

Wednesday, February 18, 2026 | 1:00 PM– 3:00 PM

Contractor Technical Advisory Committee (CTAC) Meeting Minutes

[Meeting Recording](#)

Discussion

1. Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) Introduction

DEEP reviewed the meeting objectives and agenda which focused on Residential and Commercial & Industrial (C&I) topics.

2. Public Comment 00:07:29

Edgardo Mejias, Efficiency for All, raised concerns regarding the absence of an agenda item related to pricing and access to anonymized request for information (RFI) data. Mr. Mejias stated that this topic had been raised at a prior Energy Efficiency Board (EEB) meeting and that he had expected it to appear on the current CTAC agenda.

- DEEP acknowledged the issue, noted that the matter was an existing follow-up item associated with the EEB, and agreed to add it to the CTAC tracker to ensure formal follow-up before the next meeting.

Lorenzo Wyatt, Home Comfort Practice, Inc., expressed concern about program pricing, administrative requirements, and system functionality. Mr. Wyatt shared that the current pricing structure did not reflect contractor costs or align with bids submitted through the request for proposal (RFP) process, stating that experienced contractors believed the pricing to be inaccurate and that the structure failed to account for additional administrative work introduced through program redesign requirements.

Mr. Wyatt further expressed concern about prolonged United Illuminating (UI) system outages, which were preventing contractors from completing work and receiving payment. He also questioned the status of expected federal Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) funding, noting that contractors had been told that several redesign components—such as the plan view diagram requirement and the two-visit model—were necessary to qualify for federal funding. Mr. Wyatt stated that if the IRA funds were delayed or uncertain, the program should reconsider requirements that added significant operational cost and complexity.

- DEEP staff responded that updates on system issues and IRA funding were included later in the agenda. DEEP clarified that while IRA funding had informed some program decisions, the redesign was not solely dependent on federal funding and would remain in place even if federal timelines shifted.

- Jordan Schellens, Eversource, and Amy McLean, Avangrid, shared status of these pricing issues and contact with the contractors to resolve these concerns. The utilities explained that contractor submitted RFI data had been used to establish prices, consistent with past practice, and noted that procurement policies prevented sharing the underlying dataset. However, the utilities stated that they could formally share the procurement rationale in writing.
- DEEP agreed that the topic required a formal response and reiterated the importance of direct contractor utility engagement to address immediate pricing concerns. DEEP encouraged contractors to continue working directly with utilities to resolve measure-level pricing concerns and stated that CTAC would revisit the matter if issues remain unresolved by the next meeting. DEEP also acknowledged the need for a formal explanation of the pricing determination process and committed to coordinating with the EEB's technical consultants to identify an appropriate venue for that discussion.

3. **DEEP Updates 00:20:37**

DEEP provided updates on federal funding, a contractor ombudsperson, an evaluation process consultant scope, and gas foodservice equipment. DEEP reviewed the CTAC question & answer tracker for outstanding and resolved questions.

a. Federal Funding

Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) Rebates

- U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) leadership has been made aware that CT is ready to launch the Home Electrification and Appliance Rebates (HEAR). DEEP is currently waiting for DOE authorization to launch.
- DEEP has executed Home Efficiency Rebate (HER) contracts with both of the companies and will work to submit the HER blueprints as soon as possible, with an estimated HER launch several months after HEAR launches.

New England Heat Pump Accelerator

- The quick launch portion of the midstream program has gone live and distributors are being enrolled. Currently, air source heat pumps and heat pump water heaters are eligible for midstream incentives. Other heat pump technologies, such as geothermal systems, are expected to be added later this year. DEEP encouraged interested stakeholders to sign up for regular updates on the website.
- In November 2025, DEEP issued an RFI to solicit feedback for an Accelerator-funded, state heat pump pilot program to be launched in 2026. DEEP is reviewing stakeholder feedback to develop the pilot concept and will likely issue an RFP for an implementer in the coming months.

Energy Efficiency Request for Proposals (RFP)

- DEEP issued an RFP for energy efficiency and demand response offerings that are additive and complementary to existing C&LM offerings on Oct 1st.

- Electric or natural gas efficiency or demand response measures in residential, commercial, or industrial settings were eligible. Bids were due November 21, 2025, and a review team is actively reviewing proposals.

