**RTF Policy Advisory Committee**

**April 17, 2013**

**Meeting Notes**

In the room: Jim West, Tom Karier, Susan Stratton, Erin Erben, Eugene Rosolie, Bruce Folsom, Steve Bicker, Lauren Gage, Josh Warner, Larry Blaufus, Jeff Buamgarner, Tom Eckman, Sara Patton, Charlie Black, Charlie Grist, Nick O’Neil, Jeff Harris and Susan Hermanet

On the Phone: Bill Thomas, Pete Pengilly, Fred Gordon, Deb Young, Bob Stolarski and Ralph Cavanagh,

**Introductions, Announcements, Agenda Review**

* Mr. West asked the group of their preference for the level of detail in the minutes. Sara Patton likes condensed. Susan Stratton wants the notes with action items. Fred Gordon appreciated the detail since he was not at the meeting and Erin Erben preferred summary plus detail.
* Jim West asked for review and approval of the January 24th minutes and it was approved with no changes.

**Item one: Update on Council and PAC Business**

* In the February Council meeting Jim West gave an update to the Council on the conflict of interest policy. Minor change to the language in the charter, mainly to strike any specific quotes from the conflict and just refer to it as the Conflict Policy. Second major item was the renewal of the policy advisory committee. The Council at its March meeting approved the conflict of interest policy, renewed the advisory committee for another two years and issued a new charter continuing for another two years.
* In addition to votes on approved measures or savings, the Council added Measure Life to the conflict areas. With that insertion the conflict of interest policy was approved by the Council.
* RTF adopted a new policy and new conflict of interest forms. The new form was signed by the RTF members.
* Tom Karier is re-appointed as WA Council member and PAC co-chair.

**Item two: New or replacement members for the Policy Advisory Committee**

* West reminded the group of the Council process for member appointment, and suggested in doing all the changes in batch. Tom Karier clarified that this is for organizations that want to make an official change of their named committee members.

**Jim West announced the following changes:**

* Richard Genece will replace Karen Meadows for BPA
* Gary Huhta will replace Chris Hill for Cowlitz
* Pete Pengilly to replace Theresa Drake representing Idaho Power

**Item Three: Dashboard Updates**

From the last PAC meeting members request to give more visibility on what the RTF is doing, the following changes were made on the dashboard.

* On the Subcommittee page: Quantify hours spent on each subcommittee instead of just the number of meetings. For small rural in particular, in addition to the number of meetings and hours spent on the meetings, the number and specific Utilities that have been present on the calls are added.
* On the voting page two matrixes are added, the percent of decision that was applicable and a checklist to small rural utilities.
* On the contributions Matrix: Added three columns categories for UES protocols, methods of analysis and data or measurements of people who deliver products or request services from RTF such as various funders, NEEA, and vendors and consultants. Important to realize we are not going to catch everybody’s contribution on every measure it is more a highlight of major contributions.

