



**Energy Efficiency Board**  
**May 12, 2021 | 1:00 – 3:30 pm**

Documents for the meeting are located here:  
<https://app.box.com/s/7jxz276lp15fjguhdlwke1hfno5t6tb>

**MINUTES**

1. Process

A. Roll call of Board Members: Steve Bruno, Neil Beup, Elizabeth Murphy, John Viglione, Scott Whittier, Amy McLean, Jack Traver, Brenda Watson, Joel Kopylec, Ron Araujo, Amanda Fargo-Johnson, Mike Li, Donna Wells, Bruce McDermott

Mr. Neil McLean noted that two Board Members, Eric Brown and Bruce McDermott, can be removed from the roll call list as they have resigned from the EEB.

Others in attendance: Russell King, George Lawrence, Mike Weissman, Rose Croog, Stephen Cowell, Richard Faesy, Mary McCarthy, Philip Mosenthal, Kate Donatelli, Lawrence Rush, Guy West, Devan Williemsen, Samantha Dynowski, Hammad Chaudhry, Thomas Phillips, Sheri Borrelli, Erin Kempster, Alice Martin, Emily Rice, Patrice Gillespie, Donald Mauritz, Mark Thompson, Guy West, Susan Long

B. Approve minutes from March 2021 Board Meeting

Mr. Jack Traver motioned to approve, Ms. Amy McLean seconded. Ms. Amanda Fargo-Johnson noted some changes in attendance, specifically Board members being represented correctly and removing duplicates. Mr. Beup said these items would get corrected. Board voted to unanimously to approve, with the discussed changes, and the motion passed with seven votes.

C. Public Comments

Ms. Samantha Dynowski, Sierra Club, shared two studies released since the past board meeting: (1) UN 2021 [Global Methane Assessment Report](#) and (2) [RMI mapping tool](#) showing that in Connecticut, air pollution from burning fuels in buildings led to an estimated 318 early deaths and \$3.567 billion in health impact costs in 2017. Ms. Dynowski noted that this research continues to show the use of fossil gas is bad for people and the planet. Regarding the next Three-Year Plan, Ms. Dynowski shared the Sierra Club's three suggestions: (1) end subsidies for fossil fuel appliances and equipment, (2) increase subsidies, expand eligibility, to ensure cold climate heat pumps are being deployed for heat applications as well as cooling, which will aid in the transition to cleaner energy, and (3) the Board continues to ensure programs are equitable and accessible so residents can be safe and comfortable in their homes.

Mr. Beup informed attendees that Mr. Glenn Reed would not be in attendance so the Board will not address the deep dive into performance management incentives, but will continue with the 2022-2024 Plan Update with Consultants and Companies.

## 2. Programs and Planning (125 Minutes)

### A. Performance Management Incentives and 2022-2024 Plan

*This item was postponed until the next EEB meeting.*

### B. Q1 Program Performance

Mr. Steve Bruno, Eversource, and Mr. Joel Kopylec, Avangrid, provided a high-level update on Q1 performance. Mr. Steve Bruno's slides indicated that for both electric and gas, revenues were above target while spending, annual savings, and lifetime savings were below target. Mr. Neil Beup asked if Mr. Steve Bruno could provide an explanation for the electric spend and savings being below target. Mr. Steve Bruno noted that the residential side is doing well and it's primarily on the C&I side. Mr. Kopylec shared Avangrid's Company Q1 results; UI revenue and spending on target while annual and lifetime savings below target, CNG revenue collections from CAM above target and spending on target while annual and lifetime savings below target, and SCG showed revenue collections from CAM above target and spending above budget while annual and lifetime savings were below target. Revenue for both Eversource and Avangrid was approximately \$250 million, spending at 18% of budget.

A copy of the presentation can be found in the materials folder.

