CONSERVATION ADVISORY COUNCIL
Notes from meeting on November 30, 2011

Attending from the Council:
Anne Snyder-Grassman, PGE
Don MacOdrum, Home Performance Guild
Juliet Johnson, OPUC
Don Jones, Pacific Power
Scott Inman, ORA
Holly Meyer, NW Natural
Theresa Gibney, ODOE
Bill Welch, EWEB
Stan Price, NEEC

Attending from Energy Trust:
Peter West
Tom Beverly
Oliver Kesting
Kim Crossman
Marshall Johnson
Pete Catching
Eric Wilson
Fred Gordon
Matt Braman
Jessica Rose
Amber Cole
Debbie Goldberg-Menashe
John Volkman
Steve Lacey
Scott Swearingen
Nick O'Neil

Others attending:
Jeremy Anderson, WISE
Tim Davis, CSG
Karen Des, PECI
Phil Damiano, PECI
Clark Fisher, Nexant Inc.
Marlowe Kulley, Bureau of Planning & Sustainability
Aaron Berg, CEWO
Stephanie Vasquez, BPA
Andrew Morphis, Green Hammer
Andrew Reagen, Rogers Machinery
John Reynolds, Energy Trust Board of Directors
Derek Smith, CEWO
Luke May

1. Welcome and introductions

Peter welcomed everyone and held introductions. There will be a special meeting in January to learn about the Energy Performance Score and what Energy Trust has learned from the latest studies. There were enough questions raised to hold a separate meeting instead of a whole Conservation Advisory Council meeting for just that issue.

The agenda, meeting packet, notes and presentation materials are available here.

2. Final draft 2012-13 budgets

Peter started the discussion with an overview of bonus incentives after 60 days of activity. [See slides in the meeting packet.] The initial slide showed a combination of commercial and industrial bonuses.

Peter: There were 600 Business Energy Tax Credit projects returned by the Oregon Department of Energy because of the earlier cutoff date with 311 in areas served by Energy Trust. We've been able to capture about one-third of those and help them to move forward. We also enrolled 797 other projects in the same period, so we have a tremendous amount in the pipeline. Projects with bonuses need to complete by 12/15/11. Seventy-eight are paid already; primarily lighting projects. The bonus dollars outstanding are shown in the slides, along with what we

paid. They are less than what we showed in the August worst case scenarios, so we are staying within the budget.
Stan Price: Is there an estimated aMW that tracks with those numbers?
Peter: I don't have that with me, but we can get it, and it would be useful to know.

Peter: A large amount is in the commercial sector, which is what we showed before. It's also significant that we collected 240 industrial projects, which is higher than we expected. That bodes well for our 2012 mitigation design.

Holly Meyer: Were you at all surprised by the numbers?
Peter: We didn't really know what to expect, so we had hoped for more, particularly in Portland General Electric territory, since they've really fallen off. That was built into the big ranges we presented in August. We're finding that for small industrial, the custom offer seems to be sufficient.

Andrew Reagen: We have a number of projects bumping up against the 12/15 deadline, but it's a fraction of what's out there in terms of people hurt by the Business Energy Tax Credit change. To get equipment purchased, installed and verified by 12/15 was too short of a window for custom capital projects. Those can take a couple of years.
Peter: We'll have the mitigation plans in place for all of next year, so we'll see how it plays out.
Andrew: There is plenty in the pipeline for next year.

Peter: We've found that when something gets taken away in the renewable energy sector a good number of customers will go away and stay away for some period. Our recapture of projects was good, but there will still be a settling out. As an example, when you miss the sale, you wait for the next sale. If the next sale doesn't come, you finally end up buying anyway. We expect that some of these are good energy-efficiency projects, and they'll show up in 2012.

Holly: That 797 seems high in comparison to the others. I wonder if by offering the 20 percent bonus we ended up capturing more companies who didn't plan to be active?
Peter: No, these are out of the ones that would have gone forward with the prior Business Energy Tax Credit, so we believe we are capturing what would have been lost—had there been no mitigation.

Peter: Focusing on the revised budgets by utility, the overall budget is lower than originally shown last month. A measure cost error slightly inflated costs for some measures, particularly on the gas side. Costs were 4 percent lower for Cascade Natural Gas, but with that we found a way to expand the showerhead promotion and bring in a little more than 3,300 therms—a 5 percent increase for them.

