

**Illinois EE Stakeholder Advisory Group  
Reporting Working Group Meeting**

**Tuesday, December 19, 2023 (Teleconference)**  
1:00 pm – 3:00 pm

**Attendees and Meeting Notes**

<b>Meeting Materials .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Attendees (by webinar).....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Opening &amp; Introductions.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>IQ Multi-Family Reporting Metrics.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>IQ Health and Safety Reporting Metrics.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Closing and Next Steps.....</b>	<b>8</b>

**Meeting Materials**

Posted on the [December 19](#) meeting page of the SAG website:

- [IQ Multifamily Metrics – Stakeholder Responses to Feedback \(12/18/23\)](#)
- [IQ Health and Safety Metrics – Stakeholder Responses to Feedback \(12/18/23\)](#)

**Attendees**

Celia Johnson, SAG Facilitator  
Caty Lamadrid, Inova Energy Group (SAG Meeting Support)  
Andy Vaughn, Leidos  
Babette Washington, Ameren Illinois  
Briana Moore, Will County Land Use Department  
Cassidy Kraimer, Community Investment Corp.  
Chester Kolodziej, Sustain Rockford  
Chris Neme, Energy Futures Group, representing NRDC  
Christina Pagnusat, Peoples Gas & North Shore Gas  
Chris Vaughn, Nicor Gas  
Dena Jefferson, Franklin Energy  
Elizabeth Horne, ICC Staff  
Henry Tieman, Nicor Gas  
Jarred Nordhus, Peoples Gas & North Shore Gas  
Jason Fegley, Ameren Illinois  
Jean Gibson, Peoples Gas & North Shore Gas  
John Carroll, Ameren Illinois  
John Dakarian, Nicor Gas  
Josh Sharon, ComEd  
Karen Luson, National Consumer Law Center (NCLC)  
Kari McCue, Nicor Gas  
Katherine Elmore, Community Investment Corp.  
Ken Parker, Community Investment Corp.  
LaJuana Garrett, Nicor Gas  
Matt Armstrong, Ameren Illinois  
Michael Brandt, Elevate  
Miritza Thorpe, Ameren Illinois  
Omayra Garcia, Peoples Gas & North Shore Gas  
Pat Justis, Ameren Illinois  
Philip Mosenthal, Optimal Energy, representing IL AG and NCLC

Sam Lamos, Opinion Dynamics  
Ted Weaver, First Tracks Consulting, representing Nicor Gas  
Tina Grebner, Ameren Illinois  
Zach Ross, Opinion Dynamics

## **Meeting Notes**

### **Opening & Introductions**

*Celia Johnson, SAG Facilitator*

**Purpose:** To discuss feedback on stakeholder proposed reporting metrics for Income Qualified (IQ) Multi-Family and IQ Health and Safety reporting.

**Material:** [SAG Facilitator Introduction to December 19 Meeting](#)

- This is the third in a series of meetings to discuss and reach agreement on reporting metrics. To address four new reporting principles policies that were added to Policy Manual Version 3.0.
- Policy Manual Version 3.0 was recently approved by the ICC.
- Reporting metrics need to be finalized by end of January 2024 to meet policy effective dates.
- At the November 28<sup>th</sup> meeting, stakeholders proposed metrics for all four new reporting policies. Since then, written feedback was received from utilities as a group and from representatives of the Income Qualified North EE Committee. A small group of stakeholders prepared responses to feedback, we will walk through responses during the meeting.
- The goal is to identify where there is consensus, and any follow-up items.

### **IQ Multi-Family Reporting Metrics**

*Chris Neme, Energy Futures Group, representing NRDC*

**Material:** [IQ Multifamily Metrics – Stakeholder Responses to Feedback \(12/18/23\)](#)

- SAG Facilitator Intro: For the metrics document shown on the screen: Proposed metrics are shown in red. Content in blue is feedback from utilities, additional comments from IQ North Committee in comment bubbles.
- Chris Vaughn Intro: The utilities met a couple of times with the goal of highlighting capabilities, seek additional understanding from stakeholders, or countering with proposals that are more achievable and effective. Some feedback will touch on multiple metrics, even some not discussed today, particularly on areas where geo-mapping is being requested.

