

**Illinois EE Stakeholder Advisory Group  
Policy Manual Subcommittee**

**Tuesday, July 11, 2023  
9:30 am – 12:30 pm  
Webinar**

**Attendees and Meeting Notes**

**Meeting Materials**.....1  
**Attendees (by webinar)**.....1  
**Opening & Introductions** .....2  
**Follow-up on Electrification Proposals** .....2  
**Follow-up on Prohibited Expenses Policy Proposal**.....5  
**Policy Manual Effective Dates**.....6  
**Closing and Next Steps**.....6

**Meeting Materials**

Posted on the [Policy Manual Subcommittee page](#).

- [July 11, 2023 Policy Manual Subcommittee Agenda](#)
- [Nicor Gas, Peoples Gas & North Shore Gas Policy Proposal: Electrification Bill Impacts \(7/6/23\)](#)
- [Follow-up on Nicor Gas Electrification Savings Calculation Policy \(see slides 5-8 from June 27 Presentation\)](#)
- [Policy Status Table with Proposed Effective Dates \(updated 7/6/23\)](#)
- [Updated Prohibited Expenses Policy with ICC Staff Edits \(7/10/23 version 2\)](#)
- [ICC Staff Prohibited Expenses Presentation \(version 2\)](#)

**Attendees (by webinar)**

Celia Johnson, SAG Facilitator  
Caty Lamadrid, Inova Energy Group (SAG Meeting Support)  
Allen Dusault, Franklin Energy  
Andy Vaughn, Leidos  
Billy Davis, Bronzeville Community Development Partnership  
Cassidy Kraimer, Community Investment Corp.  
Charles Ampong, Guidehouse  
Chris Neme, Energy Futures Group, representing NRDC  
Chris Vaughn, Nicor Gas  
Christina Pagnusat, Peoples Gas & North Shore Gas  
Deb Perry, Ameren Illinois  
Elizabeth Horne, ICC Staff  
Fernando Morales, Ameren Illinois  
Jarred Nordjus, Peoples Gas & North Shore Gas  
Jonathan Skarzynski, Nicor Gas  
Karen Lusson, National Consumer Law Center

Katherine Elmore, Community Investment Corp.  
LaJuana Garret, Nicor Gas  
Laura Agapay-Read, Guidehouse  
Matt Armstrong, Matt Armstrong  
Michael Brandt, Elevate  
Mike King, Nicor Gas  
Molly Lunn, ComEd  
Naomi Davis, Blacks in Green  
Nelson May, Future Energy Enterprises  
Omy Garcia, Peoples Gas & North Shore Gas  
Philip Halliburton, ComEd  
Philip Mosenthal, Optimal Energy, representing IL AG and NCLC  
Randy Opdyke, Nicor Gas  
Ronna Abshure, ICC  
Sam Dent, VEIC (IL-TRM Administrator)  
Scott Eckel, ICC  
Seth Craigo-Snell, SCS Analytics  
Ted Weaver, First Tracks Consulting, representing Nicor Gas  
Tina Grebner, Ameren Illinois  
Thomas Manjarres, Peoples Gas & North Shore Gas  
Travis Hinck, GDS Associates  
Wade Morehead, Morehead Energy  
Zach Ross, Opinion Dynamics

### **Opening & Introductions**

*Celia Johnson, SAG Facilitator*

- **Material:** [SAG Facilitator Presentation: Introduction to July 11 Meeting and Policy Background](#)

### **Follow-up on Electrification Proposals**

- **Purpose:** To discuss follow-up on the Peoples Gas & North Shore Gas and Nicor Gas electrification policy proposals.
- **Materials:** [Nicor Gas, Peoples Gas & North Shore Gas Policy Proposal: Electrification Bill Impacts \(7/6/23\)](#)

### **Bill Impacts Policy Proposal**

*Ted Weaver, First Tracks Consulting, representing Nicor Gas*

- SAG Facilitator Background: during June 27<sup>th</sup> meeting, Nicor Gas Peoples Gas/North Shore Gas shared two separate bill impact proposals. After this meeting, the utilities worked together to consolidate proposals and incorporate feedback. A document was circulated for feedback and will be presented today.
- Word document shared on screen starts with the discussion from 6/27 meeting with stakeholder comments.
- Item 4: merges the PG&NSG proposal.

*Chris Neme: switch order of 4 and 5. The remaining concern we have is that we are not comfortable with the language of a SAG Working Group that works towards consensus. We don't think it makes sense to have a working group on this topic.*

*Karen Lusson: I do not have a problem with working group, but what happens if consensus is not reached?*

*Christina Pagnusat: We do not expect electric utilities to stop their current work. It is a forum to have the conversation and have an opportunity to weigh in on how information is presented to customers. We tried to mirror language from SAG for other working groups.*

*Karen Lusson: I do not see a downside to getting interested parties' feedback.*

*Chris Neme: Agree to having a meeting or two, but not discussing in perpetuity. The downside is having too many meetings on a topic that will likely not reach consensus.*

*Phil Mosenthal: Agree that there should be a time limit on this.*

*Chris Neme: Would be comfortable with language that says SAG Facilitator would convene a meeting of interested parties to discuss feedback on the ways to present bill impacts to customers. The words "consensus" and "working group" are problematic.*

*Matt Armstrong: Ameren agrees with Chris' sentiment of having another working group on a contentious topic. We could get behind the idea of convening at most two-meetings but setting some boundaries is important.*

*Karen Lusson: Language edits on "may" vs "shall." What if there is only one measure that constitutes as electrification measure, should utilities only provide bill impacts of the individual measure?*

*Chris Neme: Yes, only the electrification measure.*

*Karen Lusson: Concern about language "when practicable."*

*Zach Ross he/him – via chat: Does "cumulative" in the first sentence refer to temporally cumulative (e.g. year over year?) or cumulative in terms of all of the measures? I assume the latter but am getting thrown by the use of the word "cumulative" which brings to mind CPAS.*

*Karen Lusson: Would it be possible for electric utilities to provide savings information to customer on a monthly or seasonal basis (instead of annual)?*

*Molly Lunn: A monthly report is not going to be possible or practical. It will be annual savings, but I will take back to the ComEd to see if it is feasible at all to show seasonal savings.*

*Matt Armstrong: In accordance with the statute, Ameren will provide total annual and average monthly effects on the bill. We agree with ComEd that monthly or seasonal*

*information to the customer is burdensome to utilities and overwhelming to customers.*

*Molly Lunn: The original proposal was overtly specific and primarily related to program design. ComEd is willing to support something that was on the spirit of transparency and accuracy. That said, we are not comfortable with convening a working group or any meetings at all. How ComEd presents bill impacts to a customer is related to program design and not to policy. Entertaining this policy is ComEd's acknowledgement there is interest in this area and stating our willingness to take feedback, but we need to draw a line around program design. We are comfortable with language that the electric utilities will consider feedback.*

*Matt Armstrong: Ameren is on the same page with ComEd. We do not need additional meetings. We are sharing what we have, we get feedback and implement when possible. We would support one meeting to get feedback.*

*Karen Lusson – via chat: Language suggestion to add: “When providing estimates of bill impacts for individual customer measure and whole building measure installations, program administrators shall reflect specific customer circumstances, including but not limited to customer past usage and building design.”*

*Karen Lusson – via chat: “Section 8-103(b): Prior to installing an electrification measure, the utility shall provide a customer with an estimate of the impact of the new measure on the customer's average monthly electric bill and total annual energy expenses.”*

*Chris Neme: As long as the information is correct, it is important to not micromanage how the communication is shared by the electric utilities to the customers.*

*Naomi Davis: I think we need to find creative ways to educate people pictorially on what their bill impacts are. If we cannot do this effectively then we are not meeting our duty. Who designs these communications and who is vetting them?*

*Celia Johnson: We can discuss all of this during the annual meeting that everyone has agreed to.*

*Andy Vaughn: Concern about these nuances being dictated in a Policy Manual. Because if it is dictated here then utilities are stuck with this way of presenting information to customers. Customers often see 10 pages of information at once, and adding more detail makes it overwhelming for the customer to understand. We are concerned that there are so many options to present to a customer, we would prefer to present utilities' recommendations to customer and allow them to ask questions if they have any.*

*Karen Lusson: Maybe this needs to be shared with focus groups post implementation to get feedback from customers.*

*Karen Lusson: Can I put in a request that the ComEd and Armstrong give a presentation on what they currently shared with customers?*

*Molly Lunn: We already have a meeting scheduled for September and we will present information then.*

**Next Steps:** Ameren and ComEd will review edited language from July 11 meeting, and may follow-up with edits.

### **Follow-up on Nicor Gas Energy Consumption Reduction Electrification Proposal**

- Not discussed due to time constraints.

**Next Steps:** Nicor Gas will present what language could be agreed to at the next meeting.

### **Follow-up on Prohibited Expenses Policy Proposal**

*Elizabeth Horne, ICC Staff*

- **Materials:** [Updated Prohibited Expenses Policy with ICC Staff Edits \(7/10/23 version 2\)](#); and [ICC Staff Prohibited Expenses Presentation \(version 2\)](#)
- ICC Staff made edits to reflect feedback from the June 27<sup>th</sup> meeting. On some sections we needed additional clarification, as the more items we add to the “list of prohibited expenses” it becomes more important to say that it is not an “all-inclusive list.”
- This updated policy is for new contracts starting in 2024, it is not intended to require utilities to change existing contracts.
  - The proposed effective date is Jan. 1, 2024.
  - Language was edited during the meeting to reference including expenses prohibitions “executed after the effective date” of the policy.

Updated policy language for “entertainment event tickets”:

*Chris Vaughn: Are you saying the event itself needs to be related to energy-efficiency? Or the activity for the program administrator? So, does the event need to be related to energy efficiency? Or in numerous instances that is not the focal point of what we’re doing at these events is to raise awareness of energy efficiency and get customers engaged.*

*Elizabeth Horne: This can be on a case-by-case basis. If it is an event in a county fair, then a ticket to a county fair may be recoverable.*

*Chris Vaughn: Concerned this language is overly broad. You need to meet the people where they are. Asking that events are prescriptive towards EE is a very small, niche group of events. As part of sponsorships, tickets are often included. We are not handing those tickets out to customers. The plain meaning of the language would deem that sponsorship a prohibited expense.*

*Elizabeth Horne: Receiving tickets as part of a sponsorship would be a prohibited expense.*

*Naomi Davis: The question is how can funds be prioritized to reach the most potential customers? The question is, have you prioritized meeting the market that will be there [at the event]?*

*Chris Vaughn: Interested in additional language carveout related to tickets received with a sponsorship for outreach/marketing.*

**Next Steps:** SAG Facilitator will follow-up with Nicor Gas and ICC Staff about additional edits. An updated policy will be shared with the group next week.

### **Policy Manual Effective Dates**

- Not discussed due to time constraints. Feedback on effective dates will be discussed at the next meeting.

### **Closing and Next Steps**

*Celia Johnson, SAG Facilitator*

- [Summary of Next Steps from July 11 Policy Manual Meeting](#)