

**Illinois Energy Efficiency Stakeholder Advisory Group:
Portfolio Planning Process Project Plan
DRAFT – updated 9/23/2015**

| Description | Participants |
|--|--|
| Champions | IL Attorney General's Office – Karen Lusson Ameren IL – Keith Goerss ComEd – Roger Baker Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity – Molly Lunn Nicor Gas – Hammad Chaudhry Peoples Gas-North Shore Gas – Sue Nathan (AEG) |
| SAG Facilitation Team | Annette Beitel Celia Johnson |
| Participants: Illinois Program Administrators | Ameren IL ComEd Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity Nicor Gas Peoples Gas-North Shore Gas |
| Participants: Non-Program Administrators that generally intervene in EE Plan dockets. | Citizens Utility Board (CUB) Illinois Attorney General's Office (IL AG) Illinois Commerce Commission Staff (ICC Staff) Large customer representatives (e.g. IIEC, REACT) Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) Other interested organizations and companies |
| Observers: Interested parties that generally do not intervene in EE Plan dockets but who may be interested in participating in the Portfolio Planning process. | Energy consulting firms (e.g. Program Implementers) Independent Evaluators MEEA State agencies (IL Environmental Protection Agency; Illinois Power Agency) |
| Final Deliverables | The Subcommittee will create the following documents to support this effort: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project Plan (schedule, process, and “ground rules”) 2. Templates¹ 3. Consent Agreement (with a Non-Consensus Comparison Exhibit, if applicable) |
| Commencement Date | July 2015 |
| Conclusion Date | September 15, 2016 |
| Attachments to Project Plan | Attachment A: Background and Definitions (pages 11-12) Attachment B: Key Issues for SAG Portfolio Planning Process (pages 13-16) |

¹ Templates may include: Existing Portfolio Report; Policy / Issue Template; Program Template – High Level, New Program; Program Template – High Level, Existing Program; Program Template – Filing; C/E Calculator Inputs

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>Attachment C: Schedule for SAG Portfolio Planning Process (pages 17-26)</p> <p>Attachment D: Templates – Proposed New Program Idea Template; Policy / Issue Template (pages 27-30)</p> |
|--|---|

I. Objectives

The objective of the SAG Portfolio Planning Process is to reach as much consensus as possible on issues related to Energy Efficiency Portfolio Plans, in advance of the Energy Efficiency Plan filing for Program Administrators in fall 2016. The goal is to reach consensus on a variety of issues in order to reduce litigation during the upcoming Plan dockets.

SAG will prioritize consensus on the following Plan components:

1. Allocation of portfolio budget across sectors (8-103 and 8-104 budgets to be provided by Program Administrators);
2. Portfolio savings;
3. Programs to be funded (existing and new);
4. Residential and non-residential split;
5. Low-income offerings; and
6. Coordination between gas and electric utilities.

See Attachment B, Key Issues for Portfolio Planning, for a list of issues proposed for discussion. SAG may also discuss program-specific details, as applicable, but those topics will not be prioritized for resolution through this process.

II. Process Rules and Guiding Principles

SAG is a forum that allows parties to provide early input and ongoing input into the Portfolio Planning process, express different opinions, better understand the opinions of others, and foster collaboration and consensus, where possible and appropriate. All SAG participants will seek to follow the process rules and guiding principles described in this Project Plan, to foster communication and productive discussion and engage in consensus decision-making.

A. **Participant Roles and Responsibilities**

The following section describes roles and responsibilities of key participants:

- **Facilitation.** SAG Portfolio Planning Process meetings will be facilitated by the SAG Facilitation Team. The SAG Facilitation Team duties include:
 - **Meeting Facilitation:** Presiding over meetings, develop agendas, complete background research, as needed and resources permitting, maintain the schedule, review draft meeting materials, and update the SAG website. Materials will be circulated to participants at least five (5) Business Days in advance of meetings.
 - **Tracking Open Items/Action Items:** Action items and open issues will be tracked by the SAG Facilitation Team during each meeting. An updated tracking document will be circulated to participants within five (5) Business Days following meetings, and will be available for download on the SAG website. Responses to open issues will also be circulated in advance of the next meeting.

- **Tracking consensus and non-consensus items**, and seek to forge consensus on non-consensus items to minimize the number of non-consensus items remaining at the end of the process.
- **Rendering Decisions on Project Process/Scope:** The SAG Facilitation Team shall render final decisions on process matters, including the Project scope, to maintain a manageable and efficient process. Agendas and materials will be available for download on the [Meeting Materials](#) page of the SAG website, unless documents include confidential or proprietary information. The SAG Facilitation Team will adhere to a clear timeline and process for conclusion of work in the SAG Portfolio Planning Process.
- **Program Administrator Participation.** Program Administrators offering programs pursuant to Sections 8-103, 8-104 and Section 16-111.5B of the Public Utilities Act shall participate in the SAG Portfolio Planning Process (e.g. Ameren IL, ComEd, the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity, Nicor Gas, and Peoples Gas – North Shore Gas), and will be providing identified deliverables to allow interested stakeholders to provide meaningful input. In addition, they will respond to requests for stakeholder information, consistent with preserving confidentiality of customer and other confidential information, and assuming information is readily available and does not require significant processing or analysis to respond to stakeholder requests.
- **Stakeholder Participation/Participation Restrictions for Financially-Interested Parties.** Attendance and participation in the SAG Portfolio Planning Process is open to all interested stakeholders. However, there may be agenda items during this process that require open discussion between Program Administrators and non-financially interested stakeholders, involving confidential and/or proprietary information. Confidential and/or proprietary topics will be identified by the SAG Facilitation Team in advance. Participants with a financial interest (e.g. current and prospective program implementers, contractors, and product representatives) must recuse themselves from attending confidential and/or proprietary meetings.
- **Writing Committee.** A small group Writing Committee will meet to discuss draft language and SAG work product, as needed. The Writing Committee includes Celia Johnson, SAG Facilitation Team; Kristol Whatley, Ameren Illinois; Karen Lusson, Illinois Attorney General’s Office; and Anne Mitchell, representing Nicor Gas. The purpose of the Writing Committee is to produce documents with a consistent voice, “look and feel”, and content, with high quality editorial review. The Writing Committee will seek to preserve substance of writings they edit.

B. Guiding Principles

The following Guiding Principles will be observed:

1. **Collaboration.** SAG meetings are intended to build trust and collaborative working relationships. Parties are encouraged to raise issues and voice concerns when they don’t support specific initiatives discussed at the SAG, and also offer constructive approaches and solutions where possible. Discussions should focus on the merits of an issue, rather than assertions of prior litigation positions or future speculation of litigation positions.
2. **Prioritizing Issues.** The SAG Facilitation Team will prioritize the issues to be addressed through the Portfolio Planning Process (see Attachment A), with input from SAG participants.

3. **Productive Discussion.** Participants in the SAG Portfolio Planning Process should avoid providing feedback to Program Administrators that is based on:
 - a. Assuming “evil” intent or inevitable opportunistic behavior.
 - b. Attempting to address extreme or worse-case scenarios.
 - c. Creating opportunities to micro-manage Portfolio Administrators.
 - d. Seeking information for purposes of seeking future cost disallowances.

