**RTF Policy Advisory Committee Meeting Notes**

**July 17, 2013**

**9:30 am – 3:00pm**

**On-Site Attendees:** Jim West, Snohomish PUD, Susan Stratton, NEEA, Richard Genece, BPA, Pete Pengilly, Idaho Power Co., Bob Stolarski, PSE, Wendy Gerlitz, NWEC, Tom Eckman, NWPCC, Danielle Gidding, BPA, Josh Warner, BPA, Eugene Rosolie, Cowlitz PUD, Chris Robinson, Tacoma Power, Bruce Folsom, Avista, Charlie Black, NWPCC, Charlie Grist, NWPCC

**Attendees via GoToMeeting**: Larry Blaufus, Clark PUD, Ralph Cavanagh, NRDC, Steve Johnson, UTC, Tom Karier, NWPCC, Deb Young, Northwestern Energy, Erin Erben, EWEB, Bo Downen, PPC, Glenn Atwood, Seattle City Light, Jim Maunder, Ravalli Electric Co-op

**Item 1: Agenda Review & Meeting Notes from April 17th, 2013**

RTF PAC chair Jim West called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.West asked for any changes to the meeting Notes of April 17, 2013. Susan Stratton felt statements she made didn’t sound articulate and didn’t feel it was captured quite right and offered additional explanation if it didn’t come across clear. West made a motion to approve the minutes and the minutes was approved unanimously.

**Item 2: Committee Members Changes**

Jim West informed the members Jeff Bumgarner will be replacing Carol Hunter from PacifiCorp.

**Item 3: RTF 2012 Annual Report Highlights**

Nick O’Neil gave presentation of highlights from the annual report by looking back at the year prior and progress that has been made so far in 2013. Some of the highlights are:

* Spent a significant amount of time trying to codify the rules RTF has developed for measure development and measure assessment and put in documents. 2012 was the final big push getting these guidelines finalized and used in the measure assessments.
* Reviewed all the existing library of measures and protocols, assigned categories and statuses for all the measures, and completed this effort in early 2013.
* Helped developed the PAC dashboard.
* Created a business plan for new end-use study.
* Expanded the RTF staff work to incorporate more full time contract staff and less third party consultant staff, and implemented a third party QC review.
* In 2012 we acted on over 80 measures with 42 of these measure buckets residential and the rest between Agricultural and industrial.
* Added few new measures to the library and developed a scheduled update. The sunset date which we now associate with each measure gives a clear indication when the measure needs to be reviewed by the RTF, and it gives us an indication of what our work load looks like as we go forward.
* On the snapshot of the PAC dashboard, based on request from the PAC we have added more information on the contribution component. Who developed the measure, who supplied the data into it and helped with the methodology, and who brought it forward to the RTF.
* In 2012 we created a business case for end-use study. As we rely on 20 yrs old data for all of the end-uses in the region, there was a growing concern among stake holders the data is not updated. We hired a consultant to create a business case for what it would take to update this data in the next few years depending on the level of effort that the region think is necessary. The business case has been developed and posted on the RTF website.
* We have shifted our business model of the RTF from contracting out a lot of our work and having staff review it to bringing more full time staff in-house to do that work and having a third party external contractor review the work.
* We have spent 96-98% of our allocated budget in 2012 on completing measure assessments and completing guidelines.
* Going forward in 2013, we had instituted solicitation for new RTF membership. We received 45 nominations for members, 20 returning members and 10 new. At the beginning of 2013 we gave orientation for new members, to help members understand what the RTF does, what the guidelines are what the website looks like, where to find information and who to contact.
* The ELCALP study that we use for our end-use data is now in digital format online.
* Per our work plan we have instituted a third party QC process to make the RTF more transparent.

Charlie Black: Wondering if it would be useful to show the committee the break up and comparison on who is represented on the RTF comparing 2012 and 2013 membership?

Nick O’Neil: During our member selection process we are somewhat blind to the affiliation. We are trying to pick people that are technically adept at the RTF. But we do track the breakdown in terms of public utilities, consultants and RTF staff and will share this later today in the meeting.

* 27 measures were categorized as out of compliance with 15 having a 2013 sunset date.
* We have started a Research and Evaluation subcommittee and hired a facilitator to help run it.
* Created proposal template utilities and stakeholders can use to bring the research plan forward. We have also set up a core evaluation subcommittee to review those plans. We are hoping by the end of the year a bulk of these research plans can be developed and brought forward so the measures can stay in circulation.