**Discussion on Dashboard Updates**

* Steve Bicker: How would you use the data on the dashboard?
* Jim West: The data is prepared for the PAC. It is to create some visibility on in-kind contributions; the dashboard does a nice job on who is actually accountable, who is funding, sponsoring and particularly the Utilities contribution.
* Lauren Gage: For the RTF to work there has to be major impact evaluation, research contribution happening at the Utilities level. Have you limited what is being shown on the dashboard to major decisions?
* Erin Erben: Asked the history of how measures and data come to the RTF.
* Tom Eckman: We have always relied on the region’s evaluation as the basis for decision making. There has been a period of time in the 90’s that there weren’t any. We have a new Evaluation committee that will evaluate where we have gaps.
* Bruce Folsom: From Avista perspective we look to RTF first for the best science and we use those UESes but we look at host of other measures and use our own technical measures to do impact analysis.
* Eugene Rosolie: What happens in a course of a year or a longer snapshot?
* Charlie Grist: Going forward we will do an annual summary.
* Fred Gordon: Would like to see annual and historic summary.
* Jeff Bumgarner: What is the current input process for program evaluations?
* Tom Eckman: It’s done topical.
* Jeff Bumgarner: Offered to deliver all impact evaluations so the RTF can see what is going on within their programs and evaluations.
* Tom Eckman: The evaluation subcommittee will be looking at this and make use of it on a topical basis.
* Steve Bicker: Interesting to me to see the funding cycle summary of what each of the contributors have contributed along with specifics of what kind of data was provided.
* Nick O’Neil: On the RTF website you can see the tabulated version of the measures, the decisions that were made and the descriptions of the measures.
* Steve Bicker: Is there a place where all non RTF evaluations reside?
* Fred Gordon: This conduit is starting to evolve to that repository, a number of Utilities are sharing their evaluation and it is also an opportunity to have information that is linked and not archived in one central place.
* Lauren Gage: The Northwest Research group which NEEA facilitates has a list we have been trying to keep updated and have been unsuccessful. Trying to track and categorized the evaluation work in the region needs an evaluator to keep the list updated.
* Charlie Grist: RTF staff will keep updating the dashboard with new additions and PAC to review it periodically quarterly or so.
* Susan Stratton: Being new to the group, I don’t have a sense of targets or when the numbers look good. Is there any way to indicate here with colors what the target is or if the measures are on target?
* Charlie Grist: The work plan is the place to measure that, in the work plan we have around 90 UES measures that expire in periods the RTF assign sunset dates for them. Overall a third of them gets reviewed every year and get updated and in a course of three years period and under the new guideline to cycle through all of the 90 guidelines. This is the big scale matrix it updates you where we are.
* Erin Erben: You mentioned in the business plan you want to cycle through 90 some odd measures, is there current coordination with utilities you are relying on to do the analysis to update those 90 measures?
* Charlie Grist: We looked at the whole thing with the RTF and out of the 90 measures, a bunch of measure that are in a category called under review, which means they are close to guideline compliance, will be scheduled at the RTF with the help of the utilities as well as their sunset dates. There are also measures that are deemed out of compliance with the guidelines for which significant research needs to be done, those are now compiled. These are hundreds of elements that need to be fixed where a primary research needs to be done. After hiring a contractor to steer a committee with the help of Bonneville, they went through all the out of compliance measures and ranked them which once are most important to their program soonest. And going through their priority list, they bundled them in a group on how they can be addressed and what subcommittee need to be formed to shepherd those through the process.
* Tom Karier: Is the workload going to phase out after we get through the new guidelines out of compliance list?
* Tom Eckman: It depends on the level of effort required to do maintenance as well as incorporating new measures as we go forward.
* Charlie Grist: In addition having the guidelines and standards is going to allow the RTF to streamline its continued updating and review

