



EEB APM Meeting

Wednesday, August 14, 2024 | 1:00 PM – 3:30 PM

[Meeting Materials](#)

[Meeting Recording](#)

Meeting Minutes

1. Process

A. Roll call of Board members

Board Members, Voting: Anthony Kosior, Amanda Fargo-Johnson, Anne-Marie Knight, Kathy Fay, Bernie Pelletier, JR Viglione, John Wright, Jayson Velazquez

DEEP Designees: Ben McMillan, Becca Trietch

Board Members, Utilities: Hammad Chaudhry, Diane Del Rosso, Steve Bruno, Marriot Dowden, Donald Mauritz

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

B. Approval of June and Annual Planning Minutes

Mr. Bernie Pelletier motioned to approve the [06-12-24 EEB Meeting Minutes](#) and the [06-26-24 EEB Annual Planning Meeting Minutes](#). The motion was seconded by Mr. Ben McMillan. The minutes were approved 8-0 with an abstention by Mr. JR Viglione.

C. Committee Updates (Evaluation, Residential, and C&I)

Mr. Bernie Pelletier provided an overview of 08-14-24 Residential Committee Meeting:

- There was a report out on the Q2 residential program status
- Overall, the programs are on track in terms of budget, except for the Eversource electric heat pump program which has significantly exceeded its budget.

Mr. George Lawrence (Caerbannog Consulting) provided an overview of 08-13-24 C&I Committee Meeting:

- There was an update from the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) on their Final Determination for the current C&LM Plan.
- There was a second-quarter metrics update, which included a review of various program performance indicators, such as retro-commissioning, weatherization, and heat pump installations.
- There was discussion on three-year planning, where Lawrence provided an overview of the second draft of the plan, particularly in the commercial and industrial (C&I) sections. He also commented on the draft savings and costs from the benefit-cost ratio models, which included projections for heat pump installations over the next three years.
- The Companies led a discussion on performance metrics, particularly focusing on performance

incentives earned by meeting specific goals. Currently, the emphasis is on comprehensiveness, but Lawrence indicated that future adjustments might prioritize other metrics, such as increased weatherization and heat pump installations.

- The meeting concluded with planning for the upcoming September meeting.

Ms. Kathy Fay provided an overview of 08-12-24 Evaluation Committee Meeting:

- The first topic was the placeholder for the evaluation budget.
- The second topic was a discussion on upcoming evaluations, where the group considered which studies made sense to pursue. Ms. Fay mentioned that there was an understanding of the evaluations typically conducted, but some topics required further discussion to clarify the intent of the studies. Additionally, there were instances where certain evaluations seemed likely to be combined with ongoing efforts or with each other.

D. Open Application for Retail EEB member

Mr. Ben McMillan provided a reminder regarding the open EEB retail position, noting that the [job posting would](#) close on Friday. He urged attendees to share the information with anyone who might be interested, as the goal is to quickly fill the position once the posting closes. Mr. Anthony Kosior emphasized the importance of getting the word out to attract quality applicants.

E. Joint Green Bank and EEB Committee Resolution

Mr. Richard Faesy provided an [update on the collaboration between the EEB and the Connecticut Green Bank](#), highlighting progress made at the joint committee's last quarterly meeting. He emphasized that their shared goal is to implement state energy policy across all sectors through continuous innovation, leveraging funds, and ensuring customer continuity. Recent discussions have focused on integrating various funding streams, particularly federal funds, to support initiatives such as solar photovoltaic (PV) systems, battery storage, weatherization, and heat pumps.

During the most recent EEB CTGB joint-committee meeting, the committee unanimously approved a goal that commits both organizations to work together to offer comprehensive services and incentives to customers. The resolution was passed by the committee and now awaits further validation by the full Board. Once approved, it will be incorporated into the three-year Plan, and both the Companies and the Green Bank will collaborate on its implementation over the next year.

Mr. Faesy clarified that the joint committee itself cannot make final decisions, and the resolution will require full Board approval. **Ms. Stacy Sherwood (EFG) proposed taking the discussion back to the Residential Committee meeting for further refinement before bringing a fuller proposal back to the Board.** Mr. Bernie Pelletier suggested to include input from the commercial and industrial (C&I) subcommittee to ensure the resolution addresses a broader scope beyond just residential initiatives. Mr. Anthony Kosior agreed with allocating time for Board members to review the resolution in more detail and supported holding a vote at a later meeting. He questioned whether there was content for the Board to review outside of the language contained in the resolution. Mr. Richard Faesy suggested that more information may come to the Board following an initial review by the Residential Committee. There was continued group discussion on if the resolution should include specific mention of C&I sectors. **Mr. Anthony Kosior suggested also discussing the proposed resolution at the upcoming C&I Committee meeting.**

F. Public Comments and Notice of Public Input Sessions

Mr. James Williamson provided a brief summary regarding two upcoming public input sessions focused on the development of the 2025-2027 C&LM Plan. The first session is scheduled for September 4th, from 12PM to 1 PM, and will focus on the Second Draft of the Plan, which is already posted on the EnergizeCT website. The second session, anticipated to be held on September 26th from 12PM to 1 PM, will focus on the Third Draft of the Plan, expected to be released around September 5th. An official notification about these sessions was expected to be distributed following the EEB meeting. Times are subject to change.

Ms. Amanda Fargo-Johnson raised a question about the decision to hold both sessions during the 12PM-1 PM timeframe, asking whether varying the session times might help reach a broader audience. Mr. Williamson responded that they had considered different times, including evening sessions, but feedback from previous events indicated that after-work sessions were not well attended. **Mr. Anthony Kosior acknowledged the suggestion and agreed to revisit the timing of the sessions.**

Ms. Anne-Marie Knight also suggested mixing up the times to encourage more participation and raised a question about the timing of distributing materials for both sessions, noting that sending information too early for the second session might be confusing. Mr. Anthony Kosior confirmed that these comments would be taken into account, and further adjustments could be made. Additionally, Mr. Ben McMillan suggested that if an evening session is scheduled, it might be more effective to hold it slightly later, as previous early evening sessions conflicted with people's commute or dinner plans.

