July 15, 2022

Lisa A. Skumatz, Ph.D.

Skumatz Economic Research Associates (SERA)

762 Eldorado Drive

Superior, CO 80027

RE: X2022 Connecticut Education, Workforce Development, and Community Engagement Evaluation

Dear Dr. Skumatz,

Eversource Energy and AVANGRID (the “Companies”) are pleased to submit these written comments regarding the Review Draft Evaluation Report: *X2022 Connecticut Education, Workforce Development, and Community Engagement Evaluation* (“Draft Report”), submitted June 23, 2022 by Illume (“Evaluator”). The Companies received the Draft Memo on June 23, 2022 and requested an extension to provide comments by July 15, 2022, which was approved. Per the Energy Efficiency Board Evaluation Road Map Process, these comments are in response to the Draft Report for consideration for inclusion in the Final Report.

The Draft Report includes findings and recommendations of the evaluation of the initiatives: “Educate the Students,” “Educate the Workforce,” “Educate the Public,” and “Customer Engagement".

**General Comments on Draft Memo Findings**

The Companies appreciate the Evaluator’s efforts to evaluate the Workforce Development initiative, Green STEP initiative, eesmarts initiative, Community Partnership Initiative, and Customer Engagement initiative. We appreciate the findings and recommendations for consideration in the design and maintenance of our initiative activities. However, some of the recommendations are not feasible and/or conflict with the DEEP Determination of the 2022-2024 Conservation and Load Management Plan. The Companies have also noted and updated inaccuracies in the Draft Report via tracked changes.

**Comments on Methodology**

The Evaluator (1) conducted interviews with program staff; (2) conducted a secondary literature review that included reviews of published evaluations of other education, workforce development, and community and customer engagement efforts both within the energy efficiency sector and outside the industry conduct; and (3) conducted primary research to understand additional details related to the program experience for two initiatives within the “Educate the Workforce” initiative: the workforce development trainings, and the Green STEP program. The Evaluator plans to conduct primary research related to the Community Partnership Initiative program. The Companies find the study methodology to be appropriate, though there are two methodology concerns to note.

One concern is that the secondary literature review included review of evaluations of education, workforce development, and community and customer engagement efforts outside of the energy efficiency industry. Efforts outside of the energy efficiency industry may not be comparable to the Companies’ initiatives and some of the best practices identified may not be relevant.

Additionally, in the primary research surveys to teachers regarding the Green STEP and eesmarts initiatives, was there a question to determine how long the teachers have been working at the school? Teachers who had not been working long enough to be involved in the Green STEP and eesmarts programs would not be able to provide relevant feedback.

**Comments and Questions**

The Companies have the following comments and questions.

1. Energize CT is not an entity – it is a brand sponsored by the Companies. So, in most instances in the Draft Report where the Evaluator refers to Energize CT, they should be referring to the Companies. Additionally, the Companies are not the project sponsor. The project sponsor should be the CT Energy Efficiency Board.
2. The Program for Community Outreach / Educate the Public should be correctly identified as the Community Partnership Initiative throughout the Draft Report. The Companies have redlined the name correctly throughout the redlined version of the Draft Report.
3. The Companies are concerned about the recommendation to use other funding streams (not rate-payer dollars) to support the eesmarts program. This is an educational energy efficiency program that falls within the Companies’ energy efficiency budget.
4. The Companies are concerned about the recommendation that the initiatives should link goals and outcomes to potential energy savings. The educational programs have indirect energy savings, but we do not expect calculating these savings to be feasible.
5. The Companies noted inaccuracies about the initiatives, suggested edits, and provided supplemental information in the Draft Report via comments and tracked changes.
6. The Companies recommend the Evaluator meet with the DEI Consultant to ensure their recommendations align.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and questions.

Sincerely,

Megan Errichetti Richard Oswald

Megan Errichetti Richard Oswald

Analyst, Evaluation | Energy Efficiency | Eversource Principal Engineer | UIL Holdings

megan.errichetti@eversource.com richard.oswald@uinet.com