**RTF Policy Advisory Committee Meeting
May 15, 2015
9:00 am - 12:30 pm**

**Meeting Attendees**

**In Person:** Pat Smith, RTF PAC Co-Chair; Jim West, RTF PAC Co-Chair; Tom Eckman, NWPCC; Charlie Grist, NWPCC; Jennifer Anziano, RTF Manager; Richard Genece, BPA; Larry Blaufus, Clark County PUD; Fred Gordon, Energy Trust of OR; Susan Hermenet, NEEA; Bob Stolarski, Puget Sound Energy; My Ton, RTF Contract Analyst; Craig Smith, Seattle City Light; Jessica Mitchell, Snohomish PUD; Steve Bicker, Tacoma Power

**Via Webinar:** Lauren Gage, BPA; Danielle Walker, BPA; Greg Kelleher, EWEB; Thomas Phillips, Honeywell Smart Grid Solutions; Pete Pengilly, Idaho Power; Robin Arnold, Montana PSC; Ralph Cavanaugh, NRDC; Brian Dekiep, NWPCC; Don Jones, Jr., Pacific Power; Steve Johnson, Washington UTC; Yochi Zakai, Washington UTC; Joe Lucas, Western Montana PUD

**Meeting Summary**

The PAC discussed several questions around the RTF’s role in research related to how to define RTF research questions, roles for prioritizing and identifying funders for unsponsored research, and the bounds of a clearinghouse or engagement function. Key takeaways from that discussion are:

* The PAC supports the shift towards the RTF defining the research objectives and needs (the “what”) and leaving it to the research funders to define the methodology (the “how”).
* The PAC agrees it is the right body to consider funding RTF research priorities that are otherwise unfunded. To consider such questions, the PAC would like to have a clearly scoped research question.
* The PAC believes that it is not the right body to prioritize research question. The PAC proposed several options for who the right body is, but agreed that a group consisting of RTF members and researchers and evaluators in the region with budget (and excludes vendors) is like the right body to prioritize and get research funded.
* The PAC cautioned against the lift to develop a successful clearinghouse function, but recommended defining RTF research questions and engaging with the region (through the Northwest Research Group and other venues) to help make connections.

The PAC also discussed the RTF taking on an Enhanced RCP that collects savings data at a more granular level (measure and end use level rather than sector level) than in years past. Given the scope for this project was outside of the work plan budget, the PAC discussed funding mechanisms. The PAC concluded:

* The PAC supported collecting the data at a more granular level on an annual basis
* The PAC requested that the staff try to fund this with the existing RTF cash flow
* If additional funding is needed, the PAC requested that the staff bring a proposal (bundled with other requests as applicable) and consider alternative paths including reallocation of funds across years.
* The PAC also requested that staff reach out to PNUCC and PPC to determine the interest in the projections data going forward.

The PAC discussed the challenge with market transformation lag and whether there was a role for the RTF. The PAC came to general consensus on language that should be included in the RTF guidelines. The draft language to be refined and acted upon by the PAC at the next meeting is:

* The RTF establishes current practice baselines based on the average efficiency, recognizing there is some distribution across the market. The RTF PAC recognizes that when markets change--whether through market transformation or codes and standards--there are inherent lags between those regulations and changes in the market. Additionally, the PAC recognizes that there is a distribution to those lags across the market, as they vary based on geography, income, and other factors. Due to the complexity of those changes and the lack of data, they are not issues on which the RTF will establish energy savings estimates.

The PAC also discussed the draft Annual Report, plans for soliciting RTF members for the next cycle (2016-2018), and results of an operations survey of the RTF.

Detailed notes are available below.

**Discussion**

The materials for this meeting are available [here](http://rtf.nwcouncil.org/rtfpac/meetings/2015/05/Default.htm)

West co-chair of the RTF PAC opened the meeting with introduction, approval of the February 3, 2015 meeting minutes and today’s meeting agenda.

**Defining the RTF's Role in Research**

The RTF is seeking guidance from the PAC as to how the RTF should approach unfunded RTF related research questions and how narrowly (or broadly) should the RTF frame its coordination on research function. Grist and Anziano walked through the materials.

