

Conservation Advisory Council Meeting Notes

February 5, 2014

Attending from the Council:

Jim Abrahamson, Cascade Natural Gas
Brittany Andrus, Oregon Public Utility
Commission
Jeff Bissonette, Fair and Clean Energy
Coalition
Warren Cook, Oregon Department of
Energy
Anne Snyder Grassmann, Portland General
Electric
Don MacOdrum, Home Performance Guild
of Oregon
Holly Meyer, NW Natural
Stan Price, Northwest Energy Efficiency
Council

Attending from Energy Trust:

Adam Bartini
Taylor Bixby
Tom Beverly

Amber Cole
Kim Crossman
Diane Ferington
Sue Fletcher
Fred Gordon
Jackie Goss
Marshall Johnson
Spencer Moersfelder
Elaine Prause
Julianne Thacher
Peter West

Others attending:

Jeremy Anderson, WISE
Dave Backen, Evergreen Consulting
Keith Barrow, NW Natural
Christina Cabrales, Conservation Services
Group
Wendy Koelfgen, Clean Energy Works
Ryan Clemmer, Clean Energy Works

1. Welcome and introductions

Kim Crossman convened the meeting at 1:30 p.m. and reviewed the agenda. The agenda, notes and presentation materials are available on Energy Trust's website at www.energytrust.org/About/public-meetings/CACMeetings.aspx.

2. Preliminary results for 2013

Peter West presented preliminary savings results.

Peter: Preliminary savings results are the best available data as of this time, and results may change as the annual report to the OPUC is compiled. The annual report will be delivered to the OPUC by mid-April, including financials and progress toward other goals.

Energy efficiency savings for 2013 exceeded electric stretch goals. Energy Trust achieved 104 percent of the electric stretch goal and 97 percent of the gas stretch goal. Savings surpassed three of the four utility IRP goals: 122 percent of PGE, 133 percent of Pacific Power, 138 percent of NW Natural and 86 percent for Cascade Natural Gas.

I want to thank staff at Energy Trust, trade allies and supporting organizations for these achievements. Meeting gas goals was especially challenging due to cost-effectiveness constraints.

Energy Trust savings by sector include those deriving from work by Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance, NEEA, supported by Energy Trust funds.

Commercial sector programs reached 106 percent of the stretch goal for electric savings and 101 percent of the stretch savings goal for gas savings. Industrial savings represented 101 percent of the stretch electric goal and 92 percent of the stretch gas goal. Residential sector programs achieved 104 percent of the stretch electric goal and 97 percent of the stretch gas goal.

The results by sector reflect relative opportunities in the markets. The commercial sector produced the highest savings, for both electric and gas, in part because this sector had the greatest growth potential. Electric savings in the industrial sector slightly exceeded residential sector savings, while the residential sector is now the second largest source of gas savings. Residential programs have been around much longer and have served a deeper share of the market, so savings in the residential sector are harder to achieve over time.

Multifamily, New Buildings and New Homes and Products performed well in 2013 across the board. These programs reached stretch goals for three out of the four utilities and came just shy of meeting stretch goal for the fourth. NEEA's results also were strong. Production Efficiency achieved outstanding results in PGE and NW Natural territories.

The commercial Strategic Energy Management, SEM, offering has struggled with enrollment. Expectations were based on industrial sector SEM performance and have proved to be optimistic. More often than in the industrial sector, commercial SEM projects have backed out or been scaled back. Commercial businesses appear to have greater capacity constraints. These concerns are being evaluated this year.

The Oregon Department of Energy and Energy Trust collaborated effectively to enroll schools. Fewer projects finished than expected. Even with a strong 2014 pipeline, more resources will be needed to improve the close rate for schools projects.

Residential results would have been higher had the program continued promoting Energy Saver Kits. Energy Trust made a strategic decision to reduce kit distribution by more than 70 percent, hoping there would be an uptick in weatherization. However, both tracks of Home Performance produced 50 percent less in savings than the previous year, while the number of projects decreased by about 30 percent. The outcome of the cost-effectiveness docket at the OPUC will be a key factor for this track.

