



**Energy Efficiency Board**  
**January 12, 2021 | 1:00 – 3:30 pm**

Documents for the meeting are located here:

<https://app.box.com/s/ht3zucrs01vm9izl0tlzow57p9afcakn>

**MINUTES**

**1. Process**

**A. Roll call of Board Members**

Board members: Amanda Fargo-Johnson, Amy McLean, Jack Traver, John Viglione, John Wright, Kate Donatelli, Neil Beup, Ron Araujo, Steve Bruno, Vicki Hackett, Ashley Marshall, Donald Mauritz, Hammad Chaudhry, Joel Kopylec

Other attendees: Anthony Kosior, Emily Rice, Glenn Reed, Kathy Fay, Lisa Skumatz, Melissa Kops, Rebecca French, Samantha Dynowski, Stacy Sherwood, Ashley Nicholls, Brendan Thomas, Brian Sullivan, Carly Burke, Colleen Morrison, Daniel Robertson, Dena Jefferson, Devan Willemsen, Diane Del Rosso, Gary Lane, George Lawrence, Giulia Bambara, Glenn Reed, Greg Caggiano, Heather Deese, Jonathan Bronke, Larry Rush, Madison Butler, Matt Macunas, Maxwell Burke-Scoll, Mike Uhl, Patrice Gillespie, Pete Jacobs, Philip Mosenthal, Ralph Prah, Randy Vagnini, Richard Faesy, Rose Croog, Sara Doutney, Tiffany Murphy, Violette Radomski

Brenda Watson was not present but designated Amy McLean as her proxy for voting. At the time of roll call there were six voting members in attendance as well as one proxy for a total of seven available voting members.

Hammad Chaudhry, Jack Traver, and Donald Mauritz joined the meeting after roll call. Please note that Mr. Jack Traver was present for the vote re: the Evaluation Workplan and Budget; making the total 8 available voting members.

**B. Minutes – Approve minutes from December 2021 Board Meeting**

The Chair entertained a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. John Wright motioned to approve the motion and Ms. Amanda Fargo-Johnson seconded the motion. The motion was approved 7-0.

**C. 2022 Board Calendar**

The Board's Executive Secretary, Emily Rice, indicated that the 2022 EEB Calendar has been set and invitations for meetings sent out. Ms. Emily Rice noted that anyone that wishes to be included in the invites can contact her at [ExecutiveSecretaryCTEEB@theenergygroup.biz](mailto:ExecutiveSecretaryCTEEB@theenergygroup.biz) She can also share a list of calendar dates for anyone that wants to have a copy.

**D. Board and DEEP vacancies – Introduction of new Board members**

Ms. Kate Donatelli announced that DEEP has hired three new office directors at the Bureau of Energy and Technology Policy. The Office of Building and Transportation Decarbonation Office Director is Shubhada Kambli, who has been Sustainability Director for the City of Hartford. DEEP

has two entirely new office director positions at the Bureau for Affordable Housing and Energy Retrofits and Broadband Office. Kenyetta Risser-Lovings has a background in energy retrofits and supporting affordable housing development; she will serve as Office Director for the Bureau for Affordable Housing and Energy Retrofits. Director of Broadband Office is Kevin Pisacich, who currently works for the City of Oxnard, California. Ms. Vicki Hackett shared that DEEP is working on bios and will share those when they are ready.

Ms. Hackett announced that she has been selected for, and accepted, the position of Bureau Chief for DEEP. Until a new Deputy Commissioner is recruited, she will continue to act as Deputy Commissioner.

Ms. Kate Donatelli provided an update on new EEB members. Two existing seats were open after members retired from their seats in 2021; a representative of a Statewide Business Association and a representative of a Chamber of Commerce. Two new seats were added during the 2021 legislative session: one for a representative of low-income customers and another for a representative of municipalities. The DEEP Commissioner is charged with making appointments for each of these seats. DEEP conducted an open nomination and application process and have confirmed appointments for three of the four vacant seats. DEEP is waiting on final confirmation of the appointment for the Representative of a State Business Association.

