



**REGIONAL EVALUATION,
MEASUREMENT & VERIFICATION FORUM**

**July 14, 2011 Quarterly Steering Committee Meeting
Teleconference Notes and Action Items**

Participants:

Name	Organization	Name	Organization
Anna Ficeto	Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control	Julie Michals	NEEP
Cindy Jacobs	Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control	Elizabeth Titus	NEEP
Tami Rasmussen	Evergreen Economics	Arthur Marin	NESCAUM
Phil Willems	Evergreen Economics (PWP, Inc.)	Clifton Below	New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission
Dennis Hartline	Maryland Energy Administration	Bill Saxonis	New York Department of Public Service
Malcolm Woolf	Maryland Energy Administration	Mary Cahill	New York Power Authority
Nancy Seidman	Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection	Lisa Shea	NSTAR
Barry Perlmutter	Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities	Tom Belair	Public Service of New Hampshire
Marilyn Ross	Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities	Rich Sedano	Regulatory Assistance Project
Jollette Westbrook	Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities	Carla Frisch	US Department of Energy
Dave Jacobson	National Grid	Mike Li	US Department of Energy
Sue Coakley	NEEP	Niko Dietsch	US Environmental Protection Agency
Emily Li	NEEP	Pam Stonier	Vermont Public Service Board
Cecily McChalicher	NEEP		

Meeting Action Items:

1. The *Glossary of Terms and Acronyms, Version 2.1* was adopted as a Forum product.
2. The *Mid-Atlantic TRM Version 2* was accepted as a Forum product.
3. Steering Committee members are invited to [register](#) for the Net Savings webinar on July 28 from 11am-1pm.
4. The Evergreen team to provide a draft Forum Evaluation report to NEEP for review on July 18.
5. NEEP to send a follow-up communication to the Steering Committee with draft Evergreen Forum Evaluation Report and NEEP proposed 2012-2014 framework for comments by July 26. (Steering Committee members who would like to provide feedback via phone rather than email to contact Julie Michals (jmichals@neep.org) as soon as possible and set up a call.)
6. If significant changes to the 2012-2014 framework are proposed, NEEP to set up a brief call with the full Steering Committee.
7. Steering Committee members who are interested in serving as an Annual Public Meeting co-chair to contact Cecily McChalicher (cmcchalicher@neep.org).

Meeting Overview:

A. Introductions

Julie Michals (NEEP) opened the meeting and introduced the meeting attendees. She reviewed the agenda: 1) Introductions, 2) Forum Updates, 3) National EM&V Project Updates, and 4) Forum Evaluation - Findings, Recommendations and Next Steps. Most of the meeting will focus on the Forum Evaluation and the proposed 2012-2014 Forum framework. NEEP will be seeking feedback and guidance on the Forum framework.

Julie Michals provided updates on Forum membership. She introduced Commissioner Clifton Below (New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission) as the new Steering Committee co-chair, serving with Rich Sedano (Regulatory Assistance Project). Clifton Below will serve in the co-chair capacity until later this fall. She added that Commissioner Rick Morgan (DC Public Service Commission) is now an observer to the Steering Committee and not a member since the DC Public Service Commission is no longer overseeing energy efficiency now that the DC Sustainable Energy Utility is underway.

Julie Michals explained that the terms for several of the Project Committees co-chairs end this month and NEEP will seek to replace them. The departing co-chairs are Dave Jacobson (National Grid), Pam Stonier (Vermont Public Service Board), and Helen Eisenfeld and Mary Cahill (New York Power Authority).

B. Forum Updates

Julie Michals shared that the Glossary Version 2 was accepted as a Forum product at the March Steering Committee meeting. At that time, NEEP noted that the Glossary would be updated with a few additional environmental terms this summer. These terms have been added, and NEEP is now seeking approval of the updated version, version 2.1.