### C. 2022-2024 Plan Update; Revenue and budget tables, Residential and C&I Plan text outlines and Public Input Process, Board Plan calendar

Mr. Steve Bruno provided a slide deck that discussed completed tasks, what's under development, revenues and program budgets, and next steps for the next month and a half or so. Companies have crafted plan outlines with Consultants, Company staff, and DEEP. Currently Companies are developing a draft executive summary and are consolidating a broad list of EEB priorities into three core areas: equity, decarbonization, and energy affordability. Mr. Steve Bruno indicated that the plan outlines were available on Box.com and welcomed comments. Ms. Amy McLean interjected to clarify the location of the files was public. Executive Secretary, Ms. Emily Rice, indicated the Box.com folder was public and that she is working with Consultants and Board leadership to link the folder to the Energize CT website to make it more accessible. Ms. Amy McLean indicated that ensuring the documents are easily accessible would be helpful.

Ms. Amy McLean shared that DEEP released eight recommendations on the residential side, and that a series of hearings are expected; she asked whether the Companies have incorporated those ideas here. Mr. Steve Bruno answered that the Companies had received comments solicited by DEEP, and as the process moves forward will pull more into the plain text. Mr. Ron Araujo reminded the Board of upcoming sessions, both technical and public input, which will allow Companies to incorporate other ideas. Ms. McLean acknowledged the good work being done by many entities in parallel and suggested linking these things together.

Mr. Steve Bruno shared the companies are aiming for June 1 to complete the Program Savings Document, which will inform the final screening models that will ultimately help share the revenue and budget models for the 2022-2024 Plan. Companies are currently working with the Consultants on performance incentives. Next Mr. Steve Bruno shared projected revenues during the next Three-Year Plan; on the electric side the Companies anticipate a slight decrease in revenue over time due to the foreign capacity market revenue while on the gas side the Companies anticipate remaining consistent. Mr. Steve Bruno also shared draft budgets by program; an overview can be found in the appendix of the presentation.

Mr. Steve Bruno shared the next steps for 2022-2024 Plan development; which include converting the plan outlines to plan text, finalizing the Executive Summary Document, and finetuning the revenue and budget models. Companies and Consultants will continue to work on the performance incentives and will provide an update at the June EEB meeting.

Mr. Richard Faesy asked if the Companies would be claiming savings for the new behavior-based program. Mr. Steve Bruno answered in the affirmative and asked Mr. Ron Araujo if this was a topic at the next EEB meeting. Mr. Ron Araujo noted that the Companies can get into that level of discussion. Mr. Neil Beup asked (1) when or where the Board and Committees would have an opportunity to review the text or outlines and (2) what the rationale was for condensing the Board priorities into the three categories (equity, decarbonization, and energy affordability). Mr. Neil Beup noted that it's important for the Board to understand what that means and be comfortable with it; he followed up by asking if the Companies plan to discuss that at the Committee level. Mr. Steve Bruno indicated in terms of the text and plan that the Companies will have text draft to the Board Consultants by the middle of June. Mr. Neil Beup clarified that timeline would mean that in July members of the Board would hear the Consultants view on the text and Mr. Steve Bruno agreed. Mr. Ron Araujo pointed out that slide 10 included the timeline. Ms. Amy McLean clarified that once the Board has a chance to review the text, the public will have an opportunity to comment and provide feedback. Regarding consolidation to three focus areas (equity, decarbonization, and energy affordability), Mr. Steve Bruno noted that the Companies were not going to eliminate other priorities, but are attempting to frame all priorities under key themes. Mr. Steve Bruno noted that the language could change, or the themes could change, but that seven priorities are more difficult to remember than three themes. Mr. Neil Beup said he understood and suggested giving stakeholders time to consider whether or not that approach accomplishes what the Board is trying to do.

Ms. Amanda Fargo-Johnson asked for reasoning behind the increase to the evaluations budget, because it would be a big increase. Mr. Steve Bruno noted this was a target number and placeholder, not final. Mr. Mike Li interjected that from DEEP's perspective, they realized the demand side resources aren't adequately modeled and accommodating studies that could improve that in the next version of the IRP is desirable to overcome this perceived shortcoming. Mr. Mike Li also noted that planning for this spending is necessary this far ahead due to the necessary timing of plan development. Ms. Amanda Fargo-Johnson asked where this increase in spending would be coming from; programs? Mr. Steve Bruno noted that there's room from the financing subsidies, interest rate buydowns and also customer engagement. Mr. Steve Bruno also reiterated Mr. Mike Li's point that there's no budget for reacting to the market and studying measures and opportunities.