For NW Natural, the budget had the same kind of decimal error. It was lower by $274,000; a 1 percent change. Correcting a very small rounding error gave us 314 more therms.

For Pacific Power, the revenue we had in the previous round is less than now expected, so we revised the budget down by $869,000; a 2 percent reduction. Overall, we end up with a half aMW reduction from what we projected in the last budget, one month ago.

For both PGE and Pacific Power, the revised Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance, NEEA, budget is lower for 2012. They scrubbed their numbers, and overall there's an 8 percent reduction, net of all changes.

For PGE, the budget is slightly higher; the error was in the wrong direction: a $202,000 increase, or a 0.2 percent change. These aren't big changes, and if you bring in the NEEA reduction to PGE, they were one-tenth of an aMW; less than what we said before, in terms of savings.

Juliet Johnson: NEEA is saying they'll deliver 8 percent less?
Peter: This is based on their scrubbed number, so yes.
Fred: They've improved their forecast by using more specific data for which service territory (Energy Trust or other utilities) savings are occurring in, using local data on stores, using data from Energy Trust on housing starts, sales data and other more specific sources. NEEA's forecast always has a lot of play, but they're doing a better job of allocation.

Peter: This budget is $150 million in 2012 for energy efficiency. It's a 19 percent increase over 2011. There are higher costs for savings, which reflects code changes and mitigations for a full year, as talked about before. Multifamily will have some mitigation bonuses available for windows with insulation and shell measures; New Buildings, as well. We've spread out what's eligible for a full year, so that's a bit of the cost increase.

In the chart broken down by program, there's nothing that's fundamentally different from what we went over in detail before. We've also provided all the documentation from the action plans, one-pagers and program strategies. Essentially this is all the same.

The 2013 budget is almost a straight line, except for New Buildings having some falloff in activity. We said that next year would bring a lot of learning and discovery. We chose to moderate and follow a slight slope from one year to the next into 2013. Other years we have been more precise about the second year of the budget. This year we're admitting we're in a holding pattern for 2013 and will revisit this as we go through 2012.

In 2012, savings go up 21 percent across the board for both gas and electric. We'll end this year with more than 40 aMW, and it will probably be 41 aMW. It will be up to 48 aMW in the 2012 stretch case. For gas, we'll have 4.75 million therms in 2011 and the stretch for 2012 is projecting 5.75 million therms.

For Cascade Natural Gas, we have a $2.7 million budget, up 11 percent for 2012.

NW Natural has a $22.2 million budget. That's a 16 percent increase from where we expect to finish in 2011. The slides are for the core program in Oregon. Efforts for the firm and interruptible customers add more.

Savings from the core part of NW Natural are net; not gross. We expect 4.38 million therms for the core program; 17 percent higher than this year. That's 14 percent above the IRP target; not quite the 15 percent buffer, but close enough for this year..

In addition, there is industrial firm and interruptible and commercial. That $2.9 million is not in the other chart, but brings in 864,000 therms.

Holly: On the gas market transformation, is there an easy answer for how that's calculated?
Matt Braman: We use new housing forecasts for homes built in our territory and savings above code.

Holly: That's only the new home market and not conversion?
Matt: There is a small amount assumed, like 8 or 9,000 for conversion.

Holly: It was de-rated, but does this reflect it?
Matt: We do show that. Five years after a code change is typical; the change will take effect in 2012 and there will be another one after that.

Fred Gordon: NEEA leads a lot of the code efforts, having conversations about how to estimate savings and how long they last. It will be up for deeper conversation internally at NEEA and then in the region.

Peter: In Pacific Power, we have $43.5 million in 2012, up 12 percent from 2011. The program mix is pretty much the mix we forecast in the first budget presentation, but a little less in Existing Buildings and Production Efficiency. It gets us 17.27 aMW of net energy in 2012; or a 6.6 percent increase. The IRP is at 15.3 aMW, so we're 11 percent higher than the IRP.

Don: It's ahead of our forecast. So we're good in terms of the 15 percent.
Peter: Okay, we have more buffer, which is great.

Peter: For PGE, we're at $77.7 million; up 24 percent from where we expect to land this year. We're underspending for PGE, so you're going to see a big change year-over-year to catch up; 31.5 aMW as a stretch case. That's a 32 percent increase, and also comfortably 15 percent above our IRP goal.

