

**New Jersey's Clean Energy Program
Energy Efficiency Committee Meeting
BPU - Trenton
April 16, 2015**

ERS Benchmarking Presentation

Michael Rovito, Senior Consultant

ERS worked with BPU and Frank Felder (Rutgers) to conduct a dense study of New Jersey's Energy Efficiency Programs. The goal of the presentation is to help attendees understand the methodology behind the study, and to provide examples of the data discovered, and any assumptions made based off of that data, for both residential and commercial EE Programs. The study reviewed 14 programs, excluding renewables:

1. Residential NC	8. Commercial Retrofit
2. Residential (Existing Homes)	9. P4P NC
3. Residential Gas & Electric HVAC	10. P4P EB
4. EEP: Appliance Recycling	11. Small Business Direct Install
5. EEP: Application Rebates	12. CHP & Fuel Cells
6. EEP: Upstream Lighting	13. LEUP
7. Commercial NC	14. LGEA

For the purposes of comparison, Energy Efficient Products (EEP) was split into its 3 largest components. Other points for consideration include:

- The study was conducted not only for data gathering, but for analysis in order to come up with actionable recommendations to the NJCEP.
- Programs with the greatest opportunities for improvements were researched further by comparing with similar programs in other states.
- Information on other state programs was gathered through both web research and interviews with Program Administrators (PAs).
- 25 other PAs were benchmarked, for comparison to NJ.
- Total parallel comparison was not possible, due to certain variables discussed later in the presentation.

Studied Metrics:

- Spending per unit of kWh, kW, and therm savings (cost-effectiveness).
- Spending vs. unit of kWh, kW, and therm savings achieved per Program participant. (In other words, are participants achieving comprehensive savings?).
- Percentage spent on incentives dollars (as opposed to administrative costs).

Dollar per savings data was fairly robust, while savings per participant data was not as readily available.

Question by Anne Marie Perrachio: Was the studied savings data Program reported, or evaluated savings? Meaning—is the data all modeled savings, not actual savings?

Answer by Mr. Rovito (paraphrased): The data studied is reported savings, in terms of what was claimed to have been achieved, in regulatory filings, after participating in the Programs.

Findings & Discussion

25 comparison PAs were researched:

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Con Edison (NY) 2. Long Island Power Authority (LIPA) 3. National Grid (NGrid NY) 4. NYSEERDA 5. Connecticut Light & Power (CL&P) 6. Baltimore Gas & Electric (BGE) 7. Potomac Electric & Power (PEPCO) 8. Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative (SMECo) 9. Delmarva Power 10. Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) 11. Southern California Edison (SCE) 12. San Diego Gas & Electric (SDGE) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 13. Southern California Gas (SCG) 14. PECO 15. Duquesne Light 16. First Energy Met-Ed 17. First Energy Penelec 18. PPL Electric Utilities (PPL) 19. NSTAR 20. National Grid (NGrid MA) 21. Public Service of New Hampshire (PSNH) 22. Efficiency Vermont 23. Wisconsin Focus on Energy 24. Commonwealth Edison (ComEd) 25. Austin Energy
--	--

Since none of the programs match NJ's exactly, a matching exercise was completed within the study to find what other state programs were similar enough to compare, which shrunk the sample size from 25 to ~15. Depending on the uniqueness of the Program, the sample size was even smaller (i.e. there is no program in other states comparable to P4P).

Question by Ms. Perrachio: Were any other unique influences captured, such as NJ's prevailing wage requirement? *Answer:* When comparing programs, prevailing wage was not taken into account. However, other comparison sets were matched to make sure there was an even playing field.

How to Interpret the Data:

- “Apples to apples” comparison was impossible, and all of the data shown in upcoming slides will be presented with that caveat. The data is raw, unadulterated, and deep (trailing back over 3+ years).
- The reference year is 2012.
- The study benchmarked on gross savings (with net savings only as additional information).

- Adjustments were made to data to split electric vs. gas savings, as some Programs split their budgets by fuel type and others do not.

Two trends roughly cancelled out:

- NJCEP centralizes certain key functions (such as marketing and evaluation), reducing program-specific budgets.
- The state of NJ experiences high cost of doing business.

Ms. Ackerman clarifies with Mr. Rovito that high costs in NJ = high construction costs. The above information is something to keep in mind while viewing the slides. However, the high in-state costs are not always attributable to certain numbers shown (i.e. programs specific to lighting in existing buildings is likely unaffected by construction costs).

