

**Energy Efficiency Post-2011 Review
Workgroup 3 Meeting 3
April 24, 2014
PNGC Power and by phone**

Summary/Decision/Action Items

To be added by workgroup chair

Meeting Notes¹ Attendees

Co-chairs:

Andrew Miller subbed for [Boyd Wilson](#), BPA
Eugene Rosolie, Cowlitz PUD

Bo Downen, Public Power Council
Christina Zamora, CAP Association of Idaho, phone
Ed Monson, Benton PUD, phone
Shan Rowbotham, City of Ellensburg, phone
Dawn Senger, City of Richland, phone
Donna Kinnaman, CAPECO
Keith Kueny CAPO
Michael Karp, NW Energy Project
Pat Didion, Milton Freewater, phone
Paul Hawkins, CAPO
Steve Jole, HACSA
Todd Blackman, Franklin PUD, phone
Jess Kincaid, ORDOE, phone
Nathan Heber, SNO PUD
Margaret Ryan, PNGC
Wendy Gerlitz, NWECC
Van Ashton, Idaho Falls, phone
Larry Blaufus, Clark Public Utilities, phone
Kathy Grey, EWEB, phone
Robert Salberg, Cowlitz PUD, phone
Ron Mitchell, Benton REA, phone
Sandra Ghormley, phone

BPA Staff:

¹ Out of respect for privacy, only attribution to comments from BPA staff and workgroup co-chairs is included in these meeting notes.

Summer Goodwin
Carrie Nelson
Brent Barclay
Mark Johnson

- Summary of findings to date. Utilities and CAPs could work together better. A survey was conducted of utilities and CAPs and the results reinforced this assumption. There is opportunity to streamline reporting requirements.
- Wendy Gerlitz presented the proposed principle for the workgroup: *Low-income customers in each BPA utility service area should have access to ratepayer funded affordable energy efficiency services funded through utility self-funding and/or BPA incentive dollars.*
 - Person 1 – we really didn't want to have a requirement.
 - Person 2 – We really wanted it to be a requirement.
 - Person 3 – I think this opens the door to utilities and CAPS to work closer together.
 - Brent – what was the meaning behind “affordable”
 - Person 4 – There wasn't a lot behind that except that when you are targeting low income we need to recognize that this is different than regular incentive programs. They already have access to the regular programs so it should be specific programs that target them.
 - Person 5 – I think the word “affordable” is subjective.
 - Person 6 – Once this is sent to BPA as a principle, how difficult would this be to turn it into a policy?
 - Boyd – that would be a nonstarter for BPA
- Ongoing meetings in the future
 - Quarterly, but may want to have subgroups, depending on what the group comes up with, maybe quarterly in the first year
 - Person 7 – This is missing the point about BPA needed to fill the gap if the utilities are not.
 - Person 8 – Things just don't work very well and we could try to get things to work better together. There is no requirement
 - Person 11 – Sometimes utilities are not able to work with the agencies or they are not working very well together. We met with ours recently and come up with some new ways to work together.

CA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	23	3	2	24	2	6	20	3	0	133

- Person 10 – my rough estimate is \$.70/kwh, we only report savings though, not dollars. Cowlitz goes to the federal of 200 percent. The IM goes to 200%
- Brent – There was twice as much self-funding to low income relative to the overall BPA portfolio.
- Boyd – self-funded savings goes through the same rigor as EEI funded.
- Brent – for the portfolio at large the average measure life is 12 years but for LIEE it is 40 years. That is really good, these are long term investments.
- Person 4 – could we have just the average measure life of LIEE compared to other residential measures?
- Summary
 - Three recommendations will be presented at the big tent meeting

Recommendation #1 PRINCIPLE

Preamble

- Financial constraints limit low-income ratepayers’ participation in traditional incentive-based programs
- There are a large number of low income households throughout BPA service territory that could benefit from energy efficiency and conservations measures.
- Existing sources of funding, including state and federal resources are insufficient to meet current needs.
- The high number of funding sources used for this work and the number of entities involved complicates effective and efficient program implementation and reporting.
- Current efforts sometimes lack coordination and could benefit from improved communication.
- Management and administration of programs usually works best when there is involvement at the local level — from the utility and low income agencies.
- One single solution will not work in every electric service territory and for every utility; therefore, recommended actions are developed with a variety of options to choose from in order to ensure management and administration remains at the local level.

Principle: BPA customer utilities should provide equitable access to energy efficiency services tailored for low-income customers funded through utility self-funding and/or BPA incentive dollars.

Pre-decisional – For Discussion Purposes Only

Recommendation #2 – an ongoing workgroup

Reconstitute a workgroup to meet quarterly on LIEE in BPA service area to address some of the topics identified by this group, such as

1. Small utilities path to do low income work.
2. Data streamlining. More comprehensive tracking system.
3. Best practices and improved communication, coordination and collaboration
 1. guidelines for structuring an agreement including CAP administrative costs
 2. approaches for cost control
4. Align so the measures line up (US DOE/ Utility). There are misaligned and have some conflicting requirements.
5. *Understand BPA's role in facilitating access to LIEE across its service territory*
6. training
7. Other topics that the workgroup may choose

Recommendation #3 –turnkey implementation for low income programs

BPA facilitates a method or process that would allow utilities to designate some of their EEI or other utility funds for implementation of LIEE, where BPA is the administrator of the funds.