Gordon [Slide 4]: My understanding is that for Planning measures we may never figure out the savings at the measure level. Are you saying that this requires an evaluation of the individual measure?

* Grist: It’s the latter. Planning measures were put on the table by the Bonneville staff. They had measures they wanted to include in their planning, but didn’t have reliable savings estimates. This allowed getting guidance from the RTF to get a sense of the reliability. You can’t book those savings as guaranteed savings, you have to do impact evaluation, but you at least have a starting place to work from.
* Eckman: In very simplistic terms: for Proven, we have data on both the baseline and the efficient case; for Provisional, we have data on the baseline, but not the efficient case; and for Planning we have neither.
* Anziano: This is the current distinction in the Guidelines. The RTF is proposing a change because in practice that distinction between Planning and Provisional has not been useful.
* Gordon: In terms of what people report against the Power Plan, do all of these have equal currency in reporting against Power Plan goals regardless of the reliability?
* Grist: The nuance is that on the left side, you don’t just report the Planning estimate; you have to evaluate that through impact evaluation. The paradigm for reporting against the Plan is supposed to be Proven measures.
* Anziano: Going forward the RTF will change the numbers with new data, but we are not requiring programs to shore up the savings.
* Eckman: We have left this to the program operators and regulators on what to do with changes, when to implement changes, and whether they reinforce a retroactive change or not. That is not the RTF’s role.
* Gordon: You can book Planning numbers if you evaluate them.
* Eckman: Right.

Genece [Slide 8]: Could the research plan be developed to a less precise degree so potential funders won’t feel locked in with no ability to modify when the plan is presented. Instead, take the plan to only “this” point, and the funders take it from that point to the end point. This would allow them to feel more ownership.

* Anziano: That is the path the RTF is headed down.
* Hermenet: When shopping for funders, maybe the RTF should define the goal of the research need and whoever is going to fund the research can figure out the specific methodology.
* Gordon: It would be good to capture what the critical variables are for the measure.
* Anziano: In the past, we were trying to give something concrete for people to react to, but we found that to be too concrete. What I hear you saying sounds like the direction we are shifting to. To use our Planning and Provisional category a little different. Less around if we know the baseline or not, but whether we have funders or not.

Gordon [Slide 10]: RTF approval language for Provisional doesn’t say identifying the key variables to knowing the savings and we have a plan to get those key variables. “Meet some of the research goals” seem fuzzy to us. We should have a plan that will get us to a moderately reliable estimate.

* Genece: Where would you draw the line on how prescriptive it need be for RTF to feel the ability to modify it?
* Gordon: Identifying the critical variables is most important, such as guidance on sampling. I am still struggling with is the RTF is trying to create credibility, but we keep using the word “not a quasi regulatory” as unlimited license to not influence outcomes. The RTF could say here are the things we need to know and, in an appendix, here are the things we are curious about. Define the problem, not how to do it.
* Anziano: Where we fell on this language is on some or all of the research goals. The reason, a funder might not have the funding to do the whole project at once. This is a middle ground that says this will get us a big piece of the research, but also identifies which pieces have not been addressed that would still need to get addressed somewhere else.
* Eckman: The research strategy does identify the all the research needs. A particular plan might not address all of those.
* Gordon: And those gaps are defined?
* Anziano: Yes. The language could be clearer on this slide, but the “acknowledgement of research limitations and challenges” is meant to do that. Identify outstanding gaps in the research needs not met by this specific plan and would need to be addressed for future research.
* Genece: Are the research goals fixed or can be tweaked by any potential funder?
* Grist: I think that is the key question. For example, with heat pump water heaters, there is one outstanding question we need to address around HVAC interactions. The research strategy specifies what specifically we need to test, but doesn’t describe exactly how to do that test.
* Genece: That satisfies me. It sounds like it is defined enough to address the core questions, but if a utility has specific needs those needs could still be a part of the plan.

Bicker: How does all this work with a funder that comes to the RTF with new evaluation or data? Do we need to check in before the research and get it blessed before?

