

Agenda

Conservation Advisory Council

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

1:30 p.m. – 4:45 p.m.

421 SW Oak St., #300, Portland, OR 97204

- 1:30 Welcome, old business and short takes** *(information)*
Introductions, agenda review, February 2017 CAC minutes
- 1:45 2018 legislative update** *(information)*
Staff will provide an overview of the recent state legislative session and the status of bills relevant to Energy Trust. Under our grant agreement with the OPUC, Energy Trust does not take positions on legislation or engage in political issues. During legislative sessions, we monitor bills that could impact Energy Trust and respond to legislative requests for information.
- 2:00 Planning for the 2018 CAC** *(discussion)*
Staff will host discussions in a participatory workshop format to solicit feedback on 2018 meeting topics, content, and format, building off CAC member input received prior to the meeting. Workshop time will be allocated to the following activities:
- Reviewing topics suggested, adding additional topics, and prioritizing the list
 - Identifying most essential discussion to have for each topic
 - Identifying essential questions that should be asked for each topic
 - Harvesting CAC member experiences on effective stakeholder meetings
 - Designing a “perfect” CAC meeting segment on measure changes
- 3:00 Break**
- 3:10 *(Continued)* Planning for the 2018 CAC** *(discussion)*
- 4:40 Public comment** *(discussion)*
- 4:45 Adjourn**

*The next scheduled meeting of the Conservation Advisory Council is
May 9, 2018.*

Conservation Advisory Council Meeting Notes

February 7, 2018

Attending from the council:

Brent Barclay, Bonneville Power Administration
JP Batmale, Oregon Public Utility Commission
Holly Braun, NW Natural
Tony Galuzzo, Building Owners and Managers Association
Danny Grady, City of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
Kari Greer, Pacific Power

Charlie Grist, NW Power Planning Council
Julia Harper, Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance
Garrett Harris, Portland General Electric
Roger Kainu (for Warren Cook), Oregon Department of Energy
Lisa McGarity, Avista
Kerry Meade, Northwest Energy Efficiency Council
Jim Abrahamson, Cascade Natural Gas

Attending from Energy Trust:

Gwen Barrow
Eric Braddock
Amber Cole
Mike Colgrove
Lindsey Dierksen
Becky Engel
Fred Gordon
Andy Griguhn

Jessica Iplikci
Oliver Kesting
Amanda Potter
Jay Olson
Peter Schaffer
Julianne Thacher
Peter West

Others attending:

Doug Findlay, Portland General Electric
Nicole Hillis, CLEAResult
Brian Lynch, AESC
Don MacOdrum, TRC
Alan Meyer, Energy Trust board

John Molnar, Rogers Machinery
Lonnie Peet, Nexant
Scott Scheuneman, RH Energy
Jeffrey Tamburro, NW Natural

1. Welcome, Old Business and Short Takes

Peter West convened the meeting at 1:30 p.m. The agenda, notes and presentation materials are available on Energy Trust's website at www.energytrust.org/about/public-meetings/conservation-advisory-council-meetings/.

Peter introduced new council members Danny Grady, representing the City of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, and Kerry Meade, representing the Northwest Energy Efficiency Council. Kari Greer now permanently replaces Don Jones, Jr. for Pacific Power.

The council accepted the meeting notes from the November meeting.

2. 2017 Preliminary Annual Results

Peter West presented the preliminary annual results. Although the results are not final, preliminary findings show 2017 as another phenomenal year. In terms of electric savings, we again surpassed the previous year to make 2017 our best year ever. Contributing factors include a strong economy, a

strong pipeline of projects and a record number of LEDs installed through the residential sector—our zenith year for LEDs installed.

In gas, we equaled our savings levels from 2016, but fell short of overall goal. Most of the deviation from the overall goal was due to the midyear agreement with NWN to moderate the pace of commercial projects from customers under interruptible rates. The economy, a strong building market and the pipeline of industrial projects drove savings. We saw growth in industrial projects where we could provide more efficient means to control air emissions.

Lisa McGarity: Does waste heat recovery also mitigate carbon released into the atmosphere, or is it strictly an efficiency measure?

Peter West: The effect is less gas usage overall. Over-combusting particulate matter means emissions are more effectively scrubbed out or condensed into another form. To the extent that we use less gas to do this, there is savings and consequently less carbon emitted in the control processes.

3. Requests for Proposals for Production Efficiency and New Buildings Programs

Amanda Potter presented industrial savings projections, market trends that inform program design changes and the process for contract bidding. There are currently three pools of contractors supporting the Production Efficiency Program (Custom Program Delivery Contractors, Strategic Energy Management coaches and a pool of allied technical assistance contractors). The Industrial program will release a request for proposals (RFP) combining these three scopes of work.

