Governor's Energy Task Force Meeting Summary

Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Potential Study
Administrative Subcommittee Meeting

Meeting Date: July 9, 2004

Meeting Attendees:

Oscar Bloch, DOA
Phyllis Dubé, We Energies *
George Edgar, WECC *
John Ness, Xcel, by phone
Jim Mapp, DOA
Chuck McGinnis, Johnson Controls
Jill Osterholtz, Alliant *
Ilze Rukis, WPS *, by phone
Carol Stemrich, PSCW
Paul Meier, Meir Engineering Research-
Don Wickert, WECC
Roger Casper, DATCAP
Brian Zelenak, Xcel *
Laura Williams, MG&E
Kevin Grabner, ECW
Karen Meadows, ECW
Scott Pigg, ECW
Susan Stratton, ECW
Peggy Heisch, ECW

* Members or representatives of members of the Governor's Energy Task Force Administrative Subcommittee.

Meeting Summary

Objectives

- Review the draft scope of work and determine any changes needed
- Review and approve the budget and proposed budget allocation

Key Decisions

Key decision points, factors to consider in the study and action items from the meeting are bulleted below. A copy of the Power Point presentation will be e-mailed to meeting attendees as a companion to this meeting summary.

1. Scope of Work - there was general agreement on the scope of work

2. Markets selected for the study – the goal is to capture 80 to 90% of the market potential. Meeting attendees suggested the following adjustments to the markets initially recommended:
    - Replace small wind with C&I use of wind energy (approved)
    - Add C&I use of solar thermal (suggested)
    - Add use of wood (suggested)
    - At minimum include the same six renewable markets that Focus on Energy uses but preferably more (suggested)

- Break down the agriculture markets into several submarkets – for example, animal, crop and irrigation at a minimum. If only one agriculture market can be assessed, look at dairy (suggested)
- Reduce the number of residential markets (suggested)
- ECW could add private market load management (customer initiated) – this is different than dispatchable
- Add residential plug loads (suggested)
- Budget for 36 markets as shown in the proposal but may want to reallocate the markets at the end of task 1.

3. ECW was cautioned to be conservative in its estimates of achievable potential.

4. A decision was made to proceed with Task 1 of the study. At the end of Task 1, ECW will prioritize the markets and, to the extent feasible, identify those markets that likely make up 80% to 90% of the total potential. Since the budget is based on 36 markets, the Committee will have the opportunity at the end of Task 1 to finalize market selection based on ECW's recommendations.

5. Renewable markets – we should define the scope of renewable to look at customer side rather than "non-grid connected".

6. ECW agreed to provide all materials being distributed for review a minimum of seven working days prior to a meeting to give everyone sufficient time to review the materials.

7. There was a great deal of discussion regarding how the data will need to be disaggregated. ECW will determine during Task 1 the feasibility of disaggregating the data in a variety of ways:

    - Low income vs non-low income
    - By utility service territory (determine data needs and cost to do this)
    - Residential and small C&I vs Large C&I
    - Other geographical splits

8. Potential Study funding - Initially, ECW will prepare MOUs for signature by each funding utility. Cost share allocation for Task 1 will be based on total number of gas and electric meters. The following utilities will co-sponsor the study: Alliant Energy, We Energies, WPS, Xcel Energy, MG&E, WPPI, and Superior Water, Light and Power (SWL&P asked to be a co-sponsor after Friday's meeting).

9. Load management (other than customer initiated) will not be part of the current study but may be considered in the future.

Next steps

- ECW will work with Paul Meier to develop a scope of work and budget to customize and populate the FIDO model with the potential study data and additional time of use data to integrate demand-side measures with supply-side performance. This will yield a dynamic, interactive tool that can be used to assess cost-benefit of various supply and demand solutions to resource needs. The committee will make a recommendation whether or not to fund this activity after the budget is determined.
- ECW will prepare MOU's to cover the potential study with initiative approval included for Task 1
- ECW will prepare a proposed list of stakeholders for the stakeholder group and will send this list by e-mail to the committee for further suggestions and comments
- Next in person meeting will be scheduled at the end of September at completion of Task 1