Following the EEB Meeting, the public input session scheduled was adjusted. The first session will focus on the Second Draft and will be held on September 4th, 12pm-1pm; the [public notice](#) was distributed to the EEB email subscription lists. **The second session for the Third Draft will be noticed after alternate times are evaluated.**

2. Public Comment

Ms. Nancy Chafetz (CPower), a demand response provider, took the opportunity to summarize the comments her organization submitted on July 15th. CPower has been participating in the Connected Solutions program since its inception. One of her primary points addressed the decision to eliminate fossil fuel generation from the Connected Solutions program in the 2025-2027 C&LM Plan. While CPower supports climate goals, Chafetz expressed concern that removing fossil fuel generation too quickly could be counterproductive. She explained that customers with fossil fuel generation, typically used for backup purposes, may continue to use it without the benefit of a targeted dispatch signal, potentially leading to more emissions as they try to reduce their capacity tag.

Chafetz proposed that while no new fossil fuel generation should be allowed into the program, existing generation should remain eligible through 2027, giving customers time to transition to battery storage, which can take years to develop at the C&I level.

Additionally, she commented on the decline in enrollment in the targeted dispatch program, suggesting that the incentive rate be increased from \$35 per kilowatt to \$45 per kilowatt, as the cost of providing load reduction has risen. Chafetz also supported the continued exploration of a winter demand response program, though she noted that it currently costs more to attract customers for winter demand response compared to summer, largely due to the absence of capacity tag savings in the winter.

She suggested that this might change with the anticipated shift toward a seasonal capacity market by 2028.

Mr. Anthony Kosior thanked Ms. Nancy Chafetz for her overview and confirmed that her comments would be reviewed in detail. Mr. Steve Bruno acknowledged that her points were valid and noted that other states have also removed backup generators from demand response programs due to environmental concerns.

3. DEEP Updates

A. Staffing Update

Mr. Ben McMillan(DEEP), began his presentation by acknowledging a request made earlier in the day to share [DEEP's meeting notes in the box folder](#). He then proceeded with staffing updates, starting with the introduction of Ms. Elizabeth Lodge, who is new to DEEP. Ms. Lodge will support work on the C&LM and the Greener Gov. initiatives. Mr. McMillan then turned over the floor to Ms. Becca Trietch, the new Director for the Office of Building and Transportation Decarbonization within DEEP, who mentioned her excitement about becoming more closely involved with CL&M and the Energy Efficiency Board (EEB) meetings. She assured the attendees that Mr. McMillan would continue representing DEEP at committee meetings while she would attend the EEB meetings.

B. 2024 Plan Determination

Mr. McMillan outlined the next steps for the 2024 Plan Determination. He provided background on the process, noting that the Comprehensive Energy Strategy (CES) and EEB approved the 2022-2024 Plan with modifications, and the 2024 Plan update was filed in November 2023. DEEP approved the budget in December 2023 and issued a final determination in June 2024.

Some key findings from DEEP's determination included the need for faster reductions in heating-related emissions to meet the Global Warming Solutions Act (GWSA) goals. DEEP emphasized the importance of scaling up energy efficiency programs to better align with Connecticut's greenhouse gas reduction targets. The plan update retained the core priorities of equity, decarbonization, and affordability. DEEP recognized the delay in implementing equity metrics until 2024 due to data misalignment and stressed that no further delays should occur.

DEEP's analysis showed that while Connecticut met its 10% emissions reduction target below 1990 levels by January 2024, the residential sector had surpassed the electric sector in emissions for the first time. DEEP called for deeper reductions in older, less efficient building stock and highlighted the need for a holistic, coordinated approach to program delivery. Energy efficiency programs were also deemed essential for managing the high energy costs faced by Connecticut residents.

Mr. Ben McMillan addressed the topic of affordability, emphasizing that Connecticut faces some of the highest annual energy costs in the nation. He highlighted the critical role that the state's energy efficiency programs play in managing the energy burden on residents. To provide context, he noted that the average household in Connecticut spends over \$3,000 annually on energy bills, making it the second-highest in the region. For households earning below 60% of the State Median Income (SMI), approximately 9% of their annual income is spent on energy bills, which exceeds the commonly accepted affordability threshold of 6%.

Mr. McMillan pointed out that addressing energy affordability will require a multifaceted approach to achieve meaningful savings for Connecticut ratepayers. He stressed that improving affordability would necessitate leveraging funds from other sources and optimizing the allocation of existing budgets within

the C&LM programs.

Two key directives were issued: the development of a budget optimization plan and the exploration of new approaches to electrification. He then detailed the budget optimization plan, which requires the Companies to develop demand scenarios and corresponding mitigation strategies. This iterative process involves collaboration with the Electric Distribution Companies (EDCs) and the EEB.

The plan outlines three demand scenarios: a base case, a high-demand scenario that exceeds base case projections, and a low-demand scenario where growth remains static or below the base case. For each scenario, companies are expected to recommend actions that align demand with available funding, taking into account the impacts on budget and contractors. Additionally, demand thresholds will be established to trigger these recommended actions.

The optimization plan is divided into two parts. Part A focuses on scenario building, while Part B involves tracking equipment costs, leveraging federal tax credits, identifying barriers and opportunities for contractors, and developing steps to avoid delays in the contractor and customer rebate process. Part B also includes an analysis of the impact of programmatic changes on both contractors and customers.

Mr. McMillan mentioned that the timeline for this work will be coordinated with the board and utilities, given the current three-year planning process. By the end of the third quarter, the utilities are expected to submit their demand scenarios. The Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) plans to host a technical meeting in the fourth quarter. By the end of the fourth quarter, the plan for program tracking should be in place, and the findings from the optimization plan will be incorporated into DEEP's determination for the next three-year plan. For Part B of the optimization plan, an attachment to the November 1st filing is anticipated. If certain items are not ready by then, they will likely be included as conditions of approval.

Ms. Amy Mclean provided a reminder that DEEPs [notes on these topics](#) were requested in writing during the earlier residential meeting. By Zoom Chat, Ms. Heather Deese (Dandelion) asked a question regarding the allocation of \$60 million for heat pump midstream rebates. Specifically, she inquired about the duration over which this funding would be spent. Mr. Ben McMillan estimated that the funds would be distributed over a period of four to five years, however, this would need to be confirmed. Mr. Ben McMillan also committed to providing follow-up on the rebate timeline and on the "Solar for All" program.

Mr. Steve Bruno (Eversource) mentioned that the Companies involved had already begun collaborating on an optimization plan, enlisting the help of consultants and engaging with the EEB technical consultants. Weekly meetings were cited as part of the structured process in place to ensure steady progress. The Companies were reportedly on track, with notable discussions around heat pump rebates already underway, emphasizing the importance of this initiative.

