

INTERMOUNTAIN GAS COMPANY

CASE No. INT-G-25-05

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUPPLEMENT 2
COMMERCIAL TECHNICAL REFERENCE MANUAL
(NATIVE SPREADSHEET PRODUCED SEPARATELY)

INTERMOUNTAIN GAS COMPANY
CASE No. INT-G-25-05

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUPPLEMENT 3
EESC QUARTERLY MEETING TRANSCRIPTS
(155 PAGES)



Intermountain Gas EESC Quarterly Meeting Transcripts

Contents:

- **Q1 Meeting Transcript**
 - Introductions P.3
 - Safety moment P. 9
 - Parking Lot topics P. 9
 - Rider Balance P. 13
 - Rebate performance P. 20
 - Promotions Update P.22
 - Program Administration P. 31
 - Special Studies: EM&V P. 33
- **Q2 Meeting Transcript**
 - Introductions P.39
 - Safety moment P.46
 - Parking Lot topics P.47
 - Rider Balance P.47
 - Rebate Performance P.48
 - Promotions Update P.51
 - Program Administration P.57
 - Special Studies P.60
- **Q3 Meeting Transcript**
 - Safety moment P.65
 - Parking Lot topics P.66
 - Rider Balance P.66
 - Promotions P.67
 - EM&V Impact Evaluation Presentation– ADM Associates, Inc. P.72
 - Introductions/agenda P.72
 - Evaluation Objectives P.73
 - General Methodology P.74
 - Impact Analysis Results and evaluator recommendations P.76

- Storage Tank Water Heater P.77
 - Tankless Water Heater Tier 1 & 2 P.82
 - Boiler P.83
 - Combination Boiler P.84
 - Smart Thermostat P.84
 - Furnace P.91
 - Whole Home Tier 1 & 2 P.98
 - Next Steps and Questions..... P.117
- **Q4 Meeting Transcript**
 - Safety Moment P.123
 - Special Studies P.124
 - Technical Reference Manual (TRM) P.125
 - Avoided costs P.126
 - Furnace Suggested Changes P.126
 - Smart Thermostat Suggested Changes P.133
 - Storage Tank Water Heater P.134
 - Tankless Water Heater Tier 1 & 2 P.139
 - Boiler P.142
 - Combination Boiler P.143
 - Whole Home Tier 1 & 2 P.144
 - Cost Testing Summary P.146
 - Program Update Summary P. 151
 - Next Steps P.152

Q1 EESC Meeting: February 15, 2024

Wold, Kathy 0:03

Use a raise hand function or jump in.

Just let us know and we'll be watching the chat and I'm looking for hand raises as well, so.

Some general meeting rules for this afternoon.

You're right.

Hey, so to begin for this afternoon, we've got our agenda here.

We'll do some quick introductions.

We'll pause for safety moment.

We have some parking lot topics, so those were things that came up in the last meeting and we wanted to circle back on some more explanations on those questions from the last meeting, we'll get an update on the writer balance and rebate performance as well as update from the promotion side of the house and some program administration updates. And then we'll talk a little bit about social studies and that'll kind of wrap up our our afternoon meeting here.

OK, So what do quick introductions and I'll just kind of do a roll call style and I'll go down the list of folks as they appear on my participant list here.

Wold, Kathy 1:12

Of course, this last weekend we had the Super Bowl.

It was the most watched Super Bowl with 123.4 million viewers.

So as I call your name today, maybe if you'll share your name and organization and let us know if you watch the Super Bowl, you watch the ads.

You didn't watch or you watched for Taylor Swift, so I'll go with the first person on my list here.

And that's Lori.

Blattner, Lori 1:43

Hi everyone.

Laurie Blattner.

I'm the director of regulatory affairs and energy efficiency for Intermountain UM, and I actually watched the Super Bowl football and ads.

Wold, Kathy 1:55

Alright, great.
Thanks, Lori.
All right, Jason.

Jason Talford 2:02

I surging with the Idaho Public Utilities Commission.
Umm, I happen to be in the same room as when a Super Bowl was playing.
I wasn't really watching anything and one of the people at at the group there recommended a drinking game for every time they talked about Taylor Swift.

Jason Talford 2:19

I gotta go take a shot on work hours now.

Wold, Kathy 2:22

I'm busy day.
Yes, great.
Alright, thanks.
How about Kevin?

Kevin Keyt 2:29

In afternoon everybody.
My name is Kevin keyt.
I'm with PUC.
Yes, I did.
Watch the Super Bowl.
I did enjoy the ad and I could have done without Taylor Swift as I'm not a swifty.

Wold, Kathy 2:41

Excellent.
Alright.
Thanks, Kevin.
How about Kimberly?

Kimberly Loskot 2:47

I am Kimberly last Scott with the Idaho PUC and I only watched the Super Bowl for the halftime show.

Wold, Kathy 2:54

Ohh OK, I missed that one.

Yes, good.

Alright, the halftime show.

Perfect.

All right.

How, Laura?

Laura Conilogue 3:03

Hi, I'm Laura with the Idaho Public Utilities Commission and I did not watch the Super Bowl, so.

Wold, Kathy 3:11

E OK, great.

OK, how about Lauren?

Lauren Marcus 3:19

Hi, I'm Lauren.

I'm the sales manager for Arcgis.

I did watch the Super Bowl.

I was really just there for usher and Taylor Swift though, but I watched the whole thing.

Wold, Kathy 3:31

There we go.

Great.

Alright.

Thanks.

Good to have you, Matt Bandimere.

MATT VANDERMEER WITH MOMENTUM LLC 3:39

Ohm momentum here in Idaho and I did watch the Super Bowl.
I did watch the ends and I could care less about Taylor Swift.

Wold, Kathy 3:50

OK.

MATT VANDERMEER WITH MOMENTUM LLC 3:51

OK.

Wold, Kathy 3:52

Fair enough.

Thanks Matt.

Min park.

Park, Min 3:58

Yes, Min Park with Intermountain gas.

I watched the Super Bowls.

I did not watch dads, though.

Wold, Kathy 4:05

Alright, great.

Thanks men, Preston.

Scantling, Preston 4:11

Hi there I'm calling.

I'm an energy efficiency analyst here at Intermountain Gas, and I watched the Super Bowl for the first time in a few years, which usually, you know, I haven't been watching it as much in the past.

I watched the ads as well.

Wold, Kathy 4:23

All right, great.

Alright, Selena.

Selena 4:33

Hi, Selena O'Neal, Ada County.

Wold, Kathy 4:35

Yeah.

Selena 4:36

I'm the editor specialist and I did watch the Super Bowl and the ads with my family.

We had a really good time.

I think it would have been even better if Taylor Swift had been the halftime entertainment.

Wold, Kathy 4:51

Alright, great.

Thanks, Elena.

OK, we have next set.

Seth Welty 4:57

Hi, I'm Seth.

I manage our utility programs with Arcgis and I was definitely watching.

Football was written for the 49ers.

Wold, Kathy 5:05

Alright, great, Thomas.

Thomas Jensen 5:18

Did you say Thomas?

Wold, Kathy 5:19

Yes.

Yeah.

Thomas Jensen 5:20

Ohh, I'm sorry, I'm still not used to answering that full name anymore.

Wold, Kathy 5:21

Yes, yes, that's alright.

Thomas Jensen 5:27

I did watch the Super Bowl, but I have to confess I watched the first few minutes and I tuned in towards the end of the halftime to see how it was going.

Then I waited till the end of the fourth quarter that because my homes.

So and when they went to overtime, looked at the session, you could kind of see what was going, but I I admit I I watched the abbreviated version live and then yeah, I look for Taylor when when I was tuned in.

Wold, Kathy 5:40

Oh.

Yeah.

All right, great.

Thank you, uh Kody.

Thompson, Kody 5:59

Yeah, Kody Thompson with Intermountain Gas.

And I watched the Super Bowl football and ads.

Wold, Kathy 6:05

Alright, great will.

Wil Gehl 6:11

I will go with the city of Boise.

I watched the Super Bowl football and ads and mostly in interested in the Super Bowl snacks.

Wold, Kathy 6:19

Perfect.

Yes, I wish that should have been another category.

We're just here for the snacks.

Yeah. Great.

Thanks everybody for sharing.

Did we get everybody?

I that's all I have on my participant list, but do we have anybody?

Maybe who's calling in that?

I'm not seeing as showing up there.

Anybody we missed?

No.

OK, not hearing anything.

Alright, great.

Well, thank everybody for introducing yourself.

I noticed some new names, some new folks, so we're glad to have you join us.

Thanks for being here today.

Thanks for everyone joining.

I'm going to turn it over to min for our moment of safety.

Park, Min 6:56

Yes.

So this would have probably been more useful a couple weeks ago when we had that cold period, but I figured it wouldn't be a bad idea to go over in case we get another one.

So 5 tips to staying safe in the cold?

The first tip is to where outdoor clothing and layers.

This can be extremely useful when you get indoors so that you're not contemplating whether to have one big coat on and sweat, or take it off and be cold.

The second tip is to eat healthy, nutritious meals, giving your body the nutrition it needs will allow it to stay healthy and run properly.

The third tip is my favorite and Cody's favorite as well is to limit your time outdoors.

The best way to stay warm is to just avoid the cold altogether.

The 4th tip is to move around, but don't get fatigued.

This will help blood circulation and keep you warm and lastly always carry a cell phone that's charged for emergencies.

Wold, Kathy 8:02

Alright, great.

Thank you, man.

OK, we're going to go back and revisit some of our parking lot topics that came up from the last meeting.

And I'm going to kick this off here.

One of the first questions we had was about the commercial rider balance.

Is this a lot relative to program spending?

And the answer is kind of yes and no.

We want to avoid changing that collection rate around a lot.

And so, umm uh, this is the same rate that when we started the program, we have not made any changes to the rate yet.

By the same token, we haven't had enough participation to know if this is the right rate.

The uptake in the commercial program has been pretty slow so far, so we're still trying to determine if that collection rate is the proper rate.

We do have some future plans for the commercial program that may help reduce that over collected balance and we we'll talk a little bit more about things that we have going on in the commercial program as we get into this meeting today.

So I'm hopefully that is helpful.

It's a yes and no.

Is is that high for relative to to program spending, but we'll talk a little bit more about commercial program here in this meeting.

And the second parking lot question was how many rebates were denied in 2023?

And I'm going to turn this over to Cody for more explanation.

Thompson, Kody 9:27

Yeah.

So of all applications submitted in 2023, nineteen percent of those were denied for a number of reasons of which are listed in the chart here.

If we exclude the portion that was for duplicated equipment, which is something that we don't really have a lot of control over that metric versus education around things like not meeting program requirements for some of these other things, the total number of denied rebates and accounting for 16% of total rebates applied for it, this is uh, slightly higher than 2020 twos rejections at about an 8% increase of rejected in total.

That said, we are seeing duplicate equipment trending down.

Again, that's something that just a little bit of our control, we have seen a decrease in applications being returned to customers with no response as well.

That's gone down by 8% compared to 22.

And when we say a an application was, uh, returned to a customer with no response, that means that they submitted an incomplete application in some shape or form, whether it's missing information, there's permits, outstanding things of that nature.

We've reached out to them on the front end, giving them some time to rectify those with us before sending the application back to them if they don't get back to us within the time

frame we set, then it does go back to them.

They have an additional time frame to correct that and send it back to us.

So we are seeing a decrease in ones that get sent back to customers because of that outstanding information.

We don't hear anything like that one down about 8%.

UM non calling non qualifying equipment submissions has increased by 6% compared to 2022 with those non qualifying equipment submissions over half about 55% of the non qualifying equipment was our storage.

Water was for the storage water heater rebate and that was why, umm, as we were seeing that trend up in 2023, we did send that email focused on water heating rebates.

Smart thermostats are the second most rejected rebate we're seeing there.

That's primarily due to customers applying for programmable or non Energy Star certified Wi-Fi thermostats that have been installed and then for our miscellaneous category that covers a multitude of reasons that aren't captured directly in the system like some of these others are.

And I say not captured directly, the system will identify a duplicate directly.

It identifies when it's sent back to a customer without any kind of response and so on, and so the things that fall under miscellaneous category are things like used equipment that's been installed, customers who requested that we remove the rebate from consideration because they weren't able to provide that but support or they didn't want to continue after receiving that contact with us and reached out and told us so equipment that was installed prior to the rebate or potentially even the program existing things of that nature.

I will be working on a standardization in our system for some of those so that we can do better reporting all those in the future.

As far as how some of those break down as well, so we can better understand ones that don't fall in these other standard categories that we have.

Wold, Kathy 12:42

Thanks, Corey.

Any questions about that?

All right.

In our last parking lot, question was last meeting we talked about sending out customer communications through customer emails.

When folks opt in to receive energy efficiency emails, and one of the questions was how much does the customer emails cost and how do we know it's cost effective the the range, the expenses that we have when we send a customer email varies.

In 2023, it was anywhere from \$40 to \$142, and this is because the company has a

allowance of emails that they send with their current email provider.

And so in a month that energy efficiency sends a customer communication, if we by sending that email, push the company outside of that allowance, that goes into a per email fee structure.

And so anytime that we're pushing outside of that allowance for, you know, normal business as usual for energy efficiency communications, then those expenses are picked up by energy efficiency and those expenses will actually hit the energy efficiency rider.

So that's why that rate kind of varies and then we don't measure cost effectiveness necessarily as a per project like a per email send, but we measure the cost effectiveness as a program.

So when we're thinking about is it cost effective, we're thinking about some things like that will add in some expense where you know in this case we're communicating directly with customers.

So we're not buying a particular list like buying a vendor list or, umm, some kind of subscription list, but we're directly communicating with customers and also working within our corporate resources of having the email sent through our corporate or or company email system.

So hopefully that helps answer those questions about our email send expenses.

Yeah, Jason.

Jason Talford 14:49

Yeah, thanks.

UM, so on the topic of the fees, if you go over, I mean obviously the range is, let me start by getting my head around this is that \$40 per email or is that per like set of emails?

Wold, Kathy 15:04

Good question.

It's for the whole send like so if we had it when we go outside of the monthly email allowance then it pushes the into a per email structure.

So we'll pay that per email fee for energy efficiency sends.

So it's kind of depends on how much email the the company is sending out for that month.

But anytime we're pushing outside of that monthly allowance and incurring additional expenses, that's where E is gonna pick up those additional expenses.

So we're not impacting what's kind of, I guess like in the base uh customer email sends.

Jason Talford 15:46

OK.

And then the, I guess the more the follow up question I was going for, but I needed to make sure I was clear getting there is is how how often does that happen that you're going past the the allotment so to speak and incurring fees for additional emails?

Wold, Kathy 15:52

Yeah.

Yeah.

So I think in I have to go back and look in 2023, but we sent emails once 1/4 and I think there were two quarters that we had incurred additional expenses for particularly for email sends.

I can double check on that too.

Jason Talford 16:23

Yeah.

Yeah, I think that be an interesting follow up item.

Thank you.

Wold, Kathy 16:26

OK.

Great.

Anyone else?

OK.

We'll go on to new business.

I'm going to turn this over to Cody's and talk about the writer balance.

Thompson, Kody 16:40

Yeah.

And this.

Uh.

This slide should be pretty familiar to those that were here for the previous meeting we had with just one additional data point of where the residential writer balance ended.

Uh.

As of the end of the year, so we did end at 1,378,686, collected at the end of the quarter.

Umm I it is trended downwards from quarters one and two with that part of the uptake and trend we're seeing there is of course we're in the heating season again.

So more guests being used than what we're seeing in porters two and three.
So we are continuing to to keep an eye on and and monitor that and evaluate whether that continues to be the correct rate to charge charge.
So we are keeping an eye on that as that does trend up and down.

Wold, Kathy 17:39

Well, Jason, yeah.

Jason Talford 17:40

They're Cody.

Before you move on from that slide, I was trying to raise my hand, but you scooted along.

Thompson, Kody 17:41

Jason yeah.

Jason Talford 17:46

Umm, could you UM, help me understand that starting balance?

From what I remember in.

One of the reports that came in recently, I couldn't tell you which one I thought the I thought the year end balance for 2022 was a bit lower than that.

Thompson, Kody 18:13

It it shouldn't be.

I'd have to look and and see what we put out there and reported that that 914,000 balance is and and I can go back and look, but that should be the the balance that was reported at the end of 22 for residential.

So that should be, yeah, that should be the over collected amount.

We had at the end of 22 going into the year before we had any collections in 23.

Jason Talford 18:39

OK, alright.

Yeah, maybe we can look into that.

I I think it's just a useful.

Tool if it to can kind of compare to the the rest of the quarters there to see that change.

Wold, Kathy 18:51

Umm.

Thompson, Kody 18:51

Yeah, absolutely.

Yeah.

And and I'll double check on my end as as well like it should be that number of if it's.

If it's inaccurate, it is user input error on my part.

Ah, but I can definitely go and double check too.

Wold, Kathy 19:07

OK, great explorer.

Laura Conilogue 19:12

Hi so I was looking at what could that be a total rider balance instead of residential is that residential and commercial?

Writer balance.

Wold, Kathy 19:26

No, these are this is just residential.

Yeah, we have two separate balances for, one for commercial and one for residential.

Laura Conilogue 19:33

Hmm.

OK.

Yeah, because I thought from the from the.

The table that I was looking at, it looked like the ending balance in 2022 that I saw for residential is 450,000.

Thompson, Kody 19:53

Yeah.

Laura Conilogue 19:54

And then the commercial was 463 like that.
So those together would be.

Thompson, Kody 19:58

Yeah.

I'm yeah.

I'm I'm pulling that up as we speak.

Me.

Look here and that's on me for not getting those numbers, but that's a mistake.

That was perpetuated back when we did that last quarter as well.

Uh, so yeah, it does look like that.

That is the case that they're combined. Yes.

So accurate.

Laura Conilogue 20:19

OK.

Thompson, Kody 20:21

Yeah.

To accurately state the beginning writer balance as we went into 2023 where we ended 2022, it is 450,521.

I apologize for that error.

I should have gone back to the source of truth and vetted that, rather than assuming that I had it correct when we met last, so I apologize for that.

Laura Conilogue 20:36

I want reduce.

Yeah, no problem.

That was just, I think both Jason are like, wait a second, that's a lot higher than we thought.

Wold, Kathy 20:45

Yeah.

Laura Conilogue 20:46

So that's what what happened.

Thompson, Kody 20:46

Yeah.

Laura Conilogue 20:47

So, OK, thank you.

Wold, Kathy 20:49

Great.

Good catch.

Thank you.

Kevin Keyt 20:52

Kody Kevin, if you've got the numbers in front of you, could you just read them down?

What the actual residential was please.

Thompson, Kody 21:00

Yeah, I I can.

Even I can even put it in the chat if that be helpful.

Kevin, would that be more beneficial than reading it aloud?

Kevin Keyt 21:09

That'll work.

Thank you.

Thompson, Kody 21:10

OK. Yeah.

Wold, Kathy 21:18

Do you want me to go into the commercial or are you are you?

You're updating the chat.

Thompson, Kody 21:23

I'm updating the chat.

Wold, Kathy 21:25

OK.

Thompson, Kody 21:26

Let me.

See, now that we've got this, let me just vet 2023.

I'm fairly sure that I reported the correct number there, but if I got it wrong once, I don't want to trust that I got it right on the back end there.

So let me just make sure that 1.3 million number is correct as well.

Take Me 2 seconds here.

OK.

Yeah, that that ending balance of the the 1 billion three, 78,000 is correct as was reported for residential for 23.

Wold, Kathy 22:00

OK.

Thompson, Kody 22:07

Yeah, we don't have any other questions.

I think we are good at doing the commercial.

Uh and I, I did put the right starting number there with the 463,938 fifteen for their like Kathy mentioned, it has turned it up to that 865,800.

We are continuing to monitor that there are those additional activities that we talked later, but it is primarily low participation that's continued to drive that up.

Wold, Kathy 22:37

Yeah, Jason.

Jason Talford 22:40

Yeah.

So I think we touched ohh, there's camera.

Thank you.

I think we touched on this with the parking lot item, but it sounded like you were gonna defer it to here.

So I think this might be the right home for it.
I think it might be useful for both the the residential and the commercial.
Umm, what did their actual expenditures turn out for for 2023?
Just, you know, not to say if it you know if it's too high or too low, it's an instant.
You know problem, but just to inform you know what?
How does this balance compare?

Thompson, Kody 23:19

Yeah.

As far as ohm, yeah, as far as what expenses have been, yeah, get those.

Jason Talford 23:24

Umm.

Thompson, Kody 23:56

Yeah.

So for residential and I'll drop this in the chat as well.

But residential total expenses in 2023 was 3,774,000 and \$39.00 and commercial total commercial expenses was \$72,318.

Jason Talford 24:20

OK.

Thanks.

Thanks for for running those checking on that.

Thompson, Kody 24:24

Yeah.

Jason Talford 24:26

Yeah, that I think that gives the right sense of scale.

That was 720 in change.

Is that right?

No.

You'll put it in the chat you go do that.

Thompson, Kody 24:33

7072 and change, but I'll put it in chat, yeah.

Jason Talford 24:36

All right.

Thank you.

Wold, Kathy 24:39

Thanks Cody.

Anything else on the writer?

OK, it's going here.

Are you still crunching numbers or referring to charts?

Thompson, Kody 24:56

I just typed them in.

Yeah, yeah, yeah, I know.

Wold, Kathy 24:57

Are you ready?

OK, alright.

Thompson, Kody 24:59

We're good to go.

Wold, Kathy 24:59

I was gonna turn this off.

Whenever you're ready, I'll let you from in.

Is going to give us an update on rebate performance for 2023.

Thompson, Kody 25:08

Yeah.

And so these are just some some preliminary numbers as we're coming out of 23.

Just looking at how residential rebates have performed, we had a 7% increase in paid rebates compared to 2022.

So we are still seeing Ward rebates here over year as we continue to offer these 61% of all residential rebates were paid out for homes identified as new construction.

That is, uh.

That includes new construction homes that had just qualifying appliances that were, you know, furnaces, water heaters, thermostats, as well as homes that meet our whole home, new construction program criteria as well.

UM, as far as uh, looking at those a little bit separately, the number of whole home rebates that were issued out is 18% higher compared to 2022.

So we did see 8% more applications for the whole home, new construction rebates and then new construction appliance rebates stay pretty steady.

There was a 1% increase there and then we have the the chart here just kind of shows how where where we're seeing some of that growth in the areas, all of our territories except Boise didn't see more rebates in 23 than 22.

We did see a a marked increase of 54% participation in Idaho Falls compared to 22.

We did have a secondary energy service Rep that was new, hired on in November of 22 and we did see an increase in rated homes.

So we think that those two things have then a factor in what led to the increased participation in that district of our service territory.

Wold, Kathy 27:04

What the commercial?

Thompson, Kody 27:04

Uh for?

Yeah.

For commercial, we saw 15% decrease in the number of commercial rebates issued.

Now that sounds like a big number, but it's it's a 5 application difference between 2022 and 23.

So we received 5 less applications.

You know, it's it's hard to talk in percentages with.

These are significant numbers with how few applications we are receiving there the majority of applications that we received were for Energy Star fryer installations and we saw the most of those commercial rebates redeemed in our Pocatello district.

And then we had a total of five applications that were denied on the commercial side, all the applications that were denied for commercial customers were furnaces that were installed at customer rate locations.

