

## NEET Executive Committee Meeting

June 17, 2010

### Executive Committee Members:

Tom Karier, co-chair (NWPCC)  
Pat Egan, co-chair (Pacific Power, sitting for Pat Reiten)  
Steve Wright, co-chair (BPA)

Ralph Cavanagh (NRDC)  
Carol Dillin (PGE)  
Bill Drummond (Western Montana Generation and Transmission Coop.)  
Melinda Eden (NWPCC)  
Steve Eldrige (Umatilla Electric)  
Claire Fulenwider (NEEA)  
Margie Harris (ETO)  
Jess Kincaid (Community Action Partnership of Oregon)  
Lou Moore (Montana Department of Environmental Quality)  
Kim Drury (NWECA, sitting in for Sara Patton)  
Stan Price (NEEC)  
Bob Rowe (Northwestern Energy)  
Cal Shirley (PSE)  
Brian Skeahan (Cowlitz County PUD)  
Phil Welker (PECI)  
Roger Woodworth (Avista Utilities)  
Dave Zepponi (NW Food Processors Association)

### Absent Executive Committee Members:

Richard Beam (Providence Health and Services)  
Lisa Coltart (BC Hydro)  
Paul Elias (McMinnville Power and Light)  
Bill Gaines (Tacoma Public Utilities)  
Erin Holland (Edelman)  
Warren Kline (Idaho Power Company)  
Bob Repine (Oregon Department of Energy)  
Brady Wiseman (Montana House of Representatives)

### NEET Administrators

Ken Canon, Facilitator  
Josh Warner, Coordinator (BPA)  
Joshua Binus, Assistant Coordinator (BPA)  
Gillian Charles, Minutes (NWPCC)

### External Presenters

Scot Davidson (NEEA)  
Kim Drury (NWECA)  
Teri Duncan (PECI)

Ryan Fedie (BPA)  
Lee Hall (BPA)  
Jeff Harris (NEEA)  
Barbara Hins-Turner (Centralia College)  
Karen Horkitz (NEEA)  
Rob Russell (NEEA)  
Michael Wehling (PSE)

Other Attendees:

Pam Barrow (NW Food Processors Association)  
Bo Downen (Public Power Council)  
Tom Eckman (NWPCC)  
Dick Edwards (Nexant, Inc.)  
Chad Gilles (Global Energy Partners)  
Kari Greer (Pacific Power)  
Charlie Grist (NWPCC)  
Massoud Jourabchi (NWPCC)  
Dave Kresta (NEEA)  
Terry Morlan (NWPCC)  
Lauren Shapton (PGE)  
Mary Smith (Snohomish PUD)  
Deb Martin Young (Northwestern Energy)

-----  
CANON: [Welcome to all]

[Intros around the Executive Committee table and around the room]

The first Executive Committee meeting was held on [June 18, 2008](#), and here we are almost exactly two years later. We, as a region, have accomplished many good things so far and many more today. Thanks to Pacific Power and Portland General Electric for sponsoring the lunch today. Thanks to BPA for financing the room, coffee and pastries. Really appreciates all the presenters putting together their handouts. I am looking forward to today's discussions.

[Introductions] We will proceed through the agenda and use our time as it is needed. When we are finished with the meeting today, Joshua Binus and Gillian Charles will help finish the minutes and put together a short summary of the day's proceedings. We will get it out for comment within a week and then send a final copy to all.

We will pass on introductory comments by the co-chairs. Anyone with opening comments before we get started? [none]

### Action 1: RTF Evaluation, Bill Drummond

DRUMMOND: This effort was tremendously successful due to the efforts of Mary Smith, Massoud Jourabchi, John Kaufman, Jeff Harris, Lauren Gage, Ken Keating, Karen Horkitz, Charlie Grist, Tom Eckman, Gillian Charles, and others. The need for data was a prime focus of Workgroup 1. Describes the progression of Workgroup 1 and its actions.

The need for data is huge in EE. Load growth, end-use load shapes, market characteristics, potential, behavior, did we get the savings expected, what did it cost? “Power supply guys are now looking at me and saying that we are not going to build new power because of your programs.” Do any of you doubt that measurement and verification are important and will be important in the future? [No vocal doubters in room.] It is important, and costs will no doubt increase in the future.

CAVANAGH: It’s much cheaper here than in California.

DRUMMOND: Workgroup 1 had three key recommendations to the Executive Committee:

1. Projects are needed to collect data on energy efficiency and performance; it’s going to cost. The expectation is that this is going to be \$8 to \$10 million per year, shared between NEEA and the RTF. They estimated that the region currently spends about \$5 million per year.
2. The RTF’s regional role should be expanded. The budget for this expansion could be as much as \$3 million per year. Modification of the RTF must include the organization’s role, structure, governance and funding. NEEA’s role in data acquisition should also be expanded, with a change in their budget to the tune of \$5 to \$7 per year. That is consistent with NEEA’s business plan.
3. The four NW states should be encouraged to use regional data and participate in funding.

The NEET Executive evaluated Workgroup 1’s recommendations and arrived at two action items to pursue.

- ACTION 1: Prepare an independent evaluation of the Regional Technical Forum (RTF) to determine how it can best meet the region's needs in data collection, analysis, evaluation and dissemination of findings.
- ACTION 2: Compare how NEEA data collection efforts activities mesh with NEET report recommendations and determine gaps for future regional attention.