The three new members are in attendance today, but they will not be expected to participate as voting members until February. Ms. Kathy Fay is the Directory of Community Sustainability at Neighborhood Housing Services of New Haven; she will be the low-income representative. Ms. Melissa Kops is a Project Manager and Architect for the City of New Haven and will be the municipal representative and will serve on the Residential Committee. Ms. Kops is active with the Green Building Council and an advocate for building energy efficiency. Mr. Anthony Kosier is the Director of Facilities, Operations, and Engineering at Yale University. Mr. Kosier is serving as a Representative for a Chamber of Commerce (New Haven). Mr. Kosier has been at Yale for 15 years and oversees all operations, including energy conservation and sustainability planning.

Ms. Donatelli thanked Ms. Kops, Ms. Fay, and Mr. Kosier for joining the Board. Ms. Hackett and Mr. Neil Beup welcomed the new Board members. Ms. Amy McLean made a plea to existing Board members to engage with and join Board Committees and appreciated that the new members have joined Committees already.

Mr. Neil Beup shared that the Board will be setting up an orientation, which is new for the Board, that will help new members get up to speed and learn more about serving on the Board.

#### E. Public Comments

Ms. Samantha Dynowski shared [a report](#) from the Trinity College Action Lab. The report summarizes a study conducted by students at Trinity College of one of the most energy-burdened areas of the state, North End of Hartford. The study included engagement with the community and a deep dive into data to assess the impacts of energy burden. Ms. Dynowski believes the work is moving and impactful. Mr. Beup added that he participated in the interview process for the study and is looking forward to seeing the results.

## 2. Programs and Planning

### A. 2022-2024 C&LM Plan Approval Process and Schedule – DEEP

Ms. Kate Donatelli stated that in order to allow the utilities to move forward with the conservation adjustment mechanism process before PURA, DEEP issued an Interim Decision approving just the budget of the Three-Year Plan. This decision only applies to the Budget, and DEEP's Final Determination will address the Text, including potential compliance condition(s).

There will be an opportunity for public comment before the Determination is finalized.

**B. 2022-2024 C&LM Plan Update Process and Schedule (March 1 refiling) – Companies**

Mr. Stephen Bruno shared a slide on the timeline. The Companies are currently working on finalizing the 2021 final revenues, spending, savings, and performance incentive calculation. Regarding the 2022-2024 C&LM Plan and the DEEP Determinations, if there's anything that comes out between now and March 1 filing, the Companies will incorporate those changes as well.

Companies are also preparing the CAM filing which will determine carry over/under; net under collection would reduce 2022 budgets and 5% of a carry over would be applied to the 2022 budget and the rest returned to customers. The Companies will file the CAM with PURA February 1, 2022. In February the Companies will provide an update on 2022 Plan Budgets, ahead of the March Filing with DEEP.

**C. 2022-2024 Evaluation Workplan and Budget – Board vote – Evaluation Administrators and Board Committee members**

Ms. Lisa Skumatz provided an overview of the Evaluation Workplan and Budget for 2022; materials can be found in the [materials folder](#). Ms. Skumatz noted that typically this would be presented earlier in the process and the Evaluation Team is working to change the timing so this Budget can be included in the overall Plan Budget vote.

Ms. Skumatz thanked the Evaluation Team, Evaluation Committee, Company representatives, and Technical Consultants that contribute greatly in developing the Evaluation Workplan. Ms. Skumatz indicated changes in the Budget due to a substantial increase in forward-looking topics and a broader array of topics. Energy efficiency is changing, both in the state and nationally, so more funding is required to better inform programs and policies on changes coming forward.

Ms. Skumatz reviewed recent changes; including a return to 3-year research area contracts, which avoids annual RFPs, inflexibility and adds flexibility to time projects over the 3-year period, and increased process integration with the Technical Consultants and C&LM processes.

Ms. Skumatz outlined changes that are driving recommended budget changes. Stakeholders have expressed a need for focus on substantive, forward-looking topics. Evaluation Committee has had tight budgets, including a steady decline 2012-2020 as a percent of the CT C&LM Plan, to address these topics. Some of the topics have carried over from previous plans, putting the Evaluation Committee in a more reactive position rather than an integrated/iterative position. The stakeholder engagement process elicited a much broader range of evaluation needs, as well as more flexibility.

