



Energy Efficiency Board
March 9, 2021 | 1:00 – 3:30 pm

Documents for the meeting are located here:
<https://app.box.com/s/r12ewrt3gzzlp4vbk2n2uvm6w8n2c0mj>

MINUTES

1. Process

A. Roll call of Board Members

The Chair called the meeting to order and the Executive Secretary took roll.

Board Members: Amanda Fargo-Johnson, Amy McLean, Anthony Kosior, Jack Traver, John Viglione, John Wright, Kate Donatelli (For Vicki Hackett), Kathy Fay, Melissa Kops, Neil Beup, Ron Araujo, Stephen Bruno, Brenda Watson, Donald Mauritz, Hammad Chaudhry, Joel Kopylec, Walter Szymanski, Anne-Marie Knight

Other Attendees: Devan Willemsen, Emily Rice, Glenn Reed, Samantha Dynowski, Shubhada Kambli, Stacy Sherwood, Stephen Cowell, Amanda Stevens, Ashley Marshall, Brian Sullivan, Dan Mellinger, Dan Robertson, Diane del Rosso, Dennis O’Connor, Erin Cosgrove, Ghani Ramdani, Glen Eigo, Greg Caggiano, Griff Keating, Jay Goodman, Julia Dumaine, Larry Rush, Madison Donahue, Matt Macunas, Mike Weissmann, Nate Kinsey, Patrice Gillespie, Peter Kenefick, Philip Mosenthal, Richard Faesy, Rob Whelan, Rose Croog, Samantha Caputo, Sheri Borrelli, Tim Fabuien, Violette Radomski

Mr. Neil Beup reminded attendees to mute when not speaking.

B. Minutes – Approve minutes from February 2022 Board Meeting

Ms. Amanda Fargo-Johnson motioned to approve the minutes. Mr. John Viglione seconded the motion. Ms. Fargo-Johnson noted that the version distributed had track changes still open. Ms. Emily Rice will correct this. With this correction, the minutes were approved with a 12-0 vote.

C. Conflict of Interest Training

Mr. Neil Beup noted that with the recent expansion and reshaping of the Board, DEEP raised a question with Board leadership as to whether or not they would be interested in State Ethics Officials providing training. Mr. Beup shared that Board leadership agreed it was a prudent thing to do and training will be scheduled soon, hopefully in 1-2 sessions outside of normal meeting times.

Mr. Beup believes the training is important and it’s fairly standard procedure for any board to

either undergo training or fill out a Conflict of Interest form annually.

D. Introduction of new Board member Anne-Marie Knight

Ms. Kate Donatelli stated that Ms. Anne-Marie Knight wasn't able to introduce herself at the last Board meeting due to technical issues. Ms. Knight is the Board Representative for a Statewide Business Association. Ms. Knight is the Executive Director of the Black Business Alliance (BBA), which is a statewide organization that represents Black business owners. Introducing herself, Ms. Knight noted that the BBA is here to empower, educate, and develop Black business owners around the state and beyond. Ms. Knight is excited to be on the Board and to represent this group.

Mr. Beup welcomed Ms. Knight, stating that he's looking forward to having Ms. Knight on the Board and hearing her perspective. Mr. Beup also remarked that gaining a broader and more diverse set of board members that can kind of bring unique individual perspective is something the Board has been waiting a long time for.

E. DEEP Legislative Update: Home Energy Labeling

Ms. Shubhuda Kambli, DEEP's Director of Building and Transportation Decarbonization, shared two Governor's bills introduced this session related to home energy labeling. House Bill 5041 ([HB5041](#)) proposes labeling requirements for rental units and it's being heard by the Housing Committee. Senate Bill 14 (SB14) proposes labeling requirements for homebuyers and is being heard by the Insurance and Real Estate Committee. Generally, these bills will require the disclosure of the home energy label when residential properties are listed for rent or sale.

The bills are very similar in terms of their labeling requirements in the 2021 legislation SB882 that did not pass, but there are substantial differences in compliance. Home energy labels, including Home Energy Rating System (HERS) and ENERGY STAR scores, are the only compliance pathway. Disclosing billing information in lieu of a label is not an option. The second major difference is that compliance with the labeling requirement will be phased in over time, starting in areas with the highest energy burden. SB14 is focused on environmental justice communities and DEEP has the authority to add new labeling options, as appropriate, in the future. Ms. Kambli noted that DEEP provided testimony and supported these bills at the relevant Committee meetings last week.

