PSC EPS Proceeding
Working Group III
October 29, 2007

- **The first part of the meeting was devoted to reviewing status of data to calculate EPS goals.**

- **<u>Review of Draft Power Point Presentation for All Group Meeting with ALJs</u>**

All group meeting to report progress/status to ALJs. Also, the meeting will provide an opportunity for interaction among groups, for overlaps and help.

The review began with a general discussion of focus for lead-off slides – as drafted, with ALJ questions our group was assigned, or accomplishments (outlines, worksheets, data); further discussions included primary charge of our group, need to have a better understanding of responsibilities of other groups.

p. 2 <u>WG 3 Objectives:</u> A proposal was made to expand #2 to include roles and responsibilities under "Guidelines" and another to delete "analysis" in #3.

p. 3-4 <u>WG 3 Process/Reports Utilized</u>: Comments included sharing data and drafts; and providing a list (or links) of major documents used for sources by group

p. 5 <u>Defining 15X15 Savings:</u> Comment to note group is not using NYISO forecast as baseline. A sidebar discussion followed regarding an inclusion, or not, a list of the organizations in the group. It was noted that member organizations have had varying degrees of involvement.

p. 6-7 <u>Issues:</u> The group discussed baseline issues with data such as NYPA double count, SBC imputation levels, and NYPA funding independent of SBC funds. In first bullet of p. 6, a suggestion was offered to replace "measures" with "savings".

p. 8-9 <u>Objectives:</u> Bill Steigelmann, not able to attend the meeting, provided written comments. His comments discussed included the inclusion of demand savings in addition to energy, the addition of an effectiveness assessment to identify improvements to the process. Other comments included a need for market assessments (studies) – regional and/or statewide.

p. 10 Bill Steigelmann provided possible bullet to review "old results" to "new results" that use metering data and self-reports by participants.

p. 11-12 <u>B/C Test/Issues:</u> A suggestion was made to delete the first bullet for Fast Track given that these programs are already established and running programs. A number of B/C issues were raised and discussed for test options, including externalities, taxes, and discount rates. Also discussed were impacts of including or changing inputs that may not be significant in the final selection of programs; sources of valid input data, such as, avoided costs and participant cost of ECMs); and a sufficiently high level of program expenditures to allow for economies of scale. Mark V. suggested for 2nd bullet, slide 11 to change "options" to "toward options" to indicate group does not yet have an options list.

p. 13+ Suggestions were made to eliminate the last few slides – too much detail and not needed. Counter suggestions were to leave them and have available if related questions were asked at presentation.