

Farrell, Lauren (EEA)

From: v9558 [v9558@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 4:02 PM
To: Farrell, Lauren (EEA)
Subject: Energy policy review commission

Hi Lauren,

I am Vin McLaughlin from McLaughlin Weatherization. We are a long time weatherization contractor that has and continues to work for state low income programs and masssave program. There are 11 employees in our company and all have gone through extensive training to meet the high standard set by today's programs. Some of our employees have worked for us for up to 20years. We offer competitive pay ,health insurance ,vacation and personal time and treat our employees as a valued part of our success.

I feel that the two men on the commission who are there to represent the insulation community have a personal agenda and they misrepresent the companies that work for masssave. The Masssave program serves a valuable service to all homeowners that are eligible to be serviced. Most people today have a limited amount of money to spend on anything extra. That is the reason they max out rebates to multiple years instead of doing all the work that could be done in a single year. The average homeowner does not want or understand a deep energy retrofit and can not afford the cost therefore would do nothing instead of what they can barely afford in today's economy.

Masssave works! It works for company owners,employees and most importantly the homeowners that need to save money running their homes. I hope that it will be a part of our future since it has been a great success up to now.

Thank you,

Vin McLaughlin
McLaughlin Weatherization
Sent from my iPad

Farrell, Lauren (EEA)

From: Al Pellegrini [al@advancedenergyllc.com]
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 5:07 PM
To: Farrell, Lauren (EEA)
Subject: MassSave - IIC Contractor Advanced Energy Services, LLC

Hi Lauren,

We are reaching out to you regarding feedback about the MassSave Program lead vendor CSG.

We have been an approved MassSave IIC for almost 9 years. We feel CSG does an exceptional job running the program for NStar and NGrid.

CSG sets high standards that contractors must meet to be part of the program. My belief is that most good contractors are in the program. We constantly hear about below average contractors complaining about the program. If they had the ability to do quality work they would not have a problem getting work. Certain contractors blame the program for this instead of being accountable for their poor work quality.

CSG has been a great business partner for us. They always have your back when issues arise with customers, and I believe they fight to see that we are treated fairly. CSG payment terms are the best in the industry. When we started 9 years ago we were able to get paid on a weekly basis. This was crucial in our ability to stay in business when we first launched the company. We were able to pick up a check every Friday afternoon at CSG corporate in Westboro. Without CSG doing this we would never have survived.

We believe the pricing is fair. MassSave contractors don't have to spend any money on advertising and have jobs sent to them via email almost on a daily basis.

In our opinion it all comes down to work quality. CSG holds contractors to high standards if you don't do quality work you don't belong in the program. The contractors we know and have worked with in the program for many years are not the ones complaining. It's the contractors that can't execute the jobs to the standards of the program that seem to be the ones always complaining.

All contractors have the same opportunity for success in the program. CSG is constantly making changes to improve the program for contractors. If contractors can't stay in the program don't blame CSG.

We are grateful to CSG and the MassSave program for our thriving business. CSG training and support has helped guide us every step of the way. Please feel free to contact us if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Al Pellegrini
President
Advanced Energy Services, LLC
P.O. Box 87
Hopedale, MA 01747
508-634-1010

Farrell, Lauren (EEA)

From: Brogan Kusske [bkusske@myenergymonster.com]
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 4:56 PM
To: Farrell, Lauren (EEA)
Subject: Energy Policy Review Commission

Hi Lauren,

Thank you for your consideration and the opportunity to provide feedback on the Mass Save program.

I've been working in the Mass Save program as an HPC (Home Performance Contractor) since 2011. We've created 10 jobs have treated over 1000 homes these last couple years. Overall I'm a firm believer in the Mass Save program and Lead Agency model. In particular, Conservation Services Group has been instrumental in the success and growth of the energy efficiency industry in Massachusetts and my company has benefited from the positive impact they've had. The energy efficiency industry continues to grow as technologies improve and the awareness with home owners becomes more mainstream. The Mass Save model is highly relevant and serves as an important example to the rest of the country of what can be achieved.

Like all relevant programs Mass Save must continue to evolve and improve in order to maximize the return on investment for rate payers. Under the current program design HPCs and Lead Vendors compete against each other for customers. However, the Lead Vendor is responsible for the quality and compliance of HPCs which presents a significant conflict of interest. While some HPCs have been able to survive many have closed or opted out of the program and unless this design flaw is fully vetted and removed HPCs will continue to struggle thereby jeopardizing the sustainability of the HPC model and minimizing the potential of program savings.

The contractors I've met in the Mass Save program are very capable, quality individuals and I feel fortunate to associate myself with them. The Mass Save standards are extremely high, and rightfully so. Installing energy efficiency measures must be done with care, skill, and quality. Anything less puts the occupants at risk or minimizes savings. Mass Save, Lead Agencies, and the Utility Companies have played a vital role elevating the 'performance' of the Home Performance industry. And they have my full support as we continue to work together in this thriving and evolving market.