Two of these applied under the residential rebate application.

The other three listed them under the high efficiency condensing boiler rebate, but then had furnaces installed and so unfortunately because we don't have a furnace offering and we weren't able to rebate out any of those pieces of equipment.

Wold, Kathy 28:10

Any questions on rebates?

We'll go on to promotions update from Preston.

Scantling, Preston 28:22

Thanks, Kathy.

Yeah.

So to start, so to kick this off again, we'll put this up between our residential and commercial programs and we'll start the residential section with our Q4 email, which we sent on November 28th.

We sent this out post post Thanksgiving before Christmas, so we stuck with the holiday theme.

Kind of making that seasonal on time of your connection there and had a list of all of our available repeats on that email.

So we can go ahead to the next one where we'll compare our Q4 and Q3 emails.

Yeah, that's emails speak.

You know, there's a lot of different factors that go into that.

One, be it be it email, it's going into people.

Some spam filters, trash, trash folders, etcetera.

People opting out of emails as a whole so we're so we're we're working with the the customer experience team to continue with evaluate where where the you know the fluctuations in the email send numbers are coming from.

But we did have a slightly higher open rate.

We had a 13% increase in our open rate for Q4 email and an 18% increase in our click rate for the Q4 email with 59 and 22% respectively.

And according to our to our customer communications team, one of the reasons for this much higher click rate was due to the new umm subject lines that they've been that they've been implementing.

This is an area in the past where we haven't had as much control.

This is something that customer communications has taken on more themselves because they know what to put in that subject line.

That's gonna get it passive spam and trash filters for most people.

See emails so with some new processes that they've been putting in there.

We've had great success with our Q4 email.

Alright.

And we've also been continuing the sponsorship of in person events throughout throughout Q4.

We sponsored or or.

I mean going into the start of 2024 here, we sponsored the Idaho Home Builders Association with our board meeting here in Boise on January 31st, which this was in this was a statewide I'm building contractors Association update where representatives from all the bcas around the state came.

We had a great turn out from NBC's here in our service territory.

So it was nice to catch up with some of the some of the organizers from those areas and hear about what they've been doing in their in their respective territories regarding customer member outreach and education.

So always good to stay informed there and make sure they're aware of our program.

We also sponsored the Snake River Valley Building Association Builders Expo, which is a mandatory meeting for builders who are entering the period homes and builders were able to come by and by working with one of our energy service reps in our business development department carry, she brought in a flyer that was alerting builders of some upcoming operational and procedural updates for Intermountain.

So she was able to do some outreach there to pull the builders in and give them some updates.

And on the way, we were updating them a better program.

So that's a good that's a good program reception there and spreading around some updates.

Yeah.

No, go ahead and move on to our professional highlights for 2024.

This is kind of a broad scale update on what we're on on.

What our year is gonna look like for the residential program as far as promotions go, we're gonna be continuing our online communications, which have proved to be which which which have been a been effective in the past.

We were going to be continue our customer emails and you know quarterly and we're also gonna do our monthly social media post.

Ohh, we're gonna be continuing to do our print ads and all the parade of homes, magazines, city chamber magazines and real estate guides will be sponsoring events through the building contractor associations and the city chambers.

This includes the point of environmental affair, which is down in Pocatello, as well as a couple economic summits throughout the year.

And then we also have as a special project for this year, we're going to be doing some

promotions on our customer web app, which I believe will be a touched on a little later, but we're gonna be doing a bill insert and all customer email which which will go out of the scope of our normal quarterly emails because our normally quarterly emails only go to OPT in customers.

But this this email for the customer web app will go to all Intermountain customers.

So we'll have, we'll have, we'll have a, you know, proper reach there.

And along with that will send out the builder to let people know of that when it comes up.

So more to come there and if there's any questions there, feel free, but if not, we'll go ahead and move.

Move ahead. Thanks.

Alright, so I wanted to take a moment to talk about our 2023 energy our our energy savings kits.

This is our customer engagement activity for 2023 and in the last part of the year.

Last year, we sent out a survey to evaluate the performance of this of this promotion that we did.

And if you remember, we ended up sending out 100 energy savings gets to randomly selected winners.

And of those that we sent sent those kits out to, we sent out a survey to each one of them to evaluate the installation rates and overall satisfaction with the kit itself.

We got a 12% response rate through that which through a quick Google search we see that most you know you know a lot of surveys that go out will average in the six to 15% response rate.

So pretty, pretty satisfied with our response rate, there seems like it's flying within average expected survey response results or rates.

So yeah, pretty happy with that.

There the we we were able to see that we had high installation rates for some of the items including the foam, the foam tape, weatherstripping and the V seal weatherstripping.

We had some really good feedback there from from people and seeing how I'm seeing the race of these products being installed, obviously those ones seem to be taking up really well and we also got some good feedback on customers attitudes towards kids as a whole.

Some of them, you know, some of them might include or install the products right away.

Some of them will end up waiting a little while for them, and we also had a couple of requests for different or, you know, quote unquote better instructions where they wanted potentially video instructions on how to implement the products or or just a different format altogether.

This question here from Kevin.

Kevin Keyt 34:18

Yeah.

For the customers that did respond and did install, are you able to see an appreciable difference in their build number of terms?

Did it make a difference?

Scantling, Preston 34:32

Uh and Kathy, my lean on you a little bit here, but we were not measuring therm savings on this project.

Wold, Kathy 34:40

Yeah, we didn't.

Kevin Keyt 34:41

OK. Thank.

Thank you.

Wold, Kathy 34:42

Yeah.

Thanks Kevin.

Scantling, Preston 34:46

Who?

Thanks.

And if there is no more questions, are we?

Oh yeah, and then we had a couple.

Jason Talford 34:50

Oh, I'll jump in with the question here.

Wold, Kathy 34:52

Yeah.

Scantling, Preston 34:52

Yeah. Yeah.

Go for it.

Jason Talford 34:54

Ah, so on on the previous slide.

Umm, I read the bulk point of high installation rates for the following items and then on the next section there in the feedback that some of the kits.

Uh, the customers received the kits but will wait to install the products and and that seems perhaps slightly contrasting of high installation rates with their not installing them.

Scantling, Preston 35:17

Umm.

Jason Talford 35:24

So I was hoping you could kind of help me separate those ideas and little bit more behind it.

Scantling, Preston 35:27

Yeah.

Yeah.

Yeah, that's totally fair.

I think I think that was probably something like of a specified a little bit more.

There were, there were certain products like the phone type, weather stripping that we saw 100% installation on through our survey of the 12 response.

So we had and then there were other products that did not seem to receive as high of installation rates.

So I think for for some of the products themselves, there were prolonged periods of delays. But for some products they were able to be readily installed, which again kind of showed us which products were resonating really quickly and which ones weren't.

And there were and then there were some customers that just kind of stated that overall to bring me slow.

Jason Talford 36:06

Do do you know what other products?
Kind of had that delay attached to them.

Scantling, Preston 36:11

Let me pull.

I remember the I remember the window installation specifically was one that was a little slower to update just because it was a it.

It might have been a larger installation process.

It just a little bit more expensive, but yeah, the the window, the window insulation was the biggest one stood out.

Jason Talford 36:25

Great.

OK.

Thank you so much.

Scantling, Preston 36:30

No worries.

Thank you.

You know, we had a couple of quotes in the next slide from for from the from the survey respondents just on the products, the whole there, there a couple really good notes there, just saying that they had problems that they didn't know how to address.

So getting a variety of products in hand where they didn't have to go out and think of, you know, the right product to go find, they found it very helpful because they could just sit there and try much solutions.

So that seemed to be very helpful for people that didn't know exactly what to use to solve their weatherization programs or problems.

And then there was also some some feedback given on just the fact that people did enjoy the the fact that case like this could potentially save them money.

So they're they're also appreciative for the fact that they can have the ability to do a Delaware project that can save that money.

If there is no questions there, we'll move on to the commercial side of things for promotions.

Thanks.

And then this is like this is a copy of the Q4 email that we sent for commercial customers. Again, this for option customers.

We send 8674 of these and if you wanna.

Ohh yeah, I guess we're gonna stay on this one.

Pardon me.

There we were unable to get the statistics for relating to the click rates and open rates for this email because we had some technical difficulties with our communications department.

There were some.

There were some difficulties around around the time frame that was required to to ascertain those stats, so didn't end up getting the the stats for that one, but we have a process in place that will make sure that we can get those sets in the future.

There is no questions there.

We'll go ahead and do the next one.

Yeah.

And then this is kind of an overview for our 2024 commercial program planning or a promotional.

There we go.

Yeah.

So for online communications, you're gonna continue with our quarterly customer emails for commercial, we're gonna continue a sponsoring events in person through the Association of of Architects through ashtray and through city Chambers.

These have been, you know, we've been doing them in the past, so we're going to continue with these in the future where we've had good connections and we're gonna do a whole on promotional push regarding our commercial commercial customer survey, which we're going to be doing a bill insert, Bill Onsert another email for the book has and the social media post which all those have been in progress with our design team.

So we're working on getting those wrapped up and we'll have a have, we'll have more of an update on the commercial survey later in the presentation.

Wold, Kathy 39:11

Gonna jump back to that slide and jump in here on the commercial.

Scantling, Preston 39:13

Yeah.

Wold, Kathy 39:14

Yeah.

Thanks, Preston.

Scantling, Preston 39:16

No worries.

Wold, Kathy 39:16

Uh, yes, Preston mention.

We're gonna launch a customer survey for commercial customers.

Try and learn more about the equipment that they have in their buildings.

If they have a certified building operator at their location, we have been working with the Integrated Design lab, the University of Idaho Integrated Design Lab to come up with the survey.

So we're currently in the last stages of that, just finalizing the survey and we're working on an incentive for the survey takers so that we can hopefully you get a good high response rate and get some good valuable information about our commercial customers.

So I'm trying to learn more about how they use natural gas gauge to their interest in energy efficiency.

You know, asking questions about if they have any upcoming remodeling, any projects, opportunities where we can elevate the conversation about energy efficiency at the time of those kind of projects.

So we hope to get that launched in April just as we kind of put the finishing touches on the survey and also the incentive tied with that survey, which is going to be like a \$5 gift card where they can go to a vendor and select which vendor they wanna get their \$5 gift card from.

So just hammering out the final details there and I am also in the process of working with vendors to help on the design of the commercial program.

Specifically, we'd like to explore the commercial custom program and so we just have our new CPA done.

The avoided costs have been updated.

We're getting ready to do this commercial survey of customers and so I feel like a lot of pieces are there that we can work with a vendor to help us, umm, kind of really figure out the design of the commercial program.

UM, due to kind of the low response rate that we've gotten so far, really figure out what is going to resonate.

What opportunities are there to work with commercial customers to save some money and energy?

So those are some upcoming things that we have going with our commercial customers.
Yeah, Kevin, jump in.

Kevin Keyt 41:28

I'm trying to connect some dots here, Kathy, I think, he said earlier in the presentation, where requests were denied, that there may have been commercial customers who applied for a furnace rebate.

Wold, Kathy 41:31

Yeah.

Kevin Keyt 41:42

So where my head went with that is I'm thinking the little tiny mom and pop restaurant that is a commercial customer who actually has residential sized space heating.
Would it make sense in those cases that a rebate for a residential sized furnace be available for them?

Wold, Kathy 41:56

Yes.

Kevin Keyt 42:06

Or am I way overstepping the connecting the dots?

Wold, Kathy 42:06

Yes.

No, you're way ahead of us, Kevin.

Actually, that was one of that's some of the feedback actually that we got from customers, commercial customers, but also from our energy services Rep team is the feedback that there are commercial customers that are small enough, they're on the commercial rate, but they use residential sized equipment.

And so that was one of the kind of the holes that we identified that needed to be addressed and that was addressed by guidehouse in our most recent CPA.

So that is something that we're looking at is what kind of measures can be implemented into the current offering so that we can capture some of those folks just as you've described smaller on commercial, but indeed use residential sized equipment.

Kevin Keyt 42:47

And itself.

OK, great.

Thank you.

Wold, Kathy 42:55

Yeah.

Thank you for that.

Yeah.

Other questions about commercial.

OK.

We'll move on here.

Next thing, I'm just gonna give a quick uh probank program admin update.

As we mentioned in the last meeting, we implemented a rebate processing software in House to help us get away from using Excel spreadsheets.

We actually have a processing software that was developed by our in House IT folks.

It's called era, and we're going into phase two of that.

And the second phase was going to allow us to step away from using a third party vendor software for our online applications and customers will now be able to sign into their customer account and apply for a rebate directly from their customer account.

This will auto populate a lot of the information that we need from the customer, which will be kind of a nice streamlining option both for the customer and for us.

So as internal processing, we won't have to do the data entry to to fill out all those fields and it'll be you know we don't have to validate against the customer database because we know they're coming in through the customer portal.

So and in addition to that, customers will be able to see the status of their rebate when they sign into their customer account.

So we'll continue to accept rebate applications by paper by PDF.

You know they can snail mail, they can email us.

But this online portal through the customer account will allow us to streamline both for the customer and for the rebate processing folks.

So we're going to be sending out a bill, insert all customer bill insert as well as an email in March actually.

And when this will go live for our, for our customers.

So I'm trying to keep improving that rebate process and making sure that we provide the

easy button for customers and make it easy for them to apply for a rebate.
OK.

Laura Conilogue 45:09

Uh, sorry, I've got a quick question.

Wold, Kathy 45:11

Yeah.

Laura Conilogue 45:12

Did this is Laura.

Did you say?

Wouldn't you think this will be done?

Wold, Kathy 45:15

This is going to launch in March.

Laura Conilogue 45:17

Not much.

Oh, nice.

OK, great.

Wold, Kathy 45:18

Yeah.

Yeah.

Laura Conilogue 45:19

Thank you.

Wold, Kathy 45:19

So she'll see customer communications will come out in March as well.

So yeah. Great.

Laura Conilogue 45:23

Perfect.

Wold, Kathy 45:23

Thanks, Laura.

Any other questions about that?

I pause and I forget.

It takes people a second to find their unmute button and then I'm just moving on, so I'll try and give him long enough pauses, but do jump in when needed.

So appreciate that.

OK, special studies.

I'm going to turn this over to min for an update.

Park, Min 45:48

Yeah.

So sorry for Ian and B, we are currently in the beginning stages.

We will be working with Adm and Associates to conduct a study and this impact evaluation is slated to be finished around the beginning of July, barring any setbacks.

Wold, Kathy 46:16

Yeah.

And I think our original plan was to do impact evaluation on the whole home furnace and smart thermostat.

And we'll actually also be adding in the water heating measures for the study.

So they will be doing evaluation on all of those measures for this round of EMB.

So yeah, expanding the scope just a little bit.

Any questions about human being?

Jason Talford 46:43

OK.

Wold, Kathy 46:44

Yeah, Jason.

Jason Talford 46:44

Yeah, hoping I could just hear a little bit more about the including the water heating. I want to say in the past prudence evaluation, we had a comment about the timing of evaluations based on participation.

So are you seeing in a lot of increased participation in 2023 for the water heaters and that's why we're tossing that in or is there something else moving there?

Wold, Kathy 47:13

Yeah.

So that is part of our conversation that we have with Adm was we were seeking kind of their expert opinion about did we have enough there to actually evaluate and they're feeling is yes, that there were enough measures, enough rebates in the water heating categories to evaluate.

So that's why we rolled it into this study here, along with the the furnace, whole home and smart thermostat.

Yeah.

Good.

OK.

Thanks for asking.

Yeah.

Any other questions about MB?

Jason Talford 47:47

I guess just one more quick confirmation and women mentioned that that's gonna be the estimate of the beginning of the July, the beginning of the July.

It's an important, very important Sheila.

And how does that that timing align with when you expect to file your?

The next prudence case is that gonna be coming in beforehand.

Wold, Kathy 48:12

I think that we'll do those together.

We'd like to file the MBA along with the prudency filing.

I think that was the intent was to have them file together.

Jason Talford 48:20

Excellent.
Thank you.

Wold, Kathy 48:22

OK.

Yeah.

Anything else?

All right.

Umm, I might mention too that part of the evaluation will be doing some surveys.

So for our energy raters that are on the line, you may want to give you some, you know, warning of who it might be so that you're not missing any communications going to spam or anything.

But they may be reaching out for surveys.

On that.

So on your experience with the program, so we'll make sure that folks will be aware when those communications come out if they do so.

Ah, OK.

Any other questions about the program that we can answer for folks today?

Comments, questions.

Jason Talford 49:19

Yeah, all jump in here.

Wold, Kathy 49:21

Yeah.

Jason Talford 49:23

Sorry, sorry, Kevin.

I just went straight forward.

Sorry, your hand popped up.

There was one piece that I wanted to revisit here.

Uh, with the commercial rider balance.

Thank you Cody for for running around and and catching numbers for us on the fly.

I know that that's always super fun, but it is well appreciated.

I was.

I was noodling off to the number that he had in the chat there.

The \$72,000 uh for 2023 expenses.

And I held that up to the the writer balance of 865,000.

I think that that's something of a concerning balance for the commercial that for the commercial rider balance, I mean, you know, assuming things stay safely, I think that can the balance could fund the program for a lot of years based off of just that balance alone. Now, obviously, you're gonna be doing things to help reduce that, and that's great and wonderful and you know, appreciate you doing that.

But I think even if that expenditure increases, it might still well, it's got a long way to go before it makes a dent in that size.

So I think that would be something to consider moving forward is if that commercial rider needs an adjustment.

Umm, but to your point, Kathy, very early and we don't wanna give whiplash on this.

You know, in general, when we run a writer balance we well, uh.

Adjust its such that it will become zero across three years.

So it's a fairly gradual transition and it shouldn't scare anybody too dramatically.

Wold, Kathy 51:12

Umm, no, I appreciate that.

Yeah, I think you know we've talked a little bit about a custom program for a little while.

We know that a custom program is where you can really secure those therm savings and in my participation at some of like the ashtray and the AIA conferences I've met a few folks contractors who are out there doing these kind of custom projects for Idaho Power.

And they said, you know, we see opportunities for gas savings.

We're there for Idaho power, but we do see, you know, potential for for gas.

And so we would love to see you have a custom program.

So that's that's kind of where we're going that we know there's some potential there.

There's potential with different equipment that's been identified in the CPA.

So and we are working to and have a more robust offering so that we can secure those therm savings.

And I think the introduction of a commercial program could probably quickly address some of that over collected balance.

So, but definitely something that we will keep an eye on to not let that that grow too over collected so.

Appreciate that.

Kevin, did you have a question?

Kevin Keyt 52:26

Jason stole my Thunder and I was.

Wold, Kathy 52:27

Oh, OK.

Kevin Keyt 52:29

I was just gonna articulate it a little different and and ask the question is, what are the triggers that you're considering of when you will consider adjusting that writer?

And I think you spoke to him.

So thank you.

Wold, Kathy 52:42

OK.

OK, good.

Good, good.

All right.

Any other questions or comments for this afternoon?

Give everybody time to find their unmute.

OK, alright.

Well, if there's nothing else for this afternoon, we'll keep it short and sweet and our our thanks to the entire committee for joining today and we always appreciate your feedback and comments.

I don't know.

Let's see here.

I got one more slide.

Next meeting May 16th.

All right.

So I will be sending out again a save the date calendar request.

Watch for that and we'll look forward to meeting with everybody in May.

Jason Talford 53:33

Alright, thank you all.

Wold, Kathy 53:34

Thanks everybody.

Wil Gehl 53:35

Thanks everyone, it's.

Scantling, Preston 53:36

Thanks everybody.

Thompson, Kody 53:36

Thank you everybody.

Lauren Marcus 53:37

Think.

Laura Conilogue 53:38

Thank you.

Thomas Jensen 53:42

Thank you.

Q2 EESC Meeting: May 22, 2024

Wold, Kathy 3:23

Good afternoon, everybody.

Welcome to the energy Efficiency Stakeholder Committee meeting.

Looks like we have a couple folks that are.

You're supposed to join us, so we'll give them a minute and then we'll go ahead and get rolling.

Jason Talford 3:43

Yeah.

I think just for your knowledge, we're not gonna see a tailor or Kevin today.

Wold, Kathy 3:48

OK.

Thank you.

I appreciate that.

Not Kevin, because he's retired, right?

Jason Talford 4:00

That's correct.

He's left us all behind.

Wold, Kathy 4:01

Yeah, yeah.

Jason Talford 4:06

He's doing well, so all the best.

Wold, Kathy 4:08

Ohh, good, good, good.

Jason Talford 4:08

You well.

Wold, Kathy 4:21

Alright, well looks like we have a few more folks, but maybe they can just join us as they're able.

Cody will watch the.

Thomas Jensen 4:29

Which?

Wold, Kathy 4:31

Waiting room and let folks in.

That'd be great.

And we'll just keep on timing and respect over on time and get get going here.

So again, thanks for joining the Intermountain Gas Energy Efficiency Stakeholder Committee meeting.

This is our Q2 meeting.

I think the there we've probably saw the notice I had a new thing in teams that I could have the meeting recorded automatically as we start the meeting.

So we are recording.

Feel free to jump in at any time with any questions you may have.

Raise your hand or jump in there and then.

Otherwise, we'll mute everyone for now.

OK, quick overview of the agenda.

We'll do some introductions.

We'll take a moment for a safety moment.

We'll address parking lot topics.

Those were outstanding things from the previous meeting.

We'll do a review of the writer balance, give an update on the writer balance and an update on rebate performance, as well as an update on promotions and then umm, a brief update on some program admin and social studies.

OK, for introductions today, if you would share your name, your organization and anything that you would write a 10 out of 10.

So we'll just start with the folks that I have on my attendance list here and the first one coming up is Jason.

Jason Talford 6:01

Right.

Jason Talford with the Idaho Public Utilities Commission.

I gotta go with a little bit of dry humor and say water.

It's pretty great.

It's used for a lot of things.

If you don't like water, you can put stuff in it that stuff.

Wold, Kathy 6:12

No.

Perfect.

We'll take it.

Alright, how?

Kimberly.

Kimberly Loskot 6:22

Kimberly oscott.

I'm a technical analyst with the PUC and I'm so sorry I did not hear the question.

Wold, Kathy 6:30

Ohh, just anything that you would rate a 10 out of 10.

Kimberly Loskot 6:36

Umm, sleeping in on the weekend?

Wold, Kathy 6:41

Yeah, it's definitely A10.

I like it.

Thanks, Kimberly.

Let's see how much Laura next.

Laura Conilogue 6:49

Hello.

I'm Laura channel with the Idaho Public Utilities Commission.

I'm an auditor and something I would write 10 out of 10 I guess.

Go along with like Kimberly's theme is my bed.
I really, really like that.

Wold, Kathy 7:03

Yeah, sounds perfect.

Alright, great.

Well, let's see.

Here we have Lauren, Lauren, Marcus.

Lauren Marcus 7:13

No, hi.

I am Lauren Marcus.

I'm with Arcgis and I am gonna piggyback on what was already said, but sleeping in on the weekends is definitely a 10 out of 10, specially if my baby sleeps in.

Wold, Kathy 7:24

Perfect. Alright.

Ah, OK.

Great.

Thank you.

Alright, Michael.

Michael Shepard 7:33

Hi, I'm Michael Shepherd with Neighborworks Boise and I would have to say that view out my office window is a 10 out of 10.

