Energy Efficiency Advisory Group Meeting
May 14, 2026

Present

Becky Torgrimson – Office of Energy & Mineral Resources
Derek Goldman – NW Energy Coalition
Don Strickler – J.R. Simplot Company
Jason Talford – Idaho Public Utilities Commission
Matt Fuxon – Charlie's Produce
Quentin Nesbitt – Idaho Power
Riley Maloney – Idaho Power
Sidney Erwin – Idaho Irrigation Pumpers Association
Steve Hubble – City of Boise Public Works

Not Present

Christian Douglas – NW Power & Conservation Council
Becca Cottrell – Idaho Public Utilities Commission

Guests & Presenters*

Alexandra Rathinali* – Qualus
Andee Morton – Idaho Power
Becky Arte Howell – Idaho Power
Billie McWinn*– Idaho Power
Brenna Garro – Idaho Power
Camy Holden* – OEMR
Chellie Jensen* – Idaho Power
Cheryl Tuning – Idaho Power
Dahl Beitz – Idaho Power
Damon Woods* – IDL
Danielle Ready – Idaho Power
Dylan Agnas* – IDL
Elena Radcliffe – Idaho Power
Gina Powell – Idaho Power
Julie Rosandick – Idaho Power
Kaitlyn Parks* – OMER
Katie O'Neil – City of Boise
Landon Barber – Idaho Power
Lisa Young – Sierra Club
Mary Alice Taylor – Idaho Power
Matt Scheel – Idaho Power
Michelle Toney – Idaho Power
Mindi Shodeen – Idaho Power
Nathan Black – Idaho Power
Nick Ackerman – Idaho Power
Ray Short – Idaho Power
Sedge Lucas* – Qualus
Serena Helsley – Idaho Power
Sheree Willhite – Idaho Power
Sophie Joinnides – Idaho Power
Todd Greenwell – Idaho Power
Ty Johnson – Idaho Public Utilities Commission

Note Takers - Michelle Toney with Sophie Joinnides

Meeting Facilitator - Quentin Nesbitt

9:33 A.M. Welcome & Announcements—Quentin Nesbitt

Quentin opened the meeting with introductions from the group, including non-members. There were no questions or comments on the February notes. He then highlighted the 2026 Energy Efficiency Exchange and noted that the company hosted the event with Lisa Grow, Idaho Power's President and CEO, as the keynote speaker.

Quentin briefly discussed the Oregon sale to OTEC and how it is still in the works and noted the company has not yet filed its application with the Oregon Public Utilities Commission. Quentin also highlighted that this filing is anticipated to be a lengthy process.

9:44 A.M. 2026 YTD Financials, Savings, & Evaluations—Quentin Nesbitt

Quentin presented the Q1 financials, energy savings, and expenses including DR. However, Quentin identified inaccuracies on the slide and Billie stated they would update the slide with the correct information. Quentin then discussed the evaluations.

Discussion

One member asked about any key takeaways from the numbers in the first quarter. Quentin answered that the savings are on track and DR enrollment is up and will be completed in May. He added that things are looking good, better than last year.

9:50 A.M. Residential Programs—Billie McWinn

Billie presented the 2026 Q1 savings and participation by residential program, smart thermostat DR, marketplace pilot, and marketing updates.

Discussion

<u>ACCC | Smart Thermostat</u>

One member asked about manufactures and if they were doing the marketing for the company. Billie answered that both the OEMs and the company would be marketing the STDR option to customers and that it would be a dual effort.

Another member asked whether customers would see that they could get incentives when shopping for a Nest Thermostat. Billie responded that the option would show up in the app when they were setting up their thermostat.

The member then asked about which of the two DR participation options the company prefers to steer customers towards. Billie answered that it depends on what works best for the customer, but the company would not encourage customers on the cycling option to transition to the smart thermostat option since the device needed to allow for the cycling option would have already been installed by the company, and that there is more reduction potential in the cycling option. She added participation continues to decline for the cycling option; therefore, this is a great opportunity to get more enrollments, and the company is supportive of both options.