Mr. Ben McMillan then turned to the topic of electrification, with the Companies tasked with addressing four key objectives before the next three-year program cycle began. One of the main tasks was the evaluation of best practices for encouraging customers to combine cost-effective weatherization measures with heat pump investments. Although customers were not required to undertake weatherization in order to qualify for heat pump rebates, the aim was to encourage this combination wherever possible. This focus was expected to extend beyond residential applications, potentially influencing the commercial sector as well.

The discussion moved on to programmatic shifts under consideration for the coming years. There was an ongoing conversation about moving the focus of energy savings reporting away from traditional kilowatt-hour and CCF metrics toward MMBTU savings. DEEP expressed no opposition to this shift but mandated that a comprehensive analysis be provided before any changes were implemented. This analysis would need to outline the potential impacts of this new approach on energy savings reporting.

There were also deliberations concerning the prioritization of greenhouse gas (GHG) reductions within the CL&M programs. This could eventually lead to the development of performance metrics tied to GHG reductions. DEEP expressed support for exploring this shift, but with the stipulation that program cost-effectiveness must be preserved. Accordingly, utilities and their technical consultants were directed to prepare an analysis detailing the potential impacts of prioritizing GHG reductions within these programs.

Another significant point of discussion was the phase-out of gas incentives. DEEP directed United Illuminating (UI) to implement a phase-out similar to the one proposed by Eversource in its 2024 plan update, signaling a move toward reducing reliance on fossil fuels and supporting cleaner energy alternatives.

DEEP issued several new conditions of approval (COA) as part of the Plan update. COA #31 involved elevating the visibility of clean heating and cooling technologies on the EnergizeCT website. Efforts had already begun on this front in the fall of 2023, with the aim of making these technologies more prominent and easily distinguishable for customers. The focus appeared to be largely aesthetic, intended to improve the customer experience by making clean energy options more visible.

COA #32 required utilities to conduct an assessment of the Heat Pump Installer Network (HPIN) program. DEEP identified 14 areas that required attention, including the need for periodic re-enrollment of installers, addressing design or installation issues, and potentially developing a preferred vendor designation for those vendors who demonstrated excellence in training and quality. DEEP expressed satisfaction with the existence of a designated network of heat pump installers but emphasized the need for continuous improvement in customer experience.

COA #33 requested for the Companies to investigate the possibility of instituting a heat pump incentive pre-approval process, particularly with regard to ground-source systems, which typically have longer project lead times. While there was already a reservation system in place for air-source heat pumps, the pre-approval process would need to be evaluated for its potential relevance to ground-source systems, including considerations of budgetary impacts and other outcomes. Although DEEP did not mandate the implementation of this system, it called for an evaluation of its potential benefits and challenges.

COA #44 addressed the sharing of income qualification information between utilities and DEEP, specifically for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP). This sharing of data was intended to streamline the process for customers seeking to qualify for various energy assistance programs, including the Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP), making it easier for eligible customers to receive support.

Mr. Anthony Kosior inquired on the progress of a reservation system for both air source and ground source heat pumps, questioning on whether this system is currently in place or still under development. Mr. Steve Bruno confirmed that while a reservation system exists, it has not yet been implemented for ground source heat pumps. An update on this system is expected later in the meeting from Ms. Erin Engelkemeyer.

Mr. Kosior asked for the status of ongoing updates to the EnergizeCT website. Mr. Steve Bruno responded that the website has dedicated Utilities staff working on updates. Mr. Ben McMillan discussed some of the website updates, including a proposal to incorporate a "green leaf" symbol to clearly denote clean technologies.

C. IRA Funding Status

Mr. Ben McMillan provided an update on new funding awards and initiatives related to climate pollution reduction, solar programs for low-income communities, and the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) rebate programs.

He began by discussing the Climate Pollution Reduction Grant (CPRG) administered by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The CPRG awarded \$450 million to a coalition of applicants led by Connecticut, with the goal of spurring heat pump deployment across New England. The coalition includes Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, and Maine. The original request was for \$500 million, so budgets are being reworked. The CPRG focuses on three core activities: a market hub for midstream incentives for heat pumps and heat pump water heaters, an innovation hub to deploy heat pumps in low-income communities, and a resource hub for education, outreach, and data tracking. Connecticut's share includes at least \$68 million for the market hub, around \$20 million for the innovation hub, and an undetermined share of \$50 million for resource hub activities. Mr. McMillan thanked the Board for their support of this application.

Mr. McMillan then moved on to the Solar for All program, for which DEEP was awarded \$62.45 million through the EPA's Solar for All competition. The funds are intended to benefit low-income and disadvantaged communities through greenhouse gas-reducing technologies such as residential solar and storage. The project, known as Project Sunbridge, focuses on multifamily affordable housing. DEEP collaborated with the Connecticut Green Bank, the Connecticut Housing Finance Authority, the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (PURA), and the Department of Housing on the application. DEEP is currently revising the work plan and budget, which requires EPA approval before funding can be deployed. DEEP is also conducting a stakeholder process to ensure that the Solar for All initiative meets the needs of the targeted communities. DEEP will follow-up with additional information on program timelines.

Moving on to the IRA rebate programs, Mr. McMillan announced that DEEP submitted its initial application for the Home Energy and Appliance Rebate Program (HEAR) in mid-July. Based on stakeholder input, all funding from this program will go to low-income customers, defined by the Department of Energy (DOE) as those at or below 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI). The application includes a 50/50 split of funds between single-family and multifamily households. DEEP received approval from the Office of Policy and Management to collaborate with Eversource, United Illuminating (Avangrid), and other utilities on program design and implementation. Mr. McMillan expressed gratitude for the Utilities' support in submitting the application on short notice. He also noted that extensive follow-up with DOE is expected, with the approval process potentially taking several months.

DEEP is also working on the application for the blueprint portion of the Home Efficiency Appliance Rebates Program (HEAR) and the Home Efficiency Rebate Program (HER) and is focusing on leveraging existing programs to efficiently use federal dollars. However, some elements of DOE's guidance do not align with current operations in Connecticut. Mr. McMillan again acknowledged the utilities' assistance in this effort.

4. Q2 2024 Progress Report – Companies

Mr. Steve Bruno (Eversource) presented [the quarterly update, covering results as of the end of June 2024](#). He began by introducing Ms. Dianne Del Rosso as Mr. Ron Araujo's replacement for Ron Araujo's former EEB seat. Mr. Hammad Chaudhry (Avangrid) introduced Marriot Dowden as Avangrid's new C&I manager and noted that the open **Avangrid EEB seat was still being filled.**

The presentation began with an outline of the total 2024 budget, which is set at \$246 million and is sourced from revenues from customer billings for the CL&M charges, as well as funding from the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI) and the capacity market. Revenues as of June 2024 were reported as \$145 million. Spending through June was \$103 million. Mr. Bruno explained that, ideally, halfway through the year, they would expect spending to be at 50%, but they were at 42%. However, revenue collection was at 59%, which was a positive sign. He explained that many programs ramp up during the year, particularly C&I projects, which often see completions later in the year. He noted that Eversource's gas side was particularly low in terms of spending but reassured the group that they had a plan to address this. He also noted that gas companies overall were lagging behind the electric companies in project activity, with the electric companies performing well from January through June.

