

City of Keene
New Hampshire

ENERGY AND CLIMATE COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, May 3, 2023

8:00 AM

**Council Chambers,
City Hall**

Members Present:

Zach Luse, Chair
Paul Roth, Vice Chair
Councilor Bryan Lake
Peter Hansel
Jake Pipp
Jude Nuru
Diana Duffy
Clair Oursler
Kenneth Swymer
Charles Redfern, Alternate
Lisa Maxfield, Alternate
Rowland Russell, Alternate

Staff Present:

Mari Brunner, Senior Planner

Members Not Present:

Councilor Raleigh Ormerod
Beth Campbell

1) Call to Order and Roll Call

Chair Luse called the meeting to order at 8:03 AM. Attendance was taken by roll call.

2) Approval of Minutes – April 5, 2023 & April 11, 2023

Chair Luse noted the minutes for the retreat said 8AM, but the retreat was at 1PM. With no other changes to the minutes, Chair Luse asked for a motion to adopt the minutes, and noted that both sets of minutes could be adopted at the same time. Vice Chair Paul Roth motioned to approve the minutes with a second from Councilor Bryan Lake. With no opposition, the minutes were accepted.

3) Guest Speakers: 2021 Energy Code

A) Chris Skoglund, Clean Energy NH

Mr. Skoglund offered a little background explaining that Clean Energy New Hampshire is often considered to be a trade organization that is out to support principally solar organizations, but they have a membership that has grown to represent thirty-six municipalities which covers approximately 425,000 New Hampshire residents and almost one third of the population. While their membership does include numerous solar installers, they also have many other clean energy companies, as well as all three utilities, and then non-energy businesses that are members of their organization.

They do not see their mission as to advance the economic interests of any one entity but to pursue clean, affordable local abundant clean energy for all. Mr. Skoglund's interest in building energy codes is one that he brought to the organization back in 2022, when he moved over from the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services, where he had been for approximately fifteen years. His portfolio there was mostly climate and energy, and he was fortunate to work with Rhett Lamb and Micaela Engert, when they were with Keene, on climate mitigation and climate adaptation issues, and very often held Keene up as the city to follow.

He explained that his involvement in building energy codes came after recognizing that the most cost-effective and ideal time to incorporate energy attributes, especially energy efficiency ones, is when the building is first built. Having to go back into a building adds time, cost, and material costs that would not otherwise be there. Buildings can last decades to centuries in New Hampshire as opposed to some energy measures which mainly last just a few years, so by building right the first time it saves money in the long run.

Beginning in 2009, building energy codes became slightly more problematic for the state as that was when the stimulus program was passed by the Obama Administration and embedded in that program were requirements necessary for the State to be able to accept future funding from the Federal Government. As such, building energy codes had to be updated to the 2009 levels. Codes are updated every three years, so three years later when the 2012 codes came out, there was a big jump in terms of the efficiency requirements, which translated to a big jump in the upfront costs that the builders and contractors would experience when putting these codes in place. These were also costs that were not necessarily going to be recognized by the real estate market, making it a much larger issue all the way through in terms of who ends up paying and who ends up benefitting, which results in this distinction, called the split incentive. The occupant will usually be the beneficiary, but sometimes the costs are borne by the realtors and the contractors.

The Building Energy Code Review or the Building Code Review Board, which was created in 2000 out of recognition that the State would benefit from a uniform code, opted to try to skip the 2012 code. When the 2015 code came up, there was again a modest increase in the efficiency of that, but it was still a big jump over 2009. The Building Energy Code Review Board ended up adopting the 2015 Energy Code, but when it went to the Legislature there was significant pushback. The code was ultimately amended on the energy side, both for the residential chapter and then for the commercial chapter. It took 4 years of haggling for all parties to agree on the adoption of the 2015 code. Those key amendments were left in place until last March of 2022.