The focus of this presentation is on the RTF Evaluation.

The study did three things:

1. Reviewed the history, structure and operational procedures of the RTF;
2. Conducted survey of 45 people who work in and around the RTF (including the founders, 13 voting members, and 28 members and stakeholders); and
3. Analyzed the results of the findings.

[Reviews historical background of RTF; see “[An Evaluation of the Regional Technical Forum](#)”]

[Reviews handout: “[Some Thoughts on Responding to the RTF Evaluation](#)”]

The study itself found that the RTF has provided great value to the region. Seventy-one percent of those surveyed found that RTF was important/essential to attaining the goals for energy efficiency in the region. Again, their ability to do what they have done with such a shoe-string budget has been remarkable; however, the current structure is showing signs of strain and may not be appropriate for the increased role they are to play in the region. There are also concerns over objectivity. Who do members represent when they show up? What are the broader interests? The question about how to define stakeholders led to questions about governance and funding issues. There is strong agreement over the core responsibilities of the RTF; there is less agreement around its future role. The report noted that the region presently lacks a shared understanding of the future role of the RTF. There is no clear understanding of how the RTF’s work is prioritized.

Going forward, assuming additional demands on RTF, there were questions about funding, transparency, etc. These were the issues raised in the report. These boiled down to three fundamental recommended action items.

1. Initiate a process to reach agreement on stakeholder definition and address issues related to governance and structure of the RTF
2. Build upon the work initiated in this study, continue to inventory the full range of stakeholder needs, establish a transparent process to prioritize these needs, and establish a multi-year work plan for the region with which all stakeholders are fully aligned.
3. Implement incremental operational changes that will increase the transparency of the operations of the RTF in the following areas:
  - a. Budgeting process;
  - b. Voting requirements;
  - c. Operating procedures; and
  - d. Potential conflicts of interests.

Some of these issues are already being addressed by the RTF. The integration of 5-year projections, more work at the subcommittee level, the development of a conflict of interest policy, they’ve contracted for a review of RTF savings estimates. The RTF has moved forward; however, the fundamental issue of stakeholder definition still needs explored.

In my view, this reflects a maturation of the RTF itself. It is not unlike what NEEA has gone through in terms of moving from one structure that worked well to another. More demands have been placed on the organization and it responded to change. For the RTF, it is experiencing the reality that its existing structure and operating procedures are not able to support it efficiently anymore. That the RTF has worked as well as it has is a testament to the dedication of the Council staff and RTF members. However, that success has bred additional demands and work. This is why there is the need to review the structure, funding and resources.

ELDRIGE: Are there stakeholder groups that could be characterized or are they all individuals? Is there some grouping that could be done? Do those groups have commonalities?

DRUMMOND: Certainly there are groups: Bonneville, investor owned utilities, public utilities, public utility commissions, and contractors. The involvement of the contractors, in particular, have led to discussions about conflicts of interest.

CAVANAGH: And public interest groups.

DRUMMOND: Certainly. The study breaks out the responses by major groups.

CAVANAGH: The remarkable thing is, compared to other regions/states, this is the best, most cost effective work being done in the country. If we can do it even better, that's great.

ELDRIGE: Seems to me that we are entering an era where the need to find commonality between groups is upon us. We need to regroup and see if we can agree on outcomes. Both globally and regionally we need to make sure we are not getting in our own way in our approach to this.

DRUMMOND: The issues raised are too important to have them languish. This recommendation is mine and mine alone. I tried to come up with a process on a way to move forward. What moved me was that there are issues facing the region from time to time where we need to place the responsibility for addressing them in one single entity. That can be problematic. There needs to be a regional effort for everyone to buy-in.

I propose a steering committee that includes the Council, BPA, and utilities—maybe 12 people to help guide this review of the RTF and the questions surrounding stakeholders, governance and funding. As my memo indicates, it would be a finite process, much like NEET, potentially 6 months long, 3 meetings total. It would include people from the public interest community, funders, and be open to the public to listen in.

The group would meet 3 times, and I've already laid out who might be on it. A challenge we will have with this issue is that on one hand you want to retain the elements that have been successful (i.e. independence, unquestionable nature of conclusions, and voluntary funding by those who feel that they have to be getting value for their money). We need

to balance the needs of voluntary funders and organizational independence. My thought is that if people are comfortable with this today, I would like to get a statement from NEET supporting this and then send a proposal to the Council. I envision the NEET Executive Committee making a recommendation to the Council itself. The Council has the ultimate decision. I would like to take our recommendation to the July Council meeting.

CANON: What you are suggesting is an expression of support from the NEET Executive Committee to charge the Council and BPA to go forward and create an executive committee to work for about 6 months or so to eventually come up with specific recommendations for the Council. Questions?

KARIER: Personally thinks this is a great idea. I embrace this. It highlights issues that need addressed. I think Ralph Cavanagh was right. We would be hard pressed to find a group that does so much with so little. This is an opportunity to do it even better. Trying to do this on \$1 million per year is creating some strains. Our other staff is spending a lot of extra time on this. Case in point: the amount of strain experienced while we were working on the 6<sup>th</sup> Power Plan. We can revise the charter and solidify relationships with stakeholders and funders. Think we have made major progress.