Mark Johnson: What's included in the kits?

Peter: Energy Saver Kits include faucet aerators, showerheads and lighting, and can be obtained online, through promotions or through school projects.

Andria Jacob: The savings in Home Performance was switched from modeled to deemed. Did that cause part of the issue?

Peter: Yes. But the drop in the number of projects was a surprise.

Holly Meyer: Perhaps this is due to the time needed for the program to switch from Energy Saver Kits to Home Performance.

Peter: Yes, more patience may be needed. We did well in residential overall, reaching 104 percent of the electric stretch goal and 97 percent of the gas goal. While weatherization projects are an area of concern, the measure counts for installed equipment were up in most every

category in Existing Homes. In 2014, we will push equipment further and look at how to turn weatherization around.

On the utility level, Energy Trust hit 99 percent of the stretch goal for PGE. In Production Efficiency, SEM was successful and a megaproject at Intel contributed to savings. PGE staff did a good job keeping things on track and deserve thanks for their great work.

Savings for Pacific Power came in at 113 percent of stretch (net; gross numbers are being prepared). Data centers and multifamily projects were particularly strong in Pacific Power territory.

Don Jones: I want to point out that NEEA's great results are on Sixth Power Plan baseline.

Peter: Energy Trust achieved 100 percent (rounded) of stretch goal for NW Natural. The industrial and commercial demand-side management effort has really taken off and finished close to double the expected achievement. ICF, Spencer and Existing Buildings did a great job. In addition, OPower delivered stronger results than expected.

Energy Trust finished at 73 percent of stretch goal for Cascade Natural Gas. New Buildings and New Homes and Products performed well. Energy Trust worked with Jim and Allison on an outreach effort with Cascade's field offices that resulted in more allies, connections and projects, although these efforts could not overcome the drop-off in Production Efficiency projects. Existing Buildings also experienced project evaporations, including a large Sunriver project. We hope to get back out in the field with Cascade Natural Gas staff to explore whether any of their connections can be engaged.

Again, it is important to acknowledge and thank the 2,700 trade allies, allied technical assistance contractors, designers, architects, code officials, real estate allies and all of the outreach staff who helped drive the 2013 accomplishments.

3. Conservation Advisory Council operating principles for 2014

Kim read the portions of the council charter and operating principles to the group and asked for thoughts on how well recent activity has aligned with them. Last year the Conservation Advisory Council took a close look at the charter and updated the operating principles.

Holly: Should we receive previous meeting notes one week in advance of the upcoming meeting?

Kim: Right now, the meeting notes go into the board packet, but not the next Conservation Advisory Council packet. Should we include them? Several council members responded positively.

Kim: We tried to create a shift toward shorter presentations and more room for discussion. Does anyone have feedback on that?

Holly: There is always kind of a tension around that goal. We're often trying to stay on schedule, but there isn't always enough time to discuss things. It may always be a problem.

Jim Abrahamson: You've tried to stay structured, which is helpful. Sometimes a 10 minute discussion becomes an hour, but it may be helpful. This group doesn't usually go off on tangents, so the extended discussion is valuable, in my opinion.

Kim: The discussions can be great, and we have to make continuous improvements on this.

Kim: We provide minutes in the board packets, and we've found that board members pay attention to these notes. There was interest in having a board member present at Conservation Advisory Council meetings, and last year we asked to have someone here. Mark Kendall joined us in 2013, to good effect.

Holly: Sometimes there is a delicate issue in the minutes, and we would like to review before the minutes go to the board. Can Conservation Advisory Council members review the minutes before they're finalized?

Kim: We've discussed that internally, and I have been informed that with monthly board meetings, timing is often very short to get the council minutes done and in their packet. Building in another round of review would break the system. If there is something concerning in the discussion, you can always let me know after the meeting and I'll review the notes with you.

Don Jones: At the Regional Technical Forum we approve the minutes at the next meeting. Even though we don't vote here, we should consider having a short review process at the beginning of each meeting.

Kim: Since we discussed attaching the minutes to the next packet, we can consider something like that.

