

Meeting Notes
EE Stakeholder Advisory Group

Tuesday, December 16, 2009

12:30 – 4:30 pm

Location: Midwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (to be confirmed)

645 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 990

Chicago, IL 60611

Time	Agenda Item	Discussion Leader
12:30 – 12:40	Opening and Introductions	Annette Beitel
12:40 – 1:00	ComEd Image Building	Rob Kelter - ELPC
1:00 – 1:45	DSMoore Cost-Effectiveness Tool	Rick Morgan
1:45 – 2:00	Break	
2:00 – 2:30	Observations on the Evaluation Process	Val Jensen- ComEd
2:30 – 4:20	ComEd's Impact Evaluation Results	Jeff Erickson – Summit Blue
4:20 – 4:30	Closing	Annette Beitel

Meeting Materials:

- ComEd Advertising
- Presentation: Observations on the Evaluation Process
- ComEd's EE and DR Evaluation Presentation to the SAG

Attendees:

(in person)

- Dave Nicol – ComEd
- Tim Melloch – ComEd

- Bryan McDaniel – CUB
- Rick Morgan – Integral Analytics
- Roger Baker - ComEd
- Jeff Erickson – Summit Blue
- Anthony Star – CNT
- Randy Gunn – Summit Blue
- Geoff Crandall – MSB Consulting representing ELPC
- Val Jensen – ComEd
- Jackie Voytas – Ameren
- Mike Brandt – ComEd
- David Baker – DCEO
- Agnes Mrozowski – DCEO
- Dylan Sullivan – NRDC
- Keith Martin – Ameren
- Jay Wrobel – MEEA
- Susan Hedman – AG
- Bryan Granahan – Env IL
- Bob King – CSG
- Dave Pelton – CSG

(phone)

- Carol Mullholland
- Cheryl Miller – Ameren
- Heidi Merchant – Ameren
- Judd Moritz – Ameren
- Scott Demetrosky – Cadmus
- Cliff McDonald
- Dave Costenaro
- David Brightwell – ICC staff
- George Malek – ComEd
- Ken Wolcutt – Ameren
- Maria Turner
- Megan McNeill – ICC staff counsel
- Nick Lovier – Ameren
- Phil Mosenthal – Optimal for AG
- Rebecca Stanfield - NRDC

- Tom Lyle
- Rich Zuraski – ICC Staff

Action Items/Notes:

- Image Building
 - Rob Kelter presented photos from stores containing ComEd labels for CFL discounts that suggest ComEd, not ComEd ratepayers are paying for reduced – price bulbs
 - SAG participants discussed various ways to clearly and succinctly communicate who is paying for discounts, including the California “paid for by California ratepayers under the auspices of the CPUC.”
 - No clear consensus reached on how to communicate source of money for discount. Further discussion needed.
 - ACT: Rob Kelter offered to develop proposed language for how to communicate source of funds for discount, and present at a future SAG for SAG consideration.
- DSMoore Cost-Effectiveness Presentation
 - Rick Morgan of Integral Analytics presented on the DSMoore calculator.
 - The DSMoore calculator will be used by ComEd and Ameren for doing the economic analysis for the next three-year portfolio, including SAG member suggestions
 - Purpose of presentation was informational to explain to SAG members what inputs are required to do analysis and outputs from calculator that will be reviewed to assess whether measure or program “screen” as cost-effective.
- Observations on the Evaluation Process
 - Val Jensen described how evaluation results, particularly NTG results (but also realization rates) can have very significant impacts on how ComEd and other portfolio administrators run programs.
 - Despite previous SAG discussions on how to apply NTG ratios in IL, no SAG consensus has been reached, which creates large and unnecessary portfolio management risks. Other jurisdictions have settled rules on application of NTG, which allows portfolio administrators to rationally manage their portfolios.
 - Val Jensen made a strong plea to:
 - Resolve retroactive vs. prospective application of NTG values

- If retroactive, how far back?
 - Establish process for reviewing results and final numbers
 - ACT: The AG's office offered to draft a strawman proposal for application of NTG ratios for SAG consideration at the next SAG meeting. If SAG consensus is reached, the SAG can discuss how to memorialize/file with the ICC, which either could be through the Year 1 SAG Report, or some other process such as an informational filing.
- ComEd's Impact Evaluation results
 - There was considerable SAG discussion about the ComEd and Ameren NTG impact evaluation NTG ratios being very different despite similarities in the program design.
 - ComEd's NTG ratio was .68;
 - Ameren's was 1.03.
 - It is not clear if the difference in values is due to service territory differences, different evaluation contractors or different evaluation methodologies
 - ACT: SAG participants would like evaluation contractors to explain different methodologies used, and also provide their opinion about source of difference: service territory, methodology, contractors.