C. Process Guidelines

The following Process Guidelines will be observed:

- **Proposal Support.** SAG participants that propose to discuss a policy change, Program design, or other topic relevant to the SAG Portfolio Planning Process shall demonstrate fact-based support of their recommendation(s) prior to discussion at SAG. Support includes, but is not limited to, background, research, and data analysis. The Proposed New Program Idea Template and/or Policy / Issue Template must be submitted to the SAG Facilitation Team at least fifteen (15) Business Days in advance of scheduled discussion. The SAG Facilitation Team reserves the right to request additional information prior to scheduling discussion at SAG.
- **Discussions in the Nature of Settlement Discussions.** The SAG Facilitation team will seek to build group consensus on issues that are addressed through the Portfolio Planning Process. Consensus decision-making is in the nature of settlement discussions. As a matter of general agreement, positions or statements made during SAG meetings shall not be used by any party to contradict or impeach another party’s position, or prove a party’s position, in a Commission proceeding. See Section V, Settlement Policy, for more information. If, after a reasonable period of time as determined by the SAG Facilitation Team, consensus is not reached, the SAG Facilitation Team will prepare a “Comparison Exhibit” that tracks areas of non-consensus, including positions and rationale.
- **Conflict of Interest Policy.** Various SAG participants have raised concerns about stakeholder participation on sensitive issues that may arise during the SAG Portfolio Planning Process. A conflict of interest is present when a SAG participant, in the judgment of the SAG Facilitation Team, has a financial stake in a SAG discussion topic and participation of the financially interested party could have adverse consequences, such as hindering complete and frank discussions. SAG participants that have a conflict of interest in specific meetings topics must recuse themselves from participating in those meetings. Topics that may include conflicts of interest and the associated SAG participants include, but are not limited to, the following: 1) Discussion of proprietary and/or confidential information (e.g. current and prospective program implementers, contractors, and product representatives); 2) current and past program performance (e.g. current program implementers and contractors); 3) Future bids (e.g. current and prospective program implementers, potential bidders, and contractors); and 4) Evaluation performance and proposed changes (e.g. current and prospective independent evaluation contractors).

III. Settlement Policy – TBD

Kristol Whatley (Ameren IL) drafted a proposed settlement policy and stipulation – to be discussed at the September/October SAG meetings.

IV. Schedule

The schedule below has been developed for the Planning Process by the SAG Facilitation Team.² Meeting invitations are circulated to the SAG distribution list. See Attachment C for additional details on SAG Portfolio Planning Process schedule topics. Schedule topics may be re-adjusted, as needed. If adjustments occur, the SAG Facilitation Team will provide advance notice to SAG participants.

| 2015 Portfolio Planning Process Meetings | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| Date(s) | Agenda Item(s) | Presenter(s) | Deliverable | Next Steps |
| Tues., July 28 | Stakeholder Group Discussion on SAG Portfolio Planning Process | Annette Beitel, EE SAG Facilitator | Draft Portfolio Planning Process Plan document | 1) Circulate updated final draft SAG Portfolio Planning Process Project Plan prior to September meeting. 2) Confirm presenters/topics for Sept. meetings. |
| Mon., Sept. 28 - Tues., Sept. 29 | <u>Day 1</u> 1. IL-NTG Working Group Report-out 2. Clean Power Plan – Overview of Final Rule 3. Illinois Energy Roadmap Overview 4. State Carbon Emissions Tool 5. NRDC Analysis (TBD) 6. How does the Clean Power Plan impact the SAG Portfolio Planning Process? 7. ComEd presents current Portfolio (EPY7) 8. Ameren IL presents current Portfolio (EPY7, GPY4) | 1. Residential – Jane Colby, Cadmus; C&I – David Diebel, ADM 2. Julia Friedman, MEEA 3. Molly Lunn, the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity 4. Becky Stanfield, NRDC 5. Chris Neme, Energy Futures Group, on behalf of NRDC 6. Annette Beitel, SAG Facilitator 7. Todd Thornburg, ComEd 8. Keith Goerss, Ameren IL | Presentations due by Sept. 22. | To be determined following meeting discussion. |
| | <u>Day 2</u> 1. TRM Version 5.0 Update 2. Addt'l Program Administrator presentations on current Portfolios, including IPA programs (Ameren IL and ComEd). | 1. Sam Dent and Cheryl Jenkins, VEIC 2. Program Administrators (Keith Goerss, Ameren IL; Jim Jerozal, Nicor Gas; Paige Knutsen, Franklin Energy on behalf of PG-NSG; Molly Lunn, the Dept.) | Completed Portfolio Planning Template due by Sept. 15. | Initial Stakeholder input on current programs and programs that could be improved. Discuss consensus stakeholder input on areas of existing portfolio to scale-up/scale down. |

² The 2015 and 2016 schedule also includes regular SAG topics, as indicated in yellow highlight in Attachment C.

| 2015 Portfolio Planning Process Meetings | | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------------------|--|
| Date(s) | Agenda Item(s) | Presenter(s) | Deliverable | Next Steps |
| Mon. Oct. 26 - Tues., Oct. 27 | <u>Day 1</u> 1. Changes to current Program design – follow-up discussion on Sept. Program Administrator presentations 2. Midstream/Upstream Opportunities 3. Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity Funding 4. Annual vs. lifetime savings 5. Allocation across Programs 6. IPA portfolio – what should be included? | 1. Annette Beitel, SAG Facilitator 2. Phil Mosenthal, Optimal Energy, on behalf of IL AG 3. Annette Beitel, SAG Facilitator; Molly Lunn, DCEO 4. Chris Neme, Energy Futures Group, on behalf of NRDC 5. Annette Beitel, SAG Facilitator 6. Annette Beitel, SAG Facilitator | Presentations due by Oct. 20 | SAG Facilitation Team to track stakeholder input on current Programs and planning issues. |
| | <u>Day 2</u> 1. Preliminary Potential Study Results (Ameren IL) 2. Customers Served by Portfolios 3. Electronic TRM presentation follow-up (tentative) 4. Illinois Clean Energy Finance “Tune-Up” Memo 5. Smart T-stat Follow-up (Navigant); Nicor Gas presentation on Emerging Technologies Program t-stat results 6. Clean Power Plan Model 7. Utility/the Department Quarterly Report-outs – Q4/annual; Q1 for current program year | 1. Keith Goerss, Ameren IL 2. Presenter TBD 3. Presenter TBD 4. Molly Lunn, Department 5. Bill Provencher, Navigant; Todd Thornburg, ComEd; Jim Jerozal, Nicor Gas 6. Ian Adams, Clean Energy Trust; Doug Jester, 5 Lakes Energy 7. Program Administrators | Presentations due by Oct. 20. | To be determined following meeting discussion. Completed Proposed New Program Idea Template for any new ideas due by Oct. 30. |
| Mon., Nov. 16 - Tues., Nov. 17 | <u>Day 1</u> Presentations on Proposed New Program Ideas | Presenters TBD (Note - completed Proposed New Program Idea Templates were due by Oct. 30). | | Consensus stakeholder input on which new initiatives should be included in portfolio plans. |

| 2015 Portfolio Planning Process Meetings | | | | |
|---|---|--|------------------------------|---|
| Date(s) | Agenda Item(s) | Presenter(s) | Deliverable | Next Steps |
| | <u>Day 2</u> 1. Lighting Opportunities 2. New Technology Opportunities 3. Financing Programs 4. Demand Response Programs 5. Voltage Optimization 6. Role of Codes and Standards / Codes Collaborative | 1. Phil Mosenthal, Optimal Energy, on behalf of IL AG 2. Hammad Chaudhry, Nicor Gas 3. Bryan McDaniel, CUB 4. Mike Brandt, ComEd; Keith Goerss, Ameren IL 5. Kristin Munch, CUB 6. Molly Lunn, Department | Presentations due by Nov. 9. | Proposed policy changes due Nov. 16 (completed Policy / Issue Template) |
| Mon., Dec. 14 - Tues., Dec. 15 | <u>Day 1</u> Presentations on Proposed New Program Ideas | Presenters TBD (Note - completed Proposed New Program Idea Templates were due by Oct. 30). | | Consensus stakeholder input on which new initiatives should be included in portfolio plans. |
| | <u>Day 2</u> 1. Multifamily Opportunities; EE for All Recommendations 2. Statewide Coordination; Gas-Electric Coordination; Geographically targeted EE 3. Fostering IL-based businesses and WMBE businesses 4. Leveraging Smart Meters with EE 5. Leveraging Other Players (cities, non-profits, etc.) 6. Follow-up on policy issues (following veto session) | 1. Presenter TBD 2. Annette Beitel, SAG Facilitator 3. Annette Beitel, SAG Facilitator 4. Kristin Munsch, CUB 5. Presenter TBD 6. Annette Beitel, SAG Facilitator | Presentations due by Dec. 8. | Discuss stakeholder input and consensus on new programs and initiatives to pursue. Achieve common understanding about how new policies may impact portfolio planning. |