Ms. Kambli shared another bill of interest SB292, an act concerning heating efficiency in new residential construction, and major alterations of residential buildings was introduced by the House Committee. The purpose is directing the State Building Inspector and Codes and Standards Committee to prohibit the use of electric resistance or fossil fuel combustion systems as a primary source of space or water heating in new residential construction and major renovation projects. If passed, this would occur in the next code adoption cycle, no earlier than 2024. The goal of this coalition is really to encourage the use of more energy efficient systems, such as heat pumps. The bill would give DEEP the ability to develop a training program for engineers, builders, contractors, and construction superintendents on alternative space and water heating measures. The House Committee will hear testimony on the bill in their meeting on March 10, 2022.

Ms. Amy McLean asked if DEEP planned to submit testimony for SB292. Ms. Donatelli believed that DEEP was planning to provide testimony; if not at the meeting, by submitting in writing.

F. Public Comments

Mr. Stephen Cowell shared that the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act that passed has billions of dollars that will be distributed. There are 12 buckets and one of the biggest challenges is how to integrate, co-ordinate, and collaborate between the existing state funded programs, utility funded programs, and the new money coming in. Some of the funding is formula-based but other dollars are competitive. Mr. Cowell said it's important to start thinking about what competitive grants make sense to request for the State of Connecticut.

Mr. Cowell suggested that a working group get together with DEEP to coordinate. Mr. Cowell shared that the Energy Efficiency Strategy Group has a meeting with the U.S. Department of Energy on March 24. Mr. Cowell urged all the infrastructure folks to begin thinking about whether, and how, and to what extent they need to be working together to take best advantage of those very substantial funds. Mr. Cowell noted that if Build Back Better Act gets approved, there will be funds on top of that to consider. Mr. Cowell shared that E4TheFuture is a resource. E4TheFuture hopes to get a year and a half heat pump study to inform whole house heat pump design.

2. Programs and Planning

A. CES Scoping – DEEP, Consultants and Board

- Take-aways from Scoping Meeting
- Board comments and Discussion
- Next steps

Ms. Kate Donatelli reminded the Board that DEEP [launched a process](#) at the start of 2022 to develop a new Comprehensive Energy Strategy (CES), which is a process DEEP undergoes regularly for energy planning in the state. DEEP is currently in the scoping phase of that process, which is being heavily informed by public input. A couple weeks ago, DEEP held a public input session and had great attendance, 170 attendees at one point, which generated great discussion. A written public comment window closed on March 3 with 70 comments submitted by a variety of stakeholders. Ms. Donatelli said that DEEP appreciated the Board members taking time to submit comments. DEEP is in the process of reviewing comments and will be refining the scope of the CES.

Mr. Glenn Reed provided a slide deck summarizing the Board's comments that were submitted regarding the CES. Copies of Mr. Reed's summary and the Board's submitted comments can be found in [the materials folder](#). DEEP requested feedback on eight specific topic areas and the Board commented on six of those. The Board engaged on equity and decarbonization, studies for modeling and quantitative considerations, thermal decarbonization and energy affordability, industrial thermal processes, greenhouse gas accounting for biofuels, and resilience and reliability in a decarbonized economy. The Board's comments did not address updates to the Electric Vehicles Roadmap or the Integrated Resource Plan. Mr. Reed shared that the Board and Consultants provided 20 specific studies that address many of the individual topics that DEEP will be considering over the coming months.

The Board wants to ensure that energy efficiency continues to be a front and center consideration within the CES as a decarbonization strategy. The Board wants to ensure that both residential and C&I underserved customers are addressed both in terms of their participation in future decarbonization efforts and the benefits that could potentially accrue to them. The Board

would like analyses to have sufficient granularity and resulting strategies from the CES to be useful to the programs in terms of design and implementation strategies. Mr. Reed noted that the energy efficiency programs function “in the weeds” by necessity and hopes the CES provides strategies with that in mind. The Board’s comments also indicated a need to consider potential impacts of strategies; for example, the impacts of electrification on customers bearing an increasing portion of fixed costs.

