

EEB Residential Committee Meeting
Wednesday, April 12 2023 | 9:00 – 11:30 AM

[Meeting Materials](#) | [Meeting Recording](#)

Minutes

1. Welcome – Melissa Kops

a. Roll Call of Committee Members

Board Members: Melissa Kops, Kathy Fay, Shubhada Kambli (DEEP), John Viglione, Walt Szmanski, Larry Rush

Board Consultants: Richard Faesy, Emily Rice, Stacy Sherwood, Baharah van Boekhold, Leigh Michael, Glenn Reed

b. Meeting procedures and process update

Ms. Kops reviewed the [Meeting Process and Procedures](#). Ms. Rice provided the link to [subscribe to the EEB distribution](#) lists.

2. Approve March Residential Committee Meeting Minutes

Ms. Kops motioned to approve the minutes and Ms. Fay seconded the motion. The minutes were approved 4-0.

3. Public Comments

Mr. Bernie Pelletier, PACE, called attention to the community-facing program data on the Clean Energy Communities dashboard. Mr. Pelletier believes there are some errors and requests that the utilities review the data so any necessary corrections can be made. Mr. Faesy confirmed that there are some inaccuracies and explained that the Technical Consultants are working with the Companies to get this fixed. Mr. Faesy noted that the data should be corrected soon and Ms. Amy McLean noted that an update would be provided at the [EEB Meeting](#) this afternoon.

4. DEEP Updates

a. 2023 Plan Update Approval

Ms. Kambli indicated that DEEP was in the process of working on the 2023 C&LM Plan Determination and it is forthcoming.

b. Residential Energy Preparation Service (REPS)

Ms. Guilia Bambara provided [an update](#) on the current referral process for the REPS program. The Program is currently only accepting applications from single-family owner-occupied units with the intention to expand to rental units for 1–4-unit buildings by late-April. An updated training will be provided at that time.

Ms. Fay asked if the referrals are going through the utilities or different funnels. Ms. Bambara explained that referrals come through Community Action Agencies

on the WAP side and on the HES-IE side the referrals come through utilities.

Mr. Mike Uhl asked who and how will residents get notified that the projects were a) submitted, b) rejected/accepted, c) receive details of why/why not ICAST proceeding, and d) if not proceeding, what is the cost and type of issue that is preventing progress. Ms. Bambara explained the process and indicated a formal letter is provided when an applicant is not accepted. Ms. Fay asked if there were supplemental programs in case someone is not accepted. Ms. Bambara said there are some local programs, and the rejection letter includes some of these resources. Additionally, there is a [study on the website](#) that includes a list of resources across the country. There is also a spreadsheet, which is linked at the bottom of the [REPS webpage](#). Ms. Bambara added that DEEP is looking for other funding sources that could help widen the scope.

Ms. Long said that referrals through HES/HES-IE still require the person to apply for the CT Energy Assistance Program (CEAP). Ms. Bambara said the LIHEAP funding accounts for 45% of the program and includes time restrictions. Due to this, the CEAP application is still required. If a customer doesn't receive a CEAP award letter, they will still have access to funding for about half of their project scope.

Ms. Long said that there is not a direct referral process from HES/HES-IE as they must come through CEAP. Ms. Bambara said DEEP wants to amend this to make it more fluid, and DEEP is open to suggestions on how to make this clearer for the customer, but to optimize spending some things must remain the same. Ms. Diane Del Rosso explained the process on the utilities' side: the contractor provides recommended measures and barriers to the utilities, then the utilities make the referral and ICAST has to come back to generate the full scope of work. Ms. Fay asked why iCAST has to make another visit to the home. Ms. Barbara and Ms. Del Rosso explained this is due to the contractor's expertise and data requirements for the program.

Mr. Uhl asked if ICAST will alert the resident for projects that the Utility/CAAs did not submit for REPS, but were submitted by contractors for consideration? Ms. Long explained that the contractors need to follow the established referral process.

Ms. Fay asked how fast the timeline is and Ms. Bambara believes it's 2 weeks, but will need to follow up.

Mr. Pelletier suggested that deficiencies of the program be turned into a grant-funding request with IRA dollars. Mr. Pelletier said that correcting knob-and-tube wiring is a barrier and the program doesn't cover it, suggesting a technical pathway to address this. Ms. Bambara said knob-and-tube is an allowable measure if it's within the funding cap, but often is not.

Regarding slide 4 on Data Tracking for the Program, Ms. Bambara said she could provide data later. Mr. Pelletier suggested keeping tabs on what needed to be

done versus what was able to be done. This way gaps caused by Program rules/restrictions are known and can be addressed later on should those rules change. Ms. Fay agreed this will be useful so the process can be refined based on actual needs.

Gannon Long: How much time does the extra referral (step through the utilities) add to the process? How can the customer track where their project is? Why don't the contractors have the expertise (to complete the full scope of work for referrals from the site visit)? Could the customer just skip ahead to the comprehensive ICAST assessment?

Mike Uhl: Is the data that is collected from these site visits (scoping, photos, barriers identified, etc.) shared in their entirety with the resident?

c. Federal Funding Coordination Update

Ms. Bambara provided an update on the following [\(slides 8-13\)](#):

- WAP, HES-IE & IRA Coordination
- WAP Draft RFPs
- Customer and Program Eligibility Efforts
- Green Storm Meetings

Mike Uhl: Did a survey of customers result in a request for this kind of tool being developed? Who suggested the tool as the solution for the identified problem? What is the identified problem?

Ms. Long: regarding AMI/ SMI overlaps/ gaps across the state, utilities submitted a chart with that info in the SCEF docket which is public.

d. CTAC Meeting Review

[Slides 15-16](#) include an overview of topics covered at the last CTAC meeting. DEEP is reaching out to contractors to continue the conversation around the pricing comparison sheets and IRA funding. DEEP expects to schedule further meetings in the next week or two.

5. DEI and Equity Metrics – DEI Consultants

The DEI Consultant provided [a presentation](#) on the following items:

a. Recap on the 2022 Assessment findings

The DEI Consultant [presented](#) its [2022 Preliminary Equity Assessment Report](#) to the Board in March. The DEI Consultant provided an overview of the approach and findings of the Report.

Regarding Equity Definitions under Construction on slide 16, Mr. Pelletier asked if ILLUME performed a companion study for how these populations are defined in other state agencies such as Housing, Social Services, and Education Department. Ms. Michael said that they did not, but added this could be an action item for the DEI team. Ms. Kops asked for more information on who's leading the process for defining priority populations and other program criteria. Ms. Michael explained that the DEI Consultant's role is to guide the Board and DEEP. They will be making suggestions on who could be charged with certain

tasks.

Ms. Fay asked when the Board would see different options for defining target populations, expressing a concern the task could drag on too long. Ms. Michael said the DEI has performed research on definitions used across the state, and referred to the Preliminary Equity Assessment for more information on their findings. Ms. Michael explained that the DEI Consultant will be focusing on aligning the equity goals first and then aligning the criteria for defining priority populations later this year. Ms. Van Boekhold further explained the DEI Consultant's upcoming process.

Regarding slide 49, Ms. Gannon Long asked: How would a customer be coded "hardship" but still be referred to HES instead of HES-IE? Guidelines for hardship status and HES-IE are the same income - 60% SMI. Ms. Long said leaving out multi-family households from the goals is a glaring inequity.

- b. Review current equity goal and PMI metrics C&LM programs are guided by
The Technical Consultants provided an [overview of the existing Performance Management Incentives \(PMI\) and equity metrics](#). This included a background on equity metrics, parity, and the E3 proceeding and metrics on how the state has done according to its existing goals.

Ms. Kops asked where the budget number for IE comes from, wondering if it's based on participation or the number of eligible ratepayers. Mr. Faesy said there is a defined process and that the budget is driven by somewhat by demand, but there is not a precise way these budgets are derived. Mr. Larry Rush explained the budget is based on multiple variables, noting that past participation and current demand are both factors. Ms. Diane Del Rosso added that the planning teams have a model based on many factors. Ms. Del Rosso suggested further discussion around this topic in the future and Ms. Kops agreed this would be beneficial for the Committee.