| 2016 Portfolio Planning Process Meetings | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| Date(s) | Agenda Item(s) | Presenter(s) | Deliverable | Next Steps |
| Mon. Jan 25 - Tues., Jan. 26 | <u>Day 1</u> 1. IPA - which programs will be included in Section 16-111.5B? 2. Low-Income Funding 3. Budget Allocation to low income/moderate income 4. Wasted Energy | 1. Mike Brandt, ComEd; Keith Goerss, Ameren IL 2. Karen Lusson, IL AG 3. Annette Beitel, SAG Facilitator 4. Presenter TBD | Presentations due by Jan. 19. | |
| | <u>Day 2</u> 1. Street lighting – both DCEO and utility programs 2. Cost-Effectiveness 3. Utility/DCEO Quarterly Report-outs – Q2 (Program Administrators) | 1. Keith Goerss, Ameren IL; Molly Lunn, DCEO 2. Annette Beitel, SAG Facilitator 3. Program Administrators | Presentations due by Jan. 19. | Discuss stakeholder input and seek consensus on cost-effectiveness issues. |
| Mon. Feb. 22 - Tues., Feb. 23 | <u>Day 1</u> 1. DCEO presents high-level Potential Study results 2. SAG Feedback on DCEO Programs (ICC Directive) 3. Market Transformation (Molly Lunn, DCEO) | 1. Molly Lunn, DCEO 2. Annette Beitel, SAG Facilitator; Various 3. Molly Lunn, DCEO | Presentations (high level) on Potential Study results due Feb. 15 | Educate SAG on DCEO Potential Study results. Stakeholders provide feedback on programs. Seek consensus on market transformation initiatives to pursue. |
| | <u>Day 2</u> Program Administrators (electric and gas) present on high level Potential Study results. | Ameren IL, ComEd, Nicor Gas, Peoples Gas - North Shore Gas | Presentations (high level) on Potential Study results due Feb. 15 | Address stakeholder questions; discuss how results will impact Portfolio plans. |
| Tues., March 22 | Program Administrators present high-level draft Portfolio Plans | Ameren IL, ComEd, Department, Nicor Gas, Peoples Gas - North Shore Gas | Program Administrator presentations on high level draft Portfolio Plans due by March 6. | Build consensus with stakeholder input on issues. |

| 2016 Portfolio Planning Process Meetings | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| Date(s) | Agenda Item(s) | Presenter(s) | Deliverable | Next Steps |
| Mon. April 25 - Tues., April 26 | <u>Day 1</u> 1. Statewide marketing of Programs 2. Additional topics TBD. | 1. Phil Mosenthal, Optimal Energy, on behalf of IL AG 2. Presenters TBD | Presentations due by April 18. | Build consensus with stakeholder input on issues. |
| | <u>Day 2</u> 1. EM&V Resources and Planning. 2. CUB Proposal | 1. Presenters TBD 2. Kristin Munsch, CUB | | |
| Mon., May 16 - Wed. May 18 | <u>Day 1</u> Utilities (electric) present draft Portfolio Plans. | George Malek, ComEd; Keith Goerss, Ameren IL | Program Administrators (electric, gas, Department) to circulate draft Portfolio Plans for review and comment by Monday, April 15. Stakeholder comments on draft Portfolio Plans due Friday, May 6 (15 Business Days for review). | Build consensus on draft Portfolio Plans with stakeholder input. Draft consent agreement and Comparison Exhibit circulated for review Wed., June 8. All stakeholder comments due by Wed., June 22 (10 Business Days for review). |
| | <u>Day 2</u> Continue discussion of electric draft Portfolio Plans, if needed. Department presents draft Portfolio Plan. | Molly Lunn, Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity | | |
| | <u>Day 3</u> Utilities (gas) present draft Portfolio Plans. | Jim Jerozal, Nicor Gas; Pat Michalewicz, Peoples Gas-North Shore Gas | | |
| Mon., June 27 - Tues., June 28 | <u>Day 1</u> 1. TRM Version 6.0 – Discussion of Priority Measures 2. Discuss updated draft electric and Department Portfolio Plans and build consensus with stakeholder input. | 1. Cheryl Jenkins and Sam Dent, VEIC 2. Various; Annette Beitel, SAG Facilitator | Updated electric, Department, and gas draft Portfolio Plan filings due Fri., June 10. | Continue building consensus on updated draft electric and Dept. Portfolio Plans with stakeholder input. <i>Note: Updated gas plans to be discussed at July and September meetings.</i> |

| 2016 Portfolio Planning Process Meetings | | | | |
|---|---|--|--------------------|--|
| Date(s) | Agenda Item(s) | Presenter(s) | Deliverable | Next Steps |
| | <u>Day 2</u> Finalize consensus on draft electric and Department Portfolio Plans with stakeholder input (consent agreements, Comparison Exhibits). | Annette Beitel, SAG Facilitator; Various | | Finalize consensus on draft electric and Department Portfolio Plans with stakeholder input by July 15. |
| Tues., July 26 | Discuss updated draft gas Portfolio Plans and build consensus with stakeholder input. | Annette Beitel, SAG Facilitator; Various | | Continue building consensus on updated gas Portfolio Plans with stakeholder input. <i>Note: Final gas consensus discussion will take place in September.</i> |
| Deliverable Deadline: Fri., July 15 | <i>Finalize consent agreements with any non-consensus items (electric, DCEO).</i> | | | |
| Tues., Sept. 6 | Finalize consensus on draft gas Portfolio Plans with stakeholder input (consent agreements, Comparison Exhibits). | Annette Beitel, SAG Facilitator; Various | | Finalize consensus on draft electric and Department Portfolio Plans with stakeholder input by July 15. |
| Deliverable Deadline: Thurs., Sept. 15 | <i>Finalize consent agreements with any non-consensus items (gas).</i> | | | |

V. Deliverables and Due Dates

The following Deliverables and Due Dates will be followed by the SAG Facilitation Team and SAG participants:

| SAG Portfolio Planning Process Deliverables and Due Dates | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| <i>Due Date</i> | <i>Deliverable</i> | <i>Responsible Participants</i> | <i>SAG Meeting Date(s)</i> |
| 2015 | | | |
| Tues., September 15 | Existing Portfolio / Program templates due | Ameren IL, ComEd, Department, Nicor Gas, Peoples Gas-North Shore Gas (Program Administrators) | Mon.-Tues., September 28-29, 2015 |
| Fri., October 30, 2015 | Any new proposed Programs due (complete Proposed Program Template) | Stakeholders | Mon.-Tues., November 16-17, 2015; Mon.-Tues., December 14-15, 2015 |
| Mon., November 16 | Any new proposed policies due (complete Policy / Issue Template) | Stakeholders / Program Administrators | Policy Manual Version 2.0 Subcommittee Process (meeting dates TBD; January to May 2016) |
| 2016 | | | |
| Mon., February 15 | Potential Study Results (high level) presentations due | Program Administrators | Mon.-Tues., February 22-23, 2016 |
| Mon., March 7 | Draft Portfolio Plan (high level) presentations due | Program Administrators | Tues., March 22, 2016 |
| Mon., April 15 | Program Administrators' draft Portfolio Plans due for review and comment | Program Administrators | Mon.-Wed., May 16-18, 2016 |
| Fri., May 6 | All stakeholder comments on Program Administrator draft Portfolio plans due (15 Business Days for review) | Stakeholders | Mon.-Tues., June 27-28, 2016 |
| Wed., June 8 | Draft electric, Department, and gas Consent Agreements and Comparison Exhibits circulated for review | SAG Facilitation | Mon.-Tues., June 27-28, 2016 |
| Fri., June 10 | Updated electric, Department, and gas Program Administrator draft Portfolio plan filings due | Program Administrators | Mon.-Tues., June 27-28, 2016 |
| Wed., June 22 | Stakeholder comments on draft electric and Department Consent Agreements and Comparison Exhibits due | Stakeholders | Mon.-Tues., June 27-28, 2016 |

| SAG Portfolio Planning Process Deliverables and Due Dates | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| <i>Due Date</i> | <i>Deliverable</i> | <i>Responsible Participants</i> | <i>SAG Meeting Date(s)</i> |
| On or before Fri., July 1 | Finalize consensus on draft electric and Department Portfolio Plans with stakeholder input (Consent Agreements and Comparison Exhibits) | SAG Facilitation | Mon.-Tues., June 27-28, 2016 |
| Wed., July 20 | Stakeholder comments on draft gas Consent Agreements and Comparison Exhibits due | Stakeholders | Tues., July 26, 2016 |
| On or before September 1 | Electric companies and Department file Plans with ICC | Ameren IL, ComEd, Department | N/A |
| Thurs., September 15 | Finalize consensus on draft gas Portfolio Plans with stakeholder input (Consent Agreements and Comparison Exhibits) | SAG Facilitation | Tues., Sept. 6 |
| On or before October 1 | Gas companies file Plans with ICC | Nicor Gas, Peoples Gas-North Shore Gas | N/A |

VI. Attachments

- Attachment A: Background and Definitions
- Attachment B: Key Issues for SAG Portfolio Planning Process
- Attachment C: Schedule for SAG Portfolio Planning Process (2015-2016)
- Attachment D: Templates³:
 - Template D1: Proposed New Program Idea Template
 - Template D2: Policy / Issue Template

³ Additional templates are forthcoming.

