



Memorandum

To: Lisa Skumatz, Bob Wirtshafter and Ralph Prah, Connecticut Energy Efficiency Board Evaluation Administrators

CC: Craig Diamond, CT EEB Executive Secretary; Richard Faesy, CT EEB Technical Consultant

From: Glenn Reed, CT EEB Residential Technical Consultant

Date: June 2, 2017

Re: Residential Technical Consultant comments on the 05/12/17 Residential New Construction (RNC) Process Evaluation Draft Report (R1602)

Provided below are summary and highlight comments on the May 12 review draft of the Residential New Construction (RNC) Process Evaluation Report. These comments supplement those contained in the marked-up draft report that was also submitted. Most of the comments below are included in the marked-up draft and are provided here as a high-level summary and for emphasis. I note that some of the information requested may be provided in the two subsequent RNC volumes addressing billing analysis impacts and new construction baseline practices.

1. The report should provide additional detail as to program participation, statewide new construction starts and/or completions, HERS tiers, incentives for these tiers, and bonus incentives. These should be provided for the 2015-2016 timeframe and any changes noted for the current 2017 program year.
2. Given the growth of multifamily building participation in the program, this market segment needs to be discussed in more detail as to how services are offered and incentives paid, particularly for buildings that are on both residential and commercial rates. Further, depending on building size, the multifamily building may need to comply with residential or commercial code requirements. For example, it is my understanding that air leakage testing is only required of low and mid-rise multifamily structures, but

not of high rise multifamily buildings. Finally, the report notes that different air leakage testing sampling requirements are in place depending on the rater. Why?

3. The report should characterize the most current full year of available residential new construction activity in CT and compare this to program participation numbers. What are the program participation rates for both single and multifamily buildings? If possible, the multifamily program participation should be provided on both a building and unit basis.
4. There are several self-reported statements made by Company staff that should be verified before their inclusion in the Report. For example, on page I there is text:

Program staff see the program as streamlined and consider the program's generous incentives—**some of the highest in the nation**—as a key strength

Has NMR verified the highlighted statement?

5. The study largely fails to address EE and renewable integration in the RNC market and program. It may have been interesting to have interviewed CT Green Bank staff. Does the program track the number of participants that installed PVs and their installed capacity? If so, please report that data. If not, please recommend that such data be tracked. This is separate from the tracking of the kWh generated from such systems which is an important consideration for any planned billing analysis and is already noted in the report.
6. Why were there no nonparticipant builder interviews? Similarly, why were no real estate agents interviewed. Were such interviews not part of the original workplan?
7. There several statements noting that the program incentives cover most of the costs associated with program participation. Is this correct? If so, these statements do not appear to be consistent with the reported percentage home price increases (~5%) attributable to program participation. However, the report does not provide an estimate for the average cost of a CT home so one is not able to convert the percentage incremental costs into actual dollars.