



Energy Efficiency Board
July 13, 2022 | 1:00 – 3:30 pm

Documents for the meeting are located here:

<https://app.box.com/s/53dm5xis6f4xgn4uoj0f456nhieuje0k>

[Meeting Recording](#)

Minutes

1. Process

A. Roll call of Board Members

Board Members: Amy McLean, Neil Beup, Ron Araujo, Victoria Hackett, Amanda Fargo-Johnson, Hammad Chaudhry, Joel Kopylec, John Wright, Kate Donatelli, Kathy Fay, Melissa Kops

Board Consultants: Emily Rice, Deidre Sanders, George Lawrence, Glenn Reed, Philip Mosenthal, Richard Faesy, Stacy Sherwood

Other Attendees: Daniel Robertson, Gannon Long, Heather Deese, Jim Walsh, Leticia Colon de Mejias, Samantha Dynowski, Adam Tardif, Alex Sopelak, Alise Zigmont, Alyssa Alves, Amanda Stevens, Anthony Fonseca, Brendan Thomas, Charles Rothenberger, David Dobratz, Diane Del Rosso, Devan Willemsen, Edyta Shim, Gary Pattavina, Ghani Ramdani, Guy West, Haig Rickerby, Jamie Klase, Jay Goodman, John Cottell, John Figlewski, Jordan Tuttle, Joseph Roy, Larry Rush, Lauren DiSalvatore, Lorenzo Wyatt, Mark Rubano, Martin Harisi, Michael Cresta, Michelle Long, Mike Weissmann, Nicholas Francis, Nickey Kollie, Patrice Gillespie, Paul Tangredi, Pete Carlson, Peter Ludwig, Peter Millman, Randy Vagnini, Rebecca Baez Castro, Rebecca Dube, Richard Oswald, Rose Croog, Sara Doutney, Scott Glidden, Shannon Laun, Shubha Jaishankar, Stephen Cowell, Tammy Wilson, Thomas Martinez, Tim Fabuien, Tim Kendzia, Violette Radomski, Viraj Sheth, Wendy Simmons, William Giblin, Yiran He

Ms. Anne-Marie Knight joined during Item 2A but was not present for the votes during Items 1C and 1D.

B. Minutes – Approve minutes from June 2022 Board Meeting

Mr. Neil Beup entertained a motion to approve the June minutes. Ms. Amanda Fargo-Johnson motioned to approve the minutes and Ms. Vicki Hackett seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The motion passed 8-0, with no abstentions.

C. Joint Committee Green Bank and Energy Efficiency Committee Member position open

Ms. Brenda Watson's recent resignation from the Board has also left a vacancy of Energy Efficiency Board representation on the CT Green Bank – EEB Joint Committee. Mr. Neil Beup discussed the role and encouraged Board members to consider volunteering to serve in it.

Interested Board members can reach out to [Mr. Beup](#) directly or to the [Executive Secretary](#).

D. EEB RFP for Technical Consultant and Evaluation Administrator

Ms. Amanda Fargo-Johnson shared that the Consultant Committee has received one application each for the two RFPs issued. Given the low response, the Consultant Committee recommended extending the RFP deadline to August 15th, with questions due by 5:00PM EST July 28 and responses due by August 4. Selected vendors would still be onboarding October 1, 2022. The Chair entertained a motion to extend the deadline as described. Ms. Amy McLean motioned, and Mr. John Viglione seconded the motion. There was no discussion and the motion passed 8-0, with no abstentions.

E. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

2. Programs and Planning

A. Focus Area: EE Funding in CT and Surrounding States – Technical Consultants

Ms. Stacy Sherwood, Technical Consultant, provided a presentation that covered CT funding sources, limitations on funding sources, funding sources specific to NE states, a comparison of surcharge and bill impacts as well as investment per customer. A copy of Ms. Sherwood's presentation can be found in the [materials folder](#).

Regarding energy efficiency investment per customer (Slide 16), Ms. Melissa Kops asked for clarification on whether that only included participants or all customers. Ms. Sherwood noted that it is for all customers in each state per Energy Information Administration's 2020 report and asked if Ms. Kops would like information on participants. The numbers on Slide 16 represent total funding forecasted for the Programs divided by total number of customers (both residential and commercial). Mr. John Wright asked if this was \$310 per capita annually and Ms. Sherwood said yes, for 2022. Ms. Vicki Hackett clarified that this is total funding, including commercial and industrial (C&I) customers, Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI) funds and Forward Capacity Market (FCM) funding. Mr. Wright noted that the numbers still seem high, and Ms. Sherwood said she could follow up with Mr. Wright to dig further into the numbers for him.

Ms. Kathy Fay asked how other states determine surcharge rates. Ms. Sherwood said this is based on the utility budget, the number of customers and their usage. Ms. Vicki Hackett added that DEEP approves the annual budget, which is statutorily capped, and then the budget goes to Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (PURA) for implementation. Ms. Hackett added that this year Public Act 22-25 established that any proceeds from RGGI that go to the Connecticut Green Bank more than 5.2 million dollars in a year are being redirected to support electric school buses in environmental justice communities.

Ms. Melissa Kops would like to see investment per customer, by customer class (C&I vs residential). Ms. Kops asked what the percentage of residential versus commercial in Connecticut compared to Massachusetts. Ms. Sherwood said Massachusetts has two to two and a half times more residential customers than Connecticut. Ms. Sherwood said she would follow up with more information to address Ms. Kops's questions.

Ms. Kops asked what is contributing to Connecticut's high effectiveness compared to Massachusetts. Ms. Kops wondered whether it can be concluded from this data that Connecticut is doing better than neighboring states with less funds or if other factors should be considered; and if the latter, wanted to know what those factors would be. Ms. Sherwood said that Massachusetts has behavior programs, and since those savings are shorter lived (1-2 years)

higher lifetime savings require higher investments. Ms. Sherwood said this is something the Consultants can investigate further.

B. CT Green Bank Update – CT Green Bank

Mr. Bryan Garcia, Mr. Ed Kranich, and Mr. Ralph Mesite of CT Green Bank provided an update on loan products, including the Commercial Property Assessed Clean Energy (C-PACE) and Smart E-Loan programs. The presentation included information on energy storage solutions as a business development opportunity as well as incentive programs available. Lastly, Mr. Garcia discussed the Governor's Council on Climate Change and Recommendation 56 which considered expanding the scope of the Green Bank beyond clean energy to include environmental infrastructure. Mr. Garcia shared an update on the Green Bank's progress in this area. A copy of the presentation can be found in the [materials folder](#).

Regarding the Summar Rate Special (Slide 5), Mr. Mesite indicated that there is not a set date for when that will end but it is expected to last until September. Vendors and participants will be notified when that will be winding down. Ms. Kathy Fay commented that it is difficult for customers to know what to expect regarding loans when the rates change frequently.

Ms. Fay asked how CT Green Bank defines "low income" and Mr. Mesite noted that it's the same qualifications as the HES-IE Program (under 60% of state median income). Mr. Garcia added that [Public Act 21-48](#) included affordable housing as a residential customer, defined as less than 60% average median income. Mr. Garcia discussed the ongoing PURA docket addressing affordable housing.

Ms. Fay stated that small landlords (less than five units) with a portion of tenants that meet that criterion for low-income are eligible for HES-IE and asked if the same eligibility is allowed under the Green Bank programs. Mr. Kranich said that the Green Bank has a goal for multifamily, affordable housing which includes five or more units. Mr. Garcia noted that the tools are there for these customers to participate, but the technicalities of working through the process falls to the utilities as program administrators in collaboration with the contractor or customer. Mr. Kranich noted that if there is something that doesn't fit under the Energy Storage Solutions program to please contact the Green Bank.

C. HES and HES-IE Funding Through 2022 – Avangrid

Mr. Larry Rush, Avangrid, provided a slide that continues the conversation around Southern Connecticut Gas (SCG) residential spending and budget trends. Mr. Rush explained that between 2015-2017, SCG was almost on budget, and close to overspending in SCG territory. In 2018-2020 SCG underspent; in 2018 and 2019 there was a shortfall in residential new construction programs. The dip in 2020 was related to program shutdown due to COVID and funds were carried over to 2021; despite the carryover, the budget decreased in 2021. Avangrid took measures during the downturn of COVID in 2020 and 2021 to increase participation.

The start of 2022 saw a dip of approximately \$3 million in the budget. As of June 2022, SCG has spent 70-75% of its residential budget. Mr. Rush indicated that over collection and additional RGGI funds can be used, but there's still a need to stabilize the field. Avangrid is looking at prioritizing multifamily and low-income customers, but steps must be taken to make sure the budgets are managed for the rest of the year. Mr. Rush noted that Program Managers met with

vendors to review purchase orders and discuss the need to hold them to their purchase orders. Mr. Rush noted that there has been an increased demand for HES, HES-IE, and solar programs since 2021.

Ms. Melissa Kops reported hearing from customers and vendors that not only is the budget being reached earlier, but that the anticipated budget has been reduced. Ms. Kops asked if this was due to some vendors overspending, and whether vendors who are managing to the budget are being “punished” because other vendors have overspent. Mr. Rush noted overspending across the board, including rebates.

Mr. Neil Beup asked if this issue was limited to the HES program and Mr. Rush said the numbers presented are portfolio wide. Mr. Rush added that Avangrid has not curtailed the HES-IE program, and discussed that certain curtailment is necessary to manage the budget. Mr. Beup clarified, in terms of the budget challenges Avangrid is experiencing, do they cover both HES and HES-IE or not? Mr. Rush reiterated that 75% of the HES budget is spent. Once Avangrid recognized the overspend, Mr. Beup asked if the communication to curtail was sent to only to HES or to both HES and HES-IE. Mr. Rush said that communication went out to HES.

Mr. Beup said at the June meeting the Board was asking for answers to what has happened in SCG territory to explain this budget issue, given that the same budget challenge is not happening in other territories across the C&LM Programs. Mr. Beup said that the Board needs to know what steps and protocols need to be put in place to avoid this situation going-forward.

Mr. Rush noted that a disproportionate number of gas customers are in Avangrid territory, and therefore a disproportionate number of HES participants are in SCG territory. Mr. Rush suggested that Avangrid could consider different incentives and measures across its territories, including increasing the customer co-pay to address this issue. Mr. Beup noted that the Board is looking for consistency across the state and asked if Mr. Rush was suggesting that the Board abandon this practice. Mr. Rush said more investigation would be needed around the effects of such changes. Mr. Rush noted that SCG has a history of high spending and anticipates further budget shortfalls if gas usage continues its downward trend.

Mr. Hammad Chaudhry, Avangrid, suggested that there are multiple ways to address budget shortfalls and overspending. Mr. Chaudhry said that Avangrid can take further steps to address this issue and discussed some possible tactics going forward.

Mr. Beup communicated the Board’s desire to avoid territory-specific or utility-specific incentive changes to address this issue. Mr. Beup reiterated that this issue is specific to SCG and HES and would like Avangrid to connect with the Technical Consultants to work on a plan to address the issue before the next Board meeting.

Ms. Vicki Hackett noted that while the Board is reluctant to have frequent changes in incentives or co-pays, there were some adjustments made during the pandemic to increase program interest and provide near-term relief. Ms. Hackett continued that some of those temporary incentive changes haven’t been dialed back. Ms. Hackett said that her understanding is that the overspending isn’t specific to SCG’s HES program, but also HES-IE. The HES-IE pressure has been relieved given the shift from RGGI funds. Ms. Hackett pointed out that SCG is one of the most

underserved and overburdened service territories and suggested that redirecting funds to SCG where appropriate is necessary.

Ms. Hackett said that the Board needs to readdress the temporary changes to the programs, and further stated that DEEP would like the Board to take that on before the annual Plan Update. Ms. Kathy Fay asked how the Board goes about doing this. Mr. Beup explained that the Board asks the Companies and Consultants to do some analysis and provide recommendations and subsequent impacts and then deliberates. Mr. Beup suggested putting this on the agenda next month. Mr. Beup asked for Avangrid to provide more granular data on the SCG programs.

Ms. Fay said she hopes the HES-IE continues to increase and doesn't want the incentives for HES-IE to decrease. Ms. Fay asked how much of the EE budgets are contributing to the state weatherization goals and how much the state is depending on other programs. Ms. Vickett said that DEEP is taking steps within the Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP), which is not overseen by the utilities, to take on additional federal funding. Ms. Hackett mentioned that there is currently an RFP out, issued yesterday, to solicit vendors for the 2023 program. Ms. Hackett mentioned that DEEP is planning to issue an RFP for more program administrators in the future.

D. Energize CT Website Walk Through and Update on Mobile Event in June 2022

Ms. Mary McCarthy shared an update on the Energy in Action program, including recent events and program metrics. Ms. McCarthy also discussed program evaluation surveys and the results as well as shared the Media Event held on June 23rd with DEEP and the Board. The Energy in Action Mobile exhibit launched in April; 23 school events have been completed to-date with 11 in environmental justice communities. Events so far have reached approximately 12,000 people, 4,590 students and 7,798 community members. A copy of Ms. McCarthy's presentation can be found in the [materials folder](#).

Mr. Beup asked if the Companies have visitation numbers from the previous exhibit for comparison. Mr. Beup asked for a comparison with historical data from the Energize CT Center and for more details, including a visual map, demographic information on visitors, grades, etc. Ms. Amanda Fargo-Johnson added that she would like to see a map of where the exhibit has been and where it's projected to go. Mr. Beup requested a presentation next month with the requested details. Mr. Beup added that he wanted to include anywhere the Board is sending Energy Efficiency Funds in the name of education. Specifically, Mr. Beup requested a spending comparison with foot traffic and demographics for these various efforts.

Ms. Fargo-Johnson asked for clarification on the total school and community events. Ms. McCarthy said all 40 school events will happen and more to meet the target for environmental justice communities (EJC). Ms. Fargo-Johnson asked how the Companies were going to ensure the EJC target is reached. Ms. McCarthy noted that they have the vendor targeting EJC communities.

The Update on the Energize CT Website has been pushed to the August meeting. Ms. Fargo-Johnson asked for an explanation. Ms. Stacy Sherwood indicated that the launch of the website has been delayed and to provide a live view of the website launch, the update was pushed back. Ms. Fargo-Johnson requested getting a demo for the website higher on the agenda. Ms.

Sherwood said this item could be addressed first next month since there is not a focus area.

E. DEEP Updates – DEEP

Ms. Kate Donatelli provided a slide deck that covered the following items: New Residential Committee EEB member and the Final DEEP Determination & Conditions of Approval (COA) for 2022-2024 Plan. A copy can be found in the materials folder.

Ms. Brenda Watson stepped down from her role on the Board. Ms. Watson's position statutorily represented residential customers. DEEP released a call for applications for a new Board member serving in that same capacity May 31 and closed June 30, including evaluation criteria and appointment details. (Slide 2) DEEP is now evaluating applications.

Ms. Donatelli reminded the Committee that [DEEP's Determination](#) on the Plan with [Conditions of Approval](#) was released June 2 (Slide 3). Companies will be submitting responses and those can be reviewed on the [DEEP Energy Filing page](#). Ms. Donatelli showed a screen shot of this page to help stakeholders find this information (Slide 4).

3. Closing Public Comments

Ms. Leticia Colon de Mejias asked if DEEP could report on the Contractor Technical Advisory Committee (CTACT) work. Ms. Donatelli indicated that a report out was provided at the Residential Committee meeting. Ms. Colon de Mejias shared a concern that there's a bottleneck of information from the CTAC meetings and those issues addressed in CTAC aren't reaching the Board. Ms. Colon de Mejias pointed out that the CTAC meetings were designed to create a pathway to report out on contractor or ratepayer programs. Ms. Colon de Mejias pointed out that contractors attend CTAC meetings on their own time to explain ratepayer problems, exclusionary practices, etc. and is concerned that information isn't reaching the Board. Mr. Neil Beup said to some degree the Board assumes the Committees will report out but said that the Board can confer and figure out how this information is flowing freely by the meeting next month to ameliorate this concern.

Ms. Kathy Fay added that the Residential Committee requested minutes from the CTAC meetings as well as survey results and tracking information going-forward.

4. Adjourn

Mr. Neil Beup entertained a motion to adjourn. Mr. John Wright motioned to adjourn the meeting; Ms. Amy McLean seconded the motion. There was no discussion and the motion passed 9-0.