Mr. Bruno highlighted a particular challenge regarding changes in Eversource HVAC rebates which has made filling measures for the HVAC portion of gas programs more difficult. He noted that, as they plan for the 2025 to 2027 program cycle, they will need to reconsider which measures are included and possibly reallocate resources between HVAC and other program areas.

Breaking down spending by sector, Mr. Bruno shared that collectively, the companies had spent 49% of their residential program budgets and 42% of their C&I program budgets. On the electric side, spending was at 55% for residential and 44% for C&I, while on the gas side, spending was lower at 35% for residential and 30% for C&I. Mr. Bruno pointed out that the pie chart on the lower left breaks out spending by company—Eversource Electric, UI, CNG, and SCG. He explained that, due to larger budgets, the electric companies dominate spending, and the chart on the right shows spending as a percentage of total budget, further illustrating that electric companies are making better progress toward their goals, while gas companies are lagging.

Tables were presented to describe the grants received from the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) and the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI). Key highlights include that Eversource received a \$9.2 million collective grant between RGGI and ARPA, and by the end of June, they had spent \$1.3 million of that, leaving about \$8 million remaining. A clarification was made that this data reflects the period from April 4th through June 30th.

The charts also broke down spending between single-family income-eligible and multifamily income-eligible projects. He explained that multifamily projects were required to pay prevailing wages, while single-family projects involved measures like weatherization, heat pump water heaters, and heat pumps. He mentioned that when they report to DEEP at the end of the year, the file will include information on installed measures, costs, and savings. Avangrid, he added, had received a \$1.4 million ARPA grant and had spent \$344,000, with approximately \$1 million remaining as of the same period.

Mr. Steve Bruno shifted focus to MMBtu (million British thermal units), explaining that the companies are trying to emphasize MMBtu savings over kilowatt-hour (kWh) and cubic feet of natural gas (CCF) savings. For the year so far, the companies had achieved 489 million MMBtu in annual savings, with residential programs typically leading during the first half of the year due to the carryover of

weatherization projects from the previous year. C&I projects typically catch up in the latter half of the year. He highlighted that electric savings were driving the high MMBtu savings, and that the numbers included savings from fossil fuel measures, such as converting gallons of fuel oil and propane, as well as electricity and natural gas.

Addressing lifetime MMBtu savings, Mr. Bruno explained that this metric converts annual savings to lifetime savings based on the installed measures. He noted that longer-lived measures, such as insulation or heat pumps, yield higher lifetime savings. Overall, they achieved 6,646 million lifetime MMBtu savings, with 56% of that coming from residential programs and 37% from C&I programs.

Shifting back to kWh and CCF savings, Mr. Bruno showed that electric companies were on track to meet their annual savings goals, while gas companies were still behind. For gas totals, residential programs are at 37% and gas programs are at 25%. For electric programs, residential programs are at -135% and C&I programs are at 44%. He pointed out that negative kWh savings observed for electric companies were due to increased electricity usage from heat pump installations, which offset savings from fossil fuel conversions. He explained that while they would continue to present kWh and CCF savings, the focus would increasingly shift to MMBtu.

A table was presented for kWh accounting for with the negative electric savings impacts of heat pumps removed. Key metrics indicate residential electric programs at 43% and C&I programs at 45% of annual savings goals.

Mr. Bruno also covered passive demand savings, which refers to demand reductions achieved through energy efficiency measures. The electric companies collectively achieved 50% of their passive demand savings goal, with Eversource at 45% and UI at 53%, based on savings from residential and C&I programs.

Ms. Kathy Fay makes a follow-up comment relating to the work of the residential committee, specifically referencing items 5-6. She notes that the committee is capturing data on the number of units, which ties back to a request she made earlier. While she acknowledges that she may not have asked for all the intricate details, she expresses that since the information is being collected, it would be beneficial to have access to it. Mr. Steve Bruno responded that unit and heat pump data was available on the dashboard and that a demo could be provided.

Mr. Richard Faesy asked for a status update on the dashboard development. Mr. Bruno explained that a joint RFP had been issued by companies in Connecticut and Massachusetts to replace the dashboard. He expected the process to start in September or October. A demo of the current dashboard would be scheduled to gather feedback and discuss desired new features. He offered to organize a meeting for those interested before rolling out the new dashboard more broadly.

Ms. Kathy Fay raised a question regarding demand response, asking if the grid resilience benefits of demand response are ever factored into non-energy impacts (NEIs) or reported in some way to demonstrate the value these programs bring to companies. Mr. Bruno responded by explaining that NEIs for demand response hadn't been quantified in previous studies, but they do quantify benefits such as capacity savings and energy savings, which are included in cost-effectiveness tests. He agreed with Ms. Fay's suggestion to see the benefits alongside spending data in future reports.

Mr. Anthony Kosior addressed the UI C&I expenditures, noting they are around 38% halfway through

the year. He asks about the directionality and what trends might be expected moving forward. Mr. Hammad Chaudhry explained that while spending appears low, the pipeline of projects is strong. He mentions that these projects take time due to factors like build-up and signing letter of agreements (LOAs). He could provide a precise answer at the moment but assures Mr. Kosior that the team is close to auditing the projects and understanding the timeline. He emphasizes that by the next meeting, there will be a clearer picture.

Mr. Kosior acknowledges the information and stresses the importance of monitoring this issue, referring to how last year, similar concerns arose late in the process, especially with additional funding from Park City Wind funds. He encouraged the C&I committee to strategize on spending and approaches, underlining the need to stay on top of developments.

Ms. Erin Engelkemeyer (Eversource) provided an [update on the heat pump rebate processing](#), detailing the current volume, the reservation process, and projections for 2025. She began by addressing the recent launch of the preregistration process for heat pumps, which had been met with positive feedback from both internal stakeholders and external partners, such as HPIN contractors and ground source heat pump installers. The preregistration process officially launched on July 1st, and it allows for air source heat pump registrations to be valid for 60 days. Ground source heat pump registrations, however, do not expire due to the longer sales cycle and the complexity of installation, which typically lasts between 10 to 12 months.

