

Wednesday, April 15, 2026 | 1:00 PM– 3:30 PM

Contractor Technical Advisory Committee (CTAC) Special Session Minutes

[Meeting Recording](#)

Virtual Only

Discussion

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

DEEP reviewed the meeting objectives and agenda, which focused on Residential topics.

2. Public Comment

No public comment was provided.

3. DEEP Updates

a. Federal Funding

Ben McMillan, DEEP, opened the meeting with a series of updates related to federal funding and statewide program activities.

IRA Rebates

DOE leadership has been made aware that CT is ready to launch the Home Electrification and Appliance Rebate (HEAR) program. DEEP is currently waiting for DOE authorization to launch.

- DEEP will work to submit the Home Efficiency Rebates (HER) blueprints as soon as possible, with an estimated HER launch several months after HEAR launches.

New England Heat Pump Accelerator (NEHPA)

- VEIC is under contract with DEEP as the program implementer. DEEP updated that many of the program's midstream heat pump incentives have launched and more will be added in June 2026.
- DEEP shared they are reviewing stakeholder feedback to develop CT's state heat pump pilot concept. Massachusetts will issue a Request for Proposal (RFP) for their state pilot in April.
- The Implementer issued a Request for Information (RFI) for the Community Grant program on April 13. These are grants of \$100-\$500K for Housing & Community Orgs for heat pump

related projects, including outreach. DEEP announced that the related RFP will be issued in Spring 2026.

- DEEP welcomed feedback and directed interested stakeholders to the NEHPA website.
- Lastly, DEEP shared that the program issued an RFP for an Evaluator and is currently reviewing proposals.

Energy Efficiency RFP

- DEEP issued an RFP for energy efficiency and demand response offerings that are additive and complementary to existing C&LM offerings.
- Electric or natural gas efficiency or demand response measures in residential, commercial, or industrial settings were eligible to apply.
- DEEP has conditionally selected entities and next steps include contract negotiations between selected entities and the Utilities.

Clean Energy, Sustainability, and Connectivity Incentives Tool

- DEEP updated that RFP proposals for a vendor were due on July 11, 2025, and contract negotiations are underway

DEEP Operational and Program Updates

Air-Sealing Exception Letter

- DEEP reported that an updated air sealing exception letter has been finalized and filed on the Energy Filings system.
- DEEP reported that from inception of the Home Energy Solutions (HES) and Home Energy Solutions- Income Eligible (HES-IE) program redesign, there has been public acknowledgement that the redesign guidance may require adjustments.
- DEEP therefore granted the Companies' request for HES-IE and HES contractors to perform air sealing services on the first visit when no other measure opportunities are identified and air sealing work will take three hours or less to complete.

Financial and Operational Audit

- On March 30, 2026, DEEP issued a [Request for Comment](#) on a proposed Financial and Operational Audit Scope.
- DEEP directed stakeholders on how to participate in the Written Comment opportunity to the Audit Scope.

Multifamily Affordable Loan Program

- On March 18, 2026, DEEP issued a [Request for Information](#) on a Multifamily Affordable Loan Fund Program
- DEEP directed stakeholders on how to participate in the Written Comment opportunity to the Audit Scope.

March CTAC Special Meeting

- DEEP thanked contractors for their participation in the March 25, 2026, Special CTAC meeting.

- Topics addressed during the meeting included: HES/HES-IE Program Pricing, HES/HES-IE Quality Assurance/ Quality Control (QA/QC), and Program Funding with & without HEAR (federal funding).
- DEEP updated that the CTAC webpage has been updated. The presentations, minutes, and recording are posted if you wish to review the materials.
- Several items raised during that meeting were carried into the April agenda for follow-up.

b. Review written comments and CTAC Tracker

Ben McMillan, DEEP, presented the latest status of the CTAC Question & Answer (Q&A) Tracker. He reviewed newly added items, issues that had been closed with completed utility responses, and items still pending follow-up. Mr. McMillan reiterated that the tracker is updated after each CTAC meeting and posted publicly. DEEP encouraged contractors to continue submitting questions for documentation and follow-up in the tracker.

DEEP then reviewed the communication escalation process, emphasizing that contractors should first work with utility program staff to resolve issues, then elevate issues through formal CTAC channels if a resolution cannot be reached with the Utilities.

Comment: Amy McLean, Avangrid, suggested providing an updated order of escalation table to DEEP and the Contractors.

- A stakeholder comment in the Zoom Q&A requested that this be published on the CTAC webpage.

