



DATE: Tuesday, December 13, 2016
TIME: 11 AM
LOCATION: Xcel Energy Larimer Office

Meeting Minutes for 2016 RE-TOU and R-TDR Pilot Study and Evaluation Plan

Call to Order

- **Meeting to Discuss**

- Marketing, Communication and Enrollment Plan

- **Attendee Names**

Xcel Energy	Carla Scarsella, Jennifer Augustine, Tandy Dilworth, Louise Wood, Ryan Matley, Steve Wishart, Jaclyn Webb, Scott Brockett, Kristen, Kerry Klemm
SWEEP	Adam Bickford
WRA	Gwen Farnsworth
CPUC Staff	Jason Peuquet, Erin O'Neill, Fiona Sigalla
OCC	Cindy Schonhaut, Cory Skluzak, Tom Dixon
EFCA	Jake Schlesinger

- **On the Phone:**

EOC	Skip Arnold
EFCA	Brian Warshay
SUNRUN	Gracie Walovich
CPUC Staff	Michael Santisi
Vote Solar	Rick Gilliam

Overview:

Ryan Matley from Xcel Energy presented the Marketing, Communications and Enrollment plan developed by the Product Development Team. We also presented the initial letter to be sent to customers along with the marketing material accompany the letter. Finally, the Company presented the enrollment intake form for comment.

Discussion:

XE: What is the overlap between low-income and energy assistance? We have maybe hundreds of thousands of low income customers who are not on energy assistance. It would be easier for Xcel energy to consider the low income hold harmless customers as those who receive energy assistance because we do not have the ability to verify income.

SWEEP: Wants XE to see if there are differences between low income customers and other types.

COSEIA: Can we do this by zip?

EOC: No. Due to gentrification, we do not have zip codes that are primarily low income. We would just hold harmless the energy assistance customers? Yes.

XE: We will have information on the form for individuals to self-report income, but we will not hold them harmless even if their reported income falls into a low income category.

OCC: If a customer is in more than one segment, will they be placed in one segment and tracked by that attribute? How will we pick which bucket a customer with multiple attributes goes into? Will there be a protocol system of ranking attributes?

XE: We will put them in the M&V bucket (designed to ensure statistical significance) based on the protocol system of ranking attributes as described in the Study and Evaluation Plan, but there will be secondary attributes and can be analyzed (though not necessarily guaranteed with statistical significance).

Staff: Will we provide documentation on both RD-TDR or RE-TOU to the solar developers for equal marketing? Add to the questionnaire a question about how a customer selected their final rate, i.e. were they aware of both rates, etc. (this is something that Xcel Energy would collect). Trying to get at whether the individual customer selected the rate or if it was more of a developer driven decision?

XE: Yes.

COSEIA: In the intake form process, ask solar customers about their awareness of both rates. The developer will be motivated by self-interest and select the rate on the whole that is best for the developer in the long run.

EFCA: We will be sharing the email/direct mail messaging?

SWEEP: If an existing solar customer signs up for RD-TDR do they get the new REC or is there a methodology where an existing solar customer would find the RD-TDR rate more attractive even without the REC incentive.

XE: Existing solar customers switching to RD-TDR will not be assigned a new REC.

OCC: Denver Electric Vehicle council could help us target EV customers - as well as other entities.

COSEIA: Is there a reason a customer would be rejected from the trial?

XE: No, the customer will be given the rate they choose.

EOC: If the customer is individually metered then we will put the premise on the rate. If it's multi-family housing with one meter then those customers will be on the C-Rate so they will be ineligible for the rate.

Staff: It would be beneficial to review the developers down the road to see which rate they prefer.

COSEIA: Is there a place in the process where developers can be reviewed about their choice of rate?

Staff: How aware is the customer of the rate they are placed on based on the developer? Is there a place to ensure the customer understands the choice? Could the developers' choice of rate affect the design of the panels?

XE: We will reach out to groups that can help us locate additional EV customers.

OCC: AARP would like to be involved, Kelly Fritz, is available to talk. Kelli Fritz' name provided by Bill Levis from AARP – Bill really wants AARP to participate in a meaningful way.

Staff: We need to define senior. People who are on a fixed income, not working, home during the day, may have a health issue, technologically challenged?

OCC: 62 and above?

WRA: 65 and above? But will accept 62.

XE: Senior will be defined generally as 62 and over but the Company cannot get as granular in the system. Prizm data defines 55 and up and it will depend on the segment selected by the customer. Group decided that the definition of Senior will be 62 or older.

COSEIA, SWEEP – ok with getting information regarding who seniors are, not ok with having AARP doing the actual marketing.

Xcel Energy – modify questions 11 and 20 on the intake form to reflect the senior population of 62 and above. We have agreements with landlords where we can target some renters.

Staff: Employee enrollment program – may not be a great idea. The group doesn't want us to market specifically to the Company.

Xcel Energy: We assured everyone that the Company would not induce or reward employees for signing up on the RD-TDR rate or the RE-TOU rate.

WRA: What channels will be used to recruit customers for the program? Will XE be coordinating with these channels or customers? XE should be communicating with customers in addition to the channels communicating with customers also to ensure alignment in messaging.

XE: All the channels will drive customers back to XE's website for enrollment.

EOC: Will a meter be installed for each renter under the rate?

XE: The person getting the rate should be the person signing up and paying and will be addressed in the questionnaire.

