

#### Michaels Energy

#### Connecticut R2015 Study

Low Load Electric Residential New Construction

Workplan and Stakeholder Presentation

October 1, 2021

Ingo Bensch Evergreen Economics



#### Program and Study Context

- Residential new construction programs need an upgrade to stay ahead of standard industry practice
- Interest in electrification and decarbonization in state and region, although policy elements are still evolving for incorporation into utility programs
- Energize Connecticut runs residential new construction program and Zero Energy Challenge; both are HERSbased
- Substantial MF and SF construction
- Conducting this study to help inform program strategy and tactics
  - > Just a start: small study with limited budget
  - > Will focus on key secondary information

#### Planned Project Results (1 of 2)

### Planning parameters and directional recommendations for CT's residential new construction program

- Based on research completed elsewhere, approaches and experiences of leading program approaches, insights of thought leaders
- Translated to implications for Connecticut
- Informed, in part, by check-in discussion with stakeholders

## **Plo**

#### Planned Project Results (2 of 2)

#### Bringing info available from literature, market leaders, and experts to CT

- Program approaches / strategies (directional, descriptive)
- Program design parameters (descriptive and/or quantitative metrics)
- Market response and effectiveness (quantitative and qualitative)
- Policy complements (descriptive)

Passive House, leading edge RNC programs, ZNE /ZNE-ready programs, DER/DR/EV integration, Well Building standard, ideas on thought leaders' drawing boards

New technologies, approaches to advance HPs, incremental construction costs, non-energy benefits, market-focused metrics such as HERS ratings or other labels / communication intended for decision-makers, owners, residents

Program uptake rates and expressed interest by owners; developers, builders, trade allies; barriers; market transformation successes

Use of stretch code, accelerated reviews, program goals and direction on electrification

Approach	
Program   Literature review     CT PA Staff Discussion   Image: CT PA Staff Discussion     Image: CT PA Staff Discussion   Image: CT PA Staff Discussion     Image: CT PA Staff Discussion   Image: CT PA Staff Discussion     Image: CT PA Staff Discussion   Image: CT PA Staff Discussion     Image: CT PA Staff Discussion   Image: CT PA Staff Discussion     Image: CT PA Staff Discussion   Image: CT PA Staff Discussion     Image: CT PA Staff Discussion   Image: CT PA Staff Discussion     Image: CT PA Staff Discussion   Image: CT PA Staff Discussion     Image: CT PA Staff Discussion   Image: CT PA Staff Discussion     Image: CT PA Staff Discussion   Image: CT PA Staff Discussion     Image: CT PA Staff Discussion   Image: CT PA Staff Discussion     Image: CT PA Staff Discussion   Image: CT PA Staff Discussion     Image: CT PA Staff Discussion   Image: CT PA Staff Discussion     Image: CT PA Staff Discussion   Image: CT PA Staff Discussion     Image: CT PA Staff Discussion   Image: CT PA Staff Discussion     Image: CT PA Staff Discussion   Image: CT PA Staff Discussion     Image: CT PA Staff Discussion   Image: CT PA Staff Discussion     Image: CT PA Staff Discussion   Image: CT PA Staff Discussin  <	Thought leader interviews



### **Deliverables & Timeline**

Timing	Deliverables	Notes
Late October	Interim memo	Based on initial literature content / implications / issues
November	Interim presentation to evaluation committee	Complements memo Supports translation of findings for CT Allows for reprioritization, as needed
February (2022)	Report Annotated bibliography	Results oriented and actionable Bibliography to serve as resource as well as documentation



# Schedule and Budget

Task	Time frame	
Project initiation and scoping	late July – early Sep	
Initial literature review	mid Sep – mid Oct	
Interim memo and check-in	mid Oct, Nov	
Remaining research (more lit review, practitioner & thought leader interviews)	Dec – Jan	
Analysis, synthesis and reporting	Feb	
Activity		Approx. budget distribution
Planning, literature review, check-in, project mgt		\$25,000
Interviews		\$25,000
Analysis, recommendations, reporting		<u>\$25,000</u>
Total		\$75,000

#### Thank you