CAVANAGH: Bill we are all grateful for this effort. I have a few suggestions to move quickly and capitalize on energy here.

1. Practical issue: The current \$1 million per year is not working; looks like we need to build up to about \$3 million per year. One of the most important things that needs to get fixed is the annual soliciting from RTF for funding. One of the reasons that it doesn't work as well as it might is the effort that has to go into the fund raising. I propose that NEEA's funding plan that allocates costs be used as a good starting point for this effort.
2. As far as the 2011 budget: Support the \$1.5 million for 2011 and then wait for funding plan for the rest.
3. As far as the executive committee of 12 members: All of the members are already around the table. Can we put this group together today? I don't think we need to set up a separate list.

CANON: Let's work on this during lunch today.

CAVANAGH: We should also agree on the \$1.5 million for a placeholder for 2011.

CANON: [To Tom Eckman] What's the funding this year?

ECKMAN: Roughly \$1.1 million.

ELDRIGE: Don't have any great objection to what's been said. As far as the steering committee, we might want to give some thought to having more than the usual suspects. Is anyone being left out? The steering committee needs to have involvement of those delegated with some authority to speak on behalf of others.

ZEPPONI: Feels similar to SE. Where is the accountability? Who handles the money?

DRUMMOND: The Council.

ZEPPONI: If they have that much money and sustain it, how are we going to make sure that the vision is correct for the region? If you put in place measurements, you want to affect behavior. We will need to provide some strategic level guidance to the Council on the executive committee.

DRUMMOND: You raise an important point I forgot to mention. This group will need to involve policy level people, not technical level people.

ZEPPONI: You have done a good job with this. I do want to point out, though, that the intent in measurement and verification is to measure things that have been accomplished in the past. We need to make sure there are folks involved who can look forward.

KARIER: If we are going to be making recommendations involving budgets, I would like to see all of the funders involved. I talked with the staff about what was cut back from \$1.5 million recommended from the RTF itself. What they had wanted to do was an end-use survey of the region. It included additional funding for staff, more measures to compare to other regions in the country.

WOODWORTH: [To ME] Asks if the \$1.5 million will work?

EDEN: Agrees with everything TK has said.

WOODWORTH: I think that the regulatory commissions in all 4 states should be represented.

HARRIS: Agrees with everything said. Thinks a longer term budget is important, along with some succession planning.

SHIRLEY: With respect to RC's recommendation regarding the \$1.5 million for 2011. Our budget is already in place. Moving things around is difficult, though not impossible. [To Tom Eckman] If we threw more money at the RTF, could you absorb it?

ECKMAN: We could absorb it. We already have contracts nearly in place. \$1.5 could be absorbed without much trouble. \$3 million per year would take longer...perhaps a few years.

EGAN: Agrees with much of what is being discussed. Concerned about putting the funding needs in context with what may also be called for in the following presentations. Thinks it would be good to reserve judgment until all presentations have been heard.

CANON: Good suggestions to move forward. It would be good to move on RC's suggestion for moving forward quickly by putting together an executive committee today. Asks all to think about coming to some agreement on the 2011 budget. We will rework the agenda to fit in after we come back from lunch.

WRIGHT: RC is right on with his direction to develop a 5-yr budget for RTF. Appreciates the vision. Wants to make sure we know what we're buying for \$1.5 million. Makes for a good first task of the executive committee.

CANON: To the extent that we can form the executive committee faster today, it will shorten the time needed to get things underway.

### Action 2: Data Needs, Rob Russell

RUSSELL: [Reviews [handout](#)]

Provides a short update since Workgroup 1 completed its work. For the most part, it looks like that more funding and effort has been going into evaluation, measurement, and verification across the region. There has also been a re-founding of a NW Research Group (NWRG), which Lauren Gage suggested in order to recreate a forum that existed previously. They are to look at identifying best practices, and to see what is going on in the region? What are the gaps? This is an organization that is facilitated by NEEA and occurs every 2 to 3 months. Thanks the NEET Executive Committee for allowing their staff to participate.

Came up with list of gaps needing treated:

1. Absence of end-use load data for all sectors;
2. Lack of sales data to help understand what is going on in the markets that we want to transform. Nobody is doing it. Region-wide concept, not a lot going on; and
3. Market characterization in industrial and agricultural sectors.

The NWRG will develop proposals on each, then what? The suggestion is to utilize the Regional Collaboration Group to consider the proposals being developed by the NWRG.

CANON: When do you see proposals from the research group?

RUSSELL: 1<sup>st</sup> in 60 days; 2<sup>nd</sup> coming 30 days after that; 3<sup>rd</sup> is not as pressing and can wait a bit.

ELDRIGE: Is retail information available from retailers and manufacturers? What is meant by market characterization?

RUSSELL: Yes. It is, but it's expensive.

ELDRIGE: Will the U.S. govt. be doing this?



RUSSELL: They may, but not in time for our needs. As far as market characterization, it helps us track trends occurring in industry so we can better strategize.

WOODWORTH: This afternoon, we are going to hear about some of the marketing needs coming out of Workgroup 4. Are they reflected here?

RUSSELL: There is some cross over, but not really.

ZEPPONI: The release of sales data and energy consumption data is very sensitive with industrial groups. Generally speaking, the data is available, but it can be difficult to regionalize it. Really wants to make the point that there is a huge level of sensitivity and points out that we may end up with some conflict between utilities and end-users.

RUSSELL: There are safeguards that can be pursued. It's ultimately in everyone's interest to participate.

FULENWIDER: Hears what is being said. Points out that this is focused more on the sales data that is more readily available.

RUSSELL: The first things on the list are consumer electronics.

ELDRIGE: We have a good fortune to serve food processors and agriculture. By policy we don't release any info about any end user but we aggregate. How granular does it need to be? Also, in our neck of the woods, we export roughly 90 percent of our goods. I don't want to lose the global aspect of things.

RUSSELL: We do respect the desire for privacy, but there is value for participation. We're not doing work that leads to taxes, but it will add value to all parties. As far as exports: not sure how to respond.

ELDRIGE: American are so used to thinking about ourselves as the center of the universe. We might make a decision that looks good for the region, but not globally.

WRIGHT: How were the priorities set? What if we started by looking at the targets first? Also, are we going solely after energy or are we also looking at capacity?

RUSSELL: These priorities were not arrived at by looking first at the Council targets. There was some overlap in regard to DR and SG.

HORKITZ: Adds that the next step for each priority would involve a business case being developed.

### Action 3: Emerging Technologies (Ryan Fedie and Jeff Harris)

HARRIS & FEDIE: [Review [Handout](#)]

HARRIS: Points out action item from NEET: “ACTION 3: Create a plan for NEEA, BPA and other regional entities to coordinate emerging technology activities and keep the “pipeline” full to meet future energy efficiency needs.”

Highlights that the idea of having a pipeline of technologies and ideas that add value for all parties in the Northwest is of critical importance to the region. What can we do to find the next CFLs? Not one big winner, rather there are a lot of new technologies that will need to be relied on for savings. In the emerging technology universe, we are looking to identify leading technologies and move them into readily adoptable programs.

Our first response to NEET’s call to action was to develop a plan. We needed to have the right people in the room. NEEA and BPA have developed a Regional Emerging Technology Advisory Committee (RETAC involves utilities, educational institutions, Electric Power Research Institute, PNNL, Council). It is a formal group with a two-fold charter. This group directly advises NEEA on where it should spend its emerging technology budget. It also provides a place for collaborative efforts and communication on emerging technologies. The group has already developed a Northwest Energy Efficiency Technology Roadmap.

FEDIE: Reiterates the importance of filling the pipeline in emerging technologies. Points out that BPA and other stakeholders are ramping up this effort again for future program acquisition. At BPA, Office of Technology Innovation (Terry Oliver) has taken a leadership role to define how we research and choose technologies to meet our business challenges. One of the strategic planning efforts is the idea of technology roadmaps. The roadmaps are meant to be a visual tool to relay a research agenda to highlight gaps to meet business challenges. There is an existing roadmap that BPA did in 2006. It needed refreshed, so the Regional Emerging Technology Advisory Group worked together to put together a regional effort across all end-uses and sectors to identify energy efficiency business challenges to meet in the 5 to 20-year timeframe. It’s a 100-page document with very little text, but lots of visuals. It is available on BPA’s website. It is meant to be a living document. Fedie asked that all energy efficiency managers have their staffs review the roadmap and send comments and suggestions to BPA [send to Joshua Binus, project manager] so that it can be strengthened.

Excited with the response we are getting from this document. Common research agenda has really helped many of us moving forward. On an ongoing basis, how do we get more input? We are all facing the same issue. A lot is going on in emerging technology. How do we know where to put our resources? BPA has put together formal technical advisory groups (TAGs), along with a framework for their governance. Two groups, lighting and HVAC, include both regional and national representatives, with installers, planners, utilities and a good cross-section of experts involved. We have had a favorable response on these and are looking to eventually set up 8 to 10 technology advisory groups. We are

looking to set up the TAGs as a regional resource; these are entities that can be hosted by other utilities or organizations looking to help the region move the ball forward faster.

HARRIS: Out of the roadmap process and the Sixth Plan, a very large opportunity was identified in heat pump water heaters. These provide a good example of how NEEA and BPA are working together. The HVAC TAG has also provided invaluable input.

I have a personal goal: sometime in the future, now that we have a roadmap, I would like to see the region pick one of these technologies and undertake a collaborative effort to move it beyond its technical and market barriers to wider adoption.

CANON: Since both NEEA and BPA are working on emerging technologies together, what do you consider to be your respective strengths in this area?

FEDIE: Some of these were laid out in a previous document to the NEET Executive Committee. BPA has a strong engineering group, is strong with field testing, and M&V.

HARRIS: NEEA has marketing expertise. We focus on identifying and addressing the opportunities and barriers for wider adoption of emerging technologies.

FEDIE: If you look at the diffusion slide, the better we address the technical and market barriers, the faster we can increase adoption rates.

EGAN: In terms of technology being looked at, what kind of intake process are you looking at? Also, how do you establish your high-ed connections? Beyond that, how are you determining who presents to your group?

