

**Massachusetts Energy Efficiency Advisory Council**  
 Meeting Minutes (DRAFT)  
 Tuesday, May 12, 2009

**Councilors Present:**

<b>Voting</b>	<b>Present (designee)</b>	<b>Non-Voting</b>	<b>Present (designee)</b>
Heather Clark	X	Derek Buchler	X
Martha Coakley	Jed Nosal	James Carey	X
Paul Deare		Penni Conner	X
Lucy Edmondson	Jim Colman	Alisha Frazee	
Philip Giudice	Frank Gorke	Kevin Galligan	X
Debra Hall	X	George Gantz	Deb Jarvis
Charles Harak	X	John Ghiloni	
Elliot Jacobson	X	Paul Gromer	X
Samuel Krasnow	X	Andrew Newman	
Rick Mattila	X	Richard Oswald	X
Robert Rio	X	Michael Sommer	X
		Timothy Stout	Jeremy Newberger

DOER: Michael Sherman, Steven Venezia

Consultants: Paul Horowitz, Jeff Schlegel, John Livermore, Doug Baston, Tom Franks

Attending:

Scott Albert	Lyn Huckabee	Danielle Rathbun
Marc Breslow	Birud Jhaveri	Lori Segall
MaryJo Connelly	Paul Johnson	Lisa Shea
Fran Cummings	Emmett Lyne	Tilak Subrahmanian
Christina Dietrich	Jeremy McDiarmid	Christine Vaughan
Scott Durkee	Andrea Mitter-Burke	
Jack Habib	Stephanie Pollack	

I. Introduction

Gorke convened the meeting and reviewed the agenda, noting that the discussion of marketing will be abbreviated to allow more time for discussion of budget issues. He noted that more documents will be forthcoming from the Program Administrators (PA), that the process of reviewing the statewide plan (the Plan) will be iterative, and that the consultants have been asked to process the documents as they are provided.

II. Overview of Proposed Council Work Plan

Schlegel presented an overview of a proposed council work plan and presented a summary of key issues. He encouraged the Council to adopt a work plan, priority topics and issues, and task allocation promptly so that deadlines can be met. Proposed decision dates include preliminary comments to PAs by May 29<sup>th</sup>, a second round of comments to the PAs on June 23<sup>rd</sup>, and Council action on the Plan on July 29<sup>th</sup>. He reviewed two proposed schedules of sixteen key topic areas distilled from councilor comments and other input and asked that the Council review and provide feedback. He noted that councilors are encouraged to comment as soon as possible, but that they are welcome at any point. One of the goals of this process is agreement on issues that would take up time at the DPU in the absence of agreement.

Horowitz presented the consolidated summary of the topics of interest suggested by council members. One of the key themes is the need for additional data to understand the elements underlying the Plan's estimates of potential, costs, and savings. Gorke encouraged councilors to review the consultant proposal and propose additional topics if appropriate.

### III. Overview of the Plan's Commercial & Industrial Sector Initiatives

Baston described the review process, noting that there was a convergence on many issues from a wide range of reviewers and the Council. He noted that the Plan is a remarkably well constructed document and highlighted some themes. First, the Plan contains broad commitments but with many caveats whose collective weight raises concerns. Secondly the Plan raises many issues without providing a clear description of how they will be addressed; e.g. the Plan talks about the integration of gas and electric programs but does not set a specific timetable or process for achieving consistency within three years. Finally, there is a concern that that programs may achieve the PAs' objectives by going broader instead of deeper. In short, the consultant team is looking forward to engaging with the PAs to refine the Plan's details.

### IV. Overview of the Plan's Residential Sector Initiatives

Livermore presented the consultant overview of the Plan. He noted that there has been unprecedented cooperation over the last months. He looks forward to a comparable cooperation to build a plan to meet the goals of the Green Communities Act (GCA). The issues the residential team saw relate to the depth of the program efforts, integration between the gas and electric programs, program design and strategy, and the multi-family program. The consultant team notes that the savings appear to be achieved at a lower cost than they expected, that there may be an over-emphasis on lighting, and that the distinction between integration and coordination is not clear.