Best regards,

Brogan Kusske
Energy Monster
Worcester, MA

Farrell, Lauren (EEA)

From: Kyle Martin [kyle@bldgscience.com]
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 4:59 PM
To: Farrell, Lauren (EEA)
Subject: Response to Energy Policy Review Commission

My Name is Kyle Martin,

I am president of Building Science & Construction, We have been in IIC participant in this program for over two years

We employ anywhere from 5 to 10 employees, I find this this to be a great program with great potential for grow for employees as well as a company

We started off with 1 truck and now we have 3 and plan to add more

Kyle Martin/President



Building Science & Construction

P 781-353-2455

F 781-353-3104

kyle@bldgscience.com

Farrell, Lauren (EEA)

From: brian.iarussi@apexonewx.com
Sent: Saturday, October 26, 2013 12:13 PM
To: Farrell, Lauren (EEA)
Cc: Rick Taglienti
Subject: ApexOne Weatherization / Mass Save Participating Contractor

Hi Lauren,

My name is Brian Iarussi and I am the owner of ApexOne Weatherization. I have been a participating contractor for over a year in the program. I feel this program is outstanding for a bunch of reasons. The most important I believe is the reduction of the Carbon Footprint. Lowering our demand to burn energy etc. Since I have been in this program I haven't come across one customer we have performed work for that wasn't thrilled with the program. They cannot believe all the work they receive for such little out of pocket contribution. I could speak to some of my past customers and ask them for their comments etc if you would like some emails sent to you direct. I feel their voices should be heard on this subject as well.

Lastly I would like to give some kudos to CSG for their management of this program. They are very detailed with updates regarding the program, answering questions while on the job. They also upon request provide us with on the job mentoring for testing procedures we have to perform for the program. It also provides a living for me and my family and my employees. I feel strongly that this program should remain intact for many years in the future.

Regards,

Brian Iarussi
ApexOne Weatherization

Farrell, Lauren (EEA)

From: Joe Ryan [mvinsulation@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 9:05 AM
To: Farrell, Lauren (EEA)
Subject: Massave Program

Hello Lauren,

We have been performing Massave Program work for 4 plus years now. In the beginning it was myself and a helper advertising online and by word of mouth bringing in customers. We had to bid against other contractors, win the bid, collect payment from the homeowner and then process the rebate form so the customer could be reimbursed through the Program. Because of the evolution of the Program through CSG we have gone from one employee to thirteen full time employees in that span. Fair contractor pricing was implemented. Air sealing was introduced as part of the program. We went from just an insulation company that blew in attics and walls to a weatherization company that performs pre and a post blower door readings and combustion safety tests before actual weatherization. The program has required us to be lead safe certified and educated in that respect. Training has been provided for all our workers to become crew leaders and weatherization workers. A lot of improvements have taken place in the last four years and not without its bumps along the way. But there has been a concerted effort to get things right. I was skeptical at first when we went to Tier System but it definitely keeps everyone making an effort to get better at what we do. The system works and like all new programs there will be changes and improvements along the way. Four years ago this was just a discounted insulation opportunity. Now it is a viable program that saves customers on there energy costs, improves the value of their home and puts people to work in what still is a slow economy.

--

Thank you,

Joseph Ryan
Merrimack Valley Insulation
978-888-3495
Fax/978-663-0731
mvinsulation@gmail.com

Farrell, Lauren (EEA)

From: Rick Frehill [fre1insul@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 11:47 AM
To: Farrell, Lauren (EEA)
Subject: Energy Policy Review Commission

To Whom it may concern:

Our company is an active insulation contractor with Mass Save, and I would like to share my opinions and personal experience about the program.

First I would like to say that the most important component of the whole process is the customer.

With that being said, I believe that the inspection process is extremely important to the function of the program. It is the only way to be sure the customer is getting the quality of work they deserve from all the contractors. Anyone complaining about 100% inspections makes it seem suspect that they feel mediocrity or perhaps even less is acceptable. Nothing less than the highest quality of workmanship should always be the goal.

The second area that seems to be a concern for some is the fixed pricing. They feel it leads to poor quality. I don't believe fixed prices that are agreed to are the cause of poor quality simply because they are fixed. I do agree however that low prices do cause contractors to find "ways of making it work", which often means cutting corners. This is why making it a competitive bid situation would be harmful. It simply leads to price erosion in an effort to win more work leading eventually to the decline in the quality of the work.