The answer in all cases is that we have sufficient stretch budget to meet IRP. As for next steps: we are looking for formal review comments by 12/1/11. Everything is on the web. Program and utility-specific data and designs are updated on the web, as well. Details will go up before the end of the day. Comments or feedback can start now.

Comments and discussion
Bill Welch: Overall savings are up how much and budget how much?
Peter: Savings are up 21 percent, and budget is up 19 percent overall.

Juliet: It seemed like one main driver this year was filling the pipeline for market transformation activities. What does that mean, and how does that interact with NEEA?
Peter: I might not have described it that way. When we fill the pipeline, there are standard commercial and industrial projects we depend on each year. Some of these take 18-24 months to set up, and are important to us. We have a pretty small pipeline and we need to rebuild for 2012. Are you asking about market transformation specifically?

Juliet: There was a list of something like five bullets; kind of underlying assumptions for the next year. They were things like the economy, Business Energy Tax Credit impacts and market transformation activities. I wasn't clear and seemed surprised with some of this. Were those the budget themes?
Fred: The majority of spending in 2012 is going for savings that year. A couple of years out, when codes and standards are changing, we're going to have to do new things. A smaller portion of the funding is going to test and learn how to deliver new measures, measure bundles and services. Some of these development activities are at NEEA, some at Energy Trust and some coordinated between the two. For example, we'll be working on lighting design for Existing Buildings to get savings beyond the new federal fluorescent ballast and bulb standards. We're trying to get the market to move smoothly for heat pump water heaters and 0.67 water heaters. We are trying to grease the market channels for these new products. Spending on future measures. It could diminish our annual throughput, but it helps us get new technology and new services up and running, like new commercial strategic energy management services. We're

testing them in 2012, and trying to refine them. We'll look at OPOWER in 2012. We're trying to see if they will work out. We can say they are a "significant minority" of 2012 investments.

Kim: When we wrote up the budget themes, one of the bullets included market transformation from NEEA that we fund and get savings from.
Fred: Most NEEA projects are done with support from local programs, since they know about new technologies and approach and can create a regional framework, and we have the capability to deliver programs in the field The ductless heat pump pilot was a 4,000 unit pilot that sold 10,000 units—NEEA trained vendors, promoted and did the evaluation, but Energy Trust and local utilities did the rebates and quality control. A lot of NEEA projects are like this.

Andrew: Is there a target in our charter or some guideline we use to track percentage spent on incentives vs. our overall budget?
Peter: No, there isn't. This year, we spent more than half—a good bit more, for incentives. Really, that number is specific to program design. The incentives matter a lot on industrial projects. On the other hand, New Buildings involves quite a bit of early design; soft and direct financial incentives may not matter as much. In this case, delivery costs, which are our efforts, mean more, but it's still very cost effective to put that money in. In that case, less than 40 percent is paid in incentives; program delivery is more of the cost.

Don: You treat analysis services as service incentives, right?
Peter: Yes, if it's a study delivered to the customer. But here I'm thinking more of outreach to builders, and training or workshops that keep designers up to speed. We call those delivery costs.

Don: Specific studies fall in there as service incentives, though.
Peter: Yes.

Karen Des: In the New Buildings program, if you come in after the plans are done, you don't get as deep a look at the building.

Andrew: It would be interesting to see how those numbers change over time as you pursue those hard-to-reach goals. The next bits of savings would be harder and harder to get. I would think the trend is more toward service incentives after you use up the easy-to-get savings, which can be purchased with incentives.

Peter: I want to be careful with that because you don't have a constant set of programs over time. For instance, the Industrial Energy Improvement, IEI, initiative belonged to NEEA originally but now it's ours and is a huge part of the program.

Kim: Four years ago Industrial savings came 100 percent from capital projects. Now we are up to 35 percent from operations and maintenance. At the sector level, we do look at these things as we do our five year plans and budget. We thought it would become less and less cash and more about people, but then we find more of the cheap savings, so more incentives go out anyway. We're looking at that and how it works with our programs. But over the whole organization, it probably wouldn't tell you much.

Peter: I like to look at whether or not we are becoming more efficient as our programs evolve. That's more meaningful for the overall organization.