Attachment A: Background and Definitions

I. Background

The Program Administrator Portfolio Plans that will be filed in fall 2016 represent the fourth 3-year Plan filings for electric Program Administrators (Ameren IL, ComEd, and the Department) and the third 3-year Plan filings for gas Program Administrators (Nicor Gas, Peoples Gas-North Shore Gas, and the Department). Since 2008, SAG has provided a venue for Program Administrators and stakeholders to work together to discuss a variety of issues and reach consensus on directives from the Commission. Program Administrators and stakeholders have achieved many successes throughout this process. Over the years, a number of SAG participants have expressed interest in reducing litigation in Plan dockets. The SAG Portfolio Planning Process was created to address this concern and provide a consensus-seeking process to discuss Energy Efficiency policies, initiatives, and draft Plans in advance of the next required filings. A summary of directives to SAG in past Plan filings is provided below, for reference.

Commission directives to SAG (excerpted):

- The responsibilities of the Illinois SAG include, but are not limited to: reviewing final program designs; establishing agreed-upon performance metrics for measuring Portfolio and program performance; reviewing Plan progress against metrics and against statutory goals; reviewing program additions or discontinuations; reviewing new proposed programs for the next program cycle; and reviewing program budget shifts between programs where the change is more than 20% (ComEd Final Order, [07-0540 at 32](#); Ameren Final Order, [07-0539 at 24](#)).
- In the Final Order of the second three-year electric energy efficiency Plans and first three-year gas Plans, the assigned additional duties to the SAG included the development of a Technical Reference Manual for approval by the ICC (e.g., ComEd Final Order, [10-0570 at 59](#); Policy Division Staff Report, [12-0528](#)).
- In January 2014, the ICC issued final orders in the third three-year electric Plans, and further expanded SAG duties to include, among other issues, reviewing new program designs, further discussing issues that remained unresolved in litigation, and the creation of an Illinois Energy Efficiency Policy Manual (e.g., [Ameren IL Final Order, 13-0498](#); [ComEd Final Order, 13-0495](#); [DCEO Final Order, 13-0499](#)). Final Orders in the second three-year gas Plans were issued in May 2014 and include similar expansion of SAG issues (e.g., [Nicor Gas Final Order, 13-0549](#); [Peoples Gas-North Shore Gas Final Order, 13-0550](#)).

II. Definitions

The following terms may be used in this Project Plan.⁴ Defined terms include, but are not limited to:

- **Commission or ICC** means the Illinois Commerce Commission, which is created and established under the provisions of the Public Utilities Act.⁵

⁴ Excerpted from Illinois Energy Efficiency Policy Manual Version 1.0 (filed with the Commission for approval on August 26, 2015 – see ICC Docket No. 15-0487).

⁵ Public Utilities Act (220 ILCS 5/3-102).

- **Energy Efficiency** means Measures that reduce the amount of energy, electricity, or natural gas required to achieve a given end use. Energy Efficiency also includes Measures that reduce the total Btus of electricity and natural gas needed to meet the end use or uses.⁶
- **Illinois Energy Efficiency Stakeholder Advisory Group (EE SAG or SAG)** means an Energy Efficiency and Demand Response advisory body established by the Commission that is open to all interested participants. SAG is a forum that allows parties to express different opinions, better understand the opinions of others, and foster collaboration and consensus, where possible and appropriate.
- **Measure(s)** means an energy-using appliance, piece of equipment, audit, or practice that will result in measurable, reduced energy usage at a comparable level of service.
- **Plan** means the document filed by Program Administrators for approval by the Commission that includes electric and gas Energy Efficiency Programs and electric Demand Response Programs, pursuant to Section 8-103 and 8-104 of the Public Utilities Act.
- **Portfolio** means a group of Energy Efficiency Programs funded by Customers that are offered by Program Administrators during the three-year Program cycle pursuant to Section 8-103 and Section 8-104 of the Public Utilities Act.
- **Program** means an Energy Efficiency or Demand Response Program within the Portfolio offered to Eligible Customers of Program Administrators pursuant to Section 8-1039; a Section 16-111.5B Program offered to Eligible Customers of Ameren Illinois Company and/or Commonwealth Edison Company¹⁰; and/or an Energy Efficiency Program within the Portfolio offered to Eligible Customers of Program Administrators pursuant to Section 8-104.⁷
- **Program Administrator(s)** means Ameren Illinois Company (Ameren IL), Commonwealth Edison Company (ComEd), the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (Department), Northern Illinois Gas Company d/b/a Nicor Gas Company (Nicor Gas), the Peoples Gas Light & Coke Company and North Shore Gas Company (Peoples Gas-North Shore Gas), offering Programs pursuant to Section 8-103, Section 8-104, and/or Section 16-111.5B of the Public Utilities Act.
- **Program Year** or **Plan Year** means the year during which Energy Efficiency Programs offered by Program Administrators operate, from June 1 to May 31.
- **SAG Facilitation Team** means the independent organization under contract to facilitate the Illinois Energy Efficiency Stakeholder Advisory Group. For the purposes of this Project Plan, Annette Beitel (annette.beitel@futee.biz) and Celia Johnson (celia.johnson@futee.biz), of Future Energy Enterprises are the SAG facilitators.

⁶ Illinois Power Agency Act (20 ILCS 3855/1-10); Public Utilities Act (220 ILCS 5/8-104(b)).

⁷ Public Utilities Act (220 ILCS 5/8-104).

Attachment B: Key Issues for SAG Portfolio Planning Process

Threshold Issues

- All parties must commit that positions taken during this process, including presentations and comments made during discussion meetings, will not be used in litigation – “rules of the road.”
 - **ACT:** Kristol Whatley (Ameren IL) is drafting a proposed stipulation.
- What is the scope, sequencing and timing of issues?
- Commission approval of Plans⁸:
 - High level topics to be included:
 - Statutory topics for Commission approval:
 - Portfolio Savings, budgets
 - Program Budgets (within 20%)
 - Program content (an opportunity for Customers of all rate classes to participate)
 - Independent evaluation – timing for issuance of evaluator RFPs to ensure a contract is in place at the start of the programs
 - Additional topics for Commission approval:
 - Policy rules
 - Anything else?
 - For electric utilities, what belongs in IPA Portfolio?
 - What do the plans really need to settle?
 - What is within Administrator discretion?
 - With accountability comes responsibility.
 - Process issue: Syncing the specific dates in the tariffs for certain utility filings.
- What would planners/stakeholders like to know up-front?
- What is goal of discussion?
 - Stipulated agreements at end?
 - Who should participate? Review past Plan dockets to determine intervenors.
- What won't settle?
- What is current performance of Portfolios?
- Figure out what issues merit time
 - For proposals to be included in the Plan, the interested stakeholder should include impacts to the Plan, including costs and savings. Utilities should also do this as part of their planning process. This information should be allowed to be used in the docket.⁹
- Annual vs. lifetime savings
- Program gaps and overall Plan design goals
 - What are we trying to accomplish?
 - Continued enhancement of gas and electric coordination
- Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity budget
 - Can EE help former LIHEAP customers that have been cut off, to reduce usage?
- What information do we need to know to have informed discussions?
 - Data on current (2014) budget across programs
 - Data on cost/unit energy across programs
 - Non-program costs – where is money going?
 - Marketing – 3-4%

⁸ See Section 8-103(f) and 8-104(f) for a list of filing requirements for Plans.