In developing the 2022-2024 Evaluation Plan, the Evaluation Committee sought input and determined needs from multiple sources: stakeholders, Cadence review, Report REC's, etc. Multiple stakeholder discussions were held to refine the Plan and then the Evaluation Committee voted on the final proposed Plan presented today. The Plan consists of 45 projects over five major topic areas, equating to an estimated \$14.8 million dollars. The major topics areas include impact evaluation, baseline evaluation and studies, process evaluation, PSD, and high-interest, stakeholder-driven topics like data, equity, health and safety, heat pumps, etc. More details can be found in Ms. Skumatz' presentation.

The requested Budget requests an increase of 2.1%, with a slight increase by the third year of the plan (\$4.5 million years one and two, \$5.78 million year three). The third year budget exceeds adopted 2022-224 Plan Budgets in year 3. The requested Budget supports better

sample sizes and more in-depth baseline and saturation studies that enable better planning. It will allow additional emphasis on best practices, next measures, field studies, joint studies, and addressing important stakeholder-driven issues like heat pumps and electrification as well as health and safety, weatherization barriers.

The requested Evaluation Workplan Budget is split 34% residential, 26% C&I, and 40% cross-sector; and then by project type 23% baseline, 26% impact or impact/process, 9% process, 5% PSD, and 37% stakeholder-driven topics. Some of the Evaluation goals are to provide expert advice, guidance and oversight, assure independent evaluation that are useful and meet industry standards, to work cooperatively with utilities, and to consider best practices in other regions.

Mr. Neil Beup asked for any comments from Consultants or Board. Ms. Amy McLean acknowledged the amount of work and time that goes into the Evaluation Committee's work, and that the proposed changes are needed. Ms. McLean noted that Connecticut is not staying on par with other states, and leveraging the work of the Evaluation Team can help to better inform Program planning. Ms. Skumatz reiterated that this new Plan and Budget will enable the Evaluation Team to better response to needs on evaluation and to start up and complete studies more quickly.

The Chair entertained a motion to approve the Workplan and Budget. Mr. John Wright motioned to approve the 2022 Evaluation Workplan and Budget; Mr. Jack Traver seconded the motion. With no further discussion, the motion passed 7-0 with Ms. Vicki Hackett (DEEP) abstaining.

#### D. Governor's Executive Order #21-3 – DEEP

Ms. Kate Donatelli introduced Ms. Rebecca French, DEEP's Director for the Office of Climate Planning. Ms. French provided an overview of the Governor's Executive Order 21-3, which implemented many of the actions borne from the Governor's Council on Climate Change. Ms. French acknowledged Ms. Melissa Kops and Ms. Kathy Fay, both of which were involved in that work.

The Climate "EO" included 23 actions that support equity and environmental justice and are informed by best available climate science. The actions cut across agencies and sectors in the areas of: (1) buildings and infrastructure, (2) clean transportation, (3) community climate resilience, (4) health, equity, and environmental justice, (5) jobs and the economy, and (6) natural and working lands. Ms. French went on to highlight a few projects from each area most relevant to the Board, including direction the DAS Building Inspector to maintain an up-to-date code, directing DEEP to provide more affordable heating and cooling and identify strategies to achieve greenhouse gas reductions, calls for the formation of the Connecticut Equity and Environmental Justice Council.

Full descriptions of all 23 actions can be found in the slide deck located in the [materials folder](#). In the slide deck, the actions slides include codes in the lower-left corner that indicate the sections from the 2021 Report produced by the Governor's Council for cross-reference.

Ms. Vicki Hackett gave kudos to Ms. French on her work. Ms. Amy McLean indicated that the CTAC group could compliment the actions outlined in the EO and provide assistance. Ms. Hackett noted that would be necessary.

#### E. Board discussion of Annual Legislative Report – Companies and Board

Mr. Stephen Bruno provided an update of the ALR. The Board developed a draft ALR October-December 2021 and circulated a letter from the Chairs December-January 2022. During January the EEB reviews the draft ALR sections and will vote to approve the ALR at the February Board meeting

in time to submit the final ALR to the General Assembly March 1, 2022. The ALR will include a letter from the Chairs and Executive Summary that has been circulated. The Executive Secretary has been working to update the Introduction to the Board section for the cover. The Companies are working with the Consultants to finalize the draft for the sectors, outreach, and workforce sections. Companies are also compiling 2021 data that should be prepared in early February.

