



Agenda

Utility-Sponsored DSM Programs Group

March 6, 2012, 2:00 – 3:00 p.m. EST

Participants were asked to:

- *Review a small set of reference materials and be prepared to discuss whether the concepts addressed may apply to Kentucky.*
- *Join in a telephone call to discuss these issues in more depth.*
- *Think about topics/issues you would like to see addressed in Meetings 2 and 3.*

I. Welcome, Introductions – 10 Minutes (2:00-2:10 p.m.)

1. Welcome, introductions
2. Review of Dec. 2 discussions:
 - ❖ IOUs believe the DSM statute works for them, benefits their customers.
 - ❖ Co-ops are working towards a way to resolve DSM filing with the PSC, whether through the statutory or tariff procedure.
 - ❖ There may be some benefit to an expedited review process for certain kinds of DSM programs.
 - ❖ Communication between the utilities and PSC is paramount to smooth program filing, review, and approval.
3. Opportunities to provide feedback outside group forum, contact Samantha by email, phone
4. Designation of group leader/reporter

II. Initial Discussion – 15 Minutes (2:10-2:25 p.m.)

1. Opportunity for roundtable comments re effectiveness of current DSM filing process, whether it be the DSM Statute, or tariff filing
***Please limit individual comments to 2 minutes per person*

///
///

III. Reference Materials – 30 Minutes (2:25-2:55 p.m.)

1. Expedited Review Models in Other States:

- ❖ Participants in the December collaborative were interested in flexibility in DSM program filings, and reducing administrative burden
- ❖ Goal is to encourage enhancement and expansion of efficiency programs, both by IOUs and cooperatives
- ❖ One way other states have achieved flexibility is to shorten the administrative review of certain programs. Below are examples to review:
 - ❖ *Pennsylvania* – Expedited review process to approve minor changes efficiency programs (**see attached Fact Sheet**)
 - Elements:
 1. Prescriptive process
 2. Developed through public comment period
 3. Less than 2 months turn around on minor plan changes
 4. Provides opportunity for public intervention, comment, reply, and appeal.
 - What is the regulators’ perspective on this model, and how might this be implemented in Kentucky? Utilities? Advocates?
 - Would expedited review to approve minor changes relieve administrative burden for the IOUs? For the co-ops?
 - What if this review were applied to programs filed both under the DSM Statute and the tariff filing procedure? Would the procedure be different?
 - Would it be appropriate to extend this expedited review process to other efficiency filings, i.e., new programs that are below a certain funding level, pilot programs, etc.
 - What if this procedure were extended to allow expedited review of programs that have already been run through a collaborative/advisory process prior to filing?
 - ❖ *Missouri* – Expedited Review provision set out in tariff filing (**see attached excerpt**)
 - Request that tariff become effective in fewer than 30 days require Motion for Expedited Treatment.
 - Elements: Simple procedure; PSC discretion
 - How might something like this work in Kentucky?
 - How might this simple procedure function differently than Pennsylvania’s prescriptive procedure? Would it be more or less useful to reduce administrative burden?
 - Would expedited review be possible given the regulators’ docket and staffing limitations?

2. Quick Start Programs:

- ❖ Some states have adopted “Quick Start” programs to help utilities quickly get efficiency programs off the ground, and that can then be expanded to a broader and more comprehensive set of programs over a few years.
- ❖ Quick Start programs have been tested elsewhere, have proven to be effective in delivering measurable near-term benefits while simultaneously positioning administrators to capture additional savings moving forward.
- ❖ *Arkansas Example (see attached Fact Sheet):*
 - How might this approach work in Kentucky?
 - How would this approach assist IOUs in expanding and enhancing their programs, if at all?
 - How would this assist cooperatives?

IV. Next Steps – 5 Minutes (2:55-3:00 p.m.)

1. Topics to address in Meeting 2, March 22