Wednesday, March 25, 2026 | 1:00 PM– 3:30 PM

Contractor Technical Advisory Committee (CTAC) Special Session Minutes

Meeting Recording

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. **CTAC Q&A Tracker**

DEEP reviewed the CTAC Question & Answer Tracker, which included new items resulting from questions raised during the last CTAC meeting held on February 18, 2026. DEEP explained that the tracker is posted publicly and will continue to capture unresolved issues until formal responses are completed.

Ben McMillan, DEEP, summarized seven new tracker items: three related to Quality Assurance/ Quality Control (QA/QC) and two related to vendor pricing, all of which remained open pending discussion during this meeting. Mr. McMillan noted that a question regarding budget impacts if IRA rebates do not launch in 2026 had been closed, with the Utilities' response posted. He also reported that an item concerning improvements to the implementation manual update process had been closed, with Utilities preparing a tracked changes version for July–December 2025 and a full changelog beginning in 2026.

4. **Evaluation Administrator: Presentation on Evaluation Impacts on Residential Programs** **00:11:37**

Steven Cofer, Evaluation Administrator, provided an overview of the statutory evaluation framework that governs Connecticut's energy-efficiency programs. He explained that state law requires an independent evaluation process to verify program performance, quantify energy savings, and review program operations. In this role, the evaluation administrator works closely with the Energy Efficiency Board to develop evaluation plans, oversee third-party vendors, conduct customer surveys and site visits, and ensure that all evaluation activities adhere to industry best practices. Mr. Cofer emphasized that evaluation relies heavily on the accuracy and completeness of program data, and

that evaluation outputs are used to inform program improvements, stakeholder decisions, and regulatory filings. He clarified that evaluation is separate from program implementation, noting that evaluators do not design programs, manage contractors, or set requirements; instead, they assess outcomes and provide recommendations based on verified data.

Mr. Cofer then outlined the distinction between Quality Assurance (QA) and Quality Control (QC), noting that while the terms are sometimes used interchangeably, they serve different purposes. QA refers to proactive activities that prevent issues—such as technician training, eligibility checks, and development of standards and technical manuals—whereas QC refers to post-work inspections, documentation reviews, and verification activities intended to identify and correct issues before they affect reporting or customer outcomes. He explained that strong QA/QC systems help ensure accurate savings, consistent installation practices, and program credibility. Conversely, weak or inconsistent QA/QC increases the need for oversight, slows project processing timelines, and undermines confidence in program results.

Mr. Cofer concluded with a summary of current evaluation activities across residential, commercial, and cross-cutting program areas. These activities include customer surveys, Contractor interviews, and on-site visits, all of which he described as valuable opportunities for contractors to share their perspectives on program strengths and challenges. He assured participants that all responses are confidential and anonymized, and he encouraged Contractors to participate actively, noting that robust feedback helps evaluators make more actionable recommendations for program improvement.

a. DEEP Facilitated Discussion 00:22:40

DEEP invited questions and opened a discussion focused on evaluation practices, inspection coordination, and real-world field impacts of QA/QC activities.

John Mitchell, a federal QA/QC representative, asked for an opportunity to meet directly with utility teams to better understand their inspection protocols and visual inspection standards. He explained that contractors routinely approach him with questions about inspection expectations and that clearer communication from Utilities would help him provide more accurate guidance.

- Eversource responded by providing contact information and offering to arrange follow-up conversations.

Jordan Schellens, Eversource, asked Mr. Cofer how evaluation methodologies account for variability across contractors, noting that some vendors show consistently strong performance while others experience more issues.

- Mr. Cofer explained that evaluation relies on statistically rigorous sampling plans specifically designed to address this variability, and that evaluators build sample sizes that maintain confidence in results even when performance varies across sites or contractors.

Several Contractors then shared concerns about the operational impacts of evaluation and inspection activities on field crews. Contractors described situations in which the presence of evaluators or inspectors increased job duration or required repeated diagnostic testing, sometimes pulling staff attention away from air sealing or other high-value tasks. Program contractor Edgardo Mejias, cited a prior study indicating that blower-door results differed by approximately 400 cubic

feet per minute (CFM) between inspected and non-inspected homes, raising concerns about whether evaluation practices may inadvertently influence diagnostic outcomes.