4. Presentation DEEP and Utilities 00:17:53

a. Pricing

i. Regulatory context (DEEP)

Ben McMillan, DEEP, presented an overview of the agency’s regulatory responsibilities concerning cost-effectiveness and obligations under Connecticut General Statute §16-245m. Mr. McMillan explained that state law requires the Conservation and Load Management (C&LM) Plan to fund all energy-efficiency measures that are cost-effective or lower in cost than the equivalent energy supply. He noted that portfolio-level benefit-cost ratios (BCRs) have declined in recent filings, with the electric program BCR decreasing from 3.2 in 2025 to 2.76 in the 2026 plan update, and the gas program BCR declining from 2.11 to 1.63. Mr. McMillan stated that while multiple external factors influence BCR outcomes, DEEP expects Utilities to carefully manage program costs—including pricing—to preserve overall cost-effectiveness. He further explained that energy-efficiency investments must continue to remain less expensive than procuring equivalent supply resources, and that in the current market conditions, the cost gap between supply and efficiency is narrowing. DEEP indicated that it will work with the Utilities throughout 2026 to review programs and measures to ensure that efficiency remains a cost-effective resource.

Discussion: Program contractor, Edgardo Mejias, expressed ongoing concern regarding contractor pricing and the operational impacts of the redesigned residential program. He stated that

contractors have raised the same issues for nearly two years without meaningful resolution and emphasized that vendor pricing submitted through both requests for information (RFIs) was not reflected in the final structure, leaving many firms unable to cover labor, administrative, and field-service costs. Mr. Mejias noted that increased inspection-driven rework—often involving minor discrepancies—has reduced revenue-generating time for crews and placed disproportionate strain on smaller, minority-owned, and women-owned businesses. He cautioned that current pricing and Quality Assurance/ Quality Control (QA/QC) requirements risk reducing the number of active vendors, thereby limiting program capacity. Mr. Mejias reiterated that contractors seek fair and sustainable compensation and urged DEEP and the Utilities to take timely corrective action rather than continuing to defer adjustments to future review cycles.

- Becca Trietch, DEEP, acknowledged the concerns raised and noted that the Utilities would be presenting next steps on pricing, which she hoped would address many of the issues identified. She emphasized that DEEP recognizes the tension between maintaining program cost-effectiveness and ensuring contractor business viability and asked the Utilities to move quickly in reviewing pricing adjustments given the seriousness of the concerns expressed.

ii. Pricing next steps (Utilities) 00:27:06

Amy McLean, Avangrid, began the pricing presentation by outlining the next steps associated with revisiting contractor compensation under the redesigned Home Energy Solutions (HES) and HES-Income Eligible (HES-IE) programs. Ms. McLean stated that the Utilities would conduct a renewed pricing review beginning in June, informed by contractor feedback gathered at the recent April Principals Meeting. She explained that the Utilities would prioritize four high-impact measure categories identified by contractors: assessment and scope-of-work activities, duct blaster testing, ventilation measures, and air-sealing. Vendors will be asked to provide detailed cost breakdowns—including labor hours, labor rates, material costs, and overhead—to validate pricing inputs as part of this June data request.

Discussion: Becca Trietch, DEEP, asked the Utilities to clarify expected timelines for reviewing the forthcoming June survey results and determining whether pricing adjustments would be necessary.

- Ms. McLean indicated that contractors would be given 30 days to respond once the data request is released, but she did not provide a definitive schedule for when the Utilities would complete their subsequent review.
- Jordan Schellens, Eversource, noted that the timeline may vary depending on the magnitude of potential adjustments: if extensive pricing changes are required, broader budget rebalancing across the portfolio could extend the process; smaller adjustments, by contrast, could be implemented more quickly.
- Dr. Trietch emphasized the importance of timely action given the concerns raised by contractors.

Edgardo Mejias reiterated longstanding concerns regarding the treatment of vendor-submitted pricing data in prior RFIs and expressed frustration that contractors had participated in multiple pricing exercises without seeing their cost structures reflected in final program rates. He urged the Utilities to use the existing RFI data more fully rather than initiating another time-consuming

process. Mr. Mejias also questioned how many contractors have exited the program in recent years and stated that current pricing levels are unsustainable for many firms.

- Dr. Trietch acknowledged these concerns and reiterated that DEEP must balance cost-effectiveness requirements with the operational realities faced by contractors. She stressed that although DEEP recognizes the need for iterative adjustments, the Utilities must accelerate efforts to resolve the issues raised.

Mr. Mejias asked whether any forthcoming pricing adjustments would apply retroactively. The Utilities responded that retroactivity would depend on cost-effectiveness analyses conducted after receiving June cost data.