Mr. Steve Bruno's slides can be found in the materials folder.

#### D. ENERGY STAR® Partner of the Year Award for Sustained Excellence

Ms. Elizabeth Murphy shared that the Companies, Eversource and Avangrid, were awarded the ENERGY STAR® Partner of the Year Award for Sustained Excellence for the fourth year in a row. Ms. Elizabeth Murphy noted this is the highest honor and that it's incredible the Companies were able to deliver high-quality programs and services, despite the pandemic. Ms. Elizabeth Murphy shared some of the things the Companies did that stood out to the EPA and set Connecticut apart: response to the COVID-19 pandemic by increasing incentives, offering special discounts for products, offering virtual pre-assessments, and the introduction of the self-install Energy Efficiency kit. Ms. Elizabeth Murphy believes the emphasis on safety also helped the Companies stand apart. Ms. Elizabeth Murphy recognized all the partners that helped create such success and commended the incredible engagement across EEB, DEEP, vendors, and other business partners and stakeholders. More specifics regarding the application for, and the award can be found in Ms. Elizabeth Murphy's slides in the materials folder.

Ms. Amy McLean congratulated Ms. Elizabeth Murphy and appreciated the details she provided regarding the award. Ms. Amy McLean acknowledged the adversity and credited the give-and-take across the board and input from the public and contractors. Ms. Amy McLean asked what the competition was like for these awards and if the award is national or regional. Ms. Elizabeth Murphy explained that ENERGY STAR® calls for applications and outlines minimum criteria for applicants; that the Companies work jointly to decide what criteria they meet and which awards they want to be considered for based on the achievements of the prior year. Ms. Elizabeth Murphy noted that large, national, and even global manufacturers are applying and that the competition is "pretty stiff" and winning the highest level of recognition four years in a row speaks to the quality of the

Companies' programs. Mr. Neil Beup and Ms. Amanda Fargo-Johnson congratulated the Companies. Ms. Elizabeth Murphy thanked everyone for their support and collaboration.

#### E. Energize CT Center Alternative

Ms. Alice Martin, Avangrid, and Ms. Mary McCarthy, Eversource, provided an update on the Energize CT Mobile Exhibit. Ms. Alice Martin shared that the Companies have been looking for a replacement that would be interactive and educational for students and the community. Ms. Alice Martin introduced Cray Cray, the parent company of Mad Science, which has over thirty years' experience delivering and designing interactive, entertaining programs. Ms. Alice Martin shared that the new name would be Energize CT Energy in Action, with a tagline "a mobile learning experience". Energize CT Energy in Action will target K-12 students, their family and community and will focus on energy efficiency, sustainability in clean energy. Exhibits will be portable and usable both indoor and outdoor. The Program objectives include: (1) empower students, educators, administrators in the community across the state by delivering high quality, hands-on, interactive traveling exhibit in mobile training experience, (2) provide knowledge and confidence, as related to energy, energy efficiency, alternative and renewable energy, career in energy efficiency and sustainability, (3) instill responsible energy behavior, (4) targeting underserve and distressed communities across the state, (5) encourage consumers and community to participate in the Utilities Energy efficiency program by providing taiko materials. Ms. Alice Martin provided a list of services the contractor, Cray Cray – Mad Science, will provide, which can be referenced in the presentation slides.

Ms. Mary McCarthy discussed details of the program offering; including virtual and in-person presentations and activities. The goal is to present at forty schools and forty communities per year. The four main topics include energy efficiency, clean energy, career exploration, and "putting all together" which includes things like surveys and visitor challenges to gauge what they've learned. Ms. Mary McCarthy shared the branding and marketing plans; including a press release and launch event that will occur at a date to be determined. The yearly budget is less than \$300K per year and the contract term is three years, with an option to extend years four and five. The unit is leased and the lease is \$150K per year for the first two years, and \$1 per year for the subsequent years. If a new vendor is selected to administer the program, the unit can be leased for \$50K per year. Mad Science will be collecting and reporting data, per the direction of the Companies, including event and attendance metrics, surveys, and number of distressed communities attended.