HARRIS: From a Regional Emerging Technology Advisory Committee standpoint, we are not inviting pitches regarding technology. NEEA, BPA, and others have intake channels of their own for that need. RETAC focuses more on the global aspects of our work.

FEDIE: Our focus is more about the technology efforts, not the products themselves. DOE is working on products.

HARRIS: Both BPA and NEEA have fairly sophisticated ranking and scoring systems in place regarding these technologies.

HARRIS: The Washington State University Energy Extension Program was invited to participate in RETAC because of the expertise they bring to the table. We hope they will continue to build relationships with other academic institutions. This was a first step to make sure we had some representation from academia.

DRURY: Is there an entity that is comparable to EPRI that works on gas? Is that part of your mission?

FULENWIDER: NEEA's board just made a decision for gas to be part of NEEA's long-range portfolio.

HARRIS: Adds that there is a national effort to create an EPRI-like organization by tacking on \$2 dollars per year to each end user.

HARRIS: Both NEEA and BPA are working on funneling vendors, customers to the entrance of the portfolio considerations. Screening will ultimately filter out 9 of 10 ideas.

ELDRIGE: Curious about the definition of the term "meet future energy efficiency"?

HARRIS: References the Sixth Power Plan.

ZEPPONI: Great idea. We have signed an MOA with BPA and NEEA several years ago. Looking at the advisory committee, there is no industry. If we are trying to commercialize and get these technologies into the marketplace, why are they not at the table?

DRURY: Adds that the big tech companies would also be an important addition.

HARRIS: Purpose of the group is coordination and collaboration. We need to involve those folks who form the core group, with expertise invited as needed. Roadmapping effort was a good example. Involved both policy and technology experts as needed.

FEDIE: The RETAC provides a forum for candid discussion. The TAGs, however, involve a broad mix of participants, including industry experts.

ELDRIGE: I'm troubled by the definition. There are forces outside the region that might bring a higher degree of electrification. Not sure if this effort fits the tasks in front of us. Is concerned about the claims to actually meet load growth through energy efficiency. I don't think that's possible. In your survey you should offer an opportunity to comment on things (e.g. "You need to do X.").

Action 4: Energy Efficiency Forum and Strategic Planning  
(Karen Horkitz and Scot Davidson)

CANON: The next action is two different concepts rolled into one: 1) the desire for greater interaction within the energy efficiency community; and 2) coordination planning on high impact energy efficiency initiatives.. One of the key elements of the WG3 process was the interest in developing high impact energy efficiency opportunities. We need a process to facilitate the benefits of coordination on these opportunities.

HORKITZ: Reviews key tasks of Workgroup 3 and the action item from NEET.

“ACTION 4: Create a forum within an existing regional entity to increase collaboration and help move forward on new and expanded energy efficiency efforts.”

HORKITZ & DAVIDSON: [Review [Handout](#)]

HORKITZ: Workgroup 3 looked at how to make sure the region actually pursues the high-impact opportunities. We need to pursue these as effectively as possible and make sure the region is sharing enough with each other to be as successful as it can be. Two paths: 1) Develop an infrastructure for collaboration; and 2) Form a group of designated people to come together and do some strategic planning.

On the infrastructure: NEEA included this in its business plan. First is a regional online community. Even when groups do get together, how do we share documents and plan meetings? An online community would help. BPA was hearing the same thing at the same time and began building the same thing for its customers. NEEA and BPA have now come together and are building one online community. Dave Kresta is leading this effort for NEEA and has formed a regional steering team. They are seeking broad-based input. A pilot version should be ready at the end of this year. We will then be taking an iterative approach to maximize functionality. Start with regional groups who have already formed and are looking toward regional functionality. One other item to mention is a regional energy efficiency conference. One of the comments from Workgroup 3 was that interaction was taking place but that it is fairly fragmented. We need to plan a conference that focuses on best practices. How do we make sure that we pursue efforts in the most effective way possible. A program committee is working on this and is looking at some potential dates already.

CAVANAGH: For the online community, there is a similar effort in California. Want to make sure you are aware of it. To the extent that we can get/stay connected, it would be good.

DILLIN: Likes both ideas. Will it be interactive?

HORKITZ: The online community will be a regional website, and it will be interactive.

ROWE: Will it include gas as well as electric?

HORKITZ: Yes.

DRURY: Are you envisioning any other organizations, such as state energy offices being involved?

HORKITZ: Yes. We don't want it to be a commercial site. We don't want advertising from service providers. The time frame for the conference is similar to NWEA's conference in mid-November.

SMITH: I'm hoping you might expand the steering committee members? It looks light on IOU involvement.

HORKITZ: We are not necessarily planning to do this at this time. The intent is to have as broad-based input as possible. I will follow-up.

DAVIDSON: [Reviews item 2, Regional Coordination Plan, in [handout](#)]

Shares the evolution of and current status for the coordinated activity of high-impact measures. There was a draft proposal from Lauren Gage, Karen Horkitz and Ken Canon at the end of last year that detailed an approach to the coordination of the high-impact measures in the region. A challenge was that there wasn't a body that existed to take on the work at the time. We have been working on our own advisory portfolio committee (NEEA) to provide input on decision making for NEEA. This is an ideal group to pursue this coordination and we have asked this group to follow this additional responsibility. The NEEA advisory committee has now met twice, coming together to work on NEEA issues. The group has a dual purpose: to advise NEEA and to act as a regional coordinating group. Emphasize that in the second capacity, NEEA is not leading this but facilitating it.