JP Batmale: Are the territories the same?

Amanda Potter: Territories will stay the same. We're keeping the PDC model with separate savings and pricing for each territory. Bidders can bid on as many territories as they want, but we will only select one prime contractor for each territory.

Lisa McGarity: Are there different measures by territory?

Amanda Potter: No, we offer the same measures statewide. But there will be separate contracts for each PDC.

Holly Braun: Will you choose a different contractor for each territory?

Amanda Potter: Yes, we will choose a different prime contractor for each territory. Firms can be a subcontractor on multiple territories.

Holly Braun: I assume this follows the natural contracting cycle. Will new contracts take effect in 2019?

Amanda Potter: Yes.

JP Batmale: How does this change the design of the SEM program?

Amanda Potter: For large customers, this new design will facilitate better communications. Over time, the design will also enable streamlined processes for small- to medium-sized customers.

Jessica Iplikci presented an update on the contract bidding process for the New Buildings program. The New Buildings RFP will be released before the Industrial RFP.

Peter West: The structure of this program has been successful. There are some additional asks in this RFP, but these are within the existing structure. Bidders might have better ideas and proposals on structure and we will be open to them.

Don MacOdrum, HRC: When does the team aim to make a decision?

Peter West: We'll make a decision in early May to bring to the board in June.

Holly Braun: Is there overlap between these RFPs and the diversity, equity and inclusion efforts? Is that part of the criteria when choosing between vendors, or is the process more proactive than having a set of criteria?

Peter West: Diversity, equity and inclusion is a significant element in both RFPs. The New Buildings RFP will look for more affordable housing and a wider range of trade allies. Both RFPs will look for approaches to reaching more rural and diverse customers. We're asking bidders to describe how they will reach all customers. We'll highlight the diversity, equity and inclusion information more visibly than we have before.

JP Batmale: The New Buildings program spends time educating the building community. The last five years have been spent on a certain type of outreach to architects. Do you see this evolving over the next five years?

Peter West: I believe that is a question for the RFP respondents to answer. We want our respondents to tell us. We have ideas. These are available publicly in the 2018-2019 Action Plans. We'd like our ideas challenged through this RFP.

4. Action Plans: Planning and Evaluation and Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance

Fred Gordon presented Planning and Evaluation's 2018 Action Plan. Planning is working to forecast goals with more accuracy, get smarter about market segments, and understand who has participated and why. They are working to make sure pilot programs answer researchable questions.

Holly Braun: Who runs the evaluation portion?

Fred Gordon: Phil Degens.

Charlie Grist: When is the white paper due out?

Fred Gordon: In two to three months. It should come to this group around May.

Brent Barclay: How does the Regional Technical Forum fit into your plans?

Fred Gordon: We co-fund the Regional Technical Forum, a volunteer board of experts. We only do analysis where they don't. We work around what they do to fill gaps. We use information from them when it's pertinent to the program.

Julia Harper presented Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance's operation plan. A more detailed version of the operation plan is available on NEEA's website. All value streams in NEEA's operations are closely tied together. They are interrelated and important to the success of other elements. NEEA's portfolio is growing and becoming more complex. They are watching the market to see what takes off.

Holly Braun: One risk mentioned was about regional bandwidth to coordinate stakeholders. What about that is different? Why is there more risk now?

Julia Harper: First, we're managing a number of different concurrent programs. Second, in this business cycle, we made an intentional change to up the ante on collaboration and coordination. We're investing more time in collaboration than we had in prior cycles. We knew this would take more time, but there needs to be continued appetite and commitment.

Kerry Meade: Can you elaborate on the cost-effectiveness concerns you raised?

Julia Harper: One example is the ductless heat pump program. Regional utility programs support this with incentives at the consumer level. Normally, as the volume of products picks up, the cost of products will come down. We have not seen the cost coming down, and it's become a bigger concern.

Fred Gordon: Over the last few years, our forecast of the future price of power has been trending down.

5. Commercial and Industrial Lighting Strategy

Jay Olson presented on changes to commercial and industrial lighting market trends. Lighting is a large part of the electricity savings portfolio. We still expect to see savings from commercial and industrial lighting upgrades into 2019, but changing dynamics will push us beyond cost-effectiveness. We need to adapt to drive substantial savings through lighting. We're exploring a new approach to lighting incentives for business customers. It's in the conceptual phase now. It will be a deeper dive topic for future Conservation Advisory Council meetings.

