



EEB Meeting

Wednesday, November 8, 2023 | 1:00PM – 3:30PM

[Meeting Materials](#)

[Meeting Recording](#)

Meeting Minutes

1. Process

A. Roll Call

Board Members, Voting: JR Viglione, Jayson Velazquez, Kathy Fay, John Wright, Amanda Fargo-Johnson, Anne-Marie Knight, Melissa Kops

Board Members, Utilities: Donald Mauritz, Steve Bruno, Larry Rush

DEEP: Ben McMillan

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

B. Approval of October Minutes

Mr. John Wright motioned to approve the [October minutes](#). The motion was seconded by Ben McMillan. The motion passed 7-0 with no abstentions.

C. Committee Updates

Ms. Kathy Fay provided an overview of the 11-6-23 Evaluation Committee meeting, highlights include:

- Evaluation study presentations were given at both residential and C&I committee meetings. The C&I presentation covered heat pump non-energy impacts. The residential presentation covered: a heat pump and heat pump water heater metering project, results from Eversource behavioral programs, advances in impact evaluation methods (for delivered fuel analysis), and insight into the non-participant study.
- Requests have been provided for two additional studies: (1) an impact evaluation for UI's behavioral program and (2) an impact evaluation on the C&I active demand response program
- The Evaluation committee will be voting on details of a pending budget adjustment.

Ms. Melissa Kops provided an overview of the 11-8-23 Residential Committee meeting, highlights include:

- There was a request to find additional funding for Residential programs and to modify the Energy Dashboard to include: HES-IE reporting, budget spend, GHG savings, and weatherization goal progress
- There was discussion on the proposed HES basement insulation program changes. A general request was made to expand contractor engagement in program decisions.
- Q3 reports indicated Eversource programs being oversubscribed. Avangrid budgets are still recovering from the tracking system transition. There is concern over Avangrid's low HES-IE budgets and progress towards meeting the hardship metric.
- Low gas participation and negative electric savings are indicative of electrification (fuel switching). Future reporting on MMBTU savings will provide clarity on electrification impacts.
- There was discussion on the uptick in duct heat pump systems, potentially stemming from the elimination of the central air conditioning (cooling only) incentive. Draft evaluation results indicate that the ducted systems monitored appear to draw higher energy use during peak afternoon periods vs. ductless systems which appear to draw more consistent energy over the course of the day.

Mr. George Lawrence (Caerbannog Consulting) provided an overview of the 11-7-23 C&I Committee meeting, highlights include:

- The EA team provided updates on non-energy impact heat pump studies and early retirement measures on boilers, chillers, and RTUs.
- The 2024 Plan Update was recapped, with topics including the Bridgeport thermal loop, updates to the DEI metric, and highlights from the C&I Plan text
- Q3 metrics were discussed, budget and savings are generally on track
- Eversource's Monitoring Based Commissioning RFP was reviewed. This is a joint effort with Eversource MA and contains some common elements to National Grid's program.

D. Results of October DEI Metric E-vote

Mr. James Williamson reviewed the results of the October DEI Metric E-vote that was finalized on 10-24-23. The Board voted 8-0, with DEEP abstaining, to approve the "Equity PMI Metric" language described in the "[Memo: Board Vote Results for 2024 Plan Update on DEI Metric](#)" as a supplement to Illume's "[Memorandum: Recommendation for the 2024 Equity PMI](#)" dated 10-6-23.

E. Board Vote on 2024 EEB Meeting Schedule

The Board voted to adopt the "[2024 EEB Calendar](#)". Prior to the vote, it was noted that a last-minute change was made to the schedule: moving the 2/12/24 Evaluation Committee meeting to 2/5/24 to avoid a conflict with a CT State holiday. Ms. Kathy Fay motioned to approve the schedule. Mr. Ben McMillan seconded the motion. The motion was passed 8-0 with no abstentions.