I get to look, I get to look at the Boise River all day long.

Wold, Kathy 7:40

Nice.

Ohh lovely.

I like that.

Great.

Definitely a 10 out of 10.

Alright, how about men?

Park, Min 7:53

Min Park your mountain gas.

I'm a, say fried chicken.

Wold, Kathy 7:58

Did you say fried chicken?

Park, Min 8:00

Yeah.

Wold, Kathy 8:01

Alright, great.

OK.

Thanks man. Preston.

Scantling, Preston 8:07

Hi Press and Scantling with Intermountain Gas.

And I'm kind of picking back, piggybacking off men here again, and I'm going to say the grilled beef burrito from Fiesta chicken, it's very good.

Wold, Kathy 8:18

All right, let's see.

Next we have Selena.

Selena 8:25

Hi, Celina O'Neill.

Ada County operations I'm energy specialist and 10 out of 10 would be the Blimpie vest which I had this week.

Wold, Kathy 8:34

Nice, alright.

Selena 8:34

OK. Yeah.

Wold, Kathy 8:39

Great.

Selena 8:39

3.

Wold, Kathy 8:39

Next we have Seth.

Seth Welty 8:42

Hi, I'm Seth wealthy with Arcgis third party rating company.

My 10 out of 10 would be the Timberwolves right now.

Since I'm here in Minnesota, so hoping they beat The Mavericks tonight.

Wold, Kathy 8:49

All right.

There you go. Nice.

Great.

Let's see here, Thomas.

Thomas Jensen 9:01

Thomas Jensen, is that it?

OK, sorry, I fall asleep to the name Thomas.

Wold, Kathy 9:03

Yes. Yeah.

Thomas Jensen 9:05

I think I I'm Tom Jensen with Arcgis and and work with Seth and 10 out of 10 for me would be.

I think I'll go with the water theme and say water or rivers and lakes ocean, but without pee fast, that'd be a 10 out of 10.

Wold, Kathy 9:21

All right.

And it's Tom, I'll remember that.

Thomas Jensen 9:23

Tom, that's fine.

Wold, Kathy 9:24

OK, great.

Thanks for joining next, Cody.

Thompson, Kody 9:29

Yeah.

Cody Thompson, Intermountain Gas company.

And I guess today I'm gonna give the smell of fresh cut grass a 10 out of 10.

Wold, Kathy 9:37

Oh, nice.

Alright, great.

I think I know everybody here, but Kathy Wolf and I'm the manager of the energy efficiency program for Intermountain, 10 out of 10.

I just did a quick Mother's Day trip to Phoenix and it was 96 degrees and 96 degrees.

To get the 10 out of 10 for me, I'm ready for some warm weather so.

Great.

OK.

Did we miss anybody?

Did I not have anybody on the attendance list here?

Jump in if I miss someone.

Alright, OK, we'll get going here.

Next up, we'll have our safety moment.

I'm going to turn over to Preston.

Scantling, Preston 10:17

Thanks, Kathy.

Yep.

So I just wanted to go over a little bit of wildlife safety tips for safety moment this meeting. Since it's starting to heat up outside and it's very busy, time for a wildlife, you know, give it deer, elk, Turkey, ducks and geese.

All like I've seen all these from my house here in Boise.

So I think these are all applicable even if you're in a rural area or in a suburban area like me. So obviously one of the biggest ones is observed from a safe distance and try not to touch the animals.

That's always one of the best things, just to keep your distance away from them, to keep your safety of what?

Getting sick or anything.

Research the area that you're in for common cautions.

Again, whether you're in a suburban or an yeah, rural or suburban area, there is always a bunch of different hosts of different animals that are there, so make sure you just research and know what might be around you when you're out in different areas or when you're at home avoiding feeding, wildlife and store food and or.

Yeah, sorry, avoiding feeding wildlife and storing food and waste properly, especially when you're out camping, food and waste is one of the things that attracts animals to your area and can also kind of teach them to depend on humans for getting food.

So always kind of keeping all that stuff stored safely to make sure that animals don't become dependent on us for food.

Sticking to paths, which is always good for preserving the area that's around you and not trampling A the small shrubs grass that's around you always applying bug spray.

I think that's a great thing for this time of year, especially with more water, warm skills coming out and just being aware of your surroundings when you're driving through wooded areas or anywhere that animals might use as travel corridors because animals can oftentimes be in the way your car.

So always just keeping a good eye out there and that is our safety moment for this meeting.

Wold, Kathy 11:53

Great.

Thanks, Preston.

OK.

Next, we're going to move on to parking lot topics.

This was from our last meeting we had for Q1 and we had a question about our email expenses and how many times we send customer communications each quarter.

And then any time that we go over kind of the corporate allowance of emails, that's when we incur charges to the energy efficiency portion.

And so the only time that we had email expenses for 2023 was for the August email send and that was for \$39.69.

And we'll move on to the writer balance update.

I'm going to turn this over to Cody.

Thompson, Kody 12:43

Yeah.

Uh, so with the residential rider for 2024, we started with a balance of 1,378,600 eighty 668 and it quarter one with 2,320,000 hundred 2811 collected.

First quarter 2024 did outpace first quarter 2023 in terms of rebates being paid out.

Even so, the right balance has continued to climb in spite of that.

So we are planning to file a change of the energy efficiency charge with an effective date October 1st.

And then commercial rider for, oh, I didn't update that to say 2024.

It's my apologies there.

That should be phoning 24 numbers.

It's 865,881 is what we started the year with at the end of Q124 we ended with 982,593 and 44.

We continue to see low uptake for rebate offerings and we are planning to file for a change on the energy efficiency charge for commercial effective October 1st as well.

Wold, Kathy 13:52

Right.

Thompson, Kody 13:52

And.

Wold, Kathy 13:53

Unless there's any questions, we'll move on to rebate performance update.

Thompson, Kody 14:00

Right.

Hearing none, these next few slides are going to compare Q 12023 performance to Q 12024.

Like I mentioned on the residential side, we have seen that the number of rebates issued did outpace what we saw during the comparable quarter comparable quarter the previous year.

So this slide is just showing our furnace thermostat tier one takes water tears into whole home Tier 2 rebates and showing the the difference in update there.

Uh, with this increased uptake, one thing we think may be a reason why we're seeing increased participation comparing those quarters is the customer communications that we did start doing quarterly.

OK, go ahead and go to the next one, Kathy and just show the rest of the residential offerings.

Uh, these ones are the ones that have a little bit smaller of redemption as part of why they got separated.

As you can see, all of them are pretty close to one another, having met where we were as a queue as the end of Q 12023 or slightly exceeding them like with the boilers.

And then for our commercial rebates, here's our performance.

Again, just comparing the quarters, we've seen one less prior as at the end of Q124 as we did in 2023 and as of the end of Q 12023, we had not seen any high efficiency condensing boilers for the year.

So that's why you're not seeing any data there, whereas we've received four as of the end of Q1 for 2024.

Wold, Kathy 15:45

OK.

Yeah, Jason.

Jason Talford 15:49

Great.

Thanks Cody.

I had a I think two small questions for you here.

I'll start with the commercial.

Once we already on it, I just wanted to confirm that we're only seeing 2 measures, 2 rebates here.

Is that because there's no participation in the other offerings?

Thompson, Kody 16:09

Correct.

Yeah.

We haven't seen any of the other offerings as of this point in and there weren't any other offerings that had been redeemed in 2023 as well.

So the only thing that had been redeemed in 2023 as the enqueue one was the Friar.

We didn't see anything else then and then in 2024 the fryer and boiler is all that we've seen for commercial.

So the other ones not being presented is because we hadn't received anyone in Q1 for either of those years.

Jason Talford 16:36

Great.

Thank you.

And then on the previous slide, the yeah, that one right there.

Thank you.

At risk of stepping on what may come later in your presentation, are we gonna see, uh, we're going to get any information on?

These measures, if there's anything being planned for them to do differently or do market differently or uh.

Whatever is next for these ones.

Thompson, Kody 17:09

Yeah, all all the for to to Kathy on that.

If she has anything she was share this point for that.

I know there's some stuff later in the slides, but yeah, I'll for to Kathy on that one.

Wold, Kathy 17:23

Yeah, sounds good.

Yeah.

Thanks for the question.

You mean just in terms of the lower performance that we're having so far in Q1?

Is the company planning to do any additional marketing or changing of anything as far as the incentive goes?

Jason Talford 17:38

Not.

Not Even so much is to say lower performance.

It's just a it's about equal and the participation numbers are, you know, just you know, what, 6710?

Yeah.

Anything to increased participation or otherwise.

Wold, Kathy 17:54

Yeah.

So for I'll talk a little bit more about in the commercial program next steps here, maybe a little bit later as far as some of these other measures, umm, you know we're trying to increase our customer communications so that folks get used to hearing from us every quarter and really the past year we've been trying to focus on us particular topic each quarter.

So like last year, we did a water heating focused uh communication both to customers and that went and form of a customer email and we also did an outreach to umm contractors specifically water heating contractors, plumbing contractors.

So that really helped the uptake in the water heating measures.

So we'll continue to do things like that that are reaching out to customers, making sure that they're one aware of the program, but also trying to add some education in there about how often you should replace your water heater, those sorts of things that help folks with tips about their equipment that they may have in their home and getting them to apply for a rebate, making high efficient.

Jason Talford 19:04

OK.

Thank you.

Wold, Kathy 19:09

Any other questions on rebates?

Alright.

We'll turn to our promotions update and I'll turn it over to Preston.

Scantling, Preston 19:23

Thanks, Kathy.

Yep.

So we can go ahead and thank you.

Yep.

So here we'll see our comparison between our Q1 and Q 42023 residential email.

You'll see that for Q1 we had a 39% open rate, 23% click rate and 190 two 987 emails sent.

So so a little under what we saw for last time, but we're continuing to monitor the stats around these emails and continuing to work with the customer experience team to make sure that we create personalized content for our customers and that they're continuing to see these messages.

There's no.

Yep, we'll go ahead and do the next one.

We've also been continuing our event participation with local BCA's with different community organizers around the around the area.

So on the top picture there you'll see our sponsorship from the Snake River Valley building building contractor associations, economic summit.

This was an event where they were presenting forecasts on the home building industry, kind of some of the economic forecast relating to that and we had our logo on the presentation screen and brochures around this event.

So lots of good exposure there to a bunch of the different builders and other building contractors association members there.

We also sponsored the eastern Idaho Home Builders Association Associates Showcase, which was a gathering of builders for the upcoming parade of homes.

Every builder that's going to be participating in the parade of homes for Idaho Falls came to this event.

There were fourteen of them in attendance there and got some good, good interactions with builders there who still some of them have been hearing about the program for the first time.

So getting some good exposure there with builders and for the bottom one, this was the Portneuf Valley environmental fair out in Pocatello and I worked with our Energy service Rep down there, Ashley, to bring a booth down and do some community wide outreach here.

We handed out a lot of swag items here.

A lot of seed packets and little coloring books for the kids that came by.

So we had some really good community interactions here with about 3000 attendees. This is an Earth Day celebration, by the way. If I didn't mention that earlier, yeah. So that's a little summary of our events for this past year. If we can go into the next one, if there's no questions on that. And we've been continuing our ad placements and a bunch of different publications around our service territory. We have, we've been participating in the Chamber, magazines. We've been doing real estate magazines. We've been doing more ads with the Idaho Business Review. The Earth Day edition for the Idaho Business Review, which came out this past April, and we will continue to put our ads in the afraid of homes magazines for each parade of homes around our service territory. On the top picture there you'll see the ad that we placed in the Idaho business. Review this was an Earth Day centered ad, so that came out to all of the Idaho Business Review subscribers there, which you can see the number of print copies and online visits displayed there and on the bottom picture there on the right we'll see the 2024 full page ad that we have designed and this is the ad that we're putting in chamber magazines, real estate magazines and parade homes magazines. Each of these ads were also equipping this year with a trackable QR code, so later in the year, we'll be able to track some of the traffic from these ads and hopefully get some good, good metrics from how many people have been saying these and scanning through our websites. So if there's no questions there, we can go on to the next slide. We've also been continuing our monthly social media posts. We have a few here, a few examples from our Earth Day post from a post that was promoting the Portneuf Valley environmental fair after the fact, showing the picture that we had there and some more winterizing tips. Go to the next one. Thanks, Ann. This is a unique error. I shouldn't say unique, but this is another event that we hosted down in Pocatello this year. I was excited to go down there and work with our Energy service, Rep Ashley, who I mentioned earlier. We came together to host an informational meeting for builders and contractors down the Pocatello area. We had about 50 builders and contractors in total come to this event. We hosted 2 meetings and one on April 4th, one on April 9th, and these were down at the

Pocatello district office down in Pocatello.

But yeah, so we we had kind of a joint presentation here.

Ashley was presenting on a lot of kind of procedural updates for Intermountain Gas with the way they work with contractors and developers for getting line installations created.

And then since we had everyone in the room, I wanted to kind of coopt our efforts and take that time to talk a little bit about the benefits of energy efficiency and about how builders and contractors can't participate in the program.

And again, we had we've after after this meeting has concluded, Ashley's been continuing to work with these people and she's been getting some good, positive feedback from built-in contractors, saying that they were happy to learn about the rebate program and about him and about some of these procedural updates that Intermountain had been have been releasing.

They were.

They were also really happy to get an in person event with us.

They they expressed appreciation for seeing, you know, people's faces in person rather than doing something online.

So we we were thankful to them for that positive feedback and we've even heard back from a couple builders and attended that we're looking to submit applications for rebates.

So we're continuing to listen for more feedback and looking for more opportunities to work with our ESR community or ESR team in the future.

If you have any questions on that event, feel free, but I believe this wraps up the residential section of the promotions update.

And we'll dive on into the commercial side.

I'll take this first slide and then Kathy will take after this.

But if you remember from last time, we're gonna do a Q4 and Q1 email comparison here.

This is our Q4 email that we sent for commercial, which was kind of holiday themed and if you remember the last time we weren't able to get the stats from this due to some technical difficulties with our customer experience team.

But we have the stats from this new one here, which we sent 8485.

We had a 59% open rate and a 3% click rate, which is consistent with other commercial emails that we sent for 2023 as well.

So if you have any questions there, feel free to ask.

But without further ado, I'll hand it over to Kathy for the rest of the commercial section.

Have.

Wold, Kathy 25:26

Unmute myself.

Scantling, Preston 25:26

There you go.

Wold, Kathy 25:27

Alright, thank you.

Ohh great.

So some next steps for our commercial program, we are getting ready to launch our commercial customer survey.

We'll be sending out a postcard and also maybe following up with some email to learn more from our commercial customers about what kind of gas equipment they have. How interested are they and energy efficiency and really one of the main things we hope to gain with the survey is reaching the building operator or the facilities manager.

Uh, we've been sending out commercial rebate information to the customer contacts that we have at the at the companies that the customers, commercial customers locations.

But I think what we're typically getting is probably the admin person or the accounting person, so not necessarily someone who knows a lot about the building or about the equipment in the building or that the messages rebates really resonates with that person.

And so we really like to attempt to reach the building operator or the facilities manager with the survey.

So the call out is on the postcard is specifically to those folks.

So umm, the on the postcard, but then also once you access the survey, the first question is asking about are you the building operator and then it'll default to.

If no, we try and ask for who would be the closest person to being the building operator.

So really, making a concerted effort to try and capture who those folks are so that we can start those communications and relationship building with folks that are in that role at the commercial customer accounts.

So that will be going out soon.

We're working on our send list.

We've got the survey developed.

It'll be an online survey and then, thanks to some recommendations from the stakeholder committee last time, we'll also be offering an incentive to get folks to take the survey.

We've been sharing it with a couple of folks internally just to get their thoughts on the survey and it's not short, which we know is a challenge.

But in order to get enough information, we're asking folks to give us a little bit of their time.

And in exchange, uh will enter them in a drawing to win \$100 gift card and we'll give away several gift cards, so hopefully that will be enough of a an exchange or an incentive for them

to take the survey and share a little bit of information with us.
And so we're going to do this in a kind of a limited release and see how it goes.
See how it works?
Things that we may need to fine tune.
See what kind of a response rate we get.
So we'll be launching that care probably in the next month or so.
Any questions about commercial or promotions?

Jason Talford 28:24

Hey there Ada question for you, Kathy.

Wold, Kathy 28:24

Umm yeah.

Jason Talford 28:28

On your slide there it I I'm gonna.

I'm gonna kind of reengaged the question from earlier.

You're slide mentioned that there are gauge interest in EE and upcoming projects.

Wold, Kathy 28:42

Umm.

Jason Talford 28:44

And So what are the upcoming projects?

Wold, Kathy 28:46

Yeah.

So that's something that we're asking in the survey.

Sorry, that wasn't clear there a couple of things that we asked in the survey is you know how familiar they are with the rebate program.

Jason Talford 28:50

Umm.

Wold, Kathy 28:55

Are they interested in learning more about energy efficiency and energy saving opportunities?

And then do they have any upcoming projects, any kind of remodels or equipment replacement that they're doing, so that hopefully we can jump in and that point where we see that they're getting ready to do a project or ready to do equipment replacement and just make sure that they're aware of energy saving opportunities through Intermountain?

Jason Talford 29:04

OK.

Wold, Kathy 29:17

Yeah, good question.

Jason Talford 29:18

OK.

Wold, Kathy 29:18

Sorry, that wasn't clear there.

Jason Talford 29:19

So it's the customer projects, not the not the utility got it.

Wold, Kathy 29:20

Hmm.

Yes, exactly.

Jason Talford 29:22

Thank you.

Wold, Kathy 29:23

Yeah.

Thanks for asking.

OK, alright.

We'll move on to the program admin update and we'll go over to Cody.

Thompson, Kody 29:36

Yeah.

So I gotta give a little bit of an update on our customer web app.

When we met last time we talked about that this was something that we were working on and going to be deploying soon.

We did deploy it mid March, so customers are now able to apply for rebates through their Intermountain Gas Online account directly.

Previously we were using a third party for processing online application forms, so by moving it internally, you know we're removing that third party provider, reducing risk to customer data going forward because all of that data is now received and have directly by Intermountain.

Umm the data also populates automatically with some of their customer information, which streamlines the applying process as well as the internal processing, because that data comes in directly to us where we've got correct addresses and information tied to our system to ensure they are customer and brought indirectly.

We do still have where applications can be submitted by email or through the Postal Service with our standard paper application form that we've got available since we've deployed this, we have averaged about 15 applications submitted per week that is on par with what we were seeing with the old process.

So customers have just continued on as they did before.

So it hasn't led to any disruption or?

Reduction in Customer submissions through an online method.

Another enhancement that came of this is that customer information on our internal side as far as applications are concerned, does get sent in a limited capacity to the call center.

So if someone calls and talks to an agent of the call center to say, did you get my rebate?

The agent can see that we have received a rebate and communicate that to the customer directly as well.

Laura Conilogue 31:30

So I have a question real quick.

So does it.

I mean, have you gotten any feedback yet from any customers saying this was really helpful, that they that they like this app or, you know has, has there been any feedback

about it or or even from I guess you guys like people, someone from Intermountain Gas, if they're like pulling up applications now is information easier for them to find?

Thompson, Kody 32:00

Uh, yeah, yeah, I'll say.

On the internal side, it has made things easier in the sense that the old online service we were using, we had to manually enter in the data into our system where it's all imported in directly.

So we it just requires review that the data is accurate, correct and we have what we need to proceed with one from the customer side of things.

We haven't really received a whole lot of feedback.

The the biggest indicator we have there is just that the number of submissions is on par with what we were seeing before through that method.

Laura Conilogue 32:35

Cool.

Thank you.

Wold, Kathy 32:38

I'll add we have from an internal side we can see when a customer starts a rebate application and it maybe isn't getting finished and finally like pushed the submit button so it gets pushed through to us.

So Kody has been doing some proactive outreach to these customers just to say, hey, we see that you started an application, do you need help?

Is there something where you just looking and gives a couple of options so that we know whether a customer needs help applying?

Or maybe they were just kind of poking around, and so it's now sitting out there in this sort of status of incomplete and they can withdraw it or tell us that no, I wasn't really applying. I was just looking and so you can delete that.

And so we have tried to do some proactive communication with folks as we see some of those rebates out there.

Laura Conilogue 33:29

That's.

Yeah, that sounds like it's working really well then.

Wold, Kathy 33:33

Yeah.

Trying to give customers the easy button, so hopefully we're achieving that through the web app so.

E any other questions about the customer web app before I move on?

Yeah, Jason.

Jason Talford 33:50

Yeah, I'll jump in.

I think in the previous EESC we had a we had a slide on a rejected rebates and.

Some statistics on like if they were denied or if they were returned or something like that.

Is it?

Do we have data on how that's changed since you've deployed that or is it maybe a bit early?

Wold, Kathy 34:20

I'll defer to Kody, but I would.

Yeah, I'll.

I'll defer to you, Kody.

Thompson, Kody 34:24

Yeah, I'll, uh, I'll, I'll say yeah, maybe a little early to see how that may have changed.

Wold, Kathy 34:31

Yeah.

Thompson, Kody 34:31

I could definitely pull in and get some numbers.

And just kind of see when we meet next to see how that's kind of evolving and changing, that's something I do have access to.

See and track uh.

But nothing that I have readily available for you today.

Jason Talford 34:48

Yeah, no worries.

Thank you.

Thompson, Kody 34:50

Yeah.

Wold, Kathy 34:56

OK, alright.

We'll move on to special studies, and I'm gonna turn this over to min.

Park, Min 35:03

Yep.

Uh, just have a couple updates on the MB where working with Adm and we have an estimated final report expected July 12th of this year and we'll file with the next prudency filing.

It is uh, tentatively expected to be presented the findings in July by Adm, and we're also going to be conducting a process evaluation which may not be done at the same time as the impact evaluation, and we don't plan to hold the prudency filing for the process evaluation final report.

Wold, Kathy 35:45

Thanks, men.

Any any questions about human me?

Jason Talford 35:51

Yes.

So a question on on the process evaluation was that is, is that kind of paired with the impact like ADM's running them simultaneously or are they kind of a separate and valuation?

I'm I'm seeing a nod, Kathy. So.

Wold, Kathy 36:09

Yes, that's they're two separate.

We have two separate scope of work defined for the impact evaluation and the process evaluation.

We felt like the impact evaluation was the higher priority, so they were working on that one first.

Anything else?

OK.

We're we're going.

Any other questions about the update this quarter?

Laura Conilogue 36:52

I guess this is Laura from the PC and a back to the EM and V update.

So if you're getting the final report July, when do you think you'll start making updates to programs that you've you know that that might be suggested from the EMV?

When do you think?

Yeah.

Wold, Kathy 37:16

Yeah.

Laura Conilogue 37:17

Like will we see maybe some of those updates when we get the prudency filing or do you think it will be?

Too soon?

Wold, Kathy 37:26

That's a good question.

Laura Conilogue 37:27

By the time you file.

Wold, Kathy 37:28

Yeah, I think we'll want to probably absorb the results of the human V impact evaluation and do presentation with the stakeholder group to determine kind of how to move forward and any kind of program changes that we want to make.

We'd certainly want to preview that with the stakeholder committee as well.

Umm, when we make some changes, I guess we have to think about uh timing.