Julie Michals reviewed the standard language used for adopting a Forum product. She asked if Steering Committee members agree to adopt the Glossary of Terms and Acronyms, Version 2.1. Dennis Hartline (Maryland Energy Administration) moved to adopt the Forum Glossary Version 2.1. Clifton Below seconded the motion. No questions were raised. In a voice vote, there was unanimous agreement to adopt the Glossary, Version 2.1. Julie Michals thanked Nancy Seidman (Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection) in particular for her help to develop the environmental terms.

Julie Michals explained that the Mid-Atlantic Technical Reference Manual (TRM) Version 2 is now complete. This version of the TRM adds about 20 measures to the Version 1 TRM that was developed last year. Since this is a sub-regional project, the Steering Committee does not need to officially adopt it, but they do need to accept it as Forum product.

Jollette Westbrook (Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities) asked how 'accept' is different from 'adopt'. Clifton Below clarified that 'adopting' a product involves making a recommendation for all states to use the product, while 'accepting' a product authorizes posting the product to the website for those who want to use it. Dennis Hartline moved to accept the Mid-Atlantic TRM Version 2. Malcolm Woolf (Maryland Energy Administration) seconded the motion. In a voice vote, there was unanimous agreement to accept the Mid-Atlantic TRM Version 2 as a Forum product.

Elizabeth Titus (NEEP) shared that two research and evaluation products have been completed since the last Steering Committee meeting. These are the most technical reports the Forum has released to date. She provided a high level overview of the projects:

-
- ***Commercial Unitary HVAC Load Shape Study:*** This project created hourly load shapes that identify consumption for Unitary HVAC equipment throughout the region. The load shapes were developed through metering that took place last summer and analysis of that data. The results are provided for small and large units in six different weather regions. The final products include a [report](#) and [spreadsheet tool](#) to calculate peak coincidence factors. The raw data is also available from NEEP by request.
 - ***Commercial Lighting Measure Persistence Study:*** This project included Forum participants from New England and New York. The [study](#) estimates measure lifetimes for several types of commercial lighting. One major finding was that the measures do not wear out, but they are removed due to changes to the building.

Elizabeth Titus shared that the Forum will complete two other research and evaluation products by the end of July: the *Commercial Lighting Load Shape Study* and the *Incremental Cost Study*.

Elizabeth Titus invited Steering Committee members to the Forum's Net Savings webinar on July 28 from 11am-1pm. This webinar will include a presentation by Mimi Goldberg (KEMA) and Pam Rathbun (TetraTech) of a recently completed C&I free-ridership and spillover methodology study in Massachusetts. A second webinar to be scheduled in late summer/early fall will address residential free-ridership and spillover/net savings methodology. The webinars are the first of three tasks in the net savings project. The other two tasks are 1) developing definitions for net savings and adjusted gross savings and 2) net savings policy research. The three tasks in this project will inform what the Forum does in 2012 related to net savings.

Julie Michals provided an update on the Regional Energy Efficiency Database (REED) project. This project is a follow-up to the [Common Statewide Energy Efficiency Reporting Guidelines](#) that were adopted last December. The final product will be a collection tool for states to provide efficiency data per the Reporting Guidelines' template and a database with statewide energy efficiency data. The data is reported at the sector level, with an option to enter program data.

Julie Michals explained that NEEP issued the RFP for the REED project in June and received ten proposals. The project subcommittee is currently reviewing the four proposals that fell within the \$85,000 budget. The subcommittee will select the winning bidder next week and kick-off the project. The goal is to have REED ready in 2012 for states to report 2011 energy efficiency results. Sue Coakley (NEEP) added that states agreed in the December 2010 Steering Committee meeting that they would do their best to report 2011 results using the Guidelines.

Julie Michals added that NEEP will provide guidance to the states to populate the data collection tool and hopes to identify a statewide representative who can coordinate state data collection. For many states, the statewide representative may be the state energy office.

Action Items:

1. The *Glossary of Terms and Acronyms, Version 2.1* was adopted as a Forum product.
2. The Mid-Atlantic TRM Version 2 was accepted as a Forum product.
3. Steering Committee members are invited to [register](#) for the Net Savings webinar on July 28 from 11am-1pm.

