PROGRAM PLANNING COMMITTEE
OF THE
NEW YORK STATE
ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Minutes of the 87th Meeting
Held on April 7, 2014

Pursuant to a Notice and Agenda dated March 26, 2014 and a Revised Notice and Agenda dated March 31, 2014, the 87th meeting of the Program Planning Committee ("Committee") of the NEW YORK STATE ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY was convened at 11:30 a.m. on Monday, April 7, 2014, in the Authority's Board Room at 17 Columbia Circle, Albany, New York and by video conference at the offices of the New York State Division of Housing and Community Renewal at 641 Lexington Avenue, 4th Floor, New York, New York.

The following Members of the Committee were present in Albany, unless otherwise indicated:

Mark Willis, Committee Chair (New York City)
Robert B. Catell (New York City)
David D. Elliman (New York City)
Richard Kauffman (New York City)
Elizabeth W. Thorndike, Ph.D.

Also present in either Albany or New York City were: John B. Rhodes, President and CEO of NYSERDA; David Margalit, Chief Operating Officer, Janet Joseph, Vice President for Technology and Strategic Planning; Tom Barone, Acting Vice President for Energy Services; Jeffrey J. Pitkin, Treasurer; Hal Brodie, General Counsel; Valerie S. Milonovich, Senior Counsel and Secretary to the Committee; and various other members of the Authority staff.

Mr. Willis called the meeting to order, noted the presence of a quorum, and stated that a Notice of the meeting was mailed to Committee Members and the press on March 26, 2014 and a Revised Notice of the meeting (attached hereto as Exhibit A) was mailed on March 31, 2014. Each of the Committee Members introduced themselves.

## Approval of January 13, 2014 Minutes

The first agenda item concerned the approval of the minutes of the 86th meeting of the Committee held on January 13, 2014. Upon motion duly made and seconded, and by unanimous voice vote, the minutes of the 86th meeting of the Committee were approved.

## Program Management and Metrics Discussion

Allyson Burns, Program Manager, Performance Management and Evaluation Systems (PMES) Program, began the presentation by discussing how the reported metrics align with the Authority's current mission outcomes. Major mission outcomes for the Authority are: (1) the

efficient use of energy which leads to energy bill savings; (2) renewable and diverse energy supplies which lead to increasing the installed photovoltaic capacity; (3) a cleaner environment which leads to greenhouse gas (GHG) reductions; and (4) a clean energy economy which leads to an increase in start-up companies served, additional investment leverage between private capital and Authority-provided funding, and the NY Green Bank initiative. Two additional strategic initiatives being tracked are Charge NY and resiliency and energy preparedness.

In response to Mr. Willis' inquiry as to how the metrics were developed, Ms. Burns explained that they are the best attempt, to date, to represent the Authority's performance as a whole.

In response to Mr. Elliman's inquiry as to when the metrics were developed, Ms. Burns explained that they have been under development for about six months. Ms. Joseph added that the intention is to ensure that the metrics are both meaningful and clear.

Ms. Burns presented the installed energy efficiency electric and gas savings for programs that were implemented by the Authority between 2009 and 2013. She described a reduction in electric savings of about 200 gigawatt hours (GWhs) during 2013 as attributable to the measure life expiration for certain lighting measures.

In response to a clarifying question by Mr. Willis, Ms. Jennifer Meissner, Program Manager, PMES, further explained the methodology used to determine the measure life of certain lighting technologies. She also explained the approaches to tracking and accounting for the potential replacement of such lighting measures through the Authority's various ongoing evaluation efforts.

In response to inquiries by Mr. Catell with regard to the quality of field data, Ms. Meissner explained that data is collected during various project stages. It is also collected on-site from the Authority's implementation contractors. Evaluation and additional measurement and verification activities are also used to determine actual savings. Mr. Catell expressed his interest in ensuring the quality of the field data. Ms. Meissner added that a significant amount of the Authority's evaluation budget is allocated to measurement and verification, analysis of pre- and post energy consumption information, metering and field monitoring, as well as the verification of engineering estimates and baseline energy use estimates.