Fred Gordon: The board members pay attention to whether or not the Conservation Advisory Council reviewed certain issues or decisions. Board members like to have the notes, but they don't assume that all perspectives are there.

Don Jones: Are the Conservation Advisory Council meetings recorded?

Kim: No, but it's an interesting concept to take to the communications team. We'll find out more.

Jim: Are minority opinions captured in the notes?

Kim: We try to pay attention to capturing minority thoughts in the notes, and you'll see the comments reflected there.

Holly: You do a fine job capturing things in the notes, and sometimes putting conversations back together. We just need to make sure everything is represented fairly.

Kim: Continuing on, should we insert a formal discussion of future agenda items? Can you make requests? Also, we presently have 18 people on the Conservation Advisory Council. Are there perspectives that should be added?

Holly: We talked about adding representation from Clean Energy Works.

Kim: They aren't officially on the council, but they are almost always present for the meetings.

Kim: Since we are at the beginning of a new year, I hope you will consider your participation. This is a great group, but if anyone is ready to pass on a Conservation Advisory Council assignment to someone else, please let me know. Some of the organizations do a great job of changing the assignment on a regular basis. Others of you have been here for years.

Should we make participation by phone available for all meetings? I feel that the meeting works better when people are in the room, but it's an option.

Wendy Gerlitz: I've worked on some advisory committees that meet only by phone, and that approach doesn't seem as effective. I suggest keeping it as is: make phone participation available, but only upon request.

Jim: I could go either way. I gain a lot by coming to the meetings in person, but there are times I need to be elsewhere and listen in. The phone connection really helps.

Kim: Do we need webinar capability for that? If not, we can continue emailing materials to you in advance.

Jim: It's fine that way.

Holly: We sometimes hear about things after decisions are made. When the operating principles were written early in Energy Trust's history, the council probably offered a more robust advisory opinion.

Kim: We are bringing issues here for discussion and advice before decisions are made, such as budget concepts and changes in residential incentives. Energy Trust has lot of in-house expertise, but there is also great expertise on the Conservation Advisory Council. We are definitely listening. There are informational items on the agenda, too, such as reporting on progress to goals and updates on what we are learning in implementing pilots, initiatives and programs. One of the key purposes of the Conservation Advisory Council is sharing that information. That's a valid function, but in some cases, such as trend reports, it appears that we could have given you the reports and used meeting time for something else. How much time should be spent on informational items versus discussion items?

Kim: I will send the operating principles out with a few things we've taken notes on. Please send me comments on the redlined items.

Don McOdrum: Did we take an official vote in 2013 to adopt these principles?

Kim: Yes, we did. So, we'll briefly review the operating principles each year to refresh our understanding of how we operate together.

Don Jones: What changes did we identify today?

Kim: I'll need to review the minutes. We discussed changes like sending the minutes in advance and having an option available to participate in meeting by phone. I will send the others to review.

4. What is coming to Conservation Advisory Council?

Kim: I sent a large spreadsheet with everything that has come to Conservation Advisory Council since 2010. It includes a review of topics covered in 2013. While we may recall the more contentious topics, a wide range of items come to this group.

I suggest we review and discuss the draft 2014 annual schedule, available as a handout. We report on progress toward goals and hand out dashboards in Q1. Then we do more extensive presentations of dashboards in Q2 and Q3, to help guide programmatic changes. The dashboards are primarily informational.

We cover the annual budget cycle, budget concepts and sector trend reports. Do you want those intensive, deep-dive sector presentations? We were thinking that discussing one or two relevant surprises from those reports may be more useful. We usually show course corrections in Q2 and Q3.

Holly: The high-level summary is very helpful. My vote is to have that.

Kim: A lot of the statistics are prepared for internal use and are also shared with the council.

Don Jones: The reports are useful and give us the ability to see information for industry comparisons. I could go for the highlights in many discussions.

Don MacOdrum: If we change the format so that you just present the highlights and give us the reports, many of us would read the report sections we need.

Kim: We know you're interested in pilots and anything new or cutting edge, so those will continue to be topics at Conservation Advisory Council meetings. We need feedback from you on other topics.

Andria: According to this schedule, we probably only review quarterly dashboards at one meeting, correct?