Lindsey Diercksen presented midstream offerings for commercial and industrial customers. We now have 10 distributors for better coverage across the territory. For some of the measures, the program is using a market baseline, similar to the residential program.

Brent Barclay: On direct installation, how do you manage the selection process for installation contractors? Is there competition, or do they each have exclusive areas?

Jay Olson: It was a competitive process.

Brent Barclay: Bid? Rotational?

Jay Olson: The current program administrator is SmartWatt, but they don't conduct or perform the installation work. They bid competitively for the contract as a subconsultant to the PMC. Any trade ally contractor who wants to participate in the program is eligible to perform the work.

Brent Barclay: Do you use what's in the ceiling as a baseline for direct installation?

Jay Olson: Yes. We are lowering the incentive cap for 2018. It used to be a higher incentive. It may impact results.

Peter West: This is similar to the T12 bulbs that have been resistant to change. Customers don't want to give up on those bulbs.

JP Batmale: What trends are you seeing on direct installation?

Jay Olson: Trends are consistent. Thirty percent of the people who walk in the door actually participate in the program. Once they go through the energy audit, 60 percent participate.

Peter West: This offering is targeted at small industrial/commercial operations that haven't participated in our programs before.

Jay Olson: This launched not long ago. There aren't a lot of trends for us to look at yet.

JP Batmale: Is the entry point to the program to come back and do more lighting?

Lindsey Diercksen: Yes, we are using the midstream incentives to reach customers who we might have not worked with in other parts of the program, and we will use that touch point to try to do more comprehensive projects in the future at the site. In the future, we need to see how the offering fits strategically with other parts of the program as lighting continues to evolve, but we don't want to miss opportunities to move the market. We will continue working with NEEA and other regional stakeholders to understand how midstream incentives can help drive more savings for the programs.

Charlie Grist: How do you figure out which areas to target?

Jay Olson: We work with utilities to see what they're asking and where they're looking to promote more participation. Utilities have their own lighting representatives out there promoting this as well. We have historical information on how active the market is and how the region is served. We have participation studies.

Charlie Grist: Is this a comprehensive data analysis, or is it more anecdotal?

Jay Olson: SmartWatt is going out to determine customer usage. They bring this information back to us and to the PMC. We synthesize this information and work with utilities.

Danny Grady: Are there non-lighting measures that you're including in direct install?

Jay Olson: We offer plug strips as an engagement tools, but we don't claim savings from these.

Kerry Meade: When are you looking at a new conceptual program approaching? Will New Buildings use a meter-based or pay-for-performance approach?

Jay Olson: A systems approach is a better term. We're looking at load and the energy use of lighting as a whole, not measure-for-measure. We're looking at new technology, advanced technology and

design strategies to lower the energy use of lighting. We aspire to get the lighting load so low that a solar system could cover the load—achieving net zero energy use.

Lindsey Diercksen presented a new lighting tool concept. The tool is meant to streamline operations. The program is interviewing staff, utilities and trade allies on how they would use this tool. They will finish market research and release a request for proposals in 2018.

Jay Olson clarified the difference between the luminaire level lighting control pilot and the integrated advance control pilot.

Jay Olson: In the luminaire level lighting control pilot, controls are built into the luminaire itself.

Aaron Leatherwood: Yes, the lighting controls are a subset of advanced lighting controls. In the luminaire level lighting control pilot, we have control of each individual fixture. They are all connected by a network.

Brent Barclay: It looks like you're constraining research to just the Northwest region. You might want to look more broadly, even nationally.

Lindsey Diercksen: Yes. We were concerned the scope of this research would get too large. We still need to research other regions, like the Midwest and east coast to see if there is more information from other utilities and programs that can help inform our decisions.

Brent Barclay: You could look at vendor solutions. This would be more customized. It might help set requirements in the RFP.

Peter West: We'll be back with more discussion on this topic at later Conservation Advisory Council meetings.

6. New buildings penetration rate analysis

Jessica Iplikci presented on the results of the market saturation study and next steps in the 2018 action plan. Peter West and Andy Griguhn talked about the difficulties of working with secondary sources of data that are imperfect.

Alan Meyer: What share of the overall market is office buildings? Is the 20 percent in your slide a large or small portion of the overall market? Also, do you have any idea why the penetration rate is low?

Jessica Iplikci: This is a unique segment. There will be more information on this topic later in the slide deck.

Alan Meyer: So does this involve a different form of decision-making? Is it a large percentage of the total market?

Jessica Iplikci: The information can be difficult to find and explain. We think there are tenant improvement opportunities out there. We want to use this as a reference point and indicator. We'll pair it with what we already know in other analyses throughout the program, such as lighting analysis. We don't know if we'll be able to address this in a deep or holistic way.