**Item Four: Funding Discussion**

* Jim West: started the RTF funding discussion with the renewal timeline for the next funding cycle. Asked the group the important issues for the PAC, what we want to see from staff, and how we want to move forward over the next few meetings, keeping in mind in coming forward with a business plan and a funding model beyond 2014 and how that decision aligned with the budget decisions we have to make in our own company.
* To summarize how the discussion of the funding timeline went, the PAC was formed when the 2012 business plan was being approved. That budget was a 15% increase from 2011 budget. The first action the PAC was asked to take was to agree to the 2012 budget which was a slight increase for each funder compared to 2011 budget, and to agree to a funding model through 2014. For the funding commitment allocations, the PAC also adopted the same percentage allocation NEEA uses for its member funding.
* The principle element of the RTF PAC charter is not only advising the Council on the operation of the RTF, but part of the advisory committee charter is to secure the funding commitment from the utilities that are providing the dollars that support the RTF budget funding. Tom Eckman added 2014 beyond starts in September 2014. We will need a work plan and budget that BPA and other parties can look to start deliberation.
* Josh Warner: Assuming steady state if there is any dramatic changes up or down, BPA will need to know sooner or later or Spring of 2014 deadline. Having it on the five year Power Plan and NEEA cycle has been working for us. The three year agreement instead of going year to year also works well.
* Susan Stratton: Not proposing to change funding allocation. If NEEA has projects or programs that are opt in, it won’t necessarily dictate how the RTF will work.
* Fred Gordon: In terms of the way the current system focuses, there is this committee that is trying to prioritize for the research and delegate out. The number and difficulty of measures are multiplying and the savings per measure are not always growing with it. If we prioritize measures based on individual interests on how we do research, the measures that carry the largest bulk of the savings is going to get the bulk of the funding. What we need out of RTF may depend on how the informal collaborative to get the research done works. If it doesn’t work we may need to rethink of new structure.
* Tom Eckman: RTF cannot delegate research to satisfy its needs. We are relying on a voluntary placing forward of budget, and activities and if we begin to do the primary research it will change the funding matrix considerably.
* Fred Gordon: Current kind of level of funding makes sense as long as the bigger machine around the RTF is working. If not scale up or scale down options.I am hoping we can coordinate among ourselves to do enough of the researches done that we hit the biggest priorities. It would be tough to look at established technologies verses larger ones that are less established. That is the kind of struggle we are going to have to get the work done with the funding available from the region.
* Susan Stratton: I am also thinking about NEEA tightening its belt; it would be helpful to understand if there is some expectations of researches that is going to come from NEEA.
* Tom Eckman: The baseline market share of efficient vs. non-efficient product data you collect in various markets is essential for us to establish the baseline for the RTF. If you cut the budget for collecting those markets information, our work will stall.
* Bruce Folsom: Fair to say there are two realities. The Economies scales are great and the Northwest is leading the country on this. Curious if there is a third realty, the rest of the country is catching up can we benefit from economies of scale there such as uniform measure project. Can we factor this in future budgets? If others are looking at cloth washers, refrigerators, it doesn’t matter what part of the country you are in.
* Susan Stratton: I am also interested in out of region contributions, where we can collaborate on a national basis so we are not paying in this region for all the region resources the nation needs. What information or data the RTF and the Council depend on to make the machine run, so I can factor in to make a decision to commit doing it or if most of it is done in a national research, we just need to fill in an x amount.
* Fred Gordon: The Northeast and California are doing some effort resembling the RTF. RTF has been pretty good at borrowing what they can from elsewhere; the biggest adjustment we made last year was based on RTF adjustment to hours of operation for CFL based on California study. When it comes to methods, cross comparison is useful but dread the idea of trying to come up with national uniform methods for two reasons. First getting everyone to get to even a serious of round tables will take a long time. The other reason is interests and philosophies tend to vary by region and are not constructive, unless there is a national deep pocket paying for it.
* Erin Erben: Is there something like BPA road mapping work that could be done for RTF along with member contributions?
* Tom Eckman: This might be an activity the evaluation group takes on. They have started a list underway to match up what we need. The road mapping exercise will flush this process out.
* Jim West: How much does the 7th Power Plan influence the scope of the RTF work plan?
* Charlie Grist: To some degrees in the past, heat pump water heaters and ductless heat pump would be two examples in the 6th plan that initiated NEEA and BPA research work.
* Charlie Black: Not sure how things were done in the past but looking at the 7th plan, it seems sensible to me we would come out of the 7th plan with prioritization of types of measures that are going to be most useful to help address constraints in the power system particularly with the increase focus on balancing the system, providing system flexibility and helping meet capacity needs.
* Tom Eckman: I think it is up to the PAC and the Council to review the boundary conditions of the RTF work whether or not to produce other metrics.
* Eugene Rosolie: Does that mean the power plan will identify certain measures the Council will think are valuable in terms of the issues Charlie talked about and how is that going to impact the savings?
* Charlie Black: Doing the planning and identifying what types of resources are best able to meet the system constraints ideally will feed back to providing direction on looking for measures that deliver in the RTF work. As Tom said we have data constraints and don’t know how much we are going to able to do on the 7th plan. On the minimum I would think we would be able to identify types of resources and measures that we think merit further pursuit and development. Looking for the types of measures that help address those constraints that would feed back into work that goes on in the RTF and elsewhere and provide better data for the next plan.
