

**EEB Meeting**

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

[Meeting Materials](https://app.box.com/s/jpwpefowcdssglz2gndme6cbcsutnnlt) | [Meeting Recording](https://us06web.zoom.us/rec/share/oRUeIvDFf-T5cr0jURopnr2wArxh9LdigeUtstvgZFYdjY4ozcrIJOv1hicWIDPF.ju8jjq11t6xLHBwQ?startTime=1675878229000)

Minutes

1. Process
   1. Roll call of Board members

Board Members: Neil Beup, Ron Araujo, Larry Rush, Shubhada Kambli (DEEP), Amanda Fargo-Johnson, Steve Bruno, Ron Araujo, Anne-Marie Knight, Anthony Kosior, Jack Traver, Kathy Fay, John Viglione, John Wright

Board Consultants: Emily Rice, Kyle Huston, Stacy Sherwood, Leigh Michael, Bahareh van Boekhold, Anne Dougherty, George Lawrence, Phil Mosenthal, Richard Faesy

* 1. Approval of minutes

Ms. Shubhada Kambli motioned to approve the [January minutes](https://app.box.com/s/m1h2xasqfgcn8zr0w3n46108lg6eku4m) and Mr. John Viglione seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0; please note that Ms. Anne-Marie Knight and Mr. John Wright were not present for the vote.

* 1. Review of Public Participation Guidelines

Mr. Neil Beup reviewed the participation guidelines for the meeting, asking stakeholders to reserve comments for the public comment sections of the meeting.

* 1. 2022 Consultant Review – Consultant Committee

The Consultant Committee provided a [memo summarizing Board Consultant spending in 2022](https://app.box.com/s/t5xe0gtmzwk0n89hy5jo2eb4cuspc68a). The memo includes a breakout by Consultant of 2022 and 2021 spending. Board Consultants were slightly over budget for 2022 and those funds are covered by a reserve fund that accrues from the Board Consultant budget.

* 1. Executive Secretary RFP Release – Consultant Committee

The Energy Group will serve as Executive Secretary (ES) until June 30th, 2023, when its agreement ends. The role of Executive Secretary will be fulfilled via a Request for Proposal process. A [draft RFP for the Executive Secretary (2023-2025)](https://app.box.com/s/kfu4qdp0bmojcj8qjsvl8ikavze6kw0v) was distributed to the Board for review. The Board will need to vote electronically to approve the RFP in the next few days. Mr. Beup suggested that feedback or changes be directed to the [Consultant Committee](mailto:executivesecretarycteeb@theenergygroup.biz) by close of business February 10, with a vote following on Wednesday, February 15.

Mr. Beup commented that the position of the Executive Secretary has evolved, noting that in the past the Executive Secretary has had industry knowledge and has helped facilitate discussions at the Board and Committee meetings.

Ms. Amanda Fargo-Johnson pointed to one area for the Board to decide is in person attendance for the Executive Secretary and asked for input. Ms. Fargo-Johnson indicated that the Board did not require in-state attendance to capture more applicants. Ms. Fargo-Johnson also commented on the impact in person attendance will have on the ES budget.

Ms. Kathy Fay likes the idea of not requiring the ES to attend in person as she enjoys the option to attend in person.

Mr. Ron Araujo asked how the RFP would be noticed. Ms. Fargo-Johnson said that the Executive Secretary and DEEP will push the RFP through the respective channels and the Energize CT RFP page. Ms. Fargo-Johnson indicated that respondents would reply directly through DEEP. Mr. Araujo said there is a link on the home page and Ms. Sherwood said she would connect with the web team when the RFP is finalized.

* 1. DEI Consultant Work Plan – Consultant Committee

Ms. Fargo-Johnson noted that the DEI Consultant Workplan was not approved with the other Board Consultants at the end of 2022 due to the timing of the Equity Assessment deliverable. Ms. Fargo-Johnson explained that it was difficult to approve a work plan prior to the completion of that delivery. To help the Board deliberate on the DEI Workplan, Ms. Leigh Michael, DEI Consultant, provided an [update from the DEI Consultant Team](https://app.box.com/s/kfu4qdp0bmojcj8qjsvl8ikavze6kw0v) that includes introductions of new team members, DEI goals, and an overview of the DEI process and the proposed DEI workplan.

Regarding Board and Committee meeting attendance, the Board discussed balancing attendance of meetings for the DEI Consultant with the budget. Ms. Fargo-Johnson said that there is value in the DEI Consultant being at meetings when programs are being developed. Ms. Fay agreed that the Technical Consultants can help to map out critical meetings for the DEI Consultant to attend. Ms. Michael noted that her team would work with the Technical Consultants to identify critical meetings.