- Mr. Cofer, who did not oversee that earlier study, could not comment on its methodology.
- DEEP responded that evaluation sampling plans are publicly discussed through the Evaluation Committee, where evaluators present proposed approaches before finalization, and encouraged Contractors to participate to ensure that evaluation designs reflect realistic field conditions.

Contractors also highlighted challenges with inspection scheduling and coordination. Several noted that inspectors sometimes arrive late or at unpredictable times, disrupting workflow and limiting the time available for installation activities. Contractors asked for clearer protocols and more consistent communication to ensure that inspections do not interfere with job sequencing.

- Utility representatives acknowledged these concerns and offered to meet directly with contractors to review inspection expectations.
- DEEP emphasized the importance of documenting situations where evaluator behavior alters normal job performance, noting that such examples are critical for refining evaluation methodologies.

Additional questions addressed geographic and housing-stock variability, with Edgar Encarnacion, Center for EcoTechnology (CET), observing that differences in home size, construction type, and neighborhood characteristics affect diagnostic results.

- Mr. Cofer confirmed that evaluators account for geography, weather patterns, and measure types when designing sampling strategies.

Tim Fabuien, Lantern Energy, asked whether evaluation targets or sampling percentages are set in advance.

- Mr. Cofer explained that evaluators develop sampling plans using available data but may refine them as additional information emerges, ultimately aiming for results with high statistical confidence.

Edgardo Mejias reiterated concerns about the potential for evaluator presence to influence blower-door results and shorten available time for actual installation work. Mr. Encarnacion added that coordination between QA/QC teams and Contractors is essential to avoid skewed data.

- DEEP closed the discussion by emphasizing that Contractor feedback is vital to improving evaluation and QA/QC practices, and encouraged ongoing communication to ensure that program requirements reflect real-world field conditions.

5. Utility Presentations 00:42:33

a. Avangrid eTrack Backlog Update

Amy McLean, Avangrid, provided an operational update regarding vendor payments and project processing. She reported that Avangrid had experienced a backlog in project submissions and invoicing due to issues within the desk review process and the eTrack system, which temporarily prevented vendors from submitting projects for payment. Amy stated that these technical problems

were resolved as of February 20, at which point project submission and invoicing functions were fully restored in eTrack. She confirmed that vendors were once again able to submit work for review and payment and that all outstanding backlogged items had been addressed.

a. **IRA Budget Impacts – with and without Federal Funding**

Ghani Ramdani, Eversource, continued the budget presentation by outlining the key differences between residential program budgets developed with and without federal Home Electrification and Appliance Rebate (HEAR) funding. Mr. Ramdani explained that DEEP had requested two versions of the budgets to allow stakeholders to clearly understand how federal funding, if authorized, would affect program scale, incentives, and participation levels. He noted that the scenario including HEAR funding reflects additional federal resources that would expand program capacity—particularly for income-eligible customers—while the HEAR-exclusive scenario represents the Utilities' planned activities under existing state and ratepayer funding alone. Mr. Ramdani emphasized that the budget tables were projections rather than actual expenditures, and that Eversource prepared both versions to support transparency during the March 1 filings and upcoming stakeholder engagements.

Following Eversource's overview, Amy McLean presented the comparable Avangrid residential budgets, also shown with and without HEAR resources. She stated that Avangrid's forecasting methodology mirrors Eversource's, with separate budget lines identifying how HEAR dollars would influence incentive amounts and program reach. Ms. McLean further emphasized that providing both scenarios ensures that Contractors, DEEP, and other stakeholders have consistent information about how federal funding would integrate into the overall program design should authorization occur.

DEEP Facilitated Discussion 00:48:58

Becca Trietch, DEEP, asked whether Purchase Orders (POs) and contracts were inclusive of HEAR.

- The Utilities clarified that they had initially issued POs reflecting the higher revenue scenario—that is, assuming the availability of HEAR funds—while simultaneously actively tracking revenues closely to ensure that commitments remain aligned with actual collections and spending patterns throughout the year. The Utilities noted that Contractor spending varies widely, with some vendors performing at or above projected volumes and others operating below expectations; thus, maintaining flexibility in financial planning is essential. They also emphasized that collections tied to electric-usage patterns, including seasonal fluctuations, would continue to influence available funding as the year progresses.

Stacy Sherwood, Lead EEB Technical Consultant, asked about an apparent discrepancy between Avangrid's figures presented at a previous meeting.