* Tom Eckman: Speaking of one right now, we are now high centered on the impact of commercial lighting controls. We have no information on what those load shapes get changed to from standard lighting level. Commercial lighting widget has been improved to a point where the remaining potential is controlling it. It is a fundamental big area where it is advent of smart grid and be able to control end uses.
* Charlie Grist: There are also new techniques to get those data and a lot of the new controls do logging as part of their control system. There is a way to harvest those logs and analyze the data. That might be a source of data that we can tap relatively cheaply. There are few things around the country in the northeast they are bidding energy efficiency capacity into the capacity market. There is a market that is driving some measurements that didn’t occur before. We need an independent group of people evaluating that for its merit as it is now a tradable commodity.
* Susan Stratton: NEEA is testing a non invasive load monitoring techniques on the residential side to our residential billing stock assessment test and also co-funding a research on a couple of different methods of harvesting end-use load shape. May be those techniques can be applied but we are far from having the data ready.
* Jim West: Asked if there are any implications for IOUs in the regulatory environment we need to have in mind as we think about the funding cycle and the level of funding for the RTF.
* Bruce Folsom: From Avista perspective, we are planning the same level of commitment and reliance on RTF but it might change subject on how the discussion with WTC goes.
* Tom Eckman: Need to have a discussion about the reliance on numbers coming from the RTF without an understanding how those numbers are generated.
* Pete Pengilly: Not locked into using RTF savings. But regulators have viewed RTF positively and have never questioned our support contributions. But Idaho does its own work where needed.
* Bruce Folsom: We have been directed and we rely on the RTF and we would be committed to making the organization as strong as possible even with funding.
* Deb Young: At Northwestern RTF work is applied by our evaluation contractors. Because of differences in our end use saturation, adjustments are always made to measures.
* Jeff Bumgarner: We do align to RTF more than not, if it is different from our planning assumption then we adjust our forecast and target accordingly. May take differences in jurisdictions outside of the Pacific Northwest.
* Jim West: As we think about the advent of the 7th plan, the increase focus on capacity in addition to energy, the cost of doing business in the energy efficiency program seems to me we ought to consider alternative scenarios. Should we ask staff to do some work to outline scope options for RTF?
* Fred Gordon: Scenarios need to be informative.
* Susan Stratton: It brings up the need for a better handle of energy savings and RTF is not going to do the primary research, it will be the Utilities, NEEA and BPA. How the 7th plan can use its focus to encourage that is pretty important and having the RTF intelligence on what it is going to take and who needs to step up to the plate and cooperate.
* Charlie Black: The question is what can the RTF do and how do we get the data to do the work. What is a realistic scenario for getting better data and if we had it how do we use it. How can we develop those scenarios for budgeting?
* Tom Eckman: RTF staff didn’t come on board until April this year, even if we maintain the same staff level and if we brought in capacity and load shape issues that is going to take some tools and data that we don’t have, may not have a huge implication for staffing but certainly will have a bigger implication for the processing of the data. It is going to take a while to get the data to do anything with it. It might mean more for 2016-17.
* Charlie Black: What I am realizing here is this will be a longer term strategy issue for the RTF, the question is what does the long term future looks like and what we do in the mean time.
* Tom Eckman: The larger utilities in the region and BPA are going to do impact evaluation on their programs to identify this kind of things already, the scope of work you have to get energy information back from your evaluation contractors could add capacity information on the measure. That will expand your own scope of work and so it will began to feed us with information that we are not presently getting on the impact evaluation. If the need is there it will be transparent to the purveyors of the program way before it is the RTF problem.
* Jim West: We will have our next meeting in Mid July and October and six months or less for the earliest of our budget decision. Does it make sense to plan for a five year scope of work for the RTF? We can either make some smart decision now in the anticipation of that or deal with it when it arrives.
* Erin Erben: For Five-year commitment you should have a 5-year work plan to sell.
* Fred Gordon: Thinks it is a good idea, coming up with a couple of scenarios of what it might involve might be good. We can start working at understanding those differences of opinions and resolving them. Issues like how much we can learn from whole building load shape data for individual measures and how much end use monitoring it is going to require and what end-use are too transitory to study. We know it is big but how successful will cheaper methods would be?
* Tom Eckman: We need to make sure we got things segmented. We are already moving in the direction of going the 8760 load shape in the RTF work and the Council is heading there, pro cost is being revised as we speak this tool is going to be integrated as the RTF moves forward. What we don’t have is the primary research to feed that model and save 8760 load shape. Those are two different problems, the RTF can process 8760 load shape today. The data development to give us that information is the costly work that needs to be done. I don’t see that as the RTF task. The RTF budget is not hugely influenced by that problem. The region or nation as a whole has this other problem, to know the capacity benefit of a particular load.
* Charlie Grist: In addition, if you want the RTF to do that it would have to set up a way to collect the money, spec the studies and do the work. That is shifting it from one pot to another
* Jim West: I think this is beyond the scope of this room. Right now we are talking about the scope of the RTF five year funding cycle that will begin in 2015. The question you raised is most appropriate for NEEA strategic plan update engaging stake holders. The challenge at the moment is to think about those issues collectively from overall regional perspective.
* Susan Stratton: Staff is going to recommend getting rid of the stock assessment study work. We are looking at everything from bottom up.
* Charlie Black: Rather than trying to solve the end use load research conundrum, we can make assumptions in the form of scenarios. When data becomes available that allows as to look more carefully at capacity and flexibility impacts of measures and the RTF would function.
* Jim West: Concluded the funding discussion for RTF to get some thoughts on paper. Assume end use load data emerges and any other expansion of RTF requests, but not primary data collection.