Question by Michael Ambrosio (paraphrased): Did you take a look at allocating the marketing/evaluation costs back into the Programs, on some percentage basis? Sort of like how the gas/electric split was factored? *Answer (paraphrased):* We did not do that for this study, but it's a feasible way to adjust the numbers.

Question by Attendee: Did you make any assumptions accounting for flux in programs taking advantage of transactional costs? For example, a client making a refrigerator purchase regardless, versus a client buying a refrigerator for the energy savings/program incentives? *Answer:* The short answer is yes, we thought a lot about those types of fluctuations.

Results

The first slides of results discussed shows the kWh, kW, and therm savings per dollar summary for each of the 14 programs looked at, as compared to other state programs.

\$/kWh summary vs. \$/kW summary:

- The difference in the two results is significant, for reasons both positive and negative.
 - EEP shows high results (80th-100th percentile) for kW savings per dollar, which can be explained by programmatic differences. There is only one number to calculate for these programs—for example, a recycled refrigerator achieves x amount of savings. This number (x) is in line with industry standards, and the demand savings is high.
 - Multiple-measure Programs, such as Small Business DI, has many savings numbers calculated into the results—and more expense—which explains the higher results on the \$/kWh graph and lower results on the \$/kW graph.
- New Jersey, as compared to other state programs, is around the 50th percentile mark for electric savings per dollar. A part of this is due to the NJ programs focusing less on lighting; the demand savings number for lighting upgrades is higher than the demand savings number for, as an example, HVAC.

\$/Therm summary:

- Estimation may be off, as there was less available data for therm savings.
- Commercial therm savings are in the same “ballpark” as their results for electric.
- Core results for both therm and electric savings have room for improvement.

Question by Janja Lapse: Did the data take into account whole approach when looking at these programs? Some residential programs save oil, propane...the whole picture must be taken into account when assessing. *Answer:* We looked at the data given to us—it’s uncertain if the therm savings took into account all fuels. So, maybe that explains the low therm savings numbers.

Ms. Lapse: That is a problem, as fuel switching will have negative savings (since the switch is to natural gas). *Clarification by Mr. Ambrosio:* For fuel switching, the savings is reflected by removing oil/propane, but the increased gas use counts as negative savings.

Mr. Rovito states that ERS will return to the gas savings portions of Residential Programs to try and tell the “whole story”. He also reminds attendees that the presentation will move from quantitative discovery to qualitative reasoning very shortly.

Question by Mr. Ambrosio: Why is DI not showing any numbers for gas? It has a fairly robust gas component. *Answer:* It does, yes—I will have to look into why those numbers did not migrate onto this graph. On the case studies graphs, it should show.

Findings

If a program was struggling, it was marked for further research. Further research included: external reviews, web research, and interviews.

Common research areas:

- Offering/incentives
 - Are the savings/costs numbers real? What are fair incentives numbers?
 - Offerings are a relatively simple thing to dial up or down.
 - Is NJ over-estimating/under-estimating their savings? One item to note: programs that appear to be top-performing often have warped savings data calculations.
- Contractor model
 - How are other states managing their contractors? Is it an open pool, or a set of “keyed in” contractors? How does this affect quality of work?
- Savings and assumptions
 - Ties into offerings.
- Non-incentive costs
 - ERS looked at non-incentive costs to see if any operational savings could be achieved (i.e. are burdensome administrative/marketing costs adding to certain Programs’ bottom line?).

- Quality assurance
-Is NJ over-reviewing, not doing enough quality check-ins?

ERS looked at top performers of comparable programs in other states to see what could be gleaned from how those programs operate.

Residential existing homes (HPwES):

- NJ incentives are higher as compared to other state programs.
- NJ has a loan subsidization program built into the program budget, as opposed to having a separate budget for loans. This is added cost to the program.

If NJ lowers incentives, the state would be ranked higher in cost-effectiveness.

Question by attendee: So you adjusted for richer subsidizes, but did not adjust for increased participation due to high incentives? *Answer (paraphrased):* There are programs out there with lower incentives, and they survive. It's unknown if NJ's participation is due to higher incentive amounts. *Question by Mary Barber:* Is there a way to do that kind of analysis (looking at participation rates with higher vs. lower incentive rates)? *Answer:* It's possible, but it may not adjust things very greatly.

Question by Mr. Ambrosio: In other state programs, why are loans being accounted for in a separate budget, when the loan is supposed to represent project cost? Are there loans being taken out with no savings associated?

