



## Energy Efficiency Post-2011 Phase 2

### Workgroup 5 Meeting 5

Thursday, September 16, 2010

9:00am to 12:00pm

Conference Call Only

#### Overview

- The workgroup reflected briefly on the Joint Workgroup Midpoint meeting.
- Andrew Miller joined the call to request input on how to make the Utility Sounding Board (USB) more effective. He noted that they're looking at making changes to the USB in the near future and he's interested in hearing the perspective of those that are looking at regional program and infrastructure issues in this workgroup.
- The working draft of the Workgroup 5 Summary Document was reviewed. With some minor corrections, the group felt that was a statement that reflected our thinking thus far into the process.
- Josh Warner advised us that our recommendations can take two forms: 1) those things that can be presented as overarching concepts (without a lot of detail), and 2) those things that will go into the Implementation Manual (requiring more detail). No recommendation is an option on some issues also.
- The workgroup selected six items to create straw proposals on. The details on that are noted in the "Decision/Action Items" section below. The group also agreed to have those straw proposals to review and discuss at upcoming workgroup meetings.
- Plans were made to invite someone from BPA to share lessons learned from running regional third-party programs at the next workgroup meeting.

#### Decision/Action Items

- The Workgroup decided to create straw proposals on the following topics raised in the Summary Document:
  - Regional Programs (Item 1) – Wade Carey, Central Lincoln PUD
  - Negative Change Notice (Item 4) – Eugene Rosalie, PNGC Power
  - Sub-Regional Utility Roundtables (Item 5.c.) – Jim Wellcome, Cowlitz PUD
  - Federal Facilities (Item 9) – Curt Nichols, BPA
- Curt Nichols volunteered to contact Mary Smith (Snohomish PUD) to see if she would take on the task of creating a straw proposal for Items 7 (Additional EEI Funds for NEEA) and 8 (Additional EEI Funds for Low Income Programs).
- It was agreed that review of the straw proposals for Items 1, 4, and 9 would be on the agenda for the next meeting. The straw proposal for Item 5.c. could wait until the following meeting and the ones for Items 7 and 8 would depend on Mary's response.
- Curt also volunteered to ask Ray Hartwell and Gary Smith to provide someone for the next workgroup meeting to share lessons learned from running the Energy Smart Grocer program.

## **Meeting Notes**<sup>1</sup>

### *Facilitators:*

Curt Nichols

Wade Carey

### *BPA Participants:*

Matt Tidwell

Andrew Miller

Josh Warner

1. CN: (overview of previous meeting). NEEA contributions. Cost-effectiveness. Custom programs. Federal facilities subgroup formed (meeting on Friday, Sept. 16). Clarification on low-income. A few utilities mentioned wanting the same flexibility as BPA to spend on low-income, but BPA's line item for low-income is NOT for acquisition, but as a "public goods" expenditure.
2. CN: (overview of Phase 2 Midpoint Meeting). Meeting was helpful to me to get up to speed on the progress of the other groups.
3. AM: (update on USB). During the Midpoint Meeting, I was interested to hear about methods of communication to build regional awareness and there was a passing reference made to the USB. I've recently assumed the reasonability for working with and facilitating the USB. And part of this has been to get feedback from participants and stakeholders and have heard a few things: siloed discussions; inconsistency of communication, etc. So I talked internally about how we could modify the USB to make it a real asset to the region. Want to be a benefit not just to those that sit on the USB, but all customers and stakeholders. I spoke to Curt and Wade about what this group has discussed regarding communication. There needs to be clear, consistent communication and when feedback is given, something needs to be done with it and the person giving feedback needs to get a response. I would like to hear from this group on what has been discussed and will take this back to the USB.
4. CN: this goes back to our previous conversation about customers wanting to be able to provide early input on infrastructure and programs.
5. Person A: how often does the USB meet?
6. AM: it shakes out to be every month. In October, it's an in-person meeting and then November is a two hour call. Generally the second Wednesday of every month.
7. Person A: an overview of who, what, where, when, how about the USB to everybody would be helpful to bring all the utilities up to speed as what the USB is all about and then maybe discuss some of the issues that the USB is currently dealing with.
8. Person C: A good point. People need to understand what exactly the role of the USB is. It's probably out of the mind of a lot of people.

