



EEB Meeting

Wednesday, March 15, 2023 | 1:00PM – 3:30PM

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

Minutes

1. Process

A. Roll call of Board members

Board Members: John Viglione, Stephen Bruno, Shubhada Kambli, Neil Beup, Hammad Chaudhry, Jack Traver, Karraine Moody, John Viglione, Anne-Marie Knight, Melissa Kops, John Wright, Larry Rush, Kathy Fay, Amanda Fargo-Johnson, Donald Mauritz
Board Consultants: Emily Rice, Stacy Sherwood, George Lawrence, Bahareh Ven Boekhold, Dan Mellinger, Leigh Michael, Richard Faesy

B. Approval of minutes

Mr. Jack Traver motioned to approve the February minutes and Ms. Shubhada Kambli seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, and the minutes were approved 11-0.

C. E-vote Review: Annual Legislative Report and DEI Work Plan

The Executive Secretary informed the Board that the [2022 Annual Legislative Report](#) passed an electronic vote on February 21 that passed 11-0. The Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Consultant's 2022 Workplan was approved in an electronic vote on February 21 that passed 11-0.

D. Proposed Policy Working Group Changes - Technical Consultants

The Technical Consultants provided an overview of proposed changes to the Policy Working Group (PWG). Mr. Dan Mellinger shared background on the PWG, restructuring goals, information on the Massachusetts Technology Assessment Committee (MTAC) and its assessment. A summary of proposed PWG changes can be found on slides 6-8.

Ms. Melissa Kops noted the name is confusing and suggested a change. Mr. Mellinger noted that the name can be changed, but the Technical Consultants didn't include this in their proposed changes. Mr. Beup said he supported changing the name eventually.

Mr. Mellinger discussed examples of technologies the PWG reviews and explained that the PWG is reviewing technologies to determine whether savings are viable.

Mr. David Wright asked what methods are used to confirm real-world performance in terms of monitoring energy usage. Mr. Mellinger explained that once a technology is reviewed and recommended for the Programs, there is a standard program evaluation that considers savings, performance, and other cost-benefit criteria. This second step is outside the scope of PWG.

Mr. Beup clarified for Mr. Traver that there was no action for the Board regarding the proposed changes, and shared that these changes would be integrated automatically by the Program Administrators. (It should be noted that the scope of the PWG and the name would be changes that require Board approval.)

E. Discussion of Board's Role Related to Funding - Technical Consultants

Mr. Neil Beup discussed that the Board was not allowed to lobby, and therefore cannot advocate for funding. Mr. Beup added that Board members can advocate for things as individuals or representatives of their companies.

F. Public Comments

Mr. Tim Fabuien, CMC Energy, shared positive feedback from members of Aeroseal as well as other utilities and EPA members. The Energize CT's Aeroseal retrofit and Residential Programs is a "shining star for advanced duct sealing". Connecticut's programs are being used as a model across the country. Since the changes made to the program after 2015, the number of sealed homes increased from 226 per year to over 800 across the state.

Mr. Bernie Pelletier, People's Action for Clean Energy (PACE), shared that relative to 2022 spending levels, the budget was underfunded by approximately \$26 million. Mr. Pelletier has been looking for resources to ameliorate this issue and has expressed his concern directly with DEEP. Mr. Beup noted that the budgeted amounts have not decreased and explained that the special supplemental funding issued during 2022 did not raise the budget perpetually. The C&LM Plan budgets are set by the legislature and approved by DEEP.

Mr. Pelletier has previously shared suggestions for how the Programs and Board handle budget shortfalls in writing to the Energy Efficiency Board. Mr. Pelletier suggested that prioritizing measures and/or the order of installed measures be a tactic used to address budget challenges within the HES-IE program. For example, when the budget is scarce the Programs pause triple pane window incentives (low impact, high cost). Mr. Pelletier also suggested that the Programs align with WAP, Justice40, and other known parameters of the IRA funding as soon as possible so funding can be accessed more readily. Mr. Beup said he has reviewed Mr. Pelletier's written comments. Mr. Beup explained that the Residential Committee is the appropriate forum to address these issues.

