Meeting Notes
Evaluation Committee Meeting

August 6, 2010, 10:05 AM – 12:56 PM

Attendees

- Debbie Kitchin, Board Member and Committee Chair
- Alan Meyer, Board Member
- Dan Enloe, Board Member (by phone)
- Dan Davis, Board Member (by phone)
- Ken Keating, Expert Outside Reviewer
- Tom Eckman, Expert Outside Reviewer
- Steve Lacey, Director of Operations
- Kim Crossman, Sr. Industrial Sector Manager
- Fred Gordon, Director of Planning and Evaluation
- Jennifer Barnes, Navigant Consulting (by phone)
- Rob Russell, Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance, Evaluation Manager
- Sue Fletcher, Communications and Customer Service Sr. Manager
- Marshall Johnson, Existing Homes Residential Sector Manager
- Phil Degens, Evaluation Manager
- Sarah Castor, Evaluation Project Manager
- Matthew Taylor, Evaluation Contractor
- Brien Sipe, Evaluation Project Manager

Meeting began at 10:05

Items covered:

1. Industrial Energy Improvement pilot evaluation
2. Kaizen Blitz
3. SP Newsprint Industrial Megaproject
4. CFL Shelf Space Analysis
5. 2010 Trade Ally Survey (continued from previous committee meeting)
6. Committee Feedback

1. Industrial Energy Improvement pilot evaluation

Phil presented the Industrial Energy Improvement (IEI) pilot evaluation

Study Background:

- Study period: Jan. 2009 – June 2010
- Evaluation Contractor: Navigant Consulting
- Evaluation Methodology:
    - Participant interviews (8 of 10 participating firms)
    - Staff interviews (3)
    - Review of documents

IEI background:

- Implementation contractor – Strategic Energy Group (SEG)

- Savings achieved through a one year continuous improvement process
- Ten firms in pilot cohort
- Monthly networking/training workshops
- One-on-one coaching in-between workshops
- Energy savings measured at the meter
- Incentives of $0.02/kWh first year savings

Findings:

- Customers motivated by energy cost reductions (5)
- Corporate sustainability or energy management (3)
- Other reasons include:
    - Corporate citizenship
    - Understanding plant energy use
- Firms developed significant goals that were for the most part achieved
- Satisfaction with the experience was quite high with most (6/8) rating it a 5 on a five point scale.
- Savings goals ranged from 3%-15%
- Overall reduction across all participants was 7.9% of total usage
- Savings of 13 million kWh at $227,772 in incentives

Further findings:

- Participants valued:
    - Developing energy tracking and reporting capabilities (5)
    - Support from SEG (4)
    - Employee engagement (2)
    - Learning how to identify energy savings opportunities (2)
- Participants valued less or did not value:
    - Topics not applicable to their firm (3)
    - Some redundant workshop topics (1)
    - Principles (vs. list of savings opportunities) (1)
- Elements of IEI success:
    - Corporate support (3) and leadership (1)
    - Corporate culture (1)
    - Availability of time and resources (1)
- Energy Champions primarily in maintenance and engineering (5)

Suggestions for improvement:

- More in-person meetings in lieu of webinars
- Site visits at participants plants
- Shorter meetings

Study recommendations:

- Continue the IEI as a regular component of the PE program
- Continue with current recruitment strategies
- Modify the format of trainings to emphasize face to face meetings
- Analyze the content of the training to make sure that topics are not redundant
- Establish baselines for participants at onset of seminars
- Consider funding SEG as an ongoing resource to IEI participants:
- Leverage participants to continue and expand IEI activities

Energy Trust take

- Continuing on with IEI as part of program
- Currently recruiting for Cohort 3
- Incorporating many of the changes recommended by the evaluation
- Interview Cohort 1 (and following cohorts) in a year to determine long term impacts
- Review hand-off to PDC

Discussion

Alan asked if goals were based on energy intensity. Kim explained that most firms had goals set as a preliminary part of the IEI process. Sarah mentioned there was some implementation of capital measures which helped to hit the more aggressive goals. Phil indicated that goals could be intensity or total energy use (e.g. gas and electric), depending on the firm. Jennifer mentioned that participant time horizons for meeting their goals may not be in-line with Energy Trust's cutoff date for the pilot. Thus, for some participants, the IEI is still ongoing, creating the potential for additional savings, which hasn't been built into the measure savings as of yet.