* Anziano: If it is a new measure, we don’t need to see it in advance.
* Bicker: What I am thinking about is an existing measure that is already considered Proven. If we have new research, do we have to go through this process to get the study blessed?
* Grist: No. The way the RTF has been operating is it is up to you. You can come to the RTF and ask for advice on the research strategy or research plan you are putting together, but it is not mandatory.
* Genece: I like the idea of the RTF being the clearinghouse for the region’s research plan for the region utilities to collaborate. If someone wants to bring a plan to the RTF to say this is what we are doing, then the RTF can be a place to say “You might want to check with XYZ and see what they are doing.”

Kelleher: It would be beneficial if we try to have funders involved early in the process rather than having a fully baked research plan. Instead, get them involved when we are at the stage with the bullet points, take it to the funders to develop something with the funder that will work.

* Grist: One question for you all is who does that? Is that the RTF staff or is that the funders? Who is out there trying to rope funders? I am not sure that is the RTF’s job.
* Blaufus: What role does the Northwest Research Group (NWRG) play?
* Hermenet: We have a forum to share who is doing what, but we have not been successful in developing a clearinghouse where everyone shares what they are doing.
* Gordon: People are sharing in that group, but the question is around the level of engagement.
* Hermenet: You hit the nail on the head. NEEA was asked to facilitate this group, and the challenge is the engagement. When we have it, the group is very powerful, but it is hard to get others to come to the table.
* Anziano: I was at the NWRG meeting and we talked about the lift of developing a clearinghouse. That is a part of the question we are seeking PAC guidance on is the RTF role in that space. It could be very informative for maintaining our library of measures, but will not be as helpful for the Planning measures on the books that are unfunded. It might help to make connections though.
* Blaufus: If the RTF was at those meetings and keeping these measures in front of those folks, it might help.
* Anziano: An action item from the meeting was to add a standing agenda item of what research questions the RTF has to help make connections.

Grist [Slide 12]: Setting the clearinghouse aside for a minute, whose job is it to corral folks to do the research?