Mr. David Wright said that understanding real-world performance of certain products and technologies is important. Mr. Wright suggested the Board brainstorm ways in which Connecticut can measure and monitor post-installation performance of building envelope technologies and HVAC equipment. Mr. Wright is interested in learning more about what efforts are already in place. Mr. Beup explained that the Board does measure performance through energy measurement and verification (EM&V) work and under the Evaluation Administrator to ensure what the Programs are promoting is achievable.

2. Programs and Planning

A. DEEP Updates – Legislative Bill Updates

Ms. Shubhada Kambli introduced [Mr. Ben McMillan](#), who has taken over as DEEP's main point of contact for the EEB.

Ms. Kambli provided an overview of a few energy-related bills at the legislature: [SB4](#) is an act concerning Connecticut's present and future housing needs. This bill establishes a pilot program for retrofitting certain multifamily residences to improve energy efficiency via specific EE, renewable, and safety measures and includes a \$600 million appropriation over 5 years. [SB 979](#) is an act promoting energy affordability, energy efficiency and green cities. [HB 5634](#) is an act increasing funding for the EE programs. This bill would supplement funding for energy efficiency programs identified in the Conservation and Load Management

Plan by allocating twenty million dollars from the state budget to support such programs.

Ms. Kambli noted that this information is only intended to inform the Board, not to advocate for any legislation.

B. Diversity Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Equity Assessment Review and Discussion – DEI Consultants

The DEI Consultant presented a [summary of its findings](#) from the [2022 Equity Assessment](#). The Report is available in the materials folder. The presentation includes an overview of the Equity Assessment, how to tie findings into the 2023 DEI workplan goal, and a discussion of near-term next steps.

Ms. Fargo-Johnson asked for thoughts on “disadvantaged” versus “underserved” and other terms. Ms. Michael said that the terminology is up to the Board, but suggested consistency and clear definitions. Ms. Fargo-Johnson expressed that disadvantaged might have a negative connotation. Ms. Michael suggested her team lay out the terms and definitions at the Committee level to come up with terms to propose to the Board.

Ms. Amanda Fargo-Johnson asked if equity and parity goals can be achieved together, if an equity goal will be set within the current parity focus, or with another approach. Ms. Michael said that the groups in Committee meetings will need to discuss this. Ms. Michael noted that working within the current parity focus may be the path of least resistance but added that the Board will want to make sure the Board doesn’t set up misalignment to E3.

Ms. Fargo-Johnson asked if the Board is mandated to follow E3? Ms. Kathy Fay said the legislation calls for parity but doesn’t believe the Board has the authority to change those expectations. Ms. Melissa Kops asked what parity requirements are outlined in the legislation? Ms. Michael stated that the goal is to remain within the legislated boundaries. Ms. Michael said she would want to revisit the legislation. Ms. Stacy Sherwood will confirm whether “parity” is in the legislation and follow up. Mr. Beup shared that historically the parity goals were set in silos within each sector and there was a slight indexing for income-eligible programs.

Ms. Fargo-Johnson commented that the list of metrics for disadvantaged communities in the Residential sector is very disproportionate to the list of metrics for disadvantaged communities in the C&I sector.

Mr. Richard Faesy asked what the DEI Consultant has in mind for Committee-level discussions in April? Ms. Michael described the steps the DEI Consultant would take. Ms. Michael said they would follow up with Mr. Faesy and Mr. Lawrence following the presentation today. There may be material to review in advance of the next Committee meetings to prepare for discussions.

Regarding the PMI Secondary Equity Metrics, Kathy asked if there was a way to coordinate with PURA and its performance-based regulation docket. Mr. Beup said the PURA docket is separate from the PMIs being discussed here. The PURA docket focuses on the utilities’ operations in their role as a distributor of energy.

The Board thanked the DEI team for walking the Board through the Equity Assessment.

3. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

4. Adjourn

Mr. Jack Traver motioned to adjourn; Mr. John Viglione seconded the motion. The motion passed 11-0 and the meeting was adjourned.