**SEU Advisory Board Meeting**

**Minutes**

**February 18, 2020**

**Call to Order**

Chair Corman called a quorum of the Sustainable Energy Utility Advisory Board (SEUAB or Board) to order at 10:07 AM, February 18, 2020 at the Department of Energy & Environment (DOEE), 1200 First St., NE, Washington, DC.

**Roll Call/Introductions**

Roll call was taken and the following people were in attendance:

**Board Members:** Bicky Corman, Adrienne Mouton-Henderson (proxy for Sandra Mattavous-Frye), Millie Knowlton, Nicole Steele, Josh McClelland (proxy for Steve Burr), Nina Dodge, Cary Hinton (proxy for Willie Phillips), Dr. Donna Cooper, Nicole Steele, Nina Dodge,

**Board Members on the Phone:** Millie Knowlton

**Absent Board members:** Scott Williamson, Richard Graves, Farrah Saint-Surrin, Kirsten Williams

**Other Attendees:** Tommy Wells, Taresa Lawrence (Deputy Director, DOEE); Lance Loncke (Sr. Program Analyst, DOEE); Hussain Karim (DOEE), Patti Boyd (Senior Technology Strategist, DCSEU); Shawn Fenstermacher (DCSEU); Lynora Hall (DOEE); Megan Partridge (PEPCO), Dave Epley, Associate Director, DOEE), Ade Sonaike (DOEE), Dr. Lila Abron (PEER Consultants), Edward Yim (DOEE), Jenn Hatch (DOEE)

***Meeting Video:*** <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-Ngyebc0mFE>

***Approval of Agenda***

The motion to approve the agenda was made by Chair Bicky Corman to revise the agenda. .

***Review and Adoption of the November 12, 2019 Minutes.***

The motion to approve the February 18, 2020 minutes was moved to the end of the meeting

***Bicky Corman – Review of SEUAB Benchmarks Subcommittee***

The reason for the urgency is the issue is when having gone around on this issue for a while the Public Service Commission (PSC) had a working group session with stakeholders on when measures should be used in the implementation by the utilities. Provided to the PSC are recommendation and the report was printed on January 30, 2020 and any comments coming from the Sustainable Energy Utility Advisory Board (SEUAB) would be March 2, 2020, the order February 11, 2020 and the report March 11, 2020. The next SEUAB meeting is March 10, 2020. Maybe the advisory board should be looking on whether or not to recommend changes to the benchmarks or contract changes that could be made to the SEUs implementation of its statutory benchmarks and or move at the above perhaps recommendations to be made in context of the PSC efforts. The point of the benchmarks subcommittee convening was to get a handle on recommendations of any or either form of the SEU of for external right that they use the PSC in the content of sending metrics for the utility implementation of programs. It might be helpful if Ms. Adrienne Mouton-Henderson of the Office on Public Service Commission (OPC) talk about where they are or Dr. Donna Cooper talk about the PSC preceding to give a picture or recommendation.

Dr. Cooper reiterated want was said, she thinks for her perspective the working group process was extremely productive, executed within a decent time period in terms of research that in terms of legislation but a lot of influx and injections. What she wanted to indicate as I believe from her perspective that the process that emanated from DOEE working with Pepco, Washington Gas, DCSEU and SEAUB was also fruitful. We didn’t start from ground zero. So in the process we focused on and tried to really focus on the areas which we needed to do so and focusing on the performance measures, targets, evaluating the cost benefits analysis and cost recovery type mechanisms that those we some evaluation. Dr. Lance Loncke and others talked about the report that we thought would have been very helpful. We know that OPC had some concern about advancing the report and we are not going to use the right terminology but that would provide us guidance as it relates to the market in the District of Columbia. We should await information from the roadmap in the electrification study that’s underway DOEE but there was an understanding that there is a differentiation between that particular report and a report that would actually had a new analysis the market needs within the District of Columbia. This would ensure that you’re being more cost-effective by identifying the gaps and really being able to design programs and more projects that we are speaking to the interest of the District of Columbia, also in alignment with the Clean Energy Legislation as well as the goals there.

