

Bruce A. Measure
Chair
Montana

Rhonda Whiting
Montana

W. Bill Booth
Idaho

James A. Yost
Idaho



Joan M. Dukes
Vice-Chair
Oregon

Bill Bradbury
Oregon

Tom Karier
Washington

Phil Rockefeller
Washington

July 26, 2011

MEMORANDUM

TO: Council Members

FROM: Terry Morlan

SUBJECT: Report on RTF Policy Advisory Committee Meeting

The Council's Regional Technical Forum Policy Advisory Committee (RTF PAC) will have its first meeting on July 28. When the Council created this advisory committee, members requested to be kept up to date on the RTF PAC activities and effectiveness.

I will report briefly on the first RTF PAC meeting. An annotated agenda for the meeting is attached. Council members who are interested in more detail on the RTF PAC can find the meeting packet for July 28 at the following link:

<http://www.nwcouncil.org/energy/rtfpac/meetings/2011/07/default.htm> . It will take you to the agenda, and then click on the "packet" link near the top of the agenda.

The focus of the first meeting of the RTF PAC will be on a funding agreement for the RTF and identifying and discussing issues related to the RTF's Guidelines for the Development and Maintenance of RTF Savings Estimation Methods.

Attachment

q:\tm\council mtgs\2011\aug11\c-11\rtfpac_cm.docx

Bruce A. Measure
Chair
Montana

Rhonda Whiting
Montana

W. Bill Booth
Idaho

James A. Yost
Idaho



Joan M. Dukes
Vice-Chair
Oregon

Bill Bradbury
Oregon

Tom Karier
Washington

Phil Rockefeller
Washington

**PROPOSED RTF POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA
AND FOCUSING QUESTIONS
July 28, 2011**

851 SW Sixth Avenue, Suite 1100
Portland, OR 97204

1.800.786.1922, guest code 96548831#

GoToWebinar: <https://www1.gotomeeting.com/register/868637177>

1) Welcome and Introductions

2) Election of a Co-Chair

3) Background and Purpose

- Major recommendations from the NEET RTF Review Committee
- Responses already made by the RTF
- Council created the RTF Policy Advisory Committee
 - Role of the RTF PAC
 - Establish stable funding and support for the RTF's work
 - Provide the Council feedback on RTF work plan priorities and budgets
 - Review the proposed Guidelines for the Development and Maintenance of RTF-Approved Measure Savings Estimates
 - Review the revised Council charter for the RTF
 - Address other policy issues that the RTF PAC feels the Council should consider

4) Scope of the RTF

- The draft revised charter of the RTF proposes a scope of work for the RTF that is limited to efficiency verification and tracking. We have not included renewables, low-income issues, or program best practices for example. Is that the correct scope of responsibility?

5) Funding

- How can the RTF PAC best secure the funding necessary for the RTF to perform the technical work required by the region?

- In 2011 the RTF used the NEEA funding allocation. Is that a reasonable allocation of support for the RTF? Should Council seek wider funding of RTF? (mid-Cs, smaller publics with own resources?)
- Is project specific subscription funding feasible or desirable as done in the past?

6) Operative Guidelines for RTF Savings Estimation Methods, Release 6-1-11

The guidelines were developed to address some of the concerns raised by the NEET review. The guidelines capture in writing the processes and protocols used by the RTF to verify savings including reliability criteria for efficiency savings estimates. The reliability standards set forth in the Guidelines depend on research and evaluation conducted and funded outside the RTF, by utilities, Bonneville, the Energy Trust of Oregon, the Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance, and others. Implementation of the Guidelines will likely require increased regional investments in research and program impact evaluation. Consequently, the adoption and use of the Guidelines by the RTF could have significant financial and resource implications.

- Are the criteria proposed by the RTF too stringent or not stringent enough? Are there additional criteria that the RTF should use or consider when verifying savings?
- The RTF identified several issues which it believes warrant consideration by the policy committee. These are listed in the RTF letter which transmits the Guidelines to the Council and include:
 - Regional savings reporting standards
 - RTF role in research funding
 - RTF review of impact evaluation
 - Process for addressing measures found out of compliance with the Guidelines

7) Future RTF PAC meetings and agendas:

- How much detail does the RTF PAC want to get into?
- What process should be in place to track progress and adjust work plans and budgets on an annual basis? Is review of the annual work plan and priorities an adequate review process?
- Does the RTF work plan adequately scope the technical work required by the region over the next 5 years? Is existing level of funding sufficient to perform the technical work required by the region as outlined in the BOP and Work Plan?
 - Is the 5-year business plan the correct level of effort and funding? What should be added, removed, sped up, or slowed down?
 - Provide some examples of different levels of effort e.g. collecting and incorporating results of utilities' own assessments vs. doing all assessment at RTF.
- Are there other RTF policy issues that the RTF PAC should be formulating recommendations to the Council on in light of the objectives set forth in the PAC Charter?