F. DEEP Update on EEB Open Positions

Mr. Ben McMillan (DEEP) provided an update on open EEB positions. There are 11 positions on the EEB that are appointed by DEEP; 2 of those seats are currently open – (1) residential customer representative and (2) state-wide retail representative. DEEP has issued a notice of vacancy and a request for application for both positions. The applications will be open through 12/15/23. The notice will be posted on the DEEP filings page and will be distributed to the EEBs mailing lists. Board members and stakeholders are encouraged to share this notice. DEEP hopes to fill both positions in early 2024.

G. Public Comment

None.

2. Programs and Planning

A. DEI Equity Framework Kickoff

Ms. Leigh Michael (Illume) presented an [update on the DEI Equity Framework](#) with a focus on defining priority populations and a request for input.

The presentation began with a discussion of current progress and next steps. This included recapping status of definitions for the priority population (“who”) and the equity outcomes (“what”). It was summarized that the “who” portion of the metric must be defined before the “what” component can be measured.

There are two types of identifiers that will be used to define priority populations.

Geographic/community identifiers will include: CT EJC’s made up of distressed municipalities and defined census block groups. Individual/ Site-level identifiers will include: low-income, renters, multi-unit dwellings, small/micro business, and “minority, women, and veteran” owned businesses. Feedback is being requested on the site/individual level.

A screenshot was shared of a [spreadsheet](#) summarizing priority population benchmarking activities. Each category within the spreadsheet was described/defined. Categories include: definition scope, name, source, definition, clear definition, applicable sector, unit of measurement, unit type, geographic granularity, geographic data availability, income threshold, source URL, and calculation method.

A graphic was displayed indicating “CT Definitions of Priority Populations” with groupings of individual (customers and households) or as geographic (areas, communities, and municipalities). Environmental Justice Communities (EJCs) were highlighted as one of the target groups under the communities’ bin.

A list was displayed indicating sources reviewed for the equity framework development. Sources were categorized by Federal, State, CT Company, and Other. Additional identifiers were referenced; broken down by: residential, commercial, and combined commercial/residential. There was discussion on the collaborative effort that would be required with the Companies to understand which data can be tracked.

Ms. Kathy Fay asked for clarification on the difference between hardship customers and “customers that are enrolled in hardship programs”. Ms. Leigh Michael noted that the hardship clarification would be noted in the survey request. The community level identifiers documented in the E3 guideline were discussed, including: communities of color, high concentrations of customers in arrears and instances of utility shutoffs, and areas with high concentrations of non-English-speaking customers.

The EEB and meeting participants were asked to provide feedback through survey links or direct calls with Illume (for EEB members). The link was distributed by email to both EEB members EEB mailing lists and is also posted on the EnergizeCT announcements page.

A timeline graphic was presented indicating quarterly milestones from Q4 2023 to Q4 2024. During Q4 2023, tasks include: submitting the equity vision to EEB, collation of priority population criteria, and completion of the preliminary metrics inventory. During Q1 2024, tasks include: reviewing survey results, developing ground truth potential EJC+ definitions, and interviewing stakeholders to prioritize metrics, During Q2-Q3 2024, tasks include: incorporating stakeholder feedback, inventorying indicators, and developing prioritization processes, and conducts a measurement needs assessment. During Q4 2024, tasks include: finalizing the EJC+ definitions and documenting results in the equity metrics framework.

Ms. Melissa Kops asked who the target audience for the survey would be. Ms. Leigh Michael confirmed that it would be open to EEB members and public. Mr. George Lawrence asked if renters would include commercial tenants. Ms. Leigh Michael clarified that the initial classification was for residential tenants but it could be opened to C&I. Ms. Bahareh Van Boekhold referenced the 2019 C&I Evaluation on market barriers; one of finding of this study was that a C&I renter identifier does not currently exist. Mr. J.R. Viglione encouraged the group to complete the requested survey.

B. Eversource 2023 Budget Update – Eversource

Mr. Steve Bruno and Ms. Dianne Del Rosso (Eversource) presented an overview of the [Eversource 2023 Budget Update](#). The presentation began with a reminder that the September 2023 EEB meeting included a vote that authorized up to 10% overspend of the 2024 budget into 2023. A summary was given on the updated overspend percentages that had been provided since August; the current overspend is estimated at 8.2% of the 2024 budget, or 12.1M (after mitigation measures). Residential programs are still projected with an overspend, currently at \$23.9M above 2023 budget.