So far, looking at the original proposal's 30 measures identified has been an overwhelming task. The group agreed to task a small taskforce to draft a revised straw man. The group (Jeff Harris, Lauren Gage, Karen Meadows, Mary Smith, Charlie Grist, and Bob Stolarski) is working to boil the list down to a few measures for consideration as a pilot. We expect this to happen in mid-July. We hope to develop the implementation plan by August or October and then implement pilots in January. We see a review coming a year later. There is a question of resources that still needs addressed, associated with the costs associated with this work. Where are these going to come from?

CANON: Can you provide more detail in regard to the pilots?

DAVIDSON: The process of coordination still needs to be discovered for us. This is what needs explored over the year and reported on.

ROWE: To what degree are you looking at other information streams? More broadly, what is your group looking at more broadly that needs to be included?

DAVIDSON: Original intent of the effort was to look at the 6<sup>th</sup> Power Plan. Still is. We are relying on experts to bring in ideas from outside the Northwest. As far as the leading measures? We have nothing to report yet. Some measures might be great for coordination, some not.

PRICE: Thanks both presenters for their work. Admits to a twinge of disappointment that this effort has not yet evolved to embrace two legs of the conservation stool (customer groups and those involved with the customers).

DAVIDSON: Still opportunity for that. Implementation will likely involve both of those groups.

CANON: What we've heard so far is that energy efficiency is still incredibly utility centric. To achieve the goals of the 6<sup>th</sup> Power Plan, we will need to involve a wider group (e.g. customer and trade ally groups) What I see here is work bubbling up from the emerging technology group and then getting handed off to the Coordination group. Great outcome.

Regarding the forum idea: Thinks they are incredibly powerful when groups embrace them. They can encourage much interaction, and therefore more collaboration and innovation..

HORKITZ: Part of the plan is to do extensive introduction and training around the region. There is a lot of variability in experience with this topic. Need to introduce it and make sure people are comfortable with functionality.

WELKER: Thinks that the work of the taskforce has been very productive. Items 1,2, and 3 are about doing what we already do better. These first are really about needing to do these better or, if not, falling behind.

CANON: Agrees. It's about building infrastructure.

***[Break for lunch—paid for by Pacific Power and Portland General Electric]***

CANON: Let's start off the afternoon with a return to the discussion about forming up an steering committee to pick up the continuing work surrounding the RTF Evaluation. RC has been doing his best bookie impersonation walking around with his list during lunch. Ralph?

CAVANAGH: I have a list with collective recommendations we can provide to the Council.

- Regulatory commissions in all 4 states should be invited
- Bill Drummond (WMGT)
- Mike Weedall (BPA)
- Warren Kline (Idaho Power)
- Roger Woodworth (Avista)
- Craig Smith (Snohomish PUD)
- Pat Egan (Pacific Power)
- Cal Shirley (PSE)
- Bill Thomas (Northwestern Energy)
- Fred Gordon (ETO)
- Steve Eldridge (Umatilla Electric)
- Carol Dillin (PGE)
- Council
- NRDC/NWEC choice

Feel free to add EWEB and/or Seattle, of course.

CANON: Time well spent. Should help this be a 6-month process.

#### Action 5: Marketing (Teri Duncan)

DUNCAN: Provides background of the efforts carried out by Workgroup 4 [link to [memo](#)]

[Reviews [handout](#)]

CANON: [To HORKITZ] Is it within NEEA's realm to carry out the work suggested to support this effort?

HORKITZ: Yes, NEEA can take on the facilitation role for this group. The Marketing Coordinating Council formed itself before this issue was initiated. NEEA didn't have resources to play a facilitating role. The Marketing Coordinating Council felt it would benefit from having someone charged with the responsibility to make it happen. NEEA could take-on facilitation role for this group.

CANON: [To DUNCAN] What do you see being needed to target and test messages?

DUNCAN: First step is for NEEA to convene the Marketing Coordinating Council and then put together a work plan and identify/establish marketing channels.

WOODWORTH: Thinks it is fair to expect the Marketing Coordinating Council will identify the best opportunities.

HORKITZ: Points out two things: 1. The recommendation does not call for a regional campaign; it calls for tools. The whole region could use these messaging tools. 2. NEEA already built some budget into its business plan. It just needs approved.

M. HARRIS: Wants to reinforce TD's recommendation to read the "[Evaluation of Consumer Behavioral Research](#)". We can all learn something from this report. The recommendations made will help steer messaging. There is also use for having an ongoing forum. Peer pressure helps.

DRURY: At one point there was discussion about the need for a regional marketing message. Is that still alive?

DUNCAN: Yes. That was the intent; that was the purpose.



CANON: During the workgroup process, I think there was some recognition that they needed to do some research before moving forward. I think eventually that kind of thing will come out of this, but it will take some time.

CANON: Thanks NEEA for efforts on action items hosted.

