

**RTF Policy Advisory Committee**  
**January 24, 2013**  
**Meeting Minutes**

Jim West, co-chair of the RTF PAC called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Introduced the attendees and reviewed the agenda. For the first agenda topic, he asked the members if they have questions or suggestions on the order of the agenda, and comments or revisions on the last RTF PAC meeting minutes. The minutes were approved by all the members with Susan Stratton abstaining.

**RTF Conflicts of Interest Policy Discussion and Recommendation**

For the second agenda topics, the floor was turned to Sandra Hirotsu, Council staff to discuss the RTF conflict of interest policy with highlight of updates and revisions:

1. The existing conflict of interest policy only applied to RTF members and staff, there was a concern as the subcommittees handle a lot of the business in terms of contract that it is a good idea to have the COI also apply to the operations subcommittee as not necessarily all the members of subcommittee are voting members.
2. Under the policy section, the general policy is the same. Still prohibited to participate in a financial transaction if the members, domestic partner and household have a financial interest.
3. A prohibition from attending the meeting if the members as well as domestic partners have financial incentives.
4. Definition and exclusion of conflict of interest remain the same with clarification; the general exclusion for Utility employees participating in RTF transaction where a specific contract dealing with the Utilities would come up. In that case they are not excluded from having an appearance of conflict.
5. Disclosure must occur prior to any discussion not only prior to any vote on a transaction.
6. Under definition of transaction section 3i, as long as there is a full disclosure, members who are participating in the sub committees can participate in the discussion.

Bruce Folsom asked if discussion of a transaction or a consulting report for the RTF members is considered a transaction.

Sandra replied it would be under this policy. In this case the prohibition would apply to the vote and not necessarily to the discussion that precedes it. In any case the disclosure of any conflict should be made upfront before any discussion.

Tom Karier asked for an example of an employee of a contractor that is bidding on how this affects them or similar example.

Sandra replied under these circumstances the employee/contractor is forbidden in participating under the definition of the transaction in both the discussion as well as the vote.

Charlie Grist added most of the contract negotiations discussions occur in the operations committee work and almost no contract selections or award happens in the full body. We do most of the administrative work in the staff level with the guidance of the operation committee. For this very reason we don't have any contractors in the operations committee.

Susan Stratton asked Sandra to give an example where an employee of a firm that has a product and if the RTF is voting on unit savings or discussing unit savings value for that product and voting on it. How would this policy apply?

Sandra replied under this example the contractor or an employee of the contractor would still be allowed to participate in the discussion, but that person will have to disclose before the discussion begins as to what the potential conflict would be.

Susan Stratton asked who makes the decision whether the appearance of conflict is material or not.

Sandra replied if any situation is not clear the person is supposed to go to the chair or a chair designee and disclose the material facts to the chair and the chair has the authority to decide if a conflict potential exist. Or it gives the chair to ask the rest of the voting members to decide as long as the person with the possible potential is ok for them disclosing the facts.

Steve Johnson asked if the scoping of the kind of contract the RTF engage done only in operations or is the scoping of the contract also done in the larger RTF meeting.

Tom Eckman replied the scope work is written by staff and approved by the operations committee and released. We usually have the operations committee or a select few who are not conflicted but have expertise as review teams to score the RFPs and rank order them and make recommendations to staff in the operations committee for the final decision as who will be selected. But the scope work is written by staff. RTF is a public meeting and anyone who might bid on a contract can participate in the discussion but have to disclose in advance.

Lauren Gage asked if the subcommittee work is excluded from this policy or included.

Sandra replied subcommittee work is excluded unless you are in on an operations subcommittee. She added I wasn't aware of all the work that goes on in the subcommittees but as far as these policies goes it would not extend to the subcommittees other than the operations committee.

Bob Stolarski asked why we don't include all of the subcommittees in this conflict of interest policy.

Sandra replied we were concerned about the voting, we want to make sure the voting members are not conflicted and also we understand everyone come to the RTF with certain amount of bias before of who the experts are, this was an open question whether or not it should apply to all the subcommittees.

Tom Eckman added most of the subcommittee meetings are webinar based so we can have anybody from anywhere tune in and in order to have them sign a COI, it is pretty hard to administer as they could join the meeting on a conference call without signing up on webinar.

Richard Genece said he has a concern that the mere existence of a contract shouldn't bog down the process and shouldn't need a disclosure. And asked how do we make sure if someone who wasn't awarded a contract complains later disclosure wasn't received. And if the RTF chair and vice chair have the ability to bring additional vote in front of the RTF to determine weather that was harmless error.