It has been my personal experience in talking with the home owners of the Mass Save program that we have worked for, that they are pleased and amazed at the value of the work they were able to have done. It has also been said that if not for Mass Save they probably would not have done that work, but because it offered such a value they found it hard to pass it up. That to me sounds like the program is working. From a business point of view the program has been great. Payment turn around on invoices is extremely prompt and very reliable. Work orders are sent with reasonable regularity and there is nothing in the program that keeps a company from generating their own leads and customers. There is no limitation on the amount of work a company can do. If you want more work you can generate and sell more as they see fit.

So over all our company has been successful in our partnership with Mass Save. I would caution anyone looking to make drastic changes to a program like Mass Save that is an obvious benefit to those that we all agree are the most important the "customer". I agree nothing is perfect and we should always try to improve. I think that is the general feeling held by Mass Save and the participating contractors as a whole, which is why we have The Best Practices Group. So we can make beneficial changes in an organized manner that will help everyone.

Thank You,
Richard Frehill
Frehill Insulation Co.
247 High St.
Norwell, MA 02061

Farrell, Lauren (EEA)

From: westwind29@aol.com
Sent: Saturday, October 26, 2013 11:15 AM
To: Farrell, Lauren (EEA)
Subject: Hello

I have been doing insulation the past 36 yrs and have been involved in the Mass.Programs for the past 25 yrs.Have seen a lot of changes for the good,both on the Customer and Contractor side.It really irks me when I hear that the ones who complain the most are the ones who do below average work and charge 3 times as much! This is steeling! Your Programs makes it fair to the customers and keeps a watchful eye on the contractors.I am afraid that if you do change the program a lot of customers will not do any work at all but it will get rid of the shoddy people out there who are trying to get rich.
Thank you for your time.

Dennis Chicoine

New England Insulation Co.Inc.

Sent from my iPad

Farrell, Lauren (EEA)

From: hughsenenergy@gmail.com on behalf of Dan Driscoll [dan@hughsenenergy.com]
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 1:50 PM
To: Farrell, Lauren (EEA)
Subject: Public Comments to the Energy Policy Commission

Ms. Farrell: I am the owner of Hugh's Energy, an insulation firm that has been working in the energy conservation industry for almost 40 years. We've spent a lot of time working with the utility companies in demand side management for both single and multi family homes, reducing the carbon footprint of customers, long before the term popped into our daily vocabulary and national policies. Massachusetts has always been on the cutting edge of many that have led to changes through out the country. The Green Communities Act has certainly been one of them.

1. The creation of an energy conservation program, the development of such included public and private resources, by which initiating prescriptive measures that are clear and affordable to customers, utilize existing resources, and reduce the use of energy and therefore cost to customers is a winner.

2. The economic benefits are obvious - the reduction of the energy supply necessary to power the property of users - the professionalisation of the workforce involved in carrying out these programs - the growth of a new sector of the economy - recognition of the fact that it will be a number of remedial applications to reduce our energy consumption and not just that wished for 'silver bullet'.

3. The adoption of the International Energy Code in 2014 will ensure that new construction and substantial rehab can more effectively deal with energy conservation. The problem of dealing with the aged building stock in Massachusetts is being dealt with very effectively by the programs developed as a result of the Green Communities Act.

Thank you for the opportunity to add another view to this report to the Legislature and please don't hesitate to contact me for any additional information you may require.

Dan Driscoll
Hugh's Energy
781-686-9380
www.hughsenenergy.com

Farrell, Lauren (EEA)

From: save@energy-allstars.com
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 2:33 PM
To: Farrell, Lauren (EEA)
Subject: Energy Policy Review Commission

Good afternoon Lauren,

Thank you in advance for taking the time to read this message. I wanted to take a moment to share my personal and professional experience working within the MassSave program and its Lead Agencies, specifically Conservation Services Group, Nstar and Nationalgrid.

I'm a small business owner with 12 employees and started working in the MassSave program in 2010. Since starting to work within the MassSave program, I've learned a lot about the importance of energy efficiency and the impact that I'm able to make on a daily basis for our economy and the environment. In addition, I've been able to create jobs and sustain these jobs throughout the year. I also feel comfortable knowing that the "big picture" within the MassSave program works. If we do our job correctly, we lower homeowners energy bills and help them save money. I also feel that this is an industry that is still growing. As a small business owner I'm willing to take risks in order to grow and evolve with an industry and feel confident that Lead Agencies such as Conservation Services Group along with Program Administrators such as Nstar and Nationalgrid have the abilities and proven track record of success to ensure that I'll be able to provide for my employees and my family in the near and foreseeable future.

That said, don't get me wrong, it is certainly no easy task to be a successful contractor working within the MassSave program. There are many challenging aspects to this trade. There are many costly certifications to attain, many of which if not all require continual education and updating. The work that we do requires working within somebody's home which is typically their prized possession and largest investment. In order to be successful at this business you have to be willing to invest a lot of time, energy and money and constantly challenge yourself to constantly raise that bar year after year in order to progress along with this growing industry.