Tom Eckman: Added in terms of the PAC involvement, this is the critical part of making sure the RTF continues its function. If we don’t have the primary research done by the evaluation subcommittee, we will stall. It is critical to know what the regional priorities are for all the big measures that we operate, so each one of us is not doing the same thing and not coordinating it.

Ralph Cavanagh: Asked if the RTF has access of data from outside of the region or an informal touch with other utilities that are doing relevant primary research.

Tom Eckman: The staff looks for anything they can find anywhere it is produced, such as in California and New England. We are not just looking at the regional effort.

Ralph Cavanagh: Asked if more can be done with budgetary accommodation as the studies will be relevant without geographical restriction.

Tom Eckman: There are several national activities ongoing to address this issue. Historically, the general approaches for EM&V across the country are not all uniform.

Fred Gordon: Add more formal coordination will get in the way of effective informal coordination.

* O’Neil continued his presentation on the Annual Report Highlight on ELCALP database. On the effort to create the ELCALP database, RTF hired a consultant to access the study that was created in the 80’s and digitized the scanned copies of the load shape that was used in the Council’s power plan and a lot of utilities use around the nation. Created a reports that shows what ELCALP stands for and how important it is, digitize it as an online database that is now publicly accessible. All utilities can now pull out end-use load shape that has been used for the past 20 some years and establish a framework for future end use loads to come in through this database. Our intent is for the database to be flexible and portable enough that we can bring new load shape and new end uses as they become available.

Susan Stratton: Asked if the data is formatted in a way it works for the Northwest, or is there a national protocol in terms of how the data is arranged.

O’Neil: The idea behind is that it is somewhat flexible. There are filters set up to help group the data in any formant so that utilities in different part of the country can get what they want out of it.

* Continuing on the annual report highlights, on the small /rural subcommittee work, in 2013 we are focusing on finalizing school measures that we did measure assessment in 2012 for with the 50k allocation from the RTF.
* We have standardized the proposal submission process. Now we have an online proposal form that lays out the minimum required to bring a measure to the RTF so staff can look at it, help prioritize it and bring forward to the operation committee to decide to bring it forward or not. The standardized format will also give an indication when they will be contacted on the RTF decision to bring the measure forward.
* With hiring new staff, we have decided to have a third party QA/QC contractor to review all our work products. For each product they review they prepare a memo summarizing what they found of any deficiency, limitation and any recommendation for future updates. Staff takes the memo and does the updates on the workbook and posts them online. Our new online UES measure page now shows the categories and status as well as a note to stakeholders and Utilities where it is on the QC process.
* Quick snapshot of where we are in 2013, because we have large contract staff increases from last year, the bulk of our budget has been allocated to the contract staff. Right now we have 300k left to allocate and 50% of that we are expecting to allocate to other projects and 50% currently unallocated. Some of this money may be allocated to small/rural utilities for a work plan of measures they would like to get developed, or save the money for future projects that may come up during the year.
* RTF website is updated to show, calendar of events for upcoming meetings with the goto information, all subcommittee work including meeting minutes, meeting materials, decisions and guidelines are on the front page.

**Item 4: RTF PAC Communication re: Annual Report**

Jim West: Asked the members to go through the new annual report and see if it is meeting their needs, and to come back to the next PAC meeting with feedback to staff.

Tom Eckman: Added going forward it would be useful if PAC members look at the report and tell us if we are reporting on things they want to know about, and if it addresses the questions they have about the RTF.

Steve Johnson: Asked in regards to primary research, to support the completion of the review of all the measures and bringing them to compliance, is the idea for utilities to look at the measures and basic research that need to be completed for the RTF to do the work.

Tom Eckman: Answered this is the vision. We have a committee established of regional evaluators that facilitate the operation, prioritized the needs of various measures and are in the process of putting together evaluation plans for the high priority ones and begin the discussion of who takes over the work. We are in the process of formalizing that committee to take this function on.

Charlie Grist: Added coordination is desirable but it takes time and money and people have to be pulled away from their other duties to do it. We would like to come back and report to the PAC after we got through the first non-compliance measures.