Sandra Hirotsu replied this policy doesn't go to that length as far as what would happen in case someone discover later there is a conflict of interest, I still think disclosure is the best policy and the RTF would need to take it from there.

Jim West asked if the PAC might want to consider a bid protest procedures.

Charlie Grist replied in general all our contracting work is fulfilled under the Council's existing guideline.

Jim West added the PAC could recommend that the RTF adopt this revised COI policy on the February Council meeting and steps that might occur from here.

Sandra replied the only thing I would add to this process of the COI policy is to revise or amend one section of the RTF charter, section 11. On the voting, that it would not be in play anymore and I would ask until the next RTF meeting occurs on Feb. 20<sup>th</sup> and then the Council will get it on their March meeting.

Tom Eckman asked Sandra if the conflict of interest policy and the charter is adopted by the Council and the RTF abide by it and if the RTF have a vote in the matter.

Sandra Hirotsu replied the COI and the RTF charter need to be adopted by the RTF.

Jim West asked the members if they have a preference of February or March.

Tom Karier added the Council will be very interested to tighten the process of the policy and the Council will be very interested to see this.

Juliet Johnson asked a summary of where the PAC landed on the subcommittee issues and that she is not really clear where they landed on it.

Jim West replied the covered parties are staff, RTF members and operations subcommittee. The logic in that was, those are the groups that make the decisions. The subcommittees are more advisory and recommend for decision to be made, they don't make the decisions.

Charlie Grist added the RTF has a huge amount work on their plate and we are trying to use the subcommittees more to help develop the work. The subcommittees are open; they have

RTF members, corresponding members, contractors, people who have expertise in specific areas of the evaluations or technology and we can't police all of that and almost impossible to have them sign a conflict of interest policy. The RTF members gauge how the subcommittee develops its work. There is a RTF staffer who is in charge of managing each of the subcommittees. That is the structure of the RTF.

Jim West added sub committees don't make decisions, they develop the work. Meeting is open to all members, corresponding members and the RTF staffers manage the subcommittee.

Bruce Folsom asked if there is a membership list that is formalized that shows that is on the membership committee. I am struggling with the cost and benefit ratio but there is a high benefit to ask them to sign the policy. And if the subcommittees have formal membership or if anyone who shows up can join.

Tom Eckman replied there are formal members appointed from the RTF but it is an open invitation published on the web. Anyone can join in the conversation at the meeting because it is an open meeting. At the meeting we try to take a roll call. They have informal recommendation that some vote, some don't. Very rarely do the subcommittees have formal vote. There may be straw poll.

Tom Karier remarked that it sounds to him it is a hybrid of public meetings rather than distinct advisory group.

Tom Eckman added as an example on the residential weatherization specification we had 70 people participate.

Tom Karier said in order to have a conflict of interest signed up, the whole structure has to be changed, define membership, define governess. And the reluctance I am hearing is it will close out the meetings to much smaller participation.

Charlie Grist added one of the things I am hearing from the participants in the RTF process is that we can improve the subcommittees' structure and function. One of the new staffing roles is to elevate the role of the staffing guiding the subcommittees.

Lauren Gage said when she look at the amount of work done in the subcommittees, she even wonder what those conflicts are except when talking about the proposals. This will be the RTF's responsibility to look at any structure of research agendas and think if it was influenced by some contractors and I think we can do that.

Jeff Bumgarner asked who brings the work to the main RTF.

Tom Eckman replied usually it is a voting member or staff. Going forward it is going to be only staff.

Tom Karier asked Eckman if there are other issues hanging out and if the Council's COI policy has any sort of surveillance of the policy, or if he thinks there should be consequences.

Richard Genesys added staff can get involved in the process and in terms of disclosure, even though it is not enforced on a committee level, we will have some control by having staff involved.

Steve Johnson asked in the process of bidding for contract, can RTF require the bidder to disclose whether they made disclosures or would that be too burdensome. And if you have criteria of disqualifying a bid based after the disclosure is submitted.

Tom Karier replied that this will not be on the Conflict of interest policy. This will be discussed in the bidding process. We will try to find out more what to do.

Jim West concluded the first agenda by asking the group for a motion to for the PAC to recommend to the Council the adoption of this revised conflict of interest policy. Suggest the revision to the charter to maintain a reference to the COI, and under the charter on section 11, revised policy will be to let the participants who have a conflict of interest to participate in the discussion.

Motion carried unanimously.