In response to Mr. Catell's inquiry as to whether the Authority's internal audit unit should be more involved in issues of data quality, Mr. Rhodes stated that it is, in fact, one of the main agenda items for the internal audit stream of work and audit staff has already completed audits of this type of data within certain program areas.

In response to inquiries from Mr. Catell as to whether the data is weather normalized, Ms. Meissner explained that weather normalization is part of the Authority's impact evaluation activities. She further explained the Authority's approach to assessing the first year of energy savings attributable to an installed energy measure. She stated that this approach is consistent with industry standards and, in some cases, persistence studies are undertaken to reexamine energy savings at future points in time. She cautioned, however, that the Authority has done little in the way of persistence studies as that approach can be costly.

Mr. Kauffman inquired as to how to attribute energy savings or emissions reductions from Authority activities that may fund "intermediaries" in the market which are successful activities despite that the funding is not directed toward an individual project. Ms. Meissner provided information about the Authority's efforts with "mid-market" programs, with retailers and others, and the use of market survey mechanisms. She explained that much of this work began with lighting program efforts and programs involving ENERGY STAR products. Evaluation approaches can collect data from the audience affected by the program, along with sales and other data to ascertain energy savings that can be reasonably credited toward the program. She added that this speaks to the challenge of needing to obtain large amounts of sales, saturation, and measure level data in order to appropriately characterize the impact of market transformation activities.

Mr. Rhodes added that the question raised can be interpreted as one that goes beyond ease of measurement and attribution, but that also speaks to overall policy objectives and to what other involved State agencies may consider to be important activities. Ms. Joseph added that, as the Authority looks to the future, metrics will need to be developed that more accurately reflect any new organizational activities.

Mr. Willis suggested that the data presented should answer two questions: what has the Authority accomplished this year to increase energy efficiency, and what impact have the Authority's efforts had on the larger population? Mr. Elliman added that he would also be interested in the cost required to obtain those results.

In response to the presentation of the first major mission outcome, Energy Bill Savings, a discussion ensued with regard to the data provided beginning with Mr. Catell's inquiry as to how commodity prices and weather were considered. Clarifications were provided that explained that the presented energy bill savings of about 9% for natural gas and about 3.5% for electricity were tempered by the decrease in natural gas prices.

Mr. Kauffman suggested that, as the data is only applicable to program participants, it is difficult to picture what the overall potential could be for achieving greater savings and how to determine the magnitude of impact that these programmatic efforts achieved overall.

Ms. Joseph added that this specific metric was developed as it was thought to be the most meaningful to the general public. She added that it does not necessarily explain that there are many confounding factors involved in its portrayal that are beyond the Authority's control.

Ms. Burns presented information on the acquisition costs of energy efficiency, reporting that the Program cost of acquisition for electric benefits is $205 per megawatt hour (MWh), with a target acquisition cost of $144 per MWh. She explained that the difference above the target is largely attributable to the Point-of-Sale Lighting Program. Ms. Burns reported that the program cost of acquisition for gas savings is lower than its target.

By providing an illustrative example, Mr. Rhodes added that although the Authority is currently missing its electric target, the efforts are still a worthy investment in terms of saving energy and saving energy costs.

In response to comments by Mr. Catell, Ms. Joseph stated that, at about 20 cents per kilowatt hour (kWh) for electricity, the Authority's efforts are still delivering a good value, despite operating above its target. She added, depending on gas commodity prices, the value proposition for gas efficiency efforts are more difficult to gauge at any given time.

In response to Mr. Kauffman, Ms. Joseph stated that the value proposition becomes even greater when the benefits considered go beyond monetary benefits and begin to consider other factors such as environmental benefits and wholesale price suppression.

Mr. Kauffman added that future issues for consideration should include whether the Authority is potentially stepping in the way of other entities that may be able to conduct this work, identifying if there is more that can be accomplished, analyzing whether the Authority has developed a low-cost energy efficiency business model, and whether it is necessary to continue to fund certain program efforts with ratepayer funding.