---

<sup>1</sup> Due to privacy concerns, only BPA staff and workgroup co-chairs are listed in these meeting notes.

9. Person B: how are we currently communicating? We've had a member on the USB, but how it is communicated to those not on the USB.
10. AM: part of this involves updating the BPA's website on the USB.
11. Person A: the website should probably be mentioned. Involving the EER is a great idea. The EER could give people an update and then direct folks to the online notes.
12. Person A: is there a way currently somebody could communicate ideas and give feedback to the USB?
13. AM: the two easiest ways are sending me an email or we could set up a specific email for the USB, which I would have access to.
14. Person C: it's becoming clear to me that people lack an understanding of the USB. If BPA is considering changing what the USB is to something it is not today, if people think it should be something else, we should discuss that. If the agency is thinking about changing the role of the USB, that's fine, but let's not go ahead and put some patchwork if we're going to make wholesale changes.
15. AM: I haven't heard anything from my managers about changing wholesale the USB, I'm just trying to gather what folks know/think about the USB. As the facilitator, my intent is not to apply duct tape and putty, but to try and make it more valuable to the region. If the desire to change it wholesale, that desire would need to come from all the participants and stakeholders.
16. Person C: I think it's good to reexamine the USB and its role, but it seems that there are these discussions about how to better communicate with the USB and nothing really seems to change or they last for a short period of time. Again, the role of the USB is to act as a sounding board for BPA. It seems that people may be asking something that goes beyond what the USB core function is.
17. JW: we've heard a lot about clear communication in the region and we want to make sure we can communicate with customers in a two-way fashion. We're just trying to work through the different issues and we want to make sure we're getting people the information they need while keeping in mind that the USB participants are not necessarily responsible for communicating with non-USB members.
18. Person C: I agree, it's been an issue for awhile. Sometimes we don't always link everything up. The left hand doesn't know what the right hand is doing. We need a better understanding of all the things being discussed.
19. Person A: utilities need to be a part of the solution, so the initial letter you'll hopefully send out could touch on this so that you can get a broad base of input from people that have said they want the increase in communication they could step up and provide recommendations.
20. AM: a good suggestion and I will work on this to get out to people. A status update of sorts and a call for participation and input.
21. CN: from the "Summary Document," 1.c. has several recommendations related to the USB.
22. AM: thanks for allowing me to speak to the group and gather input.
23. CN: (moving to the Summary Document). The document is a general overview of the issues discussed and broad areas of consensus. Now we need to move from this to a series of more formal recommendations.

24. Person C: in some of these, it mentions that no recommendation was made. So are we going to try to reach some sort of recommendation on these.
25. CN: right now, I just see the issue of Education/Training programs.
26. Person C: I.d.iii. The RTF doesn't set incentive levels, BPA does, so this should be an editorial change.
27. Person C: 2.c.i. be more clear about cost-effectiveness review concerning the policy of moving from measure by measure to some other level of c/e.
28. Person C: 10.a. could be moved to "Regional Programs" section.
29. CN: so after making those editorial changes, how do we want to move from this summary document to recommendations?
30. JW: all the workgroups are going about putting recommendations in different ways. Some of these are great principles but may be difficult to actually implement, e.g. 1.c.i. on customer costs. Chance of implementation will be higher if it's clear about how implementation could occur. More detailed may not be possible and remain just a principle, which is fine. So if people feel strongly about certain recommendations that are more along the lines of "principles," the more details and implementation suggestions would be helpful.
31. CN: there are some things that we want to provide more details on, but others we seem not to mind providing more general principals. So we can have different levels of details depending on the issue.
32. CN: from this point moving forward we can take each of the subsections and have different groups work on them and flesh them out more. So if you'd care to work on these more and help put together straw-man proposals, that would be helpful, so please volunteer.
33. JW: if people don't step up, Curt isn't going to flesh these out more on his own, so if folks are fine with what's been put down already and the level of detail that's fine too.
34. WC: I'd be willing to write up a straw proposal on "Regional Programs." Please provide me input you'd like before next Monday or Tuesday.
35. JW: on number 2, is there anything else we're missing...is what's in the document capturing what the groups has discussed/decided.
36. JW: on number 3, do we need more recommendation here. Lauren presented previously what BPA is working on in terms of custom program proposals.
37. Person C: we want to be clear that whatever gets developed should be reviewed and developed in conjunction with the utilities that are going to use it.
38. Person A: keeping us informed on the process would be great.
39. JW: this is something we would take to the USB.
40. JW: number 4, the recommendation is "longer is always better." But there are a number of issues with this. I would like to see more on this. This really restricts how we can change these (with a longer time period). If the RTF changes the savings on a measure, it would be potentially 11 months until the change is made in our system. If we continue to pay the same amount for a measure that we know is paying less or has a standard, then we're using rate payer dollars that is acquiring fewer savings or acquiring something that is free because it's a standard. I understand the concern of utility programs, but the flip side of the coin should also be of an interest to the utilities as well.

