



## EEB Meeting

Wednesday, April 12, 2023 | 1:00PM – 3:30PM

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

## Minutes

### 1. Process

#### A. Roll call of Board members

Board Members: John Viglione, Anne-Marie Knight, Kathy Fay, Ron Araujo, Stephen Bruno, Larry Rush, Anthony Kosior, Jack Traver, Kathy Fay, Melissa Kops, Donald Mauritz, John Wright, Shubhada Kambli (DEEP)

Board Consultants: Emily Rice, Stacy Sherwood, Baharah van Boekhold, Leigh Michael, Richard Faesy, George Lawrence

#### B. Approval of March Minutes

Mr. Wright motioned to approve the minutes and Mr. Traver seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 9-0.

#### C. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

### 2. Programs and Planning

#### A. Focus Area- Equity Initiatives in CT Related to Energy – Technical Consultants

The Technical Consultants provided [a presentation](#) that covered federal energy efficiency initiatives that impact Energize CT Programs. The Presentation includes an overview of the Justice40 Initiative, Connecticut's current climate efforts, and DEEP Equity and Affordability Initiatives. Slide 9 outlines the characteristics of disadvantaged communities (DAC) defined by the Department of Energy under the Justice40 Initiative.

Ms. Sherwood outlined next steps for the Board on slide 21. Next month the Board will discuss the legislative charge of the EEB, then the Technical Consultant will be seeking guidance and approval on equity performance management incentives (PMIs), equity framework, revisions to HES and HES-IE, and integrating Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) funding.

#### B. Discussion: Broader Participation versus Deeper Savings – Technical Consultants

Ms. Sherwood noted that the Board will be making many decisions around equity and program design over the next few months. Technical Consultants shared [a presentation](#) around broad and deep energy savings to generate discussion around these approaches. The presentation includes a definition and examples of each approach as well as benefits and drawbacks for each.

Ms. Sherwood provided a list of reasons why this discussion is relevant and timely for the Board, and asked if there were other points to consider. Ms. Fay

noted that the input provided to the DEI Consultant during the Residential Committee meeting earlier in the day.

The Board discussed benefits and drawbacks to a broader savings approach. Ms. Kops shared a concern that the broader approach will have more administrative costs and individuals will see less savings. Mr. Araujo discussed the cost of acquisition for customers, explaining that multiple touchpoints is a way to keep customers engaged.

Ms. Sherwood outlined the benefits and drawbacks to a deeper savings approach and asked if there are particular groups or programs that should be considered under this design. Ms. Kops and Ms. Fay said that moderate income customers could be targeted. Ms. Fay added that the extreme income disparities in the state justify this. Ms. Kops added that the programs could focus on buildings with low energy performance. Mr. Lawrence shared that microbusiness overall account for a large portion of energy used. The programs are targeting this segment currently, but they are difficult to reach.

Historically the programs have been designed to go deeper. Ms. Sherwood asked the Board to consider whether all programs are achieving deeper savings objectives and if there are areas or measures the programs should concentrate on. Mr. Faesy explained that given net zero is the long-term goal, programs should be designed to guide customers through that process over time rather than deliver services in a “one and done” approach. The Board discussed which approach best achieves this vision and how the existing programs align with it.

Ms. Fay said that the Board should consider coordinating with similar programs and asked if the Board was keeping this in mind. Ms. Kambli agreed and noted that additional funding and existing federal funding can help the Board achieve a broader and deeper impact. Ms. Kops noted that the Board should be given more direction from agencies to help ensure it’s able to coordinate in this way.

The Technical Consultants recommend a combination of broader and deeper savings approaches, the benefits of which are outlined on slide 10. Ms. Sherwood said the Board needs to examine this on a program-by-program basis and asked if there are concerns about this approach.

Ms. Fay expressed a concern that caps will disproportionately impact customers. Ms. Sherwood explained the reasoning for caps, whether by measure or customer. The Board discussed spending caps, including existing ways caps are used and different approaches that could be taken.

Ms. Sherwood prompted a discussion on further items to consider on slide 12. Mr. Lawrence referenced the Justice40 goals and how disruptive it would be to the parity pies to get there. Mr. Bruno and Mr. Faesy discussed parity goals and requirements.

Ms. Fay said she would need more information to determine approaches for electric and gas objectives towards decarbonization. Ms. Sherwood noted that the Board can provide comments and ideas to the [Executive Secretary](#) outside of

this meeting. Ms. Sherwood suggested that these conversations be had at the Committee level.

C. HES-IE Budget Shortfall for 2023 – Eversource

Mr. Araujo shared that Eversource is seeing robust activity on the single-family side. Eversource is monitoring the budget and will notify the Board if there is an issue. Mr. Viglione asked how the spending for Q1 compares to the same period last year. Mr. Araujo said that an influx of activity in January is typical as projects are wrapping up from the previous year.

D. Review of 2022 Performance Management Incentives – Technical Consultants

The Technical Consultants provided [a presentation](#) explaining Performance Management Incentives and outlined 2022 PMI performance.

E. Community Partnership initiative Update – The Companies

Ms. Sheri Borelli and Ms. Devan Willemsen provided an [update on Round 1 and development of Round 2 of the CPI](#). The presentation includes a progress update on Round 1, which is wrapping up, and details on changes for Round 2. Round 2 will be open to distressed municipalities and municipalities containing environmental justice communities as [defined by DEEP](#).

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

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

Ms. Kambli asked if the awards are made based on the existing distribution of HES and HES-IE funding per community. Ms. Willemsen said that the Companies will be looking at that and added that funds are only being awarded for IE and not market-rate. Mr. Faesy asked how the Companies reconcile the participating communities driving participation that may be met with funding limitations. Ms. Willemsen indicated that most communities that chose HES-IE as a goal had other goals as well.

3. Public Comments<https://app.box.com/folder/188712756244>

Mr. Bruno provided an update on the Companies' [Community Dashboard](#). The Companies have reconciled some 2021 community data that was inaccurate. Mr. Faesy asked when 2022 would go in and Mr. Bruno noted that 2022 data is already in. The Companies are also working on breaking out measures on the dashboard. Mr. Faesy asked when the Board could get an overview of the dashboards and updates being made. Mr. Bruno said the Companies plan to demo the dashboards at the Committee level first, but responded that it could be a couple months.

4. Adjourn

Mr. Traver motioned to adjourn and Ms. Kops seconded the motion. The motion passed 8-0 (Ms. Knight was not present for the vote) and the meeting was adjourned.