Fred: We've roughly doubled our funding to NEEA in the past couple of years for market transformation. We don't call what they're doing incentives, although they offer upstream

incentives, for example to TV retailers at the regional level. We haven't been able to put that out in a forecast yet as "incentives." NEEA ran a program similar to IEI where customer-specific technical services were not categorized as incentives. At Energy Trust they are. We would need to look at many of these finer distinctions to make a trend analysis over time meaningful.

Peter: It's worth looking at from a curiosity standpoint. But a key number is the overall levelized cost.

Andrew: I like what Energy Trust does, and it helps my business, but it can be shocking to look at this budget, with so much that might look like overhead but really is program delivery. They're big numbers.
Peter: It's a large budget and we certainly can appreciate that.

Juliet: It might be interesting to look at that. It's maybe more of a communications issue, I think. What are the actual savings per dollar spent may be more meaningful. It might be good to look at communicating things that way instead of looking at what percentage of dollars go to incentives.
Peter: We're at 3.4 cents per kWh, which is a pretty good price.

Fred: Sometimes we describe efficiency programs as a mix of technical assistance, marketing and incentives. In some markets, incentives are the least cost-effective way of doing things, or are dependent on a lot of technical help and marketing to work. You have to create an overall stew of these different approaches to come up with the cheapest mix that drives savings.

3. Cost effectiveness policy

Fred: We thought we pulled together some fairly superficial changes to our cost effectiveness policy in March, but there was some deep conversation over them with the Oregon Public Utility Commission, OPUC. There are some key questions that are still under discussion. As we worked out more specific guidance from the OPUC and encountered new situations, the policy and how it's applied in reality didn't line up and needed adjustments. The OPUC will be taking a deeper look at cost effectiveness in 2012. The proposed changes are for the interim. I'll go over the proposed interim changes that require re-wording of the policy and how we implement it.

One area is what we do with hard-to-quantify, non-energy benefits. We have a rough proxy that isn't very precise, but is better than nothing. The agreement right now is about how we use that proxy and how broadly we use it. It first started with solar, and then moved to multifamily windows. For multifamily, the value of windows projects for multifamily owners was in question and the same was true with multifamily weatherization measures. Many owners had another reason that strongly influenced their decision to invest. Yet, at the same time, we saw that incentives pushed projects forward

The interim agreement we have reached with the OPUC staff is that we won't formally apply the proxy more broadly, but, if a measure we have been installing proves not to be cost-effective without the proxy, and there are indications of significant non-energy benefits, we won't remove that measure from our programs until the more thorough review of cost-effectiveness is completed.

Holly: If the OPUC is clarifying the tests, does it mean we shouldn't be looking at both the societal and utility tests?
Juliet: There are limitations that make us wonder if the way that we're using the societal test really makes sense, and if this is the best way to handle things, especially considering the role of non-energy benefits.

Don: This doesn't say to use one or the other, but clarifies the use of both tests.

Fred: We are still working with the same paradigm as before. Measures must pass both tests. Right now we are not throwing out measures that have big, hard-to-measure, non-energy benefits.

There are a couple of other clarifications from March. Where the feds or the state are paying part of the program costs, the part that they're paying can be excluded from the societal test. Federal and state programs are often driven by other benefits, like living wage or job creation, that are not included on the benefit side of the cost-benefit test under OPUC guidance. Because we don't count the benefits, we should exclude the costs from the tests.

Holly: Can you clarify that what we're looking at are updates to the previous changes from March? This summary is what you gave us in March, but now you're tweaking it?
Fred: That's correct. In the back of your packets there are the redlined versions we gave you last time. We just added to the redlines.

Peter: In other words, accept all the changes from March and use all the newer changes as additions.

Fred: We'll roll the new redlines in with the old, and propose one, wholesale change to the board.

Holly: Are these policy excerpts or the whole policy?
Fred: This is the whole policy. Page two shows what we did. The whole policy is a few pages into the packet.

On the second set of revisions, we changed the discussion of the proxy for non-energy-benefits slightly to clarify. Proxies can be used where benefits are large enough to influence consumer decisions. We need to discuss if the proxy is appropriate for broader use. We need to talk more with the OPUC about that, or even if the societal test fits with their plans.

On page 6-7 are the actual language changes. On 6, we talk about the federal and state programs. On 7 we use slightly more detailed language about the proxy. It responds to the OPUC statement that the policy is broad and unclear, and is there a way we can we make it more clear and specific? This has to be based on actual research, not just because someone decides it.