⁹ See 10-0568 Final Order at 26-27 (December 21, 2010).

- Research and development (“R&D”) – 3%
- Evaluation, measurement and verification (“EM&V”) – 3%
- Administrative costs – generally less than 5% in IL
- Can the utilities clarify in the Plan whether the non-Program costs used in the Plan represent any non-Rider costs?

Up Front Issues for Discussion

1. Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity Funding
 - Amount
 - Areas they would cover
 - Independent evaluation contract
 - What are realistic goals for the Department?
 - What is the load of customers that the Department actually serves, as a % of entire load?
2. What goes into IPA?
 - SAG participants need to understand what is in the current IPA Portfolio.
3. Allocation across Programs
 - Residential vs. Commercial and Industrial (“C&I”)
 - Maximize savings?
 - Funds allocated according to class contribution or more generally
 - “Balanced” Portfolio of options for customers
 - Roles that Potential Studies play in determining the allocation
4. Annual vs. Lifetime savings
 - To what extent should Program Administrators focus on annual vs. lifetime savings?
5. Costs – cents/First year (and lifetime) kWh and dollars/First year (and lifetime) therm
 - Gas and electric costs – what is current price per kWh/therm savings of the residential and C&I Portfolios?
 - i. Res
 - ii. C&I
 - iii. Low Income
 - iv. By program?
 - What is reasonably aggressive goal (price/kWh; price/therm) for residential and C&I Portfolios?
6. Changes to Current Program Design (starting point – current Portfolios)
 - Are any changes needed? Is there evidence to support that change?
 - Custom Programs – how do Program Administrators come up with savings?

Additional Issues for Discussion

1. Funding allocated to low income/moderate income
 - Defining “low income” and “moderate income” customers
 - i. Expansion of the low income customer definition.
 - ii. What does “moderate income mean”? What is the purpose of offering programs to this particular subset of customers?
 - Should there be effort to identify how much these populations contribute? Yes.
 - Policy Issue: How much to allocate to these customers?
 - i. At a minimum, proportionate share to customer population.
 - ii. Is this concern the share of low/moderate income population, or the share of the total population?
 - It is possible to offer less efficient equipment for low-income programs and achieve greater savings. (For ex: A 95% AFUE furnace saves apx. 3% more gas

than a 92% AFUE furnace, however the cost is apx. 20-25% more). Can the low-income programs serve more customers with their budget if this approach is utilized?

2. Cost-Effectiveness Issues
 - o Cost-Effectiveness of Portfolio
 - o Cost-Effectiveness Screening Issues
 - i. NEBs
 - ii. Common inputs
 1. Transparency in the sources (not always common)
 2. Transparency in incremental cost assumptions
 - iii. Sensitivity analysis
 1. Societal vs. cost of capital discount rate
 - iv. Providing joint program TRC results in Plan filings
3. Large C&I Customers
 - o Customers are currently being served; this sector will not be separately addressed as part of the planning process.
4. Are we allocating EM&V resources in an ideal way? If not, are there any fundamental changes that need to be considered?
 - o How much money impact vs. process?
 - o Forward looking vs. bean counting?
 - o Do we need simple discussion annually about forward-looking EM&V?
5. Program Design
 - o What specific programs could be improved?
 - o Maximizing savings vs. comprehensiveness.
 - o New program ideas/new technologies/new services? Additional description in the Plans on demonstration of “breakthrough equipment and devices.”
 - o Are upstream incentives being utilized to their full potential?
 - o Gas vs. electric spending (Section 8-104 limits)
 - o Smart Grid – are we fully leveraging deployment of smart meters through EE? (This question needs to be addressed within the context of where each utility will be in terms of service territory installation rates.)
 - o Role of Codes and Standards – can we claim savings? (Codes Collaborative – will this continue?)
 - o Role of Market Transformation
 - i. What are markets we want to prioritize for transformation
 - ii. How broadly should market transformation be defined?
6. Wasted Energy – do we have effective program strategies to capture?
7. Portfolio Gaps?
 - o Programs
 - o Technologies
8. Process Moving forward
 - o Matrix
 - i. Dollars/Budget
 - ii. Take off top – Portfolio costs
 1. EM&V; admin; general marketing
 - iii. Historic Information in Matrix
 1. Can the utilities clarify in the Plan and in data presented for historic detail, whether the non-Program costs used in the Plan represent any non-Rider costs?
 2. For joint programs, costs and savings for both electric and gas should be included.

- Top Down
- 9. Potential Studies
 - Role of potential studies. How will they be used?
 - i. Gas – Are there areas we are not currently getting?
 - ii. IPA – Could we use to identify other decisions that could go into Plan?
 - iii. Are there areas we have not been pursuing?
 - What are the bounds of potential studies?
 - i. Is there information gathered that could be leveraged to update the TRM?
 - ii. Is there information gathered that could inform estimates for non-participant spillover?
- 10. Gas-Electric Coordination
 - What programs should be coordinated, ideally?
 - To what extent does lower gas budget preclude full coordination?
 - Providing joint TRC results for programs.
 - Timing to facilitate ComEd having gas final numbers when their Plan is filed.
- 11. Adjustable Goals
 - Reach agreement on the NTG ratios used in the Plan filing.
 - Transparency in calculations and key inputs to facilitate any adjustments. Use the TRM measure code and articulate any assumptions made in calculating.
 - Adjustable Goals template will be discussed in a small group in Policy Manual Subcommittee Version 2.0 process.
- 12. Statewide Program Marketing
 - Can we move to statewide trademark and marketing, similar to MASSaves?¹⁰
 - Pros/Cons of this approach.
- 13. Policy Changes
 - Are any needed? Policy changes will be developed through Policy Manual Subcommittee Version 2.0 process. Completed Policy / Issue Template due by November 16, 2015.
- 14. Demand Response
 - Inclusion in the next Plan. Is it appropriate to continue these programs once the statutory requirement ends? What about customers that have already signed up?
- 15. Voltage Optimization
 - What is the feasibility to offer this?
- 16. Economically Efficient Potential
 - What are Program Administrators doing with this information? How will this be considered in Plan development?
- 17. Statewide Coordination
 - For which programs/markets might it be appropriate to have greater coordination and/or identical statewide effort?
- 18. Geographically-targeted EE
 - To alleviate T&D
- 19. New Initiatives / Proposed New Program Ideas
 - To be submitted by interested stakeholders (by completing the Proposed New Program Idea Template). Interested stakeholders must submit the Proposed New Program Idea template by October 30, 2015.

¹⁰ See <http://www.masssave.com/en/about-mass-save>.

Attachment C: Schedule for SAG Portfolio Planning Process (2015-2016)

Proposed presenters are identified in parenthesis. The purpose of each meeting is described prior to the list of meeting topics. Goals for each meeting are listed below meeting topics. Deliverables and due dates can be found in the Portfolio Project Plan. Monthly schedules also include “regular” SAG topics, as applicable. “Regular” SAG topics are highlighted **in yellow**.

2015 Meetings

July (Large Group SAG Meeting – July 28th, 2015)

- *Purpose: To narrow key issues; determine if there are additional issues; discuss questions and next steps.*

Meeting Topics:

- Stakeholder Group Discussion (Annette Beitel, SAG Facilitator)
 - Expected outcome
 - Review scope, deliverables, and responsibilities
 - Lessons learned from the Policy Manual development process
 - Scope – what will stakeholders seek to reach resolution on?
 - Overall budget
 - Targets
 - List of Programs
 - New Initiatives
 - Be clear about what will be left to the administrator’s discretion:
 - Allocation of funds to different programs
 - Program details
 - Schedule/deliverables/responsibilities
 - Question for discussion:
 - How do we retain focus on key issues and avoid spending too much time on issues that either are not of general interest, are not going to have big impacts on statutory objectives and/or impinge on Program Administrator discretion?
- **Goals:**
 - Agreement on Process: Stakeholder discussion/agreement about scope/schedule/deliverables/goals of stakeholder Portfolio planning process
 - Agreement on Process Rules: Reach agreement on process and how to avoid spending unnecessary time on unproductive discussions on minor issues/details.