Andy Griguhn: To answer your question about what share of those 3,200 buildings are office buildings, the percentage fluctuated between 2014 and 2016. In 2016, that category made up 20 percent of the building market. There was a dramatic increase in new construction in that market following this. The market grew by two times in one year.

Alan Meyer: So it's large enough to warrant our attention.

Andy Griguhn: Yes, and multifamily and stores/restaurants are the next two categories in terms of market share. Each makes up a substantial share of the market.

Peter West: As Jessica noted earlier, the structure of the office building market is more tenant-driven than owner-driven. That's a challenge for us. Decisions are made rapidly and it's difficult to keep our offerings in front of people, and we will need to address this in 2018 and 2019.

Brent: The number of buildings that participate in the program is an important metric, but we want the right buildings participating. The right square footage. Who has the biggest delta in influencing the energy index?

Jessica Iplikci: This analysis is one reference point. Additional analysis is needed to get at some of these questions. This particular analysis didn't look into that cross section. This analysis was designed to show what's happening overall, where we're hitting and what the major market segments are. The Path to Net Zero program is where we look at energy use intensity.

Jim Abrahamson: The service area map might need correction. In Central Oregon, it looks like Cascade Natural Gas covers Pacific Power territory from Warm Springs to Klamath County. It shows the same thing in Pendleton, the Hermiston area, Baker City and Ontario. We serve islands around each.

Peter West: Thank you for noticing that. We'll work with you to update our GPS.

Tony Galuzzo: Do you expect the new reporting structure for ENERGY STAR® in the Portland area to affect how commercial office buildings approach their building improvements?

Peter West: That's a good question we need to contemplate. We've been expecting more on existing buildings. By meeting the current building code, these new buildings come out favorably. We thought the real pressure was on older building stock. Is the roll out all on large buildings now?

Oliver Kesting: It's for buildings 20,000 square feet and above.

Peter West: When was that ratcheted down?

Oliver Kesting: It started at 50,000 square feet and rolled down to 20,000 square feet.

Tony Galuzzo: It's providing better focus on where they line up and where the performers are.

Peter West: We hit a record for commercial and industrial projects. Have you noticed the benchmarking driving anything specific?

Oliver Kesting: We're using benchmarking data to target, not to drive volume. We use it to see who are the worst performers, what's available to do, and how to reach out to those customers.

JP Batmale: What's the difference in barriers to participation? What are the major differences driving levels of participation by those market segments?

Jessica Iplikci: It's hard to say. Some of it depends on the building type. Multifamily is a straightforward building type. It scales easily. In efficiency, it scales well per square foot. In ground-up new construction, we work directly with the owner or developer. There are key differences when compared to the office building market.

Kari Greer: Has there been any formal work on why some buildings have or have not participated?

Jessica Iplikci: We do evaluations and get good information to use in planning. We make revisions to certain incentive packages planned for 2018. We're making sure our outreach efforts are robust and targeted. The reasons why some buildings do or do not participate could be baked into the research plans we have starting out this year. These will include further engagement with subsets or focus groups.

Don MacOdrum: Is the broader data that informed this slide deck available?

Jessica Iplikci: It's Dodge data, so it can be purchased. The analysis we've done here is available publicly and will be posted on our website. Program evaluations are also on our website.

7. Planning for the 2018 Conservation Advisory Council

Peter West introduced the annual discussion around topics to bring to the advisory council. In response to comments, we want to expand this discussion to also consider why topics come to the council and how they should be presented/discussed. Homework is required of Conservation Advisory Council members in order for us to continue this discussion at the next meeting in March. Peter asked council members to provide written responses to a series of questions in the power point. The questions will also be sent by email.

Alan Meyer: I like information presentations to be concise. This is an advisory council, not a listening council. Unless we hear from other council members, we're not getting the full value out of these meetings. This meeting was 95 percent informational.

Peter West: Fist, does what we're asking make sense?

Holly Braun: It makes sense, and the timing is ripe. Another question to consider is how the need for an advisory council has changed over time. This council was created around the same time that Energy Trust was starting out and had less expertise on staff. Over time, that has changed. There is so much embedded knowledge that these meetings now consist of updates presented back to us. There is value in that, but could the council be used for another purpose? Is the purpose more about transparency? Are these meetings more about raising the knowledge level of the community and less about advising you? I don't know that our advice is needed anymore. In 2017, were there places where changes happened as a direct result of our feedback? It would be helpful for us to see where we made a difference. If we only made a difference three times, it might be time to re-evaluate the purpose of the council. People want to be here. But are we here to help or to gain something for ourselves?