**Mid-year status of out of compliance UES measure**

Nick O’Neil started the presentation by referring to the dashboard on the 17 out of compliance UES measures that will be sunsetting at the end of this year. He explained, in the beginning of the year the RTF hired Marjorie McCrea from Research and Action Help to lead this group and create a survey of measures that are out of compliance, and send it out to few hundred people in the region to ask how they would prioritize it and which out of compliance UES measures are important to their programs.

 From that feedback, she created a research radar spreadsheet which tracks all the measures and the priority of those measures compared to all the regional groups so utilities and stake holders can refer to the spreadsheet to see what the top priorities are and what needs to be done.

Wendy Gerlitz: Asked how the prioritization was done, who weighed in on it and how they heard about the opportunity to weigh in.

Nick O’Neil: This was done by a mass email to over 200 plus contacts in the RTF Interested parties, all the members and corresponding members to fill out four questions survey of measures that are out of compliance and how they would rank it in terms of importance. We held a meeting that was attended by close to 80 people and went through the questioner to make sure we were not missing anything. We also made sure every utility that sits on RTF that has somebody who is involved with program design was included in the list to get as much input as possible.

Charlie Grist: Added the program implementers, the evaluators, the consultants and everybody who is involved in energy conservation in the Pacific Northwest are also included.

Fred Gordon: Asked in terms of influencing research plans, does it really work planning for research for one year cycle or on a short schedule.

Nick O’Neil: What we are really asking for are plans to collect the data. When we collect those data it could happen on a multi-year cycle and we can determine when that would happen. We tried to cull a list of measures that we think are small and region wide and not spend regional dollar to quantify very hard to get.

Tom Eckman: Added we can revise the sunset date if we know there is research under way. But if there is no interest in doing the evaluation or there is no chance it will get resuscitated at anytime in the future, we take the measure off the table.

Jim West: Asked what prioritization criteria were used on the four questions that were sent out.

Nick O’Neil: The questions were essentially to rate the list of measures as important, somewhat-important and not important, qualitative more than quantitative. Tally those all up, come up with a sorted list that broke them into tiers of top tier, second tier and low priority measures.

Tom Eckman: Added as we get this synchronized with the budgeting process and the planning process of the Utilities in the region, it is going to take a couple of cycles.

Fred Gordon: In the first meeting of this group, the big struggle was how to deal with the huge backlog of measures. We are balancing our expense on one end and significant loss of credibility on the other. I think what you are telling us is that it is a work in progress and we are learning how to do that and we may or may not strike that balance.

Charlie Grist: Looking at some of the non-compliance ones there are a few of them that aren’t going to get updated either because it is not needed anymore or because there is a measure that supersedes it so it dies a natural death. We cannot measure our success here by the number of measures that are out of compliance that don’t get reinserted.

Nick O’Neil: Continued the presentation on the sunsetting measures, the measures staff need to review are 15 measures that are active now or under review. This does not include all the other protocols that we have been working on for two years, lighting in particular that has taken more staff time than we have anticipated.

Fred Gordon: Asked how Nick feels about getting through the year’s objectives separately for the analysis and getting all the decisions through the RTF process.

Nick O’Neil: Answered at the end of last year we met and separated the measures the staff need to work on and when those need to come up for review at the RTF meeting. In terms of getting it through the RTF process it has been languishing this year with a couple of big challenging item we come up against, ductless heat pump and the residential SEEM model calibration has taken longer than we expected. The workload is getting backed up at the RTF meetings because we have taken so much time to get through these other items. We will have to hold an additional meeting day to get through the work.

**Update on the Mid-year financials and Contract staff - work since April and contract staff capacity:**

Nick O’Neil: We have spent so far 350k with most of it locked-in on contracts for staff. I am projecting 1.4 million out of 1.473 we received to be spent with some unallocated because a few research items were shifted to next year.

Susan Stratton: If your budget is unspent can it automatically roll over to the next year or do you have to refund it and set a new budget?

Nick O’Neil: Any unspent funds get reallocated to the funders towards the next year budget cycle.

Jim West: How are we assessing the capacity of the contract staff to do the work that is queued up? Generally speaking does the fully allocated dollar amount for the rest of the year indicate work to be done with the capacity of staff we got?