Mr. Reed noted that the Consultants received some new and interesting Board feedback, but those comments were not incorporated into the Board’s comments due to timing. Mr. Reed provided them for discussion and consideration as the Board engages over the coming months on the CES:

- improving workforce development,
- expanding the C&I Heat Pump Analysis,
- establishing a framework and timeline for EE goals,
- suggesting DEEP be intentional about the language around equity (underserved, under-resourced, vulnerable, etc.),
- whether and if the programs should project and estimate non-energy benefits,
- whether more funding is needed to ramp up programs.

Mr. Reed solicited Board feedback on these topics, and any other areas of concern members would like to raise as we move forward with the development of the CES. Mr. Beup thanked everyone for their input and time as the letter was drafted and voted on. Mr. Beup thinks the additional points are valid and directly aligned with the Board’s longstanding set of principles around equity, workforce development, etc. Mr. Beup acknowledged the difficulty in drafting these letters, getting input virtually and making amendments within the expected timeframe, which is why this is on the agenda today. Mr. Beup further suggested the Board submit an addendum to its comments on the scoping of the CES electronically.

Mr. Beup added that every entity who's represented here on this board has the opportunity to submit their own comments if they are not necessarily directly in the purview of the Energy Efficiency board as a whole. There's a lot of folks that have a lot of disparate interests and points on the CES; but for the Board’s purposes, Mr. Beup stated that we want to make sure we're focused on points that are relevant to the Energy Efficiency Board’s mission and objectives.

Ms. Kathy Fay indicated that she would be sending amendments and asked what the turnaround time would be. Mr. Glenn Reed outlined the steps going forward. The Consultants will draft bullet points based on feedback they’ve already received and will submit that to Board leadership on Tuesday. Then those comments will be sent to the Board in about a week. Mr. Beup asked Board members with additional concerns to send those into Mr. Reed.

Mr. Jack Traver asked if the Board would be able to vote singularly on the new bullet items rather than the aggregate. Mr. Traver is concerned that Board members may have to concede on some points in order to submit those they are in favor of with an aggregate approach. Mr. Beup said that this process is a challenge, but didn’t believe it would be much of an issue given that the second set of points are consistent with the Board’s current positions and mission. Mr. Beup suggested getting the points on paper and going from there, noting if there’s not consensus on any points the Board can deal with it. Ms. Fargo-Johnson confirmed that the Board

will have the opportunity to vote on approval for the additional comments. Mr. Beup said yes, they will be circulated for a vote.

B. Fuel Switching Focus Area –Consultants

Mr. Beup indicated that the issue of fuel switching has come up frequently over the passed two years, primarily around heat pumps. The broader issue of fuel switching was raised by stakeholder input throughout the C&LM Plan development process, primarily in the context of heat pumps. Mr. Beup thought it was a good opportunity for the Board to learn more about fuel switching, what it means, what the opportunities may or may not be, and what the implications may be for CT programs. Mr. Beup said there has been some dissention on the Board as to whether or not it was appropriate for CT programs to promote fuel switching. There have been some conflicting decisions from the state, dating back to when the Board submitted its C&LM Plan to the Department of Public Utility Control, which is now PURA under DEEP.

Mr. Beup noted that things have changed, and guidance has been to encourage uptake of the most efficient equipment. Mr. Beup shared that previous Comprehensive Energy Strategies have provided some feedback into certain kinds of fuels in the context of fuel switching, but there is a lot to learn. Mr. Beup added there are different lessons in each sector. Introducing the Consultants' presentation, Mr. Beup stated that this is not to move away from electrification or heat pump application but to provide a broader context of what is meant by fuel switching. This presentation will also highlight possible opportunities and risks for the Board to consider going forward as it shapes the programs.

Ms. Stacy Sherwood, Energy Futures Group, provided a slide deck along with her presentation that can be found in [the materials folder](#). Ms. Sherwood provided a definition of fuel switching: it's the replacement of end use customer-facing equipment that's powered by less efficient fuels and replacing them with a cleaner, economical alternate fuel source. This, typically, can result in reduction in energy consumption, carbon emissions, and potential build savings for the end user, but that's not always guaranteed.

Ms. Sherwood highlighted some potential benefits of fuel switching, which are dependent on the technology applied. Reduced greenhouse gas emissions due to adoption of low-carbon technology can help CT meet decarbonization goals. Fuel switching can deliver energy savings at both the site and source and positive customer economics, both capital investment and lifetime operational cost, and increased opportunities for energy affordability. It can also increase reliance on local or regional energy supplies.

Ms. Sherwood shared potential challenges to fuel switching, also dependent on technology applied and fuel being switched from. Some solutions require significant upfront investment in the form of upgrades needed to accommodate new equipment load (i.e. electric panel) and purchase of new end-use equipment. Another challenge could occur with partial displacement as owners need to maintain both the original and new systems. As customers switch over, leaving the gas system and adding to the electric demand, there may be fewer customers to spread gas infrastructure costs over. Will these costs disproportionately fall on lower-income customer and small businesses? Challenges aren't limited to customers; utilities can face impacts on system peak and electric grid that increase capital infrastructure investment and summer and winter peaks. Ms. Sherwood noted that ISO-NE forecasts summer peak will continue to exceed winter peak through at least 2030.

Ms. Sherwood shared fuel switching opportunities; including biofuels and renewable natural gas (biogas, displacing on-site fossil fuel use for water, space, and process heating), biomass (wood burning technology), electrification (heat pumps, appliances), and solar thermal. Mr. Beup pointed out that clothes dryers were included in an appliance example, and asked if it was an electric dryer. Ms. Sherwood noted that heat pump dryers are available. Ms. Sherwood provided slides in more detail on these solutions, which can be reviewed in the slide deck.

Ms. Sherwood reviewed the economics of each opportunity. Ms. Sherwood shared that the Board and Companies have not conducted an in-depth review of biomass and biofuel technologies in terms of cost-effectiveness or customer economics. The Consultants provided a high-level overview of biomass and biofuels based on research not specific to Connecticut. Overall biomass and biofuels have less efficiency performance than heat pumps but less or matched efficiency performance of natural gas technology, lower customer economics and higher greenhouse gas (GHG) levels than heat pumps and natural gas.

For electrification, the Consultants have more in-depth analysis. On the residential side, heat pumps generally perform better than other fuel heating sources (natural gas, propane, oil) and produce lower emissions. However, when compared on a life-cycle cost and utility cost bases, the economics of heat pumps is not always positive and depends on the original fuel source. In cases with full or 80% displacement, the economics improve. On the commercial side, natural gas is the only field of the three compared to heat pumps (natural gas, propane, oil), that would be more cost effective and provide better customer economics. Ms. Sherwood noted that more details can be found in [the materials folder](#).

Mr. Glenn Reed outlined the regulatory guidance on fuel switching, noting that until DEEP releases a determination addressing fuel switching, the programs are subject to the policies established in past DEEP decisions. DEEP's direction essentially limits activities to informing, but not influencing, fuel choice. Mr. Reed referenced the [2019-2021 Plan with Conditions of Approval](#). In it, DEEP acknowledges that there will be, or are, benefits from a greenhouse gas perspective from electrification, but does not commit within this decision to necessarily direct the programs to pursue that. During the development of the 2019-2021 Plan, the Board advocated for the Heat Pump Pilot, which was able to move forward. In the [2021 Plan Update and Approval with Conditions](#), DEEP allowed the Companies to calculate energy savings for ground source heat pumps using a baseline that reflects a fuel type that would have been chosen, absent incentives, regardless if it is a different fuel type than that chosen after incentives. Compliance Condition No. 24 asserted that all fuel savings shall be counted in program cost effectiveness testing.

The 2013 and 2018 Comprehensive Energy Strategies show strong support for fuel switching. 2013 CES provided sector-level analysis of gas conversion economics and heat pumps were seen as an option where gas was not cost-effectively available. The 2018 CES had greater focus on GHG reductions, decarbonization, and electrification. Ultimately, the analysis developed for the CES limited near-term applications for existing whole building and included ductless heat pumps as an opportunity.

Mr. Reed noted that historically the Board has not supported the use of C&LM funds to support fuel switching in most applications. Nearly all current program support is for more efficiency

space and water heating electric technologies. Incentives are set to address incremental cost and are not designed to promote fuel switching, although other fuels may be displaced. In some cases, electric technologies are being deployed to displace fossil fuels. Mr. Reed noted some exceptions where the C&LM Plan supports fuel switching; including residential all-electric new construction offer, heat pump pilots, net zero pathway in Energy Conscious Blueprint, and C&I induction cook top incentives. The Appendix of Mr. Reed and Ms. Sherwood's presentation includes financing options that support heat pumps, but don't actively promote fuel switching.