Kim: I have a placeholder in March and June, but those aren't firm dates. These are things we can move around and replace if we're not doing other things. Sometimes, there are moments when programs are facing decisions they want to put in front of the Conservation Advisory Council.

Andria: One of the most interesting things last year was having the customer presentations on SEM. For me it was energizing. I'm interested in emerging technologies and new items.

Holly: The value of the customer presentations depends if we're on the policy or market side in our jobs. I work on the policy side, so getting exposed to the market is great for me, but might not be as useful for other council members.

Kim: I put NEEA on the schedule for March as a guest speaker. I haven't reached out to them yet, but we'd like to have them.

Andria: All the issues about data and planning around data are another topic. It's a big issue, and we may have something to add.

Kim: Are you talking about our current utility data sharing agreements or, more broadly, the future use of data in programs?

Andria: I'm thinking of the future; and giving us some insight into how other players are doing things.

Kim: It's a big deal on the business side.

Jim: There was a round one budget issue last year related to timing of changes, and I linked that back to our utility and Energy Trust presentations. At the time, I asked how things might shift from one program to the next. The concept presentation was great, but at the October council meeting we were a bit behind the eight ball and had to scramble to get numbers. We want to get our arms around that a little better to avoid surprises in accounting. We have budget concepts in July and then we have round one and round two budgets right away without enough time.

Peter West: It may not land exactly as we have it on the schedule now. We could do the first round earlier, but then the values would probably change more by the second round. We're playing around with budget timing so concepts turn to numbers sooner. We can do the numbers earlier, but recognize that the budget values can shift quite a bit when estimates are made before things are fully baked. We need to think about what process would support more substantial input sooner within a timeframe that's reasonable.

Jim: This is probably more unique to Cascade Natural Gas because of our size. Changes that are relatively small to the others are big to us.

Kim: Round one is when we have numbers. The budget concepts are more about strategy and where the programs are going. Round one is where we finally get into the numbers behind them. We found the concepts process to be a great way to get feedback before calculations are made.

Jim: The concepts are great, but the therm impacts weren't figured in, and they had substantial impacts on us.

Don MacOdrum: I don't know if these things belong on Conservation Advisory Council planning documents, but the OPUC cost-effectiveness dockets are going to show up. Are they on the schedule?

Kim: They are in the planning column, but the dates may not be completely accurate.

Peter: Just as a caveat, we're not an alternate process to the OPUC.

Don MacOdrum: Once decisions are made, there will be reactions. I am looking for cost-effectiveness to be on the agenda after the decisions.

Kim: The topics on the schedule are probably what we want to cover, but the timing may shift. Best guesses are what's listed.

After going through last fall's residential measure changes, we're working internally to tune how we bring measure information to you each fall. Planning is taking the lead on this, working with program staff.

How we analyze measures came up as a discussion last fall. We did a deep dive into cost effectiveness last year that seemed helpful. Is that something we should do again? There was an idea that we could schedule part of the next council meeting to lay out the key variables used for measure analysis and to show the beginnings of a template for what we'll usually bring to this meeting regarding measure changes. There is a near-term constraint. The planning team is busy working on the strategic plan right now, so we're not confident that we can do a half day on this in Q1 or Q2.

Elaine: We decided to do a 45-minute presentation in the near term with a high-level walkthrough of examples, and check back to see if a half day meeting is needed.

Kim: We see a need for improvement, and are looking for ways to fit that in.

Holly: If that's all we can do, that's okay. The vibe at the last deep dive workshop was great, and I enjoyed the discussion. I would like to repeat that format.

Don MacOdrum: The informal conversations and networking were really good, also.

Kim: Will cost-effectiveness changes be the best topic? It seems we arrived here based on last year's discussions, but would something else be better?

Holly: I would be happy to focus on this topic, and there would be benefit. I don't know if the OPUC could use us as a sounding board for this item on their cost-effectiveness docket or if that last training should be taken to the next level.

Fred: At the next meeting, Juliet will probably talk about the process in the docket and how we move forward.

Brittany Andrus: Yes, an OPUC update at the next meeting would definitely be better.

