

State of New Hampshire

Energy Efficiency and Sustainable Energy (EESE) Board

ENERGY EFFICIENCY RESOURCE STANDARD (EERS) COMMITTEE

Draft Minutes of the July 13, 2020 Meeting, held electronically via Microsoft Teams

Committee Members Present: Don Kreis (Office of the Consumer Advocate (OCA), Chairperson), Eric Stanley (Liberty Utilities), Kate Peters (Eversource), Carol Woods (NH Electric Cooperative), Madeleine Mineau, ex officio as EESE Board Chair (Clean Energy New Hampshire (CENH)), Becky Ohler (Department of Environmental Services (DES)), Ryan Clouthier (Southern New Hampshire Services), Mary Downes on behalf of Cindy Carroll (Unitil), Nick Krakoff (Conservation Law Foundation), Raymond Burke (New Hampshire Legal Assistance (NHLA)), Matt Siska (GDS Associates), Jeff Marks (Acadia Center), David Borden (Town of New Castle Energy Committee).

Others present: Liz Nixon, Steve Eckberg, Paul Dexter, Jay Dudley, Brian Buckley, Jaqueline Trottier, Gary Cronin (all Public Utilities Commission Staff); Lisa Skumatz and Bob Wirtshafter (all consultants for PUC Staff); Christa Shute (OCA); Emily Levin, Christine Donovan, Dylan Voorhees (all of VEIC, consultants to EERS Committee); Mary Downes and Tom Palma (Unitil); Phil Mosenthal and Cliff McDonald (Optimal, consultants to OCA); Miles Ingram, Mark Lemenager, James Butler, Jessica Chiavara, Violette Radomski, Mark Toussaint (all of Eversource); Chris Skoglund (DES); Kelly Buchanan and Brianna Brand (both of CENH); Stephen Tower (NHLA); Kimberly Drago, Missy Samenfeld and Heather Tebbetts (Liberty Utilities).

1. The meeting was called to order by Don Kreis at 1:00. Pursuant to RSA 91-A:2, III(b) and the relevant emergency order of the Governor, the chairperson declared the existence of an emergency (specifically, the health threat occasioned by the COVID-19 pandemic) that rendered impractical the requirement for a physical presence at a specific location of a quorum of the Committee, thus permitting the meeting to proceed entirely on an electronic basis.
2. Emily Levin provided an overview of the public comment process to be applied later in the meeting. She noted that comments from the public outside of the EERS standard process could be made verbally beginning at 2:30 p.m. or in writing, by July 15th. Verbal comments from EESE Board members are due July 20th. Written comments from EESE Board members are due July 24th. All written comments should be emailed to Donald.kreis@oca.nh.gov.
3. The June 1 and June 15 minutes of the committee were approved unanimously on the motion of Becky Ohler and the second of Madeleine Mineau.

4. The program administrators provided a presentation on the July 1, second draft of the EERS plan and the marketing plan for NHSaves. The slide deck is incorporated by reference and is available [HERE](#).

Jeff Marks of Acadia Center asked about the estimates of annual energy savings for each of the years. He was directed to Bates pages 522 through 527 in the plan.

There were questions regarding the incentives related to the energy optimization pilot as it was not clear in the plan. The response was that the customer would have to put in a controller with the capability to send them data for a whole zone, not necessarily the wholehouse, as well as access to the whole house which is more difficult now with COVID. The incentive has moved from \$400 to \$1000 per zone. A question was asked about why energy optimization is set up as a pilot for three years. The response was that it was part timing and evaluation and there is a potential that by year three it becomes a wider scale offering but that will depend on how quickly people enroll. The program administrators indicated there is a specific mid-term modification trigger regarding energy optimization.

Martin Kushler of ACEEE asked about whether there would be any requirements for building shell improvements as part of the energy optimization pilot. The response was that the requirement in Connecticut led to very low participation, so they will only be *recommending* improvements. Phil Mosenthal recommended that those customers that have done weatherization be the customers that are targeted. Miles Ingram of Eversource indicated that they are setting the program up to target HPwES participants. It was noted that a more detailed conversation will probably happen within the BC Working Group.