- Dr. Trietch requested that retroactivity be explicitly included as part of the Utilities' evaluation when determining next steps.

b. Quality Assurance and Quality Control (QA/QC) 00:38:47
i. Follow up items from March 25, 2026, meeting

DEEP opened the segment by reiterating a request made at the March CTAC meeting for the Utilities to report on inspector-related QA/QC errors or, if such data were not available, to outline a plan for collecting it going forward. DEEP emphasized that understanding the rate and nature of inspector discrepancies is necessary to evaluate contractor concerns and support program improvement.

DEEP also encouraged contractors to use the established escalation process when they believe inspection findings are incorrect.

Spencer Hauer, Eversource, presented the Utilities' analysis, explaining that a review of inspection records from 2025 and 2026 indicated that less than 1% of cases involved a contractor returning to a home only to determine that the inspection finding was incorrect. He clarified that this figure specifically reflects instances where contractors performed a site visit and confirmed there was, in fact, no issue to correct. He distinguished these cases from those in which inspectors identified issues that contractors believed were minor or not meaningful enough to require a return visit, noting that such subjective disagreements were not included in the error calculation. Based on the findings, the Utilities concluded that an inspector scorecard was not necessary at this time, though utility staff remained available to discuss disputed inspections.

Discussion: DEEP asked how Utilities determine what qualifies as a return-required discrepancy and sought confirmation on how inspection data will be tracked moving forward.

- Eversource stated that both its internal systems and third-party vendors can begin systematically tracking instances where contractors return to a home and find no corrective action needed, and committed to doing so.

Edgardo Mejias expressed disagreement with the Utilities' characterization of inspector errors, stating that his company experiences a substantially higher rate of incorrect inspection findings—often in the range of 80–90% for certain categories. He suggested that contractor experiences differ widely and recommended that DEEP survey vendors directly.

Lorenzo Wyatt, Home Comfort Practice, noted that while error rates may be lower for his company, the operational impact of even a small percentage of erroneous inspections is significant given the lost production time associated with revisits. Mr. Wyatt also suggested implementing inspector scorecards or centralized tracking to ensure accountability and to reduce ambiguity in inspection expectations.

- Utilities responded that discrepancies often stem from differing interpretations of what constitutes a complete or adequately documented installation rather than from factual errors. For example, Eversource stated that disagreements around dense-pack wall insulation frequently reflect differing understandings of what qualifies as a “dense-pack” condition rather than incorrect inspector determinations.
- Utilities also reported that a checklist initiative is underway through the Technical Assistance Group (TAG), beginning with attic air-sealing protocols. Amy McLean explained that although the implementation manual defines requirements, contractors have requested clearer, more operationally focused checklists to ensure consistency between field crews and inspectors. These checklists will be derived directly from manual language and will be updated in tandem with any future manual revisions.

Edgardo Mejias further raised concerns about instances in which inspectors appear to enforce standards not included in the manual or apply newer guidance to older jobs.

- DEEP asked the Utilities to clarify how inspectors are trained on manual changes and requested a follow-up item for the CTAC tracker to address communication inconsistencies. Utilities committed to reviewing their internal notification process to ensure inspectors and contractors receive the same information on the same timeline.

Additional discussion focused on the appropriate sequence for raising inspection disputes. Some contractors reported being instructed not to contact inspectors directly, while others stated that email communication with inspectors has been effective.

- DEEP asked the Utilities to provide a clear, consistent dispute-resolution protocol and added this topic to the CTAC tracker for follow-up.

DEEP reiterated the importance of systematic data collection on inspector accuracy, consistent communication on manual updates, and continued refinement of QA/QC practices to ensure fairness, clarity, and operational practicality for vendors.

Edgardo Mejias- Dense Packing of the Wall Presentation 01:01:47

Edgardo Mejias, presented a detailed explanation of field challenges associated with achieving a 100% dense-pack standard. Mr. Mejias described the practical limitations of older housing stock, noting that wall cavities frequently contain obstructions such as wiring, junction boxes, fire blocking, conduit, and existing fiberglass batts. These conditions, he explained, make it technically impossible to achieve uniform dense-pack coverage across an entire cavity. He further outlined a comparative analysis illustrating that the majority of heat-loss reduction in wall cavities results from minimizing convection rather than maximizing insulation R-value, and that the incremental benefit of attempting to fill the last small voids is negligible relative to the labor burden placed on contractors.