A chart was presented indicating values that have changed between August and September. The largest change was a \$3.4M reassignment of reserve funding. Other reductions resulted from program changes accumulated to \$1.2M. Other mitigations efforts and vendors hitting PO limits have resulted in YTD forecast change of a \$2.3M decrease in HES and a \$3.3M decrease in HES-IE. The overall net change to the program is a \$0.5M decrease.

Mr. Ben McMillan asked for clarification on reserve review being reassigned to the program. Mr. Steve Bruno clarified that some projects were held in reserve during 2022 that never were cancelled; this funding was credited back to the programs. Ms. Melissa Kops asked why the ARPA/RGGI funding was set at 80% of the total. Mr. Steve Bruno explained that the 80% represents the split to Eversource (with UI receiving 20%).

A stacked bar chart was shown indicating spending/budgets from 2019 through 2024. The chart included categories for HVAC, HES, HES-IE, and IRA. The chart has been presented a previous meeting and there are no changes. There was discussion on the inclusion of IRA funding being assumed in the 2024 adjusted projections. Ms. Kathy Fay asked if IRA funding could be counted on in 2024. Mr. Ben McMillan recommended that IRA should not be budgeted in 2024. DEEP hopes the funding will become available in 2024 but is not in a position to provide a firm timeline. CT will submit to DOE's rolling application period during 2024. Mr. Steve Bruno commented that Companies will provide multiple spending scenarios during January meetings; one scenario will be no IRA funding in 2024.

A bar chart was presented displaying electric incentive per unit for HES and HES Rebates and HES-IE programs of the 2018-2023 period. The HES program grew from \$1600 - \$2900 and the HES-IE program grew from \$1300-\$5000. From 2021 to 2023 the HES program shows decrease from \$3800 - \$2900. The HES-IE costs climb steadily throughout the term. Ms. Dianne Del Rosso added that the overall budget spend should be taken into context when evaluating the referenced charts.

A bar chart with area overlays was presented describing "HES & HES-IE # of Vendors, Crews, and Assessments" from 2018-2023 with project breakdowns by solar and non-solar. A brief description was provided on the program history with explanations of vendor counts; the program currently utilizes 24 vendors. The average number of crews per vendor is approximately 4 crews. Trends indicate that the number of assessments due to solar projects is growing. The presentation was summarized with a concluding statement that Eversource is still within the 10% overspend allowance and anticipates increased demand in residential programs in upcoming years.

C. Q3 2023 Report – Companies

Mr. Steve Bruno (Eversource) presented on the [Q3 2023 Results](#) for the CT Energy Efficiency and Demand Management Programs. The presentation began with a summary of budget, revenue and spending by Company. For the Companies combined, actual % of budget revenues = 75% and actual % of budgeted spending = 69%. These values are in line with expectations for Q3 progress.

Figures were presented for "Spending Summary" by Company. It was noted that residential sector budget is 84% spent and the C&I budget is 62% spent. Various items were flagged: Eversource Electric has spent 100% of the residential budget, SCG is at 48% residential budget spend, the C&I spend lags slightly behind Q3 targets.

Figures were presented for "MMBTU Annual Savings" by Company. Savings and progress towards goals indicate: Total = 866 MMBTU (73%) , Residential = 433 MMBTU (87%) , C&I = 432 MMBTU (62%). Various items were flagged: Eversource Electric is at 105%, CNG is at 138%.

Figures presented for "MMBTU Lifetime Savings" by Company. Savings and progress towards goals indicate: Total = 11,202 MMBTU (74%), Residential = 7,472 MMBTU (88%), and C&I = 3,729 MMBTU (56%). It was noted that there are similar trends with annual savings; the key difference is a measure life multiplier.