* West: As a body, one of the biggest accomplishments of the PAC has been to secure stable funding for the RTF. It is my opinion that the PAC is the right body to get these funded. When we approved the five year funding plan, we acknowledged that there might be some things we need to come back to revisit and support additional funding. My question, how do we get from a general need to a specific ask of the PAC for consideration of funding?
* Genece: To West’s question on process, are there natural groups to go to for funding for specific measures that we should be thinking about?
* Cavanaugh: I support the staff proposal to conduct timely research competently, credible, and helpful to the region is to follow the procedure that is proposed here and nobody else is going to do this.
* Gordon: I am not sure. There seems to be a small overlap between the RTF and the evaluation research community. The bigger challenge is getting these two groups to talk. The PAC is not the right group to do this, but we can be a point person in the process. The key is first closing the gap between the RTF and evaluation community to make sure we have all the right folks talking and then perhaps we can address this. The other point is I don’t think the PAC will agree on a block of research funding for a scope not defined
* West: I agree with that.
* Smith: At the end of the day, when it comes to securing funding, the PAC is the right body.
* Gordon: If it is a decision for major new funding for broadly defined objectives, I would say so. My argument is about getting a certain project done is a level down.
* Genece: I agree this is the right body for the funding. Within my organization, I can help make sure the right folks are at the table to participate and engage to develop a recommendation to come to this body for approval. I think that is a role for all the funders here.
* Stolarski: I like the secure the funding piece, but the prioritization shouldn’t be with the PAC. I would like to see the RTF prioritize what needs to be done.
* Kelleher: I agree with the PAC’s role to secure funding, but I am not sure how. It seems that the Research and Evaluation subcommittee within the RTF body is the right body for prioritization.
* West: Head nod from the committee members that the PAC is the right body to secure funding, but not the prioritization. Fred’s description of the two groups gets at my question of how do we get from a general need to a clear question.
* Gage: There are research plan/strategies out there none of us the researchers have enough time to figure out who is interested and coordinating and moving forward. That is the key role that the PAC can play to raise the hand on interest, and then we can figure out how to coordinate.
* Gordon: You are relegating the task to a group with less expertise and no more time.
* Bicker: Agree with Gordon. I am wondering if there is a third group to work on these prioritization tasks. It does not feel like the PAC is the right body.
* West: Could it be the NWRG?
* Hermenet: The group is for the region, you can make it what you like.
* Stolarski: How closely is the NWRG tied to the RTF?
* Genece: Good question. I am also curious if there is an overlap of funders.
* Hermenet: The NWRG might not be the right group now, but it could be.
* West: How did this come about?
* Hermenet: NEET
* Genece: Do the research folks that come to that meeting have budget and positioning to prioritize? If the answer is no, another group.
* Stolarski: Another question is the focus that these folks have and whether it will meet the needs of the RTF.
* Eckman: I think that is part of the disconnect. The RTF tends to have very narrowly defined research needs that are different from the evaluation community as a whole. Our priorities tend to be unique and we have a better idea of the rank order than someone else.
* Gordon: There are a series of market barriers to get this done. We need to get to a point where the evaluators own the RTF objectives. If we don’t do it individually, we won’t be able to do it collectively. The evaluation folks manage the budget and research objectives. Having it all under one hat is probably the best place to be.
* Bicker: Whose job is to look at data from outside the region that isn’t weather sensitive?
* Anziano: When the RTF talked about this in March, it was clear that the research does not have to come from the region and we should leverage other research when it makes sense. My biggest concern is how to address those research questions were we don’t have a clear funder. For example: Commissioning, controls and sizing. Addressing the research questions for this measure is important because it impacts many measures, but we do not have a funder for the research.
* Eckman: It turns all measures with a heat pump into Planning, because we don’t have the right adjustment.
* Gordon: That is an area where different folks have different philosophies on that.
* Genece: Yes, but regardless, it is broad enough it will impact.
* Gordon: The RTF could use the evaluation research group as a forum to say, go find out how many are actively participating, they will form a coalition of the willing to form a proposal budget. Throw one over the fence every 6 months.
* Eckman: We have a backlog.
* Anziano: Typically these measures come up when they come up at the meetings and looked at individually, so it is hard to get context of priority. To help prioritize, we are putting together a table that describes the unfunded measures, the scope of the measure and how much it impacts reliability.
* Gordon: A role for this group might be to look at priorities, endorse those and bring it to the NWRG as a priority. That group could scope it out and bring it back to the PAC for funding.
* Genece: One thing we talked about was the challenge with engagement at the NWRG, so a role for the PAC might be to help drive engagement. Second this is a significant change in roll and scope for NWRG. If NEEA can facilitate to bring that together, this is a question still on the table.
* West: How often does the NW research group meet?
* Hermenet: Quarterly and it is driven by needs. NEEA’s role is as a facilitator and a member.
* Genece: That is where I am wondering if we need to rethink this again, especially if there is a need that is different than facilitation.
* Gordon: Make an RTF subcommittee to do the prioritization.
* Eckman: We do have a Research and Evaluation Subcommittee.
* Gordon: Who is on the RTF subcommittee? Is it the engineers researching the measures or the same folks as on the NWRG?
* Eckman: There is a lot of overlap.
* Anziano: There are also a lot of contractors that might bid on project, making this complicated.
* Eckman: NWRG doesn’t have contractors.
* Hermenet: RTF is focused on the RTF. The NWRG is as broad as needed.
* Genece: This role can be folded with RTF subcommittee, stripping out the consultants and the non-funders that engage in the research and evaluation subcommittee and folding it in with NEEA.

West: Consensus that the PAC is the right body when considering funding. Need a third piece up there is the prioritization. Is it appropriate to take this back to the RTF. The PAC is happy to secure funding and to have this discussion with the overlap and coordination with the NWRG.