Bill Welch: Could you give us an example of using the proxy?
Fred: Multifamily windows are an example where, after we evaluated, we learned that customers wouldn't do windows on their own. When we asked the owners, we learned that they did windows because of better occupancy rates, more tenant comfort, liked the way they sealed better, and other non-energy things about the building. Some other value besides energy was another big driver of their decision. The majority of them valued changing windows for non-energy benefits. There are lots of ways of trying to quantify the consumer's value for these other benefits, but different study designs come up with different numbers. We can't replicate findings or narrow uncertainty with more study so we prefer to use the proxy for non-energy-benefits instead.

Bill: But the resource gained couldn't be measured through normal cost benefit tests?
Fred: Right. There was data showing it was something other than energy.

Bill: Really, you find that it's still not cost effective, but it's still okay to do it.
Fred: That's right.

Holly: How is the tankless water heater different from these other measures?
Fred: It has clear non-energy disadvantages as well as non-energy benefits. The proxy can't be used when there are clear benefits pointing in one direction.

Holly: Isn't this why we look at the non-energy benefits?
Fred: If we did a study, we would learn that there are clear positives and negatives on the performance and equipment with tankless water heaters. We've only used this thing a handful of times for anything. It's only where we've seen the non-energy benefits go a long way. You could study a lot more things, but it's imprecise and awkward.

Holly: People are doing this anyway, so we want to know why; is that a reason to do the study?
Fred: We want the studies to consider the proxy in situations where we'd have a shot at reaching firm conclusions that can support using the proxy and making a measure cost-effective. For tankless, we saw that with both non-energy positives and negatives we'd be unlikely to reach any strong conclusions. The social science tools don't work very well to reach firm conclusions in that situation. Our observation that tankless has non-energy positives and negatives is coming from lab studies that show a delay in getting hot water and from conversations with customers and vendors We know that positive and negative benefits are there, but not how to draw firm conclusions about the balance.

Bill: To make the windows project happen, it still needs the incentive to push it over the edge? You're sort of toying with free ridership, but the incentive is still needed?
Fred: We have enough data on multifamily windows to say that roughly three-quarters of customers wouldn't have done it without incentives.

Scott Inman: So the societal test goes away on those types of measures?
Fred: No, but we can use a proxy. Basically we look at what was saved on energy bills over three years, and say the rest of what they paid was for non-energy reasons. We include that value (the proxy for non-energy reasons) in the test as a non-energy benefit. With that included most measures pass the societal test.

Stan Price: In 2012, the OPUC is thinking of a process to examine this through a more articulated policy, correct?
Juliet: We don't have a game plan yet, and I'll attempt to come back next meeting with a plan. We understand that the proxy is kind of clumsy, so we're going to address it.

Fred: The next thing was the clarification request about avoided costs. We tried to use more specific language but keep it at a policy level. Avoided costs are based on IRP where the utilities choose their resource mix. The utilities provide it to us. Costs of carbon dioxide reductions are considered in avoided costs. We're about to revisit avoided costs for the electrics for Energy Trust internal computational purposes again, and will convene the utilities and OPUC to discuss what numbers to use. That's where this review happens.

Don Jones: On page 6, what's the source of the excluded costs? I'm not sure I understand backing out the costs of tax credits paid by the state.
Fred: This came about because we were comparing efficiency costs that included the value of tax credits to an avoided cost for generation that is net of tax credits. Market price forecasts for

generation are, because they are market prices, net of tax credits. The OPUC concluded that we should also net tax credits out of the societal cost for efficiency to achieve a rough parity.

Don: The California standard practice manual says tax credits are taken out of avoided costs. If I take this back to my IRP team, it may make sense to them, but I want to clarify it.

Holly: So, if you say the tax credits are taken out, the cost of a $5,000 piece of equipment net of a $200 tax credit is $4,800, and that's what's figured in (the societal cost)?
Fred: That's correct.

Don: So, really you're measuring tax credits the same way we are. That's fine.

John Reynolds: From the handout, pages 5-7 will be presented to the board?
Fred: Pages 5-7, which are the intro to policy explanation, will be in the board packet. Pages 1-2 are the explanation, 3-4 are the resolution and 5-7 are the policy.

John Reynolds: There are 8 boldface numbers. What are they and do they need to be there?
John Volkman: We tried to refer you to specific places where these things come up in the policy. We had line numbers in the policy, originally, but the more it changed the tougher it was to follow.