Wendy Gerlitz: Is the SB 838 funding limitations topic in March or April?

Kim: In April, because we don't think we'll have 2013 results until late March. It's hard to discuss this subject without the results.

Holly: I wonder how the Conservation Advisory Council format worked from the audience's perspective.

Kim: Should we have a formal time for audience comments at the end of meetings, or do it as we go?

Jeremy Anderson: I think doing it as we go is fine.

Wendy Koelfgen: Should we ask for comments at the end of each item?

Kim: That's a good suggestion.

Wendy: Regarding the cost-effectiveness discussion, we would like to present some of our thoughts, also.

5. Energy Trust 2015-2019 Strategic Plan introduction

Elaine Prause: We'll look for your feedback at various points in the process of strategic planning. This type of plan is a requirement of our grant agreement with the OPUC. We need to do it at least every five years, or more often if something will cause dramatic changes. SB 838 funding was the last example, since it caused big changes for us.

The plan needs to include a mission, goals and strategies for reaching goals, and we need to actively seek input on the plan. The last time around, we established five-year savings and generation goals. There are also strategies outlined for how we reach those goals. The process is led by the Board Strategic Planning Committee. Mark Kendall is on that committee and will be a helpful to connection to the Conservation Advisory Council as we work through the process.

The current process started with the board retreat last June, and staff has been gathering information since then. We will come up with an issues list, and then create a draft plan that addresses these issues for board members to review at their retreat in June. We will reach out for review and comment and aim for board adoption by the end of 2014.

We're currently in the strategic issues phase. We gathered an extensive list of issues and grouped them into three general categories:

- Inside-the-box issues are within our current mandates and what we currently do.
- Expanding-the-box issues are not currently what we do, but could be added.
- Outside-the-box issues are outside our current scope or what we currently do. This would be something like: should Energy Trust have a greenhouse gas reduction goal?

Issues and questions we've been discussing so far include whether our current renewable energy approach is still workable. We've targeted five technologies, but is that still the best approach? The role of distributed generation is also important.

On the energy efficiency side, the 2010-2014 Strategic Plan was all about growth. The next plan will be all about resource potential. If we replicate the accomplishments of the last five years, we don't see enough resource to continue at that pace beyond five years. What should we do to grow the resource? Do we put a lot of money into innovation, or should others, for example? There are tradeoffs and decisions to make.

We looked at other states and organizations similar to Energy Trust and see that they have a variety of goals important to their regions. Should Energy Trust expand our goals to other criteria that are important to our state? The scope of the plan is in question as well. Our board has challenged our current five-year planning horizon. Should we set it out to 10 years instead of five?

Next steps include sending the list of strategic issues to you prior to the March Conservation Advisory Council meeting so you can have time to prepare for a discussion at that meeting.

Kim: Was anyone here during the last planning cycle five years ago or remember anything about it? (Heads shaking all around.) Do you want to read the previous strategic plan? (Numerous heads nodding, Kim will send out [2009-2014 Strategic Plan](#).)

Fred: You'll see this plan at a very high level. The strange thing looking back is that we did what it said in many ways. At an abstract level, the plan reflected what we wanted things to look like in Oregon, and we actually did some of those things.

Andria: Our organization is engaged in strategic planning right now. There is a part about how we do the things we choose to do. Will you have that? Values around implementation are helpful.

Elaine: We look at that, and we include things like actions to support the community. The plan outlines how we get our business done.

Fred: There are also value statements that were developed through another process. You can see them framed on the wall in many of our rooms. Value statements are about how we work with people. Some "how" statements go that way, and some get wrapped into the plan.

Holly: It's exciting to be part of this from the beginning. I came in right after it was finished the last time.

6. Energy Payback Estimator tool demonstration

Diane Ferington: Taylor Bixby is with me. Taylor worked with us as an intern before becoming an employee. He will demonstrate the tool, which he helped develop along with Matt Braman.

The Energy Payback Estimator is a new tool on the website that provides energy savings and costs for energy-efficiency measures. It uses deemed savings from the most current billing analyses. It will give customers more transparency around the energy savings they can expect when they consider installing measures in their homes.