Kim indicated some of the firms may be better candidates for the Kaizen Blitz (discussed in more detail in section two) than the IEI. Debbie asked how we qualify and recruit for which pilot they should be filtered into. Kim indicated the program is now working on this very topic, channeling participants into the most applicable program given the diverse range of industries served by the industrial sector.

Alan asked if there were one-on-one activities. Monthly workshops were for everyone, but the SEG did provide one on one coaching with individual firms.

Kim discussed how executive sponsors were encouraged to show up to at least one workshop. Phil also mentioned that some firms have energy teams so some firms sent different folks Program required two people to show up to each meeting, but sometimes three or four attendants would come from one firm.

Ken asked if the consultants were only allowed to talk about electric savings, they had free reign Kim indicated that they were not a systems approach, but an organizational approach. This resulted in many sites getting gas savings, but many firms were on transport rate schedules (not eligible for Energy Trust incentives and these savings could not be claimed).

Alan asked about the potential for claiming savings from firms on transport rate schedules to help meet goals. Fred indicated that the transaction cost of the data may be high; as it needs to be proved that no one else is claiming the savings, necessitating a cost/benefit of tracking system needs and evaluation budgets. Kim indicated that the sites are large, and Energy Trust has access to the data. Staff will continue to explore this area.

Debbie indicated that with any business participants, program offerings like this should aim for short meetings. Kim said the program expected it to be difficult to get consistent attendance, but indicated there was no difficulty getting folks to come to the meetings, and found attendants to be attentive and did not encounter issues with people trying to leave early.

Rob asked about the Monitoring, Tracking and Reporting (MT&R) tool, as NEEA would be interested in working from a successful tool on their initiatives, rather than working from scratch. The program came up with three different models across the 10 sites to find the best

methodology for specific industries. The Canadian tool worked well for production based loads, while Energy Expert worked well with sites with weather dependent loads. Kim indicated that there was very thorough third party review of the analyses, giving high confidence to the appropriateness of each method as applied to each sites modeling.

Rob asked if there is a report in the works on the modeling software approaches that could be made available to the region, noting that there is an audience for this sort of comparative work. Kim mentioned that there has been a strategic energy management working group formed by the NEEA industrial sector that is working with the Trust and BPA to share lessons learned in all 3 organizations' efforts. This may be the right venue for this discussion. Some caution needs to be used, however, as the modeling includes sensitive information, so research or published information on the software selection for a wider audience may be problematic.

Alan inquired more about the selection process: is and was Energy Trust actively recruiting for this initiative and how is recruiting conducted? Kim indicated that the first cohort had a wide range of sizes. Given the economies of scale, the program intends to go after larger firms, given that the most cost effective efficiency is at the more sophisticated, higher users. Program question: what is the level of complexity that the IEI can handle right now?

Some recruitment considerations were:

- Corporate sponsorship – biggest factor
- Organizational readiness
- Size of load
- How many utility meters were at the site
- Access to interval data – Willingness to work with and share data.

Alan asked why only 10 firms? Kim indicated that with an average of 2-3 attendees per firm, the workshop size of about 25-30 is manageable and does not create an intimidating atmosphere for presentations/participation/interactions.

Ken asked about the rollout of the offering into the program. The Industrial Program Delivery Contractors[1] (PDCs) will remain the key contact for the program, but the IEI will continue to be facilitated and run by SEG.

Debbie mentioned that participation in business groups, particularly when in non-competing industries, can result in a unique learning experience.

Dan Enloe and Dan Davis asked about geographic expansion of the program to non-metro areas, highlighting the fact that southern Oregon has a contingent of industries which could work well. Kim mentioned that the 2nd cohort has participating firms from Albany, and the 3rd cohort has five candidates from Roseburg. The program's challenge is to get commitment from firms in other regions to attend meetings. Thus far, a critical mass of potential participants from another region has not materialized to support a local cohort, but in the future this may be a possibility.

[1] The PDCs are a pool of five contracting teams, with geographical or industry territories who work with industrial sites year after year. They scope work, fill out paperwork and bring in additional technical resources when necessary.

