

DRAFT

STRAWMAN DISCUSSION QUESTIONS: EMT STAKEHOLDER SESSIONS

JANUARY 15, 22 and 29, 2010

A. Strawman Introduction

1. Noting that two of the largest wedges shown on Figure 2 are retrofit programs in the Residential and Commercial & Institutional sectors, are there risks in relying on this reservoir of savings over the planning period? What might they be?
2. Should the EMT account for the possibility that plug-in vehicles and electricity-based heating technologies could dramatically change the fuel use forecast shown in Figure 1?
3. Should the EMT account for the possible adoption of mandatory time-of-use pricing for electricity that could make some efficiency strategies more cost-effective?
4. Can the cost-effectiveness tests that are presented in the Appendices work as well for heating system conversions for renewable fuels as for traditional energy efficiency services?
5. Is it a concern that the Strawman focuses primarily on the first four of the eight legislative objectives found at section 10104(E) of the enabling act?
6. Should the EMT consider a different base year for the Savings Targets presented in Table 1, such as 2008 or a projection for 2020?

B. Program Overview

1. Can retrofits be undertaken in a way that avoids repeat visits and additional administrative costs – i.e. “one stop shopping” for the homeowner or business?
2. How much will the implementation of EMT programs depend on teams of government employees as opposed to private-sector contractors? Is the answer important to achievement of any of the legislative objectives?
3. Are there any particular considerations or approaches that deserve consideration for delivering EMT services and programs in Northern, Western and Downeast Maine? How important are geographical considerations?

4. Regarding building codes, efficiency standards and building performance labeling, should these efforts get started immediately in the first Triennial Year or should they wait?
5. Can on-bill financing enable Maine customers to more readily sign up for energy efficiency or alternative heating system investments?
6. How much should the costs of efficiency investments be covered by program funds as opposed to participant dollars? Will cost coverage vary depending on the customer class involved or the type of investment?
7. Will types of "Smart Grid" investments in geographically-targeted efficiency create benefits both for affected end-users and also in enhanced grid reliability?
8. How should the EMT reconcile or manage the differences in funding criteria and cost-effectiveness that exist for ARRA/"Stimulus"-funded programs as opposed to SBC/ratepayer-funded programs?

C. Sector Programs: Residential

1. What options exist for promoting weatherization of (non-low income) homes heated with propane or heating oil?
2. What types of incentives are necessary to secure significant participation in EMT residential programs at locations relying on propane or heating oil?
3. Can or should firewood play a role in achieving the legislative objectives of the enabling legislation?
4. Will renewable energy investments be evaluated on the same basis as energy efficiency measures and services? How can this be accomplished?
5. Should the EMT endorse creation of mandatory standards for water-heater insulation/wraps?

D. Sector Programs: Commercial & Institutional

1. What are the most promising opportunities for reducing residual oil usage at Commercial & Institutional locations? For promoting more efficient consumption of natural gas?
2. What types of heating/cooling technologies deserve the EMT's consideration for commercial and institutional locations?

3. Are their fruitful approaches for capturing reductions in fossil-fuel consumption at locations like “Big Box” stores whose management decisions are made out of state?
4. Should the EMT pursue investment in on-site electric generation technologies that are designed to serve a single end-user? Multiple end-users?
5. Should “Trade Allies” continue to play a critical role as the interface between customer and Efficiency Maine?

E. Sector Programs: Industrial Programs

1. Are their methods for reducing peak electric demand at an industrial location that the customer is unwilling or unable to consider without EMT assistance?
2. How likely is it that industrial customers will adopt advice from outside EMT consultants for improvements in process efficiency? How can this be made more likely?
3. What are the most promising opportunities for reducing residual oil usage at industrial locations? For increasing efficient consumption of natural gas?
4. How critical is a given “hurdle rate”, such as a two-year payback, in the way investment decisions are made within industrial organizations? How can the EMT best address these decision-making criteria?
5. Given the complexity of the EMT’s mandate and its status as a public entity, how likely is it that a potential industrial participant will be disinclined to sign up for a EMT program? How can this problem be addressed?

Note: Each Stakeholder Session will also include opportunities for individuals or organizations to provide general comment on the EMT planning process and/or to make a presentation on a particular issue, program or technology. Presentations will be limited to no more than ten minutes each in order to reserve time for interactive discussion.

Please send requests, suggested questions or comments to the Stakeholder Session facilitator, Stephen Ward, at steve@midcoast.com or to:

Stephen Ward, Perkins Point Energy Consulting
116 Perkins Point Rd., Newcastle ME 04553