**Financial Updates**

* Gillian Charles updated the committee on closeout of 2012 and update for 2013.
* RTF 2012 budget was 1.473 million, obligated 100% of it in contracts and ended up spending 1.413 million with 60k unspent. The remaining 60k will be credited to the 2014 funding contributions. Compared to 77% in contract spent in 2011, we have spent 96% budget spent this year.
* Audit for 2011 was done for all RTF financials; a copy of the report is on the RTF website.
* 2013 we have the same budget as 2012. 1.212 million or 82% has been obligated by contract by mid-April. We have spent so far 128K of that. With the new contract staff coming on board this number will start to go up.
* 2012 Annual report will come out in June and will update with the 2013 progress at the next staff meeting.
* Eugene Rosolie asked for splitting out contract staff dollars.
* Jim West commented on how much improved the budgeting/contracting/reporting is going.

**Grid Savings NEB Discussion:**

* Tom Eckman and Charlie Grist briefed the PAC on the RTF approach for reporting grid savings and non-energy benefits.
* Ralph Goode: Have we just stopped using control groups?
* Fred Gordon: The increase in heat can’t necessarily mean increase in comfort is intentional. May be the ductless heat pump heat the house more evenly?
* Tom Eckman agreed: We don’t have thermostat in the homes; we have occupants’ reports or implications. We don’t have measurements pre and post installations. Back to the end use metering study, if we had end use metering study we will know this in advance. We are trying to back fit statistical analysis on houses without knowing what they actually use.
* Steve Bicker: Does PAC have a role to make a recommendation here?
* Tom Eckman: The PAC gets to pick and choose where it thinks there is a policy call that it want forwarded to the Council.
* Steve Bicker: Given the significance, the utility CEOs and regulators would look a very close look at this, recommend this group get some sold recommendations and debate it rather than by default letting it happen. Agree there are non-energy benefits and will need to figure out how to account for them.
* Jeff Harris: Definition of conservation resource is planned load reduction and increases in efficiency of energy use production and distribution. What is fundamentally different about this supplemental use of wood is human behavior about burning wood and from a power planning stand point it puts the question of reliability there is uncertainty around wood use as it may not stay stable over long term.
* Deb Reynolds: Many of these people who are burning wood have been burning wood for the last 20 yrs and probably will for the next 20 yrs unless they choose to go to something that doesn’t require them to haul and burn wood. If they were to stop burning wood it doesn’t necessarily mean they would put in a DHP. If they go to electric resistant heat that they currently have in their homes their energy usage will go up considerably more than with DHP. The truth is for the most part in Montana and much of Idaho to the extent people have zonal electric heat, they are not heating with electricity, they are primarily heating with wood. Our end-use study demonstrated that less than 3% of our customers are primary electric heat customers.
* Fred Gordon: Going forward evaluating is good but either use a lower number for the electric savings or use a higher number with a probability of risk. Neat and dry efficiency estimates are good for the bottom-line but you need a top line.
* Ralph Goode: Agrees with Fred, we ought to be thinking about economic tests and incorporate the reserve resource value of efficiency. For conservatively planned electric systems, we do not want to assume for example, unusually high level of wood heat use, a different case for customers with well established behavioral patterns. Haven’t heard previously cost effectiveness testing that incorporates this kind of reserve resource value. It does fit the regional concept of efficiency and how the Council has been doing resource planning for thirty years and refusing to take single point estimates.
* Fred Gordon: Can trim incentive now to reduce regulatory risk.
* Steve Bicker: Think there is a PAC action? I-937 for example.
* Fred Gordon: Don’t know what the PAC can do collectively, Individually we are confronted trying to reduce uncertainty with more research and trying to model uncertainty on how we plan for measures. The RTF can generate the results but can’t really tell us what to do with them.
* Jim West: I wonder what the PAC advice to staff is if the key issues list comes forward in may to give a heads up to the broader audience like PPC and PNUCC.
* Steve Bicker: In Washington where i-937 is bolted to RTF findings this will have the force of law and a lot of utilities are going to perk up and look at this very critically. This is a very litigated issue any time you talk about extra market effects. I think we should do good policy thinking around it.
* Jeff Harris: For me the policy question comes down to is if the RTF is delivering savings estimates that are based on short term savings you would see on a meter between pre and post case of an impact evaluation, or is the RTF delivering a savings number that is representative of the long run value of the measure to the power system over the life of that measure?
* Ralph Goode: RTF has to look at integrated analysis and make the kind of reasoned judgment the RTF is there for.
* Fred Gordon: RTF job is to estimate and not to speculate. Coming up with the bottom line value and coming up with the top line value the RTF cannot speculate long run.
* Tom Karier: We can let the RTF grapple with this and see the outcome. To review the assumption and conclusions to see if there are any policy issues we can ask the RTF to highlight the policy assumptions and bring it back to us.
* Steve Bicker: If the RTF can report grid benefits separate from total benefits and a narrative about the difference in confidence that we have in grid savings and the total savings.
* Jim West Wrapped up the topic by proposing a one hour webinar after the May RTF meeting for the PAC members to hear more about this issue.