Phil indicated there is a willingness of SEG to travel (they provide IEI services in California). But there's a need for a large cohort. The metro area was also targeted with the need to achieve PGE savings goals in mind. With the 5-10% proven savings, this offering now makes it easier to forecast savings and plan goals.

Dan Davis indicated he would like to see emphasis placed on developing a local cohort in southern Oregon; Medford has large manufacturers who could benefit from the IEI. One way to bring in a local cohort, suggested by Phil, is to split payments on a local cohort, as the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is working on similar efforts. Kim did highlight that relationships with southern Oregon firms are ongoing, and the industrial sector has a variety of offerings to provide efficiency and renewable services to these them.

Debbie asked how the technical resources were identified (SEG), and whether it was a competitive process. Kim indicated that SEG did bid competitively in the PDC re-bid process. SEG is now providing service at sites, and is now a Technical Service Provider[2] (TSP), rather than a PDC. SEG has proven results for the IEI, and will continue to manage the direct training and coaching aspect of the program.

Debbie highlighted the importance of re-bidding, to prevent firms from 'owning' initiatives. Kim indicated that SEG doesn't require any more development costs, and provides a service directly to the participating firms. Kim indicated that the SEG role and contract is in line with all Energy Trust protocols.

The group went on to discuss how there are not many firms doing this sort of work at the moment. Debbie suggested that encouraging more firms to enter the market can benefit the sector in the long run and help develop a broader role for these services. The program does intend to offer other strategic energy management services for specific industries or cohorts through TSPs other than SEG.

Alan asked about cost effectiveness of IEI relative to other program offerings. Kim's analysis of the total costs indicates that the IEI, with a three year measure life, provides the cheapest industrial savings currently available. Even with less persistence, the costs for the savings are still very low.

Fred asked about persistence. Sarah described the program design, and that the firms were aware that they would be followed up with, with the expectation that they will provide data with the subsequent interviews about savings persistence.

Ken asked if there is a rule about SEG supporting firms on an ongoing basis. Kim mentioned that firms are free to continue using SEG for consulting services outside of the one year IEI supported by Energy Trust.

Alan asked about how the three year measure life was determined. Staff responded that this assumes a medium level of management awareness, and believe the three years to be a rather conservative estimate.

[2] The TSP pool will resemble the Allied Technical Assistance Contractor pool used by the Production Efficiency program, but TSP services will be focused on energy management rather than technical studies.The Program will now put out an RFP to competitively recruit a pool of contractors to become TSPs.

Alan emphasized that the approach appears good. Staff indicated being pleasantly surprised at the level of enthusiasm of the participants.

2. Kaizen Blitz pilot evaluation

Phil presented the Kaizen Blitz pilot evaluation

Pilot background

- Initial on-site tune up (Kaizen Blitz) identifies low or no-cost opportunities
- A final report: documents energy savings opportunities in an action plan for the following year. Capital upgrade projects are also identified
- 2nd Cohort also received energy tracking software
- Technical support provided for a year to:
    - Track and assist with action items
    - Help develop an energy tracking system
- Final inspection and report documenting energy savings after one year
    - Cohort 1: 4 plants
    - Start date: May 2008
    - Last Inspection: March 2010
    - Cohort 2: 5 plants

Study Background

- Study period May 2008-June 2010
- Evaluation Contractor: Navigant Consulting
- Evaluation Methodology:
    - Participant interviews (4 firms from 1st cohort, 3 from 2nd)
    - Staff interviews (3)
    - Review of Reports

Findings

Review of reports:

- Two reports were reviewed
- Calculating baselines was an issue as well as how to adjust for trends (are changes in energy use attributable to Kaizen Blitz or other influences?) and actions
- Second report had issues with clarity in describing action items and their savings
- Many other issues were raised on the documentation of the second report
- Energy Trust staff and PDC aware of issues associated with 2nd report.
    - Site still achieved 4%-5% savings
- A high level of expertise is conveyed to the participant without bogging down the project with too many details or engineering models and calculations
- Level of detail and information provided in the reports is generally adequate
- Customer and administrator can understand the assumed baseline conditions, the steps for implementation and the expected outcome
- Reports are well suited to the needs of the customer, administrator and evaluator