Mr. Mejias noted that inspectors' reliance on borescope checks at isolated outlets—used to declare failed installations when small gaps are found—does not reflect realistic building-science performance. He stated that current inspection practices are causing contractors to fail jobs even when the cavity is substantially and effectively insulated. He emphasized that these failures carry reputational consequences when customers are notified and create financial strain when contractors must return without compensation. He urged alignment between inspection practices and the program manual, and recommended a standardized three-point inspection method: interior visual/borescope review, infrared imaging, and an exterior density verification through drill-hole access.

- DEEP acknowledged the significance of the issue and invited the Utilities to comment. Spencer Hauer, Eversource, noted that any change to dense-pack standards must align with evaluation requirements, since program savings are only claimable when installations meet criteria validated through the evaluation process. He added that dense-pack practices vary in the field and require continued dialogue to define consistent expectations.
- The Utilities indicated that the topic has been raised previously through the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) discussions and expressed openness to continuing the review.

DEEP requested that the Utilities provide an update on the matter at the July CTAC meeting, emphasizing the need for clear alignment between inspection criteria, field feasibility, and documented program requirements.

- Richard Faesy, Technical Consultant, added that the program must ultimately adopt a standard that is measurable, achievable, and consistently understood by contractors and inspectors. He encouraged contractors to propose specific written standards that could be reviewed collaboratively through TAG and the Evaluation Committee.

Contractors agreed on the need for greater consistency in inspections, noting that mixed interpretations across inspectors are contributing to unnecessary rework and customer confusion. Mr. Mejias emphasized the need for blower-door verification and CFM-based performance confirmation as part of inspection protocols.

- DEEP concluded the segment by reiterating the importance of ongoing collaboration and confirming that Utilities will return with analysis and recommendations at the next CTAC meeting.

c. HES & HES-IE implementation manual changes (Utilities) 01:18:47

Spencer Hauer, Eversource, presented an overview of the Utilities' recent updates to the HES and HES-Income Eligible implementation manual. On April 8, 2026, an implementation manual was sent out to all HES & HES-IE contractors with the change log filled out and track changes identified. He explained that a tracked-changes version of the July–December 2025 manual, as well as a full changelog for updates implemented in December 2025, had been distributed to contractors the previous week. A training was held on April 10, 2026, for the HES and HES-IE contractors to hear about the changes live.

Mr. Hauer also noted that the Utilities held a bi-weekly contractor meeting to walk through the updates section-by-section, with an additional opportunity for further feedback scheduled for the

upcoming Friday. He stated that, as of the time of presentation, the Utilities had not yet received contractor comments but welcomed feedback and questions.

Discussion: Contractors expressed their view that significantly more time was needed to review the manual revisions, noting that even changes described as language clean-ups could, in their opinion, have material impacts on program requirements. Edgardo Mejias stated that, from his perspective, the December 17, 2025, updates were implemented without prior notice or opportunity for comment, which contractors believe contributed to an increase in QA/QC findings early in 2026. He asserted that contractors have historically been provided a 30-day review window for manual updates and suggested, that enforcement of the December changes be temporarily paused until contractors can fully assess them.

Michelle Long stated that, in her experience, contractors have at times encountered what they interpreted as retroactive enforcement of new requirements, particularly related to insulation and ventilation work completed before December 2025. She expressed concern that contractors cannot reasonably comply with standards they have not seen and noted that contractors perceive inconsistencies between what inspectors, desk reviewers, and contractors understand to be current requirements.

- DEEP asked the Utilities to clarify their internal process for notifying inspectors of manual updates and how contractors can verify that inspectors and desk reviewers are working from the same version.
- Mr. Hauer responded that moving forward, changelogs and tracked revisions will be distributed concurrently to all parties, and updates will undergo a more transparent review process. He also encouraged contractors to provide specific project examples where they believe outdated or unpublished standards were applied so the Utilities could investigate.

During the discussion, Spencer Hauer explained that some manual updates were driven by the 2025 Program Savings Documentation (PSD) and therefore not subject to contractor negotiation. Other updates, he noted, could be refined based on contractor feedback, particularly where clarity or practical implementation concerns are raised.

- Amy McLean added that the Utilities are committed to improving communication and noted that a previously developed communications-timeline framework—created jointly with contractors in 2024—would be recirculated to reinforce expectations around notice periods for future changes.

Concerns were also raised about the cumulative administrative burden introduced through the redesigned workflow. Michelle Long and Edgardo Mejias shared that the combination of new documentation requirements, manual changes, and frequent QA/QC interventions has reduced overall productivity and increased operational costs. Mr. Mejias emphasized that contractors are not compensated for the additional time required to identify, interpret, and adopt newly imposed requirements, particularly when changes occur mid-year or without advance notice.