Another challenging item to the naked eye is the programs fixed pricing model. As a contractor that was able to charge a premium because we had new equipment, sharp uniforms and selfishly thought that we provided the best quality work in the Northeast; we were very disappointed when this was first announced several years back. After educating myself on how the program operates from a high level, it is clear to see how the fixed pricing model works. It takes the guessing games off of the home owners plate on if they're getting the right price or not. Why I'm in support of the fixed pricing model is that it ultimately ensures the success of the program. Budgets are able to more accurately form and be forecasted and met which in turn allows the entire program to grow and evolve which ultimately also ensures my success as a small business owner within the state of Massachusetts.

Throughout the years I've met a lot of contractors throughout Massachusetts within this trade. Without a doubt, the majority of the top contractors that I've met are working within the MassSave program. There are also many great contractors that I've come across that work within the new home construction field vs. existing homes which is an entirely different trade.

In summary the standards that the Utility Companies and the Lead Agencies have set forth within Massachusetts are certainly challenging but at the end of the day they must hold the bar set high as this is what makes the program successful as it is results driven.

Sincerely,

Josh Leet
Owner, Energy Allstars
Worcester, MA. 01613

Farrell, Lauren (EEA)

From: iic@accelerateenergy.com
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 2:28 PM
To: Farrell, Lauren (EEA)
Subject: Energy Policy

Good evening Lauren,

Accelerate Energy is a small home energy efficiency business working within the massave program and have been since 2009. The program has evolved every year and my business has grown because of it. The Lead Agencies like CSG and the programs administrators from Nstar and Nationalgrid have always been a pleasure to work with and are always focused on the success of the program.

Yes it is a challenging program and field to be successful in. There is a lot of competition and more everyday. We enjoy taking on that challenge and strive year after year to remain one of the top tier contractors within Massachusetts.

I'm in full support of our current program model ad look forward to the programs continued success!

Sincerely,

Patrick Burke
Accelerate Energy
Worcester, MA. 01607

Farrell, Lauren (EEA)

From: Dave Work email [david@rebelloconstruction.com]
Sent: Friday, October 25, 2013 5:44 PM
To: Farrell, Lauren (EEA)
Subject: comments on Mass Save program.

I am with Rebello Construction, a participating contractor with Mass Save. My comments are in response to the recent report from the Dep of Energy. We have been doing work for Mass Save thru CSG for over a year. The system is very fair and promotes high quality work through it's tier system of rewarding high grades for performance and good customer feedback. It encourages companies to provide internal quality controls to ensure good grades. We have expanded to run 3 trucks and would like to add 2 more before the end of the year.

David Hebert

Project Manager
Rebello Construction
2780 G.A.R. Highway – Box 28
Swansea, MA 02777
David@rebelloconstruction.com
Cell: 508-562-1653

Farrell, Lauren (EEA)

From: Chris Kapsambelis [chrisk@bdscorp.com]
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 3:34 PM
To: Farrell, Lauren (EEA)
Subject: Comments to the Energy Policy Review Commission

Members of the commission:

With the exception of Energy Efficiency (EE), the Green Communities Act (GCA) mandate for 25% RE by 2030 has proven to be counter-productive. A similar and more advanced experience is threatening the economic stability of Europe.

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/jamesconca/2013/10/20/european-economic-stability-threatened-by-renewable-energy-subsidies/>

In Europe, and Germany in particular, electric rates have skyrocketed and Green House Gas (GHG) has increased.

RE in the form of Wind Power is particularly objectionable. The variability and intermittent nature of wind is undependable in addressing peak demand, preventing any reduction of existing conventional capacity making the added capacity of wind an additional capacity expense. Theories that wind will lower the wholesale price of electricity fail to account for market dynamics that force the megawatt-hour of conventional power to increase. While we end up using less conventional energy, we are forced to pay a higher price because we cannot live with less conventional power in the system. Every power plant in the system must make a living.

Wind power is sold in long term Power Purchase Agreements (PPA) at above market prices. The Department of Public Utilities (DPU) appears to approve these contracts only on the competitive aspects within the availability of RE power, and without any competitive consideration to the availability of conventional power. This appears to be in conflict with their broad charge to seek the most economical sources of power, and is apparently justified by accepting the mandate of the GCA as paramount.

Since cost reduction is not possible with wind power, the only other justification is GHG reduction. As reported from Europe, GHG has increased there, and here there is evidence that the variable and intermittent nature of wind power requires the firming capacity of fossil fuel power which in turn suffers enough reduction in efficiency to the point where little to no carbon is avoided and in some circumstances GHG is increased.

Among the benefits of RE expansion is new job creation. I submit that more than doubling the cost of electricity will destroy more jobs than the RE industry can create.