## **Review of Initial RTF Dashboard**

Jim West explained the draft dashboard the PAC looked at the October RTF meeting is now populated with data from RTF activities from January through November of 2012. He asked the group how much and how often they want to see this much detail.

Charlie Grist started from the agenda referring to the status of measures and protocol on the dashboard. What percent of decision receive a yes or no vote, highlight who does the primary analysis to bring those decisions before the RTF and with regard to the work plan category, that there are over 109 decisions, 92 of them were on existing measurement of use and update, 6 were new measures, 5 standardization of technical analysis.

With regards to who brings measures to the RTF, 84 by consultants and next largest brought was 18 by RTF staff, and BPA was the third biggest producer bringing 7 new measures.

Bruce Folsom asked if the utilities that bring the work or for the impact of evaluation that go into the RTF library, in terms of terminology if they would be listed under consultant.

Steve Johnson replied the purpose of the spreadsheet is to show who is doing the analysis not to account who funds it. The spreadsheet is data extracted from the record keeping or a summary sheet of the documents that has been done already.

Nick O'Neal added this spreadsheet is a summary sheet that provides more detail than the decisions page on the RTF page. The decision page just highlights the name of the decision and provides the link back to the measure analysis and where the workbook is, what this does is the detail work, each measure, its name, the members who were there, the year and nay vote, categories that were placed in, who brought the work, and this is done for all 92 measures.

Charlie Black commented, from a perspective of someone new to this, this chart is very informative and gives a good picture of a snapshot of the activities of the RTF. He asked the policy advisory committee, if the dashboard has the same value to them and if it is, he thinks it is an appropriate use of staff time.

Karen Meadows added for her it is very informative and the dashboard gives a clear picture of how the voting is done and what percent of people are voting.

Charlie Grist continued going over the voting worksheet, and explained Nick has put together a summary of the key matrix that align on the charter and by-law languages. 40% of the voting members present have to vote on an issue and 60% have to give a yes vote for the vote to be adopted. The average voting members that were voting yes were 97% and most of these measures were passing without controversy.

Lauren Gage recommends one of the new RTF staff to populate the table on an ongoing basis so it will be less backtracking.

Steve Johnson commented it answered questions about voting control. I want to see the list or summary of the measures that have been adopted.

Charlie Grist said you can see on the RTF web page all the decisions that have been adopted and the decision that was taken including the history of the workbook.

Steve Johnson suggested to put the link of the decision page from the RTF website on the dashboard.

Karen Meadows added the dashboard gives me the sense of the value of the RTF covers and why we spend the money. She said she would like to see this at least one more year, and for the PAC to reconsider whether we need to see it in the future.

Sara Patton commented it would be nice if the RTF has a name that can easily describe what the RTF does.

Susan Stratton added perhaps an annual report of the RTF, with a short executive level summary of the decisions that were made or a higher rollup of the information on the dashboard.

Tom Eckman added the RTF produce a quarterly and annual report.

Bruce Folsom asked if it would make sense to have an extra line of definitions of the measure per decision.

Lauren Gage replied the RTF does measures that already existed, The 92 measures that are listed are measures that were being worked on in the past two years. We need to focus on new research and hard research at all of the organizations and not just the subcommittees. We are working on coordinating that better on bringing new work to the RTF.

Tom Eckman added we have a huge log of measures 40-50 out of 92 that are out of compliance. We need the regions help to bring the measures to compliance.

Eugene commented when we talk about these measures, the contribution of someone who brings in the data is not really reflected on the list.

Steve Johnson said we want to bring in new measures and also to bring measures that are out of compliance to compliance. We don't see those data here on the spreadsheet

Bruce Folsom said on Sep 27<sup>th</sup> meeting we were told it is a unique and independent impact analysis, and recommend we continue the same way.

Nick O'Neil went over the RTF website and explained the process that was established last year for the approval process of measures that came to the RTF for approval. Staff looks at the checklist for every measure that is adopted, what likely barriers there may be on implementing the measure, determine whether to modify the measure, create a separate measure or leave the measure as adopted by the general RTF.

Tom Karier asked how we measure the cost associated for the Utilities to bring a measure forward.

Charlie Grist replied going forward we can do a matrix of who is sponsoring the new measures. Collect the data for measures that are out of compliance and do a year end qualitative report that shows how it went and describe it as part of the committees.

Karen Meadows asked if it is possible to do a qualitative or quantitative table that shows which utilities are sharing the data and where we get the numbers and if that would encourage the Utilities to share more data.

Tom Eckman replied when we put together a workbook to update each measure to bring it to compliance, we have data sources cited for the values of assertions.