- DEEP acknowledged the concerns expressed and reiterated the need to establish a predictable and transparent update process for both the manual and PSD-driven changes. DEEP requested that the Utilities provide follow-up information on how historical manual changes were applied, how inspector communication is being managed, and how potential

retroactive applications will be addressed. DEEP also asked the Utilities to report back at the July CTAC meeting on improvements to update procedures, comment periods, and change-management practices.

5. DEEP- Electric Resistance Conversions 01:54:07

a. Background and objectives

Jen Elazhari, DEEP, presented on electric resistance heating conversions as part of the New England Heat Pump Accelerator initiative. Ms. Elazhari explained that Connecticut is developing its statewide pilot under the Accelerator program, which is separate from the Accelerator’s substantial midstream heat pump incentives and forthcoming community-based grant opportunities. DEEP noted that households with electric-resistance heating represent a significant opportunity for energy and cost savings through the adoption of high-efficiency heat pumps.

As part of the state pilot design process, DEEP is gathering contractor input to better understand customer motivations and barriers related to replacing electric-resistance systems. DEEP invited contractors to share observations regarding installation feasibility, cost considerations, customer expectations, and common challenges encountered in the field. Staff emphasized that contractor experience is essential to shaping the pilot and ensuring that incentives, outreach, and program supports are aligned with real-world needs. DEEP informed attendees that a short questionnaire would be circulated following the meeting and encouraged all contractors to complete it to help inform the state’s pilot development.

DEEP facilitated questions and discussion:

DEEP opened up discussion for contractor feedback based on their field experience with homes heated by electric resistance systems. Contractors provided feedback based on their experience with homes currently using electric resistance heating.

- Edgardo Mejias stated that while heat pumps can deliver measurable energy savings benefits, customers often expect direct financial savings that may not materialize without proper maintenance and realistic performance expectations. He noted that electric resistance baseboard systems require virtually no upkeep, whereas heat pumps must be cleaned and serviced routinely to maintain efficiency, and customers are often unaware of these ongoing costs. Mr. Mejias emphasized the importance of clearly communicating both the benefits and the maintenance requirements associated with heat pump adoption.
- Mr. Mejias also commented on installation feasibility, explaining that some homes lack appropriate exterior locations for condensers or do not have adequate interior space for heat pump water heaters. He recommended that DEEP incorporate “heat pump readiness” considerations—such as building shell conditions, layout constraints, and ventilation—into the design of the pilot to avoid misaligned customer expectations and unsuccessful installations.

DEEP asked contractors whether they had insight into the prevalence of electric resistance heating across single family, multifamily, or condominium properties. Contractors responded that this information is not typically categorized during HES assessments and suggested the Utilities may have

more complete data. DEEP reiterated that contractor input will directly inform the structure of the forthcoming state pilot.

During the discussion, Joe DeNicola, DEEP, representing the Heat Pump Accelerator program team, provided additional detail on available funding. He explained that the Accelerator includes midstream incentives currently available to distributors—approximately \$300 for heat pump water heaters and \$650–\$750 for heat pumps, depending on equipment type. Mr. DeNicola noted that these incentives are stackable with EnergizeCT program incentives, reducing equipment cost before installation quotes reach customers. He added that the Accelerator also includes \$14.5 million in funding for Connecticut’s state level pilot and future community grant opportunities aimed at expanding equitable access to heat pump technologies.

DEEP concluded the segment by announcing that a short questionnaire would be sent to contractors after the meeting and requested that all vendors respond to help shape program design, identify customer barriers, and refine approaches for electric resistance conversions under the Accelerator.

6. Public Comment 02:06:32

No public comment was provided.

Announcements

1. 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.
 - c. April 14, 2026, DEEP issued a Draft Determination modifying and approving, with conditions, the Optimization Plan filed on February 28, 2025, as a supplementary requirement to the 2025-2027 Conservation and Load Management (C&LM) Plan.
 - i. Comments are due May 13th by 4pm EST to DEEP.EnergyBureau@ct.gov
 - d. April 14, 2026, DEEP filed a [letter](#) authorizing Eversource to begin customer outreach and transfers of existing ConnectedSolutions battery customer participants into the Energy Storage Solutions (ESS) program on a voluntary basis, per Eversource's April 3, 2026, proposal.
 - e. April 15, 2026, DEEP [granted an exception](#) to allow HES-IE and HES contractors to perform air sealing services on the first visit when no other measure opportunities are identified and air sealing work would take three hours or less to complete.
2. The CTAC Question & Answer Tracker is located at the bottom of the [CTAC website](#), which will be updated following each meeting.
3. The next CTAC meeting is residential and C&I focused and scheduled for July 22, 2026, at 1:00pm EST.