Comment 00:23:55

Edgardo Mejias asked whether program budgets would be adjusted if the anticipated federal IRA funding did not materialize. Mr. Mejias also asked what specific trigger or decision point DEEP and the utilities were monitoring to determine whether such budget adjustments would be necessary.

- The utilities explained that vendor contracts are not permitted to include IRA funds because IRA program rules require expenditures to occur before reimbursement. The utilities stated that their March 1st budget filings include versions both with and without IRA funding, allowing stakeholders to compare potential impacts.
- DEEP added that once the March 1st filing is available, DEEP will distribute the relevant budget information to the CTAC email list so contractors may clearly understand projected residential program funding with and without IRA support.

b. Contractor Ombudsperson 00:26:14

On November 10, 2025, DEEP issued a letter to the EEB’s consultant committee containing a proposed scope for the contractor ombudsperson position.

- Contractor feedback that was received during the October 2025 CTAC meeting and subsequent written comments was incorporated into DEEP’s proposed position scope.
- The Consultant Committee recently issued the draft RFP to the EEB for review.
- DEEP committed to posting the Draft RFP on their energy filings webpage and sending an email out to the CTAC group following the meeting. DEEP stated they will be accepting written comments through March 4, 2026.
- DEEP noted that there have been changes made to minimum qualifications, while the scope of responsibilities remains very similar to what the contractors reviewed late last year.

c. CTAC Q&A Tracker

DEEP reviewed the CTAC Tracker, which included new items resulting from questions raised during the last CTAC meeting as well as the December 2nd, 2025, Conservation & Load Management (C&LM) Technical meeting. DEEP explained that the tracker is posted publicly and will continue to capture unresolved issues until formal responses are completed.

- The first item addressed involved concerns about response timelines for inquiries sent to the general DEEP energy inbox. DEEP reported that the item had been closed, noting that questions unresolved during CTAC meetings are transferred to the tracker and that DEEP makes every effort to respond to emailed inquiries in a timely manner.
- A second item concerned whether C&LM funds could be used to incentivize solar installations. DEEP clarified that solar programs fall under the jurisdiction of PURA, are funded separately from C&LM programs, and are not capped; therefore, DEEP concluded that allocating C&LM funding to solar would not be appropriate or necessary. DEEP also cited statutory requirements directing C&LM funds toward cost-effective energy efficiency rather than supply resources.

- The third item involved questions about utility staff qualifications for reviewing scopes of work and conducting QA/QC activities. DEEP stated that this item remained open, with utilities having recently submitted a data response that DEEP was still reviewing. DEEP anticipated updating the tracker once the review was complete.
- A fourth item concerned coordination among DEEP, Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (PURA), the EEB, and related program areas. DEEP explained that coordination occurs through established processes and noted that PURA could be invited to a future CTAC meeting to discuss its proceedings if needed.

Comment: Edgardo Mejias commented that the tracker should be reviewed at every CTAC meeting, stating that some responses lacked sufficient detail and that CTAC should ensure items are fully resolved rather than relying on individual contractors to determine whether their concerns were addressed.

- DEEP agreed and committed to placing tracker review on all future CTAC agendas. DEEP will make every effort to address open tracker items ahead of each CTAC meeting and will provide regular updates.

d. Evaluation Process Consultant Scope 00:36:09

September 9, 2025, DEEP issued a Final Determination on the 2025-2027 Conservation and Load Management (C&LM) Plan

- In the determination, DEEP directed that the Energy Efficiency Board (EEB), through its Consultant Committee, issue a proposal to secure the services of an independent Evaluation Process Consultant to review the current Evaluation, Measurement, and Verification (EM&V) approach currently being employed by the C&LM Evaluation Administrator.
- On January 21, 2026, DEEP issued a Notice of Request for Written Comments on a Draft Scope of Work scope to be included in an RFP. Comments were due on February 6th. DEEP expressed their appreciation for feedback from program stakeholders on the proposed scope, which is currently under review.
 - DEEP clarified that this evaluation process consultant will not be tasked with reviewing specific programs. The purpose of this consultant is to review the process itself as it relates to evaluations conducted on any programs.
- DEEP stated they will provide regular updates to CTAC, and there may be additional opportunities for contractor input.

d. Gas Foodservice Equipment 00:38:09

On September 24, 2025, the Companies sent a letter to DEEP requesting approval to reinstate incentives for commercial gas foodservice equipment in Connecticut.