We did discuss as well as low-moderate income programs because the legislation speaks to the fact that utilities should focus primarily on those particular programs. However primarily was the term that was focused on whether or not their opportunities are still within the commercial arena that still does not supplant but help to assist the DCSEU reach particular goals and targets as well as the broader goals of the District of Columbia government, so looking at opportunities that may exist there? The legislation did speak to the fact that our program should also not in any way impede what the nonprofit entities are moving forward as well as small businesses and based on our experiences with this and Maryland ad well as injections that were provided by AOBA. We believe that we are in a very good place where we would not be ultimately kind of overriding these particular programs in any way. There were a few variations or opinion or opinions around that particular area. The report in the back summarizes the areas that are still unresolved and those areas were process for adopting a uniform technical reference manual, also some of the areas in terms of cost recovery in terms of expensing are amatory the DOEE program cost. There were some concerns as it relates to focusing on performance instead of mechanism within the particular context being that other actions are taking place with the PSC as well. So a very high level those were the areas that we discussed the report does indicate areas where there was agreement of consensus as well as opportunity for each participant to offer their comments as to areas in which they were not aligned with what was designated as being the viewpoints of the group as well.

Ms. Mouton-Henderson responded to Dr. Cooper’s comments regarding OPC opinion on the report that was to be done. OPC did not say that they did not support doing the report; we said it was too early in the process at this point. We thought that DOEE was doing two studies and decided to wait for those studies to be complete and then from there if additional studies are warranted, OPC will see what programs the utilities is going to give us first then we can design what study needs to be done. We asked that the utilities have a portfolio that encompasses all income levels. OPC will be filing comments.

Chair Corman asked everyone take a look as potentially submit comments and there individual capacity a question that has been kicking around that the Board has been entertaining at that’s the subject of today. Does the SEUAB want to make any recommendations or comments from what arose out of the work of the benchmark subcommittee? We have been talking about the four issues which were intent I think to align that as we use objective targets of overt expressed targets with things that the District’s talking and may have started talking about since the SEU was created in the original benchmarks for the first formulation. So again we may or may not have a bearing or relevance and what the SEU is doing or how it’s communicated whether a strategic priority of a GHG production target.

The second question has been around for a long time whether or not the energy saving should they be combined? Third, converting your one savings accounting to lifetime savings accounts?

Fourth, has been whether or not we should be converting back into a statutory mandate which is now a tracking measure which is reduced to peak demand and ways of achieving. Dr. Lawrence is passing out the Benchmarks Subcommittee report to the board.

Chair Corman thinks that the SEUAB should input into the PSC process. The Peak Demand Reduction which is a target that is in other states kind of storage technology but largely the issue that we used to have in the SEU Benchmarks statutory need a mandate for reducing peak demand and then it got converted into a tracking goal. Then the question of whether or not it would be beneficial in the new contract. It was the question whether it would be beneficial to turn it back into a hard target and if not there’s a question as to whether that out of the electric to be considered for the utilities and I would be coming out as something like a utility procurement requirement of like and that would have the effect of stimulating a market like we have for solar in the District of Columbia with the esker.

Ms. Nina Dodge said the Clean Energy DC roadmap may quantify the role of peak demand in reducing emissions in other words if it’s already been figured out with the rate of peak demand shifting under the current kind of configuration of energy sources. If it has been quantified I think that the role at of peak demand needs to be achieved our mandates.

Mr. Edward Yam talked about the peak demand reduction, something we will need to achieve but generally we talk about it’s in terms at cost effectiveness measures of insuring clean energy supply. We haven’t quantified how much GHG Reduction contribution lead to different peak demand. The peak demand absolutely has a relationship to GHG emission. We are trying to figure it and in our electrification movement but we might touch on that later. We need to know what the marginal rate is then we will know when it will be most beneficial in terms of GHG production.