Figures were presented for " kWh/ccf Annual Savings" by Company. Savings and progress towards goals indicate: Electric programs are at 110M kwh (67%) and gas programs are at 2.4M ccf (42%). It was noted that the C&I programs appear to present stronger performance in electric programs because there have not been as many heat pump installations as compared to the residential side (due to

negative savings from fuel switching effects). Overall, the residential programs are performing closer towards savings goals while C&I programs are slightly below. C&I programs are expected to close at high volume in Q4. Mr. Larry Rush (Avangrid) agreed with the conclusion that C&I programs would expect additional Q4 savings. There was group discussion the “hockey stick” data profile that is typically seen in annual cumulative savings graphs.

Figures were presented for “ KWh/ccf Lifetime Savings” by Company. Savings and progress towards goals indicate: electric programs are at 958M kwh (65%) and gas programs are at 32.9 M ccf (53%). It was noted that trends are similar to the previously displayed annual data and that variation between measure life in electric vs gas measures will have an effect on the resulting lifetime savings.

Figures were presented for “Passive Demand Savings” by Company. Savings and progress towards goals indicate: Total = 21.7 MW (76%), Residential = 4.7 MW (89%), C&I = 17.0 MW (73%). The passive demand includes energy efficiency measures (lighting, etc.) converted into kW savings. **The next version of the reporting will include data from the demand response thermostat programs.**

D. Focus Area: Marketing – Companies

Ms. Violet Radomski (Eversource) presented an [overview of energy efficiency marketing](#) efforts. The presentation began with background on EnergizeCT and its mission statement. Marketing goals and efforts were summarized as: bring awareness to EnergizeCT programs, providing education on benefits of participation, and facilitating customer engagement. Details were provided on the data-driven methods used in the marketing approach. Tactics/channels are selected based on available data; campaigns are optimized towards metrics of: awareness, conversions, and leads. An example was provided using Facebook ads, where specific user groups could be targeted such as homeowners vs. renters.

There was discussion on methods used to reach key audiences, such as customers in distressed municipalities and EJCs. Marketing efforts typically focus on multiple touchpoints; sources represented varying recommendations in range of 1-100+ touchpoints. A variety of channels are used to reach customers : targeted paid media, direct outreach, and community outreach. There was discussion on the evaluation protocols for determining if channels are producing successful results. Example evaluation metrics include: number of clicks, number of survey responses, number of participants through events, etc.

There was a review of current campaigns using direct mail. Targeted groups include low-income customers in arrears and/or enrolled in forgiveness programs and non-low-income customers in arrears. Mr. J.R. Viglione questioned if the low-income customer grouping include “hardship” customers or if the grouping was inclusive of other identifiers. Ms. Violet Radomski clarified that the grouping is inclusive of other identifiers (e.g., non-low-income customers targeting during cross promotion efforts). Direct mail campaigns are generally distributed 1-4 times per year, as needed. Mr. Mark Grindell (Avangrid) added that Avangrid utilizes a 3-week cadence on low-income mailing frequency to assist in processing.

Details were provided on Eversource’s small business outreach efforts. Methods include both direct mail (post cards) and telemarketing. Businesses are targeted based on geographic area; recent marketing has focused on EJC areas.

A summary was provided on the community partnership initiative, which was described for its complementary nature to engage customers also targeted in marketing efforts. During round 2 of the program, participants included distressed municipalities and EJC census blocks. It was noted that participating municipalities, that include EJC census blocks, are required to present a plan detailing inclusion of target groups. Participating municipalities must also partner with a community-based organization or non-profit.

There was also discussion on the Multifamily Initiative. Topics discussed included partnerships with CTREIA and the CT Property Owners Association, roundtable discussions with landlords, and the “Round 2” efforts planned for distressed municipalities and EJCs.

There was a description of the joint marketing initiatives between the Companies that focus on promotion of the EnergizeCT website. An example was provided for a Google ad campaign launched in May 2023. It was noted that web traffic was directed towards the energy efficiency programs and not to the Rate Board. Summary statistics were provided on ads served, mobile vs desktop access, and demographics reached. The campaign is currently at a 14.2% click through rate, which was compared to the industry benchmark of 3.2%. The top three keywords by click are: energy savings programs, energy efficiency programs, and EnergizeCT.