I am particularly sensitive to the environmental damage and health impacts of industrial grade wind turbines. Installations in Falmouth, Fairhaven, Kingston, Scituate, Florida, Monroe and other communities have resulted in widespread complaints from residents forced to live in close proximity. MassDEP has found some of these installations are out of compliance with existing noise pollution regulations. We expect many more will be found out of compliance and many residents will be forced to take legal action to protect their quality of life.

In more remote areas, I am concerned about the practice of clear cutting tops of mountain ridges for wind turbine installations as well as clear cutting to build access roads to install and service these installations. Aside from the physical damage done to these forested lands, experts have voiced long term ecological concerns related to the flow of rain water down mountain slopes. Access roads act to channel the rain water directly to the valleys below depriving the mountain of water needed for growth and threatening the valley with increased flooding.

There are many reports that wind turbines kill birds (Eagles, Condors, Hawks, etc..) as well as bats. Any large number of kills among these species will have incalculable consequences on the ecology. This is particularly troubling in offshore installations where the habits of migratory birds are not well understood.

Given the anticipated high cost of proceeding with the mandate of the GCA, the questionable benefits of advancing RE to the economy and the environment, and the potential of ecological disaster to remote areas, I strongly recommend that a moratorium be set on any new wind turbine installations until the cost/benefit relationship can be examined and better understood.

Sincerely,

Chris Kapsambelis
PO Box 3439
Pocasset, MA 02559

Farrell, Lauren (EEA)

From: brianbutler@bostongreenbuilding.com on behalf of Brian Butler
[brian@bostongreenbuilding.com]
Sent: Friday, October 25, 2013 7:12 PM
To: Farrell, Lauren (EEA)
Cc: Metro Insulation (E-mail); Tom Regh; Thomas J Piper; rick@rogersinsulation.com; Ted Kidd; matt@efficiency.org; Mike Browne; Mike Duclos; Kates-Garnick, Barbara (EEA); Steve White; Tom Rossmassler; bkusske; david; dennis; domenico.galdo; fssfrontierenergy; gbweatherization; hmwrks; mark; paul; paulk; robert; savehomeenergy; tednoonan; thance; Geoff Chapin; adam; airtightllc; Al Pellegrini; alternativeweatherization; andy; atlanticpavingcorp; beauchemindesign; ben; Bob's Insulation; brian.iarussi; bruincorp; caleb; carl; carolyn; Carlos de Sousa; cedelisle1; charlesburr; Dolphin-Insulation; chris; csheehan02; dan; don.burnett; edwyer; Jim and Laurie Ellis; energystarbuilding; fnfenergysolutions; fre1insul; fredhopp; hankcassidy; hannah Kane; home.energy.solutions; housedoctorservices; hrhconstruction; hughsenenergy; info; insl8; insul8r58; insulation; jasm7059; jeffrey.benson; jim; Josh Leet; joe; joereilly997; john.carroll; john; joseph; karen; kenny; lifeisgood919; mjmccarthy90; mtmc1959; newenglandweatherizationllc; Bruce2 Morell; pattypell; paul; pburke; prell; ghi13; rclark; rob; robert.meehan; rocksolid; roland; rosterecker; sales; sales; salmons370; save; Jon Schippani; scott; Mike Carbonneau; smpkm33; stephanie.george; stevenowens; swilliamson; tpalm01; tshirley; tycasbraenergy; v9558; victor; vinnleb; westwind29; westwind297; Paul Johnson; Robert Calnan
Subject: Fwd: IIC's & HPC's URGENT & TIME SENSITIVE!! Your Response is Needed!

Dear Ms Farrell,

I was forwarded this email this evening (please see below), and I thought I should offer my take on this. My company, Boston Green Building are NOT insulation contractors nor Mass Save contractors. We perform Deep Energy Retrofits through the National Grid pilot program, so rudimentary weatherization is not really our battle to fight, though it does appear (as the email below illustrates) that there IS indeed a battle raging...

What I would like to offer on the matter is my disappointment with the complete lack of any attempt to verify results from dollars spent. There's been no shortage of self-congratulation from the Mass Save program, but unfortunately, no credible verification of results.

It was determined early on in the program's evolution that a baseline HERS rating would not be required, and instead an energy "assessment" would suffice. These assessments are not intended to establish a baseline of performance of these homes, but merely to point out some deficiencies in the home's systems or shell components through a cursory visual inspection.

Conversely, a HERS rater uses software to analyze the home as a comprehensive system that is the sum of its component parts: air leakage testing, furnace efficiency testing, duct leakage testing, measurement of the total shell area, glazing area, insulation depth, and efficacy, infrared camera inspection, domestic hot water usage and system efficiency, thermostats, appliances, etc.. This (a HERS rating) is the proper way to assess home performance, NOT by poking around in the attic and handing out a bag of light bulbs.