Chair Corman said there is a consensus that the SEU has translated a message of energy savings to customers which is a different question than incentivizing or charging the market or GHG reduction by themselves that peak demand shifting isn’t necessarily a target that should come into the SEU a statutory mandate. So I think there was a consensus by the Benchmarks Subcommittee that it not be addressed that some of the questions was whether or not the board believes that there should be a recommendation that maybe an explanation as to why it isn’t necessarily, and they asked you to context but we would encourage or not it’s being taken up in the PSC context. Providing comments to the PSC the current or future thinking in setting the metrics for the utilities to be implementing energy efficiency independent action demand response. What I guess maybe is there’s also an issue in term if the SEUAB or it is to make of comment, it doesn’t have to make a comment with regard to the SEU.

There was probably a very strong reaction against advocating for a change to ascension or agreement at this point given where are in a five year contract with the DCSEU. Raising it in context of the metrics and so is this moving train and we need to be on it for the purpose without getting granular than that’s the only thing it should be something that we recommend.

Diector Tommy Wells said this is really a good piece of work. Second, a number of jurisdictions directly addressed peak power. What has prevented the District of Columbia? What’s preventing DC from addressing peak power that other states are doing. I’m wondering did something happen in the conversations. I’m not aware of by the District this needs to be a priority for the city coming from this board but not necessarily through the SEU or if the SEU were engaged in a broader effort. The SEU could not drive this, cutting the board out there directly but I just what you to know about more the board. I know its priority for DOEE to figure this out. The SEU will be a part of this with a broader strategy. The SEU is probably just not enough to be the driver but the board is important that’s why the board speaks to

There’s an agreement and direction of how to do it whether it would be you on which side if meter which kinds if investments role of batteries all that stuff would be comprehensive but because the SEU does not have direct control, I don’t see this thing a measurable outcome for the SEU but I definitely think that the board you would be very sensitive and open to advising the SEU to participant in a broader strategy for the city.

Chair Corman said back to Ms. Dodge’s good question about organizational where the opportunities to make recommendations with regard to the SEU are? It does sound like it’s a compliment the programs in the PJM, SEU innovation places it reports to us in strategy. Director Wells stated that he doesn’t believe this is a proposal, I don’t believe it’s usually measurable so you don’t want to divert the SEU resources away from the areas where they have to be measured and make goals.

Chair Corman said one of the recommendations that the board had made has been taken up, we have to use delivers the strategy to the SEU although I mean the board: I’m not sure where we are driven. It’s the SEU planning document for what is going to be doing. Dr. Loncke said the annual plan is submitted at the end of each fiscal year. The annual plan commissioned will come around August of the year is due 60 days before the end of year, so that the document you may be referring too.

Director Wells said he thinks the board represents people that drive this question. The SEU is a small cog in this wheel so he will not do anything but use your authority as the board and as the board to say come on we need to get going with this but I don’t know, I wouldn’t divert much energy into this until there’s a broader strategy for the SEU. My recommendation is that you use the board to highlight the recommendations to the City Council and Mayor. What we need are the bigger players to lay out savings either demand a strategy or get a strategy from PEPCO\Exelon and then because they’re a play in efficiency world as well and we’re concerned about redundancies and so I think the big guys need to help layout the strategy and we figure out and then direct us.

Chair Corman said having GHG reduction target an express target which we discussed in the context of whether or not one time. Maybe this would be a good time, could we think that’s fine where we are with the SEU contract as viewed modification years that are like we’re just to understand that the context as we are sorting through our heads whether we’re making recommendations in the context of the SEU or the PSC or both.

Dr. Loncke said this is year four out of five over four and a half months into the year, the fifth year we’ll start next October 21 we will start the option period which is a five year option period if the District decides to exercise that option year.