Mr. Reed highlighted challenges to fuel switching specific to CT. Workforce development is needed to ensure adequate numbers and proper training of contractors and service professionals. Regarding biomass and biofuels, there is some uncertainty regarding GHG impacts; the Governor's Council on Climate Change (GC3) asserts that wood biomass emits more CO₂ per Btu than coal and most biomass fuels are not renewable on the time scales that matter for meeting the Paris Agreement goals. Additionally, heat pumps have varying customer and utility economics depending on displaced fuel, relative fuel price differentials, and other factors. Mr. Reed noted that CT is at a disadvantage with electrification technologies having now among the, if not the highest, electric rates on the continental United States. Many of the technologies are expensive, particularly in retrofit scenarios, and financing or funding fuel switching solutions will be needed to ensure equity for low-to-moderate income (LMI) and small business customers.

Mr. Reed shared a table that tracks intentional (active) versus passive fuel switching strategies employed by Northeast states. Mr. Reed wrapped up by posing open-ended questions to the Board: should C&LM funds be used to support fuel switching? If so, which technologies and activities? And what criteria must any supported activity/technology meet (cost-effectiveness, positive customer economics, net site MMBtu savings, net GHG emission reductions). For which technologies does the Board need more information.

Ms. Kathy Fay wanted to clarify that the economics evaluation only includes the energy cost, and equipment maintenance, but does not include health, any health impact costs. Mr. Reed said that the cost-effectiveness calculations beyond low-income do not include non-energy impacts. Ms. Fay asked what role the Board plays in regard to balancing cost-effectiveness and helping CT meet its GHG emissions reduction goal and how the Board gets the data needed to balance externalities with cost.

Mr. Beup stated that the issue of equity around low-income to moderate income population is important. Mr. Beup noted that all ratepayers pay into the funds, but the programs should ensure that funds are flowing back disproportionately to people who don't need it or have access to capital. More understanding about this issue is important and Mr. Beup asked what other measures might be necessary if this issue is factored in? Or what measures need to be implemented before we move into these technologies? Mr. Beup used the example of requiring energy efficiency before investing in renewable equipment at a home. Mr. Reed noted that he could argue both sides regarding requiring weatherization before heat pumps are installed. The pilots do currently require this, but it continues to be a source of conversation.

Mr. Ron Araujo corrected that the heat pump pilots initially required weatherization, but after a year and a half that requirement was scrapped in an aim to increase participation. Mr. Reed stated that ideally every heat pump would be installed in a fully weatherized home, but timing

and other barriers exist to achieve this. Ms. Amy McLean asked what the barrier was before removing the weatherization requirement? Mr. Araujo shared that the Companies learned during the decision-making process for the customer for weatherization versus heating system replacement is on a totally different path. The cost to weatherize is usually far less than a new heating system, and so consumers are choosing that over financing a heating system project. Conversely if a customer's heating system is failing, they're going to want to fix it right away and not necessarily navigate the weatherization process. Mr. Araujo added that this doesn't mean weatherization doesn't happen. The Companies actively pursue customers who install heat pumps but haven't participated in the weatherization program because they want to make sure that we're optimizing the efficiency of that new system. Ms. McLean said she can see the first scenario, but is a bit baffled by the second when it's a relatively smaller additional cost to weatherize in order to optimize the heating system investment.

Ms. Fay underscored what Mr. Araujo said, that many homeowners don't replace heating systems until they need to and added that there's often a lag time before a HES/HES-IE vendor can visit. It's critical to respond during that window if we want to see more heat pump uptake, otherwise they will default to one-to-one replacement and we have to wait a useful life before another replacement will occur. Ms. McLean shared that there are a number of studies going on in the State that will hopefully inform the best way to ensure better uptake of these measures. Ms. McLean suggested that a different approach, like increased incentives, is necessary to increase uptake. Mr. Araujo responded that presuming we head down the fuel switching path, increased incentives to encourage both weatherization and heat pumps is a good consideration. Mr. Araujo mentioned that Massachusetts has an incentive like this.

Mr. Reed shared Massachusetts's program offers a \$500 bonus incentive for installing both measures (heat pump, weatherization) and the whole-house replacement incentive is between \$10K and \$15K per household which isn't paid until the weatherization is complete. Mr. Beup asked if Mr. Araujo was seeing installation costs of \$16-\$20K for a home, and Mr. Araujo said that's the cost range they've seen in the CT heat pump pilot. Mr. Araujo added the pilot focused on homes with central AC, so they didn't need duct work, which can significantly increase the cost of the heat pump.