- The utilities noted that previous efforts to eliminate natural gas incentives and increase adoption of electric equipment in this space had not been successful, consequently resulting in a regression toward outdated, inefficient gas equipment.
- The utilities clarified in their proposal that they were requesting approval to apply this change at the midstream level, which would apply to all qualifying commercial customers

eligible for gas food service equipment, as opposed to a “project by project” review and waiver process as required by DEEP’s 2025-2027 Final Determination.

- DEEP issued a data request on November 20, 2025, requiring that the Companies provide analysis, demonstrating that their proposal met the gas incentive exception criteria set forth in DEEP’s Final Determination.
 - The determination directed the utilities make exceptions to allow incentives for gas combusting equipment, on a case-by-case basis, in the Commercial & Industrial (C&I) sector should it be determined that:
 - electrification is not deemed to be a technically feasible option,
 - the customer’s overall utility costs will increase as a result of electrifying,
 - or, in instances when electrification is determined not cost effective for the program.
- The Companies demonstrated that the exception criteria had been met for 3 types of food service equipment: convection ovens, large vat fryers, and steamers.

Comment: Mariott Dowden, Avangrid, asked why the food service equipment exceptions were limited to the three items?

- Ben McMillian, DEEP, clarified that DEEP approved of the measures the utilities provided analysis for in their data request, which were the three measures. Should the companies wish to offer midstream incentives for other C&I gas measures, a similar request with supporting data may be sent to DEEP for review.

4. C&I Contractors 00:42:33

a. Commercial Contractor Consortium (CCC)

Dan Robertson, representing CCC on behalf of Artist Energy Solutions, delivered the consortium’s update. Mr. Robertson explained that contractors were generally pleased with the level of engagement from both utility companies, describing recent collaboration as the most positive in several years.

He reported strong contractor satisfaction with initiatives such as coordinated work on Main Streets, the use of comprehensive multipliers for small business projects, and extended financing options of up to 84 months for larger commercial projects.

These elements were described as helping more complex projects move forward, particularly those involving insulation, refrigeration, lighting, and rooftop heat pump units.

Mr. Robertson noted challenges for contractors who must carry project costs for extended periods, particularly for HVAC-related work, given that milestone payments are not commonly available. He emphasized that contractors often rely on credit lines with high interest rates and suggested that allowing milestone payments could alleviate this burden.

Mr. Robertson explained that as projects become more comprehensive and contractors rely on multiple vendors and engineering partners, speed and efficiency in the review process become increasingly important. Delays in engineering reviews or project approvals can reduce the likelihood of project completion, and he encouraged continued efforts by both utilities and contractors to improve turnaround times as the program evolves beyond traditional lighting-only measures.

Comment: Becca Trietch, DEEP, asked CCC to elaborate on the issue of turnaround time for commercial projects.

- Mr. Robertson explained that delays primarily occur in more complex projects, such as those involving refrigeration systems or rooftop heat pump units, because these projects require extensive engineering review and detailed design work. As contractors pursue increasingly comprehensive projects, engineering requirements grow more substantial, often extending timelines.
- Mr. Robertson added that although utilities have created helpful calculators and tools, the volume of project-specific engineering still contributes to slower processing. He clarified that the delays are inherent to the complexity of the work and are not attributable to a single party; rather, both contractors and utilities face increased demands when moving away from simpler lighting-only projects.

Dan Robertson continued outlining the evolving needs of commercial contractors as lighting measures decline and more comprehensive projects become the focus. Mr. Robertson described how states such as Massachusetts are increasingly relying on lifetime savings and measure useful life to support incentives for non-lighting projects, including insulation, refrigeration, and transformers.

Mr. Robertson explained that in Connecticut’s Small Business Energy Advantage (SBEA) program, more customers are required to contribute buy-downs when project paybacks exceed the 15-year financing limit, which can deter participation. He suggested that allowing financing beyond 15 years—aligned with actual equipment life—could help maintain project viability. He also noted that while third-party financing options exist, such financing requires additional applications and separate billing, creating barriers some customers prefer to avoid.

Comment: Becca Trietch, DEEP, sought clarification on whether alternative financing terms exist beyond the program’s zero-percent structure.

- Mr. Robertson confirmed that third-party financing through the National Energy Improvement Fund is available but reiterated that on-bill financing remains more straightforward for customers.
- He concluded by encouraging exploration of additional measures, such as vacuum-insulated glass technologies, noting early indications of strong thermal performance and the potential for future savings once pilot projects in Connecticut and Massachusetts yield measurable results.