We will add information to the questionnaire about whether or not the customer who pays the bill is the customer who is placed on the rate. (i.e., are you responsible for paying your own electric bill?)

OCC: Will we refer to the programs as pilots or trials?

Xcel Energy – we are using customer friendly messaging that discusses this as a test.

WRA: The key distinction to customers is that one rate is an energy rate and one is a demand rate and should be included in the marketing material.

Staff: Will there be a waiting list for customers if we meet our goal? We should be prepared to manage a waitlist.

XE: With the 60 day window, that allows us the flexibility and we expect it to even out the enrollment and customers being placed on rates. We would be willing to revise the tariff to add more time and define the start date to 90 days.

SWEEP: Recommends that we have a waitlist if we are approaching capacity for one of the rates.

Staff – perhaps suggest some tweaks to the tariff language to allow some flexibility in the installation of a meter and when a Customer is accepted onto the rate.

Suggest that we make a filing if something is inhibiting the study that we make a modification to the study/tariff language.

Staff – is the enrollment rate based on Xcel's experience or external?

XE: The enrollment rate is based on Xcel's experience.

OCC: Who is the meter vendor? Is the same meter installed for both pilots?

XE: The meter is the same and will be using 15 minute interval data and send back for analysis.

XE: Vendor for meters is Itron.

Staff: When will the meters be read? Will the meters be installed on April 1 or prior?

XE: On the customers read date, meters will be installed as soon the customer is signed up for the rate. By the end of April we plan to have 3,200 people on the rate.

CPUC, EFCA – how will we prorate the rates particularly the demand rate charge.

XE: We have a methodology to do this and to pro-rate it accordingly.

Staff: wants to modify the messaging to reflect a message that says something closer to “managing your energy use means saving money”. Also for the demand charge, need to message that each month the demand charge gets reset.

Also need to say that the customer can switch to the other rate. As far as the rates that are shown – it doesn't appear that anyone would go on the RE-TOU rate because they run the risk of a higher bill in almost all periods. Cannot save enough energy to cover the difference between the current rate and the RE-TOU rate so they would not recommend this rate to a customer.

Are we taking into consideration that peak energy use is the most expensive so individuals will shift their usage? There would be revenue erosion from customers who shift energy use so we would need an elasticity adjustment to recover the complete revenue requirement.

Revenue neutrality is not reflected in the meter rates. Therefore a customer has to pay for the meter and then be revenue neutral. Need a higher reward for the off peak reduction.

SWEEP – can we provide a better incentive for off peak reduction?

Staff: Should a bill comparison be inserted in the customer recruitment letter as opposed to the current table showing the three rates.

XE: We will provide a spreadsheet showing the rates in more detail – bill comparison (Steve W.). Bill comparison may also be used in lieu of the table in the current letter.

OCC: Graphics would help sell the TOU rate as a benefit to the customer.

COSEIA: The introduction of the control group is problematic – wants more language around the control group and how it gets introduced – i.e. that there is a significant chance that you will not get on the rate, but that the control group is a critical component. We also need to add some discussion around when you could get a meter and when you would be placed on the rate.

EFCA: Doesn't like the wording of "this premium won't apply..." doesn't like the characterization that there is a premium being applied to certain hours. Second bullet doesn't like the language of lowest, third bullet avoid saying that, "you can avoid paying the highest rates".

XE: We will delete this language.

EFCA: The chart is problematic because of how it frames the rates that were agreed to. We have to convey the rates. Add a row for a bill under different customer assumptions, i.e. Customer A (does nothing), Customer B (shifts 10% of energy), Customer C (doesn't save, ...)

OCC – explain kW and kWh. We should say electricity, not just energy so that people don't get confused that this may also apply to gas. Why do we not mention air conditioning with the time of use rate?

XE: We can look to add A/C as another indicator in the letter or graphic.

SWEEP: The demand rates that are shown do not represent or explain that there are two demand charges so that people are not surprised. Stagger is not the best word to use throughout doesn't think that stagger is comprehensible to everyone. Put more of a delineation between the RE-TOU and the RD-TDR. Move the Demand Rates row up above the Energy Rates row.

SWEEP – rather than saying that if you are consistently able to reduce your demand, say that do this every hour of every weekday.

WRA: Letter to include peak demand charges and bring clarity to the 2 different demand charges.

OCC: Tier 1 and 2 should be changed to colons as opposed to a dash.

WRA: Stagger should be changed to shift or another choice of terms. Bigger break between rates and use info graphics. In comparison, put demand rates above energy rate comparison.

EFCA: How will the developers become engaged?

XE: We will likely meet with developers in a different forum to understand their needs.

EFCA: Will we put this in the miscellaneous docket?

XE: it is not clear from the order – we will have to wait for the miscellaneous docket repository order.

XE: Parties will review the intake survey and marketing material and provide the Company a version with all comments incorporated. We will provide a date in which the letter needs to be final and a new version.

We will get the deadlines out to the Stakeholder group and then the Stakeholder group will organize to get all of the comments incorporated. Right now the group agrees to review content and messaging and not critique format at present.

Action Items:

1. Send out the final email / direct mail messaging materials once available.
2. Check to see how representative our energy assistance customers are of all low income customers as a whole.
3. Steve Wishart to provide a table of rates to show the bill impacts of the RE-TOU and the R all in rates – provide to Erin. In this spreadsheet,
4. Modify the customer enrollment letter per the discussion. Send out to the group for review. This will be sent out after we determine how the rates are presented. Ryan to provide a date.