- Avangrid clarified that the earlier figure had included administrative costs, whereas the $1.4 million noted in the tables presented during the special session represented incentive dollars only, excluding non-incentive administrative components. This clarification ensured alignment between the Utilities' budget categories and the materials provided for stakeholder review.

b. **Home Energy Solutions (HES) & HES-Income Eligible (HES-IE) Quality Assurance & Quality Control Processes (QA/QC) 00:52:11**

Jordan Schellens, Eversource, opened the QA/QC presentation by outlining the three principal outcomes used in the review process—warnings, reworks, and passes—and explained their significance within the redesigned residential programs. The utility clarified that a warning is issued for minor coaching items or documentation issues that do not alter project savings or incentive amounts and therefore do not require the contractor to resubmit or correct the project. A rework, by contrast, is issued when corrections are needed that could affect savings, eligibility, or incentive levels, such as missing measures, incorrect calculations, incomplete installations, or unaddressed health and safety concerns. A pass indicates that documentation, diagnostic testing, and measure installations all align with program requirements.

Eversource noted that July 2025 marked the first phase-in of the warning category, introduced to reduce unnecessary project reversions and to help contractors identify trends without delaying payment. The utility then reviewed the most common discrepancy categories—documentation issues, inaccurate or incomplete data entries, eligibility questions, and missed opportunities—explaining that these represent the vast majority of QA/QC flags across the portfolio

Ralph Valente, Avangrid, followed with a detailed overview of the desk review process, describing the timeline beginning January 1, 2026, when TrueView began conducting technical reviews for HES-IE add-on measures, and continuing through February 2026, when contractors regained the ability to submit projects following the system restoration. Avangrid reported that by March, it had launched an internal QA dashboard designed to track project-level and contractor-level trends, enabling staff to identify recurring issues and offer targeted support.

Avangrid stated that 550 Home Energy Solutions (HES) and Home Energy Solutions- Income Eligible (HES-IE) core service projects had been approved year-to-date, with 86 projects receiving a pass with comment—indicating minor, non-material issues—and 33 requiring rework. Avangrid emphasized that documentation was the most frequent source of rework, reporting examples such as missing system selections (e.g., central air), absent required measures (which has direct impacts on incentive levels), or inconsistencies between field data and entries in the system. The utility also highlighted improvements in communication practices, explaining that project clarifications occur through eTrack, supported by email-based best-practice guides. Avangrid further noted that the desk review team is now also identifying and recording examples of high-quality contractor work, which will be tracked as part of an effort to recognize positive performance.

Spencer Hauer, Eversource, then presented QA/QC findings related to insulation inspections, explaining that inspections fall into categories of pass, pass with modification, and fail. A pass with modification may occur when inspectors identify a discrepancy—such as a measurement variance or a missed air-sealing opportunity—that is subsequently resolved either by contractor correction in the field or by making an administrative adjustment in the system. A fail is issued only when issues cannot be corrected within the required time frame. The utility reported that most discrepancies are ultimately resolved, and trends are moving toward a higher share of first-time passes. Eversource provided examples of common workmanship issues, including insufficient insulation depth, thermal camera evidence of missing insulation, or incomplete air sealing in attics. Inspectors also regularly flag health-and-safety risks, such as insulation contacting chimneys, the presence of knob-and-tube wiring, or hazards within junction boxes.

Looking ahead, the utility described several ongoing initiatives to strengthen QA/QC alignment and contractor support, including monthly technician trainings, associated hands-on duct-sealing training

scheduled for May, updates to Contractor documentation portals, and continued bi-weekly Friday meetings with the vendor community. These initiatives aim to ensure greater consistency between vendor QA/QC practices and internal utility expectations

c. DEEP Facilitated Discussion

DEEP invited discussion on emerging trends, contractor concerns, and operational impacts associated with the redesigned residential QA/QC framework.

