BONNEVILLE
POWER ADMINISTRATION

Energy Efficiency Post-2011
Phase 2

Workgroup 3 Meeting 7

Wednesday, October 13, 2010
10:00am to 12:00pm
Conference Call Only

Overview

- Workgroup 3 went through the draft recommendations document incorporating feedback in "real time" from input from public power participants.

Decision/Action Items

- Workgroup 3 decided that another meeting is not necessary and feedback on the draft recommendations document would be solicited via email until final recommendations are reached. The group is confident that the process will conclude with final recommendations to submit to BPA during the week of October 25th.
- Comments, ,suggestions and feedback on the draft document can be emailed directly to Matt Tidwell

Meeting Notes[1]

Facilitators:
Jill Steiner
Andrew Miller

BPA Participants:
Matthew Tidwell

1. JS: we've added a sample template into the recommendations for utilities wanting to satisfy the requirement to submit a "plan" under the power contracts.
2. Person A: (review of recommendation 1). Needs some added language.
3. JS: will add clarification and more language to first recommendation.
4. JS: (review of second question). Under the section what role should BPA play, we need an actual recommendation called out (added language in Live Meeting).
5. JS: do we have any thoughts on the cost related to data collection. Carrie Cobb mentioned last time about the investment BPA is making in infrastructure for data collection. So do we want to say anything about data collection that supports CPAs?
6. Person B: so this would be surveys, market assessments, etc.
7. Person A: would this be apart of the CPAs?

[1] Due to privacy concerns, only BPA staff and workgroup co-chairs are listed in these meeting notes.

8. Person B: I would like it to be CPA-related, although the information could be used for other things, such as program design.
9. Person A: if we think these expenses should be considered as infrastructure expenses then we should include language in the recommendation.
10. JS: (added language to recommendation 6 on costs being paid for out of BPA's infrastructure budget.)
11. Person A: in terms of what we discussed regarding data collection, I'm wondering if data collection needs to be addressed in recommendation 3.
12. JS: (made changes to rec 3).
13. Person C: (rec 4) I was thinking there might be some methodologies that could be shown to us.
14. JS: one of the biggest things we would ask BPA to do is to influence NEEA to make sure that when NEEA does things that it creates useful tool kits and that the data becomes something useful for us.
15. Person C: this is kind of where I was going. I like "example" for us to look at it, to give us suggestions for how to do things.
16. Person D: important to keep in mind that the protocols from NEEA are generally for market transformation and a bit higher than what might be useful for utilities.
17. Person A: the focus here is BPA. We could make a recommendation that BPA do something in conjunction with NEEA, but I don't see us making a recommendation that NEEA do something.
18. JS: no, we're recommending that BPA influence NEEA. There's an opportunity for BPA to provide a stronger advocate for public power as they're participating in these stakeholder groups that direct some of the NEEA research.
19. JS: we'll work on making this recommendation more actionable.
20. JS: (rec 5).
21. Person B: what about if we said BPA should be aware of utility timelines and work toward maintaining compilation per that schedule. It sounds a like top down as written now.
22. JS: we do want to infuse the language with the understanding that BPA needs to be alert to the needs of the region and local utilities.
23. JS: (rec 6; some clarifications made).
24. JS: ("plan" template").
25. Person C: good job on putting together the template.
26. JS: we'll include some language on the template. Maybe we want this to be more of an example rather than an actual, prescriptive recommendation.
27. Person A: In terms of coming up with a template for this reporting requirement, that this is kind of a draft, a starting point, that there needs to be more discussion and input. We're looking forward to refining this depending on the comments received during the public comment period.
28. JS: this is just the first of many templates. We're not recommending this specific template.
29. Person A: is there a recommendation here? If there is one, it needs to be written up and send out to the group.
30. JS: the recommendation is that we set up a process to design and modify the template. So we have a recommendation 7 to write up.

31. JS: a revised document will be sent out by Monday at the latest. We request that people take the time to review and comment on the proposal and provide feedback and comments and edits by Thursday of next week. Then a “final” version will go by the next Monday for people’s final review.
32. JS: next scheduled meeting may not be needed.