

IL EE Stakeholder Advisory Group Technical Advisory Committee

Tuesday, June 12, 2011

Teleconference

Call-In Number: 760-569-6000

844452#

GoTo Meeting: <https://www1.gotomeeting.com/join/557558985>

Time	Agenda Item	Discussion Leader
10:30 – 10:35	Opening <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule = 2nd Tuesdays 	Annette Beitel
	Process Going Forward <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consolidate queries in monthly agendas. • More urgent issues to be answered by VEIC, posted to Sharepoint discussion board, and put on next Tues' agenda. 	Shawn Enterline
10:35 –	Front Matter Consensus Items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review matrix & content. 	Annette Beitel / Shawn Enterline
	Tracking System Update Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program measures that differ from TRM measure characterizations 	Rich Hackner
	Measure Implementation Q&A <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See four questions below. • Air Sealing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Custom vs Rx input assumptions - HDD & Latent Heat Multiplier • Appliance recycling algorithm 	J. Jackson / T. Hink
	TRM Database Concept	Shawn Enterline
	TRM Loose Ends <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NTG Ratios • Evaluation Priorities Memo • Source Citation & 	Shawn Enterline

	Documentation	
11:50	Set Agenda for next month	Shawn Enterline
12:00	Adjourn	Shawn Enterline

Measure Implementation Questions

- 1) There's still a note that says "Once the final table has been approved,..." for the table in 6.5. That probably was meant to be removed.
- 2) Was there a final decision on what to do with the therms penalty? Last I heard we were talking about maybe tracking it, but the utilities wouldn't be penalized for it. It doesn't really matter for our implementation why we collect it, we just want to know if we're supposed to collect information to calculate it.
- 3) I think we talked about it on an earlier call, but I can't remember for sure. The IFTherms value for the Garage building type is currently listed as 1 in table 6.5, but it should be 0.
- 4) In the T8 measure (6.5.3) table A-1, there is a note that says new bulbs are assumed to be installed with a ballast factor of 0.77. But if you do the math for some of the equipment (using bulb wattage, number of bulbs, and fixture wattage in the table) the actual value used for the ballast factor is not always 0.77. The reason that I'm asking about this is that if we can assume a constant ballast factor, we can just ask customers how many lamps they're installing. If we have to use the numbers in the table, we will have to ask them how many lamps per fixture and how many of each type of fixture on the application. It doesn't seem like a lot, but it will make gum up our process quite a bit.

Air Sealing Measure Concern

Reduced claimed savings versus existing program.

Latent Heat Multiplier – Using Energy10 versus the deeming algorithm in the TRM.

HDD base 60 versus TMY

Are all the utilities implementing this measure (both custom and Rx) with common inputs?

Refrigerator Recycling Measure

Reduced claimed savings versus existing program.

Side by Side dummy variable, etc.