Energy Efficiency Advisory Group Virtual Meeting
February 19, 2026

Present

Christian Douglass – Northwest Power & Conservation Council
Derek Goldman – NW Energy Coalition
Becky Torgrimson – Office of Energy & Mineral Resources
Jason Talford – Idaho Public Utilities Commission
Matt Fuxon – Charlie's Produce
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

Not Present

Emily Her – Office of Energy & Mineral Resources
Don Strickler – J.R. Simplot Company

Guests & Presenters*

Annie Meyer – Idaho Power
Becky Arte Howell – Idaho Power
Billie McWinn* – Idaho Power
Brenna Garro – Idaho Power
Chellie Jensen* – Idaho Power
Cheryl Tuning – Idaho Power
Dahl Beitz – Idaho Power
Danielle Ready – Idaho Power
Elena Radcliffe – Idaho Power
Jared Hanson* – Idaho Power
Jordyn Neerdaels – Idaho Power
Kimberly Bakalars* – Tetra Tech
Landon Barber – Idaho Power
Laura Conilogue – Idaho Public Utilities Commission
Mark Bergum* – Tetra Tech
Mary Alice Taylor – Idaho Power
Matt Scheel – Idaho Power
Michelle Toney – Idaho Power
Mindi Shodeen – Idaho Power
Matt Scheel – Idaho Power
Mohammad Qandil* – Tetra Tech
Nathan Black – Idaho Power
Nick Ackerman – Idaho Power
Ray Short – Idaho Power
Riley Mahoney – Idaho Power
Serena Helsley – Idaho Power
Sheree Willhite – Idaho Power
Sophie Croome – Idaho Power
Todd Greenwell – Idaho Power
Ty Johnson – Idaho Public Utilities Commission

Note Takers - Michelle Toney with Sophie Joinnides

Meeting Facilitator - Quentin Nesbitt

9:31 A.M. Welcome & Announcements—Quentin Nesbitt

Quentin opened the meeting with introductions from the EEAG members.

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

9:38 A.M. 2025 YTD Financials, Savings, & Evaluations—Quentin Nesbitt

Quentin presented the preliminary overall 2025 energy savings and expenses including DR. He then went over the 2025 DSM program incentives by program type and sector, expenditures by category and evaluations, including what has changed, and reminded everyone that the multifamily evaluation has been pushed out until 2027.

Discussion

One member asked whether the cooler temperatures impacted the ACCC numbers. Quentin responded that the temperature during an event would have an impact when evaluating the actual reductions, but that the maximum potential reduction for ACCC is based on historical results and current participation.

Another member asked about the rider balance and if there might be any changes to the rider rate. Quentin answered that the company is aware of the overfunded balance and is watching it. He said there are discussions, but no decisions have been made. The member commented that higher rates associated with rate cases would result in more being collected. Quentin advised that it would be considered when forecasting future balances. Riley added that the company is watching that balance and will adjust, if necessary, like it did in 2023 when the percentage was adjusted due to the general rate case's increased rates.

9:46 A.M. Residential Programs—Billie McWinn

Billie presented the 2025 residential highlights, preliminary 2025 annual savings by residential programs compared to 2024, changes in participation from 2024 to 2025, program updates, and marketing updates.

Discussion

<u>Savings By Program</u>

One member asked about the contents of the student kits. Billie answered that the kits contain items such as shower timers, filter whistles, showerheads, aerators, lightbulbs, etc. Mindi added that the kits also include nightlights and stickers for light switches.

The member then asked about the age group the kits are targeting. Mindi responded they are designed for 4th through 6th grades. Billie added that students and teachers also have access to things like online curriculum and contests.

HEA

Billie shared the preliminary results from the City of Boise's collaboration with the company's Home Energy Audit program and one member responded that they had heard from people who were very happy with the program and from some that had not heard about the program before. The member is excited to see the final results.

Smart Thermostats and DR

Billie shared that marketing for the new smart thermostat demand response option within ACCC will begin as early as next week.

One member messaged in the meeting chat that they were interested in the marketing email language from the smart thermostat manufacturers (OEM) and from the company. Billie shared that the company has very little control over the content in the OEMs' marketing emails, and that they provide email templates to be used where minimal information can be changed, such as the incentive amount and in some cases, the program name.

The member then asked if the company could share copies of those emails. Billie said she would be happy to email those to that member.

NEEA Marketplace

Billie shared that the company was expecting initial contracts from the marketplace vendor soon.