Nick O’Neil: The fact that we haven’t had any issues with staff bringing forward measures to the RTF or falling behind on workload or languishing on subcommittee work is a pretty good indication they are doing what we need them to do. They are being proactive in the work they are doing, gives me confidence we are not going to run into an issue later on.

Tom Karier: The idea of working with contract staff went very well from the start, the solicitation worked out great and hired good people, but wondered if there is any concern about the long term commitment.

Nick O’Neil: I haven’t heard any concerns. They plan to continue working if we want them to, and if people agree they are doing a good job. If they decide to go a different way and we need to hire more staff we have the RFP written. We had a lot of interest last time around it won’t be difficult to find people interested to do the work.

Jim West: Asked the term the contract staff is under.

Tom Eckman: We have budget for them until end of 2014. We will have to make accommodation in terms of level of effort or budget to give them a 12 month full time contract.

Nick O’Neil: Last year when most of our work is contracted out to separate consultants and reviewing in-house, it was a 400k budget, now we are at 900k budget out of 1.473 for contract staff in 2013. In 2014 it will go up a little bit more because they started in April, I am projecting 1.1million out of 1.473 is dedicated to contract staff. The remainder is allocated for the QC contractors and research projects.

Nick O’Neil: Asked the members if there are any metrics people are looking for to judge, if this business model is working better than our former model.

Fred Gordon: It would be interesting to understand more about the life cycle of different measures as they are working their way through the RTF process. How do you judge the appropriate amount of time has been spent on the measures that are producing the greatest results.

Nick O’Neil: We set the sunset date from the onset and try to capture the reason for the sunset date in the workbook, and look at other factors that influence that date, such as uncertainty in the estimate in the long term, and a spec. coming up.

Fred Gordon: What is the longest measure in the database in terms of how long it has been in existence without having to be looked up again?

Chris Robinson: Fred raised an interesting point here, in terms how this measures windup affecting particularly the I-937 public utilities. Essentially the State has said the RTF measures existing are the ones we go by and if the RTF is changing any of these measures, as we experienced with the CFLs, the original measure was used to set our target of conservation potential. Auditors look at the current measure not the original measure we set our target on.

Fred Gordon: When you do that you are working with a frozen efficiency baseline for the power plan. Are the utilities ordered the other savings for market change without having to run the program to get them?

Tom Eckman: That particular one was on the basis of storage, through a retail distribution channel.

Fred Gordon: So the correction is to the resource assessment in the plan?

Tom Eckman: It is different from the plan. The plan looks long term but the first year savings are different.

Fred Gordon: Would it be accurate to say you have a long term plan and a short term program, and with the issue of storage you may not have the tools for reconnecting the two. That may be the accurate program number but there may be a long term effect that goes in the plan that is not the immediate savings and there is no way right now to account for it?

Tom Eckman: We had a discussion yesterday about the savings of ductless heat pump today vs. over its life cycle. If you did the research today when the building get better insulated through the years, the ductless heat pump savings decline as the consequence of the weatherization of the house. We post the numbers today for the first year savings over the life that is not the average savings over the life time. On our guideline, we use a number based on at the end point of the unit, taking into account they will be weatherized. When you do program evaluation you are looking at the building as it stands today not after it has under gone weatherization later on.

Fred Gordon: It seems like some of these measures gets hang up when there is not a one to one correlation between what the power plan is looking for and what the RTF is tasked to do.

Tom Eckman: On the real time question what do the sponsors want as an answer, do they want a number that is good today because you can post it against the I-937 target today or you want a number that you can hand to the power system guys to show how the offset on loads looks like long term.

Jim West: I don’t think it is an either-or question.

Tom Eckman: That is a problem we have, if you did a building analysis today you get one number and that is not how the house looks like in 15 years.

Comment from member: The RTF can help by speeding along the process of readjusting the number based on the RBSA information but at the end of the day the challenge is convincing the auditor that efficiency assumptions has to be locked for some period of time, and can’t expect utilities to do additional conservation after utilities do their budgeting.