Jim West commented how we stretch the 1.5 million we receive, advising the Council on what the RTF does and accountability should be our main work. He said he is cautious in expanding our scope on tracking indicators that will be meaningful for the utilities actions. It is a different thing and it should be a byproduct of what we do within our scope. Our scope is to advise the Council on the operations of the RTF in terms of transparency, accountability,

effectiveness and efficiency on the policy of the RTF not so much operation of the RTF on the day to day basis.

Tom Eckman added we still have 45 measures out of compliance, we couldn't put together because there was no research. I want to be mindful this is the tension we got in the region; we don't have a way to centralize those decisions.

Jim West asked if it is the RTF PAC's role to develop the tool or is it the PAC's role to recommend the RTF do as an ongoing piece of its business.

Tom Eckman replied we can't accomplish this work with 1.5 million dollars because no one is doing the other 5 million dollars worth of research to make the 1.5 millions moves forward. That could be a frustration Lauren is concerned about and I know we are concerned.

Tom Karier asked how this is done if there is a committee that focus on one measure and then identify existing parties.

Tom Eckman replied we don't have a committee together that has scoped out to know what we need and the magnitude of the ask is and what the specifics are. Probably within the next six months we will lay out an ask. This is what has to happen in order to fill these gaps. This will be a multiyear process as these research projects will take several years. It is a multiyear budget process going forward.

Nick O'Neal added one of the reasons for forming the subcommittees this year is to bring all the stakeholders together to make sure the work is not duplicated.

Tom Karier said tracking that is very interesting where you see contributions, for me that is the breadth of the participation and it will give us some ideas how much it really cost even just one of these UESs and identify where there are problems such as not sufficient funding, and not sufficient work done. To me this is a valuable way of tracking something important and it is worth thinking about.

Tom Eckman answered we will have to do some thinking and talk with the RTF staff and with the rest of the regional evaluation network group to figure out what the issues are or if we even have an issue in the end. It is not even clear if we have an issue, there is a process we have to go through to see whether the collaboration will be there so we fill these holes in a timely manner.

Charlie Grist added looking at the status of measures workbook, it shows how many of the out of compliance measures are moving to compliance and at the end of the year we should have a report after we get a better sense of how it is working and instead of a dashboard metric it could be a paragraph in the annual report.

Tom Eckman added it also will influence how well we can process through these measures. Data availability is what drives this from one cell to the next. If you see everything sticking under review and out of compliance, no new change and active, it means we haven't been

able to get much data to move things forward. It will be a good measure.

Steve Johnson said he would like to see how much the investing utilities contribute to the overall process and to save the RTF staff time to have them fill the form themselves and submit it.

Richard Genece asked since we are looking at research that needed proof measures that are out of compliance, if we tapping resources outside of the region or elsewhere in the country.

Tom Eckman answered yes.

Charlie Grist added whenever we are ready to launch a new stuff, the underline premises is to use the best available we have and sometimes it is not from the region.

Charlie Grist continued discussing the status table on snapshot of all measures/protocols that are active, under review and out of compliance. As of December, 2012 out of around 80, 35 are active measures, 17 under review, 19 are out of compliance with the current guidelines.

RTF look at measures that are out of compliance and we have a year to develop a plan to gather the data elements that are needed to bring it in to compliance and during that time the old measure savings stand and if a plan is not put together within a year then the RTF has obligation to look at it to deactivate it.

Nick O'Neal added the 35 active measures are high level measure category and for each one measure there may have several permutations. The overall number looks low but number of permutations could be high.

Meeting broke for lunch at 12pm.

Charlie Grist started the meeting by discussing the RTF work plan, allocated funding and amount spent, with half a million dollars spent year to date and projected with some invoices not fully in the summary invoices. With a total of 1.5 million yearly budgets, one of the concerns raised two years ago when we increased our budget was if we would be able to get the work scheduled and out the door. RTF has 30 contractors to get the work done and Gillian will give us the final budget report. On the Subcommittee spreadsheet, we are trying to show all the meeting materials for each subcommittee, the presentations, and number of meetings that shows the attendees.

Karen Meadows said great work on allocating the budget and asked on the subcommittee spreadsheet, how the total effort spent on meetings on each subcommittee is decided and how the number of meetings is decided.

Nick O'Neil replied the dashboard is not used for that, we internally manage the time spent on meetings for each subcommittees by looking the effort spent on the work to be done.