One member asked about the options that had been discussed previously and inquired about which ones the company was pursuing. Billie gave a recap of the potential levels of participation that had been presented at the November EEAG and shared that the company hasn't committed to an option as the company is still waiting for the vendor to provide contract terms and final pricing before any decisions are made. She said that based on EEAG feedback and general support for engaging at the level that would enable rebate opportunities, that is still the company's preferred option. Billie added that as discussed at the prior EEAG meeting, the company will remain mindful of how costs are split between the education budget and program budget.

Another member asked if the platform would be tailored based on zip codes. Billie answered that yes, even at the basic level, customers would be able to see financial savings based on their utility rates in their zip code. She added that for utilities that participate at the higher participation level, their customers would be able to apply for rebates specific to their utility based on zip code.

10:17 A.M. – Break

10:31 A.M. Commercial, Industrial, & Irrigation Programs—Chellie Jensen

Chellie shared the top five highlights for commercial, industrial and irrigation programs in 2025. She introduced Brenna Garro as the new program specialist and shared that Elena Radcliff has transitioned to the Custom Projects team. She then presented the overall and individual program savings for the CI&I sectors, provided updates on the midstream and whole building offering progress, and SBL status. Chellie then went over the BOMA Idaho sponsorship, highlighted an engaged customer, presented recent marketing ads and irrigation, and demand response outreach efforts. She also is seeking feedback on the school cohort evolution.

Discussion

Irrigation

One member asked about the Peak Rewards enrollment numbers and the timeline of the enrollment. Chellie replied that the early season enrollment numbers will be available by the next EEAG meeting. She noted that the completed enrollment packets are requested to be sent back by the end of March so the program specialist can process them, install DRUs as needed, and reach out to past participants who have not mailed their enrollment packets by that time. Chellie stated the enrollment deadline is June 15th when the season begins.

Another member commented that they attended the recent irrigation workshop and complimented the company on the presentations. The member added that it was successful and informative. The member also pointed out that the irrigators are in the process of making this year's budgeting decisions, so the timing for marketing for energy efficiency is good.

One member asked for clarification about bringing the green motors program in house. Chellie replied that the third-party that previously managed the GM program has retired. She added that the company continues to see value in the GM program as there are cost effective savings from rewinding motors, therefore decided to continue the program by managing it in-house. Chellie stated the company developed program applications, marketing strategies, and visited

EASA accredited motoring shops to remind them that the program is still available, and the motor shops are happy with the program continuation.

Retrofits

One member asked about the preliminary program results and if it anticipates additional changes. Chellie answered that the numbers aren't final until the annual report is filed but does not anticipate any major changes. Quentin added that all the numbers today are preliminary until everything is vetted in the report through the filing and prudency process.

School Cohort

One member commented that the heat map is awesome and a great idea.

Another member asked about the heatmap and if there has been consideration to rolling out that concept to other customer segments. The member sees potential that can be used in other SEM programs. Chellie replied that it takes resources and IT involvement to roll it out broadly but if it made sense for a customer or a project, the company would create it. She added that the SEM cohorts often have an energy model that is normalized to weather, production, and any other energy dependent variables and the heatmap tool does not do that. The member commented that it seems to show equipment that they did not know was running or even have on site (existed) and says these are useful tools.

11:16 A.M. Baseline Assumptions, Part 3—Chellie Jensen

Chellie presented the third phase of the baseline assumptions and is seeking feedback. She then discussed the baseline option examples for commercial new construction, retrofits, midstream, and custom projects.

Discussion

NC

One member asked about the blended baseline and how there are positive savings when adding load and converting from gas and what goes into the math. Chellie responded that zero heating savings are considered for the gas portion of the blended baseline. She explained that in this example, 80% of the cooling savings are for the gas portion, 10% of the heating and cooling savings for the electric resistance portion and 10% of the heating and cooling savings for the

code level heat pump portion of the blended baseline. Chellie offered to send the background calculations to support the information shown in the slides.

Another member asked about using the blended baseline and if it would allow an incentive on electric units where gas is available. Chellie responded yes, that is the proposal. The member commented that they like this approach.

One member asked about this example and if it is custom or prescriptive. Chellie answered that this is conceptual for a prescriptive measure example. The member then asked if the blended baseline approach would change over time. Chellie answered that there are plans to review information in the Commercial Building Stock Assessment and the company will be evaluating how that may change over time and open to other data to get the proper blend.

Another member added that the CBSA is done roughly every five years.

Retrofits Example

One member asked about the incentive structure shown in the example. Chellie explained that the prescriptive incentives for this type of measure are typically in $/ton but the calculations to get to that prescriptive incentive per unit are first calculated in cents per kWh and compared to the percentage of measure cost to establish the appropriate total incentive that is cost-effective.

Another member asked about the NC option and if the company is proposing a blended baseline where NG is available and if it is to avoid influencing the customers' decision on their fuel source. Chellie answered yes, because it isn't possible to know what they would have chosen, using the blended baseline as a proxy represents the options of what they might have chosen.

One member commented on the Retrofit example, stating that they agree with the approach to having two different incentive baselines depending on existing equipment. The member also stated that it makes sense to claim the additional electric heat savings for the instances where the existing equipment had electric heat. The member added that for the gas baseline, the core premise that if they choose to go to electric, this incentive will encourage them to go with the most efficient electric option, and if there is no incentive, they might choose electric resistance.

Midstream

Another member requested further explanation of midstream and asked about how it relates to the baseline discussion. Chellie answered that midstream offers incentives to distributors

instead of directly to customers and the company works with the implementer to set the incentive level and savings.

The member asked if midstream is only for new construction. Chellie answered that for now, the focus is on retrofit HVAC measures for midstream and therefore a blended baseline is a conservative and simplified approach for a midstream offering.

Quentin added that the incentives would be paid with the blended baseline, so it is important to be aligned with how the company is proposing to calculate these incentives.

Another member said that the retrofits example makes sense and asked about which baseline would be considered for a dual fuel proposed measure. Chellie answered that this is a simplified example to talk through conceptually as there are other types of complex systems that will be reviewed and then the baseline will be determined.

One member asked about potential different incentives causing confusion between midstream and the prescriptive programs. Chellie answered that the measures wouldn't overlap between these offerings because anything offered in midstream would be removed from the prescriptive programs. If a measure doesn't exist in midstream or the prescriptive programs, then a custom approach would come into play.

Another member asked about how to prevent installers and distributors from inflating their prices due to federal tax incentives or other incentives. The member saw quotes with inflated prices from contractors and is curious about if there was a way to ensure the incentive goes to the customer.

One member commented that the government rebate incentives have not been implemented in Idaho.

Chellie answered that the company always recommends that customers get multiple bids. She added that distributors' prices are monitored and there would be discussions with midstream implementors to be watching for price hikes. The program design would offer an incentive to the distributor.

Another member asked about the CBSA being done every five years and if this could mean other sources would be available to use and would change the blended baseline if there was a third-party program evaluation. Chellie answered that there could be multiple sources to determine an accurate blended baseline. Quentin added that it is possible to potentially do an in-house building stock assessment by surveying the company's customers, but that it seems

prudent to use information that has already been gathered and is considered representative of customers' end use equipment.

Quentin advised that because this is a big change for the programs and some of our incentives, he appreciates members feedback to provide positive or negative feedback around this topic so an informed decision can be made.

One member appreciates the amount of work that has been put into this, and the company has done a good job outlining the concepts. The member is comfortable with what has been presented and appreciates all the work and explanations.

12:06 P.M. – Lunch

1:02 P.M. C&I Evaluation—Tetra Tech—Kimberly Bakalars, Mohammad Qandil, and Mark Bergum

Kimberly, Mohammad, and Mark presented the C&I evaluation starting with program highlights and combined evaluation methodology. They also discussed both retrofits and the new construction process results and recommendations.

Discussion

One member asked about the stipulated hours of operations by building type and how those are determined. Mohammad answered that the TRM for Idaho has a schedule where each building type has a default for stipulated hours and the hours can be collected from the TRM directly by knowing the type of building.

Another member asked about the percentage of site visits they do and how does that propagate to the other sites. Mohammad answered that it is important to visit as many sites as possible but did not get to all 400.

The member then asked if 10 to 15 percent of the sites are metered, would that realization rate apply to the unvisited sites. Mohammad answered yes, the realization rate is applied for the sampled project.

1:52 P.M. Energy Efficiency and DR in 2027 IRP—Jared Hansen

Jared presented EE results in past IRP, EE forecasts, and EE bundles. He then discussed DR, load shifting, and summarized the preferred portfolio.

Discussion

One member asked why DR is not zeroed out in 2029. Jared said he will be getting to that and then explained later in his presentation.

Quentin added that the potential study drives the EE forecast, and the study is looking at EE technology, customer usage and characteristics, the company's program results and other utility program results to determine the overall potential.

The member then asked about the EE forecast and if it presumes levelized cost levels. Quentin answered that to determine the cost-effectiveness in the EE potential study, avoided energy and capacity costs are used as the bar for cost-effectiveness as developed by the prior IRP.

The member commented that those can significantly change and asked about why not let the model buy the EE bundles. The member added this would allow the EE program to ramp up to meet the needs in five years. Jared responded that those could be ramped up, especially if they were more than a year out. He added that those bundles were selected because their small size not because they were the least expensive option to meet the forecasted load need.

Another member asked about the characteristics of the load growth forecast and whether it is more of a capacity/peak event driver of growth or is its continuous energy use across the year. Jared answered that it is both. He added that there are several large, constantly running customers and there is also traditional load growth.

One member commented that they attended the IRP meetings and asked if eliminating the EE bundles might increase the overall system cost by removing the least cost option for that need and forcing it to pick something with a higher cost. Jared responded that the company did look at the EE bundles picked by the model and determined EE wasn't the least cost option. He explained that it was picking EE bundles because of the small amount of MWs in the bundles filling a small gap in the need for resources. However, the model does not realize there is not that level of certainty on the forecast. Jared added that the forecast sways much more than the size of the bundles, but from the numbers that are entered into the model and its constraints, the model thinks it has the solution, but it is just not that certain.

The member then asked about having too much EE and if that is expected to become a problem. Jared replied that having more resources than needed is not an issue, it is the cost we would have to pay for the EE bundle savings versus the ability to easily modify the size of other lower cost resource options.

Another member asked about the added DR and if it was necessary. Jared answered yes, as long as it is cost effective.

The member then asked about the model using storage. Jared replied that the model does use storage in many ways to serve load. He added that storage is also modeled according to its costs, and the model considers that our existing DR programs are also used to help serve load.

One member asked about battery storage versus DR and what would happen if you chose the best option for each one of those, asking if DR shifts peak load and battery does everything else. Jared answered that the model is allowed to do that, but batteries and DR are often dispatched in higher risk hours, but batteries are so much more flexible than DR because of the limited hours of DR due to there being a customer involved. He explained that this is the function of the model as it adds some DR and some battery storage optimizing costs to be as low as possible.

The member then asked about the cost difference. Jared replied that it is tricky to compare because of the ability to use differently, but batteries are now a cost-effective option.

Another member asked if DR could be used for arbitrage on wholesale prices. Jared explained that the goal for DR has not been arbitrage, but shifting energy away from the peak hours can have some arbitrage benefit.

2:30 P.M. Wrap-up/Open Discussion

Thank you for the time and presentations today, it is much appreciated. I look forward to seeing everyone at the next meeting.

Thanks for the good discussion.

Chellie's presentation was most relevant for our team.

There were great presentations with interesting information. I especially enjoyed the fuel baseline discussion.

Helpful day! I need to do more research on the baseline to get a better understanding. Announcement – We are partnering with Renewable NW and hosting a transmissions summit in Boise May 7th & 8th. The member gave the link for registration in the chat. https://nwenergy.org/eventnw/northwest-transmission-summit/

Thank you, Chellie, and everyone for the baseline discussion. I'm excited about the spring launches (new programs). There are exciting things to come.

Great meeting as usual. I appreciate the effort put into these meetings. Good to see you guys.

I echo all sentiments. I appreciate the information while I'm reacclimating.

It is hard to pick a favorite presentation. Thank you for putting this together. I also appreciate the jokes spicing up the afternoon session.

I also sit on the IRP committee and rate cases. This is all important to me to look at the whole picture of where we are going to end up. Kudos to Quentin for the irrigation workshop and the information he presented. I appreciate Jared and understand what he is doing. Thank you for the opportunity for me to sit on this committee.

Riley – Thank you to everyone for taking time out of your day and for the great discussions.

Quentin – Thanks for all your feedback and time.

3:05 P.M. Meeting Adjourned

Acronyms

ACCC – A/C Cool Credit

BOOMA – Building Owners and Managers Association

C&I – Commercial & Industrial

CBSA – Commercial Building Stock Assessment

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

ESA – Electrical Apparatus Service Association

GM – Green Motors

H&C – Heating and Cooling

HEA – Home Energy Audit

HER – Home Energy Report

HVAC – Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning

IRP – Integrated Resource Plan

kWh – Kilowatt per Hour

MW – Megawatt

NC – New Construction

OEM – Original Equipment Manufacturer

RNC – Residential New Construction

SBL – Small Business Lighting

SEM – Strategic Energy Management

TRM – Technical Resource Manual

WAQC – Weatherization Assistance for Qualified Customers (Idaho & Oregon)

YTD – Year to Date