Like if we were gonna retire an offering or bring on a new offering, how to most logically do

that?

I guess so, but we will certainly keep the stakeholder committee involved in that process.

Laura Conilogue 38:11

OK, cool.

So we can expect kind of a presentation about this and July or August or something cool.

Cool.

Wold, Kathy 38:17

Yeah.

Yeah, we'll definitely have Adm join to present the results of the study.

So we'll have a chance to ask them some questions and hear from them directly and then think about how to what do we do with the results like, yeah, So what is the study mean?

Laura Conilogue 38:28

I'm nice.

OK, great, great.

Wold, Kathy 38:35

Yeah. Yeah.

Good.

That's a good segue, Laura here, cause the next meeting is sort of a question mark right now.

So and the study is underway, Adm is working on that.

And you know, barring any challenges that they have with any of the data or any hang ups that we have in scheduling, it's anticipated to be done in July.

And so we wanna coordinate with Adm to be able to present those results.

And so we will get notice out on the next meeting just as soon as we possibly can.

I just don't have it Date: to put out there on the calendar yet, so we'll do that just as soon as we know it and make sure that that works for the stakeholder committee.

Umm.

Right.

Well, we'll keep it short and sweet.

Today I put a lot of time on the calendar.

I never know how many questions or how much we'll have there, so we'll keep it short and sweet today and less anybody has any other questions.

That's really all we have from our side today.

OK, great.

OK, hearing none, please feel free to reach out to us anytime with any questions or feedback you have for the program.

Otherwise, watch for a calendar request from me about the next meeting and we'll hear from Adm and results of the study and go forward from there.

Jason Talford 40:07

Alright, thank you for your time everybody.

Wold, Kathy 40:07

OK.

Jason Talford 40:08

Have a good day.

Wold, Kathy 40:08

Thanks everybody.

Laura Conilogue 40:09

Yeah.

Wold, Kathy 40:09

Appreciate it.

Laura Conilogue 40:10

Thanks, Kathy.

Thomas Jensen 40:10

Thank you.

Laura Conilogue 40:10

Thank you.

Scantling, Preston 40:11

Thanks everyone.

Wold, Kathy 40:11

Thanks for joining.

Thompson, Kody 40:11

Thanks everyone.

Kimberly Loskot 40:12

Thank you.

Michael Shepard 40:14

Thank you.

Lauren Marcus 40:15

Thank you.

Q3 EESC Meeting: August 27, 2024

Wold, Kathy 0:06

Alright, so we'll start this morning.

We have a lot to cover.

So we will start with a safety moment.

We'll address parking lot topic from last meeting.

We'll have an update on the writer balance and some upcoming promotions, program promotions, and then we'll kind of jump into the meat of this meeting, which is a presentation on the EMV impact evaluation from Adm Associates.

So we'll get started.

I turn it over to Cody for our safety moment.

Thompson, Kody 0:38

Yeah.

So uh this morning wanted to focus a little bit about insect borne illnesses.

You know, we've got West Nile in the valley and temperatures get a little bit milder, so most might be spend more time outside in the evenings or the patio when they're more active.

So some tips to help prevent some of those insect stings and bites would be to wear clean, light colored clothing that covers as much light as possible.

Make sure you're sharing bathing daily and avoiding these perfume soaps, shampoos and deodorants.

Know uh.

Have to loans or perfumes.

Make sure you got clean and dry work area.

Make sure you're doing daily skin checks and use insect repellent with 20 to 50% DEET on your exposed skin.

If you happen to be in a field where you use fire resistant clothing like some of our text do, there is a recommendation not to apply deep products, but there are other uses out there, so just be safe out there.

Do what you can to avoid getting bit by bugs as you enjoy your your barbecues and evening activities.

Wold, Kathy 1:42

Thank you, Cody.

We'll jump into some parking.

We actually just had one parking lot topic from last meeting and since we were trying to be efficient and save on time this meeting, we didn't do our typical icebreaker introduction activity.

So if you have to jump in with a question, maybe introduce yourself.

Just say who you are in the organization you're with.

Just so we're all aware, appreciate that.

OK.

So I'll turn it back over to Cody for the parking lot topic from last meeting.

Thompson, Kody 2:14

Yeah.

So we had a question about whether the amount of rejected rebate applications had been had changed since the customer web app had been implemented.

It's a little bit early to say whether that's had any great impact on applications during second quarter.

We did receive 30 fewer applications that were rejected then quarter one, which is about a 10% decrease.

That said, the primary purposes of the web app have been to provide a more secure application method for customers wanting to apply online.

By removing the use of a third party software and to provide an easy self serve application through their customer online account.

Wold, Kathy 2:51

Great.

Alright, thanks Cody.

All right, we'll turn to the writer balance update and again, back to Cody.

Thompson, Kody 3:05

Yeah, top heavy meeting for me this morning.

Yeah.

So for the residential rider writer balance, we did end quarter two with 1,919,667 and \$0.40 over collected.

You can see that as a downward trend from quarter one, but where we are still above the beginning of the year balance halfway through the year, we did file to for a decrease for the residential rider balance.

And same thing with commercial.

Those youth, even in these, shouldn't be any surprise.

That's continued to trend upwards, ending quarter two with \$1,029,904.74 over collected and we have filed to reduce this collection rate as well.

Wold, Kathy 3:56

Alright, thanks for the update there, Cody.

All right, I'm going to turn it over to Preston for update on some upcoming promotions.

Scantling, Preston 4:05

Thanks, Kathy.

Yep.

So I'm gonna start today with our residential promotion promotions update.

I am doing kind of a brief promotions update today since we have a lot to cover, but just wanted to let everyone know really briefly that we are continuing with our ongoing promotional activities such as involvement in the building contractor associations around all of our different service areas and including the parade of homes which we've been very involved in.

Also, keep keeping on keeping up with our quarterly customer emails as well as our social media presence.

So without further ado, I'll jump into one of our more unique offerings for this year, which is our annual customer engagement activity.

We try to do 11 activity every year which combines a little bit of education for our customers along with along with a little bit of an incentive or prize.

And this year, we partnered with the Church Valley Habitat for Humanity to create a 6 video video series which shows the page visitors how to complete DIY home weatherization products or products.

Sorry, this includes projects such as doing doing a firmware like foam tape, weatherization or sorry foam tape, weather stripping.

Ohh like a like a plastic window seal or a window film for extra insulation as well as replacing your furnace filter and each one of these videos is about one to two minutes long and then customers or visitors will come in and vote for the video that they find most beneficial to them.

And then as a prize for this, we were giving away one of five \$100 gift cards to fuel their upcoming projects.

So.

So yeah, again, that's five separate gift cards of \$100 in value.

And Yep, we have all this going up on the Tuesday following Labor Day, so this upcoming

weekend, once it's over, that'll be when this launches and then it'll be running through October 4th.

And we are promoting this through a social media post.

We're doing a social media kind of campaign.

We're doing a bill insert, which is the document that you see here on the screen, and we're also doing an all customer email as you can see on the bill insert here.

We're also promoting the opt in email notifications to help bolster our email subscriber rate and make sure that those emails are still going to plenty of people here in the valley.

And yeah, we're really happy to be partnering with Habitat for Humanity on this project and doing a little Co branded promotions.

So if you have any questions about that or any of the other ongoing activities, feel free.

Let me know, but we can go ahead and hop on to the commercial side.

And same thing over here.

We're keeping it brief, but we're still doing our regular our regular outreach activities such as quarterly customer emails and event participation through organizations like ASHRAE and for upcoming activity over here, we are doing a we're doing a commercial customer survey which is which is asking all of our commercial customers about how they use natural gas and about their their interest in energy efficiency programs.

And for this, we started with a pilot to to go out to 500 customers just to get a general sense of how the how the server is gonna go and any interest.

And from here, we're going to be exploring how we roll this out to all customers with our opt in email customers, as well as a bill insert.

And I see a question here from Taylor.

Taylor Thomas 7:09

Yeah, it's, it's on the the last slide.

I was just curious as because you're saying you're doing a cobranded with Treasure Valley Habitat for Humanity.

So what exactly is the Habitat for Humanity providing in this instant?

Or they just helping you make the videos or you just talk about that a little bit more please.

Scantling, Preston 7:28

Ohh yeah yeah absolutely.

So so Habitat for many provided the on screen talent for the videos, so they had one of their members of their home repairs program.

His name was Jake, who's a great guy to work with, and he is going to be the guy that is on

screen doing all these on home repair programs and kind of walking everyone through the process of installing home weatherization products.

Taylor Thomas 7:48

Thank you.

Scantling, Preston 7:49

No worries.

And the oh, yeah.

And I should also mention there that the videos will be living on our savings tips page, but will also be living with Habitat for Humanity as well.

They'll have full access to post and share those videos.

Wold, Kathy 8:01

Why?

Scantling, Preston 8:06

Yeah, that was happening earlier too.

Wold, Kathy 8:06

Sorry my screen's going a little crazy.

I apologize, I don't know why it is doing this.

My goodness.

OK, sorry.

Give me just a moment having some technical difficulties here.

Jason Talford 8:28

They Preston this Jason Talford with the PUC.

Uh.

Maybe I'll fill the gap by asking you a question then, uh, so this is this is the for the residential side.

Scantling, Preston 8:32

Yeah.

No, no worries.

Jason Talford 8:39

That's a marketing activity or you claiming any savings on those DIY or?
Energy saving tips.

I know how many of your reports is fairly similar to that.

Scantling, Preston 8:49

Yeah.

Hmm.

Yeah.

Yeah, we are not claiming any energy savings on this project.

Jason Talford 8:55

OK.

Scantling, Preston 8:55

This is more of a promotional activity to get everyone on board and do a little bit of education.

Jason Talford 9:00

Yep, just bear.

Thank you.

Scantling, Preston 9:02

No worries.

Yep.

And then as I mentioned there for for a second, just to keep the whole thing moving.

Oh, perfect.

Yep, we're doing our survey so, so, so every respondent to our survey is gonna be sent a \$10 E gift card as a thank you for their time.

And as a little bit of incentive for completing the survey and getting more information about our commercial customers.

So if there was any information that was missed from earlier, feel free to ask.

But yeah, that kind of covers what we're doing for commercial customers at the moment.

Wold, Kathy 9:36

Right.

Great.

Thanks, Preston.

Yeah.

Scantling, Preston 9:39

No worries.

Wold, Kathy 9:39

As you mentioned, we're just kind of focusing on a more brief update from the program right now, so we can jump into a special presentation.

And but if you have any questions, certainly don't hesitate to reach out to the umm, any other Department energy efficiency department at any time.

So, OK, we're going to turn our attention to special studies.

Please.

And as I mentioned, we have a presentation from a PM on the Emin V so this is kind of the alphabet soup part of the program where we use a lot of acronyms and abbreviations.

So just a little quick review here.

EMV stands for evaluation, measurement and verification, and EMV is just one part of the E life cycle.

So that life cycle consists of program planning, program implementation and finally program evaluation.

So here we are at evaluation.

Internally, we continue, we continually evaluate how the program is doing, but we also Commission an independent third party to conduct a formal evaluation of the program.

So this is the second formal evaluation for our program and as we prepare to Commission the study, we reviewed past orders and comments and as well as the evaluation methods that other Idaho utilities are using.

So we really tried to model what they're doing in an attempt to be in line with what the other Idaho utilities are doing and what the Commission wants to see.

So with that, I will turn it over to Adm to present the results of the impact evaluation.

All stop sharing here and we'll let you take control.

Melissa Kosla 11:19

Right.

Wold, Kathy 11:23

From here.

Melissa Kosla 11:24

Thank you.

OK.

UM, can you all see the presentation?

OK, great.

Wold, Kathy 11:36

Yeah.

Melissa Kosla 11:37

Yeah.

Good morning, everyone.

Scantling, Preston 11:37

Yep.

Melissa Kosla 11:38

Thank you, Kathy, for the introduction and thank you all for dedicating time out of your day to listening to our presentation of the impact evaluation results.

Today, we're going to briefly outline our research goals, deliverables, methodology, and results across several the residential measures.

Before we get into that, I'd like to 1st just go through some brief introductions on the Adm team.

Although this slide shows the organization of the entire team working on this impact and process evaluation for today's meeting, just me and Adam are on.

My name is Melissa Kosla.

I'm a director at Adm Associates.

I've been here for about 7 years and have been managing several program level and

portfolio level impact and process evaluations in the region so that the Pacific Northwest, including I'd hope power Avista and in around gas previously and also the Regional Technical Forum.

So we have some experience there, Adam, would you like to introduce to yourself?

+18***62** 12:45

Hi, Adam Thomas.

I'm a principal at Adm Associates, so then with the Fergusons 2008 and I serve in the A in executive and advisory will over our work in Idaho, Washington and Oregon.

Melissa Kosla 13:04

Thank you, Adam.

And today we'll be going over UM in around gases evaluation objectives for this evaluation period.

The general methodology, the impact evaluation results and our recommendations for claim savings moving forward for each rebate type.

Based on our findings and precedence in the region.

And if you have any questions, feel free to jump in as we're going through with the topic, I think that'll be easier for conversation.

So for the evaluation objectives for this evaluation period, which covered August 2021 through December 2023, we were, we quantified verified natural gas savings within 9010 confidence and precision for each measure associated with realization rates.

By comparing these verified savings against the claimed and expected savings from Intermountain Gas, our next objective was to report our findings in a formal report with recommendations for each measure moving forward, and then finally, we also wanted to develop a TRM that Enron gas could use to reasonably estimate claim savings for these measures moving forward in future program years.

These unit energy savings values will be applicable to the program and Intermountain Gas customers with historical observed distribution of participation to prevent any deviations in realization rate in the future program years.

So for this tier I'm development, for each measure we will define the current state and federal regulations that may affect eligibility.

We will define the baseline and efficient values for each equipment type.

We'll identify the data sources and inputs used in these calculations in a formal format, and the methodologies outlining the final methodology and the calculation, and we'll have the value of the average participant savings using weighted inputs from the program tracking data for each measure.

We'll also include inputs for cost effectiveness, such as measure life and incremental and maintenance costs relevant to Idaho.

So we're aware that there are certain methodologies or hosted by the Commission to assess some of the measures we're going to discuss in the next few slides.

At the same time, there was an opportunity to provide provided to explore additional methods that display statistical rigor and our defensible and supported in the evaluation industry and are used by other utilities in Idaho, as Kathy mentioned.

So with this in mind, we prioritized methodologies that currently are and have been used for the same or similar measures incentivized by other utilities in Idaho, such as Idaho Power Avista and Rocky Mountain Power.

We prioritize the methods that align with the methods used by the these utilities in the same regulatory landscape to be compared and contrasted on equal ground.

So during this literature review, we confirmed that the perspective HVAC and water heating measures evaluated in Idaho used the RTF workbooks and other applicable terms with deemed savings.

We also found that the residential new construction programs implemented in evaluated in Idaho are evaluated using modeling software by comparing the as built home against current IECC code with Idaho amendments.

Umm.

And I'll get into some of these details more later, but this includes Idaho Powers residential new construction program and Rocky Mountain powers residential whole homes program.

So these two methodologies, the deemed savings and the modeling have long standing precedence in program evaluation in Idaho and in this presentation today will summarize Intermountain Gases impact evaluation results using these methods.

So although we'll be summarizing the verified savings through deemed and modeled methodologies in line with other Idaho utilities, we did conduct a billing now sees for some of these measures.

In this slide, we briefly outline our methodology for that billing analysis.

We conducted a billing nalysis per each of the measures, but not all of them displayed sufficient participation through the 2021 and 2023 program years.

The measures that had sufficient data included the 95% furnace and the smart thermostat measures, so the steps for this analysis were to 1st conduct some data cleaning by identifying homes that had isolated measure installations.

We then match the participant billing data to nonparticipant customers by matching on energy consumption trends prior to the rebated measure equipment installation.

This is prevents the score matching, which reduces bias in the treatment effect by trying to recreate a randomized control trial design.

We then conducted some validity testing to verify that the matched participant and

nonparticipant group bills in the pre period show no statistically significant differences in monthly usage.

We did this by using a T test for each month and we then ran a pre and post period billing data regression model that matched the participant and nonparticipant group which quantifies the treatment effect.

That difference between those two groups in the pre and post period, so using this treatment effect we then.

Evaluated the extrapolated annual treatment effect in the participant group.

Yeah, I see a hand up, Jason.

Jason Talford 19:40

Very briefly, I just wanted to make sure I captured a point, right.

Not all measures had sufficient participation.

It was the furnace and smart thermostat that did.

Melissa Kosla 19:50

Right, correct.

Jason Talford 19:52

OK.

And those are the only ones.

Melissa Kosla 19:54

Yes.

Jason Talford 19:54

Great.

Thank you.

Melissa Kosla 19:56

Umm.

And we'll get into some more of those numbers matter, yeah.

Taylor Thomas 20:00

One quick question, sorry.

What will you get into?

Why you couldn't do a billing analysis on the whole home later on?

Melissa Kosla 20:09

Yes.

Yeah, yeah.

Taylor Thomas 20:09

Yeah.

Thank you.

Melissa Kosla 20:11

So we'll get into more details on each of those measures in the next slides and just some background on the other methodologies we used and just in general, the billing analysis steps, umm, so separate from the billing analysis, we also calculated verified savings for each measure through deemed savings and engineering algorithms using regional inputs. We reference the Regional Technical Forum unit, energy savings workbooks and the Illinois Technical Reference Manual version 12.

For this process, we first selected a random sample of projects from each measure that met 9010, verified that the tracking data summarized the projects accurately, and then assign the correct savings values from the RTF so to and also to more accurately assess savings in the inner round gas service territory.

We utilize the participants observed billing data to calculate the participants effective full load heating hours, which effectively weighs the RTF savings to the actual observed heating requirements from Idaho or from in around gases participants and then for all the other regional inputs like Delta T, he and heating degree days, we referenced RTF workbooks which calculate which is calculated by the RTF using the regional inputs.

We then used this random sample verification to calculate a sampled realization rate and then apply that realization rate to the population.

OK, so although a lot of you may be familiar with the Regional Technical Forum already, I'll just briefly outline the organization as it is referenced several times in our presentation, the RTF is a technical advisory committee created by the Northwest Power and Conservation Council and they were funded to develop standards to verify and evaluate energy efficiency savings in the Pacific Northwest region, which includes Idaho, Washington, Oregon and Montana.

The RTF utilizes sales data throughout the entire region.

Utility program data and program evaluation results from previous reports in the area to produce regional level verified savings for measures that are being rebated in the by the utilities in the area.

Currently they have savings values for over 80 measures, but they always explore additional measures to integrate into their workbooks as well.

Many utilities currently fund the RTF research goals, such as Puget Sound, Idaho Power, Pacific Power, Avista, Seattle Gas and many more.

So it's a very useful resource for evaluation in the area.

Our team has directly included RTF supported values in our evaluation reports for several of the clients I just listed as well.

OK, so now that we have some more background and about the methodologies we are going to be going over the measure level savings and our recommendations for each measure moving forward.

So the first on the list is the residential storage tank, water heaters.

Intermountain Gas incentivizes for a storage tank.

Water heater is less than or equal to 55 gallons and larger than 55 gallons.

The RTF assigns savings for this measure by identifying whether the equipment is condensing or non condensing and powered or nonpowered with the non condensing Energy Star storage tanks, water is displaying RTF savings of about 25 therms and the condensing Energy Star units at 55 therms O in our document verification we found that most of the rebated water heaters were non condensing.

By assessing each model numbers are documents.

So we compared the 38 therms claimed for this measure to the 25 therms verified for this measure.

For the smaller size, which leads to about a 66% realization rate.

Umm, we found that the majority of the water heaters that are larger than 55 gallons did not meet Energy Star qualifications, which led to significantly lower savings for this measure as we see here with the 5.5% realization and the claim savings for some background were estimated using the Mid Atlantic TRM which defines different efficient and baseline values than the RTF does.

But one of the main differences that the RTF incorporates is something called the market practice baseline.

That means that the baseline efficiency for each of the measures represents the average efficiency that a customer in the region would have installed had they not participated in a program.

So this is calculated using regional sales data rather than the minimum federal baseline for Efficiency for that measure.

Umm.

And also to answer the question about not having insufficient data for billing analysis for this measure there were only about 80 rebates completed across the storage tank.

Water heaters to conduct a robust billing analysis.

We require at least 100 a 150 participants after billing, cleaning data steps are completed, so this didn't meet that requirement.

That requirement.

So there weren't enough customers or billing data to compare and a billing analysis.

+18***62** 26:35

I'm Melissa.

I just wanna add one time.

This is Adam Thomas at Adm I just wanna add a quick item about the above 55 gallons.

Melissa Kosla 26:39

Yeah.

+18***62** 26:42

A large issue of the savings for this was also that at that size a much more stringent federal code because it takes effect, essentially eroding about 90% of the savings potential.

And that is a main driver of, you know, of of an average being applied across system types.

Why there is such a stark difference between the you know, a deflection point?

Tapping the 55 gallon Mark, which culminates in a recommendation we're writing of excluding those models from the program going forward at that size and above as essentially having been, you know, fully addressed by federal code rather than requiring a program intervention.

Melissa Kosla 27:31

Yeah, Taylor.

Taylor Thomas 27:33

Umm, I think you said you had 88 customers.

After the billing cleaned up.

So how many customers did you like?

Do you eliminate when you're cleaning up the data, I guess.

Melissa Kosla 27:46

Bella's 88 customers at the outset, so after the billing data cleaning steps there would be fewer than that.

I don't have that number on me right now, but it maybe would have reduced by 40% this based on pre period requirements and post period requirements.

Taylor Thomas 28:08

So on average, if you were to do a study on this, you'd probably need about 100 and 4000 and 50 participants to do a billing analysis on this.

Melissa Kosla 28:19

Yeah, somewhere around that number.

It would depend the number of customers that would drop wouldn't be consistent year to year, but having that many at the outset would be a good indicator.

Taylor Thomas 28:23

No.

Melissa Kosla 28:33

You could try a billing analysis.

Taylor Thomas 28:36

Thank you.

Melissa Kosla 28:39

Yeah.

And thank you, Adam, for that clarification.

I was going to detail that in this slide, but you beat me to it.

So based on our findings for this measure, we know worries.

+18***62** 28:49

Alright.

Melissa Kosla 28:52

We recommend that Intermountain Gas align.

There is storage tank, water heater, umm, claim savings energy to the Regional Technical forum workbooks.

And because the larger than 55 gallon storage tank water heater is have much more stringent energy efficiency requirements than the smaller water heaters, the opportunity for savings is to reduce significantly by about 90% as Adam said.

And therefore, we recommend that Intermountain Gas remove incentives for the large storage tank water heaters and this action will effectively follow the natural market transformation already taking place in the region.

We also recommend that Intermountain Gas consider tiered incentives offerings for condensing versus non condensing water heaters, since the condensing heaters save over two times the energy then the non connecting water heaters.

Before I move on to the next measure, are there any more questions?

Yeah, Jason.

Jason Talford 30:01

Yeah, I'll jump in with one.

Actually, the previous side, the final bullet point on the left there, one of 17 sampled larger than 55 gallon water heaters.

This uh Energy Star or RTF standards required is that.

I'm trying to wrap my head around that is that to say that only one of the 17 sampled water heaters?

Met the requirements of the rebate.

Melissa Kosla 30:33

Not of the rebate.