Tom Eckman added subcommittees meet when there is the nitty gritty stuff that needs to be discussed and with the additional staff, we are planning on having much better agendas focused on subcommittee meetings so we can get through this more efficiently.

Tom Karier said the financial information is something that we need to keep track on. And asked if the subcommittee dashboard is something we need to continue tracking

Lauren replied she is not attached to the information of how many meeting they have per subcommittees. It seems valuable to see where we are spending effort.

Richard Genece said he is also interested in the outcomes or accomplishments of any of the subcommittees rather than the number of times they met.

Erin Erbin also agreed as a policy maker accomplishment or goal is more important.

Richard Genece said he find it interesting over time on tracking the creation and dissolve of different subcommittees as they accomplish their tasks.

Jim West asked if there is any value in stratifying to those that are active, and looking at the work result of those that are active and exclude dormant subcommittees.

Steve Bicker said he would also prefer to focus on results.

Charlie Grist showed the group on the dashboard that they can also look up this information by clicking on each subcommittee link and find out the number of time they met and the status update of the committee.

Tom Eckman added we could add scope of work/work plan for each subcommittee webpage, if they accomplished the objective or not.

Richard Genece added having the scope and work plan will reinforce an expectation that not every committee exists forever or after the work is done.

Eugene Rosolie asked if it is valuable to know how many people are participating in each subcommittee.

Charlie Grist answered the RTF members look at that to know if the right people were part on those meetings, it is the job of the RTF to make that determination whether the right talent was applied.

Jim West asked the PAC what action if any should we take on the dashboard, or if there is anything in the dashboard as it is structured right now that we want to see updated for the next meeting. And is there also a value on asking the utilities support, and collaboration to the RTF staff.

Jeff Bumgarner replied looking at the spreadsheet, he doesn't see anything needs updating. The financial page is helpful. Where the budget is being spent, it tells me if the RTF is busy but not if it is productive. If there is a way to summarize annually what is being accomplished will be helpful.

Richard Genece added he would like to see if there is collaboration and participation of the Utilities.

Erin Erbin supported the comments that were made and added the dollars are useful information. But she would like emphasis on accomplishment.

Jim West said he believes looking at the dashboard once a year is enough. Coming back together whether it is a spreadsheet or a document, he feels the conversation that it brings is quite valuable.

Tom Karier agreed with Jim West and added the key function of the RTF is to develop and approve measures that achieve certain standard. We have some measures on the dashboard how much of that the RTF has done. It shows the quality of the decision, what is active and what is not. I encourage on the next meeting to think on what other measures there might be for adoption by others in the region and to see if these are valuable and how we measure those contributions.

Sarah Patton commented the dashboard can draw us the advisory committee in to subjects that are not really in our domain or scope, and cause us to spend more time than we need to on it.

Steve Johnson said what the dashboard is doing is a scientific based engineering data measure, examining the data used. How the PAC figure out if the RTF is doing a good job is by auditing through the engineering basis and the databases of the work they do and that would have to be a budget item to add.

Eugene Rosolie added we measure the quality/data by examining the guidelines and the guidelines should give us some measure on how the RTF comes to its decision

Tom Eckman said in addition to what Eugene said we have a set of guidelines and adherence to the guidelines by being consistent and making sure we are getting quality work product and not give waiver. The safety valve right now is getting the super majority opinion of technicians to agree it is good enough to satisfy those guidelines.

Nick O'Neil said to address the concerns if staff is doing its best job to be in compliance over guidelines, with the hiring of new staff this year is to flip the qc component from staff doing the consultant work to staff doing the work with a third party review of the work. We should have in place a matrix to look at to say, what level of QC is needed on a measure and what level of comments came back from the third party reviewer.

Jim West suggested discussing on the next meeting:

- What level of qc is needed on a measure
- First quarter financials.
- Staff to look at how to develop a way to look at compliance, or how to bring the measures that are out of compliance
- Participation of support from the individual utilities as well as leverage and collaboration.
- Who is sponsoring the new measures

## Qualitative Survey

Lauren discussed the overview of the dashboard on the quantitative look and asked the PAC:

- If that gives the PAC the full view of what they want to see.
- What they would like to do with the result of the dashboard.
- What would be the goal of the survey and who should be surveyed.
- What would be possible survey questions, are the regional stake holders engaged, are they consistently using RTF data, will they be engaged on research.
- Is the process working, has it been a productive year,
- What is the quality of the decision, is there a regional adoption of the measures?

Tom Karier asked if we know how much of the RTF data the regional stakeholders are using and at the end we want to develop measures. We want to make sure it is high quality and we want to know people are using it.