Ms. Engelkemeyer explained that, for ground source heat pumps, they are handling the registrations more directly, often using bulk uploads to get a clearer picture of the projects in the pipeline. They are working closely with ground source installers to ensure that these longer-term projects are accurately reflected in the preregistration platform. For air source heat pumps, customers have a 60-day window to complete their reservations, and if they exceed that timeframe, they are required to reregister their project. Despite being only 45 days into the process, feedback has been largely positive, with only a small number of customers needing to reregister. She noted that this is understandable given the newness of the process and that they have been able to assist customers with reregistration when necessary.

Ms. Engelkemeyer highlighted that the information on the preregistration process is available on the website, which had undergone significant updates in the spring. The company continues to keep the site up to date, which has helped reduce customer escalations. She attributed the decline in escalations to improved rebate processing and quicker application reviews, which have contributed to a better overall customer experience.

She also mentioned the importance of encouraging H-PEN contractors to include Energize Connecticut heat pump rebate attribution on their invoices. This step is crucial in driving attribution from the contractor level through to the final rebate delivery for the customer. She emphasized the continued support from Abode, a partner in running communications alongside the companies to ensure contractors are informed and engaged.

Ms. Engelkemeyer provided further details on the reservation process, where customers visit the Energize Connecticut online portal to register their project. The rebate processing team then reviews the project to ensure that the contractor is an H-PEN contractor, that the specified equipment meets the Qualified Product List (QPL), and that the customer is a legitimate account holder in Connecticut. Typically, customers receive a pre-approval letter within two to three days. As of that time, 158 projects

were pending completion, waiting to move into the final rebate processing stage. Since the launch of the preregistration process on July 1st, 552 projects had gone through the reservation process, with 158 still in construction. This process allows the company to monitor market activity and track how quickly projects are moving from reservation to completion. The average timeline from project registration to closeout, including contractor invoices and final documentation, is around 10 days.

Ms. Engelkemeyer discussed the heat pump production trends for 2024. She noted that while they had anticipated a slowdown in installations due to the reduction in incentives and the implementation of the registration process, market adoption remained strong. July, in particular, saw an increase in installations, which she attributed to seasonality, as customers were replacing air conditioning units during peak summer months and opting for heat pumps instead. Despite the introduction of the reservation process, adoption continued to grow across the state for both heat pumps and heat pump water heaters.

Looking ahead to 2025, Ms. Engelkemeyer explained that Eversource has been examining different scenarios and projecting budget needs based on potential adjustments to heat pump rebates. She outlined a scenario where the current rebate of \$1,250 per ton would be reduced incrementally, noting that despite the reduction, data still showed strong market adoption of heat pumps. The average residential air source heat pump installation is around three tons, and based on this, the company projected budget requirements to ensure continued support for customers throughout 2025. Eversource is particularly focused on the \$400 to \$500 per ton rebate range, which they believe will allow them to continue marketing the program and supporting customers while ensuring sufficient budget for the entire year.

Mr. Steve Bruno added that despite lowering the incentive and implementing the registration system, the budget was still being impacted by a large volume of projects. He mentioned that discussions are ongoing about potentially having different incentive levels for Eversource and Avangrid to manage budget constraints effectively. He noted that further analysis is required to determine the optimal rebate level, and whether lowering the rebate further might be necessary to align with the budget.

Ms. Diane Del Rosso expanded on this point by noting that the activity in Eversource territory differs from Avangrid's due to the makeup of heating fuel types. Eversource has more rural areas that predominantly use oil and propane, which is a significant difference compared to Avangrid's territory. She offered to share a [more detailed heat pump participation analysis](#) with the Residential Committee and others as needed.

Mr. Anthony Kosior asked for clarification on the current incentive levels and the projections presented. Mr. Steve Bruno confirmed that the current incentive is \$750 per ton, and the projections show that, despite lowering the incentive from \$1,250 to \$750, participation rates remained relatively stable. The projections were based on historical data and trends, and the analysis indicated that further reductions in the incentive might not significantly impact participation rates. Mr. Anthony Kosior suggested adding the impact of the CPRG funding into the analysis and to clarify the breakdown the projections between Eversource and UI territory.

Mr. Anthony Kosior inquired about the ratio split between air conditioning and heat pump installations, emphasizing the need to track any fluctuations throughout the year. Ms. Erin Engelkemeyer responded that most installation were heat pumps but that follow data could be provided. She elaborated that while they initially projected around 200 to 250 heat pumps per month, actual registrations have far

exceeded that estimate. In just six weeks, 550 customers registered, reflecting the impact of seasonal demand, particularly during the peak of summer air conditioning use in July. They will continue to monitor this trend over the coming months, with participation remaining strong.

Mr. Anthony Kosior sought further clarification on the number of projects still in the queue. Ms. Erin Engelkemeyer confirmed that 158 projects are currently in the registration pipeline and not yet reflected in the reported numbers. Additionally, more than 200 projects have progressed from preregistration to the next stage, where they are under review and awaiting approval.

Ms. Kathy Fay expressed interest in seeing data on the trends between heat pump water heaters and heat pumps, asking if one technology is increasing in demand faster than the other. Ms. Engelkemeyer agreed to analyze the trends through different customer pathways, including retail and supply chain partners, and provide that information.

Mr. Ben McMillan raised a question regarding the ground source heat pump program, asking if customers or contractors would be locked in at a specific incentive level if a project crossed over program years. Ms. Engelkemeyer explained that this is something they are actively addressing, especially for ground source projects with longer sales cycles. She emphasized the importance of maintaining strong communication with ground source installers to ensure a clear understanding of their pipeline and to manage potential changes in incentive levels effectively. It was clarified that previous projections of future rebate levels have mostly been focused on air source heat pumps.

Mr. Ben McMillan asked how a scenario would be handled if ground source heat pump incentives were to be reduced. Ms. Erin Engelkemeyer stressed that if they decide to reduce ground source heat pump incentives due to budget constraints, they will need to communicate this to the market well in advance, particularly to installers who are quoting projects that may not be completed until 2025. Ms. Engelkemeyer mentioned that they are approaching ground source heat pump projects similarly to large C&I projects, where a Letter of Authorization (LOA) locks in the incentive level for a certain period.

Mr. Ben McMillan asked about the assumptions behind the budget projections. Ms. Engelkemeyer explained that they had worked with a third-party analyst who used historical data to model the expected reduction in participation as incentives decrease. Mr. Bruno added that while the data for the \$1,250 and \$750 per ton rebates are based on real numbers, the other figures are extrapolated projections based on expected market behavior.

