that the best we can do based on previous conversations is what is shown in phase 1 and phase 2 of this project. Both are likely steps that are needed. Julie Michals added that at this stage, we will keep the project on the 2010 agenda at a \$225,000 budget.

Potential Project PD2: Common approaches/methods for assessing savings and comparison of assumptions for second tier priority measures (Phase 2 of Project A2) focusing on emerging technologies.

This project was identified as the second highest priority. It is considered to be the second phase of 2009 Project A2. Currently, the budget reflects this could be partly funded by the \$100,000 carryover from 2009 (from Proj A2). Project Committee co-chairs advised that it might be more involved and expensive if we have to create any new information.

Dave Jacobson, Ralph PrahI, and Colleen Oswald all commented that this is a valuable project.

Potential Project RE1: Develop Incremental Cost Assumptions for Priority Sectors/Measures.

This project will draw a lot of attention and interest. The Project Committee co-chairs have advised that it might include primary research.

Ralph PrahI stated that the budget should not be decreased. He stated that getting incremental costs often is more expensive than what people expect. It can also vary regionally. He stated that it's a great project to do regionally because of the economies of scale. He added that it's worth doing it right. Dave Jacobson agreed with Ralph PrahI. He stated that the budget is not enough for two commercial programs with multiple measures. National Grid tries to do this type of project but is always running into roadblocks. It can be very hard. It is a great joint project, but not enough money is budgeted.

Elizabeth Titus noted that this project will address four geographical sub-regions. The co-chairs grappled with this and didn't know how to budget how to do everything realistically. We might divide this project up and do some parts. Dave Jacobson added that this is one thing that implementation people would care deeply about since it sets their incentives. It is very important work, but expensive and difficult. Elizabeth Titus replied that this project may require multiple RFPs to deal with multiple sectors. She asked if we should increase the budget. Dave Jacobson suggested either increasing the budget or decreasing the scope.

Ralph PrahI added that we should expect to be moving money around a lot for this project. He reiterated that it's hard to get budget numbers for most of these projects. Gene Fry agreed that the budget numbers should be increased, but it's hard to tell exactly what it will cost. Niko Dietsch suggested that the next step should be to lay out the options and make sure people know what's on the table in terms of scope.

Potential Project RE2: Conduct research to develop and/or update savings loadshape data for selected measures within the region (continuation of Project B1).

Julie Michals stated that the \$196,000 in the budget reflects the new money we'd need for this project, per explanation in the budget spreadsheet comment.

Potential Project PD3: Develop Guidelines for Incorporation Energy Efficiency into ISO System Planning.

Julie Michals explained the project goal. Right now it is not clear how energy efficiency is reflected in system planning. This project would get to that issue. FERC has indicated its interest in this activity as well. The project does not have a big budget since it looks at secondary data, and it will build from preliminary background data gathered in project A3.

Ralph PrahI and Dave Jacobson expressed support for the project.

Dave Pirtle added that the budget looks within the range that he would expect.

Potential Project PD4: M&V Standards in Wholesale Capacity Markets.

Julie Michals noted that this was Project A4 in 2009, and activities continue in projects A4.1 and A4.2. The important development in this project for 2010 is the NAESB component. The project goal is to inform ISO/RTO M&V discussions/developments including possible amendments to existing M&V manuals, and participate in the NAESB EE M&V Project. The NAESB Kickoff meeting will take place on September 30.

Dave Jacobson asked if this project will fund time for Forum staff to fully participate in NAESB process rather than producing any specific work product. Julie Michals replied that NAESB participation will likely include retaining a contractor to prepare technical briefs/comments to inform NAESB's

development of standards and model best practices. Julie Michals asked for feedback as to how the Forum should participate in NAESB. She added that Eric Winkler stated at the Annual Public Meeting that it is important for NAESB voting members to be involved in this process. Right now many Southern companies are involved, and NAESB is missing representation from further northeast. She stressed the importance that the northeast be adequately represented.

Colleen Orsburn stated that she is on the CEE evaluation committee, and CEE is currently discussing their role in NAESB activities. She asked for clarify role between the Forum and CEE's role in NAESB process.

David Jacobson stated that he's looking for the Forum to participate in NAESB and tell Forum participants what's important.

Julie Michals stated there is a distinction between what CEE's doing with NAESB and what the Forum is doing. She seems the Forum facilitating direct, technical involvement and comment into the development of the NAESB manual like the Forum did with ISO-NE and PJM. She stated that this type of process may make sense with NAESB. She will check on this with CEE.

Discussion turned to how individual Forum participants view NAESB effort. Most stated that they are waiting to see how things proceed before deciding whether to participate.

Julie Michals stated that the NAESB effort is two-prong: 1) wholesale M&V standards that go to FERC, and 2) retail EE M&V model best practices. NAESB standards are voluntary and can be used by whatever state or program wishes to adopt them. The Forum should weigh in, as Project A2 can directly inform the NAESB effort. The \$50,000 budget will allow the Forum to get technical expertise and get involved.

Action Item:

4. NEEP will determine how CEE is involved in NAESB and will provide the Project Committee with feedback as to what the Forum's role in NAESB should be as compared to CEE's.

Potential Project PD6: Develop best practices/approaches for determining impact of energy efficiency on advancing codes and standards (based on findings from 2009 Project B3).

Elizabeth Titus noted that this project is similar to PD1. Flexibility on budget would be helpful since we don't know right now what the scope will be.

Niko Dietsch asked what is meant by "determining the impact of efficiency." Elizabeth Titus replied that participants want to know if program administrators could claim benefits from activities they do that encourage adoption of code. This could be revised if there are other needs.