* Smith: Give that broad guidance and not try to design the mechanism here, and let the coordination happen between the RTF and NEEA.
* Cavanaugh: Is it reasonable to suggest that the RTF prioritize?
* Eckman: Yes.
* Gordon: Thinking about the process again. Having a sub-subcommittee without vendors in it isn’t a bad idea. The other thing we want to know is how does this research relate to the rest of the research and evaluation agenda? If it is the same individuals, they can help answer that.
* Kelleher: RTF doesn’t have trouble prioritization the research for their needs. Securing the funding we will look at the PAC.
* Jones: Agree with Kelleher RTF can prioritize the research and come back to the PAC for the funding.
* West: Take this discussion back to the RTF. Think about the right mechanism, several were suggested here. I will suggest that if it is appropriate for this group to convene by webinar, we would be happy to do that. I think you are hearing support for the funding piece. I think we need to get to what the ask is.
* Stolarski: Is there a list of these issues so we can see the scale or scope?
* Anziano: We will add it to the PAC dashboard.

Stolarski [Slide 16]: Who are some of these other groups?

* Anziano: NWGR and RETAC. Other groups as well as national groups like CEE. The goals of which are trying to understand who is doing what to avoid duplication.
* Grist: Mark Kendall developed a clearinghouse here, but after one cycle folks were busy and it never got traction. I don’t know if it wasn’t useful enough or not enough value.
* Hermenet: When I hear clearinghouse, this should be framed purely from the RTF standpoint. Also, folks have talked about a clearinghouse generically, but the oversight for these is not little. You need ownership.
* Gordon: Clearinghouse is the wrong term.
* Bicker: Agree with Hermenet. It is important to evaluate and understand our needs in the RTF then additional benefit besides getting more information that might be cheaper to do it ourselves is it slows the process down. Benefit in that because from implementation perspective, the RTF lands on a number and a year later it changes. If the process can slow down so momentum can be added. A map could be attached to the process; we could get a better result a little slower and have more confidence in the results. Because of the disciple process.
* Anziano: One of the changes I am trying to make is for the analysts to look beyond the next meeting. But this is a challenge. As a baby step, I am putting future topics in front of the RTF, which has helped. It would be good to take it a step further to look at the types of questions is another step in the process. Also, I am wondering if clearinghouse isn’t the right role, but more engagement to understand who is doing what.
* Gordon: Maybe the model is less clearinghouse, but more a specific set of questions that are more actionable.
* Bicker: Maybe a wiki function where everyone updates and benefits.
* Anziano: Currently our Guidelines have this description of a clearinghouse role, but I have been starting to think that isn’t the right role. Getting the questions out in front of folks is the right path. As well as leveraging other tools in the region, such as Conduit.
* Eckman: With the normalization of the workbooks the RTF has identified the critical variables. We can pull those out to say these are the things we will look at.
* Gordon: Modify a bit. Here are the 5 we really care about.

**Enhancement of the Annual Regional Conservation Progress (RCP) report**

Anziano presented the materials for the Enhanced RCP Topic.

Bicker: How would you articulate the benefit for the additional $30k?

* Anziano: From RTF perspective, being able to see a more detailed picture of where savings are coming from is a real value. For example, if we have unfunded measures in Planning category where a lot of savings are being booked will help us with getting our priorities right.
* Grist: We use the detailed measure levels data a lot in building the Seventh Plan for ramp rates. Up to now, all we have collected is residential, commercial and industrial sectors. It doesn’t give us much detail where things are falling short and or going faster than expected.
* Gordon: I now understand how the RTF and Power Plan can use it. Is it valuable to do the RCP survey every year? What is your perspective in doing this every year verses every two years?
* Grist: I like every year because some of these measures are lumpy, especially the industrial ones, so seeing that is good. Also, setting this process up requires a connection to the utilities reporting mechanism, and letting that go fallow a year requires a bigger lift the next time.
* West: In state of Washington under I-937, we are thinking more in two year windows. Half or more of our conservation results come from the commercial or industrial market where the lead time can be a year or longer. In terms of how we think about our business, we are beginning to think in terms of two years cycle. I wanted to ask Genece, because BPA still has the biggest share of the cost, if we did a scheme such as is allocated here does that meet Bonneville’s needs to not be the sole funder.
* Genece: Yes

West: Specifically, what is the timing?