41. Person C: My experience is that part of the concern is when the measure is just no longer there. When you have a program and then all of a sudden the measure disappears and the utility is left holding the bag. What about phasing out of things. With measures that just go away, but maybe over the next six months we're going to cut it in half and phase it out.
42. JW: nuancing this is good thing. We don't want to make it too complicated, but nuance might be a good thing. We see sometimes that a change comes through and people take advantage of this before the six month change notice kicks in, so I would like to see something like that limited.
43. Person C: I can give it a try to put a recommendation on this.
44. Person A: from an operational perspective, BPA should have a mechanism to inform utilities 30 days ahead of the actual change date. For example, rebate forms. If we don't know that certain appliances will be off the list, it puts us under the gun to contact retailers, etc. If we need 30 days in advance, we could change our forms in time for the change.
45. JW: today, don't we give 6 months on this?
46. Person A: sometimes BPA wavers on the decision and sometimes BPA is not as specific as they should be.
47. Person C: hopefully these types of things will be easier once EE Central gets going.
48. JW: that's a good point. I'll make sure Rasa is aware of this capability if she isn't already.
49. JW: on 5.c., I'm interested to hear more about roundtables and what people would like out of these.
50. Person A: I sense that there's not a set schedule for the sub-regional roundtables. You never know when they happen, sometimes it's on a quarterly basis. Each BPA person in charge of those roundtables, polls people to find the best date. It makes it a little difficult if there isn't a regular schedule.
51. CN: well that could make for an easy recommendation.
52. WC: it seems to me that BPA would want to see these happen because it's a good time for BPA to get it's finger on the pulse on what's going out there. Right now, it's left up to the EERs and a utility to volunteer to host it, but perhaps BPA should be a bit more pro-active I could see them happening more often than they do now. They used to be about every quarter, but it's been a few years since they were a big deal, maybe because it was a big deal with all the new changes.
53. JW: we're probably in the midst of a lot of change again, so maybe these should ramp up.
54. Person A: I'd be willing to write something up on this.
55. JW: on 6, we may not need too much more on this.
56. JW: 7 and 8 seem to be reasonably fleshed out.
57. CN: Mary Smith may be interested in working on these two a bit more and I'll contact her.
58. Person C: in thinking about the NEEA issue (8), I'm wondering if there should be a limit on the amount of EEI funds that could go to NEEA. I would set it a percentage of EEI, but not sure what the percentage should be.

59. CN: a good idea, I'll make sure this is communicated to Mary, but I'm not sure what the ceiling might be.
60. Person D: having a limit as a percentage is a good idea.
61. JW: we may get a better idea once we have a better handle on the amounts of EEI for customers.
62. CN: the federal group is meeting tomorrow and I can put together the recommendation for this one, but somebody might volunteer tomorrow.
63. JW: on 10, b. is going to move to Regional Programs; should a. be fleshed out more?
64. WC: I'll add something about this into the Regional Programs section.
65. Person C: there's facilitating coordination and then there's doing programs together, e.g. turning programs over to ETO (Hospitality programs). Maybe we need to put some caveats in this.
66. JW: I agree.
67. CN: next meeting is September 30, 9 to noon. We'll be reviewing the straw proposals coming back to the group.