**RTF PAC Meeting Minutes**November 13, 2015  
9:00 am – 10:30 am

**Attendees**

* Jim West, RTF PAC Co-Chair, Snohomish PUD
* Pat Smith, RTF PAC Co-Chair, NWPCC
* Dan Johnson, Avista
* Larry Blaufus, Clark County PUD
* Fred Gordon, Energy Trust of Oregon
* Greg Kelleher, EWEB
* Pete Pengilly, Idaho Power
* Robin Arnold, Montana PSC
* Susan Stratton, NEEA
* Jes Kincaid, Oregon DOE
* Don Jones Jr., PacifiCorp
* Cory Scott, PacifiCorp
* Craig Smith, Seattle City Light
* Jessica Mitchell, Snohomish PUD
* Clay Norris, Tacoma Power
* Steve Johnson, Washington UTC
* Charlie Grist, NWPPC
* Jennifer Light, NWPCC, RTF Manager

**Outcomes**

The following outlines the key takeaways from the RTF PAC meeting. More detail is included in the discussion section below.

* The RTF PAC reviewed several business items, including the potential credits for 2016, plans for RTF administrative support, the RTF PAC dashboard, and the new member slate.
* The RTF PAC asked for future updates on how the RTF Planning (non-reliable estimates of energy savings that require data to prove out, but no research sponsor is identified yet) measures are moving forward and whether research on any significant measures is lagging relative to the acquisition.
* An agenda item for the next meeting is to review the PAC dashboard and identify what indicators the PAC wants to continue to track. Light will provide information on the incremental effort for each indicator to help inform this discussion.

**Discussion**

West opened the meeting with members introduction, approval of the meeting agenda and approval of the August meeting minutes.

*Business Updates*

Light reviewed the potential credits for 2016. The total credit is anticipated to be between $95K and $145K. Gordon asked whether this was within 10% of the budget. Light said yes, and that the current 2015 allocation is about 93% of the budget. The 2015 unallocated funds will make up the biggest portion of the 2016 credit.

Light informed the PAC that Aggar Assefa, former RTF admin, has moved on from the Council. The Council wants to provide RTF administrative support and is looking into options for filling this position. West asked about the possible timing to have someone in place. Light said that they are targeting the beginning of 2016.

Light reviewed the RTF PAC Dashboard. One of the metrics looks at the breakdown of UES measures and Standard Protocols by their category (Proven, Provisional, Planning, Small Saver) and status (Active, Under Review, Out of Compliance). Light noted that there has been a big increase in Planning measures (measures for which the RTF does not have a reliable estimate of energy savings and requires data to prove it out, but the RTF has not yet identified a sponsor of the required research). Light added that many of these are tied to the RTFs need to better understand commissioning, controls, and sizing practices and savings. Gordon asked how getting sponsors for the Planning measures is going and whether acquisition is getting ahead of plans to evaluate. Light said that there is some traction on the commissioning, controls, and sizing question, which is the most significant at this point given the number of measures it touches. Light said that she can report back on the progress of Planning measures and whether there are significant measures for which the research is lagging. She added that by collecting more granular data through the Regional Conservation Progress survey might help to inform this question of acquisition verses evaluation.

The RTF PAC also discussed the value of the PAC Dashboard and whether all the metrics are still relevant. West suggested that the PAC spend some time at the next meeting to discuss which indicators are valuable and whether there are any missing indicators. Gordon suggested having the staff put together information on the incremental effort for providing the different indicators. Several participants agreed that this would be good information to have and a good discussion item for the next RTF PAC meeting.

*2016-2018 Member Slate and Member Orientation*

Light presented the 2016-2018 Member slate for the RTF, which the Council appointed at its October meeting. Light highlighted that the RTF added evaluation and statistical expertise to its voting member slate. Light also highlighted the number of new voting members (15 of the 30), but noted that many of these new members have been engaging at the RTF through subcommittee meetings. Light added that of the existing voting members (26), several did not reapply for voting membership, so these 15 new members are not replacing 15 current members. Light walked through the plans for new member orientation.

*Seventh Plan Meets the RTF*

Grist walked through some of the key findings from the Draft Seventh Power Plan, specifically highlighting some of the draft Action Items directed at the RTF.

[Slide 3] Grist walked through the graph to show how loads have decreased from energy efficiency, including the codes and standards adopted since the Sixth Plan. Pengilly asked how the plan addresses codes and standards going forward. Grist said that the Council froze the world at December 31, 2014. If a code or standard was adopted by that date, it was included in the Plan analysis.

Smith noted the 2021 timeframe is critical to the plan with the closing of Boardman and Centralia. He added that there is a need for demand response (DR) in the region. The Council did not set targets for DR in the Draft Seventh Plan, but it does call on infrastructure to be in place and ready. Gordon noted that everywhere else in the country there is a 30 year old infrastructure to do DR, and this is just new to the northwest.

[Slide 5] While discussing the Action Item about the RTF Guidelines including reliability for capacity, Jones noted that it is important that new members understand the RTF’s role for cost-effectiveness. The RTF approves energy savings, costs, and lifetimes, but does not approve cost-effectiveness. Pengilly noted that Idaho Power is summer peaking and the capacity benefit for measures will be different for them. Grist said that the Council staff and RTF contract analysts have developed a suite of tools that allow the end user to define their peak for this reason. Gordon noted that summer peak is an issue on both sides of the Cascades. Grist said that the Council analysis shows parity between summer and winter peak for the region around 2025.

Regarding the Action Item about establishing a forum to share research activities and identify research gaps, West asked what value the RTF PAC can bring to that. Grist said that it probably prioritizing and helping to move the ball forward on important research. West said that it would be good to think about how soon there might be a need for any incremental budget or level of effort for the RTF. Gordon noted that when this question has come up before, the RTF has been able to figure out how to get it done with the existing funding. Gordon added that it is probably more important for the RTF PAC to understand what measures are critical and lagging in research and then what the funding mechanism is, as the funding may not be through the RTF.

**Adjourned**

West adjourned the meeting. Staff will work with the co-chairs to find potential dates for the 2016 RTF PAC meetings.