

PSC EPS Proceeding  
Working Group III  
September 24, 2007  
Conference Call

**Feedback from First Meeting**

Bill Saxonis will be sending a list of all WGIII members based on the sign in sheets from the 9/17 meeting, as well as new additions. He also requested that Helen Eisenfeld keep separate notations for outstanding issues that need to be addressed by the group.

**Discussion of the EPS Plan (Evaluation & Monitoring Chapter 5)**

Bill stated that the PSC evaluation proposal was broad based and that WGIII should add detail to what is in the current plan. In response to a question from the Joint Utilities, Bill noted that different organizations report expenditures and budgets differently and there needs to be a logical way to track how money is spent to achieve energy efficiency without “a million footnotes.” Also we should consider whether there should be a pool of dollars that all utilities and others put money into to do studies such as was done in past to determine free ridership, spillover, etc. How would you determine allocation of these costs when some utilities have large programs and others are more limited in scope? What are legitimate study topics? For example, Joint Utilities did do not consider measuring the economic impacts of the EPS as an appropriate topic.

Several WGIII participants had provided comments for the meeting and there was discussion related to the responsibilities/power that will be attributed to the proposed establishment of an Evaluation Standards and Protocol Task Force. Should the group be strictly advisory or will they have some implementation authority (*see outstanding issues*).

WGIII still has to come up with a plan on how to identify best practices as outlined in existing Evaluation Manuals and other sources of information and what should be adopted in NYS. As a follow-up to the last meeting, Bill had sent to WGIII links to several sites. It was requested that Bill/Carol develop specific areas that WGIII should be focusing on when reviewing these materials. Carol agreed that it would save people time to do it this way (*see outstanding issues*).

Carol also agreed to see if WGIII can see a draft EPA document that would be helpful in determining Evaluation protocols (after conference call Carol was able to forward document link to WGIII).

As part of Evaluation Program in draft PSC Proposal is a section on TRC and benefit/cost tests. Marc asked if the group could come to some consensus on the application of the TRC for the fast track programs in PSC Proposal. There was discussion on whether WGIII should be looking at fast track programs, but we have since learned that this issue does belong to WGIII (*outstanding issue*).

### **Update of Staff Progress re. Load Forecast and Energy Savings Assumptions**

Marc Vatter discussed load forecast data collected by PSC staff. This was compiled in a table and sent to WGIII prior to the conference call. Marc Vatter requested that WGIII participants provide him with a contact person. This can be a WGIII participant and any additional contacts from each participating entity.

There was much discussion regarding the basis for the forecast- should it be sales or requirements. It was suggested that purpose of Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standard (EPS) Proceeding is to be part of a solution to Global Warming and the 15% target should be set against requirements -- a better indicator of how to reduce emissions at the source. PSC staff indicated that Judge Stein had already made the decision to set targets against sales forecasts but that efficiencies at generation and transmission level should be accounted for when setting 15% target. This would also be consistent with how targets were set for Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) Proceeding. In further clarification of this issue after the meeting, it was determined that the ideal answer is to provide numbers for both requirements and sales for all the utilities, NYPA & LIPA, as well as an explanation as to how one converts requirements numbers into sales numbers. Each utility has a different level of line losses, so an explanation of why that is and how it is calculated would be desirable.

After having obtained all the numbers (and some buy-in from everyone that the numbers are accurate), each option as to how the goal could be applied should be identified, along with the pros and cons.

If time permits, the Working Group should attempt to achieve a consensus position to recommend to the Commission.

Questions also arose regarding whether actual data provided to PSC was weather normalized. WGIII should confirm and get back to Marc. Also we need NYPA and WGIII to look at NYPA sales forecast and DSM programs to ensure that we do not double count.

As follow-up to the discussion- Bill sent out Marc Vatter's contact information so we can contact him directly.

### **Draft Outline for WGIII Report**

Carol and Bill developed a draft outline to help WGIII keep focused on the report to be presented on December 5. Since it was sent out right before conference call it was requested WGIII provide comments by COB Tuesday, October 2.

### **Schedule for Future Meetings**

Next Conference Call has been rescheduled for Friday, October 5<sup>th</sup> 1-3 pm. Bill and Carol will send out an agenda prior to that meeting.

### **Outstanding Issues**

- 1) WGIII has to define details of the proposed Evaluation Task Force.
- 2) Carol/Bill will provide WGIII with guidance on issues to consider when reviewing evaluation protocols documents.
- 3) Comments are due regarding Fast Track Programs by mid October. WGIII report is due later. WG III should be looking at the TRC as it relates to the fast track programs.

### **Wrap Up**

See above outstanding issues.