**Qualitative Survey**

* Jim West introduced the topic and covered how the proposal was crafted.
* West asked the group who was interested in a qualitative survey, how the RTF is doing, and asked what the PAC would do with the results.
	+ Steve Bicker: Very encouraged of what the RTF has done to make some improvements and the work plan and transparency. Likes the idea of longitudinal data.
	+ Charlie Black: What is the subject of the survey, RTF overall or PAC specific?
	+ Jim West: The dashboard gives us metric and quantitative oriented results. We got the operation aspect but it leaves unanswered the question of how qualitatively the RTF is doing.
	+ Charlie Black: RTF tremendously impressive and real success story. Yet it is its own little bubble. There is a whole group of stakeholders out there including people in higher level utilities whose perceptions are not aligned with what is taking shape on the ground. The challenge to the RTF is with those stakeholders and who to survey and what to do with it.
* Lauren Gage: The purpose of the survey would be a pulse taking baseline survey, pretty basic questions about perceptions about the RTF and in the future do a more in depth process.
* Jim West: Working group had not considered a larger EE at risk audience. This was more inner circle, have they seen improvements, transparency, objectivities, etc
* Lauren Gage: Our recommendation would be the inner circle, the RTF voting and corresponding members. The reason being these are well defined and informed group. The alternative is to try to reach all the stakeholders, the issue there will be the survey could be extended to people who may not know what has been going on in the RTF in the past two years.
* Ralph Goode: It would be a shame to completely put aside a survey we did three years ago.
* Eugene Rosolie: You will get an overlap with the previous studies, as the members and corresponding members are surveyed before.
* Charlie Black: What are we trying to get out of the survey? If we survey the inner circle, we are not going to get many surprises. It is going to be very favorable. There is this perception gap out there where the reality of what the RTF does and what energy efficient measures do. There are people with significant position or responsibility who don’t buy it and haven’t seen it and would remain skeptic until they are shown otherwise. If you go to a PNUCC board meeting, they are saying the business model doesn’t work for this resource.
* Steve Bicker: Agrees with Charlie, the informed stakeholders or the inner circle are an important key group for the survey. And also are the people whose business is affected directly or indirectly by decision made by the RTF such as power managers, folks that do IRPs, folks who use the data that comes from RTF and whose job is affected by it. And compare the survey answers of the second concentric circle with the inner circle.
* Fred Gordon: And regulators who are the ones that need to know whether the RTF is bringing value to the region.
* Jim West: We are trying to decide if the people who are closest to the RTF and its operation have seen any difference to the advent of the PAC. That is why we are recommending the inner circle.
* Erin Erben: I don’t sense a strong urgency in doing the survey. I probably will spend any survey money, time or thought on other tasks the RTF needs to address. Most pressing issue is getting the right research gaps filled. The issue Charlie Black raised is valid but they may be addressed in a different kind of communication strategy but not a problem for a survey to address.
* Lauren Gage: We recommend pulling together staff and do this relatively simple within our organization. Alternative is to hire consultants to conduct the research, relatively easy but a lot more expensive.
* Fred Gordon: Gage described the maximum we should do at this point. I wouldn’t want to do anything deeper and not entirely convinced the survey is going to tell us anything we don’t already know. If people are convinced enough to want the survey this is the right level.
* Sarah Patton: Strongly agrees with Charlie Black. Our biggest challenge is getting the story of what the RTF is about and what the RTF PAC has been doing out to the folks who need to know about it. In order to make a good policy decisions, is this survey helps us do that?