Mr. Anthony Kosior inquired about that extent that external factors that could influence participation rates, such as changes in material costs, availability of products, and the size of the contractor base. Mr. Steve Bruno discussed the beneficial effects that the HPIN network has had on program participation. Ms. Engelkemeyer acknowledged that contractor education and marketing efforts are external factors influencing participation. However, she also mentioned that a significant factor for 2025 would be the anticipated rise in heat pump costs due to refrigerant changes, which could lead to a 14% increase in equipment costs. She explained that supply chain partners are quoting a 7% increase in costs due to the refrigerant change, combined with the typical 5-7% annual price increase across the industry.

Mr. Richard Faeasy added that a new midstream incentive, introduced through an EPA grant, would help offset some of the expected price increases. Mr. Anthony Kosior asked whether exit surveys are conducted to better understand why customers participate in the heat pump program. There is concern that without this data, it may be challenging to make informed decisions moving forward. Ms. Erin

Engelkemeyer acknowledged that while they are not currently conducting such surveys, there are ongoing discussions about tracking customer engagement, particularly those participating in decarbonization consultations. The aim is to better understand the customer journey from consultation to installation. She also notes that earlier surveys, referred to as "voice of the customer" surveys, were conducted but haven't been updated recently. **Mr. Anthony Kosior suggested instituting an exit survey process for heat pump program participants.**

Mr. Bernie Pelletier cautioned that the programs should ensure that customers are using heat pumps for their intended purpose (both heating and cooling), rather than solely for air conditioning, as some customers have been known to do. Mr. Steve Bruno and Mr. Anthony Kosior discussed the evolution of heat pump technology and contractor support, with the acknowledgment that technology has improved, making heat pumps more reliable even in cold weather.

5. 2025-2027 Plan Review – Companies

Mr. Ghani Ramdani provided an [update of the 2025-2027 C&LM Plan at the Second Draft stage](#). He highlighted the current progress in the timeline, pointing out that the team currently in the "Additional Drafts and Review" stage. The focus during this period has been on preparing the second draft of the savings and tax plan, which he confirmed is in good shape, ready for the September and October deadlines. He explained that the plan outline remains the same as last time, consisting of eight sections and three appendices. At this stage, the document is around 300 pages, but with the addition of tables, it is expected to expand quickly to 500 pages.

Mr. Ramdani outlined the next steps, indicating that by August 21, they anticipate finalizing the budget discussions. They are still working on some components of the budget, particularly evaluation, savings, and the program savings documents. Additionally, the Technical Reference Manual (TRM) is expected to be finalized by the same date. Feedback on the second draft of the plan text will be collected by August 23, and work is ongoing to finalize the Performance Management Initiative (PMI) and metrics for the next year's plan.

Regarding priorities, he emphasized that decarbonization remains the main focus, supported by seven themes. He then introduced a new slide that highlights specific actions for both the residential and commercial sectors. On the residential side, efforts include educating customers on the benefits of heat pumps, promoting weatherization through Home Energy Solutions (HES) and Home Energy Solutions Income Eligible (HESIE) programs, and expanding active demand response (DR) offerings. On the commercial side, the focus is on progressing toward new construction with all-electric offerings and enhancing weatherization for commercial and industrial customers. There is also a significant focus on education and workforce outreach, where efforts are being made to recognize opportunities for contractors, such as replacing end-of-life air conditioning systems with heat pumps and requiring new homes to be built without any fossil fuels.

Mr. Steve Bruno clarified that, in response to a previous comment, in the commercial and industrial (C&I) section, active demand response offerings will include smart thermostats, air conditioner load control, lighting dimming, and industrial load shifting. He mentioned that, unlike in the prior plan, customers with backup generators will no longer be allowed to reduce their load by turning on these generators as part of the next three-year plan.

Mr. Ghani Ramdani then moved to the second priority, which was previously called "Equity" but has now been renamed to "Equitable Access" to reflect feedback from stakeholders and consultants. A new

table was added to highlight efforts to target customers in environmental justice communities on the residential side. On the commercial side, the companies will continue to work with the Energy Efficiency Board (EEB) and consultants to modify and refocus programs with an equitable access lens. Education and workforce development efforts will focus on increasing Green Step certification and participation by offering more after-school and summer energy training programs in environmental justice communities.

Next, he addressed the third priority: energy affordability. This slide had been presented at previous board meetings, but a new slide provided additional details. On the residential side, the plan includes increasing the stock and sale of efficient equipment through the ENERGY STAR® Retail Products program and HVAC distributors. The companies will also enhance and deploy web-based resources to educate customers about low-carbon technology, high-efficiency products, and active demand response offerings. In the commercial and industrial sectors, the focus is on promoting demand response as part of energy efficiency offers, particularly by integrating solar technology with heat pump installations. Additionally, education and workforce community outreach efforts will aim to drive awareness and provide resources about federal tax credits and IRA rebates.

Mr. Ramdani emphasized that the newly added slides in his presentation reflect the latest updates in the plan text. He also briefly mentioned that the residential program section now includes two new bullet points: the cessation of incentives and rebate support for new natural gas combustion heating, hot water, and commercial kitchen equipment. Additionally, the companies will add rebates for heat recovery and energy recovery ventilation systems.

Mr. Bernie Pelletier raised a question regarding the cessation of incentives for new natural gas combustion equipment, asking for clarification about whether this policy also applied to low-income customers. Mr. Ramdani clarified that low-income customers would be an exception to this rule and would still be eligible for these incentives.

When discussing commercial and industrial programs, Mr. Ramdani reiterated that the companies would no longer support new gas equipment, except for industrial or process-specific needs that cannot be converted to heat pumps. He also mentioned the introduction of a multi-year deep energy retrofit offering, which will take a holistic approach for commercial and industrial customers by allowing them to implement measures over multiple years. The Companies are also exploring the creation of an energy manager role, which would be dedicated to working with customers on the various measures that can be implemented over time.

In terms of education, workforce, and community portfolio changes, Mr. Ramdani highlighted that the Green Step certification would be increased. Mr. Bernie Pelletier shared his experience in attending the recent Green Step event and recognized efforts of the organizers and participants.

Mr. Steve Bruno, the main speaker, provided an update on the budget and ongoing program adjustments. He opened by stating that there had been no changes to the overall budget since the previous presentation. However, some final items still needed to be addressed, such as locking in the final evaluation consultant budget, the DEI (Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion) consultant's budget, and making necessary tweaks to certain programs. Once these final numbers were confirmed, the program changes would be communicated.