Answer by attendee: Some programs have loan OR rebate—if participants take out a loan, the savings associated is built into the loan budget. But if they accept the rebate, those savings are built into the incentive budget.

Discussion is curbed here to move on with the meeting, although it is established by Ms. Ackerman and Mr. Teter that the ERS presentation is the priority for discussion.

Residential Existing Homes:

- Other programs tend to offer prescriptive incentives as opposed to incentives for hitting specific performance standards. Note: "Performance standards" represent Energy Star standards.

EEP (Upstream Lighting):

- NJ's lighting hours per day is somewhat high and technology incentives in NJ lag somewhat behind other states (i.e., CFLs are still incentivized).

Creative approaches to retaining CFL savings:

- PG&E has in place designated "hard-to-reach" zip codes, where CFLs can still be incentivized).
- NYSERDA had some retail locations act as controls while other locations received incentives.

-Goal was to claim savings on normalized sales difference, but the execution failed due to logistical reasons and data privacy.

Commercial Retrofit:

- Reference year (2012) showed the \$/savings as decently ranked, but other years showed Commercial Retrofit in a higher percentile.
- The conclusion was that the 2012 year was an aberration due to the short-term TEACH program for schools running that year, which hit the budget hard and skewed numbers.
- Using other reference years, it appears Commercial Retrofit is a good performer (in the 75th percentile among its peers).

Slides showing Heating/Cooling Load Hours and Lighting Hours is shown. NJ trends high as far as usage, compared to Wisconsin (WI), NGRID (MA), and CL&P (CT).

Question by attendee: Are any of these numbers adjusted to account for electricity costs in NJ? *Answer:* No. *Follow-up by Mr. Ambrosio:* If anything, lower electric costs would make it harder for, say, Wisconsin to sell the program. If the utility costs are low, *and* the incentives are also low—but their savings numbers are high—then they are doing something right.

Inspection Approach Comparison:

- NJ inspects between 30% and 80% of all projects, depending on technology.
- Other states inspect around 10% of projects.
- Reducing inspections would lower costs.
- However, frequent checks of quality assurance is worthwhile.

Small Business DI:

- kWh savings is low, because of the comprehensive approach of this program as compared to its peers.
- Money is being spent on more expensive measures, which drives down the kWh savings number.
- Savings per participant numbers are high (in the 88th and 100th percentile).

Comprehensive approach is a strategic decision, as DI participants likely will not participate in other programs. High savings achieved, but with more money being spent.

Customer Cost Share (DI):

- NGRID and Con-Ed also divide 70%/30%
- CL&P divides roughly by half, depending on measures being installed.
- SCE and PG&E pays all of the project.

Contractor model (DI):

- There is success in other programs in the “turnkey” model—one contractor per designated territory approaching customers, doing the installation, etc. In

comparison to programs with an open pool, “keyed in” contractors work better (more quality control, cheaper).

Comment by Betsy: We have that approach now. *Response:* But those contractors subcontract. *Mr. Teter:* Some do, but the 6 designated DI contractors are the single points of contact, through TRC.

Mr. Ruvito: It is complicated. Maybe you can take a look at those contractors who do subcontract, and see if there’s any differences in their operating costs with projects that have a middle man, vs. projects without. If there is any middle man weight they’re carrying, perhaps they can be squeezed a little harder on measure costs.

Comment by Mr. Ambrosio: We are getting a pushback from contractors who are not “turnkey”—they say they are losing customers, and we are getting pushed in the opposite direction. How do other states handle that? *Answer by Mr. Ruvito:* I don’t really know, so anything said would be speculation. It is an RFP process, choosing which contractors are “turnkey”, so if any contractor misses a chance, the contract will go out to bid again. “Beat the other guy next time” may be the message.

Conclusions

Thematic Results:

- Marketing/Outreach is lacking.
 - NYSEDA successfully implemented outreach with contractors acting as account managers.
- Cost-efficiency needs improvement.
- Evaluation needs to be elevated.
 - Even with rolling budgets and yearly Program changes that discourage overall evaluation, give studies a bit more credence.
- Incentive levels are commonly too high.

Question by Mr. Ambrosio: Do you see a relationship between lack of evaluation and higher incentives? *Answer:* Yes, I do... high incentives could be status-quo that no one wants to lower; however, increased marketing and outreach can keep participation up while still lowering the incentive levels.