Mr. Neil Beup noted that he hadn't taken a look at the letter yet but will get that done, noting the Ms. McLean has provided comments already. Ms. Emily Rice, Executive Secretary, asked that Board members provide their photos by January 18; she had reached out directly to those that didn't have a photo on file. Ms. Rice added that any Board members wishing to update their photos on the website or on the ALR Cover could provide photos too.

Ms. McLean noted that the Report is significant and many people see it. Ms. McLean noted that it should be current and appreciated the work being done to make it a useful document.

#### F. Future Focus Area Calendar – Consultants

Mr. Neil Beup shared that the Board started a couple years ago to include Deep-Dive Focus Area presentations from the Consultants that help inform Board members on a range of relevant issues and topics. Mr. Beup noted that the Mr. Glenn Reed would be laying out the calendar for 2022 so the Consultants can plan and produce presentations for the Board and Committees. Mr. Beup noted that this calendar will be flexible in terms of the schedule.

Mr. Reed provided a summary of previous Focus Area Deep Dives and a list of proposed Focus Areas that were presented to the Board in November 2021. The Board provided a few more topics and then rated them by priority. Mr. Reed shared the poll results in his presentation and a proposed calendar, with a break in August. Some of the upcoming topics include Demand Response (February), Electrification and Fuel Switching (March), Combined Res and C&I Program Update (April), and Res and C&I New Construction (May). The full list can be found in the [materials folder](#).

Mr. Reed asked if the Consultants were missing anything or if Board members had input on the sequencing or other key topics. Ms. Amy McLean asked if the Board could move things around, and Mr. Reed noted that yes, the Consultants could make changes to the schedule. For example, Mr. Reed noted that the DEEP conditions of approval may necessitate some changes. Mr. Beup suggested that the Consultants solicit feedback from the Committees in order to add value and ensure the sequence makes sense. Ms. Amanda Fargo-Johnson asked if the Storage topic in October was a bit later in the year, and Mr. Reed noted the Consultants would discuss this.

Mr. Beup addressed a question in the chat referring to the rankings for each topic and stated that the lower-ranked topics would still be addressed at some point.

#### G. Low Income Program Budget Benchmarking – Consultants

After the DEEP Technical Meetings, DEEP asked the Consultants to conduct this research. Ms. Kate Donatelli shared that DEEP had asked the Technical Consultants to look into this topic in response to stakeholder comments provided during the EEB and DEEP Public Input Sessions.

There were several comments around what it means to have equitable distribution of funds to low-income programs. Ms. Donatelli noted that there are several dimensions through which we can examine how funds are distributed. The Plan includes a parody analysis, various customer groups. The E-3 Proceeding is examining this issue. And the DEEP Equitable Distribution Report looks at how funds are collected from and returned to different communities, including distressed areas. Ms. Donatelli noted that the recent presentations from the utilities in the past

few months regarding their single family participation studies also capture some of this nuance about different customer segments, including low-income customers.

In thinking about this issue, DEEP thought it was important to do some benchmarking of other states to see how they're defining low-income in their programs, and any policies that they might have regarding low-income budget allocations. This benchmarking is meant to be a starting point for further work. Ms. Donatelli expressed appreciation for the Technical Consultants in getting this done.

Ms. Stacy Sherwood, Technical Consulting Team, provided a presentation on the research completed at the end of 2021. Ms. Sherwood noted the Consultants have gathered information thus far but have not made comparisons or recommendations in relation to Connecticut and Low-Income EE Programming. The study included a review of 15 states and the District of Columbia. The Consultants gathered information on the definition, the spending and program requirements, who is the program administrator, and what is the success of the State's EE portfolio (i.e. are they leaders in this field?).

The Consultants also pulled 2020 expenditures to determine the percentage of investment in limited income compared to the overall portfolio expenditures. They reviewed the limited income statutes that influence the low-income programs that the utilities are implementing, and the requirements to determine if parameters such as a minimum savings requirement or leveraging funding was necessary.

