Meeting Notes
Evaluation Committee Meeting

June 26, 2009, 10 am – 1 pm

Attendees

- Phil Degens, evaluation manager
- Debbie Kitchin, board member and committee chair
- Alan Meyer, board member
- Dan Enloe, board member
- Ken Keating, evaluation expert
- Brien Sipe, evaluation project manager
- Sarah Castor, evaluation project manager
- Matthew Taylor, evaluation intern
- Jessica Rose, acting business sector manager, existing buildings
- Kim Crossman, senior industrial sector manager
- Ted Light, industrial sector coordinator
- Matt Braman, planning project manager
- Jennifer Barnes, Summit Blue (by phone)

1. Existing Buildings Steam Trap Site Verification Study

Evaluation Contractor: Strategic Energy Group (SEG)

The purpose of this evaluation was to verify assumptions about site conditions associated with energy savings. This measure saw dramatic activity after its introduction in fall 2008 through March 2009 and was responsible for a sizable portion of the Existing Buildings (EB) program's savings over the past year.

The two installing contractors served most of the dry cleaners in the Portland metro area. SEG visited 10 sites to assess the quality of installation, boiler operating hours, and customer satisfaction. They found:

- Installations were high quality
- High levels of customer satisfaction with equipment, savings, and program interaction, though customers saw no need for further contact with contractors or Energy Trust
- All traps at each site were replaced regardless of whether they were working, due to the expense of testing the traps; replacing a working trap results in little to no savings for that trap
- Only about half of sites had pipe insulation on steam pipes
- Boilers operated 62% of the originally assumed hours, resulting in lower savings; reduced hours were due to unexpectedly strict operating procedures from many participants, partly because of the economic recession

Brien Sipe performed in-house analysis of measure savings based on utility data. Estimated savings were between 44 and 55 therms per trap, for a realization rate of 32-39%. Despite the low realization rate, the measure still passes the cost-effectiveness test.

The study and impact analysis are valuable information before the program expands into Clark County, Washington. That territory has 43 geographically concentrated dry cleaners that could generate $60,000 in incentive payments in a short amount of time.

Potential approaches to maximize savings and cost-effectiveness in Clark County and non-Portland metro dry cleaners in Oregon are:

1. To have program staff go out to sites and tag non-working traps, then provide leads to contractors
2. Provide direct installation, rather than offering measures through a contractor
3. Require pipe insulation with trap installation

Jessica Rose noted that the program would like to combine options 1 and 3, to have program staff identify other savings potential at the sites as well as direct install measures, such as aerators and CFLs, to gain both electric and gas savings per site. This would also benefit savings and small commercial uptake in PGE territory where it is needed. Dan Enloe suggested providing the traps as a kit for remote customers to install themselves, along with marketing materials and pipe insulation, provided the traps don't require a licensed and bonded plumber or HVAC technician. Collecting and recycling the replaced steam traps was also discussed to avoid losing savings due to re-installation.

2. Review of Evaluation Schedule

The committee reviewed the evaluation schedule. Alan expressed concern about whether current staff can handle the planned number of evaluations. Dan said it would be easier to prioritize evaluations if savings potential for the measure or program, along with evaluation cost, were noted next to each proposed evaluation. Ken, Dan, Debbie, and Alan all noted that the residential set-back thermostat pilot should not be attempted given other utilities' experience of no savings from the measure; Phil will relay this concern to program staff.

3. Production Efficiency (PE) 2007 Impact and 2007-2008 Process Evaluation

Evaluation Contractor: Summit Blue

Major findings from this first draft of the 2007 impact evaluation were:

- 89% realization rate over all measures
- 27.5% free rider rate
- 65% net savings rate
- Very low realization rates for water and waste water treatment measures due to excessive engineering savings estimates

Phil noted that the process for estimating savings for water and waste water treatment measures has improved since 2007, with the decision to bring program implementation in-house and hire a part-time contractor to review the savings estimates, and future years will likely show higher realization rates.

A megaproject accounting for 45% of the program savings in 2007 has not been evaluated for savings realization yet.

The impact evaluation involved site visits representing 90% of total program savings, to perform end use metering, inspection, and log hours of operation. The committee discussed how to report savings for sites that have experienced a closure or production change, either temporary or permanent. Probability of plant closure is already used in calculating measures life, so to zero out the savings for a plant that had closed would be penalizing the program twice. The committee agreed that plant closure would continue to be used to assign measure life, but not cancel savings. On changes to production levels, Phil suggested taking the midpoint between savings at full production and savings at revised production to determine the realization rate. Another suggested approach was to take the savings under first-year production levels. The committee was not able to come to an agreement on which method to adopt; options, and their impact on program realization rates, will be considered at the next meeting. Phil noted that the Evaluation team will look into conducting a plant persistence study to gauge how long facilities operate relative to our assumptions.

Ken noted that many states and utilities are no longer reporting net savings (savings reduced for free-ridership), but report gross savings and use free ridership estimates for program design only. Ken, Debbie, Alan, and Dan agreed that Energy Trust should consider moving towards a gross savings metric and discuss this with the OPUC .

Key findings from the process evaluation were:

- High levels for satisfaction for both custom (4.6 out of 5) and small industrial initiative (SII) participants (4.7)
- All participants were aware of energy efficiency after participating in the program
- Nearly all (100% of custom and 97% of SII) participants would participate again
- Reasons among non-participants for not participating varied, but they also appear to be actively managing energy costs

The committee was unable to finish the review of the PE evaluation before the end of the meeting.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for August 21 from 9 am to noon.