Peter West: That's a good idea. We still need your individual responses to these questions. In the meantime, we'll think about the most efficient way to answer your questions.

Holly Braun: The meeting structure might take the form of a workshop or world café. I wonder if this room is the right setting for a dynamic workshop. What does it mean to be on the council if meetings mean getting updates and getting smarter? We could be in the audience.

JP Batmale: The operating principles do envision more participation. The principles are broad, but do envision a feedback loop that doesn't seem to happen.

Peter West: It's true that a lot of what comes here is informational. Conservation Advisory Council members have policy expertise, program expertise and customer perspective. All of this is important. I'm hearing that this discussion is positive and you're willing to go forward with the homework. Do you have early thoughts on the list of topic categories?

Brent Barclay: You have some idea of what Energy Trust's needs are. Energy Trust has a constellation of engagements. If you take Conservation Advisory Council out, what's not being met through those other engagements? What's left is a candidate for what comes to this group. This group has a range of interests. From a governance standpoint, is this body an important piece of your public responsibility? Do you need this for transparency when disclosing budgets? We can do a lot of things, but we're broad and dispersed. If the feedback you need is about how to optimize program operations, that's a different conversation than reviewing policies.

Holly Braun: Yes, looking at what would be left if you removed Conservation Advisory Council is a helpful exercise. I love the idea of finding a way for us to help you while also benefiting, but it should start with identifying what you need. We could probably help more. This gets to the question about meeting format/structure and how things can be delivered to pull out the best value from us. I don't feel like we can answer the homework questions until we know the nature of what's been helpful.

Peter West: It's a good idea for us to come up with a list of where Conservation Advisory Council has influenced Energy Trust, but it would be wrong for us to start with that list. Feedback has been all over the map because people have different perspectives. There is overlap between our organizations out in the field. I have a notion of what I need from the Bonneville Power Administration, but it's better for you to say that so we can hear and contemplate as a group. The Conservation Advisory Council needs to be a representative body of interests of the stakeholders, funders and customers. That is fundamental to what you're providing to us.

Alan Meyer: The most impactful meeting in my memory took place when you presented new incentives, and the council came back and said that you don't understand the impact of those incentives. We broke into groups and came up with new incentives. This group provided a real service.

Garrett Harris: If our role is to support the board, I don't understand how the outcomes of this meeting are conveyed to the board.

Alan Meyer: Notes from advisory council meetings are included in the board packet. If there is something of significance, it may be called out for discussion. The council provides feedback for staff to refine things more than we provide feedback for the board to act on.

Peter West: Thank you. We'll send these questions out by email. We'll work on our part of the homework and send that out to everyone. That leaves plenty of time before the next meeting for sharing information back. We'll craft some participatory engagement that will drive a straw proposal.

8. Public Comment

There were no other public comments.

9. Meeting Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m. The next Conservation Advisory Council meeting is Tuesday, March 20, 2018.

Stakeholder perspective	CAC member	1. What topic areas interest you the most for your stakeholder interest?
OPUC	JP	Future sources of savings/ Program innovations -- Pilots and pipelines Planning & Evaluation Work and Research Net-to-gross & attribution Evaluation committee updates Measures and MADs Avoided Costs: Acquisition and IRPs Leveraging data Customer research and segmentation How diversity efforts impacts savings What can be done with AMI Trends in programs and customer interaction Special Initiatives Leveraging DR
EE Org	Kerry - NEEC	I think everything on the list included is relevant. To prioritize from my perspective, I would rank them as follows 1: Context: Market & Policy –what is the level of understanding and recognition of the large changes happening in our industry. How is ETO preparing for these changes? 2: Sector Strategic plans – what are the specific strategies for each sector. Are the opportunities growing/shrinking? What is driving these changes and how do these strategic plans then respond to them. 3: Budget & Action Plans 4: Significant New Pilots/Initiatives 5: Implementation Success & Challenges and if not, why not?
ODOE	Warren	Commercial, Industrial, Residential EE and Renewables activities, especially program implementation details to achieve goals, expand program reach or change costs of incentives and delivery
EE Org	Julia	Areas of opportunity that Energy Trust is having difficulty addressing New and different risk that are arising for Energy Trust and for energy efficiency efforts in the region Collaboration opportunities with other partners (utilities, local governments, etc) – how can 1+1= 3+ ?
Utility	Alison	Measure Reviews and Changes. <i>Opportunities for actionable input.</i> Emerging and Ongoing Issues and Challenges (<i>a chance for “heads ups” and working through barriers together</i>) Strategic Planning and Discussion Specific Strategies (<i>what’s working, and what can be further evolved</i>) Emerging and Ongoing Policy New Opportunities/Initiatives
Utility	Lisa	Everything we have covered in past meetings are of interest to the utility. However, current CAC topics might be discussed in greater detail at utility only meetings.
City	Danny	As a representative of the largest municipality in the State, I’m interested in how delivery of programs can be streamlined to decrease the administrative burden of customers- particularly low income and small businesses. Program delivery to historically underrepresented groups and equity considerations align with strategic goals of the City as well. The City also has a