* Lauren Gage: We thought fall 2013 would be appropriate to do the survey.
* Charlie Black: Going back to what Ralph said about the earlier survey, that could be a good starting point as to who this survey goes to and the topic can be what do you think of the PAC, how the governess of the RTF is going? That may set us up for further steps down the road with the broader communication or education piece.
* Susan Stratton: Using the NEEA survey as a base may not always reach the right people. Shouldn’t we relook at the old survey and determine the pressure point and find out if the issues that were raised were taken care of or are they still there?
* Bruce Folsom: Workgroup got to where it is after consideration of some of Charlie Black’s and Steve Bicker’s questions, and went in the direction of doing a survey light and inexpensive.
* Lauren Gage: For the question of when to take pulse of inner circle, the inner circle might feel narrow but we want to make sure those people are as happy as we tend to think they are. They are the most damaging if not satisfied.
* Jim West: If we feel a need to ask, I think we would learn something from a narrow scope, survey light that is not to say we don’t want to revisit the audience and the issues that lead to creation of this policy advisory committee.
* Steve Bicker: It would be very helpful to cross tab inner circle against the outer circle.
* Lauren Gage: Would be easy to do a web survey and expand the list. If the PAC wants to go inner and outer, we need to be thoughtful on how we develop the sample frame.
* Fred Gordon: My concern about the inner and outer circle strategy is, asking people who don’t know something and have no experience with the question and they make something up. I think we know that two levels above anybody here is not very familiar with us. How they are familiar with us is how much they talk to us. We are looking at audience that may not have the time to get familiar with us.
* Steve Bicker: By outer circle, I don’t mean CEO type folks, I was thinking more like power managers, people that have to implicitly rely on the data that comes out of the RTF to manage load resource issues.
* Jim West asked the PAC if they want to do the inner circle survey now.
* Tom Karier: I would postpone the survey until 2014, but at least have some sort of qualitative check-in to bring in issues that are out there to compliment our dashboard.
* Ralph Goode: Agrees with the chair.
* Eugene Rosolie: Having the survey sooner than later is important. We have 30 percent new members in the RTF and these are members who are critical of the RTF. Getting their views on how being part of the group or the process changed their views about the RTF.
* Out of 18 PAC members the majority voted no and decided to revisit this topic in October.

**Staff Updates:**

Charlie Grist gave staff update on the following.

* We have two new members in the Operations Committee, Bill Welch and Tom Lienhard. Both are solid experienced managers and are pulling heavy loads.
* For the QA/QC RFP 14 proposals were received from AES, Cascade, EMCOR, EMP2, EnerNOC, Evergreen, ICF, Lockheed, Michaels, Navigant, PECI, Quest, SBW and WSU. Operations reviewed them Thursday last week and decided to hire EnerNOC.
* New Contract Staff now on board as of April 1st and is going well. Had a one-day full “staff” retreat to organize and divvy-up the work. We have a very productive and motivated staff. They have devised a protocol on going through the measures and how to present measure findings and the format to present work to RTF in a consistent manner. They have also presented their first RTF meeting presentation with less than two weeks to get their presentation and analysis done and was delivered on time and well received by the RTF.

Tom Karier: On behalf of the Council, I would like to say how much we appreciate the PAC’s work. The Council and my colleagues have come to trust and rely on the RTF PAC to help guide its oversight.

Jim West concluded the meeting by tentatively scheduling the next RTF PAC meeting in three month after the next RTF Meeting in July, and a one-hour webinar on Grid Savings / NEB in May.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00pm