C. National EM&V Projects - Updates

Julie Michals provided an update about the NAESB M&V project. In March, the NAESB wholesale EE M&V standards that were adopted. The implication of the wholesale standards is that they may become a future FERC protocol. NEEP is keeping tabs on this possibility. At the last Steering Committee meeting in March, Pam Stonier commented on the lack of representation of energy

efficiency stakeholders from the northeast in NAESB and suggested that Steering Committee members get involved IN NAESB. Julie Michals reiterated this suggestion.

Julie Michals reported that the retail EE M&V model best practices (MBPs) are under development, and she has played an active role in the process. The working group finished a draft version earlier this week, and a call is scheduled to review that document. The MBPs are high level and general and are intended to complement the SEE Action effort. NEEP has encouraged NAESB to speak directly with DOE so they can coordinate NAESB and SEE Action efforts. Julie Michals added that the draft retail NAESB MBPs will be circulated to Forum participants.

Pam Stonier reported that NAESB President Rae McQuade will make an effort at the NARUC meetings next week to discuss the importance of coordination for all of these projects.

Julie Michals provided an overview of the SEE Action EM&V effort, which has a goal to transform EM&V to yield more accurate, credible and timely results that accelerate successful energy efficiency deployment and management.

Carla Frisch (US DOE) shared that the SEE Action project is focused on moving to better inter-jurisdictional comparability, exploring new methods to address emerging issues and technologies, and building capacity and increasing the adoption of best practices. She added that US DOE is working on a uniform methods project, which will identify a standard method to calculate savings for each efficiency measure. This will involve stakeholder outreach and will build off what NEEP has already done.

Julie Michals added that SEE Action goals are parallel with Forum goals.

Malcolm Woolf, who is a SEE Action co-chair, asked for additional suggestions about how to move forward with the SEE Action effort. He added that Julie Michals has helped to make sure SEE Action is moving in the right direction and coordinating appropriately with other efforts like NAESB. There was some discussion on the timing of completing these efforts, and there was general agreement that the timing is uncertain, and it could take some time to complete these projects.

D. Forum Evaluation - Findings, Recommendations and Next Steps

Julie Michals welcomed Tami Rasmussen and Phil Willems from the Evergreen Economics team to review the results of the Forum evaluation. She thanked the Evergreen team and the Project Committee co-chairs, who served as the project subcommittee, for their good work on this project.

Phil Willems gave a presentation on the Forum evaluation results, which included the key highlights and themes of the forthcoming report.

In the Evaluation, the Evergreen team assessed the Forum's progress towards its goals through a start /stop/continue analysis, evaluated the Forum's effectiveness based on the value provided to stakeholders, examined the Forum's structure and processes, and looked at emerging trends and issues to determine to what extent they should be addressed in future Forum work.

Phil Willems explained that data was collected through 18 in-depth interviews and 72 surveys of Forum participants. The Evergreen team obtained good representation across states and stakeholder types.

Phil Willems shared the key themes from the evaluation:

- The Forum should continue, with some modifications.
- The Forum has produced high quality work products, but implementation has been spotty. This is due in part to lack of understanding of Forum products and how they may be used and the fact that products are new.

- The large Forum agenda makes participation challenging. This is reflected in the large number of people who responded 'don't know' when asked about various Forum activities, and the large percentage (about 50%) that described themselves as not very involved in the Forum.
- There is a preference for research projects over protocol development projects. Through its projects, the Forum has increased the credibility of energy efficiency somewhat, but the perceived high value of the Forum is not always related to direct usage of Forum products.