As a result of the disagreement concerning energy codes as well as fire code, the code adoption ended up being almost three cycles behind. This started to impact insurance rates for municipalities across the state. Currently, the state is on the 2018 code and the Building Code Review Board is considering the 2021 code, even though the 2024 codes are about to come out. In response, there was recognition from some key representatives and Senators that a more consistent review and adoption process was needed, especially since some municipalities were already pushing for more advanced modern energy code and there were also significant insurance implications for falling too far behind the code. By watching and learning from surrounding states as well as across the country, they hope to identify what worked and what does not work and what new codes would be a benefit so that they are not moving ahead and adopting codes that might be counterproductive or not work within the climate, or just turn out to be technically unfeasible.

Mr. Skoglund explained that Mr. Mike Hagan has been leading one group, which is the energy code chapter review of the 2021 code. There's another couple of individuals that are leading up the residential chapter, which also include energy elements. He explained that the energy elements in the residential chapter are separate from the amendments, and this can lead to it being quite confusing and is a direct result of the different but interrelated moving parts and references across time. The concern lies in that there is a big jump between the 2018 code and the 2021 code in terms of efficiency. While there is a big gain in terms of energy reduction, it comes at an upfront capital cost to the contractors and the developers, and this is a cost that may not be easily recovered in a real estate market. He explained there has been more work to try to address how to have more upfront ratings for buildings that are more accessible and understandable to the consumer. The contractors and home builders have made it clear that they do not wish to adopt the 2021 code and they prefer to stay with the 2018 code. So far, that is the only position that has been laid out.

On Friday morning, Mr. Hagan will be facilitating a conversation at the Department of Safety from 10AM to Noon, which will provide an opportunity to dig into some of the assumptions that the builders and contractors have. He mentioned some claims about recent added costs to new residence in the range of \$30-40,000. He believes those are not new costs, but rather the total cost of compliance with the code and believes they may be using some values that were provided by the National Association of Homebuilders. Mr. Skoglund was hopeful that they would be able to dig into and understand those numbers better. This will hopefully help various stakeholders to be able to find some common ground allowing for amendments that are modest, without eliminating all the energy efficiency benefit. While hopeful, he is also realistic that this will take some haggling and some deep diving into the specific details of the various proposals and data that the home builders and contractors are going to place before them. This situation is compounded by several municipalities that are interested in moving faster than the State because of their climate energy targets. The town of Durham often gets cited as a bad actor because they have an ordinance that allows them to or directs them to adopt the newest building energy code as soon as it is released. They are currently working under the 2021 code and as soon as the 2024 code comes out they will start implementing that. This creates a headache for contractors, builders and

code enforcement officials as it creates a patchwork of different codes used throughout the state rather than a uniform building energy code. Mr. Skoglund paused there for questions.

Chair Luse thanked Mr. Skoglund and asked what some of the items were that have been seen as significant added costs. Mr. Skoglund welcomed Mr. Hagan to step in. Mr. Skoglund shared that his portfolio covers a bunch of different technology, but shared that from his perspective, some of the added costs tend to be from the weatherization requirements, such as insulation. Requirements have gotten more stringent requiring continuous insulation that is on the outside and is air sealed. For example, if someone was to install pink board, they would also have to ensure that all the junctions between the boards are sealed and tight. By adding insulation, it adds one level of efficiency. By ensuring that there are no leaks in the building envelope, that ensures that any air that has been heated or cooled stays where it should be. This, however, comes at an additional cost because not only is there the cost for the foam board and the sealant, but also the increased workforce costs for crews to go through and seal all of it.

There is also this question of mechanical ventilation. Previously, buildings used to be built so that they ventilated themselves. Mr. Skoglund explained that anyone that has been in an older building knows that there are drafts and leaks around the windows or up in the attic. As building science has improved, buildings have gotten tighter. While this is beneficial on the energy side, this has raised new concerns. Warm, moist air that is trapped inside a building creates ideal conditions for mold and fungus and can lead to what is called sick building syndrome. Building materials have also advanced so that they are not just using all-natural material, but they are using material that can off gas. It comes down to a balancing act of making sure that a building is tight and adequately insulated in terms of air not getting in or out, but still allowing for controlled air exchange to prevent moist, stale air from accumulating to make sure these buildings not only operate properly and last a long time, but also do not become a source of illness for the inhabitants or users of the building. Unfortunately, the mechanical systems are somewhat of a new feature and while they add long term health benefit, it comes at a significant upfront cost that can be a hindrance.