In Connecticut, limited income is defined as someone whose income is 50% of the state median income, which is stated in the C&LM Plan. The Plan is implemented by the utilities who partner with Community Action Agencies. There's potential for weatherization funding to be leveraged. The utilities do not have any specified minimum spending or savings requirements related to limited income. There is a parity policy that is followed in the evaluation of limited income spending. The parity calculation is the evaluation of energy efficiency in the Plan Budget in comparison to the revenues from similar customer classes; 14% of the budget is allocated to income eligible residential customers and the residential income eligible class contributes 13% of the utility revenue. Ms. Sherwood noted that the Plan is over-indexed in favor of income eligible class.

In looking at other states, low income can be defined either through a statute, a regulatory approval, or a utility plan. In particular, with the utility plans, we found in Minnesota that the definition of low-income varied by utility, and not set at a state level. The income qualification for low income program tends to be based on the percentage of one of the following: state median income, area median income, federal poverty guideline or level, or a combination.

The trend in funding requirements is that there shouldn't be a funding requirement, as noted in the table of the 16 areas researched within Ms. Sherwood's presentation. Half of the state's reviewed did not have a minimum spending requirement. Of those that did, the majority was based on the percent of the total plan, which was either a 10% or 20% allocation to low-income spending.

There was quite a bit of variance in who administers to the programs. In a lot of cases, the utility implements the program or, in the case of Arkansas, the electric utility operates the limited income program on behalf of the gas utility. A few states provide the rate-payer fund through the Department of Housing and Community Development or Community Action Agencies implement the program. There were also some states that use third-party implementers. In looking at leveraging of funds, some programs use outside sources.

Ms. Sherwood noted that it might be useful to an interesting point to review the level of investment based upon who would implement the Limited Income Program.

Ms. Sherwood shared in her last slide a chart that depicts low-income spending as a percentage of total energy efficiency expenditures for 2020 by state. Ms. Sherwood noted the total portfolio may include statewide programs, so it could be skewed slightly and that not all 2020 data was available so 2019 was used as a proxy. Most of the data in the chart came from annual utility reports or ACEEE. On the electric side, low-income spending either falls into 5% to 13% of total plan spending, or it's above 20%. Gas is similar, but it is below 10% or above 20%.

Mr. Neil Beup asked if there were any questions, adding the Board may need to spend more time with the data before there are questions. Mr. Beup noted this was an interesting exercise and appreciated the presentation. Mr. Beup shared that this would be a good presentation to have available as the Board gets into more low-income issues going forward.

#### H. 2022-2024 Plan Commitments – Consultants

Ms. Stacy Sherwood indicated that Mr. George Lawrence has recommended the Consultants put together a tracker for Plan commitments, similar to surrounding states. The Consultants looked at other states to inform how Connecticut could track Plan commitments. This is in the early stages of development and Ms. Sherwood welcomed comments and feedback.

Overall, the tracker could be used as a management tool to help Residential and C&I Committees prioritize commitments. By year 2023 and 2024, hopefully the tracker can enable better accountability around achieve these Plan commitments. The Consultants identified 137 Plan Commitments to track, which Ms. Sherwood noted could seem daunting and administratively burdensome. However, Ms. Sherwood added that with further development, we could define group commitments. This tool would not be as firm as DEEP's conditions of approval. The majority of the 137 commitments don't have a deadline, though three do have a goal to achieve by end of 2022 and the rest by the end of the Plan term.

Ms. Sherwood shared a snapshot of the tool to-date, indicating there would be additional columns and some of the categories may be further refined. In the tool, the commitment uses direct language from the C&LM Plan and each has a reference to the page number in the Plan. Commitments are organized by sector, program, category level which could help group them in the future. Additionally, the tracker includes an accomplishment timeline and an indication of whether the commitment is statewide or utility-specific. The measurement column is more subjective and will require further discussion.

There are various subcategories for sector program like portfolio, cross-sector and non-residential. There are also subcategories like sustainability, HVAC, multi-family, small business program. And per category, commitments are broken down to affordability, leverage of funding, marketing, weatherization, workforce development, and more. To see a breakdown of the 137 Plan Commitments and more information on the tracker, please review the presentation Ms. Sherwood provided, located in the [materials folder](#).

In looking forward to the development of this tool, Consultants will to consider what is measurable and how. The Consultants also want to determine how to solicit comments and how to mark completion. Ms. Sherwood reiterated the Consultants are looking for feedback and are hoping to get feedback from all parties. Further questions to consider include whether the document should be public, how commitment achievements will be tracked and how it should be used.