Phil Willems shared that most respondents indicated that the Forum has been very or somewhat effective in each project area (protocol development, research and evaluation, education and information access), although there were many 'don't know' responses in each area. He shared findings related to each project area:

- Protocol Development findings:
 - The Glossary of Terms and Acronyms is the most reviewed product and is widely used.
 - There are mixed opinions about the Methods Guidelines. They are thought to be more important for policymakers, and there is no NEEP authority to mandate use.
 - Net Savings is seen as an important topic and the Forum's net savings scoping paper well received. States are likely to retain control of this area.
 - There is significant interest in continued Forum work on Building Codes.
 - The Mid-Atlantic TRM is widely used and highly valued.
 - The Common Reporting Guidelines are important for credibility, but there will be issues with implementation.
 - The Forum's work in tracking National Protocol development efforts is important, but there is no agreement on the need for national protocols.
- Research and Evaluation findings: These projects are highly valued and are seen as a good way to leverage funds. It is difficult for members to participate in projects given the large Forum agenda.
- Education and Information Access findings: This area is crucial to the Forum's success. NEEP staff does a good job of running meetings, developing graphics, and communicating with Forum participants. Even so, Forum products are not all well known. The website and the Annual Public Meeting were seen to be useful. Over 50% of respondents use the website monthly, and 80% of respondents say they always or mostly find what they need.

Phil Willems provided an overview of feedback about Forum Operations. The perceptions regarding geographic balance are that NEEP focuses more on the northeast, but respondents appreciate the Forum's inclusion of the Mid-Atlantic states. Some respondents from New England stated that more basic education is required for states that are new to energy efficiency, which leads to more work for experienced participants and fewer benefits. The Forum's cost allocation is mostly accepted, but there is concern about state budget constraints and states dropping out of the Forum or not being able to join the Forum due to limited budgets.

With regard to the stakeholder mix, Phil Willems shared that the Forum is perceived to be focused on regulator participation, and some recommended more program administrator involvement. Respondents also recommended that the Forum structure be streamlined as there is too much going on and some perceived committee overload. The Forum's plate may be too full with too many committees and projects relative to budget and staffing.

Phil Willems shared Strategic Planning findings. Respondents indicated that the Forum has a full agenda and should build on existing or completed projects. The highest value was seen in the following issues: 1) development of a regional database with energy efficiency data, 2) integration of energy efficiency into system planning, and 3) cost effectiveness analysis.

Phil Willems provided recommendations for the Forum for 2012 and beyond:

- Protocol Development: A large number (40%) of respondents suggested modifying this area. The recommendation is to change the emphasis to helping states implement protocols rather than developing protocols.
- Research and Evaluation: Almost all interviewees said to continue this area. The recommendation is to focus funding here, and to continue to improve cost tracking for large research projects.
- Education and Information Access: Almost all interviewees said to continue in this area. Some modifications were recommended, including allowing read-only access to materials on the private site that have been restricted to subcommittee members and modify communications to provide fewer, more targeted communications.
- Operations: Add more staff if the scope expanded, limit the size of subcommittees, continue with the allocation formula, and reach out to non-participating states through Forum champions.
- Strategic Planning: Build on existing work. Future areas of focus may include: developing a regional energy efficiency database, examine integrating energy efficiency into regional system planning, and studying new methods and approaches for energy efficiency cost-effectiveness.

Phil Willems shared that the next steps are for the Evergreen team to provide a draft report to NEEP for review on July 18. Comments on the draft report will be due to Evergreen on August 2, and a final report will be produced later in August.

Pam Stonier thanked the Evergreen team and stated that their work was excellent. She added that the comments about lack of implementation of Forum products are reasonable because the products are so new.

Marilyn Ross (Massachusetts DPU) asked the Evergreen team to remove the 'don't know' column from the findings to get a better sense of the distribution of those who did provide a response. Phil Willems replied that the Evergreen team will do that in the report, but for the presentation they thought it was important to highlight that some did not feel they could respond to certain questions. Julie Michals added that it is important to point out that not all respondents are involved in every core function, so they may not have experience with one area of the Forum even though they are very experienced with another area of the Forum. Furthermore, inactive members were included in the survey.

Cindy Jacobs (Connecticut DPUC) asked for a definition of an 'active' participant. Julie Michals replied that 'active' means regular participation in quarterly meetings and/or participation in one or more subcommittee. Phil Willems added that the Evergreen team asked people about their level of involvement in the interviews and surveys, so they were able to self-designate their involvement.