FULENWIDER: Recognizes the good efforts of staff. Took action items on from the region as they needed addressed, without adding bureaucracy. It was fortunate that the NEEA business plan was moving in parallel with the Taskforce. There was much convergence with both efforts. Some concerns were expressed during the process. Needs were merged with existing requirements in a way that avoided redundancy. Thanks co-chairs and Canon for efforts along the way.

Wants to make sure the group is aware of a huge opportunity in regard with federal standards. NEEA will be coordinating efforts to engage in the process. At some point, the rulemaking will morph off into legislative lobbying efforts. NEEA doesn't lobby and will need to pass on these tasks. Encourages those in the room with lobbying arms to take the handoffs and pursue them in earnest as they come up.

Action 6 – Workforce Development Assessment  
Action 7 – Workforce Development Curriculum Coordination  
(Cal Shirley, Barbara Hins-Turner, Michael Wehling)

SHIRLEY: Went into this with some trepidation. Everyone had observational fact and experience that there were a lot of closed systems. Competition, not collaboration, is what has been traditionally encouraged. That trepidation has remained throughout the course of the work. Our fears were experienced. Identifying what can be done regionally was a huge challenge.

There is a regional workforce shortage with a lot of competition across industries. Not sure if the market was going to handle things efficiently. Should we come at this from education; succession planning; k-12? Did all agree that time was of the essence? Immediate needs carried the day and led us to do a literature review to identify what was already in play—finding out who was doing what, where. We figured we should focus on doing things now, rather than 5 years from now.

[Reviews [Handout](#)]

SHIRLEY: Thanks all parties who had put together some funding to move these recommendations forward. Hired Canon to help find a home for this kind of ongoing work. Worked with Centralia College because of the holistic nature of the work they were already engaging in on the energy production side. We looked for a group with a regional footprint and a training desire/orientation with potential alignment with NEET's goals. Considered starting something new if no group stepped up, although that idea was discarded.

With respect to the model. With all of the folks that Ken and I talked to, there was broad agreement that it looked like a good idea.

We were prepared to report to NEET that there was no host. As it turns out Barbara Hins-Turner has agreed to have Centralia College take on the job as host for both action items.

HINS-TURNER: The DOE grant did help with \$5 million funding. This also created a regional focus. Of course, this work needed to be woven into Smart Grid work. The support from the NEET Executive Committee was considerable in winning the grant. The grant and the matching money from NEET will provide the opportunity to host the workforce development efforts of NEET

Recognizes Dr. Bob Topping of Chemeketa Community College for his help.

Dr. TOPPING: Key goal is to focus on mission critical competencies. Topping used the example of using common core competencies in safety and hazard prevention to illustrate the power of using collaborative approaches. Using the portal that Hins\_Turner's effort has created will be critical.

SHIRLEY: Approximately \$100,000 has been raised through the voluntary NEET funding process for Actions 6 and 7. NEEA has been the escrow agent holding the money. While some of this money has been spent to get to this point, a substantial portion of this seed money will be transferred to Centralia College where it will be used to match federal grant funds.

DILLIN: There seems to be an opportunity to link with the marketing effort.

SHIRLEY: We still need to work on this. There are new things facing us, and I think that will be endemic to the work needing done. Bottom line is that consumers want it easy. The energy efficiency industry has always been deregulated. Even if we don't normally think of it that way, it's true.

CANON: We need to move on, but before we do so wants to offer an opportunity to PRICE to talk about his recently received grant.

PRICE: We did get a grant to put people to work with energy efficiency in the Puget Sound region. We are trying to use our network to put the right connections together.

WELKER: PECCI also just won a DOE training program grant using professions in the building commissioning operations.

PRICE: We also won one of those grants as well...for facilities operations staff.

M. HARRIS: Points out that there is also an Oregon Green Jobs Council on one of the charts in the handout. Will be matching up skills needed with gaps that exist to meet the needs in Oregon.

CANON: Tremendous activity and opportunity in the region.

WRIGHT: Believes that the workgroup has done some great work. Glad to hear a happy ending with the efforts.

#### Action 8: Cost Effectiveness Manual (Kim Drury)

DRURY: [reviews [handout](#)] The recommendation is no longer a high priority. Since the time that the original recommendation was made the federal government produced a national booklet on cost effectiveness. While it doesn't completely meet the needs of the Northwest (it is overly long and is not user friendly), it provides enough guidance to push the priority level down on the production for the "handbook for dummies."

FULENWIDER: There has been increasing attention on cost-effectiveness criteria. Would not be surprised if there were to be a request to move forward on this at some point.

#### Action 10: Decoupling (Ralph Cavanagh)

CAVANAGH: I have been watching all day for announcement by the TVA; I wanted to let you all know that a guy Bob Balzar will now be heading up the energy efficiency effort at TVA.

In regard to decoupling: Energy Efficiency at the levels we are looking for require a new business model. Every state is taking this on in some way. There are ongoing efforts in each state. Utilities around the west are adjusting the business model. IOUs are moving on this. Publics, not so much.

The public utility sector has two choices: 1. Move more costs into fixed costs, which makes promoting energy efficiency a difficult proposition; 2. Support through regular adjustments, like San Francisco.

Public power systems that do this are in the position to save costs and pass those savings onto customers. My offer is still on the table to help public power get there.

This offer is now formalized through NRDC.

