

# Energy Efficiency Advisory Group Meeting November 12, 2025

## Present

Christian Douglass – Northwest Power & Conservation Council (Virtual)  
Derek Goldman – NW Energy Coalition  
Emily Her – Office of Energy & Mineral Resources  
Jason Talford – Idaho Public Utilities Commission  
Quentin Nesbitt – Idaho Power

Rebecca Cottrell – Idaho Public Utilities Commission  
Riley Maloney – Idaho Power  
Steve Hubble – City of Boise Public Works  
Sidney Erwin – Idaho Irrigation Pumpers Association (Virtual)

## Not Present

Don Strickler – J.R. Simplot Company  
Matt Fuxon – Charlie's Produce

## Guests & Presenters\*

Alexis Freeman – Idaho Power  
Annie Meyer – Idaho Power  
Becky Arte Howell – Idaho Power  
Billie McWinn\* – Idaho Power  
Chellie Jensen\* – Idaho Power  
Cheryl Tuning – Idaho Power  
Danielle Ready – Idaho Power  
Donn English – Idaho Public Utilities Commission  
Elena Radcliffe – Idaho Power  
Gina Powell – Idaho Power  
Landon Barber\* – Idaho Power

Laura Conilogue – Idaho Public Utilities Commission  
Mary Alice Taylor – Idaho Power  
Michelle Toney – Idaho Power  
Mindi Shodeen – Idaho Power  
Matt Scheel – Idaho Power  
Nathan Black – Idaho Power  
Nick Ackerman – Idaho Power  
Ray Short – Idaho Power  
Sheree Willhite – Idaho Power  
Sophie Croome – Idaho Power  
Todd Greenwell – Idaho Power

**Note Takers** - Michelle Toney with Sophie Croome

**Meeting Facilitator** - Quentin Nesbitt

## **9:32 A.M. Welcome & Announcements—Quentin Nesbitt**

Quentin started the meeting and after introductions, he discussed the Idaho Public Utilities Commission's November 2025 DSM prudence order.

There were no questions or comments about the August meeting notes.

## **9:38 A.M. 2024 YTD Financials, Savings, & Evaluations—Quentin Nesbitt**

Quentin presented the 2025 YTD financials, savings, and evaluations. He went over program changes including name changes, new programs, and discontinued programs.

Quentin then discussed program evaluations and went over the pros and cons of moving the Multifamily and SBL evaluations from 2026 to 2027.

### **Discussion**

#### Financials

One member asked about the departure in the total savings compared to the same quarter last year. Quentin answered that there was some departure. But, overall, it was similar and explained that Billie and Chellie would go into more detail.

#### Multifamily Evaluation

One member asked about participation and if there would be enough data to run an analysis with two years of operations. Billie answered that there were two participants last year and five this year and more participation would allow for better evaluation methods. Quentin added that this is a new program, but a process evaluation could provide suggestions for improvement.

Another member asked about the expected number of participants for 2026. Billie replied that it isn't possible to know but she expects more participants compared to 2025. Chellie added that there are a few projects from participants expected to be completed in 2026 and we have a good pipeline of potential projects.

The member then asked if there is a minimum number of participants required for a better evaluation. Quentin stated more participation is better for the evaluation. Landon added that with a smaller group, the evaluator would look at all participants to get a 90% confidence level and more participation would contribute to that.

The member then asked about the C/E. Quentin answered that the C/E is a concern when participation is this low and savings are low, but it's the same with all smaller programs.

Another member asked about the evaluation method and if it would include a billing analysis. Quentin replied that typically the prescriptive measures are from the TRM. Landon added that it is industry best practice to include a billing analysis as it is done with the NC program, but it is the evaluators who decide how they run the analysis.

One member stated that with low participation, they likely want to wait until a year when there will be more participation.

Another member asked for clarification around program participation. Billie answered it has been all new builds, but the program includes retrofits, though there has been no participation for retrofits yet. The member then asked about the HER program and if it is included with the MF program. Billie replied that HER is independent from the MF program.

One member asked about the measures being risky on the C&I side of the TRM and if they are in flux. Chellie answered that the C&I measures are typical measures that we utilize with existing C&I programs and MF bundles existing measures from the other programs with new MF-specific measures.