If you'll permit me an analogy: Would you trust an auto mechanic who takes a cursory visual look around your vehicle and suggests you replace your tires and your windshield wipers? Would you feel confident that you'd been presented with a thorough baseline analysis of the overall condition and performance potential of your car? No test equipment on the engine? No test drive? No inspection of the brakes? The transmission, the steering, emissions, etc...? So then why is a cursory glance OK for homes in the Commonwealth...? And how do we have any idea if this program is producing ANY results...? Are the utilities tracking reductions at the meter? NO. So what metric ARE they using...??? How can Mass Save be so successful? Successful at what? Handing out lightbulbs...??

We have highly skilled home energy performance analysts in Massachusetts (HERS raters) who can very accurately audit a home's performance baseline at the outset and then return post-weatherization work to document the success or failure of the improvements carried out by the IIC's. WHY DON'T WE DO THIS??? This is the primary failing of the current Mass Save methodology. I've spoken with numerous HERS raters who tell me that their primary source of business is NEW CONSTRUCTION...!! These professionals should be auditing our existing housing stock, not just new homes. This is New England, not New Mexico. We have OLD HOMES and the majority of them perform badly. If we expect REAL change in the Commonwealth, we need a major re-think of this program.

I offer this opinion, not out of spite to any stakeholder(s), but because I hope to move us towards efficiency and carbon reduction fast enough to hopefully stave off climate change in our time. Not going to happen this way...

Thank you,

Brian Butler
Boston Green Building
218 Lincoln St.
Allston, MA 02134
brian@bostongreenbuilding.com
www.bostongreenbuilding.com
O: [617 202 3777](tel:6172023777) (ext. 201)
C: [617 899 4512](tel:6178994512)



----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Rick Taglienti** <rick@rogersinsulation.com>
Date: Fri, Oct 25, 2013 at 4:18 PM
Subject: IIC's & HPC's URGENT & TIME SENSITIVE!! Your Response is Needed!
To: ricktaglienti@rogersinsulation.com

Good Afternoon,

[Thanks to Christine McEachern for pulling this email together!!](#)

This email directly impacts everyone one of you as a participating Mass Save contractor. Please take the time to read this and respond by this Monday, Oct 28th with your comments in support of the program.

We are working proactively to prevent this program from being dismantled. We need everyone to pull together and help us!

For those of you that don't know what the Energy Policy Review Commission is, let me explain. This commission is comprised of various members of our community who have to be appointed by members of our government. There are 2 members specifically that were appointed to this committee this past year who are insulation contractors but **DO NOT** participate in the Mass Save program. They have attended every monthly EEAC meeting in Boston over the last several years to make their case that the current HES program we all work in today doesn't work for contractors and isn't good for customers.

One of the jobs of this Energy Policy Review Commission is to submit a report to the Massachusetts legislature regarding our program and to make recommendations about how our program should function.

With that said, I have attached the final report the Energy Policy Review Commission is going to submit to the legislature. This report is riddled with inaccuracies and misconceptions about our program in an attempt to have it shut down. If we don't respond to this and set the record straight, the legislature may believe what is written and make **DRASTIC** changes to our program that could **NEGATIVELY** impact all of us.

Please read the email below and click "online here". This will bring you to the home page of the Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs. The final report link is on that home page if you wish to read the approx 100 page report. I have read through this and am highlighting below some key statements that were made by both of the appointed insulation contractors that again, **DO NOT** participate in our program. How these contractors think they can offer any feedback or suggestions about how it all operates and functions and what improvements should be made is interesting to say the least.

**THESE ARE A FEW OF THE STATEMENTS MADE BY THESE CONTRACTORS:
THIS IS BASED ON THEIR OPINION NOT FACTS:**

Page 69 &72- The program services are highly subsidized, making them appear less as incentives and more as handouts.

Page 81- Contractors are viewed by the PA's as expendable resources and not valued partners. (**I sit on BPWG with the PA's and this is completely FALSE!**)

Page 81- 100% quality control inspections and lack of transparency of inspection results and contractor scores.

Page 83- The lead vendors should have required proof of a building permit as part of the payment process.

Page 91- The fixed pricing strategy promotes the lowest common denominator (low performance, low quality, low customer service and low contractor motivation)

Page 91- The pricing is completely arbitrary and was devised without reasonable input from contractors themselves.

Page 96- The best contractors in the state choose not to participate in the Mass Save Program

Please feel free to respond to these points or any others if you wish. If you have positive things to say, this is your chance to show support for our program. Please submit your comments by this Monday, Oct 28th to lauren.farrell@state.ma.us.

If anyone has any questions, please feel free to call me at [\(617\)839-8975](tel:(617)839-8975).