Action 9: Smart Grid, Demand Response, VO (Lee Hall, Ryan Fedie)

EDEN: Thanks BPA for the work that they have done on these action items. They have done a lot of work.

HALL: [Reviews Smart Grid [handout](#)]

Thanks all parties and people who have been collaborating on this project.

CANON: Are these the total dollars or the match?

HALL: These are the match.

EGAN: Central Electric Cooperative got a grant for Smart Grid. How does that link to this.

HALL: Central Electric got their grant through PNGC.

WELKER: What is a transactive signal?

HALL: A signal that includes a price component. This is a value signal with a different value at different points in the hierarchical level and node.

WELKER: Responsive assets?

HALL: Many of the utilities have DR assets; distributed generation; CVR; electric vehicles. Smart Grid is all these things, aggregated. As much as we can integrate all of these together. There is a range from Smart Grid-heavy to Smart Grid-light.

WELKER: This links to a lot of the work that Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory has been doing on Open AutoDR. Buildings are nearly as antiquated as utility systems.

HALL: [Reviews Demand Response [handout](#)]

HARRIS: Thinking ahead for when it is more broadly available...regarding incenting behavior change. Should we be incenting behavior change?

HALL: Yes. Absolutely. The pilots we are pursuing are experimenting with various strategies.

WOODWORTH: Sees a linkage with the marketing council to share information. You have been generous with many kind comments. The project discipline, style, and organization has been critical in providing this resource for the region. Thanks HALL for his great work on this effort.

CANON: On the next-to-last slide, please explain how the residential pilot can help with wind integration. Does it increase or decrease the load?

HALL: Both.

CANON: Thinks BPA has done exemplary work here. Thanks. Has also been hugely impressed with the Voltage Optimization [VO] effort.

FEDIE: Thanks Ken. I'm just relaying this info. This work has been carried out primarily from our industrial group and contractors. The collaboration has been very strong with other parties as well. Points out that this is both utility system improvements and VO. It's the marriage of those two efforts that has made the effort a success.

[Reviews VO [handout](#)]

CANON: Points out that this measure ramps up significantly to be approx. 400+ aMW over twenty years. Really gets at the importance of this measure. The efforts to get the protocols through the RTF are a big deal. Do you have a sense of how we are doing compared to the rest of the nation?

FEDIE: There has been a lot of interest, nationally and internationally, regarding what we are doing.

GRIST: We are clearly out in the lead on this.

CANON: That concludes the presentations today.

We have a very good working group here; great diversity. Wonderful people to work, all of whom bring great experience and ideas to the table. Want to raise the question: Would this group be willing to meet on an on-call basis, regardless of whether it is facilitated or not? Thinks this is a great group of people to have on call...even if not the same people, the same groups should be able to pull together, on call, to provide the broadest executive level policy look and to see how we are doing on energy efficiency. Would like to see this group reconvene in a year or year and half to see how we are doing on emerging technologies, marketing, etc. It would be a shame to have all this work fade away because someone is not looking at it.

WRIGHT: We came together around a shared value—a commitment to accelerate the acquisition of energy efficiency. Some really great things and tremendous ideas were nurtured here. These action items will still need some work. I have a very high level of expectation on the groups coming out of the regional forum. These will need some executive-level help to keep them going. Hopes that all on the Executive Committee will continue to take ownership with the efforts that the group has shepherded and continue to do so. Asks all to continue to keep a close eye and keep things needing more attention in front of the rest of the group. Thinks if we do that, we will keep the momentum going.

M. HARRIS: In agreement with WRIGHT. Thinks that absent some form of agreement, things might dissipate. Much is in NEEA's court and believes that they could reconvene the group if needed.

EGAN: If we are going to carry forward, it should be on a planned and precise period.

WOODWORTH: Agrees. Thinks a prescribed time to take a strategic view might be helpful. That way we know and we can plan for it. NEEA is the appropriate entity to convene future meetings of a group similar to the NEET Executive Committee.

KARIER: Thinks it's important to graduate and then be able to look forward to reunions. Thinks co-chairs could keep an eye on this and work with NEEA to find an opportunity.

CANON: Thanks co-chairs of various working groups and sub-groups, all presenters, all the other support from the various staffs. This region has done a great job of working together.

EGAN: Thanks all for efforts. Definition of what is energy efficiency and how it is achieved is going to change over the next several years with new uses coming. That will drive our next articulation. Whatever we do going forward, the work being done to articulate how energy efficiency is designed and cost-benefit preservation of savings are critical.

KARIER: At our first meeting, I talked about my fridge. At this one should talk about my lawn mower. Sharpening the blades isn't glamorous, but it does make the mower much more efficient.

What we have done is considerable. We already have the plan and turned it into a regional work plan. Thanks Ken for all his work.

If you get it right with all the details, you get it right with the bigger picture. Wants to make sure we document our work accurately.

WRIGHT: Moments like this remind him of the great decision he made moving to Oregon 30 years ago. This has been one of the best experiences of his life.

The Northwest Coordination Agreement was a cornerstone for the Northwest. Right now we are building a legacy of energy efficiency. I hope people will look back in the future and see NEET as a foundation for the building of that infrastructure. We must treat these efforts as our children and continue to help them grow.

CANON: The meeting is adjourned and the Taskforce's work is concluded.