So the RTF has measure specifications that may be different than the way that the program is set up.

So the RTF may have like more stringent requirements than the program, but since they evaluate the energy savings based on.

Sometimes to higher requirements than the way that we evaluate to those measures would have to meet those requirements as well.

So for this, the program didn't exactly align with the RTF standards.

For example, the program doesn't require it to be Energy Star certified, so if we align it with

the RTF then that meets on the rebated sample only meets one or one project met that requirement.

Jason Talford 31:28

OK, I think I got it.

+18***62** 31:29

And it it's also the case.

Jason Talford 31:30

Appreciate it.

+18***62** 31:31

It's also the case that to meet Energy Star above 55 gallons is incredibly difficult, again because of how much more stringent the code is to begin with.

So to be above that code is at 55 at above 55 gallons is is exceedingly difficult for a model to align with and so that's why the item identified in the slide here by Melissa is strictly for the large category.

Melissa Kosla 32:02

Yes.

And the lower category all of them were verified to be Energy Star.

That's why the verified savings per unit is 25.2 therms which is exactly in line with the RTF average value.

Taylor Thomas 32:20

Do we know how many of the participants had water heaters above 55? Don't.

Melissa Kosla 32:30

Yeah.

So it looks like almost half of them, 36 out of the 8886.

Taylor Thomas 32:40

Yeah.

Melissa Kosla 32:48

I'll move on to the tankless water heaters.

Umm.

So Intermountain Gas incentivizes tankless water heaters using a tiered approach. The RTF assigns regional savings for this measure based on whether the equipment is Energy Star certified or not.

Non Energy Star certified water heaters are assigned 46 therms per unit while Energy Star certified is assigned 60 therms per unit.

So compared to the claimed savings of 65 and 58 therms per unit respectively, the realization rates we found for this measure was 90 and 82% for a tier one and Tier 2.

The claim savings were previously estimated using Efficiency mains term.

Umm.

And for this measure, we also recommend to align with other utilities in the region that in around gas estimate claim savings using the RTF water heater workbooks moving forward.

Umm, there were only a few measures.

There were a number of projects that didn't meet Energy Star, but it didn't look like it doesn't look like it affected too much of the varified savings as we see for tier one it's about 59 which is close to 60 and then Tier 2 at 47.

So some of those did meet Energy Star.

And so for our recommendation for this measure, we recommend in round gas, remove the Tier 2 incentives which like the storage tank, water heaters will encourage customers to follow the natural market shift as that's already occurring.

Finally, we also recommend that Intermountain Gas consider offering a tiered incentive approach instead of for unit energy or UEF Efficiency.

Aligning that measure specification with the RTF workbook based on whether or not they are Energy Star certified because they do show differing unit energy savings values.

Before I move on to boilers, are there any questions for this measure?

OK.

Umm so for the boiler measure?

Jason Talford 35:18

Turn me, Melissa.

Melissa Kosla 35:18

Umm yeah.

Jason Talford 35:19

I did find it question, sorry I wanted to get this in before we took off.

Melissa Kosla 35:23

Yeah.

Jason Talford 35:25

So previously you'd mentioned that sample size is a consideration.

Did the tier one with 1500 rebates have enough samples to, uh, make a full analysis?

Or did that get paired down too much?

Melissa Kosla 35:43

Yeah, there, there were enough participants to conduct a billing analysis, but for this measure specifically, we didn't find any statistically significant differences between the participating and non participating group.

So therefore, we couldn't verify savings based on that method.

Jason Talford 36:02

OK.

Thank you.

Melissa Kosla 36:08

Thank you for the question.

And then umm, so for the boilers, umm, and the combination boilers, which we'll be talking about next, there are no defined RTF savings.

Therefore, to evaluate this measure, we utilize the engineering algorithms used in across several technical reference manuals specifically for this case, we reference the Illinois TRM version 12.

Although we use the Illinois team engineering algorithms, we pulled regional inputs where applicable from other RTF workbooks such as the AFUE baseline market practice baseline.

The EFLH assumptions were estimated using actual participant, customer billing data and for this measure we verified average measure savings at 103 therms per unit, which is about 65% of the claim savings value of 159 therms per unit.

The claim savings were estimated using the Illinois Tiem version 7, so we used a more

updated version of that same workbook and umm for this measure we recommend claim savings in the future estimated using the updated version 12 Illinois TRM with RTF inputs. So it's more applicable to Intermountain Gas customers and.

The EFLH verified by the evaluator, which will be using in the term development.

Any questions on boilers before I moved to combination?

OK.

Umm, so same thing with combination boilers.

We used the Illinois Tiram with regional inputs, UM, regional inputs for this one also included delta temperature and UM also the UEF baseline.

So for this measure, we verified average measure savings at 168 therms per unit, which is about 108% of the claim savings value of 155.

The claim savings were sourced again from the Illinois TRM.

The differences between those input values differ by the EFLH value and then the baseline assumptions, so we recommend claim savings in the future.

Our estimated using the RTF inputs and EFLH verified by the evaluator.

Again, same as boilers to remain consistent across the measures and within the region.

OK, so I'm assuming we'll have a lot more discussion in the next three measures, which is the smart thermostats, the furnaces and the whole home rebates.

So these three measures were specifically discussed in previous conversations where additional evaluation methodology exploration would be considered.

So before we dig into the results for the smart thermostat measure, I thought it would be useful to refer you specifically how the other utilities in Idaho evaluate this measures, since it is a common measure throughout the Idaho portfolios.

In this chart, we can see that Idaho Power and Avista evaluate their smart thermostat measures using the RTF connected thermostat.

Workbooks claimed savings are also defined using this resource.

Umm, which make the realization rates lack deviation too far from 100%.

Adm has conducted these evaluations for Idaho at power and Avista Utilities as well.

Furthermore, the Rocky Mountain Power utility evaluates savings for smart thermostats using deemed savings from the technical Reference library.

3A Pacific Oratorium, and therefore this is there's precedence for this measure to be evaluated using deemed savings values.

Additionally, the last row in the table summarizes how the RTF estimates its regional savings values, which includes a meta analysis of several different evaluations in the region to produce a single value applicable to the utilities in the region.

So now that we have some background on the precedence of evaluation methods for this measure, we summarize here the results of two distinct analysis that we had run for this measure.

Method One summarizes the deemed savings values which reference the RTF workbooks and the then method 2 summarizes the billing analysis savings by comparing participant customer billing data to nonparticipant customer billing data before and after that installation.

So the RTF assigns about 24 to 27 therms per unit depending on heating zone of the home. Umm.

We found the average savings for the participants to be less than 21 therms using the RTF solely because a number of these smart thermostats pamphlets didn't meet the RTF requirements.

Specifically, the requirement it didn't meet was occupancy sensors and we do see this issue a lot for other utilities as well.

Since this requirement isn't typically a requirement in program implementation implementation, it's only a requirement in the RTF workbooks.

On the other hand, we found that billing analysis resulted in over 27 therms per unit, which does align very closely with the RTF savings.

Umm.

And because there is a presence for that RTF Dean savings for this measure for this measure as well, we recommend Intermountain Gas use the RTF workbook to evaluate savings in the future.

And it is.

Uh, I'm glad they kind of align and in savings values as well.

So that kind of shows that there is, umm, observable savings in the household energy consumption reduction.

Umm, so a little bit more detail about the billing analysis of these smart thermostats.

Umm, one of the reasons we recommend the RTF workbooks moving forward is because although this measure is highly used by Intermountain Gas customers, there is large participation in this program with about 2000 customers applying for a rebate between 2021 and 2023.

Many of the participating customers do not have sufficient pre period billing data to remain in the billing analysis.

We can see this the fact with the highlighted blue row.

Umm, where we see a large portion of the treatment group drops from the cleaning steps, which requires at least nine months of prepared data.

So we see a reduction of about 58% of those treatment customers and although the measure, the regression model does show a good fit as displayed by the adjusted R-squared value on the table and the right, the analysis shows that we are effectively quantifying half of the typical customers savings, half of the customers that don't have that nine month pre period data requirement are being left out of this evaluation effectively.

And therefore there's potential for this bias in the analysis that we are unable to correct for or reverse the sharp decline in the number of homes without nine months of prepared data are essentially buying biasing.

This analysis we're only looking at customers with consistent occupancy and therefore we're effectively removing customers that have recently moved into their home or customers who have recently purchased new construction homes.

It also requires the assumption that the billing now SIS results quantified from the homes with consistent occupancy and existing homes also applies to customers that do not have consistent occupancy, which is simply not the case.

Renter homes are not consistent and behavior with long standing occupancy homes umm and in occupancy does not occur randomly.

So those are some of the of the reasons supporting our recommendation for moving forward with RTF savings for this measure.

We recommend to align evaluation methods with other Idaho Power or Idaho utilities and use the RTF workbook.

This allows for programs to be treated equally in Idaho and allow comparison across the utilities with methods that are supported by all parties, and this this aligns with the savings that we displayed in the previous slide was savings at 21 therms per unit for this measure.

Before I move on to the furnace measure, are there any questions about the smart thermostats?

Yeah, Jason.

Jason Talford 46:07

Sure.

I had a few here, so maybe I'll throw out one or two and then and I want to make sure I don't dominate the time and other people find their questions that I'll let them take the stage.

Ah, I wanted to.

Uh start.

That's uh, that's the last slide.

That phrase, potential bias that is unable to be reversed or rectified.

I wanted to get a little clarification.

Is that bias that?

Uh, implicit to the fact that we're running a billing analysis?

Or is that bias that's introduced by program design?

I guess I have a bit of knee jerk reaction to it and I'm curious if.

Changes in program design could counteract that bias.

Melissa Kosla 47:05

Right.

So for a lot of downstream measures, well, the typical, the ideal experimental method to evaluate unbiased treatment effect is to use a randomly randomized control trial, which is you take a group of customers, you randomly assign them into treatment or control group. Half of them get treatment, half of them don't, and that way you can verify that these customers are randomly distributed.

There's no customers that are self selecting into the treatment group for downstream measures.

We, like, we just can't do that unless somebody signs up for a rebate and you deny them if deny half of them effectively.

So the way that a billing analysis tries to recreate that randomized control trial is to create a control group after the fact.

Umm.

Which we can try our best to reduce bias as much as possible by, umm.

Propensity score matching or matching the treatment pre period energy consumption behaviors to nonparticipating customers, but we can't completely eliminate that bias.

There's going to be behaviors and characteristics that we just don't have data for.

Umm.

And things that potentially are unable to be quantified.

Umm.

So just billing analysis with that experimental post hoc design includes that type of bias.

And then additionally, there's an additional bias introduced because over half of the customers don't have sufficient pre period billing data, which means that some of the customers are different from other customers and we can't include all of those customers in this billing analysis.

+18***62** 49:01

It's been I would just wanna note here.

Melissa Kosla 49:02

So there's like a.

+18***62** 49:04

Sorry, I'm looking at something.

Melissa Kosla 49:06

Yes, go ahead.

+18***62** 49:07

So that the RTF workbook values are based off of, you know, a somewhat of a meta analysis of a larger number of billing data studies in the region.

They're not, you know, some to the wind engineering algorithm.

And So what we've kind of gleaned from our results here is that.

The the results of the billing analysis for smart thermostats that we had found put things in the in the, you know, relative universe of the values output from, you know the RTF workbooks and some of the items that you know Melissa is describing in terms of, you know when you're you have to remove, you have to remove households because of lack of data et cetera, et cetera.

You know when you get to absolute large enough numbers at the scale of sort of the whole, you know, region of values examined when going into something like the RTF deemed workbooks, it's it you start being able to overcome those to a greater degree than you can when looking at a single utility in isolation.

And you know, I look at the table values of our method one and method two of which is looking at the RTF and then looking at the Intermountain specific customers.

And I conclude that what's happening with Intermountain is within, you know, again within reasonable boundaries of what's happening, you know, of of, of where our TfL found savings values to land.

And that's without.

And knowing who we had to exclude, but seeing that what's left is still within reasonable boundaries of that, that's kind of one of the, you know, reasons why we see some value in in you know use sourcing savings based off of the the meta analysis of regional savings that went into the into these workbooks.

Jason Talford 51:10

OK.

Thank you.

So I guess to to kind of recap, Melissa, what I'm hearing is that there is some bias from the evaluation methodology because it couldn't be that randomized control trial, but there's also.

The the exclusion of some participants because of the the data requirements, so it's a little bit of both.

+18***62** 51:31

Yeah, I am a little bit of both.

Melissa Kosla 51:32

Right.

+18***62** 51:34

It's more so who we excluding and by the nature of you know the constraints of the study, we have a very good sense of what a smart thermostat says in a home that is consistently occupied.

And when you think of a a type of home that is versus isn't consistently occupied, you know the the that factor is not demographically random.

Jason Talford 52:00

Umm yeah.

And and yes to your to your points there.

I yeah, I I think that's all well taken.

More so, I just wanna make sure I capture them all this summary properly.

I think your your final point that the RTF value and the billing analysis came out.

Uh.

Within reasonable boundaries, as you said, yeah, they're they're pretty close together.

So I think that kind of helps away a lot of the concerns.

Melissa Kosla 52:36

Yeah.

Great.

Umm yeah, there are those two introduced biases that are kind of common with billing analysis.

The first one is very common with billing analysis.

The second depends on the customer group.

So for this customer group, we found that because half of the customers don't have pre period billing data, they're most likely new move INS or new construction homes.

Umm, we can't effectively quantify or extrapolate the savings to all the customers?

Jason Talford 53:14

Yeah.

Can I?

Yeah, actually just answered another one of the questions I had been sitting on it.
Is that it?

Melissa Kosla 53:19

No.

Jason Talford 53:19

Reasonable conclusion.

It's maybe build that's or.

Umm, you know, it's a smart thermostat and a new build.

Umm.

With this kind of analysis that you're running account for interactions with a little bit later than the whole home program.

Melissa Kosla 53:40

Umm so for this billing analysis we focused on only isolated smart thermostat installation.

So this wouldn't interact with any other rebates.

Any other rebates, savings.

Was that your question?

Jason Talford 53:57

Yeah, that's exactly it.

Preciate it you can have.

Melissa Kosla 53:59

OK.

Jason Talford 54:02

Let's see.

Yeah, I only have one more, but I'll make sure to leave the floor open for a few seconds.

Melissa Kosla 54:14

Yeah, I think you can go ahead.

Jason Talford 54:17

Appreciate it.

Wanna be conscious of that?

Melissa Kosla 54:20

Yeah.

Jason Talford 54:21

Did the evaluation that you ran distinguish between?

Contractor installed and self installed smart thermostats.

Melissa Kosla 54:33

For this, umm, billing analysis, we did not and then for the umm RTF workbook those values are the same for installed and contractor installed self installed.

Jason Talford 54:54

Gotcha. Life.

Ink.

That's all I had for you.

Appreciate that the answers.

Melissa Kosla 55:00

Yeah.

Thank you.

OK.

So next we'll move on to the Umm 95% Fe furnaces.

So here we summarized the results of.

Sorry.

Umm, the way the other utilities in Idaho evaluate their HVAC programs, HVAC measures is through the RTF teams savings workbooks as well.

None of the these utilities incentivized for a natural gas furnace furnaces specifically, but

they do incentivize for other space heating measures using the RTF or, in the case of Rocky Mountain power, using the deemed savings from the TRL.

Therefore, there's also precedence for this measure to be evaluated using deemed savings values.

UM, the RTF quantifies their regional savings values using an aggregation of several seem modeling results or meta analysis.

Also, billing analysis that quantify a single savings value applicable to the region.

So depending on the measure it differs what methodology they use to quantify that value.

Umm, but for the RTF.

For the natural gas furnaces, I believe those are calculated using seem modeling.

And so for the results of the furnace rebates, UM, we summarize the two distinct analysis we run for this measure.

Again, measure one is the deemed savings result using the RTF workbooks and method two is using the billing analysis.

By comparing participant and nonparticipant billing data, the RTF assigns 27 to 55 therms per unit for our natural gas furnaces.

Depending on the Efficiency tier and heating zone of the home, umm, we found the average savings for the participant to be about 44.

Therms using this team savings workbook, the 87 therms claimed value was calculated using the Illinois Tier M version seven so the main difference between those two values is the difference in baseline energy efficiency assumptions.

The RTF uses the market practice baseline, which is a quite a bit higher than the minimum it federal standard efficiency UM, while the Illinois Tier I'm uses that met federal minimum standard.

For the method two, we found that the billing analysis resulted in 32 therms per unit UM, which is again kind of in the same ballpark as that that RTF savings.

And because there is precedence for the RTF Dean savings for this measure, other Idaho utilities are also using deemed approaches for their space heating measures.

We also recommend that Intermountain Gas use the RTF workbooks to evaluate savings for this measure and getting into some of the again details of the billing analysis results similar to the smart thermostats.

Umm, that introduced bias of reduction of treatment group customers after requiring nine months of pre period billing data.

We also see this effect where the treatment group drops by about 60% from that cleaning step.

And again, although the model shows a good fit as displayed by the user .77 adjusted square value, umm, this analysis that we're displaying here effectively quantifies half of the

typical customer savings.

The other half of the typical customer, we're not really sure what their savings estimate would look like because they are not included in this analysis similar to the previous measure.

So.

There's also that bias introduced to this billing analysis for the smart for the furnaces, many of the homes lack sufficient prepared billing data due to new construction or new move in customers.

So therefore the same conclusion we came to for the smart thermostats.

We recommend that Intermountain Gas align the umm the verified savings to other Idaho utilities and use the RTF workbook to estimate gas savings for this measure.

Again, this allows programs to be comparable and contrasted between the utilities that offer similar measures and this recommended approach aligns with the savings verified savings that we provided in the previous slide, summarizing savings at about 44 therms per unit for the 95% furnaces.

Before I move on to a whole homes, are there any questions about this furnace analysis?

Jason Talford 1:00:28

Sure.

I'll jump in with one.

So just as a.

Melissa Kosla 1:00:31

Yeah.

Jason Talford 1:00:34

It's for a Saturday.

Check for me it may be a redundant question.

That's fine.

You can tell me it's redundant and all except that, uh, is all of the difference that we're seeing between the RTF and the billing analysis attributable to that, that data bias that we're seeing or are there other factors that are and pushing those verified therm savings apart?

Melissa Kosla 1:01:04

Yeah, it could.

There could be other characteristics that attribute to that difference in savings between the RTF and our observed billing analysis results.

Some of them are unquantifiable in existing data.

Some of them are just larger factors that could be affecting the particular evaluation period could be affecting the particular participant group.

There could be a number of factors.

The one that we are able to identify is the.

The lack of sufficient pre period data for large number of the customers?

Umm, so it could be a difference in the participating group.

Perhaps the UM the billing now sees used in the RTF savings are.

Have a larger sample size so it kind of reduces those biases, whereas we're kind of limited by the participation in the past two years.

Umm, that was just a long winded way to say there could.

There could be more affecting it more than the pre period requirement.

Jason Talford 1:02:21

Fair enough, could be more, but identifying, I imagine, can be difficult.

I think in this way you're more knowledgeable than these.

I'm just kind of curious it.

How would that bias change if?

There was an analysis run on.

Specifically.

I guess not new construction.

It's an existing home.

There is a reasonable amount of pre period billing data.

Would that eliminate the the bias that we're seeing here?

Or at least I guess it wouldn't eliminate it, because those houses still exist.

Melissa Kosla 1:03:11

Right.

So if we wanted to quantify the typical savings for a customer that is in an existing home that has been in the home for at least a year or two, then the billing analysis results would effectively quantify that.

But because a large portion of the purchase pants don't reflect those characteristics, we can't really reasonably alley that value to the population.

So there if we wanted to quantify, if we wanted to say like the typical savings for an existing customer is about 32 therms, we could say that.

Jason Talford 1:03:41

Umm.

Melissa Kosla 1:03:53

Because that's who's included in this analysis.

Jason Talford 1:03:56

So I'm definitely getting a little bit hypothetical on if you need to rein me in, that's fine.

Melissa Kosla 1:04:02

No, no worries.

Jason Talford 1:04:03

Umm would it be possible if?

Or have you seen this, or would there be any obvious issues with splitting?

Uh, for example.

This case, the natural gas furnace into two measures, a new construction actually gas furnace to be held separately in A and I guess more of a replacement measure for existing homes.

Melissa Kosla 1:04:33

That is a consideration that could be.

Umm.

Explored for the RTF savings, there aren't really any differing there's no specification for either Umm installation method it's they include both of those in the seem modeling analysis, so they would effectively be verified to have the same savings, but if that's something that is needed on the implementation side.

Umm, that wouldn't be an issue.

Yeah, I see Lori's hand.

Blattner, Lori 1:05:13

Hi Melissa ohm.

And and Jason, I just wanted to say don't feel bad about asking questions cause this is your chance.

So.

So we really appreciate the questions.

Umm, one thing to keep in mind.

And.

And we're gonna have more discussions on program design.

You know in the future, based based on these recommendations, but just to keep in mind.

One of the things that customers if they're if they're going to be upset about the program, I think one of the things that could trigger that frustration would be if it seems like we're treating, you know, regular customers differently than.

Umm.

Contractors or, you know, people building homes.

And so I'm not saying that we wouldn't consider, you know, a new construction rebate different from a A retrofit, but that's one of the things that we'll want to that we'll wanna talk through is how that would be perceived by customers.

So just a just a thought.

Jason Talford 1:06:31

Yeah.

No, that's a good consideration.

But yeah, I agree, that's something too.

I think explored point taken, we'll explore that later. Thanks.

Melissa Kosla 1:06:42

Yeah.

You have questions, Taylor?

Taylor Thomas 1:06:46

Yeah, mostly.

Do you mind going back just one slide?

Melissa Kosla 1:06:52

Was that the previous slide?

Taylor Thomas 1:06:52

Uh, so I guess this is just a general question about ADM's practices around residential

programs.

I'm seeing a common theme here on the first kind of bold point in the all the sub bullets underneath that of recommending of using deemed savings.

Because of these reasons, for residential programs is that a general practice across most residential programs at Adm recommends due to some of these biases that you have here.

+18***62** 1:07:21

So there's two, there's.

There's two questions there.

There's when you're doing an analysis like this.

Sorry, sorry, Melissa for jumping in, but I haven't subscribed.

Melissa Kosla 1:07:31

Yeah, go ahead.

+18***62** 1:07:33

OK, umm, there's two different types of questions of this.

You could be answering one.

Are you trying to say this is the savings that happened in the program over this period versus 2?

Are you trying to say this is the estimate that should be used on an ongoing basis?

And those two questions can be approached methodologically similarly, but and there's there's some subtleties there that kind of need to be captured, because if you're, if you're able to take all the customers in the program and do a billing analysis, I mean, you don't really and say, OK, we've measured the savings over this cohort over this year.

We don't care if it's biased because or if this is, there's a bias in this group because we know we're measuring this group adequately.

OK, great.

But if you're trying to say that doesn't necessarily mean that's the value you want to recommend for deemed savings long term going forward as a planning value.

If you have reason to think that the group you've analyzed isn't representative year over year of what's coming ahead, and so your question about our practice really sort of depends on what's the research goal.

Is it purely to look back in history or is it to make a recommendation for future planning?

Or if it's both, then sometimes we have to talk through some of these nuances because it kind of we could be giving them a stake in impression of, you know, of of holding 2

conflicting truths, 1 on the left hand, one on the right when they're both true.
But just for a different purpose.

Taylor Thomas 1:09:06

Yeah.

Thank you.

I appreciate that and it's just a general question.

I mean, ultimately all you get a lot of billing analysis results and you adjust accordingly to maybe a new deemed number and that's why the RTF pulls a lot of that data from other regional other regions within Idaho and Oregon and Washington and helps get a better estimate for the region.

So I was just curious and I appreciate the response.

Melissa Kosla 1:09:32

Yeah.

+18***62** 1:09:32

No problem.

Melissa Kosla 1:09:33

Thank you for your question.

+18***62** 1:09:33

And yeah, I would say, yeah, I'm definitely more inclined on saying, you know, if you just wanna measure a population and be done with it, you can look more insularly.

But if you're trying to plan for ongoing for the future, well, a larger regional body starts adding more value.

Melissa Kosla 1:10:01

Yeah.

Any other questions before I move on to the whole home?

OK, so this is the final measure we're going to be discussing today.

Umm, in 2021, the whole home rebates underwent requirements and incentive change instead of requiring homes to meet a certain HERS rating.

Additional, more impactful requirements were incorporated to lead to proven energy

savings.

This so these requirements in a tiered approach are listed on the Inner Mountain website and are currently in effect.

Same for both tiers, they must be hers rated.

They must have for Tier 1 below Ache 3 and for Tier 2 below 4.

The duct air handlers must be located in condition space and then for tier one it requires a 97% furnace and for Tier 2 and 95% furnace.

So for this we see most of the whole home rebates Meeting Tier 2 rather than tier one almost solely because the difficulty to purchase a 97% furnace. Umm.

And just some background, the other utilities in Idaho also offer program new residential new construction programs for customers.

Idaho Power offers a rebate to townhomes and condos and also single family homes, similar to Intermountain Gases program.

Avista offers incentives for purchasing Energy Star manufactured homes.

Rocky Mountain offers both of those.

So single family homes on a tiered approach and then also manufactured homes, the manufactured homes, umm we evaluate that prevista there's an RTF workbook for that that uses the modeling for evaluating those savings.

Those savings are much more predictable because they're are less variations in manufactured home construction on the single family home residential new construction side.

These utilities evaluate those programs using REM rate software or Ekotrope software. Essentially, the homes construction details are used as inputs to a software modeling things like furnace efficiency, window, you value, ceiling insulation, wall insulation, air sealing values.

Those inputs are modeled against a typical occupancy and whether really values dependent on the home location and they're modeled against the Energy ICC code with Idaho amendments.

So that's how other utilities evaluate their whole home programs.

The Regional Technical Forum on that last row also created a new homes protocol which defines the modeling methodology that is recommended.

The appropriate software tools and then outlines the current codes for each of the states in the service territory.

So this really lays the groundwork for evaluating new construction programs in the region approved by the RTF and therefore all the utilities that fund the RTF.

Therefore, this is the kind of precedence where moving forward with for modeling and evaluating this program.

Yeah, Jason.

Jason Talford 1:13:35

As a brief aside.

I will curious where the timeline for this portion of the evaluation is.

Did it capture?

The August 20th RTF meeting.

They had information specifically about their new homes protocol.

It I don't know if it was in time to be included in the evaluation, that's all.

Melissa Kosla 1:14:02

Umm, we were evaluating the 2021 through 2023 program years.

Are you asking if that conversation was in effect during those rebates?

Jason Talford 1:14:13

Uh.

Umm, no, it would be part of the evaluation when it was running.

When it was said, you know intaking this data and drawing these comparisons between the different utilities and RTF, and because they recently had new information on new homes protocol and I'm not sure if it's reflected.

Melissa Kosla 1:14:25

Ohh sure.

I'm not sure about that either.

I'll have to check the.

Effective date for that workbook and what updates were made.

Jason Talford 1:14:46

Yeah, the the workbook itself, the protocol hasn't changed.

But it was, and they they had some evaluations from other, uh, other states.

I think the Oregon and Wisconsin that, umm, kind of set them in a new direction so.

Melissa Kosla 1:15:03

OK.

So maybe they're moving forward with the meta analysis at some point.

Jason Talford 1:15:10

Absolutely.

It sounds like it may not have made it in that.

That's. That's alright.

Melissa Kosla 1:15:16

OK.

Yeah, I'll double check that.

Jason Talford 1:15:18

Thank you.

Melissa Kosla 1:15:20

Yeah.

Thank you.

Umm.

OK.

So umm.

For the whole homes rebates, the billing analysis was a bit more of a difficult approach because there's no prepared data to match similar homes to each other.

That introduces essentially another layer of the bias, because we can't effectively tell if the customer the control customers are similar to the participating customers, we're unable to tell they have similar behaviors.

Umm, we're working with limited housing characteristic data, so that introduces another layer of bias.

Umm, these are also new construction homes, many of which we found that have account numbers that are still associated with the builder company and therefore are likely unoccupied.

So or are still being renovated to the customers preference.

They're not the customer.

Purchasing the home hasn't moved in yet, and so exploring a billion Alexis for this measure in specific the unoccupied homes leads would lead to deflated energy consumption and also we wouldn't be able to verify the match of those participating customers and non participating customers the same way that we're able to do with these smart thermostats and the furnaces.

So it lacks that layer of validity and introduces another layer of bias that we can't really measure and can't, uh, fixed.

Umm the modeling approach, however implemented by the other Idaho utilities, can overcome these biases by modeling the homes construction to typical occupancy and typical behaviors.

So what would the home be saving once it's fully occupied?

Umm, it's also matched with the weather dependent variables with the heating and climate zone.

Umm.

Therefore, with this approach with the modeling approach, we're able to model the energy savings the home would have if it's not sitting empty in the Builders hands.

If it's fully occupied and homes that are are customers that are typical to the region are occupying these homes and using it the way a normal home would be used.

So for the evaluation results for this measure, we summarize the modeling approach results.

We incorporated the homes modeling files in Ekotrope and compared component level consumption against the same home, but built to code standards.

So the IECC 2018, this is a.

This method is in alignment with other Idaho utility residential new construction evaluation methods.

We found that Tier 1 displayed 114% realization rate and Tier 2 displayed 85%.

Realization.

Tier one only saw three rebates.

Umm.

Completed across the three year period.

UM, so a larger majority of customers are meeting that Tier 2 requirement.

We recommend this modeling approach in future impact evaluations to validate claim savings, but moving forward in order to claim the savings for a projected years, we will create a tiram section using the evaluation results from this analysis so that can be periodically readjusted based on impact Ryan results.

And again aligning yes, go ahead.

+18***62** 1:19:21

And.

Ohh, I just wanted to add one thing as far as the one examining you know non non program homes, one of the main sources of difficulty as well is it's not the same set of Builders

doing program versus non program homes and so you can have some inconsistency in builder practices that makes that comparison of the problematic.

Melissa Kosla 1:19:53

Yeah, that's a good point.

OK.

So again, aligning the evaluation methodologies with the Idaho, the utilities that are in Idaho allow for residential and new construction programs to be evaluated with the same measuring stick.

Comparing results and implementation practices among those programs and allowing for learning across each other's programs for that reason, and in addition because of the introduced bias that would result from exploring a billing analysis, we recommend following the RTF new Homes protocol, which details the modeling approach we use in this analysis.

This and it sounds like the that protocol is, umm, consistently being reviewed and updated by the parties that fund the RTF as well.

Any questions on that whole home?

Umm recommendations are analysis.

Jason Talford 1:21:16

It works.

It's like I'm the guy again.

Out Taylor had it.

Melissa Kosla 1:21:19

No worries.

Jason Talford 1:21:20

Taylor, you get in there?

I asked too many questions.

Taylor Thomas 1:21:23

You know, I it's I have questions going through my head and I'm trying to understand everything he kind of said as to why a billing analysis couldn't be done.

Umm.

And mostly trying to understand it because it was ordered for the company to conduct a billing analysis specifically for this program.

Umm, so when you're looking at, I guess I'm trying to understanding of how many non program homes that were new construction that there might have been within that and that is that even data that you can get within the company service territory?

Melissa Kosla 1:22:04

Yeah.

So that data is umm available just having customers or accounts that are newly created or and and then also pulling a permit data or new construction home data from Redfin or Zillow.

We can identify new construction homes that aren't present in the program.

Yeah, that that is available.

Taylor Thomas 1:22:35

So I guess I'm trying to understand why as to why we couldn't and I think he kind of walked through it.

But I'm not fully grasping as said why you couldn't use that as a model to compare savings for the program participants in this program for someone that maybe didn't.

I understand you mentioned you know different builders have different standards.

Umm.

But I'm just trying to get an understanding of that a little bit better.

Melissa Kosla 1:23:03

Yeah.

So that is something that we explored, but we didn't post the findings of that exploration here because the just the prerequisites for the billing analysis have so many introduced biases that we tried to present our findings here that are most in line with other Idaho utilities, umm.

And therefore the recommendation that we would have moving forward, it's not something that's impossible, it is something that wouldn't display results that are in line with the.

Observe savings.

If we were to see these whole homes fully occupied and.

Have a valid comparison group.

Basically, there's there's not a way for us to validate that control group savings.

A more robust approach would be comparing pre and post, but since that's not available

for the participants in this group because there is no prepared data, the only way to do that is to model that savings based on the homes construction and typical occupancy. Using these software programs. Does that answer your question?

Taylor Thomas 1:24:25

So kind of I think with like the occupancy, I know you're it's you're not really sure when some of these homes are occupied in theory. Wouldn't you be able to kind of tell when these homes are occupied based on the billing data?

Melissa Kosla 1:24:42

Right.
So there is the opportunity to do that.
There are.
It's kind of hard to define that cutoff line as well, like when when would you say a customer is using enough to be using? Uh.
Typical, say, typical energy consumption.
What if this customer is just a lower energy consumer?
What if they're higher energy?
Consumer, we're not really able to tell what their typical behavior is because we don't have any data supporting that.
Also, it's really hard to get information of when these homes were fully occupied separate from like just the handoff between the builder and the new account owner.

Taylor Thomas 1:25:29

And then just I guess it's just one comment and I know you mentioned a couple of times, you know looking at other Idaho utilities in their current practice. And I guess just my comment on that is yes, a lot of other Idaho utilities may be using a deemed savings, but ultimately we we still go through evaluators and do billing analysis to verify that there's deemed savings and accurate. Umm, so just a general comment like while the current practices they're using a deem savings, we're still doing billing analysis multiple times throughout the life cycles of these programs to verify that these team savings are accurate representation.

+18***62** 1:25:59

Uh.

Melissa Kosla 1:26:09

Right.

+18***62** 1:26:09

For, for for new homes specifically, it's not happening.

The billing analysis that was they comparing program homes against non program homes. I mean, I I'm open to the possibility that I've missed something, but in my review of at least the publicly available information on evaluation reports, you know, done by some other other entities that have been hired in the past, this type of analysis, you know, the new homes are pretty consistently having verified savings reported based off of energy modeling, comparing their performance to minimum code.

And that's so yes, the other measures do receive billing analysis some, some of which, many of which have been performed by us.

But the new homes is sort of a a a, a different area.

Uh, and specifically, and this is a pretty common, you know, industry wide you know phenomenon or you know fundamental pieces that you know new construction has a longer lag time before you can say there is primary data to be used.

I mean, it's even worse with commercial new construction in terms of that you have to, you know, engage in hypotheticals.

But residential as well and so.

Umm, you know?

Anyway, that's that.

That that was, that's just been my finding, you know, on the electric side, the most recent evaluation I was able to find of new residential single family, new construction efficiency was using the approach that that has been specified specified here like an energy model output.

Melissa Kosla 1:28:01

I think an important clarify.

Taylor Thomas 1:28:01

If they thank you for that and I guess just understandable and that my comment is more

general across the board for all measures you mentioned longer lag times.
Do you generally know how long of lag times that is until you can kind of reliably use that data?

+18***62** 1:28:24

So my in my experience is you know you can for residential new construction when you know from when the home is considered built, you oftentimes need three years before you could say I have a year of steady state occupancy data for a commercial, you could be looking at five years or more, especially if it's something like an office space that needs that needs time to lease out space.

Taylor Thomas 1:28:49

OK.

Thank you for that information.

Melissa Kosla 1:28:51

Umm yeah, I think.

Uh, important clarification or point to your question, Taylor Umm specifically for this measure is this isn't considered deemed savings for the whole homes rebate.

This is a specific program participation level evaluation, so a lot the way that the whole home or new construction programs are evaluated instead of using a billing analysis like you said, to see if those deemed savings are in line with the program savings every so often.

This is the way that that happens for residential new construction homes and it's basically the residential new construction version of a billing analysis.

We're looking at the homes actual construction built in the actual program year for that actual customer and then comparing it to the.

Residential building code, so it's not a general statement of saying like this program is having this amount of savings.

We're actually looking at individual homes that were rebated and sentenced through this program.

And then to confirm what you were saying, every so often billing analysis is completed.

Typically, to see if those deemed savings values for other measures like the furnaces are smart thermostats are in line with with the RTF savings.

So we do see that and do that as well.

Umm yeah, Jason.

Jason Talford 1:30:30

Right.

I wanted to return to something you were talking about with Taylor.

You mentioned that you were unable to validate control the the control group, but a little bit earlier you're you would said that data is available.

And I guess I want to do exploring that a little bit more because I don't that kind of seems counter to me of if billing data is available for a control group.

And also I assume that the company has umm data when a customer initiates service, either overtaking an existing.

You know, existing service that was maybe under a, A, a landlord or a a builder and how couldn't that data be used to validate that control group and say here's when they started.

Here's what their consumption is afterwards.

And.

Melissa Kosla 1:31:32

Right.

Yeah.

Umm so billing data for that nonparticipant group is available.

The reason why I said that we're unable to validate that control group is because although we have billing data, there's no real information that we could gather at this point that would be able to.

Say conclusively that the treatment group and the control group are similar.

Umm, because we only have post period data for a new construction homes and in the post period data we're trying to identify that treatment effect.

So we want the treatment and control group post period data to have a difference where we don't want them to have any differences as the prepared data which simply doesn't exist for billing data and new construction.

Therefore, we would supplement that with other characteristics like square footage of the home number of bedrooms.

Umm.

Zip code location.

Even if we had all that information, there would be several characteristics that we wouldn't be able to reduce bias in, such as their behavior.

So their energy consumption behavior, there's no data that we would be able to kind of aggregate or or collect that would be able to show that kind of information the same way

that pre period billing data can.
Does that kind of answer your question?

Jason Talford 1:33:07

Yeah, yeah, I think I'm.
I'm starting to understand the.
How you're struggling didn't make a group that you can properly compare. Umm.
It's starting to jog my memory. I think.
For what I was referring to a little bit earlier with the RTF meeting, I think Energy Trust of Oregon had a way that they compared them, but it may have also been in perfect but and struggling to draw that up so.

Melissa Kosla 1:33:40

OK.
Yeah, I'll definitely look into that because that sounds interesting.

Jason Talford 1:33:45

Yeah. OK.
So I guess to kind of summarize that point of why billing analysis wasn't performed, it was that seems to be the main driver is that there was no way to match a control group to the treatment group.
Is that accurate?

Melissa Kosla 1:34:06

Yeah, that's one of the main reasons.
Also, another reason was even if we were able to validly match a control group to the treatment group, it wouldn't be quantifying typical year savings just because many of those homes would otherwise be unoccupied or have very, umm, low energy consumption. That's not typical for when they're fully occupied, so therefore the lower energy consumption throughout the year would lead to lower opportunity for savings. So we even if we were able to validate a control group, we're not sure that that's what the savings would look like for a typical home.
Whereas the modeling approach overcomes those, UM, uh, those issues by modeling against uh, typical occupancy and typical behaviors and in space heating and water heating usage.

+18***62** 1:35:12

Two also, I know that Energy trust study you're referring, you know they they did a study but it was like a like a 10A study of 10 years of program implementation.

And so there was definitely a a rather expansive effort.

I don't recall it in full detail in full, you know, gory detail here, but that's something and or the program requirements that would went into their homes.

What have you?

I I will say you know most.

New construction programs are on sort of a HERS rated basis like you know you know achieve this HERS score to qualify for the program in response to our last cycle of evaluation work and in response to our recommendations, Intermountain changed the program requirements away from being HERS, driven to do these items in your home to produce natural gas savings because a lot of the elements of a, HERS score are not natural gas savings producing.

And so I would want to, sorry, it was someone asking a question.

Melissa Kosla 1:36:13

The.

No, sorry.

I was agreeing with you.

+18***62** 1:36:20

Ohh OK.

Ohh.

OK, OK.

So when we examine other studies, I would want to just make sure that that that is that that is noted that there requirements were changed because this is in keeping with you know the utility cost test of the primary screening mechanism.

The program was redesigned to be programmed that performs better under a utility cost test framework versus if you're examining, you know the policy framework and you know the motivations of energy trust of Oregon.

They're, you know, they're looking to produce a more of a societal range of benefits with a with, you know, so you know, more avenues of Efficiency are considered on the benefit side and therefore more paths to, you know, complying with program requirements are available.

Jason Talford 1:37:18

Umm yeah, that makes that makes sense.
Appreciate the context.
I guess I have a few more questions.

Melissa Kosla 1:37:32

Yeah, go ahead.

Jason Talford 1:37:34

In the comparison to other utilities. Uh.
Idaho Power and Avista had 100% realization rates from their evaluations.
But Rocky Mountain Power had a 88% net to gross ratio.
And I'm wondering if your comparison had some information on why they had that ratio typically I've seen.
Net to gross ratio is of 100% because if the program didn't exist then there would be no savings.

Melissa Kosla 1:38:10

I know that for Rocky Mountain power they applied that 88% net to gross ratio across their entire portfolio.
So not only the whole homes program, but all the other programs that they offer, I didn't look into too far about how they calculated that.
I think it was referenced from a previous impact evaluation for the company.
Yeah, I don't have very many details surrounding that.

+18***62** 1:38:38

I am, I know sometimes due to a lack of participants because of their small territory for a Rocky Mountain power, Idaho.
What happens in Utah gets uh slapped onto Idaho and they call it a day.
Yeah.
You know, in case of, you know there are results were a larger sample size was achievable in Utah than Idaho.
And so I would want to look to see if that was, if that was done in some of these cases.

Jason Talford 1:39:13

Yeah.

Yeah, that's that's fair enough.

I appreciate that.

I think I wouldn't want to ask you to go poking too deep into Pacificorp stuff for Intermountain Gas evaluation.

So I think that's plenty.

Melissa Kosla 1:39:24

Right.

Jason Talford 1:39:29

I appreciate the contact.

+18***62** 1:39:29

But I'm just, you know, I'm.

I'm just we're we're adding bullets to our after meeting follow up items and off or for for one to be omitted as office.

Yeah, we're forever grateful.

Jason Talford 1:39:40

Yeah.

There you go.

You're welcome.

Melissa Kosla 1:39:42

People.

Jason Talford 1:39:43

All charge you for it. Later.

Melissa Kosla 1:39:45

Yeah.

Jason Talford 1:39:45

Uh, I think I had.

One more here and arkins back to I think.

The an idea that Taylor had of of billing analysis to inform are deemed saving.

Reasonable and accurate are they?

They're reasonable approach to that and specifically with regards to that RTF new Home Standard protocol is you know it states that it's unclear how well modeling corresponds with actual energy savings and they recommend you know program evaluations to validate those savings so.

I guess even with all the biases that are involved, would a billing analysis still provide some measure of validation to address that uncertainty?

+18***62** 1:40:49

I'm sorry, go ahead.

Melissa Kosla 1:40:51

He's there.

There would be definitely some, umm helpful information for the magnitude and the sign of the coefficient of treatment just to see if they're the customers in the treatment group are definitely say have lower energy usage than the customers that didn't participate in the program.

Again, like the magnitude and direction can't.

We can't fully say with confidence that those are indicative of the program effect, because those groups may be.

Differing for other reasons, we want to try to isolate that treatment effect and we can't really.

Jason Talford 1:41:34

But can I ask for a clarification magnitude and sign of coefficient of the treatment group is?

Melissa Kosla 1:41:39

Yes.

Jason Talford 1:41:41

Would that not translate to how much savings and if they are saving therms, OK.

Melissa Kosla 1:41:48

Yes, yes, exactly.

+18***62** 1:41:52

And you know, because it's it's the comparison against non program homes is very difficult and with So what you know if you look back far enough and you could say we have homes that steady state you could look at bills and say what's what's the actual annual build use of these new homes and you know how does that compare to what the model predicts the build use of these new homes are and that could be something to say you know are the models producing something within you know reasonable you know boundaries or reasonable realm of reality.

Of what an occupied homes gas consumption looks like the point the the issue from there then becomes a an A matter of comparison, though I would still say even in that case you would then want to take the the same customers and compare the efficiency of the new home against the minimum code rather than against a non program home.

So if there is a use case for billing data for new homes, it would be specifically for the purpose of saying you know.

Are are, are, are, the, are the models reasonably accurate in estimating what you know a a four bedroom 2 bathroom?

Two story home built in Boise consumes per year.

Under this, you know, under the this you know with these energy efficiency improvements.

Melissa Kosla 1:43:22

Yeah.

And like you were saying, Adam, that there might be a lag effect for occupancy of those homes, maybe looking at homes that were previously rebated several years ago to see what their occupants or their consumption is, umm, a few years after that movement date would be useful too.

+18***62** 1:43:47

And that would require some weather adjusting because you know that you have to look at that specific years heating degree days compared to a model output, you know which is

based off of typical meteorological year.

So you have to do some some adjusting, but that's pretty straightforward.

Melissa Kosla 1:43:57

Right.

+18***62** 1:44:01

Umm.

Does this is what I'm describing?

Making sense?

Jason Talford 1:44:06

Yeah, I think I got what you're makes sense.

It's less of a comparison to a non participant and it's just a a long term comparison to the model of the billing actually match the model.

Is that where that little bit earlier you had that five year?

Five years of data.

+18***62** 1:44:24

Ohh 333 year for Residential 5 plus for commercial.

Jason Talford 1:44:28

Uh, three, so is that where that number comes from?

In order to do that kind of analysis you you need approximately 3 years.

+18***62** 1:44:37

Yeah, you got a home, basically, you know.

Yeah.

In general, borrowing a 2008 S you know recession where builders were sitting on homes for years.

Barring that, which hasn't been the case for quite some time.

Ohm, as I understand, the home in Idaho sells relatively quickly these days that you know, to account for time, the Builders holding it.

Ohh I do account for you know time of transfer time of relocation then accumulating data by living in the home.

Yeah, three years after it's built, you have get you, you have data that you might consider be able to safely consider steady state and we have a year of we have a year of this is what the occupied homes usage looks like.

Melissa Kosla 1:45:36

Also, I know that the RTF likes to compare against market practice baseline, so maybe one of the updates to their new homes protocol will be identifying.

Jason Talford 1:45:36

He kept.

Melissa Kosla 1:45:47

Umm, a.

A baseline that's more similar to non program homes rather than the ICC baseline. So that's some additional research that could be done on a region wide approach as well that which could help improve those modeling results they comparing against non program homes rather than code.

Jason Talford 1:46:17

OK.

Yeah.

Thank you all for the question.