Stakeholder Proposed Metric:

- In response to first comment from utilities about public datasets that can be utilized for reference, stakeholders believe there is one from Community Investment Corporation that can be used.
- With respect to subsidized and unsubsidized, we want participation broken into these categories because we want to understand if certain sectors are being missed or underserved.

*Katherine Elmore, CIC – via chat: National Housing Preservation Database (NHPD) is the best, user-friendly resource that has this information compiled – <https://nhpd.preservationdatabase.org/Data>”*

*Phil Mosenthal: Stakeholders were surprised to see the utility concerns about the metrics, provided that this is part of the principles that have already been agreed to.*

*Ted Weaver: In reviewing the Policy Manual, I do not think that we have agreed yet to the unsubsidized vs subsidized categories and data points. Open to exploring.*

*Matt Armstrong: Once we gather data, won't we need to know size of the market for subsidized and unsubsidized units available to make sense of it? i.e. the size of these populations in utilities service territory?*

*Chris Neme: We might get the numerator via this reporting, but understand we won't get the denominator. We know what the denominator could be for the subsidized housing market from available data. We may not have perfect information, but it is better than nothing.*

*Kathie Elmore: Agreed, this would be more information than we currently have. The goal is not to figure out if they are being treated evenly to proportion of stock, but it would give stakeholders valuable information to allow asking informed questions.*

*Matt Armstrong: Is there another way that we can get to this maybe via potential study or evaluation research?*

*Chris Neme: Potential study will only ask for size of market, but not what participation is. I don't think this makes sense to do through evaluation.*

*Katie Elmore: What is the barrier to the utilities to collecting this information?*

*Matt Armstrong: There could be properties with mixed use, and the difficulties that brings in synthesizing data.*

*Katie Elmore: I'm not sure what you mean by saying that there would be a mixed of subsidized or unsubsidized it would be the whole property.*

*Matt Armstrong: My team is telling me that there are instances where there are mixed properties.*

*Karen Lusson: Aren't implementers already gathering this data when walking into buildings whether it is Section 8 or Public Housing Authority (PHA)? Presumably this data exists and can be put together. We could consider an annual basis instead of quarterly.*

*Phil Mosenthal: A clarification for all of the metrics – anytime stakeholders ask for “annual reporting”, we mean the Q4 report.*

*Karen Lusson: As we think about timelines, it is important to remember that we are interested in seeing what the successes and deficiencies of the programs are, and annual reporting does not seem often enough to provide visibility.*

*Chris Vaughn: Understood, but there are also data lags.*

*Matt Armstrong: I see a challenge with pushing out more data that isn't paid much attention to. We do not receive many questions on the data from quarterly SAG meetings or other avenues, so if we are sending data out, we want to make sure it is actionable.*

*Katie Elmore: We certainly have started doing this and try to respond to reports in writing with questions.*

**Stakeholder Proposed Metric:**

- The next metric is about splitting projects by size based on unit ranges. Stakeholders came up with proposed ranges to align with census data available through the American Community Survey (ACS). The Idea is to use ACS to understand county by county what is happening. It would be helpful for stakeholders to understand if programs are getting more into smaller or larger buildings. We would be open to hearing other suggestions on project size breakdown.

*Chris Vaughn: No additional suggestion from utilities. Multifamily properties are considered 3 and above.*

*Karen Lusson: Suggested edits to breakdown, edits made on screen.*

*Matt Armstrong - via chat IQ: Joint Utility Channel Overview: The Joint Utility Channel will coordinate with Nicor Gas to deliver the energy efficiency retrofit offering in the Single-Family Channel when customers are both Ameren Illinois Electric and Nicor Gas customers, utilizing the successful Community Based Organization customer outreach delivery model.*

**Stakeholder Proposed Metric:**

- Next item is about describing programs better in quarterly reports.

*Matt Armstrong - via chat Program-Level Narratives on Program Successes and Challenges. Each Program-level narrative shall include: a. Brief (2-3 sentences) description of the Program and key Measures (including delivery approach and any past Program names associated with the current Plan).*

*Chris Neme: We just want a description of how this program is delivered, whether there is one or more vendors.*

*Katie Elmore: We are specifically looking for the questions in the document to understand customer experience.*

*Chris Vaughn: Understood. It may not be necessary to capture this type of reporting as a metric since it is something that will not change quarterly.*

*Celia Johnson: Marked as consensus; may need to be edited to clarify.*

Stakeholder Proposed Metric:

- Stakeholders are interested in having an evaluation done in 2024. Sounds like utilities are on the same page. Stakeholders disagree that this should only be for joint-delivery between multiple utilities. We feel the one-stop shop concept is regardless of whether the utilities overlap and coordinate.
- Stakeholders provided a spreadsheet to utilities on the data points needed by measure. First part of response was to agree to evaluation, but that data reporting does not need to be captured quarterly.

