

Minutes
VEIC Study ("SB323 Report") Review Committee
Energy Efficiency & Sustainable Energy Board
NH Charitable Foundation - Conference Room
2 - 4 p.m.
Tuesday, January 10, 2011 Meeting

Members in Attendance:

Steve Eckberg, Ben Frost, George Gantz, Gil Gelineau, Jim Grady, Dick Henry, Chris Kintz, , Jodie Lucci, Rebecca Ohler, Kate Peters, Jack Ruderman, Deborah Schachter, Chris Skoglund

Members by Phone:

Carol Woods, and Mary Downes (for Eric Steltzer)

Guests:

Dana Nute and Ryan Clouthier

1. Introductions & Framing of the Day

2. Review of Preliminary Evaluation Tool

- The committee discussed their individual reactions to using the evaluation matrix, which was developed by the group to guide and manage the review of the individual recommendations in the report.
- The concerns included the large number of recommendations and the committee trying to evaluate each recommendation in too much detail. The committee members expressed an interest in winnowing down the potential recommendations they would need to address.
 - The committee discussed using a determination of whether a recommendation was within the EESE Board's statutory obligation as a first cut.
 - If a recommendation falls outside the EESE Board's legislative purview then the Committee members would suggest to whom it should fall to implement or carry forward.
- The committee members noted that there were a number of criteria, against which they had been asked to evaluate the recommendations,, where terms need further clarification.
 - The committee discussed appropriate common definitions of the terms "horizon," "impact," and "cost" to allow comparison across recommendations and a fair comparison of costs to impacts.
 - More specifically defined terms will be added to a revised evaluation matrix.
- The matrix tool and its use was recognized as useful to drive members to evaluate and understand individual report recommendations better. However, there are a lot of recommendations, some are less fleshed out than others, and some may be related to recommendations in other, separate chapters.
- The committee agreed to move from independent review to discussion among the Chapter Teams.

- It was suggested that the committee may best serve the EESE board by using the tool to distill the recommendations in the report and see what rises to the top. Then a high level analysis could be presented to the EESE Board, including options to consider, without necessarily requiring that the committee achieve consensus on every recommendation.
- The group discussed pros and cons of providing a quantitative score for the three major criteria for each recommendation (horizon, cost and impact), and ultimately declined to do so.

3. Develop Approach/Process for future work

- **The committee members identified next steps.**
 - The evaluation tool will be updated and circulated
 - Chapter teams will revise their preliminary evaluations.
 - Chapter teams may elect to recruit additional participants as needed to round out the expertise and experience of the group.
 - Chapter Teams will meet before the next committee meeting to initiate and test Team scoring and prioritization of recommendations.
- The committee discussed appropriate procedures and what aspects of the work invoke RSA 91-A considerations.

4. Wrap-up

- The group discussed additional post-meeting follow-up by Committee co-facilitators:
 - to present a summary of efforts to date at the EESE Board meeting on January 13;
 - to send out a follow-up email with a revised evaluation tool and Chapter Team instructions; and
 - to send out a scheduling request for the next meeting, and to make every effort to schedule future meetings on a predictable schedule, preferably on either a Monday or Friday in recognition of the legislative calendar.