Interview findings

- Participation motivated by:
    - Energy Savings

    - Return on investment of less than one year
    - Corporate sustainability
    - Raise employee awareness of EE
    - Identify opportunities for energy savings
    - Success of project
    - Respect for Cascade (PDC) expertise and experience
- Participants had mixed opinions about time frames required to implement the recommendations provided in the reports
- Incentives adequate to motivate action
- Participants would have preferred using their cost share to implement further ECMs
- Not all action items could receive incentives
- 2nd Cohort use and are highly satisfied with energy tracking software
- Participants likely to be repeat PE participants
- Participants adopting practices at other plants
- Concerns could be addressed for the most part:
    - Cost
    - Staff buy-in
    - Equipment failure due to aggressive EE
    - Not all action items could receive incentives
- In some cases resistance to aggressive EE as it might damage equipment and hurt production
- Participants had mixed opinions about the time frame required to complete the Kaizen Blitz action time
- Savings persistence will be helped with:
    - Updated procedures and set points
    - Utility budgets reduced by energy savings
    - Conducting a system audit to check set points
    - Work orders for maintenance and calibration of the equipment
    - Placing locks on thermostats

Recommendations

- Continue to offer Kaizen Blitz services as part of industrial program
- Consider shortening implementation time (6-9 months) while considering seasonal operations and budgeting cycles
- Continue the 90 day/90% incentive kicker to spur action
- Continue Cascade Energy's role as the Kaizen Blitz service provider

Energy Trust take

- Successful pilot that resulted in significant and high cost effective savings as well as highly satisfied customers
- Pilot actively working on improving reports and documentation of baselines
- Pilot adopting new components (e.g. tracking software) and potentially widening scope to serve more diverse plants
- Service offerings well suited for inclusion in regular industrial program

Discussion

Debbie asked about whether or not protocols are being written up to deal with the issues surrounding the issues identified in one of the two reports reviewed. Kim indicated it was a difficult project done two years ago, with nine projects since then, with stellar results. The

committee asked how it was determined which two reports to review. Staff indicated that the evaluator had sampled, the report was not chosen given the known documentation issues. Kim highlighted that the contractor improved significantly based on the feedback provided by staff on the report.

Also mentioned were the program management changes occurring at the time. Debbie emphasized that offerings should not be staff dependent.

Phil noted that the level of detail in the reports was reasonable. Costs and benefits needs to be considered with the level of engineering review and detail in the report. Staff feels the program has developed a good balance and that support for the savings is strong in the reports.

Debbie asked about the cost split (how much Energy Trust pays compared to the participating firm).

- Three different structures have been used
- Current incentive structure is that Energy Trust pays 100% of the consulting. Measures are $0.08/kWh capped at 50% of cost.

Kim indicated that Cascade technically verified that equipment could tolerate the implemented practices, but gave an example that on one site the program could not overcome the behavioral obstacle to install a single large measure, despite the program offering to make a new motor eligible for incentives if equipment failed due to the Kaizen Blitz effort.

The committee asked for the distinction between the Kaizen Blitz and the IEI. Kaizen does not involve overt training, and results in immediate savings shown by metering savings, is technically focused, whereas the IEI starts with a higher level overview and relies more on staff training to achieve savings at participating sites.

Currently, the pilot has been focused on sites with large refrigeration loads, although actions included all systems at those sites. It was explained that the IEI was not tied to a specific energy use. But the IEI could include refrigeration in the future, and Kaizen Blitz can be expanded to non-refrigeration end uses.

Kim indicated that refrigeration has been proven to offer the cheapest savings through the Kaizen Blitz, so the program is likely to pursue industries where refrigeration represents a large fraction of loads, such as food processing. Cascade has successfully applied Kaizen techniques outside refrigeration, so program staff believes there are opportunities to expand the offering to new industries.

Ken, Alan, and Debbie discussed that the cost effectiveness is not well documented in the evaluation. There is only one simple statement. More analysis of the savings and costs should be identified in the report. Ken indicated that the cost effectiveness of the offering seen during the pilot phase should result in even lower costs in the event of a wider rollout.