- Eversource noted that the volume of project reviews had increased significantly beginning in August 2025, coinciding with both the waiver of the copay and the introduction of several new documentation and diagnostic requirements. Although the overall project pipeline grew, Eversource emphasized that the charts presented during the meeting illustrated only the percent distribution of QA/QC outcomes rather than the underlying raw counts. Eversource clarified that October alone included more than 1,400 assessments, providing context for the elevated number of warnings and reworks shown in the materials.
- Avangrid reported that, within its service territory, approximately 550 projects had been reviewed year-to-date, with a relatively small percentage requiring rework and many passing with minor comments. There has been a mass increase from August and throughout the fall, an overall increase.
- Joe Roy of TrueView, third-party QA/QC review vendor, explained that improvements were already apparent, especially in the accuracy of area measurements and documentation submitted by contractors. In particular, reviewers were seeing a shift from gross to net square footage calculations, which aligns with new plan-view diagram requirements and has improved the precision of insulation-related documentation and incentive calculations.
- When asked whether the data presented captured only outstanding issues or also included items later corrected or withdrawn, the Utilities clarified that the dashboards shown represented the historical record of flags as they were initially issued. However, Utilities also confirmed that both flags and inspection outcomes can be adjusted retroactively when subsequent review indicates that a correction is warranted. This includes updating a project from fail to pass following contractor remediation or removing a warning or rework designation if the Utilities determine that the issue should not have been flagged.

Several contractors raised significant concerns regarding the increased frequency and impact of QA/QC interventions under the redesigned program.

Edgardo Mejias, Efficiency for All, stated that the apparent rise in QA/QC flags should be interpreted carefully, noting that many contractors experienced major documentation and process changes in the second half of 2025 that were not fully communicated prior to implementation. He stated that this lack of advance notice contributed to an uptick in warnings and reworks and suggested that the July 2025 introduction of the warning category—and the associated increase in reviewer communications—likely contributed to the roughly 20% rise in QA/QC notifications shown in the Utilities' slide.

Mr. Mejias further expressed concern that contractors are scored heavily based on inspection and desk-review outcomes, whereas inspectors themselves are not subject to similar performance metrics. He explained that contractors may have to return to customer homes to address findings they believe to be inaccurate, often without compensation, and that inconsistent interpretations

across inspectors contribute to operational strain. Mr. Mejias offered examples illustrating these challenges, including instances in which insulation dense-pack work was failed by field inspectors because existing wall R-values exceeded certain thresholds, even though the same work had passed desk review under program rules allowing dense-packing when wall cavities contain at least 1.5 inches of open space.

Mr. Mejias noted that several of his own inspection failures were associated with the same inspector, raising concern about inspector-level consistency and suggesting the need for systematic tracking of inspector performance. He added that contractors face a strict 30-day requirement to resolve discrepancies identified during rebate inspections. If the issue is not corrected or disputed in time, the fail notification is sent to the customer, which can create reputational harm and misrepresent contractor workmanship. He emphasized that field technicians and inspectors generally share similar levels of certification and training, underscoring the importance of ensuring fairness and accuracy in QA/QC determinations.

- Utilities responded by acknowledging contractors' concerns regarding notification timing and customer communication.
- DEEP committed to ensuring these issues would be tracked formally, requesting that questions about inspector consistency and flag correction conversion data capabilities be added to the CTAC tracker for Utility follow-up.

Eversource and Avangrid described a recently revised inspection-review process, developed through the Technical Assistance Group (TAG), which now provides the Connecticut Insulation Installers Network (CTIIN) contractor with a 3-business-day window to rebut or clarify an inspection finding before it is formally communicated to the customer. This change was implemented to allow contractors the opportunity to provide additional photos or explanation, thereby reducing the likelihood of customer confusion or unnecessary site revisits.

- DEEP requested that the Utilities also explore whether inspection-result notification timelines and tracking—particularly the contractor 3-day rebuttal window—could be added to the CTAC tracker for future discussion.
- During the discussion, Utilities noted that despite invitations for stakeholder feedback during earlier manual revisions—including a July 18, 2025, email notice requesting contractor comments—no responses were received at that time.
    - Contractors explained that the timing overlapped with the Request for Proposal (RFP) process, during which contractors may be reluctant to submit critical feedback.
    - Utilities noted that improved communication with contractors is a priority and that the future Contractor Ombudsperson position is expected to help strengthen communication channels. The Ombudsperson role should help contractors receive and navigate information more reliably, creating an additional, dedicated contact point.
    - Michelle Long, Energy Management Authority, added that the primary issue was not the July draft manual but rather a December 17, 2025 revision that substantially altered several requirements and pricing assumptions without advance notice, resulting in unexpected QA/QC findings for work performed before contractors had an opportunity to review the updated manual.