DEEP Facilitated Questions and Discussion 00:51:00

Ricky Jordan, Eversource, acknowledged the challenges described by contractors and explained that as lighting measures continue to decline, a greater share of projects involves complex end uses such as HVAC and process-related measures. Mr. Jordan stated that these types of projects require more detailed engineering reviews, which increases review time but is necessary to maintain quality.

He emphasized that the utilities prioritize ongoing process improvements and are actively seeking ways to reduce review timelines without compromising technical rigor. Mr. Jordan also noted that strong incentive structures are already in place for commercial and industrial projects, with additional program modifications scheduled to be presented at an upcoming rollout event.

- Dan Robertson expressed interest in continued collaboration, particularly regarding emerging measures such as advanced window technologies. Mr. Robertson stated that contractors are gathering early performance data from pilot sites and that the consortium plans to share results with both utilities once available, to support potential future updates to program measure offerings.

5. Utility Updates 00:54:42

a. **Home Energy Solutions (HES) and Home Energy Solutions- Income Eligible (HES-IE) redesign status updates**

Jordan Schellens, Eversource, provided an update on vendor training, contractor support, and IT-related changes connected to the residential program redesign. Ms. Schellens explained that Eversource had conducted extensive vendor training throughout November and December, including six recorded sessions addressing the two-visit model, plan view diagrams, quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) procedures, and system updates affecting both TrackSys and eTrack. Ms. Schellens stated that Eversource was holding weekly vendor meetings to review contractor questions submitted through an online form, and that Eversource maintained ongoing one-on-one check-ins with contractors depending on contractor needs.

Ms. Schellens also described IT updates underway within the TrackSys system, noting that the utilities were completing incremental changes to data fields needed for new air sealing and duct sealing algorithms, updating the Hancock mobile tool to reflect redesigned measure requirements, and working on improvements to the DOE Home Energy Score integration. She stated that contractors would receive notifications prior to system changes and that all updates were being managed to avoid disrupting ongoing project submission and review.

In addition, Eversource reported that documentation updates—including revised brochures, incentive summaries, and public-facing materials—were nearly complete, and that Eversource’s website had already been updated to reflect the redesigned program structure.

Becca Trietch, DEEP, asked whether all necessary marketing and public-facing materials were in place.

- Eversource and Avangrid confirmed that nearly all materials had been updated, the website and documentation had also been updated.

Avangrid system update 00:58:25

Amy McLean and Ralph Valente, Avangrid, announced that on February 19th and 20th, contractors will be able to log in to the updated system with a partial release enabling contractors to enter completed work and begin moving projects forward. Amy McLean provided an operational update regarding the launch of Avangrid’s redesigned system. Ms. McLean noted that the transition had taken longer than anticipated due to fundamental differences between Avangrid’s IT system, eTrack, and Eversource’s IT system, TrackSys.

Avangrid stated they would provide guidance to contractors on which components of the system were fully functional, which components were still in progress, and what temporary workarounds would be needed. Ms. McLean emphasized that the utility was in the final stages of development,

that support would be available through staff and third-party partners, and that Avangrid remained focused on processing both new submissions and the backlog created during the transition.

Ralph Valente added technical details, explaining that all measures would be available in eTrack and that data from the Hancock tool would flow into the system. Mr. Valente stated that new data fields created for the redesign would appear in eTrack, and that Avangrid would distribute written guidance outlining each new field and instructions for addressing incomplete entries to ensure correct incentive and savings calculations. Mr. Valente also explained that Avangrid's desk review team would assist with clearing the backlog of projects that contractors were unable to submit while the system was offline.

Becca Trietch, DEEP, asked the utility to clarify how long it would take to work through the backlog and whether review resources were being expanded temporarily. Dr. Trietch also requested confirmation that Avangrid would issue written guidance summarizing all changes within eTrack.

- Ms. McLean and Mr. Valente responded that Avangrid did not expect the backlog to take a full month to resolve and explained that additional reviewer support was now available through the desk review team. Mr. Valente affirmed that written communication and a detailed guide would be sent to all contractors, including instructions for imports and explanations of required fields.

Comment: Edgardo Mejias raised concerns about the level of burden placed on vendors during the transition to the redesigned residential programs. Mr. Mejias explained that vendors were being placed in a position where they might need to verify whether submitted projects, invoice amounts, and measure-level payments were being processed correctly during the transition to the updated TrackSys and eTrack systems.