3. SP newsprint megaproject

Phil presented the results from the megaproject final evaluation

Evaluation Contractor: Navigant Consulting

Project background:

- Most recent PE Program Megaproject
- Expanded de-inked pulp capacity by ~12%
    - Majority of savings stemmed from the shutting down of a thermo-mechanical paper (TMP) process.
- Original savings were estimated at 54,000,000 kWh
    - Review of project estimated savings at closer to 35,000,000 kWh using typical motor loadings and motor efficiencies
- Review of project led to changes in procedures for megaprojects (e.g. evaluation plans are now required)
- Project was installed as planned
- Market impacted the project savings in two ways:
    - Downturn in newsprint market
    - Increase in demand for recycled paper, increasing the cost of raw materials for the deinking process
        - Higher recycled paper prices caused the TMP line that was to be shut down to be restarted in 2008
        - Deinked pulp production was reduced below the capacity that existed prior to the project.
- Market impacts have resulted in:
    - Plant shutdowns
    - Changes in the forecast use of deinked pulp and TMP
    - Reduced output

Project savings:

- Savings estimated at 13,308 MWh when deinked pulp process is active (24% of the expected savings)
- Economy adjusted savings are 0 MWh since the plant was shut down for most of 2009 and deinking capacity utilization below that installed prior to project expansion
- This results in an average realization rate of 12%.
    - Rationale for the average realization rate is that the firm still has the de-inking equipment intact and could use the equipment if market conditions change.

Low savings due to:

- Initial savings calculation based on higher motor horsepower, rather than utilization.
- Actual capacity higher than average production used for baseline.
- Price for TMP and recycled paper will determine production content and if prices are volatile, production will be as well.

Recommendations:

- Forecast savings estimates should be supported by measured data, such as logging or spot measurements
- Capacity estimates should be based on consistent conditions.
- For large projects, every effort should be made to determine the conditions of use of the project. In this case, variations in the market for recycled and virgin pulp severely reduced the operation of the installed system.

Energy Trust take:

- New procedures for Megaprojects have been implemented by Energy Trust as a result of the SP Newsprint project.

- Results of initial evaluation review resulted in downgrading of expected savings.
- These results were shared with the industrial program and Energy Trust management.
    - Energy Trust is cognizant of the risks associated with these projects.
- Market effects were unanticipated and SP Newsprint invested a significant amount in the process changes, indicating that they were also caught off guard by the changing market conditions.

Discussion

Ken indicated that the realization rate used is a market adjustment. A similar project in Washington had the opposite happen, with an increase in demand for deinked pulp rather than recycled content purchased at the time or project completion.

Fred indicated that the savings are still cost effective at the estimated level, but from a forecasting and goal point of view it is more problematic to have a very large underperforming project.

4. 2010 specialty CFL shelf survey analysis

Matthew Taylor presented results from an in-house analysis he authored on specialty CFLs trends in Oregon.

Study background

- Study was based on data collected by KEMA during regional shelving surveys. KEMA was awarded the project through a competitive bidding process.
    - Fifth shelving survey since 2005, covering Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington
    - First year to record shelf space of specialty CFL, LED and Cold Cathode bulbs.
    - First year with an Oregon sample stratified to be representative
        - 38 retailers were surveyed in Oregon.

Study purpose

- Analysis of the specific retail lighting market in which Energy Trust is active
    - Shelf Space Share of Specialty CFLs
    - Market Share of Specialty CFLs
    - Trends in availability, diversity, and prices of the different bulb types
        - Focus on metro compared to rural and big box compared to non big-box.

Findings

- Almost half of all retail lighting shelf space in Oregon is specialty bulbs
- One quarter of specialty bulb shelf space is CFL bulbs
    - Big Box stores more so than non-Big Box stores
    - Metro stores more so than Rural stores
    - CFLs have not made inroads in rural and non-big box specialty bulbs.
- Market share
    - 32%-36% of specialty bulb sales are CFLs
        - Assumes sales are directly related to the amount of shelf space.
    - Marginally lower than estimates for CFL share of non-specialty bulb sales.
    - Results are in-line with NEEA's regional market share methodology.
- Percentage of stores stocking specialty CFLs is increasing steadily over time.

- Since 2008, Oregon retailers have increased the diversity and availability of screw based CFLs, while reducing availability of alternative base CFLS
- Prices
    - Average prices for twister and reflector bulbs has decreased for the last two years.
    - Average a-lamp and globe CFL prices has increased over the last year, but are consistent with 2008 prices.
    - Average prices for alternative based CFLs has been increasing since 2008.
- Availability (median number of models stocked).
    - Availability and diversity of reflector bulbs has increased since 2008.
    - A-lamps – same as reflector trends.
    - Globes – highly variable availability.
    - Pin based CFLs – highly variable availability.
    - Circline – Consistently very low number of models stocked.