6. **Home Doctor of America LLC: Presentation on Contractor QA/QC Techniques for Residential Programs 01:41:32**

   a. **Presentation**

Denise Pankosky, Home Doctor of America, delivered a presentation outlining the company's internal approach to Quality Assurance and Quality Control (QA/QC) within the redesigned residential program structure. Home Doctor described how the company had previously operated in a largely reactive manner—responding to flags, inspection findings, and documentation issues as they arose—but recognized in early 2025 that this model created delays, inconsistencies, and avoidable rework. In response, the company shifted to a proactive, process-driven QA/QC framework designed to embed quality controls at each stage of the workflow rather than relying solely on post-installation corrections. This approach includes clearly defined staff roles, a dedicated QA manager, and standardized reporting and documentation practices that ensure uniform expectations across all crews.

Ms. Pankosky explained that the revised process begins with intake and scheduling, incorporating structured job reviews and pre-installation planning to confirm that technicians are prepared with all necessary information before arriving at the customer home. Crews now follow mandatory, non-negotiable checklists, and any deviation from established procedures requires supervisor approval. This system was introduced in response to the company's analysis of its most common failure modes, which showed that many issues stemmed not from technician skill but rather from process inconsistencies, overly complex workflows, incomplete photographs, and gaps in documentation that hindered desk review and field verification.

To address these issues, the company implemented a corrective action model focused on identifying patterns of repeat discrepancies, enforcing checklist compliance, expanding required photographic documentation (including before, during, and after photos), and providing targeted training to technicians who demonstrate recurring error types. Ms. Pankosky noted that these measures helped significantly improve field consistency, reduce avoidable reworks, and create a continuous feedback loop between the QA manager, technicians, and schedulers.

The company emphasized that the updated internal QA/QC structure has strengthened accountability while streamlining operations, resulting in fewer discrepancies being flagged by utility desk reviewers and inspectors. These improvements reflect the importance of clear processes, repetitive reinforcement of expectations, and strong communication channels across all levels of staff.

   b. **DEEP Facilitated Discussion 01:56:09**

Amy McLean, Avangrid, asked about the timeframe of Home Doctor's QA/QC improvements.

- Home Doctor responded that although the company had been participating in the residential programs for many years, the most substantial process changes emerged over the past three years, with the redesigned program requirements in 2025 accelerating the need for a more structured approach. The company indicated that it took roughly one full year to stabilize the

new QA/QC workflow, refine the corrective action model, and fully integrate standardized documentation practices.

- They also highlighted that the updated TrackSys dashboard has become an essential tool for monitoring notes and trends, allowing the company to identify potential issues early—even when observations are not severe enough to result in reworks. This capability enables supervisors to communicate feedback more efficiently, support technician development, and anticipate where additional training or process reinforcement may be needed.

7. HES & HES-IE Vendor Pricing 02:02:04

Jordan Schellens, Eversource, began the vendor-pricing presentation by summarizing the role of the Home Energy Solutions (HES) program in generating customer leads and supporting a statewide energy-efficiency workforce. The Utility emphasized that HES serves as a central entry point for many homeowners and that vendors frequently diversify their services—such as insulation, HVAC, or hot-water work—based on opportunities created through HES assessments. Eversource explained that the Utilities developed the redesigned pricing structure through a formal Request for Information (RFI) process conducted in 2025, during which all HES and HES-IE vendors were invited to submit labor and equipment cost data. This data, along with historic program performance and cost-effectiveness requirements, informed the pricing included in the 2025 program redesign. The Utilities reiterated that while they are able to share the procurement rationale, they cannot release anonymized or contractor-level RFI responses due to procurement rules.

Ghani Ramdani, Eversource, then discussed the framework used to determine measure-level pricing, noting that Connecticut's energy-efficiency programs are governed by statutory cost-effectiveness requirements. Program benefits must exceed costs, based on savings quantified through the Avoided Energy Supply Cost (AESC) Study, which is updated every three years. The Utilities described how measure costs include not only direct customer incentives but also administrative expenses such as marketing, evaluation, and quality assurance. Eversource explained that HES and HES-IE have the highest cost-to-achieve of the residential offerings because they involve significant on-site diagnostic and installation labor. To comply with cost-effectiveness thresholds while maintaining equity goals, the Utilities restructured air-sealing compensation into multiple components, including separate fees for blower-door testing, duct testing, and other diagnostic activities. They also added a dedicated air-sealing labor measure to reflect hourly production rates rather than reductions in CFM alone, stating that the program needed a more accurate representation of contractor effort under the two-visit model.