August (Prep Work):

- Develop Program Administrator Portfolio/Program Data template on current Portfolios (Sue Nathan, AEG; with input from Program Administrators; SAG Facilitation)
- Develop Project Plan, schedule and process “Ground Rules,” including settlement discussion rules. (SAG Facilitation; Kristol Whatley to propose draft stipulation and settlement policies)
- Identify all parties who should be notified of planning process and schedule so they can participate when interested (SAG Facilitation):
 - Prior EE Plan intervenors
 - Others:
 - Cities: City of Chicago; Metropolitan Mayor’s Caucus
 - Large C&I customers and representatives

- Low Income (HUD, Chicago Housing Authority, other authorities – Rockford, IL AG recommendation on low income rep)
- Any other parties?
- **Goal:**
 - Various parties to complete prep work to ensure an informed planning process.

September (Prep Work):

- Program Administrators to complete Portfolio/Program Data in common template (2014 Base Year)
 - Program NTG and TRCs
 - Program cost/unit energy
 - Program budgets and savings
 - Any other data?
 - Admin costs (Portfolio-Level Admin, M&O)
- Program Administrators to provide C/E screening inputs in template (besides TRM values)
 - Confidential items (avoided costs) don't have to be included
 - Any basis for confidential avoided costs?
 - NDA for parties to review who want to?
 - At least generic \$/MW value
 - Cost per marginal MWh should be disclosed so we can use for general cost-effectiveness.
 - NEBs – Portfolio or measure-level?
- Develop “Portfolio and Program Filing Template” (SAG Facilitation; review Massachusetts filing for ideas):
 - Portfolio Template
 - Front Matter
 - Program Template
 - Existing programs – key changes
 - New Programs – more detail
- Survey of other leading jurisdictions to identify program gaps (VT, MA, CA, Other Midwestern) (SAG Facilitation; Stakeholders)
- **Goal:**
 - Various parties to complete prep work to ensure planning process informed.

September (SAG Meeting +1, Monday/Tuesday – September 28-29th)

- *Purpose: To educate SAG. Discuss questions and/or concerns. Determine whether there are additional threshold and general allocation issues to consider. Discuss whether there are additional program types in IL that could be improved in the next Plan cycle.*

Meeting Topics (Day 1):

- IL-NTG Working Group Report-out (Residential – Jane Colby, Cadmus; C&I – David Diebel, ADM)
- Clean Power Plan:
 - Clean Power Plan – Overview of Final Rule (Julia Friedman, MEEA)
 - Illinois Energy Roadmap Overview (Molly Lunn, the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity; Kevin Green, IL EPA)
 - State Carbon Emissions Tool (Becky Stanfield, NRDC)
 - NRDC Analysis (TBD – Chris Neme, Energy Futures Group, on behalf of NRDC)

- SAG Portfolio Planning Process Kick-off (Annette Beitel, EE SAG Facilitator)
- Draft Consent Agreement/Proposed Stipulation; Proposed Path Forward – Planning Discussions (Annette Beitel, EE SAG Facilitator; Kristol Whatley, Ameren IL)
- ComEd Overview of EPY7 (Todd Thornburg, ComEd)
- Ameren IL Overview of EPY7/GPY4 (Keith Goerss, Ameren IL)

Meeting Topics (Day 2):

- Ameren IL Overview of EPY7/GPY4 – continued (Keith Goerss, Ameren IL)
- TRM Version 5.0 Update (Sam Dent, Cheryl Jenkins, and Rebecca Foster, VEIC)
- Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity Overview of EPY7/GPY4 (Molly Lunn, the Department)
- Nicor Gas Overview of GPY4 (Jim Jerozal, Nicor Gas)
- Peoples Gas-North Shore Gas Overview of GPY4 (Paige Knutsen, Franklin Energy, on behalf of PG-NSG)
- **Goals:**
 - Educate SAG on current programs, including areas of scale-up/scale-down; which programs are going well; etc.
 - Initial Stakeholder input on current programs.

October/November (2 SAG Meetings + 2 days (4 Days – Monday/Tuesday October 26th – 27th; Monday/Tuesday, November 16th – 17th) – Up-front issues; new program ideas/initiatives

- *Purpose: To discuss and reach consensus on threshold “up front” issues. To educate SAG on proposed new initiatives; answer questions and concerns; determine if any additional research is needed. Discuss consensus on new initiatives to be included in Portfolio Plans.*

Meeting Topics (October Day 1; Up Front Threshold Issues):

- Changes to current Program design – follow-up on September Program Administrator presentations (Annette Beitel, SAG Facilitator)
 - Portfolios and programs are mature – evidence-based discussion to inform changes (for example: other jurisdictions)
 - Are there any Portfolio gaps?
 - Are there programs in other Midwest jurisdictions; as well as CA; NY; MA and VT that are missing in IL?
 - Any technologies missing?
 - Maximizing savings vs. comprehensiveness
 - What specific programs could be improved?
 - Are there new program ideas/new services that could be added?
 - Example: Additional description in the Plans is needed on demonstration of “breakthrough equipment and devices.”
- Midstream/Upstream Opportunities (Phil Mosenthal, Optimal Energy, on behalf of IL AG)
 - Are upstream incentives being utilized to their full potential?
- Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity Funding (Annette Beitel, SAG Facilitator; Molly Lunn, Department)
 - What % of the total budget should be going to low-income? Should the utilities also serve low-income customers?
 - Can EE help former LIHEAP customers that have been cut off, to reduce usage?
- Annual vs. lifetime savings (Chris Neme, Energy Futures Group, on behalf of NRDC)
- Allocation across Programs (Annette Beitel, SAG Facilitator)

- Residential vs. Commercial and Industrial (“C&I”)
 - “Balanced” Portfolio of options for customers
 - Gas vs. electric spending
 - Should electric utilities put more money into joint programs if gas is limited and electric is still cost-effective?
 - Maximize savings?
 - Funds allocated according to class contribution or more generally?
 - “Balanced” Portfolio of options for customers
 - Roles that Potential Studies play in determining the allocation
- IPA Portfolio – what should be included? (Annette Beitel, SAG Facilitator)
- **Goals:**
 - Identify current Programs that potentially could be improved.
 - Discuss consensus stakeholder input on areas of existing Portfolio to scale-up/scale down.
 - Educate SAG; address stakeholder questions. Consensus stakeholder input on threshold planning issues.

Meeting Topics (October Day 2):

- Preliminary Potential Study Results for Ameren IL (Keith Goerss, Ameren IL)
- Customers Served by Portfolios (Presenter TBD):
 - Discuss niche customers that are currently not being served
 - C&I Customers – how can we improve offerings?
- Electronic TRM Presentations (tentative)
- Illinois Clean Energy Finance “Tune-Up” Memo (Molly Lunn, the Department)
- Smart T-stat Discussion (follow-up from June 23rd SAG meeting)
 - Smart T-stat Evaluation Results – Navigant
 - Nicor Gas Emerging Technologies t-stat results – Nicor Gas
 - Smart t-stat scale-up in next 3-year Plan? (Todd Thornburg, ComEd)
- Clean Power Plan Model (Ian Adams, Clean Energy Trust; Doug Jester, 5 Lakes Energy)
- Utility/the Department Quarterly Report-outs – Q4/annual for last program year; Q1 for current program year (Program Administrators)

Meeting Topics (November Day 1):

- Presentations on Proposed New Program Ideas (Specific topics/presenters TBD – Proposed Program Idea Templates due on or before 10/30/15)
- **Goals:**
 - Educate SAG on proposed new program ideas/initiatives.
 - Consensus stakeholder input on which new initiatives should be included in Portfolio Plans.