The Energy Payback Estimator is accessible on the residential web pages, through a link on the left sidebar. It's also available from the Find a Contractor page. We'll have links on the EPS and financing pages. These are the four ways to get to the tool.

It's been in development for nearly two years. Utilities and trade ally groups have seen it, and we expect it to be live by mid-February. We'll continue to incorporate feedback but feel good about what we have right now.

We brought it to the Conservation Advisory Council as a concept about a year ago. It's used in Home Energy Reports right now. It uses the same back-end database. We're also considering it for a contractor-facing report and modeling tools. It's meant to be

used after the customer has received a bid and has an idea what they want to do. It's not meant to supplant other tools offering high-level ideas and next steps.

The tool shows a customer's energy use over the past year. Customers can use their utility account numbers to confirm this data if they choose. If they have both gas and electric accounts, they can use either account number. If they don't have their account numbers handy, they can select low, average or high usage from a dropdown box. They can also enter general information about their house.

Once the customer enters these basics, they can provide more information about their project. It's important for them to have a bid in hand so they can look at the payback and value of the measures.

Andria: From a customer point of view, you already have the Energy Savvy tool, so what does this do differently? If the customer is very early in the process, would they use Energy Savvy?

Diane: Energy Savvy will tell you what measures to consider. This one will give you better information about the energy savings for a given measure once you have measures in mind.

Taylor Bixby: You need at least one bid, or at least a clue of the market price for the measure, or the tool can't calculate payback.

Andria: It could be useful for comparing two bids.

Jim Abrahamson: Evaluating bids is one part of it, but it would be valuable for comparing the investments and outcomes from them. It gives a good, comprehensive look in terms of what the energy savings will be. It should drive things.

Mark Johnson: It can tell you more about what's cost effective. If a \$10,000 bid isn't cost effective, you need to look for something lower.

Jim: If you were looking at a greenhouse gas reduction goal, for example, a tool like this would be essential to reaching it.

Diane: EPS would also help with that.

Mark: Is it possible to see the savings behind this?

Taylor: Yes, the tables behind this are fairly easy to use and can be provided upon request.

Marshall Johnson: We brought cost estimates to the Conservation Advisory Council as a possibility a few years ago. We had used modeled savings in Home Performance before, but costs were overstated by about 50 percent. Consumers can get this information and project their savings and cost effectiveness. This is a way to protect customers and allies by giving good estimates. It grew out of that initial discussion.

Diane: The dropdown allows you to change your usage assumptions on the fly, also.

Taylor: The detail section gives estimated costs and incentive values specific to Washington or Oregon.

Mark: Can you look at the assumptions behind it? Like the assumed coefficient of performance, COP, on a heat pump?

Taylor: The assumptions around savings are made when evaluations assess the measure. Through our evaluations, we've already bracketed heat pumps into different efficiency ranges. The Energy Payback Estimator uses these ranges, and no further assumptions are made.

We include language about estimates on energy savings and plan to make these more prominent.

Anne Snyder Grassmann: Will you capture any of the customer information so you can get back to customers who use the estimator but don't follow through?

Diane: We don't now, but we could see some value in it.

Holly: That would be interesting because gas payback periods are long right now, and customers may need follow up.

Andria: I thought we were trying to get away from showing payback.

Holly: We worked on this with Juliet from the OPUC, and we decided that payback should be shown and other benefits associated with installation of measures should be emphasized as well.

Fred: We're trying to show the OPUC that people are doing savings for more reasons than just the investment values. We know this already, but we need to demonstrate it.

Jeremy Anderson: You are confident in your estimates, but it may not be clear to the customers that they're based on your deemed savings. There are tools available which will give vastly different estimates. That should not be hidden in the fine print. I would tell them there are multiple tools out there—personally, I would go to the Regional Technical Forum.

Peter: Where would you suggest putting it, Jeremy?

Jeremy: I'd prefer bullet points.

Holly: They are more likely to be read.

Peter: A specific idea would help. I appreciate the comments, but we could best use specifics about changes you would like to see.