		key strategic interest in program delivery and EE/RE funding in the State, as these initiatives align with strategic goals of the City (Climate Action Plan, 2050 Renewable Energy resolution, etc). The City’s ability to execute on these plans and implement these goals is greatly helped by the continued success of Energy Trust programs. In addition, as a large commercial/industrial customer, City is interested in C&I program development – what’s new, what’s coming, how Energy Trust is evolving program offerings and delivery mechanisms to best serve these customer segments.
		Where should be our focus in 2018?
Utility	Garrett -	I would like to see CAC take a more active role in informing the board and ETO. As a CAC member, it often feels like we are simply being informed of decisions that are being made. During a CAC meeting (a year ago?) we went through an exercise to evaluate and make recommendations on how residential, small MF and large MF programs are designed/managed. I thought that was a great activity and would like to see more of this kind of approach. Perhaps the board and program managers would find it more helpful to be presented with CAC outcomes in a format other than notes. It’s probably tough difficult to draw conclusions based on notes alone. It might be helpful to present the meeting outcomes by summarizing positions on key issues as to better inform board and program decisions.
OPUC	JP	Preparing for Next strategic plan Reformulating the CAC Program innovations
EE Org	Kerry	I think it’s helpful to have a pre-read packet emailed to the CAC members before the meeting to help prepare us with background materials that are relevant to the discussion, as well as any specific questions or topics that we should be prepared to answer/discuss.
ODOE	Warren	A look back at accomplishments and corrections along the way to inform the next strategic plan
Utility	Alison	The focus should be dynamic-- centered on whatever is most pressing to ETO, your programs, and the customers you/we serve. What are the key challenges and opportunities? Where will our input have the most benefit and impact? What are the areas that are in greatest need of our support? And also, where are the “pain points” challenges/barriers that we need to be made aware of in order to best serve the interests of our customers/stakeholders/members, etc? As a utility whose customers are served by the ETO, we hear about most of this already, but I always value the chance for collaborative discussion and problem solving.
Utility	Lisa	Looking at the efficiency landscape to discuss challenges, and strategic directions.
Utility	Holly	Categories ripe for CAC for advisory purposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New and changing measures • Significant program changes • Shifts in philosophy • Evaluation plans and results • Pilots – prioritizing/narrowing/vetting which to pursue (I.e. \$15k manufactured home incentive) • As it pertains to budget presentations: If CAC is a conservation advisory group then our role with the budget would be very high level and informational. It would be appropriate to hear how the budget reflects various perspectives shared throughout the year in our CAC meetings rather than a detailed breakdown of each budget component – that seems more like a board level activity.
City	Danny	What new and innovative ways can Energy Trust continue to generate energy savings in programs and technologies that are nearing their saturation point? Is there an opportunity to explore new energy service pathways (beyond EE & RE) under the