Steve Johnson added other state public offices are auditing public utilities conservation efforts.

Eugene Rosolie replied my understanding is the state auditor is taking what the RTF and BPA have done and accepting it and using it in its audit of the public utilities.

Steve Bicker asked if the public utilities claim something beyond what the RTF has posted, the burden of proof will be upon us to prove it. If they reserve the right to do their own independent audit in analysis using a contracted subject matter expert but it doesn't look like it is something they are going to do.

Charlie Grist replied we have to be careful how we present the question, as there are different ways various groups use the information they get from RTF.

Steve Bicker said looking at what the state auditors have done in Washington, it is not looking directly at what the RTF, they are looking at the PTR or BPA's reporting mechanism. The question is not how the RTF data is going to be used; we need to look at how they are going to be incorporated in the PTR.

Tom Eckman added UESs has many flavors, I use it with no change or modification and there is USE I use with modification but with the same methodology to get to an answer with a local input.

Jim West asked if this is the sort of discussion that we choose to undertake a qualitative survey on.

Susan Stratton said part of the conversation may be if there is anything the RTF should be doing in addition to what they are doing now that would make it more useful to stakeholders that are modifying the results, or are those modifications service territory dependant so they will always be done separately.

Tom Eckman replied one of the question that came up with the conversation I had with Avista on this is, if we are not providing you a lot that are directly portable then maybe we are not meeting your needs as much as we should. Let's figure out why they are not directly portable and see what we can do to modify the way we describe measures that make them more useful without needing modification as that cost add and risk.

Jeff Bumgarner added we can do an impact evaluation very specific to the delivery channels, the service territories and then it can be discounted at a regulatory level sometimes because it doesn't lock with RTF data.

Jim West said what he hears in this discussion is there is a fairly high level of interest in this sort of inputs and if we are interested how might we then go about doing this.

Lauren Gage explained there are two primary ways you can do this. Hire a consultant or do this internally. Part of the problem is the PAC doesn't have a budget. The value of hiring a consultant like a market research or evaluation firm is you have an independent source that is requesting the information and keeping the data confidential that credibility and anonymity none of our organization have that information I think is valuable.

You will also have the flexibility of doing phone or in-depth interviews and would get better input analysis or output. You would still have to define which organization is managing it, how are we developing the survey and obviously put some money into it. The alternative is to hire a bigger organization such as the RTF, BPA, ETO, NEEA etc...to conduct a web based survey.

Charlie put on the table we gain information by PAC members reaching out to a wider audience. Nick, Eric and I tried to look if the survey is done internally what would the staff cost would be I believe you are looking at around a month of staff resource.

Bruce Folsom asked if it is envisioned that this would be a bench marking type of survey would you do it at a later time with the same survey or a onetime survey.

Lauren Gage replied looking at the matrix, it came from needing information or finding out if the stakeholders like what the RTF is doing. It is up to you if you want to see the regional perspective?

Jim West said understanding if the stakeholders are satisfied of the RTFs work will give us a better direction. And what we learn from the qualitative survey would improve the effectiveness of the RTF in its work.

Steve Bicker suggested a high level web based survey, such as if you trust the data produced by the RTF and so forth. And if there is a problem, may be something in depth can be done, that would involve phone interview.

Bruce Folsom and Richard Genece agreed to remain objective an external party should conduct the survey.

Eugene added this survey should go beyond a baseline survey.

Jim West asked if there was a stakeholder survey around the RTF and where the results are housed.

Tom Karier said there was an extensive survey done and a report with a high level summary of the answers.

Lauren Gage added those were in-depth interviews that probably had an interview guide that we would be able to leverage and can use as a starting point.

Karen Meadow said there is a need for a different perspective that wasn't there when the NEET survey was done. I don't know if we want to use the same questions, you may want to update it.

Bruce Folsom asked if where it says on the chart to find funds to hire consultant is being done.

Jim West replied I would envision if we decided that we want to engage a third party to do this, we would discuss this as a group if there are members of the committee that would be willing to bring money in an effort to fund this thing. The same thing as we did by hiring RMI the scoping work that led the creation of the policy advisory committee.

Charlie Grist added before we do an in depth interview, maybe we can use web based survey such as Survey Monkey, might not give us a lot of the information we are looking for and see if there is a problem before we decide to go in-depth interviews. I am concerned this conversation seems to be going to hiring someone the full blown analysis when we are not sure there is a problem first.

Stacy Donahue said she is a little hesitant on spending a lot of money on an expensive survey and agreed on doing a much less expensive web based survey first.