Mr. Bruno emphasized that the budget remained the same, totaling \$234.4 million, with \$181 million coming from the electric side and \$53 million from the gas side. The electric revenue breakdown

showed that \$181 million in revenues primarily came from the CAM (Customer Assistance Mechanism), with additional contributions from the capacity market and Reggie auctions. He noted that in recent years, RGGI auction values had increased, while the capacity market prices had decreased. Despite this decline, there was a slight increase projected for 2026 and 2027, where prices were expected to rise from \$2 per kW per month to \$3 per kW per month.

For natural gas, the sole revenue source was the CAM, with a collective revenue of \$53 million across three companies. Mr. Bruno provided a breakdown of the budget allocations, with \$108 million dedicated to residential programs, \$81.6 million to C&I programs, and \$44.7 million to other areas. He explained that the budget decreases in 2024 were partly due to the impact of the Park City wind benefits, particularly on the C&I side.

Mr. Bruno then moved on to a slide showing budget changes over the years, highlighting that residential spending remained relatively flat, ranging from \$106 million to \$102 million across the three years. Another slide focused on residential budget allocations, comparing the current numbers to those from the previous three-year plan. The budget for 2024 stood at \$107.6 million, and despite this consistency, the primary drivers of the programs were single-family, multifamily, HVAC, and water heating initiatives. He pointed out that demand in some programs, such as HVAC, was almost 50% higher than the allocated budget, a challenge the team was addressing.

He noted that 2024 was performing well in the HES (Home Energy Solutions) programs, both for single-family and multifamily homes. Diane and Amy confirmed this progress. Mr. Bruno also mentioned that rebates across HVAC systems and territories were a significant focus area.

On the C&I side, he presented a slide showing the budget trend for 2024 and the plan for 2025 to 2027, with approximately \$83 million allocated for the next three-year plan. The decline in 2024 was again attributed to the Park City wind benefits. He then broke down the C&I programs, noting that the core programs included energy opportunities, retrofit programs, new construction programs, and small business programs.

The discussion shifted to demand management, focusing on active demand response programs such as Wi-Fi thermostats for residential customers and various programs for C&I customers. Mr. Bruno mentioned that the team was still refining these programs and addressing public comments, including a suggestion to raise incentive levels from \$35 to \$45 and to discuss backup generators. The budget for demand management was estimated at \$10 to \$11 million.

Mr. Bruno also provided details on the education budget, which was approximately \$5 million. This budget covered community outreach, customer engagement, energy education, and workforce development, with energy education being the largest component. He thanked Bernie for attending the Green Step event and noted that Diane had also participated.

Mr. Ghani Ramdani presented four charts describing residential and C&I spending and savings from 2022-2027. The top charts focused on residential spending and savings, while the lower charts addressed C&I programs. The residential spending chart on the left-hand side showed historical data and proposed spending for the next three years. The right-hand side chart focused on savings, but these were noted that these figures were still drafts shared with the consultant a few weeks earlier. He emphasized that final budgets would lead to updated savings estimates. Similarly, the lower charts depicted the C&I budget and lifetime savings, with a significant bump in 2024 due to the Park City wind

project. The C&I budget was generally around \$80 million, with corresponding trends in lifetime savings.

Mr. Bernie Pelletier added an observation on the impact of inflation on costs, particularly the rising costs of heat pumps and labor, despite the budget appearing flat. Mr. Ramdani acknowledged this point, noting that inflation affected the value of services provided.

Mr. Anthony Kosior also addressed the topic of greenhouse gas impacts, responding to input from earlier in the meeting. He agreed that it would be beneficial to add greenhouse gas data to the slides, particularly in the context of the overall savings and spending trends. He suggested that while spending might be flat, greenhouse gas emissions should be decreasing due to electrification efforts that displace oil and propane. The team would work on displaying this data in future presentations. Mr. Bernie Pelletier speculated that the GHG effect is increasing due the rate of delivered fuel displacement.

Ms. Kathy Fay asked about the significant drop in residential lifetime savings, which Mr. Ghani Ramdani attributed to the reduction of lighting as a primary driver of savings. Additionally, some evaluation studies, particularly those related to weatherization, had affected savings estimates in 2023 and 2024.

Mr. Ghani Ramdani concluded the presentation with a summary table of statewide electric and gas budgets, totaling approximately \$230 million per year, with a combined \$690 million over three years. The table also highlighted that for every dollar invested in energy efficiency, nearly \$3 in lifetime benefits would be returned to customers, resulting in a total benefit of \$2.3 billion over the three-year period. Mr. Steve Bruno added that the previous legislation required 1.6 annual MMBTU savings and that this goal expires in 2025; it was developed when lighting was a significant contributor to the program savings. Mr. Ghani Ramdani noted that the next presentation would delve into the details of the benefits and cost savings, particularly those related to the new avoided energy supply costs (AESC) metrics.

In response to a previous question from Ms. Kathy Fay, Mr. Bruno confirmed that detailed breakdowns of lifetime benefits for each program, including active demand response programs, would be available in the plan's documentation in Table B. The team would also incorporate the feedback received during the presentation into their future work.

Mr. George Lawrence added to the conversation by discussing the promotion of natural refrigerants, such as CO₂, ammonia, and propane. He mentioned that propane, while flammable, had regulations that limited the charge size, making it a viable option for energy-efficient refrigeration. He shared information about the availability of these systems for walk in coolers and freezers.

6. New England Avoided Energy Cost Study Updated Assumptions – Companies

Mr. Ghani Ramdani presented [the 2024 Avoided Energy Cost Study \(AESC\)](#) and provided insights into how it will impact the cost-effectiveness of energy efficiency programs in Connecticut. He explained that the study converts energy savings (from kilowatt-hours, kilowatts, gas, or propane) into financial benefits, which are crucial for comparing program investments with accrued benefits. The study is regional, applied every three years, and aligns with Connecticut's Three-Year Plan. This allows the state to evaluate the effectiveness of energy efficiency programs by measuring their financial impact.

Mr. Ramdani clarified that while the ASC provides conversion metrics for energy savings into monetary value, it does not cover non-energy impacts (NEIs), state-specific transmission, or distribution benefits. However, the study offers a methodology that companies and states can use to develop transmission

and distribution benefits. He emphasized that the 2024 ASC showed an overall increase in avoided costs compared to the 2021 study, particularly on the electric side, which saw a 30% rise. This increase is attributed to several factors, including higher near-term gas prices, more stringent Renewable Portfolio Standards (RPS), and rising technology costs.