Mr. Rhodes responded by stating that this is an occasion whereby a performance assessment often leads to a broader strategy conversation. He stated that the Authority is in the throes of that broader conversation through its Corporate Strategy Assessment, including addressing issues such as whether there is a better way for the Authority to approach its work or to acquire energy savings more efficiently, or whether there is another entity that can acquire the same results more economically.

Ms. Burns presented information showing energy efficiency sector-level impacts, including two programs that are contributing well. The New Construction and Industrial Process and Efficiency Programs are ahead of their electric targets. Most natural gas programs are also ahead of their targets, with the exception of residential market-based programs. It was reported that the residential programs which are adversely affected by measure payback estimates that are not allowed under current Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standard rules or rules with regard to On-Bill Recovery Financing. It was also reported that fuel oil efficiency presents an additional opportunity, but the Authority lacks available funding to further pursue additional efficiency in this area.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Elliman regarding funding to support fuel oil efficiency efforts, Mr. Rhodes described the issues as an important and perennial topic from a carbon emissions perspective. The Authority would like to pursue opportunities that are fuel neutral and that can do the most good. He stated that fuel oil efficiency is high on that list but funding constraints do not currently allow for additional efforts.

In response to comments by Mr. Catell that the market should resolve this owing to the tremendous price differential between oil and gas, Mr. Rhodes stated that oil-to-gas conversions and achieving efficiency are two different issues. A major issue is that gas is not available to many energy consumers who would consider it.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Willis as to why targets are not being met, Mr. Barone stated that it is clear that electric targets are not being met and that is primarily attributable to the Point-of-Sale Lighting effort that was unsuccessful. The Program is being redesigned to include

incentives for lighting measures that were not previously permitted, and although the new effort is unlikely to achieve the entire goal, the redesign is expected to significantly increase the performance of the program.

In response to further questions on the intent of the program, Mr. Barone explained that Authority staff is confident that there remains substantial energy savings potential in the lighting market. He added that this is a very low-cost program if functioning properly and that there are substantial targets associated with this program. Mr. Rhodes added that staff is attempting to find a solution that will be an appropriate use of ratepayer dollars in order to achieve those potential savings and that Authority staff is very attentive to the concern that the program design must be an appropriate use of ratepayer funding in order to achieve those savings. Mr. Barone stated that the redesign will push the market to light emitting diodes (LEDs).

Mr. Elliman expressed concern that the lighting market has shifted, that the program is no longer necessary, and that the Authority may not be being responsive to that market change.

Mr. Willis questioned the value of maintaining the metric.

Dr. Thorndike asked about the percentage of the Authority's expenditures allocated to lighting and the importance of lighting, in general, in the market. Ms. Joseph stated that less than 10% of total efficiency budget is allocated to lighting efforts, but about 38% of savings targets are allocated to lighting initiatives.

Mr. Rhodes stated that if Authority staff is not convinced that it will be putting forth a program that is better than what the market can accomplish now or in the future, it is not something that should be pursued.

Mr. Kauffman stated that the Authority should play a role where the market is not, and if there is an investment to be made that can move the market, that is a role that the Authority should play.

Ms. Meissner described a lighting evaluation study that examined saturation and penetration rates of the different lighting technologies, stating that there appears to be significant savings potential on the order of magnitude of the current unattained Point-of-Sale Lighting Program target. This information is being considered in the CSA process in order to further understand and inform the future program design.

Mr. Barone reported that staff is having communications with the performance contracting sector of the market, as staff believes there is a large opportunity to attract energy service companies (ESCOs) into the commercial sector in New York. He explained that ESCOs generally do not participate in the commercial sector due to the traditional business model. However, he stated that recent communications have opened up the possibility of a changing model and the industry is interested in tying that new model to the Green Bank, which if successful, could be a large increase in activity.

