Energy Efficiency Post-2011
Phase 2

Workgroup 4 Meeting 7

Tuesday, October 26, 2010
1:00pm to 4:00pm
Conference Call Only

Overview

- Workgroup reviewed the 10/19 version of the workgroup's recommendations.

Decision/Action Items

- A final draft version of the recommendations will be sent out to the group by Thursday October 28th, and all participants are encouraged to review the document and provide final comments/edits back to Matt Tidwell by Thursday, November 4th.

Meeting Notes[1]

Facilitators:
Melissa Podeszwa

BPA Participants:
Lauren Gage
Matt Tidwell
Josh Warner

1. MP: overview of October 12 meeting.
2. MP: Lauren Gage put together a document on some issues that have come up in review of the recommendations.
3. LG: 1st issue. No mention of project cost cap.
4. Person A: I would like to see project cost cap, otherwise there's no way to control the liabilities that are out there. I used to have a cap and it was my assurance that we had a handle on exactly what it was going to be.
5. Person B: we've been doing this throughout the region. Consistency would say that we continue to do this. I don't think it was intentional that it was left out. It was just an oversight.
6. MP: we do want to put a 70% cost cap back in.
7. Person C: It wasn't the job of the workgroup to detail everything that will occur in post-2011, some things we just take as given, such as this.
8. LG (Deemed measures): there are some customers that have their own individual deemed measures. The door felt to the opportunity for individual deemed

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

measures in the write up. Or is the workgroup recommending that we shut the door.

9. Person B: we use deemed measures that are different from others because we're getting a reimbursement rate is different. I think Option 2 is specific to custom. I'm all for having a minimal number of deemed measures. It's confusing having all these different reference numbers. With the willingness to pay the same, we plan on using the same deemed measures as everyone else.
10. LG: (cost-effectiveness): right now non-standards are using a "quasi" cost-effectiveness test. I was hoping we could use Option 2 customers to the total resource cost test. I think we can modify the bulk upload that would calculate the TRC, but we would need to add a column for load shape and non-energy benefits. We're just a small step away from being able to use the TRC, which has a lot of benefits.
11. Person B: it may be a small step, but you fall off a steep cliff.
12. LG: what's the barrier.
13. Person B: in our custom project arena, we have projects that have maybe 6 to 8 to 10 measures and the simple calculation now is based on the dominant energy saving measure. Going the next step to load shape is something I'm not going to do. You guys could do it, but it sounds like a lot of work.
14. LG: you would only have to specify the load shape of the dominant measure. My idea is that you would select a load shape from a drop down menu. It would be a simple look up table. The TRC is not incredibly sensitive to the specification of the measure, but it does allow us to more accurately assess the TRC.
15. JW: The other advantage is that you could now include non-energy benefits, which is now not available to non-standards.
16. Person B: I'm not opposed, but what benefit does it give me. I spend 80 to 100 hours getting this report ready to upload. I'm hesitant to do anything else that would slow this down.
17. LG: the benefits are three-fold. You're going to be able to bring in more projects by bringing in marginal benefits if the non-energy benefits are brought into the calculation.
18. JW: if there's a project that is on the margin, you could add these in.
19. Person B: you're catching me at a bad time because I'm in the middle of uploading.
20. Person C: if this is beneficial overall, we could put something in our recommendation that this be explored and when you finally have it all together you could come up and get the group back together and see how this works. I understand Person B's point and I agree with him. How much benefit are we getting for how much complication.
21. JW: that's a reasonable point. One of the basic principles of this workgroup has been to make Option 1 and Option 2 and similar as possible and making this change goes a long way to make the two Options similar.
22. LG: I understand the concern about the burden. But some other benefits: the TRC allows you to have a more continuous variable with your measure life.
23. MP: currently the workgroup has not recommended a cost test, but rather that we have one instead of multiple.

24. Person D: I'm confused by what the difference is between Option 1 and Option 2. The complexity and the additional workload is an issue for everybody.
25. JW: we're trying to talk about something that we don't know precisely how it's going to work. For Option 1 customers, no additional information would be required. For Option 2, we're talking about the load shape, but we could make this as complicated or as simple as possible. I understand the fear about additional work, but it creates a more level playing field, which is something we've been trying to do.
26. MP: is measure life also required?
27. LG: we could provide pre-specified measure lives.
28. Person C: I propose that we recommend that Bpa continue to explore this and work with interested parties to come up with a solution that makes sure it simple and not overly burdensome on Option 2 customers.
29. Person E: I think this is a good suggestion. We would need some consistency on how measure life is applied.
30. LG: we need to have an evaluation context for our M&V. It's likely that we'll see additional evaluation work for Option 2 utilities. We recognize that this is additional burden. We may have to come back to a project 3 years after completion to do impact evaluation work. We could leverage work already being down by the non-standards. This was just an FYI. It seems like an additional piece of the puzzle.
31. MP: in the last two weeks, we've been able to come close to a final draft of the document. A brief introduction has been added as well as discussion of the process. As well as some clarification based on our last meeting.
32. MP: for the Willingness to Pay: individual projects have a minimum of 0.5, but the sum of all projects is 1.0 or greater.
33. Person C: we've talked about making it clear that administrative payments would need documentation, so do we need to include that here.
34. JW: we should probably just keep it in one place, that workgroup 2 makes sense.
35. JW: we'll send out a redlined version of the recommendations to the group. If no major issues arise, we'll consider the recommendations final. And if something major comes up, we can have another meeting. Then the recommendations will be ready for the November 17th meeting.
36. MP: Person D brought up some technical issues that have been helpful.
37. MP: we have the November 17th meeting where we'll present the workgroup's recommendations.
38. Person B: BPA needs to understand that however this is set up isn't working very well. You're seeing the reaction I'm giving. One more detail is just too much. It's going to be important to understand how EE Central is going to work.
39. Person C: Person B isn't the only one on deadline with the Nov 1. deadline.