Fred: What you'll get is a cleaned up version, with everything from March and since rolled together into a single change request.

Holly: To compare apples to apples: in the participant test, it's benefit vs. cost, participant cost vs. cost of the saved power over 20 years?
Fred: We do not use a test called the participant test. That was originally in the cost-effectiveness policy but it's really a program design issue, not a regulatory test. For the participant the payback has to be short enough that it's a good value. For the participant, the tax credit makes the payback period shorter. In program design, we look at what payback we have to hit in order to get the consumer to buy.

Stan: Yes. I'm glad you did this and made it explicit. The proxy thing may seem inelegant, but it shows that you're trying to consider these things in the analysis.

Bill: I appreciate that you're calling out the proxy, too. After years of doing this I know that the incentive pushes something that makes the participant go forward. If something is hamstringing things, we need to figure it out.

Don: You have to be careful about using the proxy with big investments. Use it as little as possible. This set of changes balances it. We've grappled with how to do this in other areas and we came up with a different result, but they are worthy of an open docket. This request says operate with the updated policy until you have a different one, but use it sparingly. This should be sent to the board as administrative fixes, and then open a full docket on it.

Fred: We have to decide whether it's a docket or conversation.

Juliet: That's why we'll take it back and discuss it another time.

Holly: I know this is in a different venue with the OPUC. This defines cost effectiveness but not conservation, and the definition will include fuel switching.

Fred: This allows this policy to stand and work with whatever conclusions come out of that docket.

Juliet: Next Tuesday, we'll open this docket to look at fuel switching. Next Tuesday is just opening the docket, and is more of a formality. There's no need for input or comment yet. A few weeks after this, we can have the workshops and comments. The commissioners have decided to take this on, so Tuesday is just procedural. I'll keep everyone posted.

Peter: Does that docket opening set the comment schedule? Do people have to formally intervene?

Don: I know there's a formal part, but I don't know, either.

Juliet: I will find out about the formalities and let everyone know.

4. Combined heat and power policy

Fred Gordon: This is a first look and periodic review. If you have concerns we can take this back for a second look. All of our policies get reviewed every few years. This is a case where we completed the policy, operated for a few years, and on review, decided it needs clarification.

As background, we had an attorney general's decision that we can take fossil fuel cogeneration as an efficiency measure if it uses generation fuel more efficiently. We've done this at OSU and a little project at OHSU using a micro-turbine. Gas prices have been unpredictable so combined heat and power, CHP, projects have been few, but with prices going down there may be interest again. We're looking at these clarifications:

1) CHP projects are in addition to incentives for other efficiency measures for other things.
2) We're changing the title to fossil fuel combined heat and power, to prevent confusion with renewable energy CHP, which is under a different policy.
3) We threw in "fossil fuel" in the body also where appropriate
4) We clarified the language to delineate where our world ends and where the utility power generation world begins. We're really paying for electric generation for use on site; not for utility power generation.
5) We proscribed residential CHP in the first policy. One analysis of residential CHP showed payback in the hundreds of years. However, multifamily may work, and costs may come down on single-family. We're not completely closed, in case something good comes through. So we are opening the policy to residential projects.

Don Jones: Does this have the high-efficiency requirement so that whatever receives incentives meets the high heat rate of the next plant on?
Fred: We've linked with Oregon Department of Energy's heat rate requirements.

Kim Crossman: You have to beat the heat rate that's average for the grid. Incentives are only there once you're over the marginal. For residential, you couldn't even come close to getting over that bar.

Fred: You can't net meter a residential CHP project. Policy aside, there's some talk about whether our incentives are set correctly. But this discussion, about the policy, is not where we'll decide that.

Kim: It's only high-efficiency CHP in any sector.

Fred: We don't know of a reason to change that now. Want to promote very efficient facilities that use fuel a lot better.

John Reynolds: Are you going to change the title to make it clearer?

Fred: Yes, that's our plan and it fell off the edits.

5. Public comment

There was no public comment

6. Meeting adjournment

Peter thanked everyone for another year of volunteer service, and reminded everyone that comments for the budget are due December 1. He also reminded the group that the EPS workshop will be held about the third or fourth week of January. The next full council meeting is February 15, 2012, at 1:30 p.m.