Pam Stonier commented that NECPUC and MACRUC passed resolutions in support of the Forum when the Forum first got underway. She would like to do additional outreach to NECPUC and MACRUC. At this summer's NECPUC meeting, she, Sue Coakley and Clifton Below gave an educational presentation of the Forum's accomplishments. She suggested that the timing may be right to give a similar educational presentation in each state. This could inspire greater involvement in Forum committees.

Cindy Jacobs suggested that the Forum give presentations of results as products are finalized. She feels like it's difficult to keep up with all final Forum products.

Julie Michals gave a short presentation on the proposed future direction of the Forum from 2012-2014, as NEEP looks to start planning for the 2012 agenda.

Julie Michals shared that the proposed overall focus in 2012-2014 is:

-
- Effective use and implementation of Forum products
 - Align national protocols with Forum products
 - Conduct joint research and evaluation
 - Support ISO/RTO adoption and use of Forum products
 - Expand application and use of Forum products to broader range
 - Implement and potentially evolve the Forum's Regional Energy Efficiency Database

Julie Michals then shared more details about the proposed focus of specific project areas in 2012-2014:

Protocol Development:

- Shift from development to implementation/use
- Build coordination with and across key stakeholders
- Monitor/align with national protocols
- Target emerging technologies or other new areas

Research and Evaluation: Increase the Forum's focus on conducting joint studies. The specific 2012 projects will be prioritized by Forum participants in a formal survey in July/August that will identify priorities.

Education and Information Access:

- Streamline communications
- Increase targeted outreach to states and other stakeholders
- Support regional energy efficiency data sharing through the regional energy efficiency database

Base Operations:

- NEEP to continue its role to manage and operate the Forum
- Increase the efficiency of the project committee structure and communications
- Better match staff resources with the approved agenda
- Work to increase the timeliness of funding confirmations

Forum Funding and Revenue:

- Set the Forum's annual budget between \$2.0 - \$2.5 million
- Maintain the current state allocation framework
- Leverage participation from other states
- Continue to leverage funding from multiple sources
- Develop a contingency plan

Clifton Below stated that it is important to institutionalize Forum funding into budgets as much as possible. He added that the general proposed direction for 2012-2014 seems correct.

Julie Michals asked Steering Committee members if this the right direction for the next three year plan.

Jollette Westbrook stated that the presentation has been important and helpful. She would like some time to think about the proposed 2012-2014 direction in consultation with DPU staff. She added that it is in everyone's collective interest to make sure the framework we go forward with is the best.

Julie Michals agreed and provided next steps. She will send a follow-up communication to the Steering Committee and ask for feedback by July 26. If Steering Committee members would like to provide feedback via phone rather than email, they should contact NEEP as soon as possible and set up a call.



If significant changes to the framework are proposed, NEEP may set up a brief call with the full Steering Committee.

Julie Michals reviewed upcoming meetings:

- Quarterly Project Committees meeting: July 28 2-4pm, November 17 2-4pm
- Quarterly Steering Committee meeting: September 22 2-4pm, December 8 2-4pm.
- The Forum's 2011 Annual Public Meeting: October 12. NEEP will be recruiting co-chairs for the Annual Public Meeting. Any Steering Committee members who are interested in serving as an Annual Public Meeting co-chair should contact Cecily McChalicher (cmcchalicher@neep.org).
- IEPEC Conference: August 16-18.
- ACEEE Energy Efficiency as a Resource Conference: September 25-27.

Action Items:

4. The Evergreen team to provide a draft Forum Evaluation report to NEEP for review on July 18.
5. NEEP to send a follow-up communication to the Steering Committee with draft Evergreen Forum Evaluation Report and NEEP proposed 2012-2014 framework for comments by July 26. (Steering Committee members who would like to provide feedback via phone rather than email to contact Julie Michals (jmichals@neep.org) as soon as possible and set up a call.)
6. If significant changes to the 2012-2014 framework are proposed, NEEP to set up a brief call with the full Steering Committee.
7. Steering Committee members who are interested in serving as an Annual Public Meeting co-chair to contact Cecily McChalicher (cmcchalicher@neep.org).