Chair Corman stated in terms of having a GHG reduction and performance benchmarks let’s figure out how to handle. Would the board want to make a recommendation in regards to what the PSC is considering in terms of incorporating the GHG reduction? Is there somewhere the programs and utilities are in the jurisdiction, I mean it’s certainly helpful to know the other ones as well, what examples are out there? If there isn’t already existing group, there is a lot of them.

If there isn’t already existing board, is the board’s recommendation to get an understanding of what these programs are and what if the timeline doesn’t work; that’s a required recommendation the SEU is required or report in which might start to operationalize or covert to some of these programs into action. Is this a board recommendation?

Dr. Loncke stated I know we are talking about GHG the standard approach to GHG would be co2 reduction metric equipment of which the SEU and utilities can participate in that, you know the megawatt hours reduction can become converted. But I think we’re suggesting to have this group is the people are clear to answer Chair Corman questions. There are program and ones that are being run right now contributing to GHG outside of that; there are some additional things that can be done. The question is do we want that to be done, for example when we talk about strategic electrification what do we want to be incentivizing from the transportation sector. People switching from possible \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ cars to electric cars all of those things will add to awards of GHG metrics but from the DCSEU perspective and Pepco’s perspective are primarily talking about is gathering the GHG energy efficiency. The issue of what can be added now or later we can add it any point through this process but what a difference it would make.

Chair Corman is making a bold suggestion that the fact that the Benchmarks Subcommittee took up topics does not require that the board break those topics into recommendations or the PSC consumption. I am going to suggest that it sounds like we’re premature on this one for the board to be able to say anything to the PSC in a month or do we think we can say something. Do we recommend a check in? Ms. Dodge said if we can tie our recommendations to actual timeline goals of the city’s GHG emission reduction that would be great.

Mr. Yim said the GHG inventory is a tool for giving us a big picture. A couple of things me and my colleagues are looking at on the micro scale in terms of the actual GHG conversion methodologies because the ones that are currently in place but we think its outdated. Two separate issues to discuss. One is to convert fuel to co2 equivalent, a conversion factor which we’ve been relying on EPA numbers they themselves know that this is outdated because know of that involves leakage assumptions, so if you just apply that we’re not really comparing. You know you might know that you know because the methane is such a more potent global warming potential when you comfort that it makes it shoots different in figuring out which saves more GHG emission. The second issue is the marginal emissions rate because again most of the methodologies that are currently in existence doesn’t really distinguish the fuel source of the peak hours so if you really want to think about GHG reductions you want to target those peak hours that are 30 years and z-one versus clean peak hours. So you want to distinguish that we currently don’t have a methodology persistent to let us serve so that’s the marginal emission. This is great research that we are doing as part of our electrification roadmap.

Dr. Lance Loncke stated if the board would like he could circulate the report from there evaluators that looks at the whole concept of marginal emission rate.

Chair Corman asked does the board have anything to say about combining energy savings into a single goal. Does the board have anything to say about combining energy saving into a single goal? It was unanimously agree upon.

***Jenn Hatch – DOEE GHG Inventory – Process & Methodology***

Ms. Hatch presented a presentation to the Board.

* Adapt to Climate
* Climate ready buildings
* Cut energy use 50%
* 100% Clean Electricity
* Net Zero new buildings
* Net Zero Retrofit
* Cut GHG Emissions 50%

Some of the other topics:

* Citywide Emissions and Targets
* Change in Population, Emission, GDP since 2006
* Drivers of Change
* 2017 Emissions by Sector

Chair Corman asked is there something that you can do to formulate recommendations with regard to how aggressive or whether it’s saving support verbatim. What the recommendations is the working group with the annual reporting in three year check-in the world wants to say something more aggressive or progressive and is there vocabulary that we can apply.

**Other Matters**

* None

**Actions taken by the Board**

* Approval of February 18, 2020 meeting agenda
* Approval of January 14, 2020 meeting minutes

**Actions for Follow-up**

* Benchmarks Subcommittee Conference Call

**Adjournment**

* Chair Corman adjourned the meeting at 11:54 AM.

*Minutes prepared by: Lynora Hall*