### V. Discussion

Clark asked to see the consultant work product to understand the full range of consultant concerns and was informed that summaries will be provided. Conner noted that the

absence of a template made the task more difficult and that the PAs will be able respond to some of the concerns raised promptly. Jacobson noted that real progress has been made in planning but that planning only goes so far and adaptive management is critical for success. Colman asked about provisions for feedback and revisions in the Plan and Schlegel responded that there an opportunity for midterm revisions and that effective implementation will require willingness to “do and learn.” Colman followed up with a query about feedback loops which Schlegel described as part of evaluation, monitoring and verification (EM&V) followed by program adjustment.. Newberger stated that the PAs embrace going deeper but that the absence of quantitative data on this type of effort presents a challenge. Gorke, Schlegel, Horowitz and Newberger discussed issues related to adaptive program management, the process of evaluating pilot and demonstration projects, and feedback loops. Mattila stated interest in acquiring more detailed information and asked if PA working group information will be available on the web. Horowitz noted the consultants look to DOER for guidance on this issue, and Conner noted that additional reporting requirements may hinder the working groups. Krasnow stated preference for focusing analytic efforts on savings, benefits and cost at the program level and on the design for EM&V administration. Rio urged that the plan go deeper methodically, instead of slower, and that reproducibility be a key consideration. Gorke wrapped up the discussion and suggested that councilors review the material with an eye to determining issues that are critical to achieving the GCA objectives.

#### VI. Technical Reference Manual (TRM)

Gorke stated that some work has been done to develop this product. Sherman describe the TRM as a single source of information for documenting savings assumptions for prescriptive measures. He anticipated that it will ultimately be configured as updatable database. It will include data for measures in all sectors for both gas and electric efficiency programs. DOER’s intention is to link the TRM to the PARIS database to have a unified basis for planning and reporting. DOER is seeking to have all data on measure level savings assumptions from the PAs by June 1 and to complete a TRM in time to be useful for the October 31 filing. This is a critical to presenting defensible plans to the DPU. Optimal Energy will consolidate the information and present this to the PAs for review. Lawrence Masland will lead this project for DOER and Franks will coordinate for the consultant team.

#### VII. Budget update

Gorke informed the Council that DOER sent a request for budget authorization to the DPU. The DPU has specified the PA share. He anticipates that the Council and the PAs will need to revisit he administrative procedure for handling transactions. He described anticipated funding sources as including RGGI auction revenues, gas charges indentified in submitted plans, and the transition from the non-utility party (NUP) process to the Council process, effective February 24, 2009. Galligan noted that the allocation methodology differed from those used in the past. Gorke state he will investigate and provide an update at the next Council meeting.

## VIII. Marketing Education & Outreach

Due to time constraints this agenda item was abbreviated. An update will be provided at the next meeting.

Gorke noted that this topic will receive more attention in the both the Plan and the Council agenda going forward. The Plan would benefit from a customer-centric description of the means of access to the programs. Schlegel described the necessary shift from marketing programs, as under the past efforts, to marketing and educating on energy efficiency as a concept. The focus will need to be on messages and themes that encourage comprehensive action and investment on the part of customers using. It will need to use a variety of media targeted at variety of customer segments and utilize multiple messages. He pointed out acquiring the GCA goal of all cost-effective energy efficiency only with ratepayer investment would have a significant bill and rate impact and the objective is to set up system where customers invest in their own benefits. On a related topic, Venezia informed council that meetings have been noticed for the rate/bill impact docket 08-50 working group on May 14, May 21, May 28, and June 4.

## IX. Public Comment

Paul Johnson stated that the public needs to have confidence in the portfolio presented and suggested that the Council provide 1) a list of things that were excluded from the program and why excluded; 2) a list of the explicit criteria for selecting program elements and description of how they were applied.

## X. Adjourned at 5:10PM