Regarding Ad Hoc Technical Consulting, the Board expressed support for this. Ms. Fay asked the Board how it would decide which priorities to focus on. Ms. Michael said the DEI team assumed 5.5 hours per month, but that this budget can ebb and flow throughout the year as needed. Mr. Beup said that the Board will need to let this play out as it’s new to the Board, adding that if there are issues. Ms. Sherwood added that there are existing pathways to discuss this.

Regarding Project Administration, Ms. Sherwood asked if the time was for the 2023 workplan or the next 2024 workplan. Ms. Leigh noted that the time is for the 2023 workplan, but there may be time remaining. Ms. Anne Dougherty added that the DEI Team spent more time on the 2023 workplan to align with the Board’s expectations but anticipates future workplans may not demand the same amount of time.

Regarding the Equity Subcommittee, Mr. Beup expressed concern that a segregated subcommittee would not be as embedded as it ought to be in Board deliberations and discussions. Ms. Fargo-Johnson shared this concern and would like to embed DEI work in existing Committee meetings. Ms. Fargo-Johnson suggested that Public Input Sessions could be another way to engage the public. Given the consensus around not establishing a subcommittee and using the existing committee framework, Ms. Fargo-Johnson asked if the budget for this item would be put back to the line item for meetings discussed earlier and Ms. Michael noted that some of the dollars would but not all of them.

Ms. Fay commented that she is most active on the Residential and Evaluation meetings, which take 2.5 hours each, and isn’t sure how to embed this topic in those already packed meetings. Ms. Sherwood said that the Technical Consultants will work with the DEI Consultant to coordinate and ensure there is enough time. Mr. Beup said that if the Board finds the agreed approach isn’t working, the Board can adjust and schedule ad hoc meetings. Ms. Anne-Marie Knight said she was in favor of a subcommittee but agrees with trying the approach discussed. The DEI Consultant will use the existing meeting structure for now. Mr. George Lawrence said he is confident the C&I Committee can carve out enough time to prioritize and focus on this matter.

Regarding the Equity Goal Development, Ms. Fargo-Johnson said that some combination of the pathways might be needed but expressed concerns about the cost. Mr. Ron Araujo said that he wants to make sure the pathway chosen includes parity work and is done in time to incorporate in the 2024 Plan. The Board discussed the timeframe for parity and equity goal development and noted it must align with the Plan development schedule, and be completed no later than August 2022. Ms. Fay noted that pathway two is critical. Ms. Knight said she is concerned about the cost to get to the end of pathway two but agreed with Ms. Fay that it’s the most critical aspect of this work. Ms. Michael said her team can come up with a combination of the pathways, with a lighter lift, and could pull some of the funds from the subcommittee item. Ms. Knight and Ms. Fargo-Johnson support this approach. Ms. Michael explained that a lower-cost approach for pathway two will require more engagement from the Board.

Regarding Target Population Definition Development, Ms. Shubhada Kambli indicated that pathway two is important given the federal funding environment and the need to align with federal and state programs. Mr. Beup agreed that pathway two is important, adding that existing environmental justice community definitions (pathway one) doesn’t map perfectly with the populations the Board is trying to reach. Ms. Sherwood noted that setting equity goals is also a priority that’s on the same timeline as this objective and suggested that the equity goals are prioritized first. Ms. Sherwood also pointed out that pursuing equity goals and target population definitions consecutively rather than concurrently could help alleviate some of the budget challenges for these priorities.

Mr. Jack Traver pointed out that pathway two will need updated to account for the Board’s decision to forego establishing an equity subcommittee. Mr. Traver shared that the C&I Committee has struggled to come up with definitions that are analogous to the Residential targets.

Ms. Fay added there are other stakeholders in Connecticut working on target population definitions, particularly geographically, and suggested that it could serve as a springboard for this objective. Ms. Michael explained that the budget includes time spent ensuring existing work and progress is understood.

Mr. Beup suggested the work plan be refined ahead of a vote, and Ms. Sherwood added that Board members could provide comments ahead of the vote. Ms. Michael will provide an updated work plan by COB Friday, December 10th. The Board will have a window to comment further, and then will vote electronically to approve the work plan next week.

* 1. Launch of Residential Energy Preparation Services (REPS) – DEEP

DEEP provided an [update on the REPS program](https://app.box.com/s/ygzpy62d0r38asyzpw6e2b5rz9u4bqdd). More information can be found on DEEP’s [website.](https://portal.ct.gov/DEEP/Energy/Conservation-and-Load-Management/Weatherization-Barrier-Mitigation)

* 1. Public Comments

There were no comments.