Mr. Mejias cited examples such as potential discrepancies in administrative cost allocations, missing measures that might not carry over correctly, and the risk that vendors would need to conduct extensive reviews of past submissions to identify errors that originated from the system rather than contractor actions. Mr. Mejias stated that vendors were already absorbing significant administrative and financial strain due to system delays and program changes and requested that utilities implement systematic internal checks to identify issues proactively rather than relying on vendors to detect errors one project at a time.

- Amy McLean, Avangrid, explained that desk reviewers would be conducting detailed reviews of project data, but also noted that reviewers could only identify errors visible within the submitted documentation; if certain measures or fields failed to populate automatically, utilities would not know that information was missing unless contractors raised the issue.
- Amy stated that Avangrid did not anticipate additional work for contractors beyond the normal submission process but emphasized that unexpected issues can arise during any IT rollout.
- Jordan Schellens, Eversource, added that user acceptance testing (UAT) had already been conducted to identify and resolve issues before system launch, and that utilities would initiate corrective actions as soon as contractors, energy efficiency consultants, or desk reviewers reported system-related problems.

Mr. Mejias then clarified that his concern extended beyond correction of newly surfaced issues; he emphasized that when a system error is discovered, utilities should conduct a comprehensive review to determine how far back the issue extends and how many vendors may have been affected. Mr. Mejias stated that vendors should not be expected to individually audit multiple weeks of work to determine whether payments were accurate, especially following extended periods when projects could not be submitted.

- Jordan Schellens agreed that such look-back reviews were standard practice. Avangrid stated they would conduct retroactive assessments and issue mass recalculations wherever necessary.

Comment: Jane Bourdeau, F.F. Hitchcock, raised concerns regarding payment delays and the operational strain placed on contractors as a result of the recent system outage. Ms. Bourdeau stated that contractors continued providing services from January 2nd onward despite being unable to submit projects for payment, and emphasized that standard 30- to 60-day payment timelines were not acceptable under these circumstances.

Ms. Bourdeau requested that Avangrid prioritize payments for this backlog and work toward a shorter, more reliable payment cycle. Ms. Bourdeau also asked that utilities apply reasonable flexibility when reviewing documentation for work completed during the outage period, noting that contractors should not be required to return to customer homes for minor issues such as a missing attic-hatch photograph, particularly when several weeks had passed since the work was completed.

- Amy McLean, Avangrid, acknowledged the burden caused by the system downtime and stated that Avangrid would explore measures to expedite payments where possible. Sharon Guarino, Avangrid, added that all contractor purchase orders were established on net-15 terms, meaning payments should be issued within 15 days of invoice approval, provided adequate funds remained in each purchase order.
- Ms. Bourdeau expressed appreciation for this clarification but noted that payment turnaround had not historically aligned with the stated net-15 terms and reiterated the importance of timely payment for contractor stability.
- Ralph Valente addressed the documentation concerns, explaining that Avangrid would prioritize review of essential installation photos—such as air-sealing and duct-sealing documentation—and would not require contractors to revisit homes for immaterial omissions on projects completed during the outage. Mr. Valente stated that Avangrid would apply reasonable flexibility during the backlog review period.

Becca Trietch, DEEP, asked whether Avangrid expected to maintain standard payment cycles once the system was fully operational again.

- Amy confirmed that Avangrid planned to adhere to standard processes while also exploring opportunities to accelerate payments whenever feasible.

Comment: Edgardo Mejias raised a broader concern regarding the current QA/QC and desk-review processes. Mr. Mejias stated that the level of scrutiny being applied was creating significant operational and financial strain for contractors, resulting in rework, increased liability, and inconsistent application of newly implemented rules.

Mr. Mejias emphasized that contractors had repeatedly raised questions regarding inspection standards, inspection frequency, and quality-control expectations, and that unresolved issues continued to impact project delivery and customer experience.

- The utilities responded that QA/QC was not included on the current meeting agenda and that a full discussion would require participation from the program’s evaluation team, whose prior assessments had shaped the current QA/QC framework.
- DEEP acknowledged the repeated contractor concerns and stated that QA/QC would be scheduled as a dedicated topic at a future meeting to ensure a complete and informed discussion with the appropriate staff present.