*Matt Armstrong: Struggling on why the data needs to be sliced by projects, buildings, and apartments. Can we just look at it in building and apartment basis?*

*Katie Elmore: I think this is fine. We are interested in buildings and units, not projects.*

*Matt Armstrong: For central heating vs heating units, I will need to confirm how we track this data. And as far as reporting why owners are not following-through with the work, we will need to modify our database to track this and this will be difficult to do early in 2023. It feels this is going to be a lot of work, and it might be more efficient to do this post-project during an evaluation and ask why they did not follow-through with a project.*

*Chris Neme: I think some of those questions are not just why the owner decided, but also why the utility decided not to – a project may not have been cost-effective, or there wasn't enough opportunity, or structural problems, etc. There might be a category "the building owner" did not want it and there might be subcategories there. We want to understand why a utility would recommend not moving forward with a project. I think evaluators can ask some questions of building owners, but they won't know the reason for utilities doing it. We want to understand how often it doesn't happen because building owner said no, vs when utility said no.*

*Phil Mosenthal: It is hard to interpret data for example when things are not happening because we don't have context.*

*Zach Ross: Can you clarify if the spreadsheet is exactly what you want or not?*

*Chris Neme: This is our proposed categorization, if there is something else we would like to see it.*

*Phil Mosenthal: We care about level of comprehensiveness of projects and have concerns that the work is not being done as comprehensively as possible, so that is why we are asking for data quarterly and for transparency. For example, we recently saw information from Ameren that indicated that 4% of buildings are getting any shell measures, this seemed low and we wanted to understand why.*

- Next step: Utilities to check with evaluators on whether they can provide what is in spreadsheet.

Stakeholder Proposed Metric:

- Next request is for reporting on leveraging sources and utilities wanted to define "leveraging".

- We are interested in where utilities are combining funding, or jointly-delivering something with outside entity or using their funding to supplement. For example, IRA or city of Chicago funds. Changed language to “combine” to clarify that’s what we meant.

*Matt Armstrong: I don’t think that changing the word “leverage” to “combined” is helpful.*

*Chris Vaughn: The problem is that leveraging could also be on the tenant side (co-pays).*

*Phil Mosenthal: We are interested only on whether a utility is leveraging additional funds from public agencies, not the customer.*

*Karen Lusson – via chat: Are there that many funding sources that are currently being used that the utility sees as an overwhelming number?*

*Phil Mosenthal: I view this as the joint program delivery, I don’t think this will change very often, it can just be a few sentences in the report.*

*Karen Lusson: We know City of Chicago and IRA funds are coming. Another example is Blue Cross and Blue Shield is providing grants to utilities for H&S measures. Stakeholders want utilities to disclose when they get this funding, because it has impacts on budgets and attribution.*

*Matt Armstrong: This is going to be disclosed to the SAG and discussed for large grants. The concern is that there might be small pieces of funding that comes from various sources and if they are overlooked, utilities might be dinged for it.*

*Karen Lusson: This is not about tripping up utilities, this is so stakeholders can share ideas of other available funds.*

*Phil Mosenthal: We already agreed that there would be reporting about leveraging of other funding sources. Maybe it makes sense for utilities to submit a counter proposal.*

*Matt Armstrong: Our understanding and agreement is to report on large funding sources that make a significant difference, but for small contributions we don’t think it is needed.*

- Next Step: Utilities will consider a compromise proposal on leveraging reporting.

#### Stakeholder Proposed Metric:

- Geographic participation reporting, including heat map. The original principle included zip code and census tract, but we heard that census tract was difficult to do. Stakeholders know utilities have zip codes and we are OK with this. But if all we do is a map showing participation by zip code, we have no way of correlating to where the need might be. So PIPP/LIHEAP can serve as proxy for where the needs are.

*Cassidy Kraimer: If it would be possible to receive info by zip code in spreadsheet, that would enable stakeholders to use data better than in a PDF. It allows to do their own mapping. We would request to receive spreadsheet quarterly, but mapping with overlay on an annual basis.*

- Next Step: Stakeholders will discuss annual vs. quarterly. Utilities will edit the metric language for clarification.

