

**Sundermeyer, Susan**

---

**From:** Dietrich, Natelle\*  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 10, 2010 2:59 PM  
**To:** Sundermeyer, Susan  
**Subject:** FW: MoPSC DSM Potential Study-work papers

---

**From:** Stanfield, Rebecca [mailto:rstanfield@nrdc.org]  
**Sent:** Friday, October 01, 2010 2:37 PM  
**To:** Dietrich, Natelle\*  
**Subject:** RE: MoPSC DSM Potential Study-work papers

Natelle: In the pretty short time we had to provide some feedback on the first round of KEMA deliverables, I had some experts at Optimal Energy take a look at the documents you circulated. I offer the following observations based on their feedback and my own.

1. There are just two things that we see missing from the list of measures, namely, commissioning and retro-commissioning for C&I customers. Otherwise the list of measures seems pretty consistent with what we'd expect to see. Costs and measure-level savings as a percent of baseline appear to be in the range of reasonableness (although this is difficult to determine due to the pdf file).
2. But that at some point in the not-too-distant future, it will be necessary for KEMA to provide a thorough description of their own assumptions and underlying inputs. We would like to be able to review the following kinds of assumptions and inputs:
  - Baseline Energy sales, disaggregated by sector, building types, end uses
  - Avoided costs
  - Measure characteristics; i.e. measure level baseline parameters compared to efficient measures
  - Portfolio Screening inputs such as
    - Penetration rates,
    - Feasibility rates
    - Persistence

Thanks for letting us know where this study was in the process, and we would appreciate getting a better sense of how we will be able to engage with the staff, DNR and KEMA on this going forward.