

# IL EE Stakeholder Advisory Group

## TRC Subcommittee Meeting #4

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

10:30 am – 4:30 pm

Midwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (20 N. Wacker Drive, Ste 1301, Chicago)

Call-In Number: 760-569-6000; access code 844452#

Webinar: <https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/3354146347942317570>

<b>Time</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Discussion Leader</b>
10:30 – 10:40	<b>Opening and Introductions</b>	Annette Beitel, EE SAG Facilitator
10:40 – 11:10	<b>TRC Subcommittee Report</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Discussion of draft TRC Subcommittee Report.</li></ul> <p><b>Purpose:</b> To determine next steps.</p>	Celia Johnson, EE SAG Facilitator
11:10 – 12:10	<b>Non-Energy Benefits (NEBs)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Quantifying NEBs in other jurisdictions – where are they used, how are they quantified, and what is the magnitude?</li><li>• Utilities/DCEO – what adder is currently being used?</li><li>• NRDC Proposal – do SAG participants agree or disagree with values?</li></ul> <p><b>SAG questions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. What studies support the NEBs values that NRDC recommends?</li><li>2. How should NEBs be calculated, at the measure, program, or portfolio level?</li><li>3. Can NEBs be negative? If so, how to deal with this?</li><li>4. Is there a difference including NEBs on electric vs. gas portfolios?</li><li>5. Should IL have a “blended” adder?</li><li>6. Should carbon and environmental benefits (SO<sub>x</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, microparticles) be calculated separately?</li><li>7. Find out how IPA will treat NEBs in upcoming procurement.</li></ol>	Celia Johnson, EE SAG Facilitator; Various

12:10 – 12:40	<b>Lunch</b>	
12:40 – 1:10	<b>NEBs (cont.)</b>  <b>SAG question:</b> 1. Narrow the issues; discuss consensus resolution.	Annette Beitel, EE SAG Facilitator
1:10 – 1:40	<b>Status of DRIPE</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review updated draft DRIPE Comparison Exhibit.</li> <li>• Addt'l question from the Commission: <i>the parties should address the possibly outdated literature relied upon by ComEd in its opposition to the inclusion of DRIPE in the TRC test.</i></li> </ul> <b>Purpose:</b> To determine next steps: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Assess whether any further discussion or research needed?</li> <li>2. Put issue “on hold” until Clean Jobs legislation is addressed?</li> <li>3. Best procedural vehicle for litigating, if litigation is needed</li> </ol>	Annette Beitel, EE SAG Facilitator
1:40 – 2:10	<b>Marginal vs. Average Line Losses</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ameren IL to present follow-up research from March meeting.</li> </ul> <b>SAG questions:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What proxy number will Ameren IL use for marginal line losses? What is the timeframe for using that number?</li> <li>2. Determine the consensus approach.</li> </ol>	Keith Goerss, Ameren IL
2:10 – 3:00	<b>Administrative Costs</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tracking administrative costs – how does Ameren IL plan to track? How do other utilities track administrative costs?</li> <li>• Illustrative example – allocating fixed administrative costs to programs for cost-effectiveness screening.</li> </ul> <b>SAG questions:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In calculating 3<sup>rd</sup> Party admin costs,</li> </ol>	Annette Beitel, EE SAG Facilitator  Keith Goerss, Ameren IL; Chris Neme, Energy Futures Group, on behalf of NRDC

	<p>should fixed costs be included or only incremental costs?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For C/E screening, what % will Ameren IL use this year?</li> <li>For IPA review of bids, what will IPA use?</li> <li>What are typical practices for allocating non-allocable costs in IL? (Discuss practices in other jurisdictions)</li> <li>Discuss Consensus resolution.</li> </ol>	
3:00 – 3:20	<b>Break</b>	
3:20 – 4:20	<p><b>Follow-up on Previous Meetings</b></p> <p><i>Overall Impact to TRC</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the overall impact of proposed changes to the TRC calculation?</li> <li>What is the range of the overall impact, as a percentage?</li> </ul> <p><b>SAG question:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should current approaches be altered?</li> <li>What is the next step?</li> </ol> <p><i>Issue: Should IPA run its own C/E calculations?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Follow-up on 3/17 discussion.</li> <li>Input assumptions – are there areas that need additional scrutiny? Should IPA scrutinize independently?</li> </ul> <p><b>SAG questions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What input assumptions are currently used by each utility in C/E calculations?</li> <li>Are input assumptions being used consistently between utilities? If not, do assumptions need to be reconsidered?</li> <li>What is the next step?</li> </ol>	<p>Keith Goerss, Ameren IL</p> <p>Chris Neme, Energy Futures Group, on behalf of NRDC</p>
4:20 – 4:30	<b>Closing</b>	Annette Beitel

**Meeting Materials**

- Draft TRC Subcommittee Report
- Updated draft DRIPE Comparison Exhibit
- Memo to TRC Subcommittee: Non-Energy Benefits (NEBs) in Other Jurisdictions