EnergizeCT social media efforts were detailed, with platforms including: Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn, Twitter (X), and Tik Tok. Customer reach and engagement rates were highlighted for multiple campaign efforts by platform. In some cases, the platform content can be shared interchangeably (i.e. TikTok videos can be shown on Instagram)

A summary was provided on the 2023 YTD overview of public relations activities. Statistics highlighted include: 67 pieces of coverage, 245,000 views, 15.6M audience, and 237 engagements. Example articles included: the eeSmarts Student Contest, GreenStep programs, and the Community partnership initiative. Additional examples were provided on past case studies that have been posted to EnergizeCT: Bridgeport Beverly Pizza, Manchester Schools, etc.

A status update was provided on the new [EnergizeCT.com](https://www.energizect.com) website. To date, the following activities have been completed: SEO analysis has been performed, the job board has been posted, and Google Analytics 4 has been implemented. Upcoming activities include: the “find a professional” filtering upgrade, a gated contractor portal, a new document library, and enhanced SEO tools.

Metrics were summarized for the “Energy in Action” mobile exhibit. An average, the events see approximately 175 attendees per school and 100 attendees per community events. Ms. Kathy Fay asked for further elaboration on the progress towards reaching EJC goals for the mobile exhibit. Ms. Violet Radomski commented that the information was not available but could be provided in a follow-up. Mr. Mark Grindell added that there are difficulties with scheduling mobile exhibit appearances during the school year and encouraged any follow-up questions to be submitted in writing. Mr. Larry Rush commented that the mobile exhibit was exceeding goal at the community level and had achieved total goal. Ms. Stacy Sherwood asked if there were any plans to add a second mobile unit. Mr. Steve Bruno responded that mobile unit expansion was not in the 2024 budget.

Ms. Stacy Sherwood noted that the Residential Committee Meeting presentations showed SCG’s HES-IE program lagging in terms of spending and performance. A question was asked on how the marketing teams work with the program teams to modify efforts throughout the year. Mr. Mark Grindell

responded that the decisions are data driven and that specific values could be shared. Decisions are made based on budget and resource capacity and adjustments are informed by quarterly meetings with the program managers. There was additional discussion on challenges with engagement in the low-income community, particularly with individuals resistant to accepting help. Mr. Steve Bruno asked if the ads could be targeted to specific geographic areas, such as specifically to SCG services area. Ms. Violet Radomski responded that paid ads can target specific areas and are structured by operating company.

Ms. Kathy Fay asked if the Community Partnership Initiative rollout has produced measurable impacts in the HES-IE programs. Ms. Violet Radomski responded that the rollout timing was by design from Eversource's perspective and that the initiative has affected the level of in-field marketing. Mr. Mark Grindell added the Initiative helps marketing within the communities without affecting marketing budget and resources. Ms. Kathy Fay followed with a question asking if the rollout delay had to do with budget burdens. Mr. Mark Grindell suggested that the marketing group could gather additional information and provide a response based on the performance statistics. Ms. Dianne Del Rosso added that Eversource designed the program to start later with the communities because of the 2023 overspend. Some of the success in the equity metrics is due to carry over from participation in the previous year.

E. Website Budget Discussion – Companies and Technical Consultants

Ms. Stacy Sherwood (EFG) lead a [discussion on the EnergizeCT website budget](#). Agenda topics included: website timeline, budget, and background on the EnergizeCT brand. The presentation began with a general review of the EnergizeCT landing page. Each of the menu areas were reviewed: About EnergizeCT, Resources, Find a Professional, Energy Efficiency Board, Government Resources, Industry Opportunities. Additional links on the ribbon include the "Explore Solutions" and "Rebates and Incentives" tabs; these areas apply to energy efficiency program offerings. The "Financing" link provides information to CT Green Bank and EnergizeCT loan offerings. The "Rate Board" drop down provides the supplier rate finder tool, which is an initiative through PURA.

A timeline was provided describing the website development. The website has been in redesign phase since April 2022 (including a 7-month extension) and was launched in October 2022. Since rollout, the website team has focused on support and maintenance (provide by Velir), web analytics, and SEO optimization. It was noted that there is an ongoing effort to add a DEI and evaluation document database.