		existing mandate from the Legislature? If so, what are appropriate new sectors to explore? (some examples: demand response? Carbon? Equity?) How do we determine whether to spend resources to drive deeper into existing markets, or to instead focus on how to enter new markets?
		How is it best to engage you at CAC?
OPUC	JP	Would be nice to get the reports and data ahead of time to prepare. Letting us know what CAC topics are informational and what topic are designed for feedback from the CAC
ODOE	Warren	I like to get detailed packet info well ahead of the meeting to review and make notes. Some feedback to staff before meeting might be helpful. Seems we use up most of the time in the meetings presenting --there is little time to solicit questions.
EE Org	Julia	Engage us in brainstorming or helping identify potential solutions to your problems.
Utility	Alison	Materials provided in advance with notes on the specific action items in need of attention. Clearly defined expectations of what is needed from the CAC (just to listen/be informed; to provide feedback; to take action; make recommendations) and the benefit it will serve.
Utility	Lisa	Asking questions, and allowing time to have interaction
Utility	Holly	I don't have strong opinions on the how at this point. I feel like that's a third layer discussion- the first is <i>why/purpose</i> of CAC; the second is <i>what</i> supports that and finally, we could engage in the <i>how</i> .
City	Danny	The City can serve as a consumer representative for municipal interests. I can bring the perspective of both a large and diverse customer as well as an "outside" view of how new program initiatives may be perceived by the public. I can also serve as a resource regarding municipal policy and development models, such as Residential Energy Score, Commercial Building Energy Reporting, 100% renewable energy resolution, Climate Action Plan, land use and development policy, etc.
		How should we approach topics?
Utility	Garrett	I'd like to see CAC engaged earlier on strategy and program development/changes.
OPUC	JP	More interactive; posing questions you'd like the CAC to answer Allowing more time for conversations Occasionally including CAC members in the presentation
Utility	Alison	A combination of presentation and roundtable discussion. (A healthy blend of informational and actionable items shared with the CAC.)
Utility	Lisa	What is the main reason to discuss the topic, are there issues to resolve, and have specific questions to ensure discussion.
City	Danny	Approach every topic from the perspective of the customers/end users/communities you serve. Given the utility reps and interests on the CAC, it is natural to fall into "utility think", which is often necessary but can also be counterproductive to developing solutions that will be embraced by the public.
		What level of information is appropriate?
Utility	Garrett	This is tough given the diverse backgrounds of CAC members so I'd say a moderate level is best.
OPUC	JP	Meeting PowerPoint with background documentation 3 page briefings with Excel files
EE Org	Kerry- NEEC	That's difficult to answer. I think the level of detail needed really depends on the topic.

ODOE	Warren	The CAC is capable of discussing “less-baked” program and measure topics, but they need to have a guided discussion, which requires some extra effort from the facilitator. I think sometimes the CAC doesn’t engage because they feel their input is late and not able to be incorporated
EE Org	Julia	The level of information you have been providing seems appropriate – though sometimes you use acronyms and “inside baseball” terminology that can be difficult to interpret.
Utility	Alison	This varies from topic-to-topic and depends on the desired outcome. Depending on the CAC member, there may be different perspectives on what’s mission critical and what’s simply “nice to know”. That said, where action is needed or there is a direct impact on our customers, a deep dive is helpful. The more background we have, the more we’re able to make informed decisions and provide useful advice. I think a lot can be shared in advance and then cross-referenced in the presentation. I’m more than willing to come to a CAC meeting prepared and with “homework” completed if the means the chance to maximize the value of my participation.
Utility	Lisa	Information should be as high level as possible, but enough to guarantee understanding of the topic.
City	Danny	Depends who you ask. Going deep into the weeds on C/E, minor measure changes, and the like can be deeply satisfying to the utility reps on the Committee, but isn’t relevant to non-utility reps. Provide context to the data being shared. For example: annual savings achieved, actual outcomes relative to annual goals in each customer segment isn’t very compelling if it’s not put into context of year over year trends. Same goes for budget- how is it changing over time? Trending analysis over multi-year time horizons helps the committee to view programs with perspective.
What role do you feel is best for you as a CAC member?		
Utility	Garrett	I’d like to have a role where I feel that I can support ETO and its mission by providing my perspective influence when appropriate.
OPUC	JP	Provide informed feedback to help programs Bring outside perspective to Energy Trust Help Energy Trust forge connections and relationships with the CAC member's organization and their network
ODOE	Warren	I can advise on measures and implementation based on experience. Also bigger picture – state goals and coordination with other programs
EE Org	Julia	I believe my role is to provide input and feedback on Energy Trust issues and requests and also to bring information about how Energy Trust issues and actions relate to NEEA issues and actions. My role is also to bring back information to my team about Energy Trust activities that are relevant to or inform our work at NEEA.
Utility	Lisa	To partner with Energy Trust on direction from a utility standpoint that brings best in class, cost effective conservation to our customers.
Utility	Holly	As discussed during the 2/7 meeting, CAC’s current role is more a knowledge sharing/transparency exercise where Energy Trust staff brings fully baked ideas and program changes to CAC members in order to keep us informed. I would recommend returning to more of an <i>advisory</i> role we would look at <i>proposed</i> changes with a variety of options and then went around the table sharing our perspective and actually vote or work for consensus voting if that was more appropriate. This would result in a succinct take away that was then available to staff and the board. Using CAC as a vetting mechanism could be quite valuable to the board and remove some pressure off Energy Trust staff.
What are you looking to get out of CAC?		
Utility	Garrett	I’m looking to understand perspectives from the diverse set of stakeholders to inform ETO.

