



## Energy Efficiency Board Monthly Meeting

Wednesday, August 14, 2019, 1:00 – 3:30 PM  
10 Franklin Square, New Britain, CT (Hearing Room 1)

### MINUTES<sup>1</sup>

#### In Attendance

Voting Board Members: Neil Beup (EEB Chair), John Wright, Taren O'Connor, Adrienne Houel, Jack Traver, Michael Li, Amy McLean Salls

Utility Board Members: Andy Brydges, Ron Araujo, Jane Lano, Will Riddle

Board Members Not in Attendance: Amanda Fargo-Johnson (EEB Vice-Chair), Eric Brown, Bruce McDermott, Scott Whittier

Board Consultants: Glenn Reed, George Lawrence, Craig Diamond, Richard Faesy (phone), Ellen Zuckerman (phone)

Others: Mary Sotos, Julia Dumaine, Donna Wells, Linda Foreman, Steve Bruno, Violette Radomski, Jeff Pollock, Jennifer Gray, Mark Grindell, Guy West, Bill Dornbos, Liz Murphy (phone)

#### Process

##### Minutes

The Board considered whether to approve the minutes from the July 10, 2019 Board meeting. Ms. Houel moved to approve, Mr. Wright 2<sup>nd</sup>. All present voted to approve, except Ms. O'Connor who abstained. Minutes approved.

##### Public Comments

None.

##### Board member service recognitions

The Board recognized Mr. Dornbos for his many years of service to the EEB. The Board presented Mr. Dornbos with a plaque of recognition. Mr. Dornbos thanked the Board.

##### DEEP staffing changes

Ms. Sotos provided an overview of recent staffing changes at DEEP. She said that she would now be Special Policy Advisor for Energy, and Michael Li would be the new Chief of the Bureau of Energy and Technology Policy. She also said that Vicki Hackett would be the new Deputy Commissioner for Energy. Mr. Li introduced himself.

---

<sup>1</sup> Meeting materials available in Box.com: <https://app.box.com/s/1y8rl2rs5k3409mpcvldry49ule194h>

### Vote: Selection of Evaluation Administrator and EEB Technical Consultants

Ms. Sotos noted that the RFPs included a three year scope of work, rather than one year scope of work. She asked if the Board should consider approving the Consultant Committee's recommendation for the Evaluation Administrator, but with only a one year agreement instead of a three year agreement. The Board discussed the advantages and disadvantages of such an approach. Mr. Traver said it would not be fair to the bidding process to change the agreement period from one year to three. He said the only other choice would be to re-bid the RFP. Mr. Li noted that the current language in the RFP still required three years of budget. Ms. O'Connor noted that all Consultant Committee members voted on the three year language when the RFP was approved by the Committee for distribution. Ms. Houel asked if it would be possible to add contract language saying the contract could be terminated if significant problems were to arise with the contractor. She suggested that such language could be in the contracts (purchase orders) between the Companies and consultants. Board members generally agreed this would be a good approach. Mr. Beup recommended that the Board vote today to approve the Consultant Committee's recommendation to select SERA Inc, with the additional requirements that the Companies' purchase order language would be reviewed. Mr. Traver agreed with Mr. Beup's recommendation, but suggested that the Board should approve for SERA for all three years. **Motion: to approve the Consultant Committee's recommendation to select SERA, Inc. as the Evaluation Administrator for a 3 year period, and to subsequently review the Companies purchase orders with Consultant to assure that language would be included to assure that contractors could be terminated after each year if significant problems were to arise with the contractor. Mr. Traver moved to approve, Ms. McLean Salls 2<sup>nd</sup>. All voted to approve, including Ms. Fargo-Johnson via her proxy given to Mr. Beup.** It was agreed that there would be an electronic vote for the Technical Consultants, and that the Companies' purchase orders would be reviewed for that agreement as well.

### EEB Roles and Process

- EEB legislative mandates. This was not discussed at the meeting. Mr. Beup said this would be discussed at the September Board meeting.
- Focus areas. Mr. Beup said that four possible focus areas for the Board had been identified: incentives, marketing, education, and administration/labor costs. He noted that another focus area might be parity (residential and C&I). Ms. Houel said it was a good idea to look at Residential parity, and LMI issues. Ms. O'Connor said it was important to look at LMI as a focus area. Mr. Araujo noted that the Table Cs in the C&LM Plans contained labor costs. Ms. Sotos said DEEP would consider other potential focus areas for the Board. Mr. Li said he would like to see some benchmarking data from other states. Ms. Sotos said she would like to see parity data for programs within the C&I sector; for example, the Government sector is under-indexed in regard to services received. Mr. Beup said that strategic electrification might be another focus area, in regard to how much the C&LM programs should address strategic electrification.

## Programs and Planning

### 2020 Plan Update

Mr. Bruno provided a presentation. Mr. Reed noted that Consultants were comfortable with the current draft budget, but he encouraged Board members to provide any feedback they might have. There was no discussion.

### Marketing and Customer Engagement Platforms

- Overview of Marketing program data. Ms. Gray, Mr. Grindell, and Mr. Bruno provided a presentation. Ms. McLean Salls asked how the Companies determined the amount they spend on marketing. Mr. Bruno and Mr. Riddle noted that they try to budget enough to reach goals, and Mr. Riddle noted that it varied depending on the level of demand during different periods.
- Customer Engagement Platforms. Mr. Bruno provided a presentation on Eversource's CEP. Mr. Grindell presented on UIL's CEP. Ms. McLean Salls asked if the Companies had thought about a "Friends and Family" approach? Ms. Gray said they needed to be careful with which emails they send to customers. Mr. Beup said he was still concerned, even after presentations, that Eversource's CEP did not lead to enough direct savings. Mr. Pollock noted that the Companies had seen previously that if they reduce marketing activities significantly, that leads to a significant reduction in demand for services. He also noted that the CEP had allowed Eversource to be more efficient and smarter in other parts of their marketing programs. Mr. Araujo noted that they had a very large drop in demand in 2018 when marketing was cut back. He said the CEP allowed them to be extremely targeted in their marketing efforts. Ms. O'Connor said she still did not feel comfortable with the investments being made in Eversource's CEP. She said she did not see the relationship between direct savings and the costs of the CEP. Mr. Bruno noted that the CEP costs had displaced other costs, and that the marketing budget had remained the same over that time. Mr. Araujo noted that their marketing costs would go up if they stopped spending on the CEP, and they would go backward technologically. Ms. Zuckerman suggested that the Companies lay out a customer acquisition funnel. She said that might be helpful to the Board. Mr. Beup agreed that would be a good idea. Mr. Traver said he wanted to know what had changed in the marketing approach over the last five years, in terms of marketing budget, savings, etc. He asked what had changed in savings since the technology/approach was less advanced in years past? Mr. Pollock said the Companies would be happy to present more detailed information on this at future meetings.

### Update on Evaluation Studies

This was not covered at the meeting due to lack of time. Mr. Beup said this would be covered at the next Board meeting.

### Closing Public Comments - none.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm.