



EEB Meeting With Public Input Session
Wednesday, August 9, 2023 | 1:00PM – 4:30PM
[Meeting Materials](#) | [Meeting Recording](#)

Minutes

1. Process

A. Attendance

Board members: Neil Beup, Ronald Araujo, Steve Bruno, Amanda Fargo-Johnson, Kathy Fay, Karraine Moody, Melissa Kops, Larry Rush, Anthony Kosior, Donald Mauritz, J.R. Viglione, John Wright

DEEP: Victoria Hackett, Shubhada Kambli, Benjamin McMillan, Ashley Marshall

Board Consultants: Stacy Sherwood, Richard Faesy, Leigh Michael, Bahareh van Boekhold, Richard Faesy, George Lawrence, Lisa Skumatz, Phil Mosenthal, James Williamson

B. Approval of May Minutes

Mr. J.R. Viglione motioned to approve the minutes and Mr. John Wright seconded the motion. The motion passed 9-0.

C. Equity Database Request

Ms. Stacy Sherwood provided an update on the “equity database request” made during the June residential committee meeting. The EEB consultants are currently developing a webpage to be posted on the Energize CT website that will house the equity file database and a summary of tasks performed by DEI consultants – the page is expected to go live by Q4 2023. Stakeholders were encouraged to provide suggestions for incorporation into the webpage by [emailing Ms. Stacy Sherwood](#).

D. Public Comments

None.

2. Programs and Planning

A. Review of Evaluation Activities – Evaluation Administrators

Ms. Lisa Skumatz (SERA) provided an [update on recent activities by the evaluation committee](#). The presentation began with an overview and introduction of members of the evaluation team. A summary was provided for the evaluation study process and the evaluation committee’s involvement. Process discussion included an explanation of the pathway taken to incorporate study results into PSD and C&LM plan.

Ms. Kathy Fay commented that posting of evaluation studies should be searchable and accessible to the public. Ms. Lisa Skumatz recommended revisiting the comment during the “next steps” slide upcoming in the presentation.

An overview of the evaluation plan budget and study counts was provided with updates to progress relative to targets. A list of 19 ongoing and recently completed studies were presented; multiple were highlighted including: a data quality study, an evaluability assessment, and several residential and C&I program studies. The ongoing-study discussion was followed by an overview of list containing 23 of the “next cohort of studies”. Multiple studies were highlighted including: a variety of residential, C&I, and cross-cutting (Type x) studies. An additional line item was shown, yet to be allocated to a specific study, that will be used to support study scope revisions, control cost overruns, etc.

Mr. Ryan Kroll (Evaluation Team) presented on the requirements for the Conditions of Approval Data and PO Tracking. A performance summary table was provided for on-time data request rates by utility. A clarification was made that “second round” values are also inclusive of the “first round” and that UI’s Q1 score was updated from “3 to 4”.

Mr. Ralph Prah (Evaluation Team) presented updates on Study C2014, Phase 2: C&I Lighting Remaining Opportunities and Potential. The goal of the study was to characterize the commercial lighting market while gauging project opportunity potential by customer segment. Results indicate declining net-to-gross (NTG) rates with higher rates for distressed municipalities, small businesses, and lighting controls measures. Recommendations were to provide alternative NTG assumptions based on “distressed municipality” classification.

Ms. Kathy Fay questioned why the utilities opted to use the data set “without breakouts for distressed municipalities” and if the data should be considered for inclusion on the in-development DEI page. Mr. Ralph Prah suggested that utilities may have opted out of using the “distressed data set” due to tracking limitations and lack of data for SBEA programs. Ron Araujo (Eversource) detailed some challenges with breaking out the referenced data from the midstream lighting program.

Ms. Lisa Skumatz presented an overview of R2212: Behavioral Program Impact Evaluation. The study results found that there were not statically significant savings resulting from the behavioral program. Next steps will be to research remedies to increase claimed savings. Mr. Anthony Kosior asked if there was a best-in-class methodology used to define savings levels deemed as “significant”. Ms. Lisa Skumatz explained that typical rates were previously ~1.5% savings but have eroded over time – the lower bound of 90% confidence bands for CT data (and other states) have dipped below zero. Mr. Anthony Kosior provided a follow-up question asking how many states were considered in the analysis. Ms. Lisa Skumatz clarified that the analysis included CT, MA, NY, and 1-2 others. Ron Araujo explained that the customer base has become more efficient and that there has been diminishing returns on behavioral change programs.

Mr. Peter Jacobs (Evaluation Team) presented an overview on Study C1906, Phase 2: Strategic Energy Management (SEM) Process Evaluation. Objectives included establishing best practices, conducting process evaluations, and conducting impact evaluations. Results indicate that Eversource contractors are generally already using best practices. Recommendations include

using new vendors to improve program enrollment and emphasizing early identification of data collection needs.

Mr. Scott Pigg (Evaluation Team) presented on key recommendations and findings of the HES/HES-IE Impact, Process, and Profiling Study. There was discussion on variance in state-to-state program models: less savings in more homes (CT) vs. more savings in fewer homes (MA, RI). Billing analysis indicates that CT air sealing savings are significantly lower than current PSD values and to MA & RI value. There was follow-up discussion on consideration to induce program changes by increasing insulation incentive level, relaxing customer qualification criteria, and incentivizing vendors to promote insulation.

Mr. Robert Wirtshafter (Evaluation Team) provided details on a geographic analysis of participation in residential programs (2017-2020) by census block group. Findings included: savings are generally proportional to population distribution, the greatest remaining opportunity is in the moderate-income category, and there are concerns with renter participation. Recommendations include increasing marketing to landlords and rural households, addressing pre-weatherization barriers, improving non-English communication resources, and resolving customer time and trust constraints.

Mr. Peter Jacobs presented on Study C1920B Commercial New Construction Baseline. Study objectives were to develop industry standard practice (ISP) baselines for commercial new construction projects by review of building plans for non-participating buildings. Results indicate ISP baseline in the range of 10-20% for a variety of measure categories. As a result, the study recommendation is to utilize ISP as baseline, rather than code minimums.

Ms. Lisa Skumatz provided information on upcoming share-outs of studies with the committee including a variety of both kickoff and final-result presentations. Next evaluation committee activities will include updates to the evaluation plan, finalization of the evaluation use memo, PSD updates, kickoff of next cohort of projects, and consideration of options for improving access of past and upcoming study postings.

Steve Bruno (Eversource) questioned if the recent \$5.8M added to evaluation budgets covered the previously discussed line item for run-over and scope revisions. Ms. Lisa Skumatz confirmed that the referenced line item was included.

Ms. Kathy Fay asked to flag various studies for the DEI searchability efforts and asked for input/recommendations for topics that should be added to evaluation efforts. Ms. Lisa Skumatz seconded the request for input of evaluation processes and topics.

Ms. Victoria Hackett (DEEP) commented that DEEP would be following up on evaluation results in the 2024 Plan Update and asked if implementation costs for insulation projects in CT, relative to neighboring states, have increased following the increase to incentive levels. Ron Araujo confirmed that implementation costs have seen recent increases and suggested that the topic be discussed at future CTAC meetings.

Ms. Victoria Hackett also asked for the program administrators planned response for addressing the low values presented in the air sealing program.

Mr. Larry Rush (Avangrid) asked for confirmation of the year that air sealing study data was analyzed for. The evaluation team confirmed that the impact evaluation was for 2019-2020, but profile data was analyzed for earlier years. It was confirmed that the incentive levels presented were for “before covid-related incentive increases”.

Ms. Victoria Hackett asked for consideration in adjusting future evaluation processes such that results were still relevant at the time the study was presented. Ms. Lisa Skumatz explained that the upcoming “data study” and the “evaluation response study” are expected to address the study turnaround times.

Ms. Victoria Hackett asked when the HES study would be completed. Ms. Lisa Skumatz commented that study would be completed early in the next 3-year period. A general consensus was made to “make an effort to present meaningful evaluation data in more real-time”.

Mr. Anthony Kosior suggested that future evaluation efforts may be supported by addition of new metrics and questioned if there were better metrics that EEB should be using to infer program processes.

B. Focus Area: Public Act 15-5 – Technical Consultants, DEEP, and Avangrid

Stacy Sherwood (Energy Futures Group) presented an [overview of Focus Area: District Heating System Program](#). The presentation began with a general description of “district heating loops” and a discussion on “PSC Chapter 283 Section 16-258d”, a statute that requires Companies to develop incentive programs for district heating loops.

Ms. Ashley Marshall (DEEP) reviewed additional details of the statute, including a conclusion that SCG must submit a full proposal to EEB and DEEP detailing the proposed incentive structure. The proposal should be included in the 2024 CL&M plan update. DEEP will review the proposal, solicit public comment, and will present a determination.

Ms. Stacy Sherwood provided additional information on requirements for the proposed incentive including : incentive to be paid to customers connecting to the loop (not the developer), incentive to be based on customer’s projected natural gas reduction, and incentive amount not-to-exceed amount equivalent to one paid for equivalent natural gas demand reductions through CL&M programs. PURA will ensure that revenues to fund incentives are provided through a conservation adjustment mechanism (CAM) separate from the CL&M CAM.

Discussion of NuPower Project - Avangrid

Mr. Daniel Donovan (NuPower Thermal) presented an overview of the Bridgeport Thermal Loop. The general major components of the project include: fuel cell, thermal loop, and interconnection to the electrical distribution loop. Additional component details were discussed including: review of project location (600 Iranistan Dr – Bridgeport, CT), 20-year PPA lease term with UI, and operating contract details through Doosan Inc. The primary fuel designed for the fuel cell is hydrogen, but it will be supplied with natural gas in the near term. The thermal loop will distribute low temperature hot water.

Several aspects of the permitting process were described – including environmental and local permits. Schematics were provided for the thermal loop, identifying key customers – University of Bridgeport, Bassick High School, and ASW (industrial), and other additional customers with smaller loads. A schematic was presented of a “BMS interface style” control graphic identifying key thermal loop components (fuel cell, plate and frame heat exchangers, boilers, pumps, metering equipment, and distribution piping) along with fluid temperatures at various points in the loop.

The project was discussed in relation to its application to Conn. Ge. Stat. 16-258d(a)(1). Relevant requirements include: reduction in natural gas use, located in designated area, exceeds annual minimum waste heat recovery requirement of 40,000 MMBTU, and meets minimum requirement of 75% thermal energy recovery delivered to end-use customers. Additional details were provided on the specified plate and frame heat exchangers (including reference to 90% heat transfer efficiency).

Mr. Larry Rush provided information on Avangrid’s approach to developing the incentive associated with this project. Details were provided on the project review process including: analysis of billing data, review of the 22-building portfolio, assignment of measure life (set at 14-year based on PSD recommendation for plate and frame heat exchangers), and incentive structure references including the 2021 AESC report and the 2022 C&I Net-present-value screening tool.

Incentive calculations were reviewed in detail and estimated incentive and savings were provided: approximately \$3,836,471 incentive is projected at an average annual fuel savings of 539,931 CCF. Clarifications were made including: incentive would be recovered over 2+ year period through a separate charge outside of CL&M CAM with incentives being paid to customers connecting to thermal loop. Regulatory determination would be required for the project to advance.

Ms. Melissa Kops asked for additional information on strategy for backup of the thermal loop during failure. Mr. Daniel Donovan clarified that there would be backup auxiliary boilers located on site, however planned use would be reserved for peak heating periods. Customers are expected to have no space heating or natural gas use on their site. Ms. Melissa Kops followed with an inquiry if existing gas services would be decommissioned and if there was any

opportunity to reuse piping for the thermal loop. Mr. Daniel Donovan confirmed that piping requirements differed and piping will not be reused. The NG distribution line will remain in place.

Ms. Melissa Kops suggested that there is potential to eliminate entire branches of gas services, and that thermal loop implementation without elimination of gas service represents a missed opportunity. Mr. Daniel Donovan confirmed that the largest implementation cost is trenching related to installing new thermal loop piping and that the team was open to consider alternatives to reduce this cost.

Ms. Victoria Hacket asked if UI had made a preliminary determination if the project qualifies under the referenced statute (given that it does not use 75% of total waste heat, but only 50%). Larry Rush explained that UI has constructed an estimated incentive based on projected natural gas displacement and is seeking a statutory determination if the project qualifies under the referenced statute.

Ms. Victoria Hacket asked if UI was seeking DEEP's approval as part of the CL&M plan approval or by another process. Mr. Larry Rush responded that the application was currently filed with PURA under Pending Motion Docket 18-08. Mr. Victoria Hacket suggested that PURA's role in approval was analogous to approval of expenses associated with the CL&M fund (pass-through of DEEP's findings). It was noted that this may represent an open issue and that UI is expected make a determination before the project is submitted for DEEP review.

Mr. Anthony Kosior commented that emissions will not exactly be zero and that associated fuel cell natural gas will produce green house gas emissions. Mr. Daniel Donovan responded that project would have a net reduction in CO2 emissions. Mr. Anthony Kosior suggested that the fuel cell's CO2 emissions could be viewed as partially apportioned to the thermal loop. Mr. Daneil Donovan responded that PURA reviewed the referenced CO2 concern and issued a requirement that 50% of waste heat from fuel cell should be recovered in thermal loop to overcome the CO2 issue.

Ms. Victoria Hacket noted that the referenced PURA determination was made under the context of a PURA incentive – which is separate from the UI administered incentive. UI is expected to weigh in on the aforementioned legal issues when seeking DEEP's approval.

Ms. Melissa Kops asked if there was a plan to transition from the fuel cell using natural gas in the future. Mr. Daniel Donovan discussed ongoing efforts to develop a hydrogen hub in Bridgeport.

Mr. Richard Faesy asked how the system would be balanced in the summer when there was lower need for space heating. Mr. Daniel Donovan responded that the heat would be removed from fuel cells with heat-rejection fans. There are opportunities being investigated to apply waste heat to absorption chillers.

Mr. Neil Beup stated that it was unclear what the EEB's role was in the determination and that further articulation was needed between what is expected from EEB vs DEEP. Mr. Larry Rush responded that the thermal loop topic was added to the agenda to provide the EEB with awareness of the project and that funding for associated incentives was through a mechanism separate from the CL&M CAM. UI will work with DEEP to prepare requirements as needed for approval during the plan update review. Mr. Neil Beup responded that the description provided suggests that the EEB does not have a formal role in the approval of the project. Ms. Victoria Hacket suggested returning to the statute to review requirements and that UI is expected to submit the project proposal to DEEP for review only if UI concludes that the project meets statutory requirements.

Mr. Neil Beup commented that the language presented earlier in the presentation noted that "DEEP and EEB have a role jointly in approving" the project. Ms. Victoria Hacket responded that the process can be viewed as similar to that required for approval of the C&LM plan. The group agreed that approval responsibility required further clarification.

Ms. Kathy Fay commented that there is community concern with placement of Bridgeport's nearby seawall due to associated flooding and that this concern should be taken into context during the project's evaluation.

Ms. Amanda Fargo Johnson asked for security and safety concerns that are associated with the system due to its proximity to the highway. Mr. Daniel Donovan responded that Doosan has planning in place to address referenced issues. Ms. Amanda Fargo Johnson followed up with an inquiry on the expected down time of a fuel cell if a disruption were to occur. Mr. Daniel Donovan explained that there are backup boilers in place in case of emergency – however the issue's severity will be heightened if the system was required to run on backup boilers during the winter.

C. Q2 Report – Companies

Steve Bruno (Eversource) provided an update on [Q2 2023 program results](#). A combined summary was presented indicating budgets, revenue, and spending. Notable high-mark occurrences in data trends were highlighted and commented on: Eversource's rate of spending is faster than revenues coming in. SCG has more revenues coming than associated rate of spending. Total program spending is 51% of actual budget revenue and 49% of actual budget spend.

Additional granular data was provided for "Actual % of Budgeted Spending" and a breakdown by Residential and C&I programs. It was highlighted that the residential program budget spend percent is 61%, while C&I programs are at 46%. Eversource residential was flagged at 75% at the Q2 mark; other programs appear at normal ranges.

Data was presented indicating kwh and ccf savings rates across companies and programs. Comments were provided that Eversource Electric and CNG have savings marks in-line with Q2 targets. A general comment was made that savings and spending percentages are expected to be in-line throughout the year (the program should see approximately 50% savings and 50% spending at the Q2 mark)

There was discussion on program's heat pump activity with a focus on the impact that heat pump installation has on reported Kwh savings – heat pump installs will indicate negative savings. Heat pump activity is ahead of schedule, which amplifies the “negative savings” effect on program reporting. In the future, total program savings data may be broken out in two formats : “with heat pumps” and “without heat pumps”.

Program data was also shown by presenting savings in terms of MMBTU units. MMBTU reporting shows actual-to-goal percentages in better alignment (than kwh and ccf presentations).

Summary figures were also presented for lifetime savings. There are similar trends to those presented in annual savings data. It was noted that the measure mix installed has an average measure life less than originally projected.

Passive demand program savings were presented. Overall, the Companies show actual savings are in-line with targets (50% at Q2 mark).

Ron Araujo (Eversource) provided an update on spending in the residential program. 2023 expenditure activity has been forecasted to look similar to 2022 activity. The plan to manage expenses was to balance with other programs that are not utilizing funding, however there is not currently underspent budgets available to transfer. The Companies plan to request from DEEP: to partially expend into 2024 in order to fulfill on existing commitments to prevent program shutdowns. Other alternatives are being investigated such as right-size adjustment to certain program incentives.

Mr. Anthony Kosior asked for future presentations to include a chart displaying the heat pumps negative impact on total program savings. Mr. Steve Bruno confirmed that the referenced chart could be developed.

i. Update on Residential Rebate Processing Transition

Ms. Amy Mclean Salls (Avangrid) presented an update on the [residential rebate processing transition](#). Initial results were discussed explaining that an issue developed in past EFI rebate processing causing a lag in rebate application time which led to a high volume of customer inquiry on rebate status.

A timeline was presented on steps taken during the EFI system conversion processes including monthly breakdown of events triggering issues and their corresponding remedy. Recent activities indicate that the rebate application processing was up-to-date as of June. EFI will remain available to process applications through October - including non-compliant applications (NCAs). Resource Innovations began processing applications on July 1 and will work with customers on NCAs after August. A reminder was provided that rebate processing metrics were being reported monthly per a DEEP condition of approval.

Mr. Neil Beup asked if current monthly values were available to present. Ms. Amy Mclean Salls clarified that last report prepared was for July. Mr. Neil Beup noted that the monthly reports were not shared with EEB. The Companies confirmed that the report is sent to DEEP and that future reports can be shared with EEB.

D. 2024 Plan Update Overview – Companies

Steve Bruno presented on the [2024 plan update overview](#). The presentation began with an overview of the 2024 plan update components. New changes highlighted include: alignment with CL&M Plan conditions of approval, changes to education and workforce development programs, development of the 2024-2025 budget/savings tables, evaluation updates, and 2024 PSD revisions.

A monthly timeline was presented, highlighting the key deliverables dates remaining in the 2023 program year. As of August, the [draft plan outline](#) and [program savings document](#) is complete and available for review. The “Budgets and Savings” table will go to vote in the September EEB Meeting.

Ghani Ramdani (Eversource) presented on 2024 cross-sector program changes including a review of changes to heat pump and heat pump water heater offerings (addition of air-to-water heat pumps and small duct high velocity heat pumps). The process was standardized among MA and CT programs including development of common qualified products list and collaboration with the MA technology review process groups.

2024 Residential Program Changes were reviewed including the addition of an HRV and ERV offering, removal of behavioral program offerings, and updates to active demand response programs through EV charging and electric storage offerings. It was clarified that these changes are Eversource specific. There was additional discussion on changes to HES and HES-IE programs with key highlights including: discontinuation of advanced duct sealing for cooling-only, removal of lighting offering for HES-IE single family homes, institution of heat pump incentive caps, incorporation of IRA funding for a pay-for-performance pilot, and multiple other offering changes.

Mr. Neil Beup asked for the reasoning behind changes to HES-IE programs (removal of SF lighting and addition of heat pump price cap). Ron Araujo clarified that lighting is being phased out of the program due to market saturation (diminishing savings claims). The heat pump cap was created as a cost control measure to prevent over inflation of HES-IE installation prices. Ms. Melissa Kops added the heat pump pricing analysis revealed that HES-IE pricing was ~33%+ higher than market rate of other installations.

Larry Rush (Avangrid) presented on 2024 Commercial and Industrial Program Changes including revisions to the “new construction and diversity, equity and inclusion” programs and “retrofit” programs. Highlights discussed include: alignment with the DOE Grid Interactive Efficient Building Program, development of C&I weatherization tool, and early-retirement program updates. Additional updates were reviewed for the Strategic Energy Management and Active Demand Response programs. Highlights include: exploration of the virtual SEM offering, development of a thermal storage pilot, and inclusion of “curtailment” in demand response programs.

Steve Bruno provided an update for 2024 education, workforce, and community program changes. Highlights included implementation of summer certification and after school training programs, expansion of offerings to all CT high schools, focus area and funding updates for the community partnership initiative.

An update was provided on 2024 program revenues (relative to 3/1/23 update). Overall budget change reflects a net \$1M decrease resulting from RGGI budget changes. A detailed breakdown was also presented for draft electric and gas revenues by source. There were adjustments made for the evaluation budget (+\$1.3M) and energy education programs (+\$300k). Resulting changes to individual programs (residential, C&I, and demand management) were also discussed.

An update was provided on 2024 Education Budgets – referencing the previously discussing \$300k budget increase for additional after school programs. A comment was made that an estimate for the mobile unit came in at approximately \$300k.

A summary was presented for 2024 Statewide savings vs the previous 3/1/23 filing. Highlights in annual energy savings reflect: +15% kwh, -10% ccf, -12% MMBTU. kW savings differences were presented for passive and active programs. Results indicate: -18% in passive programs, and a slight decrease in active programs. Reasons for changes were discussed including success of heat pump programs and the transition of EV programs.

Ms. Stacy Sherwood highlighted that an additional in-depth analysis would be provided by technical consultants during the September EEB meeting.

Ms. Kathy Fay commented that the round 2 community partnership initiative was originally scheduled for 2023 and has been pushed to 2024. Steve Bruno confirmed that the schedule had been push back due to timing constraints in program.

Ms. Melissa Kops asked if there is any evaluation underway that could result in increased incentive levels for insulation and for general information on the strategy for adjusting insulation and air sealing incentives. Ron Araujo clarified that insulation program application changes (changing of R-value requirements to increase project opportunity) but incentive value changes were not anticipated. Ms. Melissa Kops provided follow up questioning on incorporation of air sealing during insulation projects. Mr. Ron Araujo explained that the existing insulation program requires before/after air-tightness testing and that insulation application consequentially creates an air-sealing effect.

E. DEEP Updates –

Ben McMillan (DEEP) provided updates for several DEEP program areas.

i. REPS Program Update

Updates were provided on the number of in-progress (54) and completed units (24). The pace of work continues to increase. A timeline has been developed to document

the lifecycle of the REPS contractor. For additional information, the REPS program was also described during the [08-09-23 Residential Committee Meeting](#).

ii. Weatherization Definition

DEEP continues to refine the draft weatherization definition and plans to release the definition for public comment within the next couple of months.

iii. CTAC Meeting Review

A summary was provided on the hybrid CTAC meeting held on 8/3. DEEP continues to work with contractors to increase meeting accessibility. Topics included: budget updates, HES/HES-IE programs and audit requirements, REPS program, utility updates on rebate processing, BETP's update on the customer incentive tool.

iv. Release of DOE Guidance on IRA rebate programs

DOE released IRA rebate program guidance on July 27. DEEP is still working through guidance and has summary documents available to share with EEB members. The first deadline is in August 2024 and full applications are due January 2025. More information from DOE is expected. DEEP has pending application for early administrative funding to support staff that will assist in developing the response. Ms. Amy Mclean Salls questioned whether the deadline was set for August 2024 or if it was a rolling deadline. Ben McMillan responded that DEEP was waiting on more guidance from DOE.

3. Public Comments

None.

4. Adjourn of EEB Meeting

Mr. J.R. Viglione motioned to adjourn the meeting and it was seconded by Mr. John Wright. The motion passed 9 - 0. The meeting was adjourned at 3:43pm.

5. 5. Public Input Session on 2024 Plan Update

Comments were provided by the public in reference to the 2024 Plan Update – topics are summarized in the sections which follow.

A. Dandelion Energy – Doug Presley

Doug Presley (Dandelion Energy) provided background information on Dandelion Energy – a residential geothermal installation company. Recommendations were provided to transition rebates so that they are calculated based on heating capacity of the systems. The current rebates are based on cooling capacity, which may not be appropriate for CT's heating-dominant climate, and may be a detriment in the selection of unit's heating performance. Examples were given of other states that use heating-based approaches (including, NY, CO, VT). A recommended \$2,700 per 12,000 Btu/hr heating capacity rebate was recommended.

A table was presented giving examples of various 3-ton GSHP systems (Enertech, WaterFurnace, Climate Master) and the associated rebate under the existing and proposed

structure. Options were shown for both two-stage and variable refrigerant flow models. An incentive mismatch was identified where some lower efficiency units have potential of receiving higher incentive rates under current program rules.

B. CMC Energy – Joe Roy

Joe Roy (CMC Energy) provided comment on proposed changes to advanced duct sealing in the HES and HES-IE programs. CMC described their investment in AeroSeal implementation infrastructure as a response to the EE program transition away from lighting and other easy-to-reach measures. The proposed change in the advanced duct sealing program was forecasted to negatively impact availability of skilled workers in residential energy efficiency. It was speculated that the proposed change would cause the low-moderate income class (that does not qualify for HES-IE) to become underserved.

C. AeroSeal - Maggie McCarey

Maggie McCarey (AeroSeal) provided background on AeroSeal – a company that provides air sealing technology to tighten ductwork, ventilation systems, and building envelopes. Additional background was providing describing the AeroSeal process and advantages over external tape and mastic hand-sealing processes. A detail from the evaluation results referenced a concern with completing duct and air sealing at the initial HES visit as opposed to during a follow-up appointment. It was clarified that AeroSeal is always completed as follow up visit. An additional concern was noted about application of the evaluation results to both AeroSeal and manual sealing. It was recommended to reconsider savings methodology to view manual duct sealing and advanced duct sealing separately. A recommendation was made to require duct sealing as a prerequisite of electrification (heat pump installation). A concern was noted that the proposed incentive change may reduce availability to income eligible customers.

D. Sierra Club CT Chapter – Samantha Dynowski

Several items associated with the 2024 CL&M Plan Update were discussed. A comment was made on fund distribution – specifically on the differentiation between parity vs equity. A request was made to better align funding allocations to reach targeted equity groups (such as renters). There was discussion on layering funding from C&LM programs with other sources – WAP program, IRA rebates, and the housing environmental improvement loan fund.

There was concern noted that the 2024 CL&M plan update Section 2.1.3 (Review of Fossil Fuel Incentives) was not planned until 2024 and that 2023 implementation should be considered. A recommendation was provided to accelerate natural gas phaseouts.

For Section 2.1.6 (CL&M Incentives for District Heating Systems), a comment was made that most hydrogen is produced from a feedstock of natural gas. There was concern noted that incentivizing a natural gas-based system was not in alignment with the State’s zero-carbon electricity mandate.

For Section 3 (Benefit Cost Screening), it was noted that there is no mention of the social cost of carbon – health impacts, mitigation, climate change adaptation, etc. and it was recommended that the screening analysis be revised to consider these impacts.

6. Conclusion of Public Input Session

With no additional request to comment, the public input session was concluded at 4:10pm. Additional written comments can be sent to the EEB's [Executive Secretary](#) for inclusion in 2024 C&LM Plan Update.

Ms. Kathy Fay asked a question on process for timing for board meeting, voting, and public input session. Mr. Neil Beup confirmed that the September EEB meeting would not have a vote for the entire C&LM plan, but just on the budget and savings tables.