Jim West agreed on starting fairly high level but targeted enough on small number of items that gives us actionable or measurable results in the feedback we get.

Eugene Rosolie said his thought is not to rush into this because the data we get now is going to reflect some of the past and not the number of changes that have taken place as we have new voting members. Doing something simple now is fine but wouldn't jump into doing something that would take a long time.

Steve Johnson second the motion on doing something simple and get a lot of result with no cash outlet and time from volunteers who are willing to participate in constructing Survey Monkey type web base even interviewing people. If the PAC is suggesting in the direction of spending the money to just fund the RTF work more than spending money on the RTF PAC survey.

Charlie Grist asked the group who is getting surveyed.

Tom Karier replied I think from the type of information we are looking for that we get who is being surveyed. I would think of staff writing the questions and then hire a third party so it is independent. Find out first what information we need, why do we need it and who do we get it from.

Steve Bicker added if you are going to start from a fairly shallow lever, it would make sense to start pretty broad. I would think anybody who is a stakeholder of RTF information we would want responses from them in the first high level web based survey and the members of RTF should be surveyed as well.

Jim West suggested as a next step to entertain a small number of volunteers to form a subcommittee that would construct a web based survey or email survey that would go out to the PAC. Take the questions that Lauren has in her decision tree and use those to ask the respondent if they are interested, if they want it high level or if they want a phone interview. And see what our responses are and come back in the next meeting with the result.

Karen Meadows asked if it would it make sense to have a few representatives including Council staff to put together the questions of the survey.

Tom Eckman replied we can parcel it out as to what mechanism would be best to learn it by.

Karen Meadows replied from her perspective, what we are trying to do is figure out if the RTF is a valuable entity, if it is serving the purpose it could serve or if there is a minor thing we can change to make it actually more valuable.

Since we are all funding this right now, I would like to make sure we are satisfying the need of the funders or it will go away. It is worth making sure in the realm of what the RTF can do it is doing.

Tom Karier replied it seems there are categories of those questions and I think of that as a substance or product and refinement of the product. There are also questions of process, transparency and involvement.

Sara Patton added she is interested in finding out the people who could be using the RTF product actually know about it. And she suspects there are few folks out there who would be thrilled in the region to know they can use this information.

Bruce Folsom said Avista would volunteer to participate in the small group with Karen, Jim and others to probe the next steps.

Steve Johnson commented he has told his staff to tell the RTF if there is something they don't like or something they need to just tell them and not wait for a survey.

Jim West said for Bruce Folsom, Lauren Gage, Steve Johnson and from the Council Charlie Grist and Nick O'Neil to take a pass at asking the PAC if they have something they want to submit or suggest and explore on what is not covered on the first pass and comeback to the next meeting and we will talk about the result from that and get that out in a written form for people to look at ahead of time and think about where we want to go with it. We will be interested as committees are those things that are high level policy that we can advise the Council on RTF effectiveness and efficiency. We might learn a lot that is great for the RTF staff to take and understanding we don't get too consumed in the day to day activities.

Charlie Grist suggested for the members to look at the RTF home page where the EMA evaluation report of the RTF is located.

Tom Eckman said the NEET recommendations were to establish a committee to figure out whether how there should be a policy input into the RTF. And the PAC was formed at the result of that with the Council charter.

## **PAC Recommendations for Co-chair and Charter Renewal**

Tom Karier said the charter expires in April. The Council appoints a Council member to be a co-chair of the RTF PAC. We recently had an election at the Council and Bill Bradbury is the new Council chair. He has appointed him to continue as the co-chair. The Charter also says that we have the option to elect a co-chair from within this group. We will handle this as a formal election process for Co-Chair and open the floor for nomination of co-chair.

Bruce Folsom nominated Jim West for Co-Chair, and Jim West was elected unanimously.

Tom Karier asked the group if there is any objection to continuing the charter for two years and to put it on the Council business agenda in February.

Steve Johnson asked if the PAC should consider whether at the two years juncture to evaluate if there is a need to continue or have a purpose.

Tom Karier answered if we want to disband we can always do that but it is more difficult to continue once our charter expires.

Tom Eckman answered sometime between now and next charter expires, we would hope to have before you a proposal to recommitting and signing up at least 3 perhaps 5 year period. Assuming the RTF provides continuing value to you agencies. Part of that charter period over the next two years would be to take this issue up and get some sort of funding commitment going forward.