Active Demand Reduction is in the July draft in more detail. People interested in a more detailed conversation on Active Demand Reduction should email Emily Levin or Don Kreis. Acadia Center is interested in such a conversation.

The program administrators offered to do a meeting in which they walk through the BC models to walk through key elements and help people find what they are looking for. Anyone interested in this walkthrough of the BC model should notify Emily Levin or Don Kreis.

5. During the public comment period there were two comments from Hopkinton. Simon Doneski spoke on behalf of Hopkinton Students for 100. They are working to get the school district to 100 percent renewable energy and identified efficiency as a crucial part of that process. Though less flashy than solar and wind, efficiency is important. Mr. Doneski identified the climate crisis as scary with local indicators such as Lyme disease in the White Mountains and intense winter weather events, stating that the time has passed for conservative measures. He urged the Committee to be bold and position New Hampshire as a leader rather than a follower in order to protect our community. Cooper Kimball-Rhines, also from Hopkinton Students for 100, stated that energy efficiency presents the number one way to combat the emissions from fossil fuels because it eliminates the emissions in the first place. Committee has the opportunity while addressing the financial side to keep in mind the ability for New Hampshire to become a more efficient and sustainable state. Mr. Kimball-Rhines highlighted that this could help address the demand in the school districts where schools are looking to cut down on budgets and expenses. He concluded that there should be

no trouble reaching a goal that is higher than the one was discussed during the presentation.

6. The program administrators provided a presentation on the statewide marketing plan for NHSaves associated with the July 1, second draft of the EERS plan. The slide deck is incorporated by reference and is available [HERE](#).

Kate Peters commented that the utilities registered the NHSaves mark. Christine Donovan asked if it was a trade mark or service mark. Kate Peters was not sure.

7. Chris Skoglund from DES presented on potential codes and standards programs for the New Hampshire EERS plan. The slide deck is incorporated by reference and is available [HERE](#).

The work is a continuation of past EESE Board support and draws on expertise of Northeast Energy Efficiency Partnership and Matt Siska of GDS Associates. Eric Stanley of Liberty Utilities was pulled in as lead for the program administrators on this issue.

The program administrators are working with E Source to perform analysis and looking to strategize what will be recommended and incorporated in the September 1 edition of the EERS plan. The program administrators are also looking at appliance standards to see how this could work with the implementation and the set up for moving forward in future plans.

A question was asked as to the goal of incorporating savings into the EERS plan. The response was that there are baseline studies that would need to happen in order to put a code plan into place. More data may be needed to analyze long term savings and design an appropriate program. What can go in this plan is the enhanced code trainings that are largely proposed in the proposal. There is a potential for getting savings in 2024 and beyond.

Matt Siska of GDS commented that the topic of enhanced code training is a supplement to the plan circulated. Currently the trainings are primarily full day trainings that take in a broad audience of participants. The enhanced code training is premised on breaking participants into more distinct segments and proposing topic areas that address the segment needs. Regarding code adoption and support for adoption, Matt Siska commented that not only is it important for the utilities to advocate for the next iteration of the code but also against the weakening amendments that are proposed.

Mary Downes of Unutil commented that the difference is that the utilities are now looking to evaluate what the resulting savings are from the advanced trainings in the built environment. To date there has not been a policy environment to support this as an opportunity to claim some of those savings. Ms. Downes further commented that they do not perceive a huge change in activity, but that they are asking for a change in policy so that they may recognize the support of code adoption as a legitimate energy efficiency activity that the program administrators can get savings credit for.

There was a comment that one aspect is compliance and the gap in enforcement throughout the state. In addition to the training being supported by the utilities, there should be additional focused targeting for compliance. Phil Mosenthal of Optimal commented that the cost to evaluate savings runs far higher than running the program because of collecting the pre and post compliance studies. He recommended that the first thing to do is to get a handle on what is the current state of compliance to better understand the need. Code amendments and adoption have really high pay off if they succeed. Mr. Mosenthal

recommended that more of the effort shift to code promulgation and standard.

Dylan Voorhees of VEIC expressed a willingness of VEIC to work on these issues if the committee would like their involvement. He indicated there may be opportunity to leverage evaluation light proposals and determine other ways to phase in the more costly evaluation work as the actual program work phases in.

8. The meeting was adjourned at 4:00.