Ms. Amy McLean asked what the team expected for number of events and how many people are going to be reached. Ms. Mary McCarthy noted that they didn't have goals for number of students or attendees, just the number of schools and communities; she indicated attendance would vary by school and community. Mr. Richard Faesy asked how the budget compared to the old Energize CT Center budget. Ms. Alice Martin noted the center budget was \$500K per year, compared to less than \$300K per year for the mobile unit. Mr. Neil Beup appreciated the work done on the metrics so far and commented that he and other members of the Board want to make sure the unit targets & reaches the right audiences in a constructive manner. Mr. Neil Beup recalled from the presentation that the key (to success) is reaching kids at a younger age and asked whether the metrics can break down further to do that; he noted the variance between schools and communities. Mr. Neil Beup asked if they have thought of targeting specific schools based on audience criteria, or if the vendor had insight. Ms. Mary McCarthy said they can run that by the vendor and noted they are trying to hit K-12 and Ms. Alice Martin noted that the surveys can capture attendee ages/grade level. Mr. Neil Beup said a retroactive look at the metrics is great, but that one of the reasons for the change was that the Board wasn't convinced the Energize CT Center was reaching the right people at the right time. Mr. Neil Beup pointed out the value in educating younger students and shared a desire to see more targeted approach; i.e., 25 elementary schools, 10 middle schools, 5 high schools for example.

Mr. Mike Li asked for more information on the vendor. Ms. Mary McCarthy stated that Mad Science is an educational company that does science, STEM-related activities, hands-on activities, camps, parties, etcetera, with students. They have trained staff and know Connecticut standards. Because they are located in the state,

they have relationships with school districts and teachers, which have spoken highly of their work. Ms. Amanda Fargo-Johnson clarified that the unit would be located in Stratford, CT and Ms. Mary McCarthy confirmed. Ms. Amanda Fargo-Johnson asked how the schools would sign up and what the reach would be. Ms. Alice Martin indicated that the reach would be statewide and Ms. Mary McCarthy noted that the marketing campaign would reach all schools and they could sign up. The vendor will visit a minimum 40 schools and 40 communities but could reach more. Ms. Amanda Fargo-Johnson also asked if the contract allowed for changes by the Companies and Ms. Mary McCarthy said they would, and added that the vendor is also expected to update content as any standards change.

Mr. Richard Faesy asked if there was an opportunity to consider the environmental justice communities in terms of prioritizing visits. Ms. Mary McCarthy said that 60% of visits must be within those communities. Mr. Neil Beup asked for clarification on what defines an environmental justice community and Mr. Richard Faesy stated that the state of Connecticut has defined these communities and identified 24. Mr. Jack Traver suggested considering having a goal that guides the vendor in terms of geographic location, so as not to ignore far-away communities or deprioritize communities with less schools or residents, etc. Ms. Mary McCarthy noted this comment and will follow up with the vendor. Ms. Mary McCarthy also added that the goals include service provider so there's an appropriate distribution of events across those territories. Ms. Mary McCarthy stated the vendor has been encouraged to reach underserved as well as distressed communities. Mr. Neil Beup pointed out that the definitions underserved, distressed, and environmental justice are all different; he further suggested the Board pick one target and be clear with the vendor so there's no confusion.

Mr. Neil Beup was thankful for the progress made and believes this is a more efficiency and effective use of resources. Ms. Alice Martin and Ms. Mary McCarthy's presentation can be found in the materials folder.

#### F. Other Company Updates Community Engagement Initiative

Mr. Ron Araujo indicated the Companies have been holding stakeholder meetings and continue to gather input and build relationships. The Companies conducted a stakeholder survey for clarification from feedback they'd received and are in the process of assessing the results. These efforts are helping refine the round one application and their strategy for community engagement with respect to the round one application status. The Companies have developed a draft document, and anticipate a final application in late spring. Ms. Amy McLean asked for clarification on when that would be and Mr. Ron Araujo said within the next few weeks.