OPUC	JP	Insight into program operations from Staff and the occasional opportunity to provide insight Deeper connection to programs and staff
EE Org	Kerry - NEEC	I'd like to have a better understanding of ETO's broad conservation strategy, especially as it relates to the transformations that are happening in the energy sector, as well as the more specific, targeted strategies it is undertaking to acquire energy efficiency.
ODOE	Warren	Further Oregon energy policy in a cost effective and just manner
Utility	Alison	The opportunity to provide actionable feedback on a range of issues affecting the ETO programs that serve our customers, and the chance to brainstorm and explore new initiatives.
Utility	Lisa	For my thoughts to be valued, and suggestions considered.
City	Danny	I'm seeking to understand how conservation programs are serving the public interest. How do these programs contribute to energy affordability, consumer choice, adoption of new technology? What role does conservation serve in a rapidly changing energy utility model?
		What are you hoping to bring to the meetings?
Utility		I'm looking to be able to provide utility and customer perspectives.
OPUC	JP	Expertise OPUC perspective
EE Org	Kerry -NEEC	The perspective of the energy efficiency business community stakeholders.
ODOE	Warren	Experience, expertise, state level viewpoint, national issues and influences
EE Org	Julia	I hope to bring perspective in areas where NEEA has experience and is active and also to bring good questions and help to identify ideas, risks, alternatives to address. I also hope to bring fresh eyes and perhaps a different perspective from the Energy Trust team members who are very close to the issues and live with them every day.
Utility	Alison	A genuine desire to engage and contribute based on my industry knowledge and background.
Utility	Lisa	Years of program implementation, customer experience, and perspective of the utility.
Utility	Holly	I posit our shared value as CAC members is wanting to see the advancement of EE in a "wise" manner. This is our shared "bond" but we all have some nuanced objectives and different perspectives. We attend CAC for the advancement EE while being mindful of our nuanced objectives and the impact Energy Trust's work affects those. CAC members represent a broader swath of stakeholders than Energy Trust and by bringing us all together a broader view of perspectives can shape the largest programmatic EE opportunities in our state.
City	Danny	Strategic planning perspectives, incorporation of equity into planning and program delivery processes. Municipal, C/I customer perspectives, identification of opportunities for Energy Trust and local government policy to intersect.
		If there are other questions you think would spur helpful discussion at our March 21st meeting about CAC's role and purpose, what would you suggest?
OPUC	JP	Should the CAC have standing sub-committees ?
Utility	Alison	Please provide some examples of the type of past feedback and dialogue from the CAC that have resulted in actions/changes/system improvements/etc. from the ETO.
Utility	Lisa	How does Energy Trust staff view their interaction with CAC, and what do they get out of the meetings?
Utility	Holly	Additional areas of insight that could shape CAC 2.0 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interview those who do not attend to learn <i>why</i> they do not attend (I.e. NWEAC, CUB)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the purpose of non-presenting Energy Trust staff in the audience- is this new material for them or do they want to hear the dialogue that ensues or...? • Understand decision points in the board discussions that could have been simplified by a vetted CAC opinion • Create a list of changes that were made or impacts of CAC input in 2017 (could include 2016 as well) <p>Bonus material:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't believe the DEI efforts would best be served with a separated advisory committee. I would like to see DEI voices added to the existing committees (CAC/RAC) as that effort needs to be integrated into conservation, not a standalone topic. If that means more training for our Committees that's fine too – but siloed does not seem wise. • Possible missed advisory opportunities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recently (2016 or early 2017) the residential program underwent a major change in delivery/philosophy - this would have been a ripe area for advising but we were never truly afforded this opportunity. Instead, a meeting was called with no pre-reading, a presentation was projected but never provided for hand out and then I think we had a tiny window to give response but it was very compressed because the direction was already decided upon by staff and we didn't have enough material to wisely respond. As a CAC member this felt wrong and if I was a board member I would have definitely wanted to know what the advisory committees has said to this major shift. ○ More recently, at the last board meeting, there was a discussion around an unfulfilled MF contract – the board was not able to ask “what did the CAC say about this matter” because this matter never came before us. It seems this might have been a fair matter to bring before the CAC in case we had some market-based or technical knowledge that would have helped explain this under performance. It might have been a more comfortable conversation if Energy Trust staff could point to a CAC recommendation or bits of insight. I think we're getting off too easy
City	Danny	I am interested in better understanding the Legislative mandate of these programs. What flexibility does the organization have to play a role in the development of emerging energy pathways? Energy storage and demand response are two areas that come to mind. How much bandwidth does Energy Trust have to pilot new technologies, particularly those new and emerging (and currently expensive) technologies that may not yet pass the C/E test?