Final Points:

- Program specific marketing/evaluation budgets work well. At times, having a centralized marketing budget ignores certain programs. Providing each program with a specific marketing/evaluation budget can help ensure each program is receiving enough attention.
- Make sure monies deemed as “incentive” are truly incentive dollars going to the customers (i.e., at one time administrative costs were labeled as “incentive” because there was a push to drive down administrative costs).

Mr. Ambrosio states that he, BPU, and Frank Felder will be drawing up responses and questions to ERS in the near future.

Program Coordinator and Regulatory Updates
Elizabeth Ackerman, Sherri Jones, Mike Ambrosio

Updates on Filings, Board Orders and Regulatory Items

The budget re-allocation into Retrofit, DI, and P4P (EB) was approved.

Discussion of NJCEP Program Administrator RFP

To date, there is no update on the RFP.

Status of CRA

The CRA has been drafted, and is currently undergoing agency review. A public hearing on May 18th is being looked at, but so far has not been finalized.

Mr. Teter guides the rest of the meeting by stating that Honeywell and TRC will go over only the FY16 Proposed Program Changes portion of their presentations. The changes being presented are ones that can be made through compliance filings and do not require contract modifications.

Question by Attendee: When would be an appropriate time to comment on the proposed changes? *Answer by Ms. Ackerman:* If you do not mind, due to time constraints, please make those comments once the proposed changes go out for public comment at the public hearing. You absolutely will be heard.

Commercial & Industrial Program – TRC Team
Fiscal Year 2016 Proposed Program Changes

SmartStart recommendations:

- Move certain LED measures from Custom to Prescriptive.
- Remove pre-inspection and pre-approval installation requirement for specific prescriptive measures (excludes lighting and lighting controls).

Question by Ms. Ackerman: What was the reasoning behind that? *Response Mr.*

Deluca: For many measures, savings do not hinge on what equipment is being replaced—for example, chillers and HVAC. If a customer is installing equipment that qualifies, then verifying what equipment had once been there is unnecessary. Removing this requirement can hopefully speed up processing and allow TRC to be more flexible.

- Allow Board staff to authorize the addition of new measures to the Prescriptive rebate list, set initial rebate levels, and approve the reduction of LED incentive levels.
- Revise Performance Lighting requirements to allow gut rehabs.
- Include building shell measures through Custom Measures Program.

- Eliminate IRR requirement for Custom Program (common recommendation amongst a few Programs).
- Eliminate Sandy enhancements entirely.
- Set efficiency requirements for Gas Heating beyond ASHRAE requirements.
- Propose revised incentive offerings for Electric Chillers.
- Consolidate lighting categories/revise incentive levels for Prescriptive Lighting, as the LED market is changing rapidly.

Direct Install:

- Add series boilers to eligible equipment list (K-12 schools only).
- Exploring enhanced incentives for projects in distressed communities.

Pay for Performance Existing Buildings:

- Eliminate IRR requirement.
- Align kW categories to eliminate overlap with DI (this also is a common recommendation across all C&I Programs with overlapping).
- Eliminate kW peak demand waiver currently in place for certain facilities.
- Expand high energy intensity reduced savings to hospitals, while creating a tiered incentive approach for savings above 4%.
- Increase cap on lighting savings from 50% to 70%. The intent is to allow buildings with high lighting saving opportunities to participate, while maintaining the Program's comprehensive approach.
- Add rule prohibiting participation in other Programs while doing P4P. This encourages the "whole building" approach and improves baseline data collection.
- An alternative path is being looked at, but may not be ready for the compliance filing.

Comment by Mr. Ambrosio regarding last point: If you know enough about it conceptually, then let's work on language for the compliance filing—something efficient enough to get you started, but still allowing you to work out the fine points later on (without having to go back to the Board).

- Allow TRC autonomy to conduct expedited pre-inspections without going through the appeal/exemption process. With long timelines on many P4P projects, this is meant to move the process along more quickly.
- Revise partner turnaround time for revisions from 90 days to 30 days.

Question by Ms. Ackerman: And was there a conversation indicating that after x number of revisions, if TRC still needed more, then the partners must come in for a meeting?

Answer by Mr. Teter: Yes, and that has already been started—it's not necessarily a compliance filing, just something we are doing to, again, help move the process along.

Pay for Performance New Construction:

- Eliminating square foot waiver currently in place for certain facilities.
- Eliminating IRR requirement.

- Increase cap on lighting savings from 50% to 70%.
- Add rule prohibiting participation in other programs while doing P4P.