Steve Johnson: These first year savings that the RTF produces is something the utilities need to know to make rational decisions at the time, later it must review whether those measures are still achieving the same savings as first assumed. What burden should the RTF have to reevaluate measures is a broader question. It does make sense to do it in a centralized way so we are not repeating the same work. I don’t think the commission has changed its basic premise around evaluating the prudency of resource acquisition just because of i-937. We don’t like to see utilities use a measure that has been evaluated and are no longer effective. When you look at it historically, savings estimates were not updated frequently enough to remain accurate at the time when the utilities are making a decision. We are getting to a point where the RTF and the work the Utilities has in place that expectation should be something they are going to be held to and it won’t be an issue of the measure changing the its value later, it is an issue of why it wasn’t evaluated better from the start. We are trying to move away from that and the RTF has done a great job helping the region do.

Bob Stolarski: One critical difference is that a lot of our measures are RTF based and generally we do try to use the frozen base line so the program managers can try to hit their numbers based on known amount of widgets they have to accomplish in the market place. If there is a mistake or if we are using a bad UES we correct it immediately, we don’t hold it steady knowing it is a mistake. However if the best available information at the time going in was a reasonable assumption that made sense and a change happens mid-year or beyond we stay with what we got and change the number at the end of the period.

Comment from member: In our case the state auditors suggest that we utilize the deem savings as the time the acquisitions was made.

Bruce Folsom: To us it is an issue of risk and uncertainty. The difference between generation cost recovery and energy efficiency cost recovery is we go in based on what we know for generation cost recovery and on the energy efficiency side. We spent the money we do the analysis then we come in a year or two later for cost recovery. The more we can do to reduce uncertainty and risk our customers are better off.

Charlie Grist: Added what Nick and the staff have done is have a record of what the UES were at the time, to make it easier for you to go back and see what was done.

Tom Karier: This was one of the key issues when we started the PAC, the issue then was to have a schedule so it was not a surprise when things get reevaluated and might change.

Erin Erben: Asked idea of checking with utilities on how they are using the measures is great idea and if there is a RTF and RTF PAC driven set of criteria to collect the right data to inform RTF work prioritization.

Jim West: We have decided not to pursue developing a qualitative survey to get stake holder input at this time. And the RTF PAC is operating on a fairly high level; our guidance has been in reacting to the work plan the RTF recommends not so much trying to drive what the work plan.

Erin Erben: In one of the discussions I heard this morning was, we have too much work to do and prioritizing the work and how it was done seemed like it was a work in progress. My thought was if there isn’t clear criteria by which the work prioritization would be done that might inform that process.

Jim West: Suggested to have more conversation on the next committee meeting.

Charlie Grist: It is important going forward that we comb through all the measures and put them in buckets of which ones need to be updated and what needs to get serious research. That is the bulk of our work that was agreed upon as very high priority and we have been working on that for about a year and a half. Where the RTF can save you money on impact evaluation work is the question.

Fred Gordon: I think there is a tough line between what the PAC role is and what governance we can push down and have it done more competently. In terms of figuring out which measures are big or important to programs, we have set up the committee structure of the RTF and they seem to be handling it fairly well. If there is a conversation, I want to have about how they are making these decisions.

Tom Eckman: In regards our earlier conversation how our work product is applied collectively, we haven’t done a systematic check on it. We can have one of our staff contact the right people to find out what fraction they are using and why, and if there is something we can do to benefit more on the way we display a measure.

Pete Pengilly: Commented transparency exists and most of the work sheets we can pull what we need. As far as the amount of research the utilities can do, I appreciate the work staff has done to prioritize and list them. If we set our plans in place for future years when these plans get reviewed and give it some time to see it will work out and if it doesn’t we will have to reassess if that model is going to work.

**Item 6: Health Impacts of Wood Smoke Reduction: Head's up on RTF subcommittee taking up quantification of health benefits.**

Charlie Grist gave the presentation on Health Impacts of Wood Smoke Reduction explaining:

* That this is a new territory to the RTF, the Council guidelines of the RTF, as well as the region.
* In the past the Council has tackled the health benefits of impacts of radon gas, developed program specs but not quantified it.
* Proposing Health impacts are potentially quantifiable and monitizable and ought to be included in the TRC calculations we do.

Susan Stratton: Asked if the RTF regularly monetize other non-energy benefits but not so much in the health area.

Charlie Grist: Answered the Regional Act defines system cost as an estimate of all the direct cost of resources over its effective lifetime. Among these costs; cost of distribution and transmission to consumers, waste disposal, fuel costs and *such quantifiable environmental cost and benefits as administrator determines on the basis of methodology determined by the Council as part of the plan, and that is directly attributable to such measure or resource.* Labor cost saving, water savings, detergent savings, savings that are directly attributable to the measure compared to what it is replacing.