* Anziano: To do the RCP this year in the 2015 work plan we will need to send it out soon.
* Eckman: This collects 2014 savings and projections for 2015-2017.
* West: Have we considered the added burden to the reporting utilities for the additional granularity compared to what they were accustomed to reporting?
* Eckman: Cadmus asked the individual IOUs and large public for a data dump. Whatever you file, send it to us, and they sorted. In the standard RCP, we ask via internet survey form that the utility sum up their savings. We don’t get 100% response. We get 90 plus % of the load from 60-70% of utilities. The rest we fill in from BPA.
* Anziano: A lot of the data we can get directly from Bonneville this time. The change for the IOUs for example is the same data that Cadmus requested last year for the Six Going on Seven.
* Eckman: The difference is that they don’t get asked twice.
* West: I am not in front of the Council that often, but I don’t think I have ever been in front of the Council when I don’t hear about small/rural markets. I am hesitant to doing anything on the expense of the investment on the small rural.
* Smith: Agreed.
* Gordon: I am hesitant to go back to my organization and say that we gave RTF $300K and now they want $7K more.
* Bicker: I do get annual projections of where we are going to land. It is by sector not by measure.
* Eckman: Projections are always by sector.
* Bicker: In favor of Charlie’s recommendation on annual, the second year out the accuracy goes down for projections.
* Anziano: The projection piece is pulled out here because we would not be able to get that data directly from Bonneville, but would be a different data request.
* Gordon: I am skeptical about this data.
* Eckman: When the Sixth Plan targets came out, the region was skeptical they could be met. The RCP never asked for that prior, but we had a request when we started the 2010 report to get projections to see how close we would get to targets. We got very few returns beyond two years, as budgets are not developed. We were asked by the utilities, PNUCC and the PPC. The PAC can certainly overrule that.
* Anziano: The enhanced piece we are talking about is the backward look.
* Grist: What Bonneville and Cadmus developed was a process for getting this more detailed data and cleaning it to ensure they were comparing apples to apples. That was a lot of busy work and, I am sure that Bonneville has committed more than $30,000 in getting that set up. Now this is set up and Bonneville can provide that for the public. The lift is more on the IOUs and Energy Trust, and they have a mechanism to do that.
* Blaufus: The discussion of projections verses backward looking that doesn’t really affect the dollar amount.
* Anziano: Correct. The additional budget of $30K is for the Cadmus and Cadmus wouldn’t be looking at the projection. It is the money that is already in the work plan for the contract analysts and the Council in-kind support to get this data.
* Gordon: My preference is every other year and plan ahead for the money. If the group goes the other way, I will support it.
* Genece: We support every other year if the group wants to go that way. Concerned about any gap from one year to the next. Does the second alternative mean we wouldn’t do it this year, but we would do it next?
* Anziano: The second recommendation is we would do our existing RCP this year and plan for the budget for the enhanced RCP in next year’s work plan.
* Cavanaugh: Staff recommendation is to do an annual report?
* Eckman: Yes
* Cavanaugh: I think it is important; this is a system that is working and heavily relied around the region. I am very hesitant to go against the staff’s recommendation to change the reporting intervals.
* West: I agree with Cavanaugh I am sensitive to the burden placed on the reporting utilities I don’t want this body to do anything that looks to the region as if we are backing off to the level of support or commitment to energy efficiency to the region.
* Blaufus: For people who do bi-annual, in Washington we still report every year.

Gordon: Why at this point in the process is this coming up? The answer is we thought of it, and it doesn’t look great.