Question by Mr. Ambrosio: Consistent with ERS’s recommendations, TRC is considering moving towards energy savings based incentives rather than square footage based incentives, correct? *Answer by Mr. Teter:* Correct, but this is not yet ready to be included in the compliance filing next week.

Question by Ms. Ackerman: Does the rule prohibiting participation in other programs while doing P4P also apply to CHP? *Answer by Mr. Teter:* That is not the intent of the rule, and we can certainly make sure the language in the filing does not bar CHP participants from other programs. *Clarification by Ms. Ackerman:* And the rule for P4P only prohibits participation in other programs, like Custom or Prescriptive, if the project is taking place at the same facility. Correct? *Mr. Teter:* Correct.

Additional clarification by Mr. Ambrosio: And the rule disallows P4P participants from enrolling in all other Programs with the **exception** of CHP, right? *Answer by Mr. Teter:* Right. We will make sure to capture those details explicitly in the language.

Local Government Energy Audit:

- Establish discretionary process to evaluate higher entity caps for larger/higher density entities.
- Allow TRC to make recommendations to participants enrolled in LGEA while also attempting to participate in other programs simultaneously.

Comment by Ms. Ackerman (paraphrased): I am having trouble understanding the logic behind that (on the participant’s side). *Response by Mr. Teter:* We believe in some cases with an ongoing project, the person working on the audit side is unaware of someone else trying to do, say, a lighting retrofit project.

Ms. Ackerman questions the frequency of the above occurring; Mr. Teter explains that although it is not a common scenario, TRC has seen an uptick of LGEA participants applying for available measure incentives through, for example, SmartStart.

Clarification by Mr. Ambrosio: So TRC wants flexibility to tell participants to 1.) either do the audit, or the retrofit—not both. And 2.) if there’s a lighting retrofit going on concurrently with the audit, allow only the HVAC portion of the audit to be completed.

Comment by Ms. Ackerman: Based off of ERS’s recommendations, may an audit Program with a broader scope, or additional audit Programs, be looked in the future? *Response by Mr. Teter:* In the future, perhaps. *Comment by Mr. Ambrosio:* That is a debatable recommendation, which can be discussed.

- Raise minimum kW from 150 kW to 200 kW to align with P4P and DI.
- Enhance Outreach/Marketing.

Large Energy Users Program:

- Work with utilities to find eligible customers for Outreach purposes.
- Eliminate IRR requirement.

Combined Heat & Power/Fuel Cells:

- Change small-scale fixed incentives to a tiered incentive structure to create consistency across all system sizes (does not apply to Fuel Cells).
- Add clarification that incentives are paid per project/per site to avoid phased applications that may drive higher incentive dollar amounts with the new tiered structure.
- Revise entity cap language to apply a \$4 million dollar cap across the board, and a \$5 million dollar cap for facilities doing both CHP and other comprehensive EE work through other Programs.

Question by attendee: Are other EE Programs outside of NJCEP included in the above?

Response by Mr. Ambrosio: That data is not tracked.

Closing comment by Ms. Ackerman: This certainly deserves more discussion before anything is finalized. The last item for CHP that I wanted to address is: Staff recognizes the program has not received the amount of participation hoped-for. One of the recommendations in the CRA is to re-visit the program design and take a look at what other states are doing. CHP is poised for an overhaul in structure.

Residential Program - Honeywell

Fiscal Year 2016 Proposed Program Changes

“Existing Homes”/HPwES Tiered Incentives:

- Increase focus on whole house savings.
- Reward higher efficiency purchases with higher dollar-amount incentives.
- Offer broader range of financing options.
- Require insulation for each project.
- Expand duct sealing to increase per project savings.
- Restructure customer rebates.
- Decrease incentives, but offer higher loan amounts.

Question by Mr. Ambrosio: How did the industry react to the proposition of lower rebates, even with the higher available loan amounts? *Answer by Honeywell:* They were sensitive to monthly amount paid by the customer, and wanted to ensure it was kept around the \$100 mark per month.

- Lower qualifications for Tier 2 incentives to accommodate WARM/COOL customers who later wanted to participate in Home Performance.

Residential New Construction:

- Increase savings performance across all tiers.

- Re-structure rebate levels and begin to align incentives with IECC 2015 energy efficiency requirements.
- Add a “Tier 3+” level that includes DOE ZERH Renewable requirement.

