



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, LABOR & ECONOMIC GROWTH
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

ANDREW S. LEVIN
ACTING DIRECTOR

Monica Martinez
COMMISSIONER

Orjiakor N. Isiogu
CHAIRMAN

Greg R. White
COMMISSIONER

EO Collaborative Workgroup Evaluation November 16, 2010

Introductions

1. Energy Savings Adjustment Process: Bill Ware (CMS)

- Document (emailed out earlier) covers what this includes – does not talk about adjustment to Michigan Energy Measures Database (MEMD). Does focus on three steps: audit, estimated verified savings, verified net savings. Makes sure data is transferred accurately. Implementer data base may differ from utility provider's database. Looking for 90-10 level of confidence.
- Actual savings values are being pulled in from the MEMD.
- What does estimated verified savings (gross) methodology look like? Is a telephone survey sufficiency, engineering adjustments, installation verification, etc.
- Estimating verified net savings (net-to-gross) don't want to get into specifics, programs will differ.
- Application for applying adjustment steps. Controversial – Step 1 annually, Step 2 allow additional time for data collection will not allow 2009 or 2010 savings. Adjustments will be used in 2011 – CMS looking at a 1 year lag, know prospectively what the adjustments are. Biggest adjustments will come from NTG adjustments.
- One thing this document does not go into detail about – one goal that Rob has stated, Collaborative will come to an agreement about what smaller utilities may use. Would like to have something in this doc to explain this, but will need further discussion after a couple years of results from larger utilities are in.
- Art Thayer (MECA): agrees with process, may not be the MEMD, but a deemed database would be useful to the smaller utilities.
- Bill: separate from the MEMD and always will be. Those are gross numbers and do not contain any adjustments.
- Any significant problems and get discussion going before submission to the Steering Committee.
- Say by 2012, gone through 3 years of experience with the HVAC program – evaluate the program or deem the adjustment until factors determine there may need a new evaluation.
- OPower behavioral programs show a lot of promise, but trickier and riskier to track those results.
- Rob Ozar (MPSC): engineering adjustment factor – for measures that are custom and not in the MEMD? Yes.
 - How is that different from the installation factor? More steps than just installation.

DELEG is an equal opportunity employer/program.

Auxiliary aids, services and other reasonable accommodations are available upon request to individuals with disabilities.

- Rob: on page 2, estimating gross savings, involves collecting gross data from participants, is there any customer privacy issues?
 - Voluntary to participate – customers usually receive a rebate or some other incentive for them to participate. Utility will send out a letter telling customers they may be contacted and asked if they would like to participate in a site visit.
- Rob: (next page) those are the 2 steps, installation verification is used for everything, but then there is an engineering adjustment that may be added together...
 - Bill: Only for custom programs. Need to add “engineering adjustment factor” replace estimation of verified gross savings (final sentence of P. 3) Or, “estimates of verified gross savings is not required”. Shorter and clearer. The whole document is not applicable to pilot projects. Percent of spend is used for pilot projects.
 - May need to add how achieved savings will be addressed – educational programs may start out as pilots.
- Rob: tried to talk with Marty Kushler about 2 year program implementation evaluation data. Still wondering why it takes 2 years?
 - Bill: second year can be used to gather good information, first year info may be funky. 50% of gas measures for 2010 haven’t hit the books yet, still in process to be installed. Will be in January 2011 before you start getting information.
 - Art: already in year 2 before you evaluate year 1.
- Rob: (in answer to a question about the difference between the annual report and the reconciliation.) Reconciliation report is a financial report – not an evaluation report. The surcharges that were collected and spent. Annual report looks to see if they achieved targets. Utilities like BWL will file an annual report.
- Jennifer (CMS) Evaluation is a separate report from the reconciliation and annual reports. Some information/summary was filed in 2010 about 2009, but not extensive.
- Rob: when we talked with the Commissioners, they said they didn’t want an all-in-one document; it’s a stand alone document that can be included as an exhibit. Filed in the docket but a separate document like in the case of BWL. Filing dates have been staggered.
- Rob: clarifying Reconciliation filing: a docketed preceding, will contain testimony and exhibits. Exhibits will contain a financial reconciliation document, by month collection/expenditures. Another EO report will be attached, consists of what was achieved by the program vs. the results. Any changes, any fund transfers, programs that ran out of money, a complete description of the programs along with an impact evaluation. If no financial reconciliation like BWL, then EO report and any evaluation work that was done.
- Sue (BWL) and that’s what we did. Evaluation was an attachment to their report.
- Art: if I can suggest that Step 1 is called a “certification of savings”
- Rob: true in the last reconciliation, looked at accuracy of tracking in step 1. 2011 will be net savings used to certify savings.
- CMS: include high level summary, otherwise there’s a lot of pages and information.
- Rob: as long as information is available to interveners...
- Bill: CADMUS gives them 10-15 page memos detailing what’s going on with the programs. EMI documents contain all the surveys, information – 100 page documents.
- Rob: process evaluation filed with the annual report – at least a summary of it. But we want more than just an executive summary, but not all the calculations.
- Prerogative to ask for it as it is independent certification of savings.
- Bill: terminology clarification: Page 2 top, “audit” still will be used. As part of the annual reconciliation process – refer to it as being the annual reporting process.

- Bill: How do we interact as a collaborative? How do we discuss various evaluation results that come up? Identify in the document – here's what happens with the report?
- Rob: especially important for small utilities who don't have large evaluation budgets; need NTG numbers.
- Art: somewhere we should have another database that this measure returns 0.8 and we don't have to measure that again. Take it to the next step for a net number.
- Jennifer has the edits, will clean them up and send them out to the group.
- Rob will get together with Marty and see if the 2 year timeline is ok and will follow up with Bill.

2. Douglas Jester: MichEEN Presentation (Michigan Energy Efficiency Network)

<http://www.micheen.org>

- An innovative project to create an on-line community of practitioners. While it is open to all to participate, the target audience is the people actually doing the work.
- Status of the project: in the soft launch phase where much of the site's usability/function is available; need for people to participate. Estimated user population of 5-10,000 in Michigan. People will only use the site if it makes their lives easier.
- Demonstrated various functions: groups, blogs, forums, posts, calendars, materials to be shared. Privacy levels for groups can be set at open (recommended), semi-private (public can read information, but not post) to private (only invited members may view materials and comment).
- *FAQ page – to start a group: Group tab, list, find group name (i.e. Program Design collaborative). Better to email request to join to people you want as part of your group.*

Next meeting: December 14th (Tuesday)