For your answers, I think I think I'm finally out of questions.

I appreciate all all the answers that you had.

I know that that was a lot.

Melissa Kosla 1:46:27

Yeah, no worries.

If you have more, we're happy to help clarify.

+18***62** 1:46:34

Yeah, and and and for for some.

For some weird reason reason we find this we we find the subject matter.

You know, actually fun so.

Melissa Kosla 1:46:43

It really is.

It really is.

And well, that was the whole home rebate was the last topic of our presentation.

So I guess if there's no other questions that we can help answer, I'll bring it back to you, Kathy.

Wold, Kathy 1:47:08

Great.

Alright.

Well, thank you, Melissa and Adam, I appreciate your time and walking through us through all the results and I appreciate all the questions.

I feel like that was a really good, robust discussion about the results and I appreciate everyone asking their questions.

While we have the experts here to chat with us.

So, umm, so next steps.

I think what we need to do is get the final EM&V report and the TRM which will allow us to do a follow up meeting with the stakeholder committee.

We'd like to bring to the committee the suggested program changes that are resulting out of this EM and V study.

Uh, and have a discussion about that and then timeline wise, let's see file for prudency combined with the program changes and we would look for a January 1st effective date.

I think if we're going to do some program changes that January 1, timeline would be an optimal time to implement something new where it's right on the program.

Uh year on the program year so.

Yeah, Taylor.

Taylor Thomas 1:48:23

So can you give me a rough timeline of when you would expect to meet again with the stakeholder group and when you would expect to make it filing in order to meet that January 1 effective date?

Wold, Kathy 1:48:34

Yeah.

So I just a quick look at the calendar.

I was gonna do maybe a poll here to see if September 19th or September 26th would be potential meeting dates to bring the committee back together.

And I can send out a poll and we can just kind of do a poll on which date works better or if folks know now if they if I'll take all feedback.

Taylor Thomas 1:49:02

The whole would be better for our side and it's so you'd point to meet around then and then in hopes of making a filing with the Commission went.

Wold, Kathy 1:49:04

OK.

I would say in October.

Taylor Thomas 1:49:13

In October.

Wold, Kathy 1:49:14

Yeah.

Taylor Thomas 1:49:16

And do you plan to make?

So that's the filing for different program changes.

When would you make your prudency filing for the current uh 2023 same time?

Wold, Kathy 1:49:26

Same time, yeah, we would file 2023 prudency along with any suggested program changes.

Taylor Thomas 1:49:34

OK.

Thank you.

Wold, Kathy 1:49:36

Yeah.

Blattner, Lori 1:49:38

Taylor, can I ask you a question?

Umm I I'm curious procedurally and and you guys can think about it a little bit too.

It seems to me like it might make sense to file prudency as one case and then file program changes as a separate case, but I'm curious if you'd rather have it wrapped into one case.

Wold, Kathy 1:49:54

Umm.

Taylor Thomas 1:50:02

It's a good question.

I mean, typically yes, but.

Most a lot of the reasons for changing the programs or lumped into the evaluation which was directly ordered to be included in the prudency filing.

So I'd I have, I would have to get back to you.

I can email you back on that.

It could talk internally what might be best?

Umm, typically.

Blattner, Lori 1:50:27

Yeah.

Taylor Thomas 1:50:27

Yeah, probably.

It'd be better to do it separate, but it's so lumped into your previous prudency filing that it might be easier to just do it in that case.

Blattner, Lori 1:50:37

OK.

Taylor Thomas 1:50:37

Umm, so I'll, I'll get back to you on it.

Blattner, Lori 1:50:38

Yeah.

Just let me know cause we won't need to know until we file, but whichever way it's easier for you guys to process that, I think.

Taylor Thomas 1:50:48

Yeah.

But I would say that if we're getting a filing in October and trying to reach a January 1 effective date, that's that's a really tight timeline on our side.

And it would be very unlikely that we'd be able to meet that.

Blattner, Lori 1:51:05

Do you think?

I guess that was part of my question on filing him separately.

Would it be possible to implement the program changes by January 1st even if the prudency review wasn't complete?

Taylor Thomas 1:51:23

In theory you can do that.

I I would still say though, that a lot of the program changes are tied to the evaluation that was presented today and an October timeline.

Umm, if you filed in October and asking for a January 1 effective date really only gives us enough time to maybe ask one.

Maybe two sets of production request and I would anticipate we would probably have more than that.

Umm, so it's still be tight on our side to try and reach that and then given current other dockets we have on other rate cases in house, I'm not sure the Commission could reach that umm given their schedules.

Blattner, Lori 1:51:53

Right.

Taylor Thomas 1:52:08

So I'm not saying it can't be done, I'm just saying it would be pretty tight.

Blattner, Lori 1:52:13

I guess another thing you guys might think about too then is if you wanna give us the recommendation on effective date for program changes.
I mean, we're the January 1st was just to keep from having a a kind of that split program here that we've had to deal with.
But I'm also not opposed to, you know it April 1st or June 1st or you know whatever we need to do to make it work.
So maybe that's something you could also just kind of think about and then we could either talk again in September in that meeting or you can just send us an email and let us know.

Taylor Thomas 1:52:56

How that works, I'll I'll think on it a little bit and not get back to you.

Blattner, Lori 1:53:00

OK. Bye.
I appreciate that.
Thank you.

Wold, Kathy 1:53:08

OK.
Any other questions?
Comments before we close for this morning.
OK. Hearing none.
We'll adjourn for today again.
Thank you all for this great discussion.
And thanks to Melissa and Adam from Adm for presenting results today, I'll send out a poll and potential meeting dates.

Melissa Kosla 1:53:33

Thank you.

Wold, Kathy 1:53:35

So watch for more from us.
OK.
Thanks everyone.

Jason Talford 1:53:40

Thank you all.

Melissa Kosla 1:53:41

Thank you.

Scantling, Preston 1:53:41

Thank you.

Laura Conilogue 1:53:41

Thank you.

Blattner, Lori 1:53:42

Thank you.

Taylor Thomas 1:53:42

Yeah, thanks.

+18***62** 1:53:42

They're on.

Thompson, Kody 1:53:42

Everybody.

Melissa Kosla 1:53:43

Have a great day.

Scantling, Preston 1:53:44

Thanks.

Q4 EESC Meeting: September 26, 2024

Wold, Kathy 0:04

If you have questions, raise your hand any way you need to get our attention.

Please do that at any time.

It's no bother for me if you jump in at any time so.

Alright, so our agenda this afternoon, we're gonna take a moment for a safety moment as we start our meeting.

And then we're gonna jump into the proposed residential program changes.

We'll talk more about that in depth, but I'm gonna turn it over to Preston for our safety moment.

Scantling, Preston 0:35

Kathy. Yep. So I just figured that it would be a good time since I've been feeling the first breath or two of winter to. Yeah, the first breath or two of winter come along to do some general winter safety tips. You know, it's a good time right now.

To prepare so that way you're not left at the last second having to do a bunch of stuff to get ready for the cold weather that's coming up.

So yeah, one of the big things we're talking about here is just what weatherproofing your home against the cold, making sure you're not having a lot of leaks coming in from the outside. Obviously making your home a little bit warmer during the winter.

That's good for your health all around.

Preparing yourself for exposure in winter weather as well, making sure you're dressing warmly and just preparing for any potential you know weather events that are going to be outside, whether that's precipitation or just cold weather, wind. So making sure we're prepared on all fronts.

There, there's a lot of different car preparation tips which I'm not gonna go too far in depth on, but making sure that all the necessary fluids and and parts in your car are up to date and topped off and ready to go for any places that you're going.

To be while while you're outside. And then this is also very, very good time to be aware of any downed power lines because of these weather events, there might be some some down power lines which might impact travel or you know, just getting around places from day to.

Day, so make sure we're we're aware of those and contacting local.

And emergency services and that's needed.

So that's about all for our safety moment today and I'll go ahead and turn it back over to you, Kathy.

Wold, Kathy 1:56

Alright, thanks.

I'm not ready to start thinking about winter.

But thanks for helping us. Be prepared, Preston.

Scantling, Preston 2:03

We can.

We can slowly start easing into it, right?

Wold, Kathy 2:06

There we go. Yes.

Scantling, Preston 2:06

Is a good time to slow slowly start that.

Wold, Kathy 2:08

Yeah.

Thompson, Kody 2:09

I'm just glad we're having to think about summer as much.

Wold, Kathy 2:12

There we go. Nice shoulder runs.

Scantling, Preston 2:12

Exactly. Not worrying about smoke either.

Wold, Kathy 2:16

Great. All right. Thanks, Preston.

All right. So we'll go ahead and jump into the kind of the meat of the meeting this afternoon.

And we want to dedicate this time to talk about special studies.

As many of you might remember, we had Adm and associates join us last meeting.

They talked about the impact evaluation that they did and presented all the results from that meeting and I just put up this picture here again of the energy efficiency evaluation life cycle.

So we've run the program, we've done an evaluation of the program and now we're kind of into this planning part of the cycle here and that's what we're going to talk about today is how do we use these results to inform program planning going forward.

OK.

So the first thing we did with the results from Adm was that we use the evaluated savings to run the cost effectiveness testing from the 2023 program.

So you can see we updated all of the the therm savings there that were evaluated, therm savings from the impact study and on the cost effectiveness. Uct ratio you can see here that.

Some measures were more cost effective.

Some were less, but since Adm didn't evaluation of all the measures, this was an opportunity.

For us to review all the measures at this time and make any updates, changes and in some cases, retirements of certain measures.

So we're gonna walk through those today.

So as we start thinking about program planning, we look back through some of the orders and some of the history of the program. And one of the things that came up was that the Commission staff had encouraged the company to explore other acceptable invited basis for deem saving.

Such as the Regional Technical Forum we shared this with Adm as well.

And from that we commissioned a study with Adm to create a technical reference manual for Intermountain Gas.

So the technical reference manual would provide the deem savings estimates for energy savings for the residential portfolio.

And these would include or the TRM was based on historical implementation rates of measures, measures that we plan to have in the program for the coming year. And then they also include an assessment of whether or not it the measure is appropriate candidate for deem savings. So we.

Can just put anything in there.

Had to be something that matched a deem savings approach.

OK.

So the manual the Adm created for Intermountain is intended to facilitate the cost effectiveness, screening, planning, tracking and the energy savings reporting for the

residential program. It's intended to be a living document, so this will be updated with the the stipulated values that are relevant to industry rese.

And impact evaluation findings.

So this will be an ongoing living document that we'll use for the residential program.

OK.

So we'll go through the proposed program changes by measure and for each measure we'll present the EM NB results. The recommendations from the evaluators and then based on the technical reference manual that was produced, will present the proposed rebate changes and compare those to the existing program and.

How that'll change going forward?

Before we do that, before we jump right into each measure, I think I'm gonna turn it over to min.

Who's gonna talk to us a little bit about avoided costs?

Give us a little refresher course on avoided costs because this will be an important part of the program planning discussion going forward.

Park, Min 6:08

Yeah. So the void costs just briefly.

It's just the estimated cost to serve the next unit of demand.

So it's essentially just the incremental cost that can be avoided through energy, energy conservation.

But yeah, like in order 35663, it states that the Commission approves the company's proposal to update all avoided costs as exhibits to IRP filings.

So basically you can see that.

Charts there or tables on the left is the 2021 IRP, which we use those numbers for previous. Uct numbers and then on the right is the 2023 IRP, which was the most recent one.

So those are the numbers we currently use for our UCT values.

So you can see the avoided costs numbers went up, went up quite a bit. So that will play a role in the numbers that we're going to discuss.

Uh. Later here.

Wold, Kathy 7:15

Great.

Alright. Thanks man.

OK.

So with that, we'll jump into our first measure here and these I just took the results slides from Adm and incorporated them into the presentation today for easy reference of the

results from the impact evaluation.

So you can see here that they did both the billing analysis and the RTF analysis here for savings there were claim savings of 87.

The RTF verified savings was 44.

And the recommendation from the evaluators was to utilize an RTF gas furnace workbook. For unit energy savings for claim savings going forward.

So what we did is we applied the guidance from the TRM to redesign the furnace rebate with all of the updated inputs provided by the TRM and we'd keep the energy or the minimum efficiency requirement the same.

So it still be for 95 afue furnace. The therm savings updated to 46 incremental cost of \$277 a measure life of 21.5 years. And then this was the only measure where the incentive remained the same. So.

It's currently 350 and a plan is to keep it at \$350.00 going forward.

So on this slide, you can see the 2023 program.

Rebate design and then the proposed changes for 2025 and this is one of those cases where it was important to remember Min's presentation about the avoided costs because it would make sense here that you see the therm savings for the current program at 87.

And it's being cut almost in half.

You'd expect that to change the incentive.

That would be cost effective, but in the case where the avoided costs have increased by enough, keeping the incentive level the same was a result of the cost testing there using the new and updated avoided costs.

Yeah, Jason.

Jason Talford 9:27

Hey, thank you, Kathy.

I had a quick question here on on the previous slide.

The sorry, not the previous slide.

The one before the one with the evaluation results we've got.

Wold, Kathy 9:38

Yeah.

Jason Talford 9:40

22 numbers here 43 numbers.

We've got the RTF workbook of 44.2 therms per unit. The building analysis 31.59 and then

we've got the RTF gas UES between 27 and 55. I'm hoping you can help me translate those numbers to.

To the 46th term is that you've arrived at.

Wold, Kathy 10:10

Yes. Yeah, great. Thanks for asking.

So the RTF uses this is what the RTF has for deem savings for a gas furnace.

Currently, that's a regional technical forum. If I'm throwing around a bunch of letters and abbreviations here, please call me out and I'm happy to explain some of those.

It's a little bit like alphabet soup.

So when Adm ran the impact evaluation, they did a billing analysis on the claim savings for Intermountain gas.

Also applied a deem savings approach as if we had been using the RTF. This is based on their recommendation. The evaluation method that is being used by a more standardized evaluation method used that's being used throughout the utilities and in Idaho.

So this was an attempt to standardize the evaluation so that it would be the same as other utilities are using.

So that's the RTF number.

There is 44. The 31 is the.

And then the 27 to 55 are the deem savings that are claimed by the RTF right now.

Does that help?

Jason Talford 11:27

Yeah, I think that's a good explanation of what those are, but I'm still not seeing 46 in those.

Yeah, sorry.

Wold, Kathy 11:32

Oh wait, OK.

Oh, you asked me one more question.

Yes, thank you.

Sorry, yes.

Thank you for reminding me, OK.

So those numbers are the evaluated savings that Adm found.

But then they also incorporated.

The impact evaluation that they just did and the inputs into the RTF and they customized the formula for deem savings for Intermountain Gas to come up with this 46 therms.

So that's where that's coming from.

They looked at the RTF. All the inputs that go into the current deem savings formula. And then they customize it based on the participation and the historical savings that Intermountain's been claiming for this measure.

So that's the customized savings amount for Intermountain.

Jason Talford 12:25

OK.

Great. So they they that was part of the evaluator and and that would that also explain.

The RTF workbook 27 to 55 and the evaluators coming out at 44.

That would. Is it the same?

Wold, Kathy 12:43

Right. So part of this 46 therms is.

Jason Talford 12:43

OK. Oh.

Wold, Kathy 12:48

Adm looked at the historical participation for furnaces, for Intermountain Gas, and they looked at a mix of the 95 and the 97 furnace to see how many were we were rebating over the time period. I think April 2021 through 23 and so this.

46 Therms is a blended number.

Weighted by past participation.

Of the savings between a 95 furnace and a 97 furnace.

So that's part of the customization that's happening in that.

lgc trm.

Jason Talford 13:27

You stole a question out of my mouth.

Wold, Kathy 13:29

Oh.

Jason Talford 13:29

I was gonna ask what the customization was and that sounds like it was exactly right.

Wold, Kathy 13:32

Yep.

Jason Talford 13:33

Are there any other?

Wold, Kathy 13:33

Yep.

Jason Talford 13:37

Customizations to the the formulas that we should be aware of or is that the extent of it?

Wold, Kathy 13:42

That's the main thing is that they looked at history and participation for the Intermount gas program in order to incorporate that, I think in the water heating measures, they looked at things like inputs like groundwater temperature and customize those for the Idaho Service territory versus a regional number.

Jason Talford 13:44

OK.

Wold, Kathy 14:01

That the RTF may use.

Any other questions about the furnace?

Katie O'Neil 14:14

I have a quick question, Kathy and sorry I'm new to this meeting.

Wold, Kathy 14:16

Yeah.

Katie O'Neil 14:19

My name is Katie O'Neill. I'm with the city of Boise.

Wold, Kathy 14:22

Welcome.

Katie O'Neil 14:23

Thank you.

Here I'll turn my camera on.

I think just to make sure I'm understanding correctly, nothing about your forecasted usage is changing.

There's nothing that's that's that would cause people to be using more or less natural gas.

It's just that the models have been updated and that's what's leading to the 87 to 46 therm difference. Is that correct?

Wold, Kathy 14:44

Correct.

Katie O'Neil 14:45

OK.

Thank you so much.

Wold, Kathy 14:46

Yes. Yeah, thanks. Thanks for joining.

Hey anyone else? Yes.

Jason Talford 14:52

Kathy, I think I might have another question for you. Just to verify for me, 'cause, you have it highlighted here when when you mentioning incremental cost that is incremental cost to the customer, right for upgrading to that higher efficiency furnace, OK.

Wold, Kathy 14:55

Yeah.

Right, that's correct.

Yep, that would be from the baseline furnace to an upgraded to the 95% afue furnace.

Jason Talford 15:18

OK.

Great. It's a.

It's a wonderful tidbit to know, but perhaps for Katie's sake, nice to meet you, Katie.

I knew Brad Whosing failed pretty well.

Spoke with him often.

As far as the utility cost test, that shouldn't make any any impact there.

OK, sharing the same brain cell.

Love it.

Wold, Kathy 15:41

OK.

All right, great.

Thanks for those questions.

All right.

Anyone else on furnace before we go to the next one?

K yeah.

Blattner, Lori 15:55

Kathy, maybe just to point out that the the reason we include incremental cost is just because we do run the the total resource cost the TRC, even though we don't, we don't do program planning really or evaluation around it.

It's just another metric to kind of.

I guess take a look at or another tool in the toolbox.

So that's I think that's why that metrics included.

Wold, Kathy 16:22

Thank you.

Additional explanation helps. Thanks Laurie.

Jason Talford 16:33

I think I have one more question for you.

I apologize.

I'd like to give a moment for everybody else to step in if they need to.

Wold, Kathy 16:37

No, it's alright.

Jason Talford 16:44

So I'm comparing that 46 therms to the 31.59 from the billing analysis.

And my understanding is that that 46 therms is what you're using in your in your new TRM as a deemed savings.

But that still highlights a difference that the billing analysis, the savings that are what it says the savings are realized on your system is different from what you're using as you're deemed savings.

Could you help me get those numbers in line?

Is there any changes that you're making that may help with that in the future?

Wold, Kathy 17:26

So I think some of the changes are that we will be using the inputs that are in the workbook in the RTF. That's where they the basis for the the RTF claim savings came from.

We have yet to receive the work with actual like Excel workbook from Adm.

So we'll be using that for tracking.

So I think that we'll have some improved tracking on this particular measure that will help us with these claim savings and securing those claim claim savings.

Jason Talford 18:04

K.

Thank you.

Wold, Kathy 18:05

Help. OK.

Well.

We'll move on to smart thermostats and again this is the the results from the Adm study here.

You can see both the RTF savings, the billing savings and then the current RTF deem savings amount 2724 to 27 therms so.

In this case, the billing analysis terms came up a little higher than the RTF terms.
Analysis But kind of right in there in line with the rtf's.

Uh.

24 to 27 therms.

OK, so from the TRM guidance, the current program is just Energy Star certified thermostat.
What we would need to do going forward is add on these parameters to the energy to the Energy Star certified thermostat.

So A7 day programmable Wi-Fi enabled occupancy detection.

So we'll have some additional requirements to.

Our smart thermostat rebate in order to meet those deem savings.

So here's the proposed.

Rebate design Energy Star qualified with additional requirements. A 26 therms an incremental cost of 165 measure life of seven years and incentive of \$50.

So this is a case where you see the therm savings being reduced and then also the S note of will also be reduced.

Questions about the smart thermostat.

Jason Talford 20:05

Kathy is Jason.

You may have said this.

Those parameters, those were from the where they were recommended by the EM and V. Is that correct?

Correct.

Wold, Kathy 20:14

These parameters that are being added on to the rebate design actually come from the RTF.

Jason Talford 20:18

Mm hmm.

Wold, Kathy 20:21

To be in line with the RTF. Those will be incorporated into the TRM for IGC as well.

Any other questions on smart thermostat?

All right. We'll move on to the storage tank water heater.

So here are the results for the storage water heater.

One thing that we did not differentiate in our original offering was the kind of the, I guess the difference between 55 gallon and greater size or a 55 gallon and smaller size water heater.

And that made a difference in the.

Claimed or the verified savings.

The evaluated savings so.

Than 55 gallons was coming back with a evaluate savings of 25 therms but very little therm savings for the greater than 55 gallon so.

The current RTF is 25 therms per unit and Energy Star condensing.

Storage water heater is 55 therms and the evaluators recommended utilizing the RTF water heater workbook for claim savings moving forward.

This I think this is the same thing I put in a kind of a duplicate slide here, but the federal standard for greater than 55 gallon storage water.

Hank Water Tank heater is more stringent than the heaters with smaller sizes, so that was one of the reasons for the the.

Fewer savings with the greater than 55 gallon.

So we looked at the storage, heater, storage, water heater, RTF.

Guidance.

And the energy efficiency requirement would be a .81, uel Energy Star qualified 35 or 33 therms an incremental cost about \$1800.

And when we did our cost testing, the cost effectiveness level came in at an incentive of \$200.

So based on the cost testing and the history that we've had, the TRM guidance is used is to use the Energy Star qualified version 5.0 which is that .81 uel efficiency, minimum efficiency.

Intermountain has historically had very low participation in the storage water heater.

It's been a .68 uel and a 115 rebate. The new recommended efficiency is .81 Uel, which is a pretty big jump up in efficiency and.

Effectiveness testing level of \$200 for the rebate, we anticipate that they'll be like no to low participation, so.

For this particular measure, we're recommending that we retire a rebate for the storage water heater participation at this level just seems very unlikely at this high efficiency level.

And then also this lower incentive level.

Any questions about the storage water heater?

Jason Talford 24:02

Kathy, yeah.

So just to be clear, you're the the recommendation is to retire the storage tank water heater

as in its entirety.

I think you had. You had the other recommendation to offer a tiered incentive for condensing noncondensing.

Are condensing noncondensing wrapped U together in the current incentive?

Wold, Kathy 24:30

Yes, we looked at the Energy Star qualified version 5.0.

This .81 uef was the guidance there and I think just even if it was condensing or non condensing, that jump up in efficiency where we've had such low participation at even the lower uef, it just seemed unlikely that.

Increasing from 115 to \$200.00 would really encourage participation at this level.

Jason Talford 25:02

When you were in the.

In the RTF workbooks for this, what was the baseline uef assumption for a storage water heater?

Wold, Kathy 25:13

Oh, I'd have to go back and look.

Jason Talford 25:16

I don't either. That's totally fair.

Wold, Kathy 25:17

Yeah.