Mr. Beup shared that this is a cool tool and that he will spend more time reviewing it. Ms. Amanda Fargo-Johnson asked if the Board was prepared to discuss whether the tool becomes public. Ms. Sherwood noted that this should be public but not before it's reviewed by the Board. Ms. Fargo-Johnson and Ms. McLean agreed that due to the Board's commitment to transparency it should be made public. Ms. McLean posited why the document would not be made public. Mr. Beup agreed with Mr. Sherwood that it should be ready before it's shared so as not to cause undue confusion. Ms. Vicki Hackett indicated DEEP would prefer it be public given Freedom of Information Act and the public nature of this work/material.

I. 2022-2024 Plan Savings & Budget Segmentation – Consultants and Companies

Mr. Glenn Reed stated that there are over 200 detailed Budget and Savings Tables in the Three-Year Plan and this presentation is intended to provide a high-level overview to serve as a grounding for both existing and new Board members. Mr. Reed encouraged comments and questions, particularly in regards to items not covered here.

The Three-Year Plan is just short of \$707 million in spending to achieve 1.3-1.4 MMBtus annually. Net electric savings breakout is anticipated to be 24% Residential and 66% C&I while net lifetime gas savings 63% Residential and 37% C&I. When the sector savings are combined, Residential delivered fuel savings could account for 24% of total lifetime savings while the C&I delivered fuel savings are less than 1%.

Increasingly over the last few years, the demand savings effort both through passive demand savings (those directly related to program measures) and active demand savings (controlling electric loads during summer peak). The majority of overall demand savings, 80%, come from active demand.

In terms of spending, the Electric Budget can be broken down in to Residential (38%), C&I (42%), Demand Response (6%), Education and Engagement (2%), Other Programs (2%), and Administration and Planning (10%). The Gas Budget is split Residential (55%), C&I (31%), Demand Response (1%), Education and Engagement (2%), Other Programs (1%), and Administration and Planning (10%). Mr. Reed shared a further breakout of Administration and Planning, which is broken into 9 further categories for both Electric and Gas, and is dominated by three categories: Evaluation Measurement and Verification (EMV), Information Technology, and Performance Management Incentives.

Mr. Reed shared pie charts comparing Share of Electric and Gas Savings by End Use between 2020 and the anticipated 2022-2024 savings. A few notable trends include a downward shift from 2020 lighting savings in the Residential sector to more heating and general savings and a decrease in water heating savings. C&I lighting savings also decrease a bit from 2020, though less markedly compared to Residential, while savings from motors and cooling measures increase. Mr. Reed noted that food service shows the most change on the C&I Gas side, shifting upward from less than 1% of the savings share in 2020 to nearly 6% in the new Plan.

Mr. Reed indicated the Consultants would provide a Deeper Dive on the Demand Response savings in February.

J. DEI Consultant and Weatherization Program Operator RFP Updates – DEEP

Ms. Kate Donatelli shared that the window for the DEI Consultant RFP closed January 5 and the Consultant Committee is currently reviewing proposals.

The Weatherization and Program Operator RFP closed on January 4, but DEEP cannot share more



details given procurement rules. The Review Committee is looking over proposals and will update the Board soon.

Ms. Kate added that the Comprehensive Energy Strategy (CES) is a document that looks at the state's energy needs and identifies opportunities to reduce costs for ratepayers, ensure reliable energy availability, and look at issues such as public health and environmental impacts. Ms. Donatelli announced that [DEEP launched the process](#) of developing the 2022 CES last week. The 2022 CES will build on previous CES, the most recent of which was released in 2018. The 2022 CES will also draw upon other important state policy documents. DEEP is looking for feedback on a few specific areas and there will also be an opportunity to learn more about the CES and provide feedback during a webinar on February 17th at 9AM. Additionally, DEEP will be accepting written comments on the scope of the CES through March third. Registration and submittal information can be found [here](#).

3. Closing Public Comments (3 minutes per organization)

There were no public comments.

4. Adjourn

The Chair entertained a motion to adjourn. Mr. Jack Traver motioned to adjourn the meeting, Ms. Amanda Faro-Johnson seconded the motion. The motion passed 8-0 and the meeting was adjourned.