Chair Luse shared that as someone who has done the air, ceiling, and weatherization piece on a one hundred and fifty-year-old church, he knows it is incredibly hard to do later and it seems short sighted to him. Mr. Skoglund responded that he spent one winter up in his attic air sealing all the top plates. One of the things that he noticed was how over a 50- or 60-year period, that insulation had degraded. All along the vent areas, where air was being vented outside, it was black from the dust that had been migrating up through the wall spaces and up against the insulation. He did this in the middle of winter, so he also got a chance to see what happens when that warm air touches the cold insulation. He was able to tell where he needed to seal based on the color. He noted new modern buildings will eliminate that, and last longer if they are built, as the code defines, but then who pays?

Chair Luse asked if they were to decide not to adopt the 2021 building energy codes or weaken them significantly, whether that would put the city farther behind for the 2024 codes, and result in

having to catch up when those come out. Mr. Skoglund responded that while he has not seen the analysis on what the jump is for 2021 to 2024, the previous 2012-2015 jumps were significant. Ultimately, the building community is pushing for a goal of having net-zero buildings that are cost effective to build for the first time by 2030 or shortly after. He explained that the codes are ratcheting down, but it is his understanding that between 2015 and 2018, there was a very modest increase in efficiency of about 1%. Really, the code was focused on fixing some administrative and clerical issues to make it simpler to implement, but also allowing the building community a moment to catch its breath with a pause after the big jumps between 2012 and 2015. Between the 2018 and 2021 code, there is almost a 14% improvement in efficiency. A jump of that nature does incur new construction techniques and new material costs. He noted that the 2015 amendments have only recently been implemented, and this jump is seen as possibly having a significant impact of the building community, which is where he believes a lot of the concern lies. There are those that feel that the code has gone far enough, the buildings should be free to breathe, and it is not needed to have them be as tight nor is there a need for the mechanical ventilation. However, on the other side, there are those that recognize that there is a need to eliminate or significantly reduce energy consumption to decarbonize the economy and having buildings that last for a century that are not optimally efficient, is just going to get in the way of that. This creates this tension between who pays now/ who pays later.

Chair Luse asked if Mr. Hagan or Mr. Medard Kopczynski had anything to add before he opened it up to questions.

B) Mike Hagan, City of Keene Plans Examiner

Mr. Hagan approached the microphone, thanked the committee for having him and introduced himself. He shared that he sits on the Building Code Review Board and has been on the board for six years now and served as an alternate two years before that. He explained that while Mr. Skoglund went over the cycle, he is there to help everyone get an understanding of where they are in the process at this point. He explained that Mr. Kopczynski is the chair of that committee, but was on medical leave, so in his absence, Mr. Hagan stepped up. Mr. Kopczynski has since returned and is helping out as they move forward in preparation for this next meeting coming up on Friday.

Mr. Hagan provided a little history of the Building Code Review Board, explaining that it is made up of eighteen different representatives from different associations. He represents the New Hampshire Building Officials Association on the Board as a representative for codes and enforcement portion. He explained there are only two other code enforcement representatives on the board and the rest are all represented by the Association of General Contractors and the spot that Mr. Skoglund held. Mr. Hagan asked if Mr. Skoglund's spot was with the Department of Energy.

Mr. Skoglund clarified that he never sat on the board and was with the Department of Environmental Services. He further explained that the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) had a seat, but when the public utilities were divided into the PUC and the Department of Energy, the

Department of Energy was given a seat. He is not sure if that individual's been able to make it lately.

Mr. Hagan explained that the first thing they do with a change in code adoption is look at whether it is an increase, decrease or neutral. They do not necessarily have to look at all 900,000 pages of code, but rather at the changes proposed between the previous code adoption and the proposed code. As a committee, they break into smaller subcommittees and then make recommendations from there. At this point, they are at the subcommittee level with the International Energy Conservation Code (IECC) as it has not been recommended to the full board yet. They are working with all the parties involved in this including Mr. Skoglund, representatives from the Legislature, and representatives from the Homebuilders Association. There were some pretty strong opinions on both sides, and more is expected for this meeting on Friday. What they hope to do is determine if people want to move the code forward or stay at the 2018. If the decision is to move the code forward, it is of benefit as it means staying with the most up-to-date code adoption. It prevents falling too far behind, which is a requirement for insurance ratings. He explained if the code is more than six years back, insurances can ding you on ratings as can The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) with building codes. So, there is a lot that goes into Insurance Services Office (ISO) ratings for municipalities, and it is at all levels; not just the building department, but also fire and police. It makes an impact on how the whole city is rated.

On Friday, they are hoping to get everybody together and move forward. They have set aside a three-hour block to get everybody in one room and propose how they want to move the code forward or not move the code forward, etc. Mr. Hagan, and Mr. Mike Soucy, Department of Energy, have been working on some proposed amendments for the envelope itself. Currently, the envelope requires increased or continuous R value on the exterior. New Hampshire is split into 2 zones: zone five (the three lower counties-Cheshire County, Hillsborough County and Rockingham County) and zone 6 (the upper counties). Zone 6 has higher standards because of the 2015 to 2018 changes. Right now, under the 2018, Zone 6 already has continuous R value. Many developers up there are already feeling the impact of that change. With the 2021 changes, the continuous R value change will continue down to zone 5, which is where the most population is in the State of New Hampshire (Keene, Manchester, Portsmouth, Nashua, etc.).

He explained that many of the benefits that come out of the IECC are not just in the thermal envelope of the building; it is with the energy and electrical portion, which is a thick part of the energy code as are the mechanical systems, the ratings for those mechanical systems and the efficiencies of those mechanical systems. Much of it comes down to education and educating new homeowners on the mechanical systems, how to maintain them, when to replace them, etc. The education portion needs to catch up as well on these very efficient homes.

Ms. Diana Duffy asked for clarification on whether this was all residential or residential and commercial. Mr. Hagan responded that the residential code is used to build from beginning to end with mechanical, electrical, plumbing, etc. Commercial (three units and above) is broken out into different codes (mechanical, building, accessibility, electrical, etc.). He clarified these changes

would be for all new buildings and all existing buildings, which are also impacted with code updates and presents a challenge of how to implement the updates into existing structures.

C) Medard Kopczynski, City of Keene Director of Economic Development

Mr. Kopczynski introduced himself and explained he was one of the original members of the Building Code Review Board and sat on the 2012 Committee for the International Conservation Energy Conservation Code. He explained the issue really is not granite countertops versus energy. The battle is going to be over affordable housing. The residential portion of the energy code applies to all residential occupancies less than three stories high. He explained that people tend to think in terms of houses, but apartment buildings that are less than three stories high are also covered under that code. The basic conversation that he hears from developers is that there is no benefit to them to meet the energy code because they build the building. There is no payback because even if they own the building and build to rent out, the beneficiary is not them- it is the tenant. So, the question would be what at the State level can be done, and he shared that there are other conversations currently happening to determine what would facilitate payback.

He explained that there is a conversation that needs to be had around the code adoption. Staying with the 2018 code is not a simple answer as it is more complicated to stay on the 2018. What one is really looking at is adopting some manner of the 2021 energy code and determining what portions can be amended. He explained that in their report, they broke it down into three potential costs. They can determine those costs using various reports that are out there. Pacific Northwest Labs, which has a contract with the Department of Energy, creates reports down to the State Level, but explained that many of these reports have been there for a while and have not taken into consideration the level of inflation. There is also the ongoing cost of operating. It is not just adopting the changes as in many cases owners must be very clear, and very careful in making sure whoever is operating the building knows some of the tricks of maintaining that equipment and making sure it is operating right. There is also going to be ongoing maintenance and repairs. The third cost they identified was societal, especially given the ongoing national discussion about the cost of carbon, increasing temperatures from climate and things like that.

He does believe there is an increased cost, but he does not think the discussion is going to be around whether to include granite counters in a half million-dollar home. He believes the real discussion is going to be on affordable housing and how this affects affordable housing.

Mr. Kopczynski explained that they have asked Mike Soucy and Mike Hagan, who are the most experienced in working with the document, to go in and look at where those differences lie, which will be the subject of the discussion for Friday. He also explained that very shortly, the energy code is becoming standards-based as it has recently been suspended. Ultimately, the IECC and the National Association of Homebuilders want to progress to a net zero code, but the battle will be affordability.

Chair Luse mentioned that one thing he heard Mr. Skoglund say earlier on was that the real estate market did not recognize some of these improvements. He asked if Mr. Kopczynski thought home

energy labeling could help with that. Mr. Kopczynski responded that he did, he believed there had been discussions around that and he understood that there were even places for that within the MLS. The question around that would be how to get that industry on board. He said he believed Mr. Greenwald, Jr. was coming into the presidency of the Realtors Association and thought there was an opportunity for a discussion to take place. He noted that it really is a matter of creating demand and questioned how to stimulate or reward the people who are building apartments and apartment buildings to build them to be more efficient.

Mr. Skoglund asked if he could add to the conversation. At the last Building Code Review Board, he heard people saying rents cannot support the added marginal incremental costs of the new codes. There were developers in attendance who build their own buildings and then rent them out. They were finding in their markets that they could not make a profit given current construction costs, current material construction costs and inflation rates, and the cost of labor. They were not able to recover and still make a profit from the existing pool of renters. This ends up creating this dynamic where, if the costs are too high and the rents do not support both the profit and recovery of first costs, buildings may not get built. As a result, they have engaged the New Hampshire Housing and Finance Authority, who were part of the conversation in 2015 through 2018 to make sure it was on their radar.

D) Questions and Answers

Chair Luse recognized Ms. Brunner. She noted that when the Committee was working on the energy plan a few years back, they had done some research into the split incentive issue and looked at what some other communities in the New England area are doing. The city of Burlington had a good example of how they have handled it. They also looked at some communities in Massachusetts who have a local ordinance where they offer rewards or incentives. For example, if a landlord who owns a rental property pays the energy costs and they pay for the utility bills, they do not have to comply to meet the energy standards. If, however, a landlord forwards those bills to the tenants, they then are required to meet the energy standards. She added that she was not sure how it works in New Hampshire and was not aware of any community in New Hampshire that has done this, but wanted to remind people of it as it has been a couple of years. One of the key recommendations developed and put into the energy plan to deal with this issue was benchmarking and home energy labeling. Those two strategies were identified to try and help make the cost of energy and energy efficient upgrades to buildings more transparent when choosing whether to rent or buy.

Mr. Kopczynski asked Ms. Brunner if the density bonus was also put in there. Ms. Brunner clarified that a density bonus for solar was put in, but it was not tied to the building code. Chair Luse suggested investigating the topic of split incentives as an issue to explore further. He asked if there were any other areas that committee members or members of the public thought they should be acting on or keeping an eye on.

Ms. Nora Hanke spoke and shared that she wanted to mention and ask the experts here if they want to make any comments about funding from the BIL or IRA (recent federal legislation) that supports stretch building codes and bringing municipalities, counties, and states into compliance with existing codes.

Mr. Skoglund offered to speak to it quickly. He shared that there had been an organization called Northeast Energy Efficiency Partnerships (NEEP). The organization was headquartered in Massachusetts but covers the 15 Coastal States from Maine down to West Virginia. They had reached out to New Hampshire, to see if NH wanted to be part of a workforce program that would support the implementation of more modern codes. Ultimately, the New Hampshire Department of Energy had to decline because there was a requirement insisting that the state have adopted newest energy code, and because before the state can adopt a code, there is a state statute that requires a two-year cooling off period before adoption. Clean Energy New Hampshire, and some other parties are watching that process because we do have a workforce issue, a program that we are attempting to maintain through the New Hampshire Saves program. New Hampshire Saves is run by the utilities, using repair funds and a new plan that is going to be filed on July first of this year. He is also involved in that effort and as part of this conversation, he reached out to the Department of Energy to see if any funding might be able to cover that incremental cost, especially for affordable housing.

Mr. Kopczynski shared he was hoping there would be some InvestNH money directed that way. Mr. Kopczynski explained that the whole energy code conversation goes back to Jimmy Carter days. There was a split made due to the economy at the time and they treated industrial or commercial very differently than they treated residential, because they did not want to kill the economy at the time. He clarified that the underlying cost is something called Ashrae 90. All the codes discussed and contained in the book he presented are found to be equivalent to Ashrae 90. He believes it is a statutory requirement and is something they pointed out in the report. The State is supposed to certify back to Congress that their top energy code equals the latest adopted version of Ashrae 90. There is no penalty that he is aware of for not complying, but there is this underlying requirement at the Federal Level.

Ms. Brunner reminded everyone of the time and given their interest in the topic, asked if there was interest in continuing this topic on another date. Chair Luse agreed they did want to continue this discussion at a future meeting.

Mr. Hagan requested to add one thing to answer Chair Luse's question. He stated the importance that all municipalities, when looking to adopt or make building code changes, be vetted through the Building Code Review Board as that process is part of the State law change. Mr. Hagan explained that they could be of benefit to the committee if they propose either a stretch code or a change. Code Enforcement already had two educated and talented individuals that already worked for the city that could help with that process if you choose to move in that direction. He encouraged the committee, if they are meeting at a subcommittee level, to utilize his department as they could help move through that process. He noted that many communities try to

do it and are unsuccessful due to not understanding or following the process. Chair Luse thanked Mr. Hagan, Mr. Skoglund and Mr. Kopczynski for their time and the very informative discussion.

4) ECC Work Groups
A) Retreat Recap

Chair Luse moved on to discuss the retreat, provided a recap and shared that the conversation with Julia Griffin was great. He shared that she suggested having people monitor legislation and the New England ISO because there is relatively no oversight, and they manage the reliability and wholesale market around New England. She shared that it is often more effective to have citizens speak up on legislation because they are not paid to be there. She also discussed leaving room to shift priorities to where volunteers were really interested and knowledgeable if it aligns with the group's goals. She also suggested using students from Dartmouth in Hanover, and that there might be an opportunity to work more with Keene State students or Antioch students. He shared that Ms. Brunner gave a great background on the climate action and adaptation plans, and the energy plan, and the purpose of the committee, which was all laid out in the minutes.

B) Proposed work groups and assignments/membership

The priorities for 2023 and 2024 were also discussed during the retreat. The current committees were spread thin, and they wanted to focus on more resources to get more done. There were lots of ideas and he thought when they sat down to figure out what the work group should be, they decided a lot of those priorities and ideas like home energy labeling, benchmarking, and measurements, all could be done by a staff person if they were able to find the funding to do that. As a result, one of the new work groups is grant funding and partnerships to really look at where to find funds to hire somebody to help facilitate and do a lot of these things.

Education and outreach were two big themes and the electric vehicle piece kind of got folded a little bit into that. Chair Luse believed market forces are going to drive EV adoption, but there were some issues around chargers that could be addressed. Ultimately, they decided to table the electric vehicle work group for now and focus on education and outreach, community solar as that was making some really good progress on finding solar sites.

The Committee decided to have five work groups: 1 - education and outreach, 2 - community solar, 3 - grants, funding and partnerships, 4 - legislative tracking, and 5 - food security.

Chair Luse suggested using the limited time left to determine who was going to lead each group and who desired to be members. He suggested sticking to a core work group that each person really wanted to focus on. Ms. Brunner offered to put together a survey, or a poll, or something that she could send out for people to pick their first and second choice. Chair Luse offered to lead the education and outreach. Councilor Lake offered to lead the legislative work group. Mr. Clair Ousler offered to work on education and outreach. Mr. Rowland Russell offered to lead the food

security group and offered to be on the grant funding and partnerships group. Mr. Hansel agreed to be on community solar. Mr. Jude Nuru offered to lead the community solar. Mr. Nuru stated he was initially under the impression that the legislative update was to be done by the sustainability coordinator. Chair Luse said they would need to determine the role and responsibilities for that.

C) Format for monthly report-outs

Chair Luse suggested changing how the report-outs are done going forward. He suggested a Google form that would allow the committee to report-out up to a week in advance. This would provide Ms. Brunner enough time to get the reports into the agenda packet. The report-outs would be in a more structured format that should be simple to fill out and submit, and then there would be a section of the meeting to address whatever topics or decisions need to be made.

5) Community Power Program

A) Update on program launch

Chair Luse moved on to community power and asked if anybody had anything to add quickly. Mr. Brunner said the first task of the education and outreach group will be to figure out how to promote that opt-up in the next 2 weeks before the May fifteenth deadline. She said they were in the middle of that right now. The letters were sent out, April 12th, and so everyone in Keene received one of two letters, either an opt-out letter with an opt-out card (if they are currently on Eversource) or if they are currently on third-party supplier, they should have received an opt-in letter. The exception to that is, if somebody recently moved in the last couple of months, then they might have been missed because of the date of the data.

The second information meeting occurred last night, and she thanked those committee members who were in attendance. She shared that the first meeting had almost 200 attendees. The deadline for people to join the program, opt-out of the program or choose a different option is May 15th. While there is a deadline, it should be made clear that they can also change at any point and without penalty, if they are not on some other provider that has a penalty for changing. She reiterated that the May 15th deadline is for people who want to join the program when it launches or opt out of the program before it launches. You can change it after that deadline, but there will likely be a delay.

The program will start with the meter reads in June, so any changes will not be reflected until the July bill for June usage. If someone makes changes after the deadline of May 15th, changes would not likely be noticed until August or September bills depending on when the changes were made.

B) “Opt up to 100%” Campaign

Chair Luse suggested talking to neighbors or friends and encouraging them to opt up.

6) Report-outs on Recent ECC-sponsored Events

A) NHSaves Button Up Workshop

Chair Luse also shared that the Clean Energy Team did a NH Saves Button Up workshop on May 1st. They had eighteen attendees. It was overall a good event with great feedback. There were able to get a lot of good information into people's hands.

7) Legislative Update

Chair Luse shared that he did not have much in terms of a legislative update other than he did personally respond to the SB 54 with remote testimony.

8) Committee Membership

Chair Luse discussed committee membership and how they are always looking for members. He believed they had 2 alternate positions and suggested committee members keep eyes and ears open for anyone that might be interested in joining.

9) New Business

A) Potential Fall Retreat

Lastly, Chair Luse discussed the idea of doing a fall retreat like the recent spring retreat. He felt the retreat was successful and offered time to talk about the issues, the group's priorities, and discuss how the group was doing overall. He personally believed that it served to energize the group and help everyone keep an eye on the prize and stay focused on goals. The group was open to it and scheduling work will start soon.

10) Next Meeting: Wednesday, June 7, 2023- 8:00AM

Without any other new business, Chair Luse shared that the next meeting is Wednesday, June 7th at 8:00 AM.

11) Adjournment

Chair Luse adjourned the meeting at 9:15 AM.

Respectfully submitted by,
Amanda Trask, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by,
Mari Brunner, Senior Planner