Jim West added may be the first item in the charter for this policy advisory is securing the funding for the operation of the RTF

Tom Karier said when the RTF PAC was formed there was an expectation this was a fairly long process, not only we have to come up with funding plan but those who are funding need to be involved more on RTF oversight and monitoring. To the most part it has worked very well and I think the Council is very pleased with the way it has raised the status and visibility of what the RTF does and provides them with useful information. I don't think there is any question that it is needed over the next two years but we can ask if there are dissenting views.

Steve Johnson said if we have some specifics we can offer up categories for the next two years would be great.

Jim West said the first two meetings of the RTF PAC talking about work plan and spent hours on by-laws, voting requirements and charters. Now we have the tools developed to do our work we will need to put all theses in front of the Council.

Susan Stratton asked if the intent is to ask every five years for funding with the scope of work.

Tome Eckman replied we needed continuity funding to pursue some of the things that require multiple year activity. The current agreement goes through 2014.

Tom Karier said we will need a new agreement in 2014 ready to go January 2015.

Tom Karier asked if there are any more questions or comments on extending the charter.

### **Update on Process of Soliciting RTF Contract Staff for 2013**

Charlie Grist continued the agenda on RTF contract staffing explaining in the previous years 2012 and 2011 we did an RFP on every single project we needed help on and realized we were spending a great deal of time on very detailed scope of work writing and managing contracts of the results, so we decided to hire additional staff with 70% contract work and the rest on RTF stuff. From the proposal we sent out we received 28 people altogether with half from consulting firms and half individuals. After the proposals were reviewed, the operation committee weighed in and the final six were interviewed. In the end, we decided on three engineers from Navigant Ryan Firestone, Mohit Singh-Chhabra and Christian Douglass and Josh Rushton from Cadmus. With Adam Hadley we have five who are highly dedicated staff to tackle the RTF.

## **Update on year-end close out on financials**

For the final agenda on Financials, Gillian gave out handout on the 2012 budget and work plan and gave the presentation on the RTF budget.

- In 2011 work plan budget was 1.473 million with a hundred percent obligated under contract.
- To date what was spent through 2012 is 1.29 millions, with obligated but not spent 182,939.29 contract work still being done.
- 2013 budget is the same 1.47 millions.
- For the funding proposals the Council has started a reconciliation and carryover funds we don't spend so your contribution will be counted as part of your next year's contributions.
- 2012 the entire budget is currently obligated to contracts, we have no unobligated amount to be credited to your 2013
- For 2012 we will be collecting from the funders 1.394 millions

Susan Stratton asked if the finance of the RTF is separate from the finance of the Council.

Gillian Charles replied It is kept separate and audited separately from the Council finance audit.

## **Next Meeting Date and Agenda**

Last item of the meeting was to set the day for the next RTF PAC meeting. Jim West asked the group if they can meet after the April RTF meeting and meeting date was set for April 17<sup>th</sup>. Susan Stratton suggested agenda for the next PAC meeting to discuss timeline for the RTF renewal process and what role the RTF PAC plays.

Charlie Grist asked for the upcoming meeting if there is a particular thing on the agenda we want to identify right now.

Jim West replied there will be a subcommittee made up who will put a call for proposal of a qualitative survey might look like. May not be enough time to see this in April, after seeing how the new contract staff is working out.

Tom Karier suggested including updates of the dashboard.

**The RTF PAC meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.**

## Meeting Attendees

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Jim West	Snohomish PUD
Tom Karier	Northwest Power & Conservation Council
Charlie Grist	Northwest Power & Conservation Council
Tom Eckman	Northwest Power & Conservation Council
Charlie Black	Northwest Power & Conservation Council
Nick O'Neil	Northwest Power & Conservation Council
Jeff Bumgarner	PacifiCorp
Stacy Donohue	Idaho PUC
Bob Stolarski	Puget Sound Energy
Richard Genece	Bonneville Power Administration
Karen Meadows	Bonneville Power Administration
Susan Stratton	NEEA
Eugene Rosolie	Cowlitz PUD
Sara Patton	NW Energy Coalition
Bo Downen	PPC
Bruce Folsom	Avista
Lauren Gage	Bonneville Power Administration
Steve Johnson	Washington UTC
Juliet Johnson	Oregon PUC
Sandra Hirotsu	Northwest Power & Conservation Council
<b>Webinar Attendees</b>	
Erin Erben	Eugene Water & Electric Board
Doug Findlay	Portland General Electric
Steve Bicker	Tacoma Power
Glen Atwood	Seattle City Light
Ralph Goode	Mission Valley Power