Multi-Family High-Rise:

- Create variable incentive structure based on performance.
- Lower starting incentive-per-unit from \$750 to \$100 (up for debate).

Mr. Ambrosio turns to attendees for comments on the lowered incentive proposal.
Comment by Attendee (paraphrased): It is very far off. The interesting thing with High-Rise Multi-Family is that it’s eligible for two different Programs (RNC and P4P) and the incentives for each are so “out of whack” that it fails to capture any of the market.

Question by Mr. Ambrosio: So Multi-Family High-Rise can also participate in P4P?

Response by Attendee: That’s another point of clarification—the NJCEP will direct any building that is 7 stories or above to P4P, but you could make a case for these buildings to go through the Multi-Family High-Rise Program. Otherwise only a very small set of buildings qualify (4-5 story buildings with common HVAC or hot water systems). The incremental cost for Multi-Family High-Rise is much higher than, say, the incremental cost of doing Energy Star in a low-rise building, because it requires a design professional, registered architect, and professional engineer to do the verification process. So it stands to reason that the rebates for Multi-Family High Rise should be brought more in line with P4P.

Energy Efficient Products:

- Increase the amount of products eligible in the Program.
- Increase the number of retailers offering “point-of-sale” instant rebates.
- Creating a 2-Tier structure for clothes dryers, washing machines, and refrigerators.
- Lowering lighting incentives.
 - CFL incentives lowered (50 cents per standard CFL, \$1.50 per specialty CFL).
 - Maximum of \$8.00 per LED bulbs.
- Focus on LEDs.

WARM/COOLAdvantage:

- Include more equipment options for HVAC.
- Look at including ratings from other sources.
- Retaining tiered incentives
- Expand Manual-J sizing requirements to include more systems.
- Minimum efficiency for gas furnaces: 95% AFUE (across all units, not only Energy-Star listed).
- Overall, expand opportunities while lowering incentive levels.

Question by attendee: Any consideration of ductless mini-splits to Tier 2?

Answer by Kevin Burke: No, we hadn’t considered that—are there many models out there with a higher efficiency level? *Response by attendee*: Yes, about 20-25.

Final Goal Across All Residential Programs:

- Enhance training and Outreach to contractors.

Utility Updates

New Jersey Natural Gas:

- Program runs through June 30th, in line with NJCEP. There are many events coming up due to the spring season.
- 100,000th subscriber mark for “e-tips”.

South Jersey Gas:

- Approaching 3 year filing
- August public hearing
- Since programs expire June 30th, an extension may be needed in order to bridge the gap before the August meeting.

PSE&G’s filing was approved at this month’s Board meeting.

Other Business, Next Meeting

The next EE Meeting occurs on May 12th, 2015.

Name	Company	In Person	By Phone
Ackerman, Elizabeth	BPU	X	
Ambrosio, Mike	AEG	X	
Beke, Veronica	Division of Law		X
Boyd, Mary Jo	CSG	X	
Brynczka, Marc	Solix, Inc.		X
Burke, Kevin	Honeywell	X	
DeAngelis, Diana	PEPCO		X
DeLuca, Brian	TRC	X	
DeSeque, Julie	CSG	X	
Donnelly, Allison	ERS		X
Donohue, John	On behalf of Fuel Merchants Assoc	X	
Dupont, Hardley	PSE&G		X
Ellman, Susan	NJNG	X	
Evans, Deane	NJIT	X	
Evans, Frank	Willdan Energy Solutions	X	
Feinstein, Abby	Go Inspired Green		X
Foster, Rebecca	VEIC		X
Georgi, Anthony	Honeywell	X	
Gibson, Sarah	Brand Cool		X
Gordon, Rebecca	ACE		X

Grossman, Bruce	SJG	X	
Hoff, Kim	CSG	X	
Jones, Sherri	BPU	X	
Kudrick, Robert	DGCP		X
Lupse, Janja	CSG	X	
Miller, Ashley	TRC	X	
O'Donnell, Tony	Sustainable Jersey	X	
Palmer, Bill	Kamson Corp	X	
Perracchio, Anne-Marie	NJNG	X	
Rogers, Dan	ICF International	X	
Skok, Andy	FuelCell Energy		X
Slaten, Marisa	BPU	X	
Teter, Carl	TRC	X	
Valora, Sam	SJG	X	
Wong, Douglas	BC Express Inc		X
Zeglarski, Sandy	NJEDA		X
Zoppa, Bob	CSG		X
Zukas, Diane	TRC		X