Christine McEachern

McEachern Insulation Inc.

From: Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs [<mailto:Barbara.Kates-Garnick@state.ma.us>]

Sent: Friday, October 18, 2013 6:09 PM

Subject: Energy Policy Review Commission

If you're having trouble viewing this email, you may [see it online](#).

Share this:

Dear Massachusetts Energy Stakeholder,

You are receiving this notice from the Energy Policy Review Commission in compliance with its requirement to seek public comment and "consult with electric distribution companies, natural gas distribution companies, green businesses residing in the commonwealth and other interested parties" on the draft of the Commission's report.

This report and subsequent information can be found [online here](#). As is mandated by the statute, the Commission will be accepting public comments on the subjects being considered by the Commission. These topics include, but are not limited to:

1. Expanding renewable energy in the Commonwealth
2. Promoting energy efficiency in the Commonwealth
3. Encouraging business development and job creation in Massachusetts
4. Reducing costs associated with energy programs while maximizing benefits
5. Reducing cost of electricity for commercial industrial and residential customers
6. Increasing electricity reliability

The public comment period will run through October 28, 2013 at 5:00 PM. Please submit comments to Lauren Farrell at lauren.farrell@state.ma.us. You may also mail your comments to:

Lauren Farrell

100 Cambridge Street, 9th Floor

Boston, MA 02114

Comments submitted to the Commission will be posted online. Please include your contact information upon submittal. You can find more information on the Commission [online](#).

Sincerely,

Barbara Kates-Garnick

Undersecretary for Energy

Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs



100 Cambridge St. Suite 1020 | Boston, MA 02114 U

Rick Taglienti

225 Arlington Street

Framingham, MA 01702

Phone - [508-875-3700](tel:508-875-3700) Fax - [508-620-8935](tel:508-620-8935)

Farrell, Lauren (EEA)

From: conor mcinerney [lifeisgood919@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 25, 2013 8:19 PM
To: Ted Kidd
Cc: smpkm33; mtmc1959; Bob's Insulation; paul; stevenowens; mark; joereilly997; brian.iarussi; Thomas J Piper; tshirley; tpalm01; fnfenergysolutions; Kates-Garnick, Barbara (EEA); energystarbuilding; carolyn; westwind297; dan; john.carroll; bkusske; caleb; paul; robert; insul8r58; salmons370; roland; karen; jasm7059; pattypell; rick@rogersinsulation.com; airtightllc; gbweatherization; carl; rclark; scott; swilliamson; Josh Leet; andy; rocksolid; Farrell, Lauren (EEA); alternativeweatherization; home.energy.solutions; Dolphin-Insulation; Tom Regh; prell; tednoonan; stephanie.george; sales; hmwkrs; housedoctorservices; Bruce2 Morell; beauchemindesign; kenny; charlesburr; adam; fssfrontierenergy; don.burnett; Mike Browne; info; fre1insul; tycasbraenergy; hughsenenergy; cedelisle1; Geoff Chapin; hrhconstruction; Robert Calnan; Metro Insulation (E-mail); Matt Golden; thance; atlanticpavingcorp; Carlos de Sousa; Brian Butler; sales; chris; edwyer; joe; joseph; rob; mjmccarthy90; robert.meehan; pburke; jeffrey.benson; Al Pellegrini; paulk; hannah Kane; vinnleb; rosterecker; csheehan02; jim; ghi13; Jim and Laurie Ellis; ben; Steve White; bruincorp; insl8; victor; dennis; fredhops; save; hankcassidy; david; v9558; westwind29; domenic.galdo; Jon Schippani; Mike Duclos; newenglandweatherizationllc; Mike Carbonneau; john; insulation; Paul Johnson; savehomeenergy; Tom Rossmassler
Subject: Re: IIC's & HPC's URGENT & TIME SENSITIVE!! Your Response is Needed!

So....we can see who has the hidden agenda. We show measurable results on a daily basis. Blower doors don't lie. What is it that HERS raters do that we don't already do? Do you model homes for the 150.00 the program pays? I believe the auditors and installers do a hell of a lot with what they're given.

This hole dialogue is suspect.

In all honesty, I appreciate the feedback tonight. I believe you just got a large group of energy professionals ready to step up to the plate to defend what we do. Thank you.

On Oct 25, 2013 8:07 PM, "Ted Kidd" <tedkidd@eesny.com> wrote:

Nicely put Brian. When they congratulate themselves loudly and hide the real numbers, the real numbers are typically terrible.

Here are a few reports that have very disappointing numbers:

bit.ly/VTsucksToo - pg: es-9 Vermont realization - " the realization rate of 51% +/- 13% for fossil fuels was found to be within the range of some of the realization rates for natural gas savings found for other, similar programs" p es-1 In other words, our results suck, but about the same as everyone else.