- c. Review other equity goals we might consider (E3, Justice 40)
Ms. Michael reviewed existing equity definitions in the region and state of Connecticut as well as types of equity goals. Ms. Fay noted there is revenue from other sources and asked if this is something the Committee needs to talk about.
- d. Map out potential goal options
Ms. Michael led the Committee in a brainstorming session around what outcomes are intended for equity efforts, what benefits can be achieved, and what harms or burdens can be reduced or avoided. Ms. Michael indicated that she will be conducting a poll for further input and the Executive Secretary will distribute that poll following the meeting. The DEI Consultants will provide an update at the next Committee meeting.

6. Company Program Updates

- a. Community Partnership Initiative (CPI)
Ms. Sheri Borelli and Ms. Devan Willemsen provided an [update on Round 1 and development of Round 2 of the CPI](#). The presentation includes a progress update

on Round 1, which is wrapping up, and details on changes for Round 2. Round 2 will be open to distressed municipalities and municipalities containing environmental justice communities as [defined by DEEP](#).

The presentation includes an overview of the five project focus area options for participants in Round 2.

Applications closed March 17th at 5PM and Round 2 will open December 16, 2023. The Companies received 18 applications across the five focus areas. The Companies are finalizing MOUs. More details on Round 1 appreciation and Round 2 kickoff are coming soon.

b. Report on Tax Credits Awareness in Programs

Ms. Del Rosso said the Companies are working on adding resources and links to the Energize CT website that will help customers navigate tax credits and incentives.

c. HES/HES-IE Program Status

Ms. Del Rosso said the Companies are launching Insulation Bootcamp Training this month. More trainings will be provided throughout the year. Mr. John Karyczak said as of this morning all seats have been filled for April through June trainings! Folks can reach out to CTBootCamp@cetonline.org with questions. Here is the [FAQs document](#). Questions regarding training can be directed to John Karyczak.

Ms. Del Rosso noted that Eversource is monitoring the single-family program, adding that if high demand continues it will put a strain on the budget.

Ms. Amy McLean provided an update on Avangrid's new training system.

Mr. Pelletier encouraged DEEP and the Committee to find ways to meet the robust demand.

7. Green Bank Update

Mr. Ralph Mesite and Mr. Ed Kranich provided [a presentation](#) that includes an overview of the Smart-E Loan Program and the Battery Storage Program. There will be a webinar May 3rd for the Energy Storage Solutions Program.

Regarding Energy Storage Solutions, Mr. Pelletier said that many low-income residential sites are not battery ready and it's difficult for these customers to adopt this technology. Mr. Pelletier pointed to this as an area to collaborate with the EEB and Green Storm. Mr. Uhl asked if Energy Storage Solutions is supporting smart panel deployment too.

Ms. Kops asked if there's an update on the requirement to spend 40% of project volume will be in environmental justice communities. Mr. Kranich said that Green Bank has made suggested changes to help achieve this goal to PURA that are pending approval.

8. Future Agenda Topics – Consultants

Mr. Faesy provided an [overview of topics](#) for the next few meetings. Mr. Faesy reminded the Committee there is no meeting in July and noted that suggestions for topics can be sent to him.

9. Public Comments

Ms. Long: is there a central place where state run/ sponsored weatherization progress is being tracked? or is it all separate? It would be helpful to see all the types happening so we can see how close we are getting to the 80% by 2030 goal. Mr. Faesy said he doesn't know of a central place, adding that the central dashboard includes HES and HES-IE. Mr. Pelletier added that a wide lens would help in terms of funding, proper deployment of resources, and tracking progress. Mr. Pelletier suggested a "universal system bus" for all programs.

Mr. Pelletier, regarding DEI Consultant Work: one point of view I might suggest is that we look at the desired end state as a perspective. In our state the EEB is confined to energy efficiency (not renewables) - but I suggest we look at the presumption that existing housing (1 to 4 household homes) is not energy efficient - and that we seek to make it efficient (to a weatherized standard). We then apply the multiple equity lenses to see what stands in the way of achieving that goal. I also suggest that we - at a minimum be aware of health, housing, education, and social services programs - because energy is key to all of those - and vice versa.

10. Adjourn

Ms. Kops motioned to adjourn. Ms. Fay seconded. The motion was approved 4-0 and the meeting was adjourned.