* Eckman: This would be a onetime adjustment this year, but we could build it in going forward.
* Anziano: The work plan this year has less flexibility. There is always time as we get closer to the end of the year, we can maybe reallocate. It is hard to know that today what will come up.
* West: What are the mechanics to get funding if we approve a motion to add additional money, is it a contract adjustment for each of the funders?
* Anziano: I will talk to our legal team to get the details of the mechanics.
* Genece: If we agree here, are we committing the funders who are not at the table?
* West: Hesitant to commit funding for members who are not here today. My suggestion would be that if we came to a motion it would be provisional approval contingent on those funders.
* Bicker: If a contract amendment is needed, that is more complicated. It would take more time to cut the check. If there is a way to do that as a simple invoice, I would expect the cover letter would make it clear as to the benefits and an explanation as to why now.
* Gordon: This will be a medium size lift for us.
* Eckman: We have an unallocated $46k. I wonder if we can wait until closer to the end of the year to see if we have unspent funds, and kick the can down the road as to whether we need to go to the till.
* Anziano: That would make me most comfortable. I am trying to be mindful of what those funds are planned for, but knowing how things shift, it does make me a little uncomfortable to ask for funds now.
* West: I think you are hearing support for this and unfunded projects. The challenge is the mechanism and doing these one off. Think about the feasibility of bundling the need into an overall amendment.
* Anziano: We can see how we can fit the enhanced RCP within the existing budget and come back if needed bundled with something else.
* West: We are operating with a five year funding cycle. If it makes the mechanics easier to allocate money across the years and deal with the additional funding later for more material amount is another option.
* Pengilly: Support the annual reporting and finding the funds in the current budget. What level are we expected to forecast our savings?
* Eckman: Sector level
* Pengilly: We don’t find much value from it. We would probably just put what is in the IRP.
* Eckman: That is what most folks do.
* West: Who is the audience for projections today?
* Eckman: PNUCC and PPC asked us to do it.
* West: If we are going to take some time to assess the incremental funding need or manage it from the current year budget, touch base with PNUCC and PPC the value of the RCP projections.
* Jones: Supportive of the annual reporting. In favor of losing the forecast piece as we don’t use it.

Motion (West): Approve the continuation of reporting. The RTF will take it on and try to manage the incremental funding out of this year’s cash flow and come back with alternatives with how we add funding to the budget if needed, including reallocation of funds across years and for staff to do a check with staff of PNUCC and PPC the primary users of the forecast.

* Gordon seconded.
* Motion passes with no opposition.

Smith: I am supportive of this motion. There is a lot of interest from the Council for the annual reporting and the additional granularity is going to be good. I appreciate the vote.

* Gordon: I appreciate Bonneville carrying it this far.

**2016-2018 RTF Member Solicitation**

Grist explained the RTF member solicitation process. Grist proposed the areas he would like to see more on the RTF is women, independent members, and those with statistical/research design expertise. The last is based on the expected measures that will be coming to the RTF in the future. Grist asked about what skill sets the PAC thinks we should look.

* How do you evaluate the expertise?
* Grist: We look at resumes and call references.
* Eckman: It is like hiring people.

Anziano showed the current mix for reference.

* Gordon: Also think about people that will sit through an RTF meeting. Those that might have that expertise might not want to participate on all topics.
* Bicker: I think we need that perspective, but I am not sure that is the right way to get it.
* Eckman: We have corresponding members that can be more focused on very specific items so they are not spending their time on things they are not interested in.
* West: Do you use rank order on the respondents or do you do some weighting?
* Eckman: It is like filling out a football roster.
* Genece: Does geographic spread come up?
* Anziano: We don’t have geographic spread, but something we can add.
* Eckman: The recommendations go to the Council for final sign off and they will ultimately look at that.
* West: Agree with Grist’s three.
* Grist: We need to do more outreach to solicit potential applicants. It is a big lift and we can structure it with some focused groups. In the end it is like hiring a staff.
* West: Make sure each of us know when the solicitation goes out, and we can help to find those diversity.
* Jones: This numbers get used in the region by folks that deliver programs. We need to keep a core group of folks who have experience going to market with these technologies.
* West: Agreed, important to maintain the integrity of the RTF.

**RTF Annual Report**

Anziano: We are in the process of developing the Annual Report we would like to ask for specific areas the PAC would want to highlight.