Kim Oswald added that people in Connecticut want this. Colleen Orsburn commented that Elizabeth captured the need for this project perfectly.

Julie Michals asked if the low-end of the budget range would be okay for this project. Elizabeth Titus replied that it would be.

Potential Project PD7: Scope Online Region-wide Database based on Findings from Project A3.

Julie Michals explained that this on-line reporting database would allow for uploading/downloading of energy efficiency savings, costs and emission impacts across the region for the purpose of analyzing the impact of efficiency efforts to meet range of state and regional energy and environmental policy goals. She added that the budget reflects carryover funds from the 2009 A3 project.

Larry Pakenas asked whether there would be interest in this project if all program administrators and states had their own database. He questioned the need to consolidate this information into one

database. He reported that New York is moving to this end, therefore this project may or may not help resolve a need in New York.

Julie Michals reported that Project A3 is addressing this issue. The A3 results will list what should be reported and how each item is defined for every state. The current issue is that individual states report and define things differently. Therefore individual state databases might be very different at this time. This region-wide database would not replace a New York database; it would be supplemental and complementary.

Larry Pakenas commented that we will have consistent state databases if Project A3 is successful.

Dave Jacobson asked if we can give people time to digest A3 before moving forward. He suggested we should put this off to 2011 and added that the regional online database seems too aggressive and fast.

Gene Fry and Niko Dietsch agreed with Dave Jacobson.

Julie Michals stated that we will remove the online database from the 2010 project agenda and move it to 2011.

Potential Project RE4: Residential and/or C&I gas program research or evaluation to meet shared program information needs

Dave Jacobson stated that we absolutely need to start gas evaluation. He added that the gas evaluation being done right now is miniscule compared to electric evaluation. There is a resistance to doing gas evaluation.

Larry Pakenas stated that the resources made available for gas efficiency in New York are much less than for electric.

Kim Oswald reported that the budgets for gas and electric are not the same.

Julie Michals reported that the Forum has tried to reach out to gas utilities. Information is needed, but if the infrastructure is not in place and funding is not there, it becomes difficult.

Dave Jacobson added that the larger and combined gas and electric are interested in this type of project, but not the smaller ones.

Elizabeth Titus replied that a very limited scope is assumed for this project.

Potential Project PDQ10: Develop a white paper to scope issues pertaining to capturing environmental costs in cost-effectiveness and avoided cost calculations. Scope adequacy of capturing costs to meet environmental regulations and goals (e.g., carbon emission reduction), and identify and develop possible recommendations on environmental cost assumptions to include in cost-effectiveness analysis.

Dave Jacobson stated that Massachusetts still has battle scars from discussing environmental externalities, and he thinks this project is out of the scope of the EMV Forum.

Gene Fry stated that this would be an interesting project, but we should defer it to the future.

Niko Dietsch stated that it would be interesting, but it seems a bit of a stretch for the Forum.

Julie Michals asked if it makes sense to look at this project regionally. She also wondered if enough time has passed that Massachusetts may now be interested in the project. Dave Jacobson said that National Grid will not be revisiting environmental externalities in the near future.

An unknown phone participant noted that in New York, RGGI is on hold because of a lawsuit. They could not evaluate environmental externalities because of this.

Larry Pakenas stated that it would be a good idea to scope this out. It might be difficult, but going through the exercise of developing a list of solutions for the region is good idea. NYSERDA is ultimately hiring a contractor to help evaluate project impacts. They are starting to figure out an approach. He believes it is a worthwhile project from a scoping perspective.

Since the scheduled meeting time was drawing short, Julie Michals summarized the discussion of the 2010 project agenda. She suggested that NEEP can report to the Steering Committee those projects that were considered and were not selected for 2010. This will allow the Steering Committee to determine if they want to pursue certain projects. Several participants agreed that this would be very helpful.

Action Items:

5. NEEP will revise the Forum 2010 Projects Estimated Budgets spreadsheet and send it to Project Committee members the week of September 21. The revisions will include breaking out any remaining 2009 project funding from new 2010 project funding, incorporating Project Committee recommendations, and moving several projects to 2011.
6. At the Steering Committee meeting on October 27, NEEP will report on the projects that the Project Committee considered for 2010 but decided not to pursue. This will allow Steering Committee members/policymakers to comment on the value of pursuing these projects.

3. Forum Operational Updates

Julie Michals noted that the meeting materials include a table that shows energy efficiency reporting practices by state based on data gathered in the 2010 Forum project survey. The Steering Committee asked the Forum to take a look at reporting practices, and to recommend best practices. The table shows that states report in very different ways. Two recommendations related to reporting practices will be presented to the Steering Committee in October, 1) short term: program administrators to make full reports and supporting data available to the Forum, with necessary protection of any confidential information, and 2) long term: states to adopt best practice for submitting energy efficiency studies and supporting data, as recommended by the Forum participants to the Steering Committee.

Julie Michals stated that NEEP will follow up with Project Committee members by email in order to cover the remaining items on the meeting agenda, including the nominating process for co-chairs. Julie Michals closed the meeting at 12:08pm.

Action Items:

7. NEEP will put forth the discussed recommendations regarding state reporting practices to the Steering Committee at the October 27 meeting.
8. NEEP will schedule a demonstration of the new EM&V Forum public and private website after the new site is launched on October 2.
9. NEEP will follow up with the Project Committee via email on the agenda items not covered, including the nominating process for co-chairs.

4. Next Steps

The next quarterly Project Committees meeting is a teleconference/webcast scheduled for December 10, 2009 from 1-3pm.

5. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 12:08 pm.