#### Energize CT website update

Mr. Ron Araujo provided an update: The Companies anticipate finalizing the contract this week and then will begin the onboarding process with the new vendor. Onboarding will likely take a few weeks. Mr. Araujo noted that the Companies are making some updates on the site in parallel.

#### G. Weatherization Barriers Update

Ms. Kate Donatelli, DEEP, provided an update for Mr. Mike Li. Ms. Donatelli reminded the Board that DEEP submitted a proposal, which was approved by the low-income Energy Advisory Board, to allocate up to \$2 million in LIHEAP funds for addressing weatherization barriers to energy efficiency. The next step in this process is to get approval from HHS, and that might be some time, but DEEP will keep the Board posted. The Governor's Office released their proposal for the use of federal funds; one of these proposals would dedicate \$7 million over three years to addressing health and safety barriers to housing remediation. Also included in that packet is a proposal for energy efficiency retrofits and affordable housing. These need to be approved by the General Assembly. DEEP is working to develop and implement some communication strategies to help move these initiatives forward through the General Assembly.

Ms. Kate Donatelli stated that the potential LIHEAP funds, ARPA money are pretty well aligned with some of the pieces of legislation that we have pending right now at our current program.

Ms. Amy McLean asked if the LIHEAP proposal was subject to the board's review prior to going to the committee for approval. Ms. Ms. Kate Donatelli asked if she meant the energy efficiency board. Ms. Amy McLean said no, asked for Ms. Brenda Watson to provide more information on the process. Ms. Brenda Watson stated that the at our last meeting of the "board", they voted unanimously on recommendations which included the \$2 billion allocation for health and safety barriers. Ms. Brenda Watson noted that DSS is not obligated to include all of the recommendations, so they are waiting to see what the draft plan from DSS will look like. Ms. Brenda Watson didn't know when DSS planned to share that with the LIHEAP Board, but hopes to provide an update at the EEB June meeting. Ms. Brenda Watson stated that the next step is a hearing called by DSS and added that the Connecticut General Assembly has three committees (appropriations, human services, energy and technology) that weigh in on that plan and they vote to approve or not approve. The hearing usually takes place at the end of August, early September, followed by the Governor's signature and federal HHS approval in October, and then DSS implementation. Ms. Brenda Watson stated that there isn't a playbook that outlines these processes but she is working on ensuring there is one so folks can be more informed.

Ms. Amy McLean commented that the seven million in the proposal from the Governor could help Connecticut access resources for health and safety initiatives, and even be a leader. Ms. Amy McLean noted that routing the \$2 million through DEEP may avoid a problem with the federal HHS approval. Ms. Amy McLean referenced Mr. Steve Cowell, who works in this area in both Massachusetts and Connecticut, - he believes this could be continuous source of funding. Ms. Amy McLean noted that the Board will have a potential two million every year to work in conjunction with the energy efficiency funds for home energy assessments and, specifically, in the hard-to-reach and the underserved populations due to the fact that they have health and safety barriers. Ms. Brenda Watson agreed and acknowledged that energy has evolved in the past years while the LIHEAP program has been operating unchanged for 40 years. Ms. Brenda Watson shared that \$80-\$90 million comes into the state from the federal government via this program and it's an opportunity for us to take a look at how those dollars are getting allocated, so that we can prioritize those who have the greatest energy burden.

#### H. Legislative update

Ms. Kate Donatelli provided an update on behalf of DEEP. There are four pieces of pending legislation that are still alive, but DEEP doesn't have a lot of updates beyond that. HB356 is the act establishing an energy efficiency retrofit program for affordable housing. Although the name calls out energy efficiency specifically, the fund created through this bill will also cover things like remediation of certain health and safety barriers, and also things like rooftop solar. SF82 is a climate change mitigation and home energy affordability bill. The major change to SF82 is that since it made it out of the energy and technology committee, the home energy labeling provision that was in the bill was amended and now it's mandatory for units listed for rent but not mandatory for units listed for sale. SF856 would expand the Energy Efficiency Board membership by two seats: one representing low-income and one representing municipality. HB672 is a stretch code bill.