Ms. Joseph described additional areas under exploration as items that will be examined during the Corporate Strategic Assessment (CSA). These include strategies to increase demand

generation, theories of change around critical customer decision points; strategies to "go-to-market"; and exploring potential sources of funding for fuel oil efficiency.

Turning to the renewable energy data, Ms. Burns stated that the Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) Main Tier continues to be dominated by wind resources and although the Main Tier will not meet its target, the Customer-Sited Tier (CST) is on track to meet the goals. Regarding the mission outcome for installed renewable energy capacity, the NY-Sun Initiative Petition submitted to the New York State Public Service Commission (PSC) requires 24% compounded growth for 10 years to achieve a target of 3 GWs of installed capacity. There are currently submitted projects that propose about 120 MWs, which is equivalent to about two years of projects.

Ms. Joseph stated that the conclusions and implications from the performance and evaluation data concerning large-scale renewable resource generation is that low energy commodity prices have dampened development of large wind projects and that trend is continuing. The New York market is less favorable than other markets in the country. However, a recently completed evaluation for the RPS Main Tier Program shows that, despite the lower scale of renewable energy development in the State and the unlikelihood of reaching the target, the 2,000 MWs that have been installed under this program have been built with a $5 to $1 benefit cost ratio. Overall, the Authority's efforts are not accelerating the market as much as staff had hoped, but the efforts are continuing to accelerate the market overall.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Elliman as to whether the projects have been profitable, Ms. Joseph stated that the pipeline of projects is shrinking as developers are not recognizing the profitability, or they perceive the risks to be greater that they are willing to bear. The Main Tier Program is being redesigned to devise a more effective strategy to provide a hedge against dropping commodity prices. Another goal is to reduce the New York State-provided incentive over time. Ultimately, it is believed that wind energy will not require a public incentive, but at what point in time that decision will be made will depend on natural gas prices.

Additional RPS issues under exploration are determining how to map a post-2015/2016 policy in New York and defining the role of off-shore wind that holds the promise of great amounts of capacity, but is pricier.

Ms. Burns described the GHG reduction metric that was developed along with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC). The Authority's role is to publish, as a percentage, how much its activities contribute to the overall State GHG reductions. Ms. Burns explained the presented data by pointing out that in the years 2012 to 2013, the Authority began using a new factor consistent with that which was used in the State Energy Plan that accounted for less coal and oil power generation. Authority programs reduced total State emissions by 0.86% in 2013, and target for 2014 is 1%.

In response to inquiries by Mr. Elliman and Dr. Thorndike about whether other emissions are measured beyond carbon dioxide, it was stated that carbon dioxide was selected as one to which it was easy for the public to relate.

Ms. Meissner stated that for R&D and the clean energy economy efforts, a data series for key metrics is being developed including product sales, product development, companies receiving support, and products brought to market. Efforts are underway to develop and collect better data to support evaluation and more meaningful economic metrics. Incubator activity is most dominant at this time, and is effectively supporting start-up companies in terms of raising private capital and graduating companies. Proof-of-concept centers are in the early stages of rollout but have a high degree of faculty, mentor and student engagement and the Authority expects to see comparable performance in a few years.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Willis about additional information regarding start-up companies, Ms. Meissner described additional metrics as being the number of full-time-equivalent personnel through the incubator efforts, the tracking of product sales, and the amount of private sector funds invested.

Ms. Joseph stated that the fundamental data challenge is the long-term nature of technology and business development investments. The Authority recently completed an evaluation study of the demonstration portfolio, and for every dollar invested in a demonstration project, the Authority has consistently generated $7 in benefits, a significant piece of information that could not be previously characterized. With regard to the product development portfolio, the benefit to cost ratio is about $6.

Ms. Joseph stated that, given these new findings, Authority staff is trying to leverage demonstration projects to bridge the gap between early commercial technology development and market adoption. There is also a push for the integration between business and technology milestones in project work scopes and contracts. She stated that the issues under exploration to drive future actions are the same issues that will be examined in the CSA. Those are to identify high potential technology and market areas with relevance to New York; to map out and animate innovation capabilities in the State; to seek strategic allocations of R&D resources across sectors, portfolios and projects; and to identify new ways to increase funding for innovation.

