

EEAG Virtual Meeting August 14, 2025

Present

Christian Douglass – Northwest Power & Conservation Council
Don Strickler – J.R. Simplot Company
Derek Goldman – NW Energy Coalition
Jason Talford – Idaho Public Utilities Commission

Quentin Nesbitt – Idaho Power
Riley Mahoney – Idaho Power
Steve Hubble – City of Boise Public Works
Sidney Erwin – Idaho Irrigation Pumpers Association

Not Present

Matt Fuxon – Charlie's Produce
Ken Robinette – South Central Community Action Partnership
Emily Her – Office of Energy and Mineral Resources
Connie Aschenbrenner – Idaho Power

Guest & Presenters*

Aleia Peterson – Idaho Power
Andee Morton – Idaho Power
Annie Meyer – Idaho Power
Becky Arte Howell – Idaho Power
Billie McWinn* – Idaho Power
Chellie Jensen* – Idaho Power
Cheryl Paoli – Idaho Power
Chris Pollow – Idaho Power
Dahl Bietz – Idaho Power
Danielle Ready – Idaho Power
Gina Powell – Idaho Power
Jeff Rigby – Idaho Power
Jordyn Neerdaels – Idaho Power

Julie Rosandick – 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
Nathan Black – Idaho Power
Nick Ackerman – Idaho Power
Ray Short – Idaho Power
Shelley Martin – Idaho Power
Sophie Croome – Idaho Power
Todd Greenwell – Idaho Power

Note Taker: Michelle Toney with Sophie Croome

Meeting Facilitator: Quentin Nesbitt

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

Quentin opened the meeting with introductions. There were no questions or comments about May's meeting notes.

9:37 A.M. 2025 YTD Financials & Savings—Quentin Nesbitt

Quentin presented on the [YTD](#) expenses and savings. He then went over the evaluation categories and the process.

Discussion

One member asked about the Custom program and asked about examples of projects since they are the largest savings. Quentin answered that the projects in the Custom category include our large commercial and industrial customers' non-prescriptive capital type projects, as well as their participation in our Cohorts and other energy management projects.

9:49 A.M. Cost Effectiveness—Landon Barber

Landon presented on 2025 cost effectiveness with a short refresher and updates to the 2025 forecast. Landon then went over reporting on the portfolio level for [EE](#) programs and compared program costs and avoided costs overtime.

Discussion

Standard Tests

One member commented on the [UCT](#) example and stated they assume an example for avoided "capacity" costs is new generation resources & tax infrastructure, whereas avoided "energy" cost is the actual [kWh](#) of usage avoided. Landon replied that yes, avoided energy costs are volumetric per [kWh](#) and are from the IRP. Landon added there are also other factors such as month and time of day that the savings occur.

Forecast Components

One member asked about the commercial SBL forecasting and if the [C/E](#) can always be borderline. Landon answered that this forecast does not have any bearing in future years, just specific to the current year.

Another member mentioned that Quentin did not show the Cohort 2025 expenses and savings as a line-item in [Q2](#) and does not understand how the Cohorts are also borderline without line-

item data. The member would like to see those broken out. Landon replied that those are under the Custom Project umbrella. Quentin added that there are accounting mechanisms to track the expenses separately, and they are shown separately in the [DSM](#) Supplement 2 report.

One member asked about the IRP forecast and the utilization of avoided costs and at what point was there a transition to updating those costs. Landon answered the company uses the latest IRP which is typically filed in June of every odd year and locked in at the beginning of the year for two years. He added the information for the 2026 and 2027 program years will be from the 2025 [IRP](#).

Another member needed clarification about which program Landon stated is extremely successful. Landon advised that it was the Multifamily program.

Program Changes

[HER](#)

One member then asked about the [HER](#) being borderline and why sudden changes were made when it was one of the most successful programs. Landon answered that [C/E](#) considers the program costs and savings over the life of the measure, but this program has a measure life of only one year, which impacts the [C/E](#).

The member then asked if the program is expected to expand and if that is considered. Landon answered yes, but there are added costs, and the savings are not yet known until the end of the year. He added that there is an evaluation in the process which will look at the success of this program and why it is borderline.

[H&CE](#)

One member asked about the [HP](#) and [DHP](#) and the performance at the measure level and whether they were borderline [C/E](#) because H&CE has a lot of complex components. Landon answered that the program does pass [C/E](#) at the program level. He added that there is also an evaluation this year which adds to the administration costs, and participation needs to come up to offset those additional costs.