Meeting Topics (November Day 2):

- Lighting Opportunities (Phil Mosenthal, Optimal Energy, on behalf of IL AG)
- New Technology Opportunities (Hammad Chaudhry, Nicor Gas)
- Financing programs (Bryan McDaniel, CUB)
 - MASSaves Loan Program
 - Commercial PACE
 - Expand IL on-bill financing, use bill payment rather than credit score for determining eligibility
 - Any others?

- Demand Response Programs (Mike Brandt, ComEd; Keith Goerss, Ameren IL)
 - Overview of current programs (Ameren IL and ComEd)
 - Inclusion in next Plan; is it appropriate to continue this program once the statutory requirement ends? What will happen to customers that have already signed up?
 - More focus on peak demand reductions.
 - Integrating DR in better ways.
- Voltage Optimization (Kristin Munsch, CUB)
- Role of Codes and Standards – can we claim savings? (Codes Collaborative – will this continue?) (Molly Lunn, the Department)
- **Goal:**
 - Educate SAG.
 - Consensus stakeholder input on issues.

December (SAG meeting +1 – Monday/Tuesday, December 14th – 15th)

- *Purpose: Continue seeking to reach consensus on threshold “up front” issues. To educate SAG on proposed new initiatives; answer questions and concerns; determine if any additional research is needed. Discuss consensus on new initiatives to be included in Portfolio Plans. Follow-up on October/November new initiative presentations, as needed.*

Meeting Topics (Day 1):

- Presentations on Proposed New Program Ideas (Specific topics/presenters TBD – Proposed Program Idea Templates due on or before 10/30/15)
- **Goals:**
 - Educate SAG on proposed new program ideas/initiatives.
 - Consensus stakeholder input on which new initiatives should be included in Portfolio Plans.

Meeting Topics (Day 2):

- Multifamily Program Opportunities; EE for All Recommendations (Presenter TBD)
- Statewide Coordination (Annette Beitel, SAG Facilitator)
 - For which programs/markets might it be appropriate to have greater coordination and/or identical statewide effort?
 - Gas/Electric Coordination
 - What programs should be coordinated, ideally?
 - To what extent does lower gas budget preclude full coordination?
 - Timing issues: a) Providing joint TRC results for programs; and b) Timing to facilitate ComEd having final gas numbers when their Plan is filed.
 - Geographically targeted EE to alleviate T&D
- Fostering IL-based businesses and WMBE businesses (Annette Beitel, SAG Facilitator)
 - Non-profits, WMBEs, etc.
 - Successful approaches in other jurisdictions
- Leveraging Smart Meters with EE (Kristin Munsch, CUB)
 - Are we fully leveraging deployment of smart meters through EE? This question needs to be addressed within the context of where each utility will be in terms of service territory installation rates.
- Leveraging Other Players (cities, non-profits, etc.) (Presenter TBD)
- Follow-up on energy policy issues, following IL veto session, if applicable (Annette Beitel, SAG Facilitator)

- IL Legislation Changes
- Additional policy issue: expansion of gas funds (requires legislation).
- **Goals:**
 - Discuss stakeholder input and consensus on issues.
 - Achieve common understanding about how new energy policies will impact Portfolio planning, if applicable.

2016 Meetings

January (SAG Meeting +1) (Monday/Tuesday; January 25th – 26th)

- *Purpose: Seek to reach consensus on portfolio issues, including which programs will be included as Illinois Power Agency programs; low-income funding; and budget allocation to “low income” and “moderate income” customers.*

Meeting Topics (Day 1):

- IPA – which programs will be included as Illinois Power Agency Programs through Section 16-111.5B? (Mike Brandt, ComEd; Keith Goerss, Ameren IL)
- Low-Income Funding (Karen Lusson, IL AG)
 - What percent of IL customers are low-income?
 - Are they getting fair share of funds back given the amount currently going to the Department?
 - Allocation should be proportionate to low income in the customer base.
- Budget allocation to low income/moderate income (Annette Beitel, SAG Facilitator)
 - Defining “low income” and “moderate income” customers
 - Expansion of the low income customer definition.
 - What does “moderate income mean”? What is the purpose of offering programs to this particular subset of customers
 - Should there be effort to identify how much these populations contribute? Yes.
 - Policy Issue: How much to allocate to low/moderate income? – At a minimum, proportionate share to customer population.
 - Is this concern the share of low/moderate income population, or the share of the total population?
 - It is possible to offer less efficient equipment for low-income programs and achieve greater savings. (For ex: A 95% AFUE furnace saves apx. 3% more gas than a 92% AFUE furnace, however the cost is apx. 20-25% more). Can the low-income programs serve more customers with their budget if this approach is utilized?
 - How much \$ is going to low-income?
- Wasted Energy (Presenter TBD)
- **Goal:**
 - Discuss stakeholder input and consensus on new programs, initiatives, technologies to pursue.

Meeting Topics (Day 2, including regular SAG topics):

- Street lighting – Ameren IL and Department Programs (Keith Goerss, Ameren IL; Molly Lunn, Department)
 - Current programs.
 - Is there an opportunity for street lighting in the next Portfolio Plans?
- Cost-Effectiveness (Annette Beitel, SAG Facilitator)
 - C/E of Portfolio

- Cost-Effectiveness Screening Issues
 - NEBs
 - Common inputs
 - Transparency in the sources (not always common)
 - Transparency in incremental cost assumptions
 - Providing joint program TRC results in Plan filings
 - Sensitivity analysis
 - Societal vs. cost of capital discount rate
- **Utility/Department Quarterly Report-outs – Q2 (Program Administrators)**
- **Goals:**
 - Discuss stakeholder input and seek consensus on cost-effectiveness issues.

February (SAG Meeting + 1 day; Monday/Tuesday, February 22nd – 23rd)

- *Purpose: Educate SAG on results of Potential Studies. Address stakeholder questions; determine if there is any follow-up needed. SAG feedback on Department programs (ICC directive).*

Meeting Topics (Day 1):

- Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity presents high level Potential Study results (Molly Lunn, the Department)
- SAG feedback on Department Programs – ICC directive (Annette Beitel, SAG Facilitator; Various)
- Market Transformation (Molly Lunn, the Department)
 - Question to address: Are current market transformation efforts maximizing market transformation?
 - New initiatives.
 - Training
 - Labeling and disclosure of efficiency at time-of-sale
 - Rental energy codes (Boulder, CO and Burlington, VT examples)
- **Goals:**
 - Educate SAG on the Department's Potential Study results; address stakeholder questions; discuss how results will impact Portfolio Plan.
 - Stakeholders provide feedback on Department Programs.
 - Seek consensus on market transformation initiatives to pursue.

Meeting Topics (Day 2):

- Program Administrators (electric and gas) present on high level Potential Study results.
 - Economically Efficient Potential – what are Program Administrators doing with this information? How will this be considered in Plan development?
- **Goals:**
 - Educate SAG on utility Potential Study results; address stakeholder questions; discuss how results will impact Portfolio Plans.

March (SAG Meeting, Tuesday, March 22nd)

- *Purpose: Educate SAG on high level Program Administrator Portfolio Plans. Address stakeholder questions and concerns; determine if additional follow-up is needed.*

Meeting Topics:

- Program Administrators present on high level Portfolio Plans¹¹, including:
 - List of programs.
 - Identification of any new programs.
 - Detail regarding any major program changes.
 - Rough allocation between residential and non-residential programs.
 - Preliminary savings and budget.
- **Goals:**
 - Discuss questions and build consensus with stakeholder input on issues.

April (SAG meeting + 1 day; Monday/Tuesday April 25th – 26th)

- *Purpose: To educate SAG on plan issues; address questions; build consensus.*

Meeting Topics (Day 1):

- Marketing of programs (Phil Mosenthal, Optimal Energy, on behalf of IL AG)
 - Can we move to statewide trademark and marketing, similar to MASSaves?
 - i. MASSaves: <http://www.masssave.com/en/about-mass-save>
 - ii. Pros/Cons of statewide marketing.
- Additional topics TBD.
- **Goals:**
 - Educate SAG.
 - Discuss questions and feedback.