#### I. Equitable Energy Efficiency (E3) Proceeding Update

Ms. Kate Donatelli presented slides to provide an update on our equitable energy efficiency proceeding, what is being called the E3 Proceeding. Ms. Kate Donatelli noted that there's going to be a lot more opportunity to discuss the first phase of this proceeding in more depth in the upcoming weeks. The E3 Proceeding started last fall, starting with a public comment period. One of the things DEEP realized right away was that given the number of issues raised in the scope of issues in this proceeding, they wouldn't be able to address everything all at once. DEEP is proposing to move this process forward in multiple, separate phases to allow for a more iterative process. This will enable addressing short-term things upfront and moving on the longer-term items. Ms. Kate Donatelli provided a timeline; including the previous draft determination release, followed by public input before a final determination is issued. May 20<sup>th</sup> and May 27<sup>th</sup> will be an informative and public input session, respectively. Deadline for written public comment is June 18 and the final determination for Phase 1 is anticipated in July 2021.

Ms. Kate Donatelli noted that what's in this draft determination and what comes after is shaped by a lot of public and private input and expressed appreciation of many on the call who have already contributed to this process. Ms. Kate Donatelli shared flyers with details for written comment and public input opportunities. The E3 webpage has background information on the proceeding, a schedule of all the different events, and links to all the relevant documents. Ms. Kate Donatelli highlighted the Executive Summary, located on the website, which can provide stakeholders with enough information to meaningfully participate in the process without having to go through the whole 20-page draft determination.

Ms. Kate Donatelli provided an outlined of the draft determination content; a vision statement for energy equity, details on the scope and process, background on each of the eight recommendations (where it came from, the impetus behind it, and any progress that we may have already made in that area), summarization of all the public comments received, prompts for public comment, and the timeline for Phase 1. Also attached is the 2018 equitable distribution report so stakeholders can consider feedback they might have on changes to the way that future equitable distribution reports are prepared. The Phase 1 recommendations are provided in the last of Ms. Kate Donatelli's slides, and the entire presentation can be found in the materials folder.

Mr. Neil Beup observed that the Phase 1 seems to be focused on the residential side and asked whether they intend to focus on the C&I side as well. Ms. Kate Donatelli noted that the initial scoping for this determination included a flag for considerations of equity in the business community and they did receive some feedback. Ms. Kate Donatelli indicated that while it's not explored in Phase 1, there's definitely a possibility that they'll look into it in the future. Mr. Neil Beup acknowledged the work done to develop an equity metric, PMI, for the Companies and in doing so found different ways to measure participation rates on the C&I side. Mr. Neil Beup offered that there may be some good lessons DEEP can learn from and leverage on the residential side, down the road.

### 3. Closing Public Comments

Ms. Samantha Dynowski, Sierra Club, shared a Yale report out today "The Air Quality Benefits of Climate Action in CT":

[https://publichealth.yale.edu/climate/policy\\_practice/YCCCH%20air%20quality%20issue%20brief\\_412616284\\_48542\\_v1.pdf](https://publichealth.yale.edu/climate/policy_practice/YCCCH%20air%20quality%20issue%20brief_412616284_48542_v1.pdf) and noted that it seems particularly relevant for Connecticut. Ms. Samantha Dynowski

also shared insight regarding the education outreach, that in light of all the research new and some decades old on the climate and health impacts of gas that the outreach and education on gas moving forward reflect that. Ms. Samantha Dynowski specifically requested that the materials allow people to understand the whole impact of choosing gas. The Sierra Club is advocating for anti-gas expansion and to start making the transition to renewables.

### 4. Adjourn

Ms. Brenda Watson motioned to adjourn; Ms. Amanda Fargo-Johnson seconded. The motion passed unanimously with 6 votes.