Regarding LMI customers, Mr. Reed conducted back-of-the-envelope calculations for internal discussion purposes. Assuming 20% of CT homes were LMI and candidates for heat pumps, \$25,000 for both weatherization and heat pumps at close to or full replacement the cost was around \$6 billion dollars, which over 20 years exceeds the C&LM spending.

Mr. Beup said there continues to be more for the Board to understand in terms of what's applicable/attractive to the consumer in each sector. Something to keep an eye on the CES. On the Committee level, Mr. Beup added, it's something the Board can continue to engage with stakeholders about to make sure we don't miss opportunities. Mr. Beup thanked the Consultants for their work and input. Mr. Reed thanked DEEP and the Companies for input.

Mr. Jack Traver asked if the GHG emission calculations factor in the generation source, noting that CT's generation assets are mostly natural gas. Mr. Reed noted there is a source assessment that accounts for the site generation of combusting a fuel on site versus the impacts of burning fuel at the power plant. The ISO-NE grid continues to decarbonize over time and the GHG impacts will continue to swing over time to favor electric technologies.

Ms. Melissa Kops shared that she's done her own calculation of electrification versus natural gas which support that heat pumps result in much lower carbon emissions, regardless of the source fuel and accounting for generation and distribution losses. This is largely due to the efficiency of the equipment.

C. New Board Member Onboarding – Consultants

- Review Draft Outline
- Scheduling

Mr. Beup noted that the Board is formalizing the onboarding process for new members due to the complexity and scope of the programs. Outside of EEB meetings, onboarding sessions will provide in-depth background, various points of background and acronyms to help acclimate new members and provide a refresher for existing members.

Ms. Stacy Sherwood shared a slide deck outlining the onboarding plan and intent as well as an overview for each session. This can be found [the materials folder](#). There will be four, 60-90 minute, sessions with presentations made by the Board Chair, Technical Consultants, Evaluation Administrators, and the Companies. The first session will introduce the CT EEB, including its role and function, C&LM Plan and process, role of DEEP and PURA, meeting schedules, and resources. The second session will get into more details of the C&LM Plan, Evaluations, and the role of EEB's Technical Consultants and Evaluation Administrators.

Sessions three and four will dive into Residential and C&I programs, respectively. Each session will provide an overview of customers and markets, offerings, Committee roles, performance and secondary metrics, key Company staff, and current discussion topics.

Ms. Sherwood solicited input from the Board on additional topics and timing. The Board Secretary will be reaching out to coordinate the sessions. Mr. Beup added that the Board wants to make sure these sessions are covering any and all aspects of what new members need. To maximize the value of a diverse and capable, unique stakeholder group and their representatives it's important we establish a baseline of knowledge so we can understand how best we can contribute. Mr. Beup said if anything comes up, to please reach out.

D. 2022 Plan Update and Annual Legislative Report Filings – Companies

Mr. Stephen Bruno shared that the Companies filed the [2022 Plan Update March 1](#) and submitted the [2021 Annual Legislative Report](#) to the General Assembly and the Board. If you did not receive a copy, please email [Mr. Stephen Bruno](#). Mr. Bruno thanked the Consultants, Board, and Companies for their help getting these completed.

E. Community Partnership Initiative Update – Companies

Ms. Devan Willemsen provided an update, sharing that 10 project teams were accepted for Round 1. Six project teams have executed their Memorandum of Understanding and completed their orientations. One team is in the process of scheduling orientation and one team declined to participate but may re-apply in future rounds. The remaining two are working through their approval processes.

Ms. Willemsen said discussions for the next round have begun to take place, and it will incorporate diversity, equity, and inclusion.

F. DEI Consultant Recommendation, Board Discussion and Vote – Consultant Committee, DEEP

Ms. Kate Donatelli said that the Consultant Committee is hoping to have a final decision, dependent on the outcome of a Board vote, to select a DEI Consultant. Ms. Emily Rice sent out a memo last week with the Consultant Committee's process, recommendation and scoring outcome for applicants, and an offer to review proposals or ask questions.