Anne: From a consumer perspective, you want to highlight the tool. There's a lot of text. You have to scroll quite a bit. If you could make the text even more sparse, like using bullets to simplify it, the focus ends up more on the tool.

Taylor: There is a lot of text. The challenge is to balance providing enough detail without losing the tool in the text.

Holly: Some of us felt strongly about the wording. Will we get to see it before it goes live? The tone is important—even down to the name. Energy Payback Estimator sounds very accounting-oriented. Our concern is that customers might go forward with projects, even knowing they don't pay back, but seeing actual numbers might stop them.

Diane: The language, tone, name, fonts and colors are communications team items. We're noting these things and will take them to the right people, but the time it will take to address this will be after the initial launch.

Holly: Energy Investment Assessment is one possible name.

Peter: We're open to the suggestions. We would appreciate seeing specific markups incorporating your suggestions.

Anne: The back end data about who is using the tool would be interesting to see. How long they are taking to come back would be helpful.

Keith Barrow: Can a consumer go in with a different piece of equipment and come back to demonstrate the differences in payback and savings?

Taylor: That can be selected, but only within the fuel type.

Fred: We don't do a payback calculation on fuel switching. The tool would just say it doesn't compute.

Diane: Yes, the answer would be "n/a."

Jim: Isn't that part of the point? Won't this tool support that mental exercise?

Fred: No, it won't support it.

Jim: Since you provide information to customers, would there be an opportunity to guide customers to those tools?

Fred: The electric or gas ones?

Jim: Customers come to you looking for energy expertise, so maybe you tell them this tool isn't going to answer that type of question. Instead you might link to the appropriate utility tool.

Kim: Web folks don't like to do redirects if they can help it.

Mark: So the gas companies have given approval for saying a ductless heat pump is better than a gas furnace in some cases?

Holly: We're not comfortable with it, but it is what it is and we've agreed to it. However, as Taylor noted, the tool does not address this.

Fred: It's our policy to be studiously fuel neutral. There's nothing we can say that doesn't create an argument, so we don't say anything.

Jim: That position leads to this undesirable situation where customers that have paid for this tool will discover that it doesn't answer their questions because of a policy decision.

Diane: That's our governing grant agreement rules.

Jackie Goss: Does the tool include things we don't offer incentives for?

Taylor: It does show some: gas furnaces, for example.

Jim: On the basis of what I've learned from Energy Efficiency and Sustainable Technology, EEAST, meetings and Home Performance with ENERGY STAR® used for Clean Energy Works activities, will this tool be used by Clean Energy Works for estimating energy savings going into projects? I'm interested in checking my own Clean Energy Works project with this tool. I think it will give me a more accurate look at the energy savings.

Diane: Today, Clean Energy Works is using the object that delivers the savings values. They've used our deemed savings for about a year now.

Taylor: They use the same inputs for their estimates.

Jim: So there shouldn't be a difference between their tool and this one?

Marshall: Prior to January 2013, there was a different modeling tool in use. Evaluations showed a big variance and led us to develop this tool.

Jim: So this was finalized, in part, to address that problem. I had my Clean Energy Works project in the old days, so I would be interested to see this.

Wendy Koelfgen: Ryan Clemmer is our tool expert at Clean Energy Works, and can help.

Ryan Clemmer: It depends on how the tool is linked and the time frame of your Clean Energy Works project. We switched to this about a year ago. It really depends on when you came into the Clean Energy Works program. I'm happy to talk about that.

Don MacOdrum: As this tool is planned for rollout, there are no explicit consumer pieces pointing customers of Energy Trust or Clean Energy Works to it. It's consumer driven: if they notice it, they will use it.

Jim: Would a Clean Energy Works contractor use with this tool?

Fred: They would use a different tool, but the tool references these same numbers.

Diane: The consumer sees the end results, but a different interface.

Taylor: The same engine runs in the background.

Fred: There aren't interactive effects between things like age of a heat pump and savings from insulation.

7. Public Comment

There were no additional public comments.

8. Meeting Adjournment

Kim thanked the council members for their participation and adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m.

The next full council meeting is April 23, 2014.