Chris Robinson: Agreed the environmental cost associated with particulates is supported by that statement, but not quite sure if he understands where the retail cost of detergent fits in.

Tom Eckman: We were asked to be expansive in our definition of cost and benefits particularly in the cost side. In the first power plan, we had the opportunity to define regional cost effectiveness which is what we referred to this as not a total resource cost because there wasn’t a definition of total resource cost in 1980, that came after the California practice manual was produced. When we defined regional cost effectiveness, we were encouraged very strongly to include all costs we can find in energy efficiency and not just use what utilities might pay. The rational was not to underestimate the cost of making things happen The Council made a policy call to not under estimate the benefits as well. That was a policy call that was made 30 plus years ago.

 Fred Gordon: This issue is broader than just non-energy benefit and we should have more discussion in the future on what is and what should be on this list.

**Item 7: EPRI Request for ELCAP database: Feedback on EPRI request for the RTF-funded on-line database.**

Charlie Grist: It would have to be open access for all ELCAP products and its derivative products and for EPRI not to make money out of this public data.

Erin Erben: This is a challenge nobody has been able to address on their own and to begin a new end-use load research sample in place is going to require major collaboration and this will be a good opportunity to work on it.

Charlie Grist: In the big picture this is more than the northwest effort; we are going to require the help of everybody’s systematic and continually updated set of data and if there is an opportunity to leverage this into a national effort that is good.

Charlie Black: Commented the idea of pooling effort is good but questioned if EPRI is the appropriate repository for that pool or should EPRI be a participant where someone else is the repository.

Ralph Cavanagh: When EPRI was founded it was with an eye of serving as a public interest national repository in which all utilities shared equally. It is true in the intervening years it has evolved to a different direction because many of the members pushed for that, but the best of EPRI would like to go to the public interest direction. And EPRI will value that there are some intellectual assets that are open to everybody and benefit everybody.

Susan Stratton: We can have a licensing agreement with some requirement of open access.

Jim West: Added his opinion is to put some basic condition to making it available to them and to be prepared the outcome might not be one we are happy with.

Susan Stratton: In order to have them on board as a partner they would need to contribute some of their own research.

West: A wider distribution that will benefit the entire industry will be better. I wouldn’t put a lot of time and energy in making sure that we have a way to police that they meet the conditions we put on it. I would be pretty basic in the conditions we set and hope they live up to it.

Grist: In terms of what we need from the PAC, when we get to the point of talking about terms and conditions, I would like few members to craft the message.

**Item 8: Brief look forward to next budget year and planning cycle - what needs does RTF PAC have?**

West: Asked the PAC, looking forward to 2015 and beyond for the next planning cycle, what they want to see the RTF and staff to react to in the preparation for the next funding cycle, and what the 7th plan entail for work by the RTF.

Fred Gordon: I would like to see how the RTF can function in a highly dynamic retail environment with respect to efficiency and how we can keep up when the market conditions are changing. The RTF is doing great work but kind of late. May be adjusting the way the RTF goes through the measures and systematically dealing with it. What the RTF doe is dependent on external research but the way the RTF goes through it is also a part. On retail sales end, getting a dynamic market look and an approach that looks at a set of principles that are applied quickly, as suppose to a whole deep dive.

Chris Robinson: Approval and non-approval of measures are not flexible or customizable enough across the region. May be the RTF can look at when measures are developed how they can be customized across the region.

Jim West: About a year from now we will be into this discussion deep in the 2015-2019 cycle. This will be on our list to consider.

Tom Eckman: Questioned if this is the right timing, as the PAC is setting budget for 2015 implementation, when do we have to have PAC recommendation weather the RTF budget for 2015 are set.

Jim West: We locked down budget for next year two weeks ago, probably in the spring meeting next year.

**Item 9: Next RTF PAC Update to Council**

Jim West: Asked Tom Karier, if the Council will be interested in hearing the mid-year look, reaction to the annual report that has been published, observation on the past three month on non-energy benefit in particular health benefit and also if the RTF staff could give a short presentation to the Council agenda in the next month or two.

Last item on the agenda was a suggestion to set a date for the next RTF PAC meeting. The meeting was tentatively set on the day after the October RTF meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm