

Illinois EE Stakeholder Advisory Group Reporting Working Group: Ameren Illinois Multi-Family Metrics Workshop

Thursday, September 15, 2022 Meeting
10:00 – 11:30 am
Teleconference

Attendees and Meeting Notes

Meeting Materials

- Posted on the [September 15 meeting page](#):
 - [Thursday, September 15 Reporting Working Group Agenda – Ameren Illinois Multi-Family Metrics Workshop](#)
 - [2021 Ameren Illinois Multi-Family Initiatives: Summary of Property Manager Interview Results \(Opinion Dynamics Presentation\)](#)
 - [Memo from Opinion Dynamics to Ameren Illinois: Summary of Findings from 2021 Property Manager Interviews \(July 25, 2022\)](#)
 - [Multifamily Workshop: Program Year to Date Metrics \(Ameren Illinois Presentation\)](#)

Attendees (by webinar)

Celia Johnson, SAG Facilitator
Greg Ehrendreich, Midwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (MEEA) – Meeting Support
Adam Fields, Ameren Illinois
Alan Elliott, Opinion Dynamics
Andrey Gribovich, DNV
Andy Vaughn, Leidos
Arlinda Bajrami, MEEA
Billy Davis, Bronzeville Community Development Partnership
Cassidy Kraimer, Community Investment Corp.
Chris Neme, Energy Futures Group, representing NRDC
Chris Vaughn, Nicor Gas
David Brightwell, ICC Staff
Dena Jefferson, Franklin Energy
Elizabeth Horne, ICC Staff
Erin Stitz, Applied Energy Group
Jason Fegley, Ameren Illinois
Jennifer Michael, Ameren Illinois
Lamisa Chowdhury, NEWHAB
Laura Goldberg, NRDC
LaJuana Garret, Nicor Gas
Mark Szczygiel, Nicor Gas
Matt Armstrong, Ameren Illinois
Melanie Munroe, Opinion Dynamics
Molly Lunn, ComEd
Nick Lovier, Ameren Illinois
Omayra Garcia, Peoples Gas & North Shore Gas
Rohith Mannam, Nicor Gas

Ron Siddle, CMC Energy
Sy Lewis, Meadows Eastside Community Resource Org.
Tammy Jackson, Ameren Illinois
Ted Weaver, First Tracks Consulting, on behalf of Nicor Gas
Tina Grebner, Ameren Illinois
Victoria Nielsen, Applied Energy Group

Opening & Introductions

Celia Johnson, SAG Facilitator

Purpose of September 15th meeting: To hold a multi-family data metrics workshop for Ameren Illinois and interested stakeholders, as referenced in the 2022-2025 Ameren Illinois EE Plan Revised Stipulated Agreement.

Multi-Family (MF) Evaluation Research Study: One-Stop-Shop

Alan Elliott, Opinion Dynamics

- Opinion Dynamics is the third party evaluator for Ameren, role is overseeing the income qualified portion including multifamily.
- Research to show early assessment of the One-Stop-Shop model.
 - One-Stop Shop is a concierge/turnkey model for MF property managers. MF properties can qualify for a variety of offerings, this is to make it as seamless as possible for managers and tenants.
 - Outreach staff generate leads. Manager completes online application. Leidos team assigns to advisor who is concierge from there on out. Interview, discussion, history of upgrades, provides assessment and DI measures. Guides through process of understanding the opportunities through MF or other AIC offerings. Advisor facilitates participation and provides support, helps find trade allies, fill out applications, address problems that arise. Seeks to establish a long-term trust relationship and repeat participation.
- Study Overview – focus is an early assessment of the program. Program launched in 2020. Looking for insights to improve and refine the approach. Wanted to hear from participants about motivations and barriers. Trying to understand if it is attractive and is the right intervention. Interviewed 8 property managers. Covers Market Rate, IQ, and Public Housing. Most respondents were from IQ segment (6/8) – which aligns with participation patterns. The other 2 were public housing. Attempted to contact the entire census but got no response from Market Rate segment.
- Motivations: 5/8 became aware of the program through direct outreach. Phone most common. 2 cases of program trade ally recommendation. Two angles: A: why make change; B: Why Ameren?
 - Answer for A: serve their tenants. All mentioned them. Improve costs and increase comfort. Ameren is going to leverage by finding a way to allow tenants to nominate.
 - Answer for B: two key things – limited cost (no cost measures for common areas and tenant units, no co-pays) and attracted to the single point of contact/application process.
 - Conducted interviews in late 2021 and things have changed in 2022 – inflation, supply costs, utility side increased costs of energy. May provide more motivation to participate.

[Chris Neme] Interested in the response about tenants. May benefit landlords, i.e., less tenant complaints. Did you ask about that?

[Alan Elliott] Good point. Some are trying to do it out of the goodness of their heart, but there is an alignment of interests there too. Showing some commitment to the tenants leads to greater tenant retention and some of them did mention less complaints/positive feedback.

[Chris Neme] How long after the project work did you talk to them? Could they see a difference in retention yet?

[Alan Elliott] Varied, but at least a few months by the time we talked to them.

[David Brightwell] How many respondents? How many did you solicit?

[Alan Elliott] 50 total unique contacts in 2021. Some represented multiple properties. Spoke with 8/50 – 16%. For residential that's good and for MF property managers it's a pretty good response rate.

[David Brightwell] Any concerns about selection bias – people more focused on tenant concerns also more likely to respond?

[Alan Elliott] Or people who wanted to talk to us might be more inclined to have positive things to say. That behooves us to keep aware of the challenges even with the positive results today. Important to continually monitor and do other types of assessments to gather more feedback. Good things to keep in mind.

[Chris Neme] Did the 50 include both market rate and IQ?

[Alan Elliott] Yes, all segments. 6/8 of respondents were IQ.

[David Brightwell] Is that proportional?

[Alan Elliott] Yes, pretty proportional to the layout of participation – most participants were also IQ. We would have loved to talk to some market rate folks, but this does mean that this research is targeted.

[Laura Goldberg] From discussion with Ameren, purpose was to help with applications and handholding but also to get them to move further into deeper measures. I see some of that in the report. Would like to hear more about how this is helping. Did any of these do deeper work?

[Alan Elliott] Not an extreme amount of detail. Mostly were within the MF initiatives, a few did go further. One did ductless heat pumps for example. 1-2 went further than MF but I'd have to check the tracking data. Some were just the initial assessment and direct install, some went a little further.

[Laura Goldberg] Maybe this is more of question for Ameren. Confirming there are additional measures in MF for 2022-2025?

[Alan Elliott] Correct. More deeper things like air sealing and ductless heat pumps. Single point of contact (SPOC) is trying to make that seamless – they might not know they are actually in multiple initiatives at once.

[Laura Goldberg] IQ multifamily versus public housing – all are IQ housing. Is the public housing offering different than IQ MF, or are they just divided by the sectors?

[Alan Elliott] I don't think there is much difference, just categorized differently to understand how they reach the segments and their needs.

[Jen Michael] There is no variation between the two initiatives – all the same offerings.

[Alan Elliott] Key thing to keep distinct is outreach and program qualification is different. IQ MF has more different ways of qualifying – a little more complicated than qualifying public housing.

[Adam Fields] Were the respondents from varying geographic locations in the Ameren Illinois service territory?

[Alan Elliott] They were pretty spread out. Some outside of East St. Louis (Greenville and Lebanon); Peoria; Champaign; some more south (Carbondale, Johnston City) but not the deep south. Also, Springfield and Jacksonville. I believe this is a mixture of larger and smaller/ rural urban communities.

- Satisfaction
 - Positive experience continues through process. All were satisfied. Some said tenants also mentioned positive results. Quote on slide – that manager emphasized multiple times how he heard from tenants about program, said it was really making a difference. Feedback was important to hear and important to Ameren.
 - All were generally satisfied with measures, some called out some opportunities – air sealing and windows, which are offered but for some reason they didn't get what they thought they wanted. One wanted more LEDs and wished for fixtures replacement since theirs were not compatible. Faucet aerators clogged at one facility. One interesting note is that the building for one manager was very old but they felt there were limitations they could achieve without a whole building overhaul. All were still ultimately satisfied. Emphasized H&S and comfort benefits.
 - In the Low Income Needs Assessment (another study) we saw that LI had more of those issues. This aligns well with what we saw here.
- Barriers and Challenges:
 - A few shown on the slide. COVID issues. A few said they needed extra precautions and virtual meetings. Which made the timeline longer and the experience less smooth.
 - Common barrier with budget constraints in the public housing segment. Extra complexity in decision making. Have to do it when they have some funds available and do what they can afford now – often in a decision-making quandary. This may be most acute for the public housing segment. A bit of extra training and

education on the heat pumps in the winter – they didn't remove their baseboard heat because of concerns. Industry research calls attention to the risk of decisions like this – backups that aren't actually needed. Need to think about how energy advisor can further educate on performance and benefits of ductless heat pumps.

- Hypothetical barriers for similar – maybe some tenant pushback, paperwork, general staff availability – possible barriers the respondents envisioned.
- Takeaway: One Stop Shop approach deals with most or all of the barriers – dealing with timelines, education, etc. Flexibility is key here. Balance project timing and dealing with the unexpected. Funding challenges in public housing are an important barrier especially in offerings that aren't no-cost (though most for MF IQ are). Market rate may need to find access to other funding sources.
- While there are important challenges, we heard overwhelming positive responses. The program is attractive and providing benefits.

Ameren Illinois Multi-Family Metrics

Matt Armstrong and Jen Michael, Ameren Illinois

- In Ameren's 2022-2025 stipulation, we agreed to keep implementing the One Stop Shop multi-family model. Another agreement was that we would continue discussions on how it is going and discuss improvements. That's why we had Opinion Dynamics share those findings. We are focusing on metrics today – to discuss the multi-family metrics that we have in the stipulation. Goal of the metrics to show comprehensiveness of projects.
- IQ MF Metrics Listing
 - Participation
 - Number of IQ MF buildings and number of apartments in those buildings, by ZIP
 - Number of IQ MF in which major measures (envelope and HVAC) were installed and number of apartments in those buildings, by ZIP
 - We're also going to be talking about the additional metrics we agreed to start measuring.
- On ZIP related measures, map shows number of buildings and IQ that measures were installed by ZIP. We've reached the point where we have a long list and we thought a map would be a better way to show you. One of our efforts was to reach out to rural territories. These maps show completed projects but pending ones aren't shown here. They are broken out by number of apartments treated. As you get out of cities, complexes are smaller – most are scattered and much smaller properties. You can see that in the map.
- Ameren is interested in whether stakeholders have reviewed the table format (in the quarterly report) vs. the map format, and whether there is any feedback on this type of reporting. As the reporting continues, the table and list of ZIP codes is going to be larger and the table may be a challenge.
 - **Discuss whether there is feedback on the table format at Q1 2023 meeting.**
- Number of IQ MF buildings with major measures
 - Tighter spread because of budgets. There are some pending projects that are large that aren't shown yet. Reaching Peoria a lot and out into Galesburg. One very large and two smaller projects. A trade ally brought them in – a veteran owned business. Several others further south that we are working on. If public housing was overlaid here, you would see more in the south as well. Primarily heat pumps at this time.

- PY22 we have had a hard time finding more envelope needs – checking whether they have been in our system and validating that data. A bit slower this year – could be market saturation. Checking insulation and doing air sealing evaluations, including thermographics for the energy advisors. Looking to add window caulking measures for next year.

[Laura Goldberg] Are the measures listed out for the maps in terms of what is being installed?

[Matt Armstrong] Quarterly report includes a list of major measures vs direct install.

[Laura Goldberg] Some education is happening – when that happens are you still getting property owners who don't want to move forward or is it helping get projects moving?

[Jen Michael] Challenge – it is solely attic insulation and air sealing. We added outlet and gasket covers and door seals and are looking to add window and door caulking for air infiltration. Property maintenance people get assessment recommendations but we don't know how much they are doing, so we thought that would be a good in-unit expansion. We can at least seal up the infiltration. The thermographic cameras were key for seeing this and finding the drafts. Door sweeps haven't been as well received, looking to change the model and see how that goes. We're trying several models for durability.

[Chris Neme] You have been constrained this year by the approved measure list and are looking to revise that. Are you also considering storm windows as a measure?

[Jen Michael] We have looked at a variety of products and still doing the research to see if it is a viable option. It's fairly expensive and takes a lot of partnership with manufacturers.

[Chris Neme] Is it predominantly in the Peoria area – the previous map for MF was more around East St. Louis. Why is that – did you try to roll out heat pumps there and then expand, or is there more electric heat there, or some other reason?

[Jen Michael] We have seen more all-electric in the Peoria region, also reaching toward Bloomington and I-80. Even in dual-fuel areas we are hitting more all electric buildings. We're not as far ahead on gas measures as we have been in other years. Maybe we have hit more of the older buildings in the past. More dual fuel in rural areas, more all-electric in the cities. We're watching it shift and it's interesting to see, but not enough data yet. As we expanded into ducted heat pumps, that gave allies some more push to find more properties. About half were referred by allies – very motivated because the incentives are high. One public housing ally referred 100 units. We look at all situations. If we have the budget then we move the projects forward. We have a good queue for next year – fully subscribed for heat pumps this year. Pushing to stimulate more envelope for this year.

[Chris Neme] Are you finding less all-electric down south?

[Jen Michael] Unsure yet.

[Chris Neme] What about propane?

[Jen Michael] Not in apartment buildings.

- Percent of buildings and projects – 100% of projects included a whole building assessment. Every property that hasn't been assessed since 2020 gets an assessment. We take them through the whole process again to make sure we didn't miss anything. Doesn't include multi-year.
- Next two slides are reflective of only direct install (DI) measures – that was 80%. No differentiation of whether it was previous years. Some properties put off DI projects because of COVID. Some discrepancies there. If you are dual fuel and you already did envelope, then you are going to have DI measures.

[Chris Neme] When you look at envelope opportunities, for what fraction do you find opportunities to do the measures? Are you finding that a majority are in good shape or are you finding issues they don't follow through with?

[Jen Michael] For the most part, properties are already meeting the criteria – we're not finding the buildings that need it. If attic insulation is adequate, then we move forward with air sealing. If attic insulation is done, the air sealing is probably already there. Some market saturation, and we need to move out to more rural areas.

[Chris Neme] You could have an insulated attic and still infiltration, are you looking at those? Elevator shafts in high-rises?

[Jen Michael] Not looking at high rises – not a lot in the region. If attic is adequate, then ally doesn't go further in the program design. Offering is limited there.

- The next slide, some confusion because it is asking projects /units that only got in-unit measures. Same as previous DI – that's our interpretation. Properties that didn't choose any major measure projects. We worked with them. One put off ductless heat pump for a year because they were doing the roof this year. Maybe DI is all they are eligible for.
- Buildings with only common area measures – 0% - exceptionally rare that a project would move forward with common area only install. Smaller facilities that would do DI only may not have much common area – entry and foyer but not commercially rated. We don't see large common areas that aren't done at the same time. This only captures residential common area and that's smart stats and LED. Have expanded to some water measures and some other things. But mostly really minimal common areas.

[Laura Goldberg] Commercial common area not applicable to the properties here?

[Jen Michael] We can look up the split between Commercial and Residential categories. 40-45% are not commercial rated at all. Can't meet that criterion. Most smaller properties have very minimal common areas – foyers, some outside walkways – all done as part of DI projects.

[Laura Goldberg] We hope we can report in the future and look at how the commercial properties common area projects are reflected.

[Jen Michael] That was one of our questions – we thought there might be room to expand that operational definition. By limiting it to YTD, we may do an assessment in July, then DI in August, then a heat pump in December, and then move forward in next January with some commercial lighting. It might show things in different years due to multi-year participation.

[Laura Goldberg] Stakeholders would work with Ameren on expanding that, I think. Happy to come back and talk more about that.

- These n5-n7 measures are “if possible” based on the recommendations vs what they actually did. We didn’t have a mechanism for tracking it in the reporting system. We have been working on creating that in our system and have just started doing PY22 backlog. In process of building the report. Anticipate in Q4 should have data on these 3 measures. Should be able to do it soon. Caution is that there may be some overlap between YTD and past-12 months and 12-24.
- Barriers and Suggestions
 - Reporting difficulties
 - m1 A-B – and n2-n7 – YTD doesn’t reflect long-term partnerships. People are coming back. Data doesn’t reflect that. Suggests moving to a rolling calendar reporting instead of YTD – 12 & 24 month period is probably fine.
 - Suggested measures: % of conversion to direct install measures, BE and HVAC (versus just how many were done)
 - It would also be helpful to show the effectiveness across initiatives. We are encouraging bulk equipment midstream and online and that isn’t reflected here either.

[Chris Neme] You have some appliance rebates that this program might be causing to happen but the savings and reporting aren’t showing up here?

[Jen Michael] Yes, last year through retail products, but we put them through MF this year and used the existing application to do it. It stayed in the One Stop Shop this year.

[Chris Neme] The point you were making is that the participation in those measures could also be tracked. I think that is a great idea.

[Jen Michael] We manually track referrals to other programs too, and we have the potential to do that in the system.

[Chris] Capturing all of those things you suggest would provide a picture of the comprehensiveness of what you are doing.

[Laura Goldberg] Agree with that. If this is doable then great.

- Major measures. Lack of clarity in the operational definition and the intentions. Major measures are merged into one rather than broken out to heat pump and envelope. Track envelope by building, HVAC by units. Hard to meld to effective data. Would be better to

break out that detail. Rural vs metro might be more useful. Rural and city have different sizes. More properties vs more units. This can skew the view of the data.

- Suggest looking at more demographic buckets. Especially the small properties that don't have access to capital – only fix things when they are broken. Those are the really low income folks sitting in those properties. We also have residential only vs commercial-eligible properties, which impacts what they are eligible for. Lastly is there a better way to demonstrate the territory areas – north vs south vs far south, rural vs urban.

[Laura Goldberg] I think the definition of common area and direct install we could use some clarification on. Trying to get beyond lighting, air sealing and insulation and into more major measures. But some of it is grouped as direct install. I think we want to see the difference between the low- and no-cost versus deeper – and we should break down these groupings to show that. I agree that thinking through the demographics is good. Even ZIP has been helpful to see where work is happening but the question on the depth of the work and I'm hearing that it would help to break those out. I think some of the suggestions are useful. Ameren's efforts with diversity maps through CCRPC – is there an opportunity to overlay some of that with the multifamily maps? That's a suggestion that could help interpret some of this.

[Chris Neme] To add on, I think the suggestion to break out heat pumps from the envelope measures would be really helpful. When you find electric resistance heat, are you also doing water heaters?

[Jen Michael] We offer it but there are constraints with space – few have the room needed. We have to see if there are smaller versions that will work – they don't want to do louvered doors and change the look in the unit. We need to look at the types of heaters available.

[Chris Neme] Not sure about the barriers point – buildings are smaller and rural which might skew the views. I'm not sure that's the case. We would all expect that buildings are smaller and there is less MF in rural vs urban. I think still that buildings and units is helpful for reporting by ZIP. I wouldn't worry about skewed views of effectiveness from that. Some of the other points are helpful though. Owner vs tenant bill paying would be helpful.

[Jen Michael] We do see that property owners that pay the bill are more likely to move forward – especially water measures. The owners that responded to the survey are likely to be the ones that are most interested. Some don't care because they don't pay the bills and they still say no to free measures. That's frustrating. Sometimes we can get some influence from the maintenance people instead of the office.

[Laura Goldberg] That could be helpful categorization – you mentioned smaller vs larger buildings. It might be ComEd has some reporting on type of IQ housing like subsidized/Section 8, versus “naturally occurring” affordable housing.

[Jen Michael] We do track that – what qualified them like their zone, HUD, etc. We use the policy manual to follow that. We also layered with our smart saver

zip codes. The other piece on HVAC is the percent eligible for heat pumps vs those with boilers, gas heat, etc.

[Chris Neme] Agree on that would be good to see how many are eligible and refuse to take it.

- Other reporting barriers: % YTD with whole building – more clarity needed to get the intention of the measure. Directive is that everyone gets one and 100% who qualify for the initiative and make their property available do get one. Additionally major measure projects, we also require an assessment first. Suggest we discontinue this measure – it's not impactful because it's not a rare occurrence to get an assessment. YTD could be changed to help show multi-year. Suggest some replacement measures - % of eligible properties in 24-months. Show how often those who apply actually get an assessment – who we weren't able to circle back to if they were initially unresponsive even after they applied.
- On buildings and projects N2 & N3 – these appear to us to be duplicative. The definitions of “only DI” vs “in-unit” are basically the same for us. High participation of only residentially rated properties, and no common areas. Suggest we discontinue and look at multi-year partnerships and deal with properties that only can do DI measures. Suggest new metric of breaking out into more program buckets, # of projects, buildings and units served.
- N4 common area – exceptionally rare that only common area occurs.
- N5 – already talked through. Major measures and building envelopes are tracked by building, not property which may have multiple buildings. Many times, HVAC is broken out into phases because of cost outlay. Suggestions of % of properties assessed that received recommendations for DI and major measures AND meets additional quantifiers. Need clarification on the operational definitions so we can stay consistent. Also, what are recommendations we gave and then what did they go forward with.
- The “if possible” measures related to recommendations. Barriers is that YTD overlaps and double counts the way it is stipulated right now. Seems it should be 0-12, 13-24 so 12 isn't counted in both metrics.

[Laura Goldberg] Supports suggestions discussed today.

- Also suggest defining the reasons that properties don't move forward – 5-6 reasons we see repeatedly. It's rare they don't move forward if there is funding but some have barriers, for example 100-amp circuits. Not H&S but it's preparedness. We are addressing one of those this year. Maybe 1 out of 20 we see that. Cost is \$800-1100 per unit for that upgrade. Very cost impactful for the program. As we've expanded into ducted, may see more of that. Need to track it so we can give you and ourselves a better picture there.

Closing and Next Steps

Celia Johnson, SAG Facilitator

- If needed, a shorter, informal meeting can be scheduled with stakeholders in Q4 2022 to review additional reporting from Q3 data
- The next Ameren Illinois Multi-Family Metrics Workshop will be scheduled in Q1 2023 (January or February). Potential discussion topics:
 - Definitions of common area and direct install; what measures are included? What are the low measures, vs. what are the deeper measures?

- Is there an opportunity to overlay with the Champaign County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC) mapping?
- Additional metric suggestions:
 - Breakout heat pumps from the envelope measures
 - % of buildings and units that have electric resistance heat, that choose to install heat pump (vs. not install)
 - Look at reporting on common area projects for commercial properties
- Ameren Illinois interested in whether stakeholders have reviewed the table format (in the quarterly report) vs. the map format, and whether there is any feedback on this type of reporting