Ms. Donatelli reminded the Board that hiring a Diversity Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Consultant was a recommendation that came out of Phase I of the [Equitable Energy Efficiency Proceeding](#). In the fall, the Board discussed the scope of work for this Consultant and DEEP sought feedback on an request for proposal (RFP). It was determined that the Board would hire the DEI Consultant via its typical competitive RFP process managed by the Consultant Committee (Ms. Fargo-Johnson, DEEP – Ms. Kate Donatelli, and Ms. Amy McLean). The RFP was issued November 17. Potential bidders submitted intents to bid by December 3, which was not mandatory, and six intents to bid were received. Bidders submitted questions by December 10, which were [answered publicly](#) by December 17.

By the RFP deadline, the Consultant Committee received six applications. Using a standardized scoring outline, the Committee scored applicants, then conducted interviews for five of six applicants in February. Following the interviews, applicants were scored again with standardized criteria and the Executive Secretary contacted references. Few responded and the Committee determined that a lack of reference response would not be counted against applicants.

The Consultant Committee recommends the Board hire ILLUME as its DEI Consultant. Mr. Jack Traver noted that Applicants 2 and 3 scored closely to the selected Applicant 6, and asked if the decision was based on the score or if there were anecdotal things that put them over the top. Ms. Donatelli said that it was a combination of the score and other factors during the deliberation process that were considered. Ms. McLean added that the interviews helped inform the Committee's decision as well. Ms. McLean shared that it was an interesting process and a significant one given the Board's direction going-forward. Ms. McLean's decision-making considered industry awareness and knowledge as well as strategy and approach. The Board's goal is to really deepen the effectiveness of the energy efficiency programs that serve every single person in Connecticut, and we need a DEI Consultant to achieve that goal.

Mr. Anthony Kosior thanked the Consultant Committee for responding to his questions. Mr. Kosior had an opportunity to review the top three proposal and feels that ILLUME had great leadership and very good experience, both on energy and equity. Mr. Kosior was impressed by ILLUME's proposal. Mr. Beup thanked the Committee and acknowledged it was a fairly intensive process that takes quite a bit of time and energy.

Mr. Beup entertained a motion to accept the recommendation of the Consultant Committee to hire ILLUME as the Board's DEI Consultant. Mr. Traver motioned to accept the recommendation of the Consultant Committee to hire ILLUME as the Board's DEI Consultant and Mr. Kosior seconded the motion. The motion passed 11-0, with DEEP abstaining.

Ms. Fargo-Johnson invited other Board members to join the Consultant Committee. Those interested can reach out to [Ms. Rice](#). Ms. Fargo-Johnson added that this Committee is going to be very active this year because we have two more RFPs that we have to go through towards

the end of summer. Ms. McLean stated that the Board has the ability to shape the programs by who it chooses to work with; so, serving on this Committee is important and fun, she added.

G. Wx Operator Updates – DEEP

Ms. Donatelli shared that DEEP has selected a Program Operator through its competitive RFP process that will be in charge of managing the program. DEEP will be entering the contracting phase and will update the Board when necessary/appropriate.

3. Closing Public Comments

Ms. Samantha Dynowski, Sierra Club, shared her concern about promoting biomass as a possible incentivized program, noting that it has serious climate and public health impacts. Ms. Dynowski shared a link to a [report from Harvard](#) at the Harvard School of Public Health that came out last year, tying biomass to a significant number of premature deaths and health impacts. Ms. Dynowski added that it's concerning to hear this technology being discussed as a possibility. Ms. Dynowski believes this highlights a real need for the EEB to update the cost-effectiveness test. It was a conversation several years ago that never move forward, but by not including climate health and other societal benefits into the cost effectiveness test, the State is moving forward with technologies that have real downsides to them.

Ms. Dynowski also said it struck her that the Global Warming Solutions Act, which is Connecticut's climate law requiring greenhouse gas emission reductions by 45% by 2030 and 80% by 2050 is not being incorporated here. Ms. Dynowski believes all entities, including the EEB, should be required to be accountable and help meet the State's goal.

Regarding the economics of fuel switching, Ms. Melissa Kops noted that electric heat pumps could be offset with solar, whereas the natural gas furnace this cannot be offset with onsite renewables in terms of costs and economics for good for the customer.

4. Adjourn

Mr. Jack Traver motioned to adjourn and Ms. Amanda Fargo-Johnson seconded the motion. There was no discussion and the meeting was adjourned by a 12-0 vote.