Jason Talford 25:18

I.

I guess to be a little bit more constructive, I'm kinda wondering 0.68 uef.

Is surprisingly low.

I don't have these numbers off the top of my head either.

I'd have to go pee. Just just alongside you.

I'm curious if the.

The the baseline, the the building code or the, you know, actual standard by manufacturers is maybe already above that. And that may explain.

Wold, Kathy 25:52

OK.

Brian Bennett 25:52

Hello.

Jason Talford 25:55

Low participation. If you can't get to one of those.

Brian Bennett 26:00

I jump in there.

Jason Talford 26:01

Sure.

Brian Bennett 26:03

K.

So the basic efficiency on most installed water heaters is 6/2.

It is.

Quite a dollar purchase jump from .2 to .68.

On our Energy Star qualified homes.

Over here, I'm over in southeast Idaho.

They are installing the .6 fours which comply with the model. It's not ideal.

But it's OK .68.

Is the \$200.00 rebate versus the cost of the energy savings?

For the construction process just isn't justifiable.

You're not going to get anybody to do that.

The next reasonable jump would be above 90% where we do the condensing. Then we can actually show enough energy savings for them to.

To participate in that, but that .68 is just in an awkward position in the food chain where it's not really viable.

You still have the expensive beevant and other stuff required for the installation, with none of the overwhelming benefits of a condensing unit.

Wold, Kathy 27:24

Thank you.

That was Brian Bennett, the energy auditor from Idaho Falls, right.

Jason Talford 27:32

That was a great answer. Thank you.

Blattner, Lori 27:32

Thank you.

Wold, Kathy 27:34

Thank you.

Brian Bennett 27:34

It's me.

Wold, Kathy 27:35

Yes. Thanks Brian.

Good to have you.

Go ahead, Lori.

Blattner, Lori 27:39

Brian and Chris on the .81, is it this kind of the same issue 'cause you mentioned you don't see significant benefits till you get to the .9 or greater?

So do you concur that we have the same issues with .81 as we would at .68?

Brian Bennett 27:56

Yeah. Yeah, because we haven't changed the installation standard. We're we're putting in a more expensive tank, but we still have.

We still have to bring in combustion air. We still use the expensive bee vent venting that is significant, more significantly, more difficult to get through a building structure than the PVC venting.

And the again, the incremental savings are not that much because.

Whenever we're using these tanked water heaters, what we're mostly paying for is to have

hot water ready to use.

So it's getting the the the main players are the contractors and they don't see the dollar return value on that because they're the reward to them isn't significant enough.

In appraisal value, if there's a if, we could find a way to get it reflected in an MLS, these things could be wonderful.

But since that isn't currently part of the procedure in the.

Uh.

Appraisal process. They have their overhead.

They're basically a burden for the contractor.

Blattner, Lori 29:11

So that's really helpful.

That seems to.

Kind of support what Kathy was saying as far as maybe just retiring this altogether.

Brian Bennett 29:23

Throwing support and education towards the fully condensing systems.

Is is probably a much more reasonable.

Resource and building codes are heading that way more and more so.

Starting to drift the ship. That direction will probably give us greater returns in the long run versus honestly investing in what is currently old technology.

Wold, Kathy 30:05

Any other questions on this one?

OK.

We'll move on to the tankless water heater.

Program had two tiers of the tankless water heater.

These were .87 uef and a .91 uef offering.

See here that the evaluators recommend using the RTF water heater workbook for the tankless water heater offering going forward.

They recommended that we discontinue the lower efficiency .87 Tier 2 incentive and then focus on the higher efficiency equipment.

But they did.

They did recommend offering a tiered incentive for Energy Star qualified versus the non Energy Star qualified tankless water heater.

So we took a look at this.

And the tankless water heater non Energy Star qualified.

These were both .95 uef based on the TRM.

The savings were a little bit different between the non Energy Star qualified and the Energy Star qualified the non Energy Star qualified cost testing resulted in a \$300.00 incentive.

And we did a little bit more looking into this one.

And the efficiency requirement of .95 non Energy Star qualified.

We only found three tankless water heaters listed in the RE directory of certified products and that's where we go to for looking for verification on energy efficiency of products. There were only three tankless water heaters that met this criteria for non Energy Star certified and we've never seen.

Any of those water heaters.

In our being rebated in our program in the history of the program.

So they were brands that we had not heard of and had not seen ever in the program.

So in addition, when we did the cost effectiveness, it was, it would require participation level of about 600 units for it to be cost effective at that \$300.00 incentive level. And so our recommendation here is to not offer this particular.

Tankless water heater non Energy Star qualified.

We would instead do is focus on this tankless water heater.

Energy Star qualified .95 uef.

Savings of 50 therms incremental costs of about \$800.20 year, useful life and incentive cost tested at \$400.

So here you can see the comparison between the previous or the what's currently in place.

This is the tier 1.91 UEF compared to the proposed changes for the 2025 program.

We would be changing almost every input on this particular measure from the efficiency requirement to the therm savings and the increased incentive.

Any questions on the tankless?

Jason Talford 33:29

Yeah, quick one.

If I'm not mistaken, the Energy Star qualification for a tankless water here requires .9 uef as part of the qualification. Is there a reason to have?

Those separated or I guess better? Is there an impact to separating them at all?

Wold, Kathy 33:53

Impact to separating oh from .91 to .95 or for .90.

Jason Talford 34:00

No.

Thompson, Kody 34:00

Where we've listed .95 and and Energy Star there Jason, is that what you're asking? Where we've we've delineated the two there? Yeah.

Jason Talford 34:04

Yeah. Having them separately, yeah.

Wold, Kathy 34:08

Gotcha. Thanks, Cody.

That's a good question.

I don't know.

The answer to that was the guidance from the TRM that it be Energy Star qualified.

I think from a like a verification standpoint and also from a customer communicating that to customers pointing to an Energy Star qualified product also simplifies things.

Does that? Does that help?

But I don't know exactly.

The answer to that Jason.

Brian Bennett 34:43

So again, the the .95 is the efficiency of the unit, the Energy Star qualification just simply means that it was put through the stringency testing.

For Energy Star and you'll find it listed on the website as a recommended product so.

I just like to back up that yes, it's more of a marketing tool than anything else.

That, but it provides that little bit of extra distinction.

This is the new hot thing over here in Southeast Idaho.

We're seeing a lot of the upper level builders moving to this style of equipment and I think over the next three years we'll see it start trickling down into the entry level homes because.

When we show the fact that we can recover.

Up to, you know, 15 square feet of mechanical room space to convert into.

Actual livable space.

There's an extra dollar value added to these just by providing that space for more marketable purposes other than mechanical space.

Jason Talford 36:00

Yeah, Brian, I I completely agree with where you're going.

You put a, you put the shiny yellow Energy Star tag on it and people go, oh, wow, look at that, right?

And and I think that's a very similar vein to where my question was coming from.

From somewhat tangential of the idea of simplicity from the customer perspective, they need to meet a .9 uef and an energy stall qualified well if Energy Star qualified has the .9 uef built in, you can just say just put it Energy Star qualified in there.

So long as those two align, I think it does the same thing with less burn to the customer.

Wold, Kathy 36:43

Gotcha. Now I'm tracking with you.

Thank you.

Yes. Anything we can do to simplify for customers, I'm all for it.

Thanks everyone.

OK.

Next one was the boiler.

The evaluated savings for the boiler were a little bit lower than the claim savings here at 103 therms evaluators recommended utilizing the Illinois TRM for the measures that.

Are not provided by the RTF. The Regional Technical forum. The evaluators use the Illinois TRM for deem savings calculations.

So the TRM with TRM guidance, the boiler incentive would look like this.

It would be the same 95% afuea 159 therms.

See here.

Incremental cost of 1166, I think I got that wrong.

I did OK.

Sorry, this slide.

This shows the comparison of the 2023 program compared to the 25 changes, 2025 changes and this would incorporate the lower therm saving estimate, new incremental cost, new measure life and then the incentive for this one actually increases from 800 to 1000.

Dollars.

Questions about the boiler.

K.

We'll move on to the commie boiler.

Combi boiler, in this case the verified savings came in a little bit higher than the claim savings.

Same recommendation for the Combi boiler as with the boiler, which is to utilize the Illinois TRM with RTF inputs for the Intermountain Gas program.

And once we incorporated those, you can see the changes here, the 2023 program, the efficiency would remain the same, but we would update the inputs to the unit savings, incremental cost measure life. And in this case the incentive would increase from \$800 to 15.

\$100.

Any questions about the commi?

Jason Talford 39:28

Kathy, maybe not a question specific to the Combi boiler, but.

You know it.

I think this is you going to wrap few others but the combination boiler I think is the only one of the measures that has an updated.

Therm savings.

That's exactly equal to the results of the evaluation.

And I guess that's maybe what I would expect to see.

So it kind of contrast why for the other measures, some of them aren't off by much to be fair, but they're all a little bit different.

And now I'm kind of wondering why.

Wold, Kathy 40:12

Yeah.

So I would say for the boiler, Combi boiler, combi boiler I think is one of the fewest rebates we've paid on a measure.

So there wasn't a lot of historical information program information for evaluators to use that they would use to customize this particular measure at all.

So they looked at the few that we did have and anything there that seemed relevant to customize the TRM for Intermountain Gas would have been incorporated in there.

But I believe it's because we had so few of them that there there probably wasn't much there to use from a historical perspective.

Jason Talford 40:57

Great. Thank you.

Wold, Kathy 41:06

So we'll move on to the whole home rebates.

This is the new construction rebate. We have two tiers of this, the tier one and the whole home Tier 2 evaluators found that the methodology for evaluating the whole home program was already in line with the ITR, with the RTF New Homes Protocol. So that was the EV. Method that was used by on the evaluators for Intermountain Gas and is also employed by other utilities in Idaho.

So, since this these rebates were already in line with the new homes protocol for the RTF, the whole home requirements will not be changing for whole home tier one or whole home Tier 2.

These requirements will remain the same.

And then you can see for whole home Tier 1.

The inputs that will be changing the annual therm savings, incremental cost measure life and then the incentive when we did a cost test on this one, the incentive would increase significantly from \$900 to \$1500.

Then for whole home Tier 2 same thing.

This one the therm savings were reduced from 1:28 to 110 therms and then the incremental cost and measure life and incentive were also changed.

But the incentive here would change from \$900.

Oh, I'm sorry.

This should be \$700.00 an error in my spreadsheet or PowerPoint there.

Sorry, should be changing from 700 to 1000.

So that would be an increase in incentive there as well.

Questions about whole home.

MATT V 42:54

I have a.

I have a quick question, so if the.

The tankless water heater changes efficiency.

Does it matter on the whole home?

Tankless water heater program.

Wold, Kathy 43:13

Well, that's a good question, Matt.

Sorry, that was Matt van der Meer, from Momentum energy rating, right?

MATT V 43:20

Yes.

Wold, Kathy 43:21

Thanks Matt.

Based on the evaluators.

Analysis I don't think this changes because these were the inputs that they used to calculate the evaluated savings and then also to line up with the RT FS new homes protocol.

So for that reason, no, they won't change.

MATT V 43:45

OK.

Wold, Kathy 43:50

For these measures, sorry, you're asking me about the tankless, though, right?

Yes. So if they want to do a tankless add on, we would, it would have to meet the new efficiency measure.

Sorry, I missed that part of your question.

MATT V 44:02

Nope, that's fine.

Wold, Kathy 44:03

Yes. So the yeah, any tankless water heater would have to meet the minimum efficiency of the new new offering.

MATT V 44:12

OK.

Wold, Kathy 44:13

Yeah. Thanks.

Good question.

Any other questions about?

OK.

So the cost testing that we did after incorporating all the inputs from the TRM is outlined here.

We use the admin budget that was used for our recent energy efficiency charge filing, so we are still waiting on the final order on that, but we use the budget to forecast for the energy efficiency charge and we applied that to the 2025 program planning cost.

Effectiveness testing.

So you can see here all the measures come in around 1.0 for cost effectiveness testing, which is how.

We help set the rebate amount. The incentive amounts here.

Questions about that.

One question I did want to bring to the committee is this change for the whole home.

Incentive going up from \$900 and \$700.

Those would be increased to \$1500 and \$1000. As we mentioned earlier, this is largely being driven by the increased avoided costs and so with homes, I feel like it's much more involved. The new construction measure is much more involved.

For builders than it is, say, a piece of equipment, you know, a furnace or a tankless water heater. And if it makes sense to increase these incentives.

Given that the next IRP cycle will be looking at avoided updating avoided costs again, granted, no one knows what those avoided costs will do, what gas prices will do? But does moving those incentive levels around like that create issues for builder participation?

And we cost tested these at the lower levels. The UCT ratio came in at around 2.0 for the whole home tier one and a 1.5 for the whole home Tier 2.

So if we were to keep those the same, it would be very cost effective.

But trying to anticipate maybe any unintended consequences that that may have by moving those incentive levels around?

Jason Talford 46:59

Kathy, I'll jump in with some feedback for that.

Wold, Kathy 47:02

Yeah.

Jason Talford 47:03

Thank you for putting that out there.

I can't speak too much.

From from builder participation I mean if it's worth it for them, they'll go for it. Not not.

But what I can say from the avoided cost perspective, you're absolutely right.

It's hard to know, but from the.

The avoided cost that you showed earlier in the presentation.

Those costs definitely do drop over time.

And you actually kind of preempted a question I was gonna ask you is.

Working with those numbers because they're what we have, they will be updated. That's fine.

You know what kind of other measures are being taken to future proof this because as those.

Avoided costs drop.

I think from as high as \$1.20 down to.

You know.

\$0.70.

These UCT ratios seem like.

A drop in avoided cost could bring them under that cost effectiveness ratio pretty easily.

So the the robustness of the program to withstand and avoided cost changes something important.

Wold, Kathy 48:35

Yes, thanks for that question.

We tried to look at our forecasted rebate count here and go with the more conservative end of that.

So we try not to be like right on the bubble of being at 1.0. When we looked at our forecast here for the participation numbers and really thought about how that could change if avoided costs go down again then.

How might that change?

Program cost effectiveness, cost effectiveness.

So we really try to use some conservative forecast numbers.

In order, just like you were saying, to kind of.

Future proof those.

Blattner, Lori 49:16

Hey, do you wanna go back to the of what it costs slide?
I know that's a long ways back.

Wold, Kathy 49:19

Sure. Yeah.
Give me a second.
There we go. There we go.

Blattner, Lori 49:31

So I just wanted to talk about something that Jason meant.
And so when you look at the?
Avoided costs in each.
Section.
Those are.
Those are going to go down over time.
Because they're those future costs are discounted and so a better comparison is to
compare.
Across the rows. So you're year one to year one.
Rather than comparing within the same column, does that make sense?
So we're still at a significant increase in year 1 from 46 cents in the previous RP to \$0.87
today.
But.
The \$0.70 out in year 26 has is a discounted rate.
I don't know if that's helpful or not.
And I think the point.
I think the point that you're trying to make, Jason, is still.
And it's the question that we're kind of kicking around is we don't know what costs are going
to do in the 2025 IRP.
And so should we increase those?
Whole home rebates.
Dramatically.
Or, you know, maybe somewhere in the middle or maybe not. Change them at all.
You know that that was kind of the the question, I guess.

Jason Talford 51:29

Yeah, yeah, I think I understand what you're you're going for here and and like I said, I try to

preface that it's not a good comparison 'cause. We don't know what 2025 has, but. The current best information we have forecasting out is that 2023 IRP avoided cost, so. You know, potentially the 2026 version of this program would be missing out on savings that the current program is currently getting. That's all.

Blattner, Lori 52:07

So Brian and Matt is the, I mean I'm I'm sure that the. Builders would like to see the increase. Will it be frustrating for them? You know, in two years from now if they if we pull that back because we because of what the costs have gone down.

Brian Bennett 52:34

This is Brendan. Anytime this year, reduction in rebate, you know for these guys, the guys that I have that are collecting the rebate and I'm sure Matt is seeing it also. A lot of them are doing this because they have. A quality standard that you guys have helped them build through the rebate programs. And they do look at this as part of their budgeting proposition. And any time you redo a funding out of a budget, it's a little bit frustrating. But also the things that this program is doing is it is helping building habits of construction. So even if they are a little bit frustrated, in my opinion, the likelihood that they're gonna fall out of doing what they've developed the habit to do. Contractors or notorious for this is what we've done. That's what we've always done. That's what we're gonna do. So once you can build that habit into them, having them fall backwards is probably not a high potential. I don't know, Matt. What do you think, Sir?

MATT V 53:55

So I think. With Energy Star changing so much next year. They see this as a kind of a safety net, like oh, we, we're gonna be spending more money to meet Energy Star.

But when we do that, we still can use the Intermountain gas rebates to help us achieve that.

And my thought process, I think Energy Star.

A lot of builders are gonna move away from Energy Star and this is just going to be a a better benefit for them.

Because of the strict.

Building.

Ways they're gonna have to do it so.

If they do pull it back in two years, it's just gonna be one of those things that they know it.

It doesn't already.

It's not going to last forever.

They understand that.

I think while it's here to benefit.

Blattner, Lori 55:02

So it sounds like maybe the advantage of of increasing the rebates, potentially getting more builders on board with some of these new methods might outweigh the disadvantages of having to pull the rebate back some in a couple of years depending on what of what costs do.

Brian Bennett 55:26

I agree with that statement. Again, if we can get in that, get them in the habit.

They start marketing a standard you know, especially when we feed them or help them build that brand. The quality of equipment we're installing is exceed exceeds the market because.

Our it makes our home better because it makes your livings lifestyle better because.

So.

A part of what we do is help them build those marketing skills.

And I think that's a good place for, you know, Intermountain, Gas.

To to focus is.

Along with these rebates is if we can get those.

Little brochures or pamphlets or even just printed sayings that we can give to the the Realtors that participate with our builders.

To to give them that differentiation. That makes it much harder for them to fall back away from it once it's built into their brand.

So what we gotta do is use these tools to secure mindset along with product.

Blattner, Lori 56:52

So that's really helpful.

Thank you very much.

Wold, Kathy 56:53

Yeah.

MATT V 56:55

And then the last thing I have is.

With certain loan companies like the F, the FDA and FDA loans, they will have to meet a higher standard in building. So these things will.

You definitely helpful in those in those areas also.

Wold, Kathy 57:27

Thank you both.

Anyone else thoughts on whole home?

So then the last slide here is just highlighting the program updates based on the TRM. So everything highlighted in yellow would be changing.

Based on the the current guidance for the Intermountain Gas TRM.

See that?

The furnace incentive is the only one that was not going to change.

Alright. Any other questions about?

Questions or thoughts or suggestions for program planning?

Jason Talford 58:35

Question for you, Kathy.

Wold, Kathy 58:35

OK.

Jason Talford 58:36

Do you know the time frame of when you're going to be getting the the work papers from your evaluator to?

Wold, Kathy 58:37

Yeah.

Jason Talford 58:46

Help inform.

That TRM and the program planning off of it.

Wold, Kathy 58:51

Yeah. I would expect to get that this week.

Yeah. I would expect to have that this week and we're just waiting on the actual the workbook so that we can look at the tracking that needs to be done on those measures.

We've gotten the report, the actual TRM report with guidance, but not the Excel workbook is.

What we're waiting on, I hope to have it this week.

Jason Talford 59:19

OK.

Yeah, I'm. I'm just kinda curious.

I was wondering if that's something that we as the as the committee could get.

To review when they're available.

Wold, Kathy 59:31

Yeah.

Blattner, Lori 59:37

I think we'll plan to file that Kathy with the.

Application that you right?

Wold, Kathy 59:45

Yes, exactly.

Yeah, next steps would be that we would file the application for 2023 prudency along with the EMNV final report.

So the results from the study, we would file the changes for the residential program along with that, we're also working on developing a commercial TRM and then we would file

changes for the commercial program as well.
So those are kind of our next steps.
To proceed for the program.
Questions about any of that.

Jason Talford 1:00:22

Yeah, I have two questions for you.
I know we've been super duper focused on, you know the results and the outcomes from the residential EM and V but I'd love to hear an update on the commercial programs.
No, but I think it was two EE Cs ago that we had some information on it.

Wold, Kathy 1:00:46

Last.
Committee meeting. I think Preston reported that we were going to be deploying a commercial customer survey. We worked with IDL on developing a survey and we sent out a limited mailing, snail mail postcard to invite our commercial customers to participate in the survey.

We're trying to target specifically our building operators and.

Reaching those folks is proving to be very difficult. I think most the mail most the billing, most the communication goes to folks that are probably in like admin or the accounting department.

And so we're trying to find the best way to reach the building operators.

So we did a limited mailing, snail mail and this month we will send out an e-mail to all of our commercial customers.

That subscribe to energy efficiency messaging and that will include a link to go to the survey.

And hoping to learn more about those commercial customers through the survey.

The survey includes asking questions about specific equipment that the customer uses.

Really trying to get in contact with the building operators or the facility managers so that we're kind of talking to the right folks, but then also gauging their interest in learning more about energy efficiency.

So if they have any upcoming projects, if they're exploring doing any upgrades, really finding a way to proactively.

We work with those customers on any kind of energy efficient upgrades that they may be wanting to explore or maybe don't even know that they wanna explore yet.

So those are a couple of things that been going on in the commercial program.

And then the next biggest thing is working on this TRM for commercial measures.

So we wanna work on incorporating some of the energy saving measures that were identified in the recent CPA and we'll specifically getting some measures into the offering for those light commercial customers.

So, folks that are technically there on the commercial rate, but they use residential sized equipment, we don't any offerings for them right now.

And so that was one area that we really wanted to address.

An area that we missed in our initial commercial offering.

Jason Talford 1:03:16

Great. Thank you. And then?

I guess is it after the survey when we might see more movement on a a potential for a a custom projects type of.

Offering.

Wold, Kathy 1:03:32

Is one thing that we're working on as well. Is what that what the incentive or the incentive calculation might be for custom project?

So yeah, I'm hoping that the survey will also help us identify those folks that, you know, maybe aren't just doing an equipment upgrade, but are looking to do more of a custom project.

I had gotten some feedback from some folks at I think it was an ASHRAE conference that they are a vendor provider who does custom projects right now for Idaho Power.

And he mentioned that, you know, we see some opportunities for gas savings out there. If you guys had a custom program, that's something that we can incorporate into doing, you know, an electric and a natural gas project at the same time.

So there's definitely some potential out there.

So we do want to design what that custom incentive would look like. So hopefully we will work on that. At the same time with the TRM is a custom option.

Any other questions about residential or commercial or energy efficiency in general?

Great. Well, great.

Well, I never know.

I wanna make sure I always leave enough time for a robust conversation.

I feel like we've had a really good discussion today.

And in my haste, I jumped over doing a icebreaker, which I'm kind of known for around here, and doing some introductions.

So I promise that next meeting we will get back to doing that introductions and and some kind of a little icebreaker to bring the committee together and start off the meeting.

But unless there is anything else for this afternoon.

We've wrapped up almost an hour early so.

I will give you some time back on your calendar.

Going once, going twice.

All right, we'll officially adjourn the meeting then.

Thanks everyone for your time and your expertise and your participation. I appreciate you.

MATT V 1:05:50

Thank you.

Katie O'Neil 1:05:51

Thank you.

Scantling, Preston 1:05:52

Thanks everyone.