One member asked about the potential to increase the ACCC incentive and if that is still an option. Billie replied that the company regularly revisits incentive levels and did explore the option to increase the incentive just last year, but it was not cost effective to do so.

Another member asked about the incentive structure and whether the cycling option was a monthly incentive in the summer and if the smart thermostat was one incentive. Billie explained that the cycling option will continue to provide $5 monthly bill credits for the summer months each year and that the STDR option provides a one-time $50 enrollment incentive for eligible customers (those not already enrolled in the cycling option) and then provides the same $5 monthly bill credits for the summer months after the customer's first year of participation.

One member asked about customer accounts and why they are not linked to the applications when signing up. Billie stated that the customer's account number is a requested field but not required because it could create a barrier if they do not have their account number when signing up for the program.

Another member asked about gaps between the OEM marketing strategy and the company's approach. Billie responded that the company is very experienced in marketing its programs and therefore does not foresee any gaps. She added that the company sees the OEM marketing campaign as complementary.

One member asked about participation and if the company has a target for the year. Billie answered that there was an initial target but that was before the company knew how close to the season it would be before allowing enrollments. She added that the aggregator used by the company was acquired by another company, so that caused some delays.

Another member asked about other thermostats brands that might have been missed. Billie answered that the current list of eligible thermostats does account for the market share of thermostats in our service area, but that the vendor continues to work to bring in other OEMs.

<u>Marketplace</u>

One member commented that it feels straight forward and it makes sense how people would use it. The member likes how it is set up and thinks it is great.

Another member asked about increasing the incentive if it does prove to be cost-effective over three years. Billie answered that the company regularly reviews all programs, however, individual incentives are based on the benefit value for each measure, so it is not expected for those to change dramatically or often.

One member asked about customers ordering equipment online or if they only apply for the incentive online. Billie answered that they can do both online. She added that the customer can also purchase the equipment in person and apply for the incentive online.

Another member asked about the funding and savings and if those were going to be specific or going to a pool like the NEEA program in the past. Billie responded that the savings will be specific to each customer because the incentives are tied to the customer's account. She added that the costs and savings will be reported just like they are for the traditional programs, and not like NEEA's market transformation activities.

The member then asked about the potential to track data on education for using the rebates and what metric will be used. Billie answered that the company can look into what will be captured regarding customer habits when visiting the website. She added that it is not known exactly what kind of information that will be made available. Quentin added that savings from this program will not be reported from NEEA. He added that the company will use savings from rebates processed for customers from the vendor specifically. Quentin also noted that the program will not claim savings on education.

The member commented that with the potential of the platform, it would be useful to show other benefits to the program.

10:25 A.M. Break

10:38 A.M. Commercial, Industrial, & Irrigation Programs—Chellie Jensen

Chellie presented the CI&I marketing & training plans, DR pre-season enrollment & activities, and the overall and individual program Q1 performance. She then gave an update on the whole building approach and requested feedback on the baseline assumptions. Chellie concluded her presentation with the custom project's energy management compressed air leaks success story.

Discussion

<u>Flex Peak</u>

One member asked about the marketing letters and how it is determined who gets them. Chellie answered that, as an example, the analyst team reviews the C&I customers that are not enrolled in the program to see who could have potentially reduced 20kW minimum by looking at their energy usage data using last year's event days. She added that their potential incentive is then calculated with the assumption that they were able to reduce their overall usage during the event timeframe by 10%.

Another member asked about the number of events and if it was about half a dozen. Chellie answered that the program parameters allow for up to sixty hours in a season, up to sixteen hours a week, totaling up to potentially fifteen events. She added that last year there were three Flex Peak events and the year before there were four Flex Peak events. Chellie explained that if the Company doesn't need to run the programs they won't, however the program has a minimum of three events. After the third event, there is a variable incentive paid in addition to the fixed incentive.

<u>NC Whole Building</u>

One member asked about how customers would engage with the company for this program offering. Chellie answered that they can engage with their energy efficiency advisor, with the company's program staff, and with community architects & engineers in which the program staff are engaged with and will ensure that they are informed about the program(s).

<u>Baseline</u>

One member asked for clarification about the data in the blend and if it included residential. Chellie answered that the blend includes C&I data and does not include residential data.

<u>Midstream HVAC</u>

Another member asked about the ground source HP and where does it fit in here in the baseline. Sheree answered that they would be included in the Water Source Heat Pump category.

One member attended the Energy Efficiency Exchange and learned that a large portion of buildings that fall into these categories are less than 50,000 square feet and asked if this was considered. Chellie replied that the size of the HVAC unit is not necessarily indicative of the size of the building as it depends on the space usage and how the mechanical engineers zone the facility. She added that the midstream vendor may have a forecast of potential savings for our territory that might show the distribution of sizes of HVAC units they anticipate, and the company could share that once the contract is signed. Sheree added that CBECS does not have data that correlates the size of the building to the size of the individual HVAC units.

Chellie stated that if the company moves forward with midstream, there will be data from participating distributors that would show the distribution size of the units that are sold in this region.

Another member asked if this included retrofit measures. Chellie answered that prescriptive retrofit measures that we are proposing to move to midstream are included, and she will show the impacts to prescriptive New Construction next.

One member asked if there was a Custom baseline example. Chellie said there was not a custom project she could share today but will present one to the group once there is one to discuss. The member then commented that they have a potential project in mind to bring to the group.

Chellie asked for feedback from the members on the assumption of a blended baseline concept for midstream and new construction measures.

One member mentioned that they appreciate the willingness to explore this and would be happy to provide technical feedback and asked if it was possible to take this information back to their design team for further discussion and get back to Chellie. Chellie replied that as far as timing goes, members are welcome to discuss with their teams and get back to her. She did add that the midstream program is expected to launch this summer. She offered that they are welcome to include her team in the discussions as needed.

Quentin stated that the company is asking for feedback to make sure in the group is aligned on what it means to use the blended baseline approach and its corresponding change to incentives and savings. He added that it is important to hear all feedback, including any negative, to help us to decide whether to move forward with this approach. Quentin reiterated that the company has had general support in past discussions but wants to make sure that all feedback has been heard from everyone before moving forward with a midstream program and prescriptive program updates for measures with a heating component.

One member asked about other utilities and if they have implemented this approach. The member is also asking about where this approach came from. Quentin answered that the RTF has done some work in the region with residential measures and that the concept was presented in a past EEAG meeting where a member suggested that the company should explore a blended baseline approach. He added that the concept of using market data to inform the savings for prescriptive programs is common and Chellie mentioned an example of that would be the blended baseline for our multifamily offering.

Another member asked about the proposed retrofits baseline from the last EEAG meeting and how it fits into this discussion. Chellie answered that it is not the same retrofit baselines that she discussed in the February EEAG because she is proposing to move all HVAC retrofit measures to midstream as well as additionally proposing a blended baseline for midstream measures. She added that the baseline assumptions presented could still be used for retrofit measures that do not fit within the applicable range of midstream as part of a custom project. Chellie stated the savings from a blended market baseline that are being proposed for midstream would be conservative for a situation where a customer has existing electric heat.

One member asked about the blended market baseline and if it distinguishes areas where gas is and is not available. Billie answered that the blended market would include all fuel sources where gas is available or not. Quentin added that we would not pay a different incentive where gas is available or not.

The member then commented that it should take gas into account. Billie stated that by applying the blended baseline differently based on when gas was not available, it would skew the blend. Quentin added that by taking this market blend, the idea is that it would not need to determine if gas is or is not available. He noted that moving forward, this would make it to where the savings would not automatically be disqualified as it was in the past if gas was available. Chellie clarified that we historically have not considered heating savings when gas was in use or available, just cooling savings.

Another member asked if this could be considered fuel switching. Chellie answered yes, in theory it could, however, we know that this customer has decided to go electric and when customers choose to go electric, it is important for them to select the most efficient electric option. That is why the Company would like to offer incentives to encourage customers to steer away from the lowest cost, highest electric energy measure.

The member commented that the blended is a more conservative option and lower incentive than the all-electric baseline and that makes it muddy. Chellie acknowledged that with a blended approach, at times we would claim higher savings and pay higher incentives and at times, lower savings and lower incentives than we would if we were basing it on their actual existing fuel types.

Quentin commented that the company wants to give customers options to get incentives for the most energy efficient option. He noted that it is not the intent to incent people to fuel convert. Quentin added that if a customer already is going to switch from gas to electricity, then it makes sense to give them an incentive to do that efficiently because the current status quo is that if you are a gas customer, you are not eligible for heating savings and associated incentives, just cooling.

The member commented that the fact that the blended baseline is a much lower incentive balances out that you are still incenting a potential fuel switch situation. The member added that it looks like a plus one minus one.

Quentin commented that if anyone feels negative about this then we want to know. We would like to have follow-up feedback, but we need to move forward before the next EEAG meeting. Quentin said that an email requesting feedback by a specific date would be sent out to the group.

11:37 A.M. Idaho Design Lab Resource Library Demo—Damon Woods & Dylan Agnes

Damon presented what the ERL is and how to use the hundreds of free tools and guides they provide. He then explained the connection between the company and the University of Idaho's IDL and discussed how and why customers use the tools located on the idlboise.com website. Damon then gave a live air leak detection demonstration and, for participants attending online, Dylan Agnes presented how to use the tool loan library.

12:00 P.M. LUNCH

1:00 A.M. Home Energy Report Deemed Savings Analysis & Program Discussion—Billie McWinn, Sedge Lucas (Qualus), & Alexandra Rathinali (Qualus)

Alex and Sedge introduced themselves. Billie discussed why we are talking about the HER deemed savings analysis and program. Sedge then introduced Qualus staff and presented on deemed savings and methodology, key findings opportunities, benchmarking analysis, and conclusions.

Discussion

One member asked about limitations based on maintaining consistency within the treatment groups and whether there were ways to implicitly account for variables such as household size or square footage of the conditioned space. Sedge answered that there are ways to try and control some variables, like square footage, in the analysis and then extrapolate that out and add it as a parameter to the deemed savings equations used. He added that there are aspects of occupancy that could be accounted for, though that might not necessarily be tied to square footage. Sedge noted that the difficulty is that there are so many other factors that are likely to change that it becomes difficult to reliably use in an equation.

Billie presented on the planned approach, the 2027 updates, the HER next steps, and she is looking for feedback.

Discussion

One member agreed with the approach to minimize the control group and maximize the treatment group sizes. The member noted that the company is providing information that will help reduce energy use and costs. The member asked if English being one of the criteria to being in the treatment group could be misconstrued as discrimination.

Billie expressed appreciation for the members comments and said that would be a consideration when evaluating vendor capabilities in the upcoming RFP process.

Another member asked about homeowners wanting to opt in the report. Billie answered that customers cannot opt in to receive the report because it would skew the savings results.

One member asked about the control group and if customers know they are participating or not. Billie stated that customers do not know that they are in the control group.

Another member referred to an earlier question regarding accounting for some variables to remove the limitations on the treatment group and asked whether it could be condensed to just three or four of the variables that make up the majority of the usage and apply some sort of blend, like we are exploring with the gas/electric blended baseline. The member also asked about looking into how many more customers this might allow to be added. Sedge answered that there are ways to identify which variable makes the most impact on customers' energy usage and if those key variables are identified, the deemed savings equations could be improved, but when the analysis is run, there are limitations related to data quality. He added that the question then becomes how high of data quality and how much data exists for unknown variables, like square footage or heating type. Sedge noted that something particularly relevant but hard to collect is occupancy.

Alex added that the occupancy rate is one of the more important factors that would be difficult to nail down.

Billie stated that one of the struggles we have for this program is getting accurate information. We have usage, but other things are pieced together from various external sources.

One member asked about staying with the RCT methodology and how that would affect the program UCT. Billie responded that it would be expected to be like what is being done now, subject to new vendor bids. Quentin added that if the numbers look dramatically different and the bids are higher, then the company will have a new estimate of the program UCT before moving forward with a new proposal. Billie noted that if the treatment group increased, it could improve the program UCT.

1:45 P.M. OEMR Activities—Becky Torgrimson, Camy Holden, & Kaitlyn Parks

Becky, Camy, and Kaitlyn presented on the Idaho Governor's Office of Energy & Mineral Resources and gave an overview of what the OEMR plans, permits, and the policies developed within the state of Idaho. They discussed the advanced nuclear strategic framework, and how the OEMR prepares publications such as the Idaho Energy and Mineral Landscape and the Idaho State Energy Security Plan. The presentation concluded with OMER funding opportunities.

Discussion

One member asked about the funding being allocated to the project or were the funds left over. Becky replied that there was leftover funding that was rapidly deployed because projects must be wrapped up by the end of the month for a quick turnaround.

Another member asked about cost-effectiveness and if it is a certain perspective or a broad definition. Becky answered that yes, it is the broad definition depending on the energy efficiency that is needed in the building such as windows, gaps in doors, HVAC, or LEDs.

2:11 P.M. Wrap-up / Open Discussion—All

I have no specific feedback, but I did take some good notes from Billie and Chellie's presentations. Thank you, those were really good.

I think there is more about the baseline assumptions and the blended market to digest, and I will have to get back to you if I have further questions.

I want to check in with my team and get back to you. There is good direction here, as seen on the HER but there are still concerns on the blended market baseline. I appreciate the updates on OEMR.

It sure is great to be here in person. It is too easy to get distracted when I am online. Being here in person helps me stay focused.

Thank you for the presentations, I find them thoughtful. I like the midstream approach, and I think it will have a positive impact on the commercial side. Overall, I appreciate that and the demonstration by the IDL.

I really enjoy these meetings and appreciate the opportunity to attend remotely with scheduling conflicts, though I prefer to be there in person. I appreciate the information on the HER treatment group. I do have technical questions about the benefits & cons of overhead vs underground but that is not for this meeting.

This was a good and interesting meeting. I always enjoy and appreciate the remote meetings.

Riley – I really appreciate you all for taking the time out of your day to be here today. Great presentations from OEMR.

Quentin – Thank you everyone.

2:25 P.M. Adjourn & Arthur Building Tour

3:13 P.M. Ice Cream Social Top Floor of Arthur Building

4:00 P.M. End of Scheduled Activities

Acronyms

ACCC – A/C Cool Credit

C&I – Commercial & Industrial

CBSA – Commercial Building Stock Assessment

CBECS – Commercial Building Energy Consumption Study

C/E – Cost Effectiveness

C&I – Commercial & Industrial

CI&I – Commercial, Industrial, & Irrigation

DR – Demand Response

DSM – Demand Side Management

EE – Energy Efficiency

EEAG – Energy Efficiency Advisory Group

ERL – Energy Resource Library

ESA – Electrical Apparatus Service Association

H&C – Heating and Cooling

HEA – Home Energy Audit

HER – Home Energy Report

HVAC – Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning

IDL – Integrated Design Lab

IRP – Integrated Resource Plan

kWh – Kilowatt per Hour

MW – Megawatt

NC – New Construction

OEM – Original Equipment Manufacturer

OEMR – Office of Energy & Mineral Resources

OTEC – Oregon Trail Electric Company

Q1 – Quarter 1

RCT – Randomized Controlled Trials

RFP – Request for Bid

RNC – Residential New Construction

SBL – Small Business Lighting

STDR – Smart Thermostat Demand Response

UCT – Utility Cost Test

WSHP – Water Source Heat Pump

YTD – Year to Date