The presentation included a detailed breakdown of capacity and distribution benefits, highlighting a 41% increase in overall capacity benefits. However, Mr. Ramdani pointed out that the final figures for statewide avoided distribution and transmission were updated internally by Eversource, with some data being switched between transmission and distribution categories. He noted that natural gas prices were projected to be lower in the long term, but oil and propane prices were expected to rise. Additionally, the greenhouse gas emissions increased by 23%, primarily due to the higher costs associated with offshore wind energy.

Ms. Jillian Winterkorn (Avangrid) elaborated on the AESC's role in evaluating cost-effectiveness, noting that the increase in avoided costs is beneficial as it translates to greater benefits in energy savings. She explained that while there was a decrease in natural gas costs, this was offset by the rising non-embedded greenhouse gas costs, resulting in an overall positive impact on the program's cost-effectiveness.

Ms. Winterkorn provided visual comparisons between the 2021 and 2024 AESC data, explaining that the more stringent RPS standards and increased greenhouse gas costs were significant factors driving the higher avoided costs. She also highlighted the regional differences between southern and northern New England and offered a breakdown of the components that contribute to avoided costs, such as energy, RPS, and greenhouse gases. A chart was included to compare the non-embedded greenhouse gas costs across different metrics, measured by short tons and kilowatt-hours.

Mr. Anthony Kosior raised a question about the avoided costs associated with the social cost of carbon, pointing out that the cost had increased from \$123 per short ton in the 2021 report. Mr. Ramdani clarified that the increase was due to the use of different discount rates, with the marginal abatement cost derived from the electric sector rising from \$125 to \$178 per short ton.

Ms. Becca Trietch (DEEP) inquired about the methodology used to select scenarios for cost-effectiveness modeling. Ms. Winterkorn explained that the team had chosen the Counterfactual #1 scenario because it is most suitable for Connecticut's energy efficiency programs, which focuses on avoided costs, energy efficiency, and distributed generation. Mr. Ramdani added that although there were multiple counterfactual scenarios, there were no significant differences between them in terms of their impact on the programs. He also mentioned that Massachusetts uses the societal cost of carbon due to their focus on the Total Resource Cost (TRC) test, whereas Connecticut follows the Utility Cost Test (UCT).

Ms. Becca Trietch raised questions regarding the decision-making process for calculating greenhouse gas emissions and options for regional benefits. Mr. Ghani Ramdani responded, explaining that in 2022, a decision was made to use the New England marginal cost of carbon for calculating greenhouse gas emissions, which was agreed upon by the board's consultant.

Mr. Bernie Pelletier asked whether the savings referenced were for 2024 or for the entire life of the energy efficiency programs (EEB). Mr. Ramdani clarified that the study accounts for savings over the lifetime of the programs, typically spanning 15 to 20 years, and that these savings are discounted to present value to compare with the investments made in that year. Specifically, the lifetime savings

originating from 2024 activities are considered.

Mr. Bernie Pelletier noted that if the board operates on a \$280 million budget, they nearly justify their existence by generating almost half of that in benefits. Mr. Steve Bruno agreed, pointing to a slide that showed for every dollar invested, significant lifetime benefits are generated. These benefits are calculated from avoided costs, which may not appear directly on energy bills but prevent future costs that would occur without the programs in place.

Mr. Bernie Pelletier further explained that while some savings, such as those related to greenhouse gases, do not directly show up on bills, they contribute to broader societal benefits, like mitigating climate change. If these programs were removed, the costs would eventually manifest as direct expenses on energy bills.

Ms. Kathy Fay expressed interest in further understanding the analysis and asked where she could direct her questions. Ms. Winterkorn offered to share the [AESC report link](#) and more information, while Mr. Anthony Kosior suggested that she funnel her questions through the EEB Executive Secretary.

7. Public Comment

Ms. Nancy Chafetz (C Power) raised a question regarding the budget for Commercial and Industrial (C&I) Active Demand Response (DR) programs, pointing out a significant reduction from \$5.9 million to \$3.7 million. She asked for clarification on the reason for the decrease and whether it was due to the elimination of fossil fuel incentives. Mr. Steve Bruno confirmed that this reduction was consistent with the public comments made and that the team would work with consultants and evaluate the situation further. Ms. Nancy Chafetz expressed concern about whether this reduction in the budget would leave room for battery storage programs. Mr. Steve Bruno clarified that battery storage falls under the Energy Storage Solutions Program and would not be affected by the C&I Active DR budget reduction.

By Zoom Chat, Ms. Heather Deese (Dandelion) asked how the discussion of heat pump installation numbers aligned with Connecticut's climate goals, particularly in terms of the number of buildings the state aims to electrify. She inquired if the state intends to see more heat pumps installed annually than what the CL&M budget can support. Mr. Steve Bruno indicated that this would require further analysis and would be addressed in a follow-up.

Mr. Bernie Pelletier acknowledged the challenge that although the role of these programs has shifted, funding has decreased in real terms. The team recognized the need to do more than what current funding allows, and further discussion would be needed to address the specifics of heat pump installation goals and budget limitations.

8. Adjourn EEB Annual Meeting

The meeting was adjourned at 3:33pm.

Action Items

Joint Green Bank and EEB Committee Resolution

- Res and C&I Committees to discuss resolution before bringing the EEB for vote.

Notice of Public Input Sessions

- Consultants to revisit the timing for the public input session to cover the Third Draft of the Plan

Q2 2024 Progress Report – Companies

- Avangrid to provide replacement for Larry Rush’s EEB seat
- Companies to host demo on Energy Dashboard that shows how to use heat pump and unit data features
- Companies to add NEI benefits to future demand response reports
- Avangrid to provide update on status of low spending/savings on C&I programs – C&I Committee to investigate further

Heat Pump Updates

- Companies to add the impact of the CPRG funding into the rebate forecasting analysis
- Companies to specify ratio of heat pumps and heat pump water heaters in future reporting (and if one technology demand is increasing at a faster rate)
- Companies to institute a customer exit survey for heat pump installs

2025-2027 Plan Review – Companies

- Companies to clarify in Plan about gas eligibility for low-income customers
- Companies to add greenhouse gas data to the slides, particularly in the context of the overall savings and spending trends

Unanswered Questions

- By Zoom Chat, Ms. Heather Deese (Dandelion) asked how the discussion of heat pump installation numbers aligned with Connecticut's climate goals, particularly in terms of the number of buildings the state aims to electrify. She inquired if the state intends to see more heat pumps installed annually than what the CL&M budget can support.