* West: Send us the draft with due dates for comments.
* Genece: Perhaps highlighting how the RTF model has been used in other parts of the country (such as the California TF). I think it is great for the RTF to take credit for that.
* Gordon: There have been questions about coordinating and leveraging the CalTF.
* Eckman: Anziano has had many inquiries.
* Anziano: Yes. One of the CalTF staff has moved to Portland (or will be) and is likely to attend more meetings.

**RTF's Role in Addressing Market Transformation Lag**

Anziano walked through the presentation on market transformation lag.

* Gordon: When there is a new Federal manufacturing standard, does the RTF do anything about the lag time or leave it for the utilities to figure out?
* Eckman: The latter
* Grist: The RTF publishes updated energy savings estimates as soon as it comes out and it is up to implementers to determine when they want to use it.
* Gordon: Recognizing that there is differential lag, but we elected to not do anything. There is not any data. It is real, there is something going on, some places are slower than others. But nobody knows it is not data driven.
* Anziano: That is why the RTF goes down that path, but there were enough questions around the table that we brought it forward to the PAC.
* Eckman: It would be helpful if the PAC makes an explicit statement that it is not the realm of the RTF, but the realm of the implementers. It is a decision between you and your regulator when the new UES goes into effect.
* Gordon: We can say it is a legitimate question and it is not our call.
* Pengilly: I agree. When the RTF deactivates a measure it causes problems when we see the baseline is different from what we have here. If the old savings can be kept on the books, that would be helpful. On HPWH example, it is difficult to buy one in Boise as the market is far from changed.
* Gordon: The RTF could try to put a number down as to when it is no longer applicable, but it wouldn’t make sense with no data.
* Grist: You could ask folks to find some data to inform but that would be hard.
* West: To Pengilly’s comment, I get what he is saying, which sounds different than being silent on it. Also, does staff have preference on what guidance the PAC gives you?
* Eckman: Historically we try to stay out of the timing of the implementation of the measures as to whether they are deactivated or not. From the RTF perspective they are deactivated but are still in Bonneville’s implementation manual. So, what does it mean when the RTF deactivates, not much to a specific utility.
* West: It will have to be decided market by market.
* Gordon suggested a motion: The RTF PAC recognizes that when markets change through market transformation or codes and standards, there are lags between those regulations and changes in the market. Those lags differ geographically, however due to the complexity of those changes and the lack of data they are not issues on which the RTF will establish estimates.
* Bicker: Support that language. Someone should also remind the RTF when they make a decision it will have regulatory impacts even though the RTF is not a regulatory body. It is appropriate for the RTF to use caution to make sure they have the data and there is not a possibility it will change in the near future. With this caveat I support Gordon’s motion.
* West: To paraphrase Gordon’s language. The delay or the lag between market transformation codes and standards changes legislative mandate, and what actually occurs in the market place is not a technical issue and therefore is not in the domain of the RTF.

The technical form establishes the right technical benchmark, but the timing will vary due to the complexity Gordon mentioned, but that timing is not a technical issue for the RTF to weigh in on. The RTF does not have a role for defining, prescribing, adjudicating what the lag time is between technology changes, be they changes in the marketplace or be they legislated.

* Gordon: My reservation is that there are no facts as to how markets change.
* Eckman: The definition in our Guidelines of current practice is that it is an average of some distribution and that distribution as a tail. There are ends to the distribution that do not fit that average.
* Bicker: When you go out to talk to regulators and others in the region, that point about the distribution is a very good one to make.
* Blaufus: This was deactivated in April, which is when the code came in. Was there any consideration to having that date further out?
* Eckman: We just don’t have any data on what that would be.
* Blaufus: Bonneville uses six months.

Collectively the PAC discussed the wording. West recommended that we tighten up the wording and bring it back for action, but recognized that directionally the PAC agrees.

**Results of RTF Operations Survey**

Anziano reviewed the results from the operations survey.

West as a closing comment reminded the group the next quarterly meeting is scheduled for August 27th on Thursday and will discuss with Anziano if there is a need for a webinar to discuss research priority. Pat Smith thanked the group for great discussion on a challenging agenda and Anziano for getting the PAC focused on the research needs.