



Energy Efficiency Post-2011 Phase 2

Workgroup 5 Subgroup Meeting 2

Monday, November 01, 2010
9:00am to 10:30am
Conference Call Only

Overview

- Subgroup convened to decide the wording for the recommendation on low income weatherization.

Decision/Action Items

- Final wording for low income recommendation will be sent to the workgroup for review. Comments on it and the rest of the workgroup's recommendations are due to Matt Tidwell by COB Friday, November 5th.

Meeting Notes¹

Facilitators:

Wade Carey

BPA Participants:

Matt Tidwell

Josh Warner

Brent Barclay

1. WC: (introduced redline version of Low income recommendation).
2. Person A: I need clarification on whether or not there will be low-income measures that utilities can fund directly.
3. JW: I have not heard that there will be anything substantially different than today. We are looking at our weatherization programs and measures and there may be some adjustments, but it's not likely to change substantially.
4. Person A: I'm wondering about the word "additional" in recommendation #1.
5. JW: we'll strike the word "additional."
6. Person B: we also need to strike the word "incremental."
7. WC: I agree.
8. Person C: my concern is that with agencies using all sorts of matching funding and putting together packages with different funding sources, does this say that all those other funds do all the repairs and that EEI funds only go to measures, so are we putting something on the agencies to parse out these funds?

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

9. Person D: most of these agencies have to have elaborate tracking of the funding sources. We require the CAPs to track it for us currently.
10. Person C: what does the recommendation exclude?
11. Person B: the changes made to the recommendation make the recommendation consistent with the practices now.
12. Person C: we should include language about what is excluded.
13. Person B: add language about EEI funds going to pay for measures.
14. JW: there's already an existing budget that BPA provides to CAP agencies on the order of \$5 million. These dollars from EEI are to acquire energy savings. We need to make sure that the individual utility can claim savings relative to the EEI funds.
15. BB: the existing Implementation Manual includes language about being able to pay for repairs. The repairs are necessary to protect the persistence of the weatherization measure.
16. Person C: I'm harping on this because we have a positive statement that implies some things are excluded, so let's make it explicit about what is or is not included and can be paid for by EEI funds.
17. Person A: why don't we reference the current Implementation Manual. We recommend that BPA continue with the existing practices and reference the IM language.
18. Person B: utilities are going to have to report to BPA for reimbursements, so will the Willingness to Pay cover repairs. Will there be a list of weatherization measures that we can enter into the PTR?
19. BB: in the PTR system you report into the PTR and you enter the dollar for dollar amount.
20. Person B: but you did mention that you don't want to have contributions to CAPs?
21. JW: not with EEI dollars, correct.
22. Person B: so instead of having a simple method as today, in the future we're going to have to track all the measures. So it's breaking one line item in the PTR into many line items. So it seems like just adding more data entry.
23. WC: it's needed in order to assign savings.
24. Person B: BPA does assign a savings to our "bucket" contribution to CAPs. We will be in a position of needing data from the CAPs that we don't get.
25. WC: according to the PTR you need to have an agreement with the CAP in which they give you the data you need.
26. JW: Person B, it sounds like you're asking that BPA require the cost of installation and the cost of repairs?
27. Person B: you would need to get that in order to get cost effective savings.
28. BB: remember that the repairs are tied directly to the measure.
29. Person D: I agree that it's going to make the cost-effectiveness of the program look worse if they aren't separated.
30. Person E: all the data is at the local level, so it's just a matter of reporting it.
31. Person B: it's been problematic to get consistent data reporting from the agencies, but I've heard that it's getting better in Washington. What we're looking for is cost-effective savings.

32. JW: we could require the additional data, or we could change our policy that we don't pay for the repairs and only pay for the measures.
33. Person B: I don't want the policy changed. When we report this into the PTR, what are you going to allow? Dollar for dollar? Before you can evaluate the program we're going to collect the data on repairs.
34. JW: we don't contemplate changing the dollar for dollar policy.
35. Person A: I think we should recommend whatever is appropriate. This process is about us recommending to BPA.
36. WC: the group recommends that dollar for dollar continue to be the policy and also recommended that repair costs being calculated and be netted out so we can appropriately determine the cost effectiveness of the programs.
37. Person C: so 100k for dollar for dollar, but 18k of that was for repairs, so you get reimbursed for 100k, but 82k is used to determine cost-effectiveness.
38. WC: I would imagine that BPA would want to know how much goes to repairs. We're in the driver seat when it comes to the CAPs, so we can get the data from the agencies.
39. MC: it sounds very reasonable for all parties concerned.
40. Person B: does this have any suggestion for how we'll enter this into the PTR.
41. WC: it would be hard to recommend this because we don't really know how EE Central is going to look and operate. We should still be entering this on a measure by measure basis.
42. JW: so this needs to be communicated to Rasa.
43. WC: right now, you can do both a lump sum contribution and measure by measure reporting, but going forward there's not going to be the opportunity to make the lump sum contribution. So instead of just doing 10 houses, you'll have to enter the measures for the ten houses.
44. Person F: there's also an advantage for the increased reporting for I-937s.
45. Person B: I just want it to be clear that this changes in data aren't going to happen overnight.
46. WC: well, you have a year to work with your CAPs to get the data.
47. Person B: they'll have to report it in a way that is uploadable into the PTR.
48. Person D: our utility has to report it manually.
49. Person B: but that would be a lot for all the utilities, so maybe BPA could put together a uniform uploadable data form.
50. WC: I think we've captured the group's feelings on this.
51. Person C: in one of the earlier write ups there was language about the ARRA funding. As it goes away, a lot of the agencies will have ramped up programs and have persons in place, so I think there's a good reason for backfilling. So currently the \$5 million from BPA is fine, but there will be a reason for increasing that amount in the future.
52. JW: we will clean up this redline version and get it out to the broader group so people can provide comments before this Friday.