A table was provided indicating budget breakdown for various website items. Costs were categorized as: EE-Related, Rate Board, and Total C&LM. Cost data was provided along with the percentage associated with the rate board portion: Web Redesign Cost = \$752,610 (45%), Ongoing Improvements = \$240,680 (22%), and Total Cost = 993,290 (40%). In conclusion, the rate board portion is accounting for a significant percentage of overall website costs. It was noted that the entire website is funded through the C&LM CAM charge.

Background was provided on the EnergizeCT brand and the intention of the website, along with a review of the mission statement. Initiatives contributing to the website were grouped into categories include: DEEP, PURA Rate Board, C&LM programs, Industry Opportunities, and CT Green Bank. The board was asked to consider which categories should be included in the EnergizeCT brand, if funding should be restructured, and if any additional initiatives should be considered (IRA, etc).

Ms. Kathy Fay responded that Energize CT is often perceived as branding and marketing for the Utilities and that it should be viewed as a broader initiative. Other entities should be contributing to funding costs and funding should be commensurate with use.

Ms. Amanda Fargo Johnson requested that Companies re-examine adding a second mobile unit exhibit and that this be discussed in future meetings. There was discussion on the perceived correlation between the EnergizeCT brand and the Energy Efficiency Board. It was suggested that the EEB develop protocols around the use of the brand and that the costs required for Rate Board content be cost-shared (and not full funded) by the CL&M fund. Ms. Kathy Fay added that there are other PURA initiatives (low-income community initiatives) that could be evaluated for inclusion on the EnergizeCT website. Mr. J.R. Viglione commented on cost recovery mechanism between the suppliers and the EDCs and considered that suppliers could support some of the website costs since they receive some of the benefit from the website. Ms. Stacy Sherwood stated that the technical consultants would work with DEEP attorneys to determine next steps. Additional updates will be provided based on feedback from the marketing and website teams.

F. Annual Legislative Report 2023 Update

Mr. Mark Grindell (Avangrid) provided an [updated on the 2023 Annual Legislative Report](#). Based on feedback from prior years, the annual legislative review process has been started earlier for the 2023 version. A graphic was provided indicating the timeline for the report development. Draft content was developed in July 2022. Cover and internal designs were shared in November 2023. Design iterations of the [cover pages](#) and [draft report content](#) are available for review. The draft chair letter is planned for EEB review by 12/1/23. All other content will be sent for EEB review (minus year-end data) by 12/13/23. Report submission to the general assembly is planned for 3/1/24. A supplementary slide was presented indicating ongoing revisions to the document.

Mr. Richard Faesy (EFG) asked how the equity work would be communicated in the ALR. Mr. Mark Grindell noted that equity content is planned in the executive summary, residential, and C&I sections; the equity content will be confirmed by the outline. Ms. Stacy Sherwood confirmed presence of equity content in the executive summary sections. Mr. Mark Grindell encouraged feedback on the draft documents posted to the meeting folder.

Ms. Kathy Fay asked how much time was available between the EEB review and comment period and the report submission. Mr. Mark Grindell reviewed the timeline and noted that year-end close out data was expected by 2/2/24 and that those figures would take roughly 2 weeks to incorporate. The report submission is planned for 3/1/24. The intention is to have the report approved by the EEB in December 2022. Ms. Kathy Fay commented on the timeline of the report's submission date and highlighted its importance as a tool to communicating with regulators. Mr. Mark Grindell suggested that a 1-pager could be developed quicker, but the final submission would be limited by the availability of year-end close out data. Mr. Steve Bruno showed support for a 1-page summary document.

Ms. Melissa Kops suggested that the 1-page document include a description of the budget conditions, including historic spending rates relative to the annual budgets. Mr. Mark Grindell noted that in past years, a separate 2-page summary had been developed to communicate budget conditions with the legislature. Ms. Melissa Kops showed support for creating a summary document that communicates budget conditions and offered to provide additional feedback on the content to be included. Mr. Steve Bruno questioned if there could be a change to the CAM rate.