1. Programs and Planning
   1. 2022-2024 C&LM Plan Update for March 1 Filing and Board Vote– Companies and Technical Consultants

Mr. Steven Bruno and Mr. Ghani Ramdani, Eversource, and Mr. Brian Sullivan, Avangrid, provided a [progress update on the 2023 Plan Update](https://app.box.com/s/opwn7854wd46xrooz4jpuschpq28ko36) for the March 1 filing. The presentation includes an overview of the update and process, a timeline, and a summary of areas that will be revised. Several supporting materials for the March 1 filing are available [here.](https://app.box.com/s/60kiqfc1cgftgnqxoteo91rutkteghol)

The Technical Consultants [shared a presentation](https://app.box.com/s/u41crfokekeo9dghhx9ynymlqz36debh) summarizing their recommendations regarding the 2023 Plan Update. The Technical Consultants recommend the Board approve the March 1 filing, with a few caveats that are outlined in the presentation. Mr. Jack Traver motioned to approve the March 1 filing with Technical Consultants’ recommendations and Mr. John Wright seconded the motion. Ms. Fay and Ms. Kambli both indicated they would need more time to vote. The motion passed 7-0, with Ms. Fay and DEEP abstaining. The Executive Secretary will need to record Ms. Fay and DEEP’s votes before the March meeting.

* 1. Annual Legislative Report (ALR) Overview and Board Vote – Companies

Mr. Bruno reminded the Board that a draft of the ALR was distributed to the Board for comment by February 10th from the Executive Secretary. The Letter from the Chairs and cover are complete, but the remaining content needs to be finalized. Mr. Bruno and Mr. Beup discussed the historical process of approving the ALR. Mr. Beup asked if there were concerns, comments, or questions on the draft.

Ms. Fargo-Johnson noted that several Board members have made comments in the working draft and asked if those were reflected yet in the draft provided today. Mr. Bruno indicated that the Companies are working on incorporating feedback received so far. Ms. Fargo-Johnson also noted that she would like to see more Connecticut-specific photos rather than stock photos throughout the report. The Companies are working on following up on this request and others. Ms. Fargo-Johnson said a single vote on the final report is desirable.

The Board discussed the timeline for the final steps. Comments and feedback are due by December 10th, the Technical Consultants will review once more, and a final copy will be distributed by the Executive Secretary next week for final comment and then an electric vote. Ms. Fargo-Johnson has asked for a voting packet to include all upcoming evotes.

* 1. Q4 and Annual Program Update – Companies

The Companies provided [a presentation](https://app.box.com/s/n8rruec4cxfvulqvurza8r6mxbzm5n1f) on the 2022 year-end summary of program results, including spending, savings, revenues, and progress on first and secondary metrics.

Regarding the Achieved 92.5 MW Savings from Active Demand Response summary on slide 10, Mr. Beup asked why the wi-fi thermostat adoption is so heavily weighted on the residential side, suggesting that many small businesses use residential equipment. Mr. Araujo shared that there are not many business customers using wi-fi thermostats, though the Companies are looking at this for small business. Ms. Sherwood suggested starting with the micro businesses for this offering.

Ms. Kambli asked whether the performance relative to goals takes into account RGGI funds. Mr. Bruno explained that the goals are prorated, so additional spending will raise the goals accordingly.

Regarding Slide 9, Ms. Sherwood clarified the statutory goals with respect to the achieved savings. Ms. Sherwood recalled that in the November 1 filing, the goal was 1.35 MMBtu but the achieved savings is below that for 2022. Ms. Sherwood asked if the Companies expect to meet their savings goal in 2023. Mr. Bruno noted that the goal is 1.2 MMBtu for 2023. Mr. Araujo and Mr. Bruno discussed the loss of lighting incentives has impacted the savings. Mr. Bruno suggested that the Companies could leverage savings generated from the IRA-funded projects and flagged this as a discussion point.

Regarding the Spending Summary on slide 4, Ms. Sherwood pointed to the 125% of the actual budget spent in Eversource Gas territory and suggested that the Board should be warned when spending is going to exceed 100%. Ms. Sherwood explained that going over budget is borrowing funds for the future. Mr. Bruno referred to the Combined Summary on slide 3, and explained that while there was overspending the influx of RGGI funding helped support that spending. Mr. Bruno suggested included revenues along with the spending and budget data.

* 1. Community Partnership Initiative (CPI) – Companies

Ms. Devan Willemsen, Eversource, and Ms. Sherri Borelli, Avangrid, provided an [update on the CPI.](https://app.box.com/s/hxrfmo9l3r7svockvrtgjowl4wh3qt67) Round 1 is wrapping up and will be able to contact company staff as a resource. All teams are on track to meet their goals.

Round 2 applications opened December 16. Round 2 included changes that resulted from input from stakeholders, the DEI Consultant, and others. The presentation provides details for Round 2, including project focus areas, terms, and targeted populations. Applications for Round 2 close March 3 at 5:00PM.

Ms. Kambli said DEEP is interested in how the Companies are thinking strategically about the tension between serving environmental justice households and budget constraints. Mr. Araujo noted that the Companies have narrowed marketing in the HES and HES-IE program to targeted populations.

1. Public Comments

There were no comments.

1. Adjourn

Mr. John Wright motioned to adjourn; Mr. John Viglione seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 9-0.