To conclude the utilities’ update, Jordan Schellens noted that weekly vendor meetings and regular contractor check-ins were being used to capture questions, address redesign issues, and provide continuous guidance during rollout. Amy McLean added that Avangrid was employing similar feedback channels as TrackSys and eTrack resumed operation, explaining that both staff and the desk-review team were monitoring contractor needs, escalating issues as required, and communicating system updates promptly to support contractors throughout the transition.

6. DEEP Facilitated Discussion- customer demand in gas programs 01:26:27

DEEP opened up conversation with the contractors to share perspective on the decline in residential program demand in 2025, as reflected in the Q4 results at the February EEB meeting. Contractors identified several factors contributing to reduced participation.

Jane Bourdeau reported that heat pump sales had declined sharply due to substantial equipment price increases, with costs rising multiple times throughout the year. Ms. Bourdeau noted that many customers were hesitant to proceed because projected savings felt uncertain and upfront costs had grown significantly.

Mr. Edgardo Mejias added that the nationwide refrigerant transition had increased material costs by approximately 20% and created supply delays, which suppressed project volume. Mr. Mejias also explained that heightened technical requirements—such as precise load calculations and “heat pump-ready” standards—resulted in fewer customers qualifying or being able to proceed, even though those requirements were intended to improve installation quality. Further, Mr. Mejias noted that prior budget interruptions in earlier years forced many contractors to downsize, and rebuilding staff capacity had been challenging.

Contractors indicated that customers were expressing frustration with multi-visit requirements, scheduling difficulties, and uncertainty surrounding IRA incentives, all of which contributed to decreased demand across the 2025 residential programs.

7. Public Comment 01:37:00

Michelle Long, Energy Management Authority, expressed significant concerns regarding program pricing, communication practices, and the impact of recent system delays. Ms. Long stated that technician and administrative compensation remain inadequate under current pricing, and that Avangrid’s six-week billing interruption created serious financial strain for contractors.

Ms. Long also explained that contractors were not notified when a revised Home Energy Solutions (HES)/ Home Energy Solutions- Income Eligible (HES-IE) Field Implementation Manual was issued in

December 2025, resulting in projects being rejected based on new rules that contractors had no opportunity to review. Ms. Long stated that this pattern of unannounced program changes, heightened QA/QC scrutiny, and shifting requirements has caused repeated rework, customer disruption, and operational hardship.

Ms. Long urged DEEP and the utilities to improve communication, strengthen the notification process for program updates, and address the cumulative impacts of manual changes, QA/QC practices, and system-related delays on contractor operations.

- Becca Trietch, DEEP, acknowledged the issues and stated that QA/QC would be added as a topic for a future CTAC meeting. DEEP committed to exploring whether the discussion could occur sooner at an Energy Efficiency Board (EEB) committee meeting.
- Amy McLean, Avangrid, responded by requesting that contractors provide written documentation of specific issues to support accurate escalation and resolution, stating that written submissions allow utilities and DEEP to act on clearly defined items.
- Edgardo Mejias requested that DEEP and the utilities implement a formal, structured process to review and resolve recurring operational problems rather than addressing issues piecemeal.

Michelle Long explained that contractors need a discussion focused on QA/QC implementation rather than general process design. Ms. Long emphasized that widespread contractor noncompliance scores indicate systemic issues rather than uniform contractor error, stating that the current inspection and scoring system creates operational barriers that must be resolved to restore program stability.

- DEEP committed to follow-up communications and the identification of an appropriate venue for more detailed review, while utilities and DEEP emphasized the need for detailed written submissions from contractors to support actionable resolution.

Announcements

1. On September 9, 2025, DEEP filed the [Final Determination](#) to the Companies' 2025-2027 Conservation and Load Management (C&LM) Plan. DEEP will draft a separate determination on the Companies' Optimization Plan.
2. The [2026 Update](#) to the 2025-2027 Conservation & Load Management (C&LM) Plan was filed on March 9, 2026.
 - a. DEEP will issue a determination after further stakeholder engagement and data requests.
 - b. On March 12, 2026, an EEB Contractor Ombudsperson [Request for Proposal](#) was posted on the Energize CT website under RFPs. Bids are due by May 7, 2026.
3. The CTAC Question & Answer Tracker is located at the bottom of the [CTAC website](#), which will be updated following each meeting.
4. The next CTAC meeting is residential focused and scheduled for April 15, 2026, at 1:00pm EST.