Ms. Meissner presented information on Investment Leverage which represents the ratio of private investment to NYSERDA investment. The investments are reported in the quarter in which the private investment is captured or contracted and does not include subsequent or follow on private investment as it is difficult to capture. For NYSERDA overall, the leverage ratio has remained relatively consistent with about $3 of private investment for every $1 of NYSERDA investment.

Ms. Meissner stated that the key observations are: the leverage of traditional Authority energy programs is dependent on program design and energy prices, and the addition of the Green Bank is anticipated to increase the leverage ratio. The Green Bank has the potential to drive private investment with very low levels of actual expenditures by the Authority. The example used for potential includes $200 million of private investment driven by the Green Bank during its first year of operation. The expected contribution will be forecast after the Green Bank business plan is complete.

Mr. Griffin, President of the NY Green Bank, presented information on the Green Bank initiative. He reported that a competitive solicitation was released and that the Green Bank Team was focused most recently on outreach efforts. Staff has attended about 15 conferences, met with about 140 market participants of late, and about 250 overall. Market participants include energy service companies, banks and developers of all sizes, technology providers, manufacturers, and specialty finance companies. Technologies encompassed within these outreach meetings include solar, energy efficiency, energy storage, anaerobic digestion, waste-to-energy, woody biomass generation, and geothermal providers. Sectors encompassed include residential, commercial, industrial, commercial real estate, multifamily, municipalities, universities, schools, and hospitals. Meetings have occurred over all geographic areas of the State.

Mr. Griffin reported that the Team has received formal proposals in response to the solicitation and will proceed with due diligence in response to some. It has been determined that some proposals will not proceed, and proposers of those have been encouraged to seek feedback from the Authority. The Team anticipates a good number of additional credible proposals in the coming weeks and months.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Willis, Mr. Pitkin explained that the metric on Investment Leverage was based upon assumptions contained in the Green Bank consultant report that looked at a variety of financing mechanisms and estimates of anticipated Green Bank capital ratios to outside investment.

Mr. Margalit, Chief Operating Officer, presented information on customer satisfaction metrics. He stated that the Authority will continue to measure certain parts of its contracting process and the goal is to achieve a better understanding of market penetration, responsiveness to customers, and the cost per unit as a more robust set of metrics. He also stated that Authority staff will continue to drive down contracting cycle times. Mr. Margalit stated that the Authority will continue to leverage data in real time to better inform decision-making and to acquire actionable insights on how to make future improvements.

Mr. Margalit stated that performance metrics and evaluation activities are areas where the Authority consistently builds capability and the main goal is to turn the information into actionable data that is used in its decision-making.

Mr. Willis thanked everyone for their hard work and recommended taking a hard look at the metrics and to develop them to be more consistent with the Authority's strategic planning.

**Corporate Strategy Assessment Status Update**

Kevin Hale, Director of Corporate Strategy and Planning, provided an update of the Authority's Corporate Strategy Assessment (CSA). This effort is intended to assess current market needs and to refresh the directions and strategies of the Authority. The primary goals of the Assessment are to increase the impact of the Authority's work and to improve responsiveness to customers.

Mr. Hale reported that, although still early in the process, he was able to report on some activities and any feedback from the Committee would be appreciated as the process continues. He addressed the resources that have been allocated to conduct the effort. He stated that, in addition to support and engagement from the Administration's energy leadership and senior staff at the Department of Public Service, the Authority has created an internal Corporate Strategy and Planning Team. The Team consists of about 8 individuals that represent various program areas of the Authority, including Energy Analysis, Performance Management, Deployment, Research and Development, and Marketing.

