



Energy Efficiency Post-2011 Phase 2

Workgroup 5 Meeting 8

Thursday, October 28, 2010
9:00am to 12:00pm
Conference Call Only

Overview

- Workgroup reviewed the 10/22 version of the workgroup's recommendations.

Decision/Action Items

- A final draft version of the recommendations will be sent out to the group by Friday October 29th, and all participants are encouraged to review the document and provide final comments/edits back to Matt Tidwell by Friday, November 5th.

Meeting Notes¹

Facilitators:

Wade Carey
Curt Nichols

BPA Participants:

Josh Warner

1. CN: reviewed previous meeting notes
2. **Negative Change:** changes occur once a year that are timed with the Oct 1 IM; clears up confusion; there is no particular amount of lead time that happens;
3. Should there be a minimum notice?
4. Would like at least a month notice of changes
5. Need most time if a measure is being dropped; would want at least 3 – 6 months. This might be a good thing to do for all changes.
6. Negative change only happens once a year: Oct 1 IM.
7. ****Change recommendation:** Annual be only for dropping measures completely, but if savings or WTP to decrease that might be every 6 months. Notice of all these changes is at least 3 months.
8. **Regional Programs:** Budgeting – three different options should be available to fit the specific program offering. Part of the collaborative process on the program development is to recommend a budgeting a process.
9. Option A. is defining a specific share for everyone, in a completely regional program. B. is for those to opt-in. C. opt-in and level of participation and hope the savings fall to appropriate utility.

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

10. Infrastructure cost is out of base and not a choice for the utility on regional programs.
11. Person A: questions on infrastructure cost;
12. Need to have clear communications on what the many players are doing in a similar space.
13. Need to be clear on the process that we have to develop regional programs.
14. Be clear in the recommendation that BPA have strong coordination with customers and NEEA on regional program development.
15. **Edit on page #6:** 'should' collaborate, remove from "that..." on
16. Concern that with regional programs and the overlap of existing local programs; need to have local oversight as the utility is ultimately responsible
17. **Edit on page #6:** Conversations need to be broad and include other stakeholders including interest groups, trade allies, IOUs, etc. This edit may want to be also in some other section of regional programs.
18. Having need for a decision-making model. Regional programs need to be regional. Ultimately BPA needs to be able to make the decision.
19. Regional programs actually put some requirements onto the local utility.
20. **Who is involved in the process:** caution that the trade allies need to be the contractors you want them to bid on.
21. **Recommendation #1:** Add a sentence or two about how big regional programs get and want to be aware of the issue and need to monitor.
22. Want to define the process
23. Add 4th option that includes a pro rata share of incentives for regional programs.
24. Add language the make the funds ideas options, and not the only choices (i.e. such as..)
25. **Regional roundtable:** overview of recommendation.
26. Person B: Need to include all stakeholders in the process.
27. WC: Idea is to enhance two-way communication b/w BPA and utility customer, not part of regional program development
28. Person B: may be discussions that other stakeholders should hear
29. Person C: other parties are often there as needed.
30. **CN:** modify recommendation to add: Efforts will continue to be made to ensure that the right people are at the meeting.
31. **LiWx:** review of recommendation. Don't want to duplicate contributions to CAPs. Utilities can currently contribute to CAPs or do specific measure in Li houses.
32. EEI can go toward incremental savings for measure but not LiWx admin. Recommend a cap of 20% of the EEI to be spent on LiWx savings.
33. Person B: issue for CAPs having restrictions on how they can spend \$\$
34. Person A: Not an issue to spend up to 20%
35. Person C: Not about having the LiWx measures available, but if BPA will pay for CAP admin payments from a utility.
36. Person C: EEI \$\$ can be used for LiWx, but still need to workout some additional issues related to LiWx
37. Person A: Add 3rd recommendation. Convene process to describe to Person A how the \$5 million is enhancing LiWx.

38. JW: Doesn't agree to having a specific percentage.
39. Person D: State that we will address any issues that come up.
40. **Additional meeting:** Monday (9:00 – 10:30) to finalize LiWx
41. **NEEA** – reviewed recommendation; no EEI \$s to NEEA, except for incremental savings from discrete activities/programs; propose that EEI could be used to fund development and evaluation.
42. EEI for development and evaluation – Person C not a good idea. BPA is expecting some self-funding, so there may be extra dollars needed in the region that are not from the EEI. Need to get incremental savings.
43. Consider having a reference document for the WTP process.
44. **Remove #5 & #6;** move #1 to background as agreed to in Phase #1
45. **Move all but the first sentence of #3 into the background**
46. Insert a summary at the beginning of the document.