Recommendations

- Specialty lighting is a significantly sized market, accounting for half of shelving.
- ETO and NEEA should focus on identifying and developing efficient lighting technologies for applications where CFLs are inappropriate

Recommendations for future surveys

- Future regional surveys should involve representative samples of each state, allowing for comparisons of each state's programs.
- NEEA should continue to look further into observed trends in specialty CFL bulbs and ballast types for insights into causes for fluctuations in availability and pricing.

Discussion

Fred indicated that specialty CFLs are not included in the current legislation which will outlaw incandescent A-lamps. Specialty bulbs are fragmented, but offer a large opportunity for market transformation. Fred also mentioned that Energy Trust is trying to determine if the A-lamp CFL is really a specialty bulb, or is just being used as a substitute for higher cost twister bulbs.

Prices are before rebates, but upstream buy-downs cannot be removed from the prices. So there is some uncertainty about whether prices are subsidized. Tom indicated 2008-09 that rebates were upstream. Ken indicated that when programs indicate large numbers of homes have no CFLs, it motivates program managers to continue programs. Research indicates that behavioral influences seem to be preventing some households from participating while other multi-CFL purchasing homes enjoy the rebates, with little net increase in market acceptance.

Dan Enloe asked about the apparent negative correlation on wattage and price in big-box stores. Clarification on the wording in the report would be helpful.

Alan asked for clarification on how market share was estimated, and the reliability of using shelf space to determine this. Fred indicated that the breakdown for sales between specialty/non-specialty CFL/non-CFL is not available. While shelf space is not an exact science, it's the best proxy for market share available.

Alan indicated that it looks like the program is looking for a baseline, Fred indicated that Energy Trust is trying to find a way to estimate the baseline in a fragmented market, one which is too large to ignore.

5. 2010 Trade Ally Survey (continued from previous committee meeting)

Phil presented a continuation of the previous meetings trade ally survey discussion Contractor's who primarily worked in Efficiency program satisfaction, % of satisfied or very satisfied was the same or increased from the 2009 survey

Study background

- Now in 6th year
- Questions about 2009 program year
- Conducted in-house

Energy Efficiency contractor satisfaction

Percent expressing 'Satisfied' or 'Very Satisfied' responses for:

Report year	2010	2009
Overall……	73%……..	67%
Incentive payment processing time……	59%……..	57%
Turnaround time for paperwork……..…	61%.....….	61%
Interactions with staff……..……	77%……..	69%
Response times to requests for information…	73%.....	66%
Response times to requests for help on forms	73%……	65%
Quality of responses to your requests….....	74%	
Knowledge of ETO programs and procedures.	80%	

Number of Firms responding .....217…… 86

Solar contractor satisfaction

Percent expressing 'Satisfied' or 'Very Satisfied' responses for:

Report year	2010	2009
Knowledge of Energy Trust programs and procedures….....	84%	-
Incentive payment processing time.....	53%	72%
Turnaround time for incentive app./approval of paperwork	55%	72%
Interaction with Energy Trust program staff.....	87%	75%
Response times to requests for information.....	72%	51%
Response times to requests for assistance on forms.....	82%	66%
Quality of responses to your requests.....	86%	-
Quality of Energy Trust inspections.....	66%	71%
Quality of your relationship with Energy Trust inspectors.....	75%	71%
Overall satisfaction with Energy Trust staff.....	79%	63%
Firms responding	38	8

Trade ally perceptions of Energy Trust

Program	Energy efficiency contractors	Solar contractors
Energy Trust understands the current demands of the market environment	61%	60%
Energy Trust is equipped to adapt to the changing market environment	56%	52%
Energy Trust has the right vision for the future	63%	74%
Our staff members respect Energy Trust	81%	81%
Our customers respect Energy Trust.	71%	73%

EBIX

- EBIX is the service provider used to track insurance status for all trade allies.
- One third of respondents not satisfied with the service.
- Energy Trust has been aware of low the satisfaction, and is working with EBIX to resolve issues.
- Tracking will be taken in-house when ISP/ERP is rolled out.