Mr. Hale provided a detailed overview of the effort, stating that it is designed to provide an objective, market-oriented assessment of the Authority's corporate strategy. This includes taking a fresh look at where the Authority has the biggest opportunity to make a positive impact in the clean energy space in New York. The CSA will touch on all aspects of the Authority's activities and the results will include preferred strategies and programs that will help the Authority accelerate the cost-effective deployment of clean energy and to stimulate technology and business innovation in the clean energy economy. The CSA will also build on the Authority's existing mission, analyses, market expertise, and experience. It will also include substantial input from relevant experts, including program staff, and market participants.

The Team is hopeful that Members of the Committee will provide additional input throughout the process. The CSA will be based on three key elements: to be as thoughtful and pragmatic as possible; to remain market-oriented; and to engage staff. In addition to two recent all-staff sessions to introduce staff to the CSA, the Team is also planning to incorporate a more formal staff information input process through structured interviews or workshops.

Mr. Hale stated that the timing for the effort was developed based the schedule of the State's energy policy activities and the policy goals of the Draft State Energy Plan (SEP). The SEP goals include: improving energy affordability; reducing the carbon intensity of the energy sector by 50% by 2030; increasing the total investment in the clean energy economy; and increasing the use of the existing electric infrastructure. With regard to the State energy policy activities, Mr. Hale stated that the Authority's major program portfolios funded by the System Benefits Charge (SBC) and the Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) are slated for reconsideration by the New York State Public Service Commission (PSC) in the 2015-2016 timeframe. The CSA will be a means to inform the policy making and regulatory processes.

Mr. Hale provided additional context on the goal of reducing the carbon intensity goal. He stated that preliminary analysis shows that there is still a tremendous amount of potential in the buildings and industrial process sectors for reducing energy use in New York State, beyond that which can be achieved through the efforts of the currently structured Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standard (EEPS).

Mr. Hale also described the current priorities of the CSA Team which includes conducting market segmentation and characterization research whereby approximately 12 market sectors and subsectors will be evaluated. The Team will also be examining the barriers to adopting clean energy in high potential sectors, and the decision-making processes and decision points that

indicate where can those sectors can be best influenced with regard to energy investment decisions.

The CSA Team is in the process of securing a consultant through a competitive solicitation process as a means of addressing the ambitious schedule for the effort in addition to seeking an objective perspective and market research and analysis expertise. The Team is also identifying and prioritizing various hypotheses. For example, in the multifamily deployment area, one hypothesis is that a greater focus on decisions regarding refinancing could elevate clean energy investments. With regard to R&D efforts, one hypothesis is that better results will be achieved if the Authority's support for R&D investments that lead to technical, financial and market milestones are provided in a more timely and targeted manner. The Team is also identifying industry experts and market actors that will be called upon to test new ideas. Current programs are also being assessed for low-effort, high impact opportunities and near-term improvements to stimulate more success.

With regard to next steps, Mr. Hale stated that a more detailed work plan with deliverables, timeframes, and milestones will be developed. Also, the Team will be working to identify high potential end use clean energy sectors, subsectors, and technology and business innovation market areas. The identification of priority program strategies and the roles of market actors will follow. The findings will be analyzed and refined to result in program strategies. These program strategies will allow the Authority to put forth in the regulatory arena the strategies and programs that will best fit the State's energy policy directions.

Mr. Hale stated that on a parallel track to the longer term transformational efforts of the CSA, the Team will be engaging the Authority's program staff to identify near-term operational improvement ideas for the current program portfolio so as to best maximize the Authority's effectiveness in the near term.

In response to inquiries by Mr. Willis, Mr. Hale stated that a specific CSA timetable will be developed within the next month and staff hopes to have a clearer view on the Authority's future role with regard to energy efficiency and end-use customers in the July 2014 time frame. Mr. Rhodes added that preliminary results from the consultant will be due within four to five months, with the phasing of more results along the way. In response to Mr. Willis' inquiry regarding the timing for hiring the consultant, Mr. Rhodes stated that proposals have been received and a review was scheduled for later in the day.