The Utilities presented early 2026 observations indicating that contractor payments under the redesigned model were substantially higher than in prior years. Based on available data, HES compensation was approximately 20% higher than 2025 levels, while HES-IE compensation was approximately 30% higher, reflecting increases in both diagnostics and installation work. Additional adjustments in 2026—such as increases to insulation add-on pricing—resulted in contractor compensation for most insulation measures being above market rates. Only a small number of measures, fewer than five, fell below market benchmarks. The Utilities noted that while contractor cost proposals submitted through the RFI were generally higher than what was ultimately included

in the Request for Proposal (RFP), the pricing adopted for the 2025–2026 redesign remained higher than in previous years and was consistent with levels offered in neighboring states' programs.

Spencer Haur, Eversource, also displayed an excerpt from the RFI showing the type of information vendors were asked to provide, including detailed labor and equipment cost fields for each measure. The utility emphasized that contractor feedback during the RFI helped refine measure categories, particularly for air-sealing and duct-sealing measures. For example, the Utilities explained that "pseudo-measures" that previously combined diagnostic and installation tasks were separated in 2025 to allow for more accurate billing and to ensure that contractors were compensated for required diagnostics even when installation opportunities were limited. This restructuring was intended to reduce disputes, simplify billing, and align pricing with the redesigned workflow.

a. DEEP Facilitated Discussion 02:13:37

DEEP opened the discussion by asking the Utilities to expand on how the redesigned vendor pricing balances contractor input with statutory cost-effectiveness requirements.

- The Utilities explained that although contractor RFI submissions generally reflected higher desired pricing, the final pricing adopted for 2025–2026 was nevertheless higher than prior years and aligned with neighboring states, while still ensuring that the overall residential portfolio meets required benefit-cost thresholds.
- DEEP reiterated that the program must maintain cost-effectiveness but that continued contractor feedback is essential to refining the model over time.

Contractors then described operational impacts of the redesign. Jonathan Casiano, Bright Solutions, noted that most measurable savings occur during Visit 2, while Visit 1 is largely diagnostic, and asked how that distribution is reflected in pricing.

- The Utilities confirmed this distinction, explaining that Visit 1 establishes accurate diagnostics and safety parameters, enabling Visit 2 to deliver the bulk of savings.

Edgardo Mejias, Efficiency for All, shared concerns about the procurement process, stating that contractors expected RFI results to be averaged rather than screened for cost-effectiveness. He added that contractors may hesitate to provide critical feedback during active RFP cycles.

- DEEP acknowledged these concerns and emphasized the need for transparency and regular opportunities for stakeholder input.

Jane Bourdeau, F.F Hitchcock, highlighted the increased time and administrative burden associated with the redesigned workflow, explaining that many contractors can now complete only one job per day instead of two. She urged DEEP and Utilities to continue monitoring early-year impacts.

- DEEP responded that increased administrative effort was anticipated and that additional evaluation of 2026 outcomes would guide any mid-year or future adjustments.

Timothy Fabuien, Lantern Energy, asked whether current pricing has reached the program's cost-effectiveness threshold.

- The Utilities replied that the portfolio still maintains a healthy benefit-cost ratio, noting that cost-effectiveness is assessed at the program level and includes incentive, administrative, and evaluation costs.
- They indicated they would have better mid-year data by June, with further opportunity to review pricing and cost-effectiveness at the September Contractor Principals meeting.

The discussion turned to building-science considerations. Mr. Mejias cautioned that some implementation rules aimed at achieving savings may conflict with Building Performance Institute (BPI) standards or create liability for vendors, for example, performing air sealing when homes are already near Minimum Ventilation Guidelines (MVG), potentially creating indoor air quality concerns.

- Ralph Valente, Avangrid, explained recent manual updates intended to prevent attic moisture problems and clarified that changes were based on historical observations. They emphasized that the goal of these changes was not to pressure vendors into unsafe practices but to align measures with building-science findings that prevent long-term homeowner issues.
- DEEP emphasized the importance of maintaining open communication and encouraged Contractors to utilize multiple communication avenues—including direct calls to Utilities, principles meetings, and implementation manual comment opportunities. DEEP reiterated that the Contractor Ombudsperson, once in place, will serve as an additional support mechanism for addressing vendor concerns and ensuring that feedback loops remain robust.

8. Public Comment 02:40:27

Tim Fabuien and Jonathon Casiano expressed their appreciation to DEEP and the Utilities for the detailed discussion held during the special session

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.
2. A HES and HES-IE Principals Meeting will be hosted by the Utilities on March 30, 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.