Washington expansion

- More than 10% of respondents (34) reported that they offered services
- Main sectors represented:
    - 62% residential
    - 26% commercial
- No major challenges cited

Green street lending

- ~55% of vendors indicated they are aware of green street lending but do not actively promote the offering.
- 15% of vendors promote the offering on a continuous basis.

Residential trade allies

- Median firm size 5 emp. (mean 14).
- 66% have been an ETO TA >=3 years
- 43% derived <= 25% revenue through ETO
- 47% expect to increase ETO work in 2010.

Primary program participated in:

- Total 154
- New homes 15%
- Products 6%
- Home Energy Solutions 57%
- Home performance with ENERGY STAR 8%
- Multifamily 4%
- Other residential program 10%

Product specific findings

Gas furnaces

- 95% efficient furnaces now the predominant furnace in existing (80%) and new (63%)
- Do these figures reflect a change in market or $1,500 tax credit?
- 69% have ECM and 46% have air cleaner.

Heat pumps

- Heat pumps with efficiencies over 9.0 HSPF are now the predominant heat pump with 60% of the market.
- As with furnaces, do these figures reflect a change in market or $1,500 tax credit?
- Roughly 75% of the contractors do commissioning on 50% or more of their installs as well as install Temperature cut out switches (majority do it on 75%-100% of their projects.
    - Consider training on and incenting of commissioning and temperature cut out switches.

Discussion

Alan indicated that with both efficiency and solar contractors the satisfaction was low for incentive processing time and turnaround time for paperwork. Staff mentioned that contractors often do not get the incentive or know about the turn-around time. Concern was expressed about whether contractors were getting complaints from their customers. Phil indicated that Energy Trust is working on moving to electronic incentive forms. Alan asked if Energy Trust was actively looking to streamline the paperwork process. Staff indicated that efforts are ongoing to reduce paperwork and streamline. Alan asked if a higher satisfaction rating could be expected in the 2011 survey and indicated that if the expectation is for low satisfaction each year why bother to ask the question on the survey. Phil indicated that comments are taken seriously and that comments from the 'unsatisfied' and 'very unsatisfied' respondents will be analyzed for trends.

Debbie re-iterated that expectations will be increasing along with any improvements. Sue from the communications and customer services (CCS) department indicated that an analysis has been conducted to identify which forms result in the most complaints or take the longest time to process. Fred indicated that electronic forms are starting with the volume applications, and indicated that customer feedback on Energy Trust processes rather than contractors, as contractors only hear the complaints from consumers on the participation process.

Staff highlighted that satisfaction among solar contractors could be a reflection of the reduced incentives starting in November and that a back log of paperwork has resulted from the solarize projects. Debbie asked whether these questions needed to be asked again.

Dan Davis asked about the 40% of contractors who indicated Energy Trust does not have a vision or understand their market. Fred mentioned that it may be due to different visions (e.g. furnace vendors who see the incentives being removed).

Phil indicated that the contract with Umpqua to deliver the green street lending products is expiring soon, but the offering is actively promoted by around 15% and is a simple financing offering.

Marshall indicated that given that since EBIX is a California based company, some contractors were concerned about sharing of insurance information. Debbie indicated that the Oregon CCB site lists all the information already. The main Issues with the service revolved around lack of confirmation of insurance. Sue indicated many issues have been resolved as a result of meetings with EBIX.

Ken asked if the 38 furnace vendors responding represent a significant amount of the market? To which Phil indicated not necessarily, as the survey is voluntary. The assumption is made they are a fair representation of the market's activities, however. To this point, Tom discussed the similarity of this survey to a recent KEMA heat pump study, with the KEMA study being a broader survey, lending credibility to the Energy Trust survey figures.

The group discussed the question of what contributed to the large increase in respondents. Various ideas were floated, with Sarah suggesting that the survey is promoted more and care is taken to present and discuss the results with contractors.

The rest of trade ally survey will be presented in the next meeting. Presentation will include a discussion of the open ended feedback provided by survey respondents.

6. Committee feedback

Committee indicated that they appreciate getting the reports as far ahead of the meeting as possible.

Next meeting schedule September 24th Friday 10am-1pm

Meeting adjourned at 12:56pm.