Dr. Thorndike expressed her concern that the effort to combat global climate change requires leadership, as it reflects the cumulative impact of countless local decisions. She expressed concerns that there was a lack of emphasis on the need to involve local sectors in Authority activities. Mr. Rhodes assured Dr. Thorndike that local decision-making is inherent in this effort and the daily business of the Authority. Dr. Thorndike was appreciative and stated that, despite the fact that the Authority is engaged in very important activities, there are other areas such as zoning and land use decisions that occur at the local level. She stated that the State's towns, cities, and counties have important and ongoing roles. Dr. Thorndike also stated that education should be a component in everything the Authority does if the ultimate goal is to change behavior.

Mr. Catell believes that the CSA is an important undertaking for the Authority at this point in time and it is implicit that the Authority's role should be where it can be most effective in the market. He also stated that there should be continued emphasis on the research and development component.

Mr. Kauffman cautioned that the end result needs to be a New York State-oriented plan and it must be clear with regard to what results can be influenced by the Authority. He stated that the end product may identify some sectors that are irrelevant to New York and even within a sector, there may be areas that cannot be influenced. He stated that certain hardware costs are an example of an area that is difficult for the State alone to influence, so perhaps the focus would be more appropriate on the soft costs of certain technologies. Mr. Kauffman also stated that the plan should identify ways to enable markets and to identify whether markets are too far in the future to be relevant efforts. He also stated that a few very effective programs that move the needle and produce a better outcome is preferable to a large number of programs that may not.

Mr. Elliman stated that the Team should be strategic and sensitive when considering where Authority funding originates and where benefits are received. He stated that this could be a challenge given the amount of funding that originates from electric customers if some of the highest energy savings potential is found in other energy sectors.

Mr. Rhodes stated that the Authority is taking this effort very seriously and the Team is aware of potential pitfalls that it will strive to avoid. He stated that there is a desire that this continues to be a meaningful conversation with the Committee.

Mr. Willis indicated that the last item on the agenda was other business and asked if there were any other matters the Committee Members wished to discuss. There being none, upon motion duly made and seconded, and by unanimous voice vote, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Valerie A. Milonovich

Valerie S. Milonovich
Secretary to the Program Planning Committee

Exhibit A

nyserda
Energy. Innovation. Solutions.

# REVISED NOTICE OF MEETING AND AGENDA

March 31, 2014

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE PROGRAM PLANNING COMMITTEE:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that a meeting of the PROGRAM PLANNING COMMITTEE (the 87th meeting) of the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority ("Authority") will be held in the Authority's Albany Office at 17 Columbia Circle, Albany, New York, and by video conference at the office of the New York State Division of Housing & Community Renewal at 641 Lexington Avenue, 4th Floor (conference room D), New York, New York, on Monday, April 7, 2014, commencing at 11:30 a.m., for the following purposes:

1. To consider the Minutes of its 86th meeting held on January 13, 2014.

2. To receive a report from the Director and staff of the Performance Management and Evaluation Systems on program evaluation and metrics.

3. To receive a report on the status of the Corporate Strategy Assessment.

4. To transact such other business as may properly come before the meeting.

Members of the public may attend the meeting at either of the above locations. The Authority will be posting a video of the meeting to the web within two business days of the meeting. The video will be posted at http://www.nyserda.ny.gov/About/Board-Governance/Board-and-Committee-Meetings.aspx.

Valerie A. Milonovich

Valerie S. Milonovich
Secretary to the Program Planning Committee

New York State Energy Research and Development Authority

Albany
17 Columbia Circle, Albany, NY 12203-8399
(P) 1-866-NYSERDA | (F) 518-862-1091
nyserda.ny.gov | info@nyserda.ny.gov
Richard L. Kauffman, Chairman
John B. Rhodes, President and CEO

Buffalo
726 Exchange Street
Suite 821
Buffalo, NY
14210-1484
(P) 716-842-1522
(F) 716-842-0156

New York City
485 Seventh Avenue
Suite 1006
New York, NY
10018-6815
(P) 212-971-5342
(F) 518-862-1091

West Valley Site
Management Program
9030-B Route 219
West Valley, NY
14171-9500
(P) 716-942-9960
(F) 716-942-9961