<http://bit.ly/NYSERDAAndreattareport> - this "we suck less" report by NYSERDA indicates Mass Save grossly overpromises savings:

The MassSAVE program in Massachusetts is similar to NYSERDA's HPwES ...The impact evaluation for program year 2006 found that the realization rates of 0.76 for natural gas and 0.47 for electricity. (bottom p. 3)

Mass Save - If delivering 47 - 76¢ on the dollar promised is "GOOD," please define bad? At some point doesn't this become FRAUD?

DOE annual report shows SOMEBODY is getting a lot of money - <http://bit.ly/HPgiantConsumerRIPoff>
In NY \$5k facilitation cost per project (<http://bit.ly/5kperproject>) pales next to the \$13k I think is spent in CA.

The basic problems with these programs:

1. No feedback on results
2. No accountability for results
3. No clarity around objectives
4. No incentive for excellence

Hope for a good model may exist in Kansas of all places:

<http://bit.ly/MWEhowsmart>

<http://bit.ly/SOOOsmart>

I've outlined a solution - pay for negawatts. <http://bit.ly/TrustTransparencyTruth>

Hope this is helpful...

Sincerely,

Ted Kidd

(585) 205-8674 Direct

[Energy Efficiency Specialists](#)

[EES Blog](#)

Published Realization Rates - Let's take the "blind buy" out of home performance.

On Fri, Oct 25, 2013 at 7:11 PM, Brian Butler <brian@bostongreenbuilding.com> wrote:

Dear Ms Farrell,

I was forwarded this email this evening (please see below), and I thought I should offer my take on this. My company, Boston Green Building are NOT insulation contractors nor Mass Save contractors. We perform Deep Energy Retrofits through the National Grid pilot program, so rudimentary weatherization is not really our battle to fight, though it does appear (as the email below illustrates) that there IS indeed a battle raging...

What I would like to offer on the matter is my disappointment with the complete lack of any attempt to verify results from dollars spent. There's been no shortage of self-congratulation from the Mass Save program, but unfortunately, no credible verification of results.

It was determined early on in the program's evolution that a baseline HERS rating would not be required, and instead an energy "assessment" would suffice. These assessments are not intended to establish a baseline of performance of these homes, but merely to point out some deficiencies in the home's systems or shell components through a cursory visual inspection.

Conversely, a HERS rater uses software to analyze the home as a comprehensive system that is the sum of its component parts: air leakage testing, furnace efficiency testing, duct leakage testing, measurement of the total shell area, glazing area, insulation depth, and efficacy, infrared camera inspection, domestic hot water usage and system efficiency, thermostats, appliances, etc.. This (a HERS rating) is the proper way to assess home performance, NOT by poking around in the attic and handing out a bag of light bulbs.

If you'll permit me an analogy: Would you trust an auto mechanic who takes a cursory visual look around your vehicle and suggests you replace your tires and your windshield wipers? Would you feel confident that you'd

been presented with a thorough baseline analysis of the overall condition and performance potential of your car? No test equipment on the engine? No test drive? No inspection of the brakes? The transmission, the steering, emissions, etc...? So then why is a cursory glance OK for homes in the Commonwealth...? And how do we have any idea if this program is producing ANY results...? Are the utilities tracking reductions at the meter? NO. So what metric ARE they using...??? How can Mass Save be so successful? Successful at what? Handing out lightbulbs...??

We have highly skilled home energy performance analysts in Massachusetts (HERS raters) who can very accurately audit a home's performance baseline at the outset and then return post-weatherization work to document the success or failure of the improvements carried out by the IIC's. WHY DON'T WE DO THIS ...??? This is the primary failing of the current Mass Save methodology. I've spoken with numerous HERS raters who tell me that their primary source of business is NEW CONSTRUCTION...!! These professionals should be auditing our existing housing stock, not just new homes. This is New England, not New Mexico. We have OLD HOMES and the majority of them perform badly. If we expect REAL change in the Commonwealth, we need a major re-think of this program.

I offer this opinion, not out of spite to any stakeholder(s), but because I hope to move us towards efficiency and carbon reduction fast enough to hopefully stave off climate change in our time. Not going to happen this way...

Thank you,

Brian Butler
Boston Green Building
218 Lincoln St.
Allston, MA 02134
brian@bostongreenbuilding.com
www.bostongreenbuilding.com
O: 617 202 3777 (ext. 201)
C: 617 899 4512



----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Rick Taglienti** <rick@rogersinsulation.com>
Date: Fri, Oct 25, 2013 at 4:18 PM
Subject: IIC's & HPC's URGENT & TIME SENSITIVE!! Your Response is Needed!
To: ricktaglienti@rogersinsulation.com

Good Afternoon,

Thanks to Christine McEachern for pulling this email together!!