Meeting Topics (Day 2):

- EM&V Resources and Planning: (Annette Beitel, SAG Facilitator; Various)
 - Are we allocating EM&V resources in an ideal way? If not, are there any fundamental changes that need to be considered?
 - iii. How much money impact vs. process?
 - iv. Forward looking vs. bean counting?
 - v. Do we need simple discussion annually about forward-looking EM&V?
 - CUB Proposal (Kristin Munsch, CUB)

May (SAG meeting + 2 days; Monday/Tuesday/Wednesday; May 16th – 18th)

- *Purpose: To educate SAG on draft Portfolio Plans (electric and gas; Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity); address questions and concerns; determine if any additional work is needed; build consensus on Plans.*

Meeting Topics (Day 1):

- Utilities (electric) and the Department present draft programs in high-level template form¹²: budget; Portfolio results (savings and cost-effectiveness) (Keith Goerss, Ameren IL; George Malek, ComEd)
 - DSMore Run No. 1
 - Existing Programs – note key changes
 - New Programs – provide more detail
 - Expected Costs for various categories (EM&V, M&O, etc. – using Policy Manual categories)
 - Identify all gas-electric and inter-Program Administrator coordination opportunities

¹¹ Margin of error for savings and budget is plus/minus 30%.

¹² Margin of error for savings and budget is plus/minus 10%.

- Review Cost-Effectiveness Inputs.
- **Goals:**
 - Discuss questions and build consensus with stakeholder input on Plans.
 - Feedback from group on DSMore Run 1
 - Reach agreement on the NTG ratios used in the Plan filing.

Meeting Topics (Day 2):

- Continue discussion of electric utility draft Portfolio Plans, if needed.
- Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity presents draft programs in high-level template form (Molly Lunn, Department)
 - DSMore Run No. 1
 - Existing Programs – note key changes
 - New Programs – provide more detail
 - Expected Costs for various categories (EM&V, M&O, etc. – using Policy Manual categories)
 - Identify all gas-electric and inter-Program Administrator coordination opportunities
 - Review Cost-Effectiveness Inputs.
- **Goals:**
 - Discuss questions and build consensus with stakeholder input on Plans.
 - Feedback from group on DSMore Run 1
 - Reach agreement on the NTG ratios used in the Plan filing.

Meeting Topics (Day 3):

- Utilities (gas) present draft programs in high-level template form; budget; Portfolio results (savings and cost-effectiveness) (Jim Jerozal, Nicor Gas; Pat Michalkiewicz, Peoples Gas-North Shore Gas)
 - DSMore Run No. 1
 - Existing Programs – note key changes
 - New Programs – provide more detail
 - Expected Costs for various categories (EM&V, M&O, etc. – using Policy Manual categories)
 - Identify all gas-electric and inter-Program Administrator coordination opportunities
 - Review Cost-Effectiveness Inputs
- **Goals:**
 - Discuss questions and build consensus with stakeholder input on Plans.
 - Feedback from group on DSMore Run 1
 - Reach agreement on the NTG ratios used in the Plan filing.

June (SAG meeting + 1 day; Monday/Tuesday, June 27th and June 28th)

- *Purpose: Final consensus-building (electric and Department)) on final draft Portfolio Plans, consent agreement, and Comparison Exhibit. Continue consensus-building on final draft Gas Portfolio Plans.*

Meeting Topics (Day 1):

- TRM Version 6.0 – Discussion of Priority Measures (TRM Administrator)
- Discuss updated draft electric and Department Portfolio Plans and build consensus with stakeholder input.

Meeting Topics (Day 2):

- Final stakeholder consensus-building on electric and Department Portfolio Plans, consent agreement, and Comparison Exhibit.
- **Goals:**
 - Reach consensus stakeholder input on:
 - Consent Agreements
 - Comparison Exhibit of Non-Consensus Issues (as needed), summarizing different positions/rationale.

July (SAG meeting; Tuesday, July 26th)

- *Purpose: Continue discussing stakeholder input on final draft gas Portfolio Plans, consent agreements and Comparison Exhibits.*

Meeting Topics:

- Discuss updated draft gas Portfolio Plans and build consensus with stakeholder input.
- **Goals:**
 - Build consensus stakeholder input on:
 - Consent Agreements
 - Comparison Exhibit of Non-Consensus Issues (as needed), summarizing different positions/rationale.

August (No SAG meetings)

September (Early SAG meeting; Tuesday, September 6th)

- *Purpose: Finalize gas consent agreements and Comparison Exhibits by September 15.*

Meeting Topics:

- Final stakeholder consensus-building on gas Portfolio Plans, consent agreement, and Comparison Exhibit.
- **Goals:**
 - Reach consensus stakeholder input on:
 - Consent Agreements
 - Comparison Exhibit of Non-Consensus Issues (as needed), summarizing different positions/rationale.

Attachment D: Templates

Template D1: Proposed New Program Idea Template

- SAG participants proposing a new initiative or program idea must complete the Proposed New Program Idea Template. Proposed New Program Idea Templates are due no later than October 30, 2015. New program ideas and initiatives will be discussed in late fall 2015 (November – December).

| Proposed New Program Idea | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Program Name | <i>Add the program name.</i> |
| Program Description | <i>Describe the proposed program, including the sector, customer eligibility, purpose of the program</i> |
| Program Duration | <i>Provide the start and end date (month/year).</i> |
| Estimated Budget | <i>Include the total estimated budget for each Program Year; specify incentive budget and estimated non-incentive budget</i> |
| Estimated Participation | <i>Include participation totals for each Program Year (i.e. customer, number of measures installed, etc.).</i> |
| Savings Targets | <i>Include proposed savings targets for each Program Year.</i> |
| Collaboration | <i>Describe whether this program will collaborate with other utility EE programs.</i> |

| Proposed New Program Idea | |
|---|---|
| Delivery Strategy | <i>Provide implementation information including but not limited to types of services offered through the program, quality assurance and control procedures that will be used.</i> |
| Target Market | <i>Describe the customer segment that will be targeted for this program.</i> |
| Marketing Strategy | <i>How will this program be promoted? Through existing or new channels? Provide details on proposed program launch and specific marketing / outreach strategies to be utilized. If applicable, describe key market barriers and how they will be overcome through marketing strategies.</i> |
| Eligible Measures | <i>Include a list of proposed measures and incentive per measure. Attach a spreadsheet that provides, by program year: the measure, minimum efficiency required, expected participation, incremental cost, savings, and NTG used in analysis.</i> |
| Program Tracking (if applicable) | <i>In what program will energy savings and costs for this program be tracked?</i> |
| Cost per Energy Saved | <i>Using high level costs and savings, estimate cost per energy saved first year and measure life</i> |
| Replacement | <i>Based on your current knowledge, since resources are limited, what program budget should be decreased for make room for this program? Why?</i> |
| Appendices | <i>Provide additional information, as needed.</i> |

Template D2: Policy / Issue Template

- SAG participants proposing a new policy / issue must complete the Policy / Issue Template. Completed Proposed New Program Idea Templates are due no later than November 16, 2015. New policies will be discussed in the Policy Manual Subcommittee.

| Policy / Issue Template | |
|--|--|
| Policy / Issue Description | <i>Describe the policy / issue to be discussed.</i> |
| SAG Meeting Requested | <i>Provide a proposed meeting date to educate SAG about this policy / issue. Policy / issue requests require at least one (1) month advance notice to the SAG Facilitator. Please review the current SAG schedule for details on upcoming meetings.</i> |
| Market Impact | <i>Describe who this issue impacts.</i> |
| Background Research | <i>Provide any background research completed in preparing this policy/issue template, including source references and links, if applicable. Examples may include, but are not limited to: Benchmarking similar programs in other jurisdictions and EE reports.</i> |
| Commission Directives (if applicable) | <i>Has the Commission previously ruled on this policy or issue? If so, please provide language and specific citations, including the docket number.</i> |
| Proposed Resolution | <i>Describe a proposed resolution for this policy / issue, including any next steps that may be necessary. If a new policy is being proposed, please include draft policy language for review by SAG.</i> |
| Collaboration | <i>Describe whether there is an opportunity to collaborate. If so, please list organizations or companies that may be interested.</i> |
| Appendices | <i>Provide additional information, as needed.</i> |