Another member asked about the program planning and if the [C/E](#) ratio being 1.0 or higher. Landon advised that it depends on the program. The company does not hyper-optimize to a 1.0 and when designing incentive levels, the measure level is optimized based on each program with many considerations including whether the incentive will affect the market.

Billie added that when determining measure level incentives, we look at what might impact a customer's decision in relation to the cost of the measure and other customer motivations. The goal is not to underpay or overpay.

Quentin then added the company does not design programs to a ratio of 1.0 because they would be more likely to not be C/E if assumptions were not exact.

10:37 A.M. – Break

10:50 A.M. Residential Programs—Billie McWinn

Billie presented preliminary savings & participation through Q2, program updates, and marketing. She provided updates on BYOT, HERs and City of Boise’s collaboration with Idaho Power’s HEA program. She then discussed changes to the savings for Efficient Manufactured Homes and asked for feedback on WAQC Re-Weatherization options.

Discussion

HER

One member asked about customers being removed from the program because they did not remember receiving a report recently. Billie explained that there has only been one set of reports this year. She added that the reports should start to go out quarterly. There was one treatment group (T5) that was removed during a pilot phase because there were not enough savings due to them being lower energy users.

Another member asked about how to participate. Billie answered that to accurately measure savings from the usage of the control group, participants of the treatment group must be randomly selected, otherwise it could skew the usage of the treatment group. She noted the company is exploring a different model using deemed savings that might include more participation at the customer’s request.

One member asked about the savings per home. Landon replied that last year the average treatment home used 190 kWh less than the average control home.

HEA / City of Boise Collaboration

One member commented that the city will be marketing the program to Boise residents. Billie responded that the company will be working with the city and will adjust as necessary to ensure the program auditor can handle the applications as they come in to prevent a backlog and a negative customer experience.

Efficient Manufactured Homes

One member thanked Billie for the presentation, saying they learned a lot and appreciated the company exploring all the alternatives.

Another member asked about the reduced savings and if it really is close to that 100% [NEEM 1.1](#) standard. Billie answered that per our dealerships, Idaho Power's service area is also seeing nearly 100% of homes being sold at a minimum rating of [NEEM 1.1](#).

[WAQC ReWx](#)

One member asked about the \$50,000 and if it went to all Agencies for qualified nonprofits for the year. Billie answered that nonprofit funds were a pooled amount that were historically carried over if left unspent. Going forward, unused nonprofit funds will not be carried over as the \$50,000 is made available per year.

The member then asked if the money is eligible for any nonprofit. Billie replied that there are income requirements. Cheryl added that nonprofits need to be specific to special needs of customers, such as a senior center in Gooding that is going to be completed this year. She noted other projects included children's homes and camps, and the company encourages projects in all regions.

The member then asked about unused money. Billie responded that the previously unused carryover funds were fully utilized by two large projects in 2024.

Another member commented that they did not understand how the [Rider](#) funds worked compared to other company funds. Billie replied that the company would present on this topic in the future. Quentin answered that Rider funds are collected from customers' bills, and the company will present on that in an upcoming [EEAG](#).

One member asked if the company has any recommendations for re-weatherization options. Billie answered that the company supports [ReWx](#) to utilize unspent carryover funds.

Another member asked about the water heater projects and what the potential looks like. Cheryl answered that there have not been any water heater conversions because agencies are not focused on [ReWx](#) but they favor keeping that option.

The member then asked about what happens to the funds left over if that program closes at the end of the pilot. Billie answered that the carryover funds will be spent on standard weatherization until those carryover dollars are fully spent.

One member asked if one option costs more to manage, stating they prefer the option to leave [ReWx](#) open until carryover funds are spent if it does not increase the company's management resource requirements. Billie stated that the only additional effort on the company's side is reporting and that it is minimal.

Another member asked about the \$527,000 carryover and if it is only for [ReWx](#). Billie advised that the money is available for [ReWx](#) but is also available for standard weatherization.

The member then asked about whether the normal operation of spending down that balance and leaving ReWx open gives more options to spend. Billie said yes.

The member asked if there will be a filing with the Commission if it is decided to leave ReWx open past the end of 2025. Billie advised the company will look into the language in the ReWx application and subsequent Commission Order and determine if a filing is needed.

The member stated this should be a consideration in deciding whether to keep it available.

Another member suggested having other CAP agencies involved. Billie advised that Cheryl frequently communicates with the CAP agencies, and they prefer to have the ReWx remain open.

One member commented that they want the program to remain open.

Another member voiced concerns about a possible filing for leaving ReWx open and any roadblocks that come with that. The member added that if there is no filing required, it makes more sense to leave it open, but if there is a filing required, then the first option to close it at the end of the year would be less work and potentially a better option.

One member added that they prefer option two (leaving it open) for accelerated energy savings.

Another member commented that they have no concerns with leaving it open given the company and CAP agencies feedback.

11:30 A.M. Fuel Conversion Baseline Assumptions—Chellie Jensen & Billie McWinn

Chellie started the presentation with an introduction to the fuel conversion baseline assumptions then gave C&I project examples, went over benchmarking, offered some options to consider, and then requested feedback.

Billie presented the residential current practices and options to consider, then requested feedback.

Discussion

One member asked about the gas boilers and why the usage is so high or if it is a kWh comparison. Chellie answered that it is the BTU equivalent shown in kWh units.

Another member commented that the table is correct, and they are pressured by customers and the community to electrify. The member pointed out that the community does not understand the impacts and costs. The member added that natural gas is less expensive and anything to help make electricity less expensive is helpful, and if a company is going to fuel-switch, it might make more sense to spend the money upfront to save money in the future. Chellie thanked the member and mentioned that is why the company wants to discuss the topic with the members with the overall goal to influence [EE](#) options for customers that choose electric as their fuel choice and support customers in making educated decisions about technology.

Another member agreed and commented about the complexities of these issues and pointed out that as a customer working to electrify, they are looking forward to incentive opportunities and making better [EE](#) choices. Chellie stated that there are many things to consider, and the company will go into this topic further in November.

Multiple members had clarifying questions around what was being presented and the [C&I](#) project example table.

One member commented that if gas technologies are selected, there are still electric [EE](#) measures to take advantage of such as adding a [VFD](#) for a combustion blower or feed water pump.

12:16 P.M. – Lunch

1:00 P.M. Fuel Conversion Baseline Assumptions Continued—Chellie Jensen & Billie McWinn

Discussion

[C&I](#)

One member commented about how the council and [RTF](#) have dealt with this issue and have chosen to use a blended baseline and industry standard as a baseline. People make their fuel choice decisions independent of incentives available, so they use baseline as industry standard practice and would be happy to share a supporting whitepaper on this topic.

Another member stated that it is tricky to come up with best practice because of the many different technologies. There are clear examples of some really good reasons to include electric resistance in the baseline.

One member commented that they do support spending money upfront to install efficient electric measures, and if an incentive were available, it would make that decision more economical. The member appreciates that the company is considering that as an option if they are mindful about which baseline is chosen.

Another member asked about the incentives and if those would be only for [ASHP](#) or would [GSHP](#) also qualify. Chellie answered that once a baseline methodology is decided upon, incentives would be available on all [C/E](#) measures that fit the structure of the program.

One member noted their appreciation for the analysis, which is based on the customer's perspective, but has concerns with one of the options of using an equivalent BTU to kWh methodology. The member added that trying to use natural gas as a baseline would not achieve savings because an electric utility will not see natural gas on the system.

One member disagrees with another member's assertion that incentives do not motivate fuel choice decisions, noting they have incentives for HP water heaters, and customers are choosing to install based on the incentive.

Another member suggested additional subjects for future training, such as industrial HPs and other efficient electric technologies.

Chellie agreed and noted the available [HVAC](#) training where different technologies are discussed but will look to enhance the trainings with industrial heat pumps and other new efficient technologies.

Residential

One member supports the concern of residential messaging by highlighting solar [PV](#) installers that create their own spin on economics. The member said the offerings could be messaged in a way that would alleviate these concerns and keep the company from being blamed for the end results.

Another member had a comment about new construction and going all electric is assumed to be more expensive, but that might not be the case, especially with higher [EE](#) standards. The member added this program is not a one size fits all like retrofits. The member shared their own experience of not receiving heat pump incentives. The member agrees that the company has a tremendous reputation but encourages the company to focus on the [UCT](#) as a regulatory driver.

Billie said the baseline for the [UCT](#) is the tricky part when having to determine what goes into customers' decision-making. She added that the company does offer [RNC](#) where [NC](#) is available.

One member advised from a commercial perspective, electric may not always be more expensive. The member added that gas prices are low now but might not be in the future, and a new [HP](#) may be more energy efficient and less economically burdensome.

Another member agrees with the assumption about gas prices and the economics of electric heating are different when combined with rooftop solar natural gas should not be assumed as less expensive option in the future.

Billie replied that it could be up for a future discussion.

One member stated that this is an excellent discussion and agrees the baseline considerations can be fuzzy with the fuel conversion issue. The member commented that when gas is available, the electric baseline is zero, but in a fuel switching scenario the baseline might be the alternative fuel.

Billie agreed that it matters whether they would be going electric regardless.

Another member had a comment that with electrification the existing infrastructure may need to be upgraded or modernized, which is an extra cost. Also, reliability is already a concern for commercial and industrial customers and support to reduce electric usage would help.

One member stated that if you separate customers broadly into two groups, those that make their decision based on cost and those that want to use electricity, the group that wants to use electricity is going to be better off financially with a heat pump than an electric resistance furnace, especially considering the lifetime of the unit. They added that for the group making their decision based on cost, the messaging should be controlled and there could also be a place to talk about lifetime of the system if there's a difference in NPV (as was seen in the commercial example) with need to replace, etc.

Another member clarified that the economics of switching from gas to electricity are different for a customer purchasing all their electricity from the utility, versus a customer with (or planning) a rooftop installation.

1:33 P.M. Commercial, Industrial, & Irrigation Programs—Chellie

Chellie presented the CI&I DR current enrollment and events. She then discussed preliminary overall EE savings through Q2 and marketing. Chellie then presented the YTD individual program performance, cohort success, SBL progress, the Whole Building Approach program and Midstream approach status, announced an engineering intern, and discussed C&I customer trainings.

Discussion

Irrigation Peak Rewards

One member complimented the gains in DR and participation.

Whole Building Feedback

One member asked about the evaluations on the first five projects once they paid out and if there will be a full program evaluation, and if so, is it considered a pilot. Chellie answered that the program evaluation purpose is to see if there needs to be any adjustments and review the C/E. Billie added that it is not a pilot but a soft launch. Chellie advised that the five projects could take multiple years, from design to complete build out and measurement/verification and incentive payout.

The member then asked about the offering and if it would be on hold while the five projects were evaluated. Chellie replied that continuity would be best and it would not be necessary due to the ongoing verification of each project and utilizing the IDL to construct a parallel model to determine if the results are accurate and the program is successful. The benchmarking with other utilities have led to very positive results, and we aren't anticipating any showstopping issues.

Another member stated that with the last couple DSM filings, energy models have been highlighted, with one instance still an open topic and then asked about the timeline and if it would accommodate a potential change if warranted. Billie replied that it is important to recognize the distinctions between the modeling for this program and Residential New Construction. We see this modeling differently than what is being done in RNC.

The member then stated that the calculation behind the savings is an energy model, which has similarities to the other applications. Landon responded that not all models are the same as they are customized specific to NC and Multifamily. Landon added there are more opportunities for transparency and detail than in residential, and the company views this as a tool to incent these buildings.

The member added that there are differences, but there is an energy model behind both and while one has a more detailed and transparent energy model, the member still has thoughts about whether any changes need to be made based on any Commission directives.

Landon commented that the company has addressed modeling concerns, it is about the assumptions. He added this program will have good and easy audit options and the IDL will verify that the model itself is working as it should.

Chellie added that the company can discuss this option more if there is additional feedback before the next steps.

The member then commented that if there is something that is directed, we should be prepared to incorporate that to ensure the modeling of this program aligns with actual savings. The member added that through the evaluations, hopefully we can find what is needed and make any adjustments necessary.

Midstream

One member thinks this is a great idea and asked about other utilities and if they have Midstream programs. Chellie answered, yes other utilities do have Midstream programs.

Another member also complimented the program and would like to see a deep dive presentation before the launch. Chellie said the company will present additional information on Midstream during the November meeting.

2:23 P.M. Wrap-up/Open Discussion

Quentin discussed the retirements of Shelley and Cheryl and due to CHQ onsite construction, he advised that there will be a slight change in the next meeting location November 12th [EEAG](#) meeting.

Members provided the following feedback:

“Congratulations Cheryl and Shelley! I appreciate the meeting and the engagements.”

“Super informative. Thanks!”

“I love feedback requested! It is always a good sign when there is great discussions and input.

Thank you!”

2:30 P.M. Meeting Adjourned

Glossary of Acronyms

ASHP—Air-Source Heat Pumps
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

Q2 – Quarter 2
SBL – Small Business Lighting
ReWx – Re-Weatherization
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