Another member asked about the significance of the evaluation's timeline. Quentin replied that it is a commitment the company has made to staff and EEAG the assurance the EE programs are prudent. He added that evaluations are typically conducted every two or three years by an external evaluator. Billie stated that the company uses the process evaluation recommendations for process improvements and the impact evaluations to validate savings.

One member asked about how it is decided whether to do a process or impact evaluation. Quentin answered that impact evaluations are more important because they relate to savings, whereas process evaluations are less needed for well-run, mature programs, but the company weighs the pros and cons of each, including the costs and timing. The member then concluded that pushing out the evaluation makes the most sense.

#### Small Business Lighting Evaluation

One member asked about the timeline of the program. Quentin answered that the program life is expected to be short due to the market being transformed to LEDs.

The member then asked about pushing the evaluation back a year and if there are risks doing two back-to-back evaluations. Quentin answered that the company would not do back-to-back evaluations on this program.

Another member asked if the evaluation showed good results, would that change the company's decision of whether it would be short lived. Quentin answered no, and that the short term for this program is because the lighting market is transforming to LED's.

One member questioned the C/E of the program if it is extended. Quentin answered that the evaluations of small programs are costly in comparison to the savings, but if the evaluations are put off a year, it would have more savings to justify the cost of an evaluation.

Another member asked about how the transformation of lighting in the C&I sectors differs from the residential sector. Quentin answered that the C&I sector transformation is slow with tube lights, but screw-ins are completely transformed. Chellie added the company is monitoring the region and confirmed Idaho is moving slower as there is a lot of inefficient lighting in the area. She noted that retrofit projects increased in quantity with increased incentives.

The member then commented that conducting the evaluation this year could be more helpful in scoping out the potential and getting a better understanding of the program's lifespan. Landon responded that evaluations tend to look at the current state of the program and not the program's future.

Billie added that there is a potential study scheduled for 2026.

Quentin advised that, per the conversation, the evaluations will be pushed back a year. There were no further comments.

## **10:05 A.M. Residential Programs—Billie McWinn**

Billie presented the residential programs focusing on AC Cool Credit, Efficient Manufactured Homes, WAQC Re-weatherization (looking for feedback), and the NEEA Marketplace pilot. She concluded her presentation with residential marketing.

### **Discussion**

#### Year-to-Year Savings

One member asked about the RNC decreasing. Billing answered that participation is largely impacted by a decrease in home energy raters available in the rater network. She added raters are hard to recruit as they are in short supply and, currently, there is only one in the Treasure Valley, but that Idaho Power is working with a regional reviewer company to recruit raters and offer trainings. Billie stated this rater shortage is not unique to Idaho Power's service area, and that it is an issue throughout the northwestern region.

Another member asked if RNC was all single-family construction. Billie confirmed yes.

### AC Cool Credit

One member asked about the customer satisfaction rating when there is an event and if the company monitors that. Billie replied that the company conducts surveys for customer satisfaction ratings.

The member then asked about customers opting out. Billie answered that customers can opt out of an event at any time, but they typically do not opt out of individual events. If they call in, it is usually to remove themselves from the program entirely.

### Efficient Manufactured Homes

One member asked about the level of difficulty it will be to bring the program back once it is suspended. Billie answered that it would be easier to restart than other programs because it involves a handful of retailers. She stated that the company would bring the topic back to EEAG if the market changed enough to warrant restarting it.

Another member expressed concerns about the expiring tax credits. Billie replied that the expiring tax credits are one of the things that the RTF and regional partners will be monitoring to determine what impacts they will have on builder practices.

One member asked about the program pausing date and how long the company will monitor. Billie answered that the program would be suspended as of January 1, 2026, and the timing for restarting the program would depend entirely on the market changes.

Another member commented that this is a hard call as it reminds the member of the Shade Tree Program. The member suggested potential assessments but added that since the company has put in a lot of thought into pausing this program, there were no concerns and thanked Billie for the company's effort.

### WAQC Re-Wx

One member asked about the amount of funds that go to agencies each year for WAQC. Billie advised that just over \$1.2 million is funded through the Rider and does not carry over year-to-year.

Another member asked about whether the agencies were okay with not carrying the re-weatherization option forward. Billie answered that the company had communicated with the agencies and while they thought it was a nice option to have available to customers, they understood that carryover funds were nearly depleted, and they did not have an active pipeline to justify extending the option.

### Heating & Cooling Efficiency Incentive Updates

Billie presented changes in incentive levels for ductless heat pumps and air-conditioners due to changes in cost-effectiveness that result from applying the 2025 IRP DSM's avoided costs. She shared that the changes would become effective January 1, 2026.

### NEEA Marketplace Pilot

Billie presented three options regarding the NEEA Marketplace pilot. Option one was to join the pilot at a lower level to be able to use it for educational purposes. Option two was to join the pilot at a higher level to be able to offer incentives and other benefits through it. Option three was to not join the pilot. One member asked about the loss of incentive opportunities for option one. Billie answered there would be a loss of incentive opportunities which is one reason the company preferred option two. Billie explained that option one would allow customers to see when the company had incentives through its existing programs, but that those incentives would be paid through the traditional route so customers would have to go through additional steps to apply. She added that option one would not allow for additional incentives and the opportunity for customers to apply online through the site.

The member asked if this is on the marketing side. Billie answered that this would be considered more educational than marketing.

Another member asked about whether option one would link the marketplace to the company's website for more program information and give direction for the customer to apply for incentives. Billie answered that the link could be on the company's site but also the marketplace could contain links to the company's website. The member then commented that this causes attrition. Billie agreed that it could contribute to attrition.

One member asked about the \$15 rebate processing fee and if it gets in the way of lower cost items. Billie answered that the incentives the company was considering already included the \$15 rebate processing fee.

One member asked about C/E for option 2 without the educational funds. Billie answered that it likely would not be C/E without those education funds from a UCT perspective. Billie reiterated option 2 is reliant on part of the expenses being paid for by education funds. Quentin added that the web traffic tracking can provide insight into education being provided to customers.

The member then asked about the participation data and what NEEA would provide. Billie answered that the participation data from NEEA would provide the concrete information needed to determine incentives and savings for cost-effectiveness calculations and reporting.

Another member asked about other peer utility commitments. Billie replied that there are a handful who have expressed interest, but she is unsure of who or how far down the path they are yet.

Another member has expressed interest in option 2 but would like to know more about peer utilities. The member has concerns about the company shouldering all the funding and would like to see what other funding options are available. The member is not sure about this option. Billie responded that NEEA is funding the pilot with all member funds, and it's up to the individual utilities whether they want to provide additional funding to build out benefits to their individual utilities. She added that regardless of how many other utilities did or did not participate, this would still be the cost.

One member asked about whether the company would have control over the retailers with option two. Billie answered the company would have control over things like the categories displayed, but not the retailers.

One member said the marketplace seemed like a great opportunity and that they completely supported it. Two other members agreed.

## **10:58 A.M. – Break**

## **11:12 A.M. Commercial, Industrial, & Irrigation Programs—Chellie Jensen**

Chellie introduced new team members and then presented on DR, CI&I Q3 program performance. She gave an update on the exploration of a Whole Building Approach and Midstream offering and asked for feedback.

### **Discussion**

#### Flex Peak

One member asked about participation in Flex Peak. Chellie answered that it is intended for all commercial and industrial customers to participate that can reduce a minimum of 20 kW during an event.

The member then asked about the multiple Irrigation groups. Chellie answered that the Flex Peak program is only commercial and industrial and there is only one dispatch group.

Another member asked for clarification on why the commercial and industrial program only has one group. Quentin replied that it is because of the size of the program, and that it's not big enough to split up into groups.

One member asked if the events can be broken out into small groups when there is a hot summer, so customers aren't participating in frequent events. Chellie answered that Flex Peak customers sign up for a max of events (15) and hours (60) in a season and hours in a week (16), and they can opt out if they don't want to participate. However, opting out will impact the total incentive they receive at the end of the season.

### Irrigation Peak

One member asked about the late group and what time they are scheduled. Chellie answered that an event can be run for Group D in an extended hour window until 11pm with extra incentive. Enrollment is yearly and enrollment packets are sent to all irrigation customers.

The member then asked about each group's participation numbers and if they were the same. Chellie answered that the early group, Group E, is smallest and the extended group, Group D, is largest, and the other groups A-C were similar sizes, but it does depend on the region.

One member commented that it's interesting that the max load reduction day was different from the Flex Peak day. Chellie responded that C&I customers are not as weather dependent as irrigators and there are more pumps on in July than August, so the max potential is higher.

### New Construction

One member asked if the program is linear. Chellie said that it depends on what is happening in the market.

The member then asked about the number of projects that will be completed by the end of the year. Chellie answered that there are a couple of large projects that the department is working on to be completed by December 31<sup>st</sup>, but completion is highly dependent on customers' project schedules

The member then asked if the program is expected to be cost-effective. Chellie answered, yes.

### Custom

One member asked about the savings and if those are calculated before the construction is completed. Chellie replied that the savings and potential incentives are typically calculated on the front end of a project and then final savings and associated incentives are claimed and paid after completion and verification of a project.

Another member asked about the different phases in which a project is paid. Chellie answered that some projects are paid as they complete a phase and are verified. She then provided examples of multiple buildings (building A and then building B) or paying on different process systems like a whole chilled water system or the building shell as one project. It depends on the size and scope of work for each project as well as customer preference.

One member asked if the Custom program is more customer driven. Chellie replied that the timeline is customer driven as it's based on the project and construction time. She added the Company is involved with the process often from conception of an energy efficiency opportunity and then fully engaged with the customer during the construction process.

### IBR Top Projects

One member asked about the incentive that was paid on the Arthur. Chellie answered that the incentive was for windows, heat pumps and light load reduction.

The member then asked if one of the incentives was for the color or coating of the windows. Chellie explained that it's the window system itself (called glazing) that met the efficient criteria outlined by the program.

### Whole Building Approach

One member asked about the meaning of "once bundle is determined." Chellie replied that the implementer establishes different combinations of efficient measures and their associated overall savings and then the owner and design team decide which combination of measures they will pursue.

Another member asked about third-party implementers vs company provided implementer and if Path 2 means that whoever is developing the project gets to pick the architect and engineer they want to work with, and their model used. Chellie answered that Path 2 is typically a design team of architects and engineers that are contracted for the design. They often have modeling capabilities, and we wanted to outline a pathway for them to participate.

The member then asked about the potential opposite of Path 2. The member added that there is possibility that the architect/engineer doesn't have the modeling skills that are wanted or needed for the project. Chellie replied that these two paths offer flexibility for the owner and design firm to pick the best fit and the best option for their project.

The member then asked for clarification that Path 1 is when the implementer gets a separate incentive. Chellie clarified that yes, Path 1 offers a separate incentive that goes to the implementer. The member asked if the customer picks one path or the other and Chellie answered yes.

Another member asked about program eligibility. Chellie answered that there is no minimum size as the company is trying to get deeper savings than the current prescriptive program offers.

Quentin added that the company is also viewing this as an additional option to the Custom new construction program.

### Midstream

No feedback or questions.

## **12:15 P.M. – Lunch**

### **1:00 P.M. Cost Effectiveness—Landon Barber**

Landon presented 2026 cost-effectiveness by first giving the group a refresher on what C/E is and gave examples. He then provided updates and future forecast.

#### **Discussion**

##### Standard Tests

One member asked about other utilities looking at the cost of carbon. Landon replied that there is some debate on whether to include that or not, but it is not a standard.

Quentin added that other things like carbon, which tend to be non-quantifiable, tend to not be included

##### IRP Avoided Costs

One member asked about the avoided costs graph going up in 2026 then slowly declining. Landon answered that the graph includes capacity and savings based on the 2025 IRP. Quentin added that there was a modest increase in capacity from \$148 per kW, in the 2023 IRP, to \$158 per kW in the 2025 IRP, but that fuel costs went down from the 2023 IRP.

The member then asked about how the company feels about the costs increasing. Quentin answered that higher avoided costs make energy efficiency look better and more cost effective. When avoided costs are lower it is difficult for measures to be cost effective.

The member then asked about how accurate the model is at predicting avoided costs. Quentin said that this is an IRP team question but added that it is an imperfect prediction.

The member then clarified that this could make a measure not cost-effective even though it's wrong. Quentin replied that yes, that is the reality.

##### Other IRP Assumptions

One member asked about the decrease in line losses and assumed it would increase the DSM benefits. Landon replied that it is less savings claimed but the system is more efficient.

Another member asked about whether the company has ever considered marginal line losses instead of averages. Quentin responded that he would look into this and will get back to the member. *Quentin did receive an email from the IRP team and had a side conversation with the member after the meeting concluded and discussed that the company does not think it appropriate to use marginal line losses for the purposes of DSM savings.*

### Other Questions

One member asked about the avoided costs and if those would be recalculated annually or only with a new IRP. Landon advised they are updated only with each IRP.

The member then asked about the slide that projected avoided costs going up a little next year, then starting to decline and if there will be big changes in the programs next year. Landon answered that there are no expected changes.

The member then asked to go back to the avoided cost chart and explain the differences in avoided costs calculated using the 2023 IRP vs the 2025 IRP, and what accounts for the differences. Quentin stated this is another question for the IRP team but suspects it has to do with gas price forecast and renewable resources, which bring down the expected future cost of energy.

## **1:35 P.M. Baseline for Fuel Switching—Chellie Jensen & Billie McWinn**

Chellie and Billie presented on the Fuel Conversion Baseline Assumptions and are asking for feedback on what should be considered as baseline and if we should change how we are incenting where NG is available or in use or if code is not applicable, such as in industrial applications.

### **Discussion**

One member asked about why there are no proposed changes to the 2026 incentives. Billie answered that the company is still monitoring conditions because what is known today doesn't justify incentive changes. Quentin added that in the two most common residential applications, HPWHs and HPs, there isn't a more efficient option to do something different.

One member doesn't necessarily believe the company should change what is currently being done. The member sees the line of thought from a customer perspective where they may be choosing electric regardless, but on the flip side, it could incent fuel switching. Quentin brought up his experience with receiving an incentive from the gas company for an efficient gas furnace even though he was replacing a heat pump. Billie asked the member that stated he didn't

believe IPC should change what we're currently doing whether that would be different for an industrial customer coming to us with a specific project where they are planning to go electric.

One member asked about the gas company's offerings and if there is a fuel conversion incentive. Quentin responded that the gas company didn't ask what he was converting from when he got an incentive, and that he had converted from a heat pump.

Another member responded that if a customer is already choosing electric, they are narrowing the baseline options for Idaho Power. However, if they haven't already made the decision to choose electric, it could incent them to choose electric to get an incentive.

Quentin commented that the company does not want to promote fuel switching but wants to offer an incentive for a more efficient option for situations where the customer is going electric anyways. He added that this is a conservative approach and, when there is a more efficient option, they could be incented on the difference between the less efficient option of that same technology.

Chellie added that if the incentive is too low, you might not actually persuade them to choose the more efficient option and that is why baselines are so important.

One member commented that the baseline that is selected makes a big difference and if the costs are high, the incentive also needs to be high.

Another member commented that the blended market rate would lower incentives where natural gas is not available, which is where it is most needed.

Billie commented that if there is an established baseline for only where natural gas is available, not service-wide, savings and incentives could be kept where they are currently. Specifically, where natural gas is not available is where the incentives are most beneficial. Multifamily is an example of where we have that market data and can utilize a blended market baseline.

One member asked about whether natural gas being available is defined as having it at the street or to the structure. Quentin answered that if it is available in the street, the company has considered that as available.

Another member stated that it is important to think of energy efficiency as a marathon and not as a sprint. The member then added that this does come back to C/E, and the UTC does not consider the customer's perspective and whether their decision is economical. The member stated that we should be working toward the most efficient use of electricity and what fuel is available is speculative. The member added that there should be a way to drive people to make decisions that cause them to use significantly less energy and most believe low incentives are better than no incentives.

One member questioned whether the electric forced-air furnace is the lowest-efficiency technology or whether baseboard heaters should be the baseline and if it makes a difference in the analysis. Billie replied that baseboard heating is not being installed for residential NC.

Another member asked about if there has been any benchmarking with other utilities to see how they are handling this baseline issue. Quentin replied that yes, there has been some benchmarking with others and some states are even calculating savings and paying incentives based on carbon reduction. He added that some areas are using the most conservative approach of just paying for the higher efficiency unit of the same technology.

The member said it has come up in the analysis of some of their conversion projects where emissions were net negative at the start. Chellie added that some utilities are normalizing energy units' usage to equivalent Btu's or kWh and evaluate incentives based on lower overall energy use, but this may be for dual-fuel utilities. Some are using a fully electric baseline, and some are operating as we are and not incenting something that's potentially not economically viable.

Chellie then commented that in the Custom program for industrial projects, the team looks at industry standards to establish a baseline because there is not a code. She asked the members whether they would support the company to look at electrification projects similarly on a case-by-case basis and bringing examples to EEAG for future discussions.

One member said this approach makes sense as a discussion is always good. The member added that residential is easier to understand but hard to compare to C&I and thinks industrial examples would make it clearer.

Another member stated that residential customers may consider rooftop solar if they have the right incentive to replace their hot water heater and HVAC from gas to electric.

Quentin commented that the company could bring specific custom industrial examples and/or specific prescriptive examples back to EEAG in the future with a specific ask. Everyone agreed that it was good to keep discussing the concept in future meetings.

One member stated that we should keep load building situations in mind for future discussions and pondered whether the issue of residential heat pumps not seeing savings would apply on the commercial & industrial side.

Quentin stated that in the commercial market, contractors are more educated and installing to better practices that avoid the issues that prevent savings, unlike in the residential market.

Another member commented that discussing and seeing real examples would be helpful. The member did point out that it is customers who are driving this concept, so it does make sense to continue to explore it.

One member asked about whether the company is capturing air conditioning savings from heat pumps. Chellie answered that the air-conditioning savings for heat pumps in the programs are claimed.

Quentin reiterated that for the next meeting we would discuss a specific project, incentive, or prescriptive measures.

## **2:49 P.M. Wrap-up/Open Discussion**

Great meeting and great topics!

I always learn a lot and IPC is light years away from other utilities in the region on DR efforts.

I appreciate these meetings and notes so I can provide feedback to my team.

I want to express my appreciation to all the work that goes into these EEAG meetings, especially Billie's presentations.

Great feedback! It gives us a lot to think about.

Thank you for the hard work. I enjoyed the baseline topic which gave me a lot to think about. You put a lot of thought into how we can encourage more EE purchases.

Kudos! I encourage all of you who receive the HER to take that information and make better products decisions.

## **3:05 P.M. Meeting Adjourned**

## Glossary of Acronyms

**BTU**—British Thermal Units  
**BYOT** – Bring Your Own Thermostat  
**C&I**—Commercial and Industrial  
**CAP**—Community Action Partnership  
**C/E** – Cost Effective(ness)  
**CHQ**—Corporate Headquarters (Idaho Power)  
**DHP**—Ductless Heat Pump  
**DR**—Demand Response  
**DSM**—Demand-Side Management  
**EEAG**—Energy Efficiency Advisory Group  
**EE** – Energy Efficiency  
**GSHP** – Ground Source Heat Pump  
**H&CE**—Heating & Cooling Efficiency  
**HEA** – Home Energy Audit  
**HER**—Home Energy Report  
**HP** – Heat Pump  
**HVAC**—Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning  
**IDL**—Integrated Design Lab  
**IRP**—Integrated Resource Plan  
**kW**—Kilowatt  
**kWh**—Kilowatt-hour  
**MW** – Megawatt  
**NC** – New Construction  
**NEEM**—Northwest Energy-Efficient Manufactured Housing Program  
**NPV** – Net Present Value  
**PV** – Solar Photovoltaic  
**Q4** – Fourth Quarter  
**SBL** – Small Business Lighting  
**Rider**—Energy Efficiency Rider  
**RNC** – Residential New Construction  
**RTF**—Regional Technical Forum  
**UCT**—Utility Cost Test  
**VFD** – Variable Frequency Drive  
**WAQC** – Weatherization Assistance for Qualified Customers  
**WAQC ReWx** – Re-Weatherization  
**YTD** – Year to Date