Stakeholder Proposed Metric:

- Proposal is for evaluators to analyze IQ MF participation at census tract level. Utilities would prefer the option for another third-party to do this (outside of evaluator). Stakeholders are fine with this.
- If stakeholders are *getting the maps and the data, then the analysis may not be needed.*
- Next steps: Potential consensus on removing; pending agreement on edited metric language.

SAG Facilitator Next Steps for IQ Multifamily Reporting Metrics:

- Utilities and stakeholders will work on follow-up items for discussion in January.

**IQ Health and Safety Reporting Metrics**

*Phil Mosenthal, Optimal Energy, representing IL Attorney General and National Consumer Law Center*

**Material:** [IQ Health and Safety Metrics – Stakeholder Responses to Feedback \(12/18/23\)](#)

Stakeholder Proposed Metric:

- Stakeholders proposed quarterly reporting. Utilities feedback is that reporting should be annual, not quarterly.

*Phil Mosenthal: One of the things stakeholders discussed is that the law requires setting aside 15% of program budget for Health and Safety measures [for Ameren and ComEd]. At some point we recall utilities suspected they may not need to spend the entire budget, and in that case that money could be reallocated to weatherize more homes. Stakeholders have heard if this happens at end of year it is not possible to reallocate it because contractors react more slowly. If we see this information quarterly, then we can act upon it in the calendar year. The other parts of the health and safety reporting we can agree to annually.*

*Matt Armstrong: In the last report-out to SAG Ameren shared we are going to max out our H&S budget in 2023. We will continue to see this moving forward as there is a great need for H&S remediations. For that reason, quarterly reporting on budget spend is not needed.*

*Chris Vaughn: Agree that annual reporting is most appropriate.*

- Next Steps: Stakeholders are interested in whether ComEd is in the same position, that they will spend all of their health & safety budget in 2023. Stakeholders will discuss whether comfortable with quarterly vs. annual reporting on budget.

Stakeholder Proposed Metric:

- Total number of participants by program type; number of projects observed, remediated, and not remediated; and the reason why remediation was not possible

*Matt Armstrong: We can provide some categorization, but not all details around why a customer decides not to move forward with a health and safety upgrade.*

*Phil Mosenthal: Agreed, stakeholders envision a few categories of “why” – too expensive, customer didn’t want it, etc.*

PG/NSG Feedback:

- Peoples/North Shore systems and processes are structured to collect information on opportunities as well as what was completed. Data centered around why customers don’t complete projects/measures would require a large lift to incorporate into the current process and would require additional time to determine what is needed to make that happen.
- Stakeholders are ok with PG/NSG not reporting on “why” a building could not be remediated, if already included in ComEd’s reporting for joint IQ programs.

*Karen Lusson: What is the large lift for PG&NSG?*

*Jean Gibson: Field training, modifying application, modifying data entry system.*

- Next steps: PG/NSG to follow-up to confirm information would be captured in ComEd reporting.

SAG Facilitator Next Steps for IQ Health and Safety Reporting Metrics:

- Due to time constraints, the few remaining discussion points/feedback on health and safety will be discussed in the January 16 Reporting Working Group meeting.
- Utilities and stakeholders will work on follow-up items for discussion in January.

**Closing and Next Steps**

*Celia Johnson, SAG Facilitator*

Follow-up Documents:

- [IQ Multifamily Draft Metrics – Notes and Follow-up from 12/19 Meeting](#)
- [IQ Health and Safety Draft Metrics – Notes and Follow-up from 12/19 Meeting](#)
- [Summary of Stakeholder and Utility Follow-up Items from 12/19 Meeting](#)

Next Steps:

- SAG Facilitator is reviewing when to agenda follow-up from the 12/19 meeting
- The deadline for written comments on the following stakeholder proposed metrics is Monday, January 8
  - [Equity and Affordability Proposed Reporting Metrics \(updated 11/28\)](#)
  - [Diverse Contracting Proposed Reporting Metrics](#)
- Feedback received on Equity/Affordability and Diverse Contracting metrics will be discussed at the Tuesday, January 16 Reporting Working Group meeting
- If needed, a final Reporting Working Group meeting is scheduled on Tuesday, January 23