Ms. Kathy Fay commented that key areas of concern are the “increase of demand” and “budget crunch”. Mr. Mark Grindell responded that the group would begin development on the referenced summary documents. Ms. Amy Mclean cautioned use of 1-pager in terms content, tone, and the deliverer (“who is it from”). A further question was posed on “what the EEB can advocate”. Ms. Amanda Fargo Johnson seconded using caution in developing the document and discussed its perception as an “educational/information source” and not as an “advocational/lobbying effort”. Ms. Kathy Fay advised maintain a neutral tone in the messaging and that other advocates may use a more urgent tone (customers, contractors, etc). Mr Richard Faesy (by zoom chat) indicated that the message should reflect “educating” and not “advocating”. Ms. Melissa Kops added that the document should be informational and that the EEB roles should be “identifying the challenge”. Mr. Mark Grindell seconded the importance of data being accurate and quantifiable as it will be subject to questioning by legislature, media, etc. Ms. Amanda Fargo Johnson thanked the ALR team for providing early draft versions and requested that these documents be emailed the EEB members.

3. Public Comment

Ms. Patrice Gillespie (Wilton Go Green) submitted [written comments](#) and provided verbal comments during the call. Wilton Go Green is a volunteer-run non-profit that supports local climate change mitigation efforts. **A request was made for the Companies to provide more information (and better information access to the public) on how engagement programs were funded.** There was reference to the customer engagement platform and the customer engagement initiative. The funding source for the customer engagement initiative was questioned. A comment was made that marketing efforts that do not results in savings, should not be funded by ratepayers. There was caution in use of the terms “marketing” and “branding” as applicable to EnergizeCT discussions. **It was suggested that the EnergizeCT website provide more information on educational and marketing budgets.** A question was asked on how to best communicate website revisions to the Companies/EEB. Mr. James Williamson provided the EEB [Executive Secretary email](#) as an option for further website suggestions. Ms. Violette Radomski added that the EnergizeCT website also has a contact form. Ms. Kathy Fay requested that any public input received be shared with the EEB and the Companies.

Dr. Mark Mitchell (CT Equity and Environmental Justice Advisory Council) asked if the Energize CT branding could include a sub-description indicating “ energy efficiency and clean energy resource” so that public can understanding the meaning of the title. In reference to the CT Coalition for Climate Action, legislative goals are being developed for next year; **it was requested that more information be provided on funding for HES-IE and other EJC applicable programs. The requested data is : amount of funding budgeted and used by source(from ratepayers and funding from other sources).** There was concern shown for the impact of the energy efficiency workforce due to budget shortfalls; data was requested to described the projected impact.

Additional [written comments](#) were provided by email from Mr. Bernie Pellitier (PACE).

4. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 3:17pm

Action Items Resulting from November Meeting

Follow-up from EEB Meeting

- EEB members to complete DEI survey or schedule call with Illume
- Companies to provide updates on demand response thermostat programs (For Q4 reporting?)
- Ms. Kathy Fay asked for further elaboration on the progress towards reaching EJC goals for the mobile exhibit. Ms. Violet Radomski commented that the information was not available but could be provided in a follow-up.
- Ms. Stacy Sherwood asked how the marketing teams work with the program teams to modify efforts throughout the year. Mr. Mark Grindell responded that the decisions are data driven and that specific values could be shared
- For the website budget, Ms. Stacy Sherwood stated that the technical consultants would work with DEEP attorneys to determine next steps. Additional updates will be provided based on feedback from the marketing and website teams.
- EEB to provide feedback on draft ALR documents
- ALR development team to work with EEB and Companies to determine if a short summary document(s) (1-2 pages) will be distributed in advance of the ALR Report. The summary document(s) would focus on communicating budget conditions

Follow-up from Public Comments

- provide more information (and better information access to the public) on how engagement, educational, and marketing programs were funded
- modify Energize CT branding could include a sub-description indicating “ energy efficiency and clean energy resource”
- provide more information on funding for HES-IE and other EJC applicable programs The requested data is : amount of funding budgeted and used by source(from ratepayers and funding from other sources).
- Begin using more transparent program monitoring practices
- Seek more funding outside of CAM and RGGI