

"Noreen Cullen" <noreen@faeryspirit.com>

02/06/2008 12:40 PM

To: gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: YES

Dear Ms. Deans;

I am writing to you in support of the proposed Integrated Resource Plan put forward by CL&P and UI.

I urge the CEAB members to support the utility plan, and in particular, Recommendation 1: Maximize the use of demand side management (DSM), within practical operational and economic limits, to reduce peak load and energy consumption, and to fund the "DSM-Focus" scenario.

The Plan (and ultimately the DPUC) should specifically require the utilities to increase funding for efficiency programs as described in the "DSM-Focus" scenario.

The CEAB should support Recommendation 1 and the DSM-Focus Scenario and recommend that the DPUC require that this scenario be funded.

Reducing the states energy consumption and peak demand are essential to meeting the state's climate and environmental goals. The increased funding scenario in the proposed plan gets us on that pathway.

Thank you,  
Noreen P. Cullen  
30 Delmar Rd  
Glastonbury, CT 06033

**CT Sierra Club <sierraclub@sbcglobal.net>**

02/06/2008 12:25 PM

To: gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: Draft State energy resource plan

Dear Mr. Deans

As the State Program Director for the CT Sierra Club and as a private citizen, I am encouraging the maximization of demand side management in the state's energy plan for many reasons.

Maximizing the funds for energy efficiency will help the environment by cutting down our SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. It will help electric users by cutting their bills. It will go the farthest in meeting the commitment to procuring energy efficiency laid out in the 2007 energy bill. It's also the least cost path to meeting our energy needs. (I hesitate to use the term "needs" because there is a wide line between "needs" and "wants.")

We have now moved into an era of scarce and expensive energy; in the traditional sense. Many people point to quality of life issues in CT and whether we can keep a competitive job market. Without a greater emphasis on energy efficiency, both these issues will be talked about in the past tense.

Sincerely

John D Calandrelli  
CT Sierra Club  
645 Farmington Ave  
Hartford, CT 06105  
860-236-4405

**"Nancy Brockett" <nancysoulsupport@gmail.com>**

02/06/2008 11:53 AM

To: [gdeans@cerc.com](mailto:gdeans@cerc.com)

SUPPORT for Integrated Resource Plan

I am registering my support for the efficiency investment proposal made by UI & CL&P in their Integrated Resource Plan for Connecticut.

I strongly call for the CEAB members to support the utility plan, and in particular Recommendation 1: Maximize the use of demand side management (DSM), within practical operational and economic limits, to reduce peak load and energy consumption, and to fund the "DSM-Focus" scenario.

I believe that the Plan (and ultimately the DPUC) should specifically require the utilities to increase funding for efficiency programs as described in the "DSM-Focus" scenario.

Reducing the state's energy consumption and peak demand is essential to meeting the state's climate and environmental goals.

The increased funding scenario in the proposed plan gets us "on the road" to that ultimate goal.

Thank you,

Nancy Brockett, PhD  
Soul Support Companies, LLC  
860-223-2232  
[nancysoulsupport@gmail.com](mailto:nancysoulsupport@gmail.com)  
[www.soul-support.org](http://www.soul-support.org)

**tom mccormick <mccormickt@snet.net>**

02/06/2008 01:26 PM

To: gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: cl&p energy plan

Please support their plan to safe energy cost and clean the air. Additionally make sure that the proposal is of a size that maxes out efficiency possibilities. The question is: Is this plan adequate? Can more be done? Also, please support federal spending in his are.

On a different tract: Oppose Lieberman , who rather spend money fighting an oil war. Just think of what an equivalent amount of money spent on conservation would have brought us.

**Suzy Enos <suzyenos@yahoo.com>**

02/06/2008 01:23 PM

To: gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: In support of the efficiency investment proposal by CL&P and UI

Ms Deans,

I had the opportunity to catch a legislative hearing on the use of peak power plants last summer. What I took away from the hearing was that we use our most inefficient and polluting power plants when peak power is needed. I suppose that makes sense but it makes conservation that much more important. Our first conservation efforts will be our most valuable.

I believe the proposal made by UI & CL&P in their Integrated Resource Plan for Connecticut are the right next steps. We need to invest in reducing demand. It's an added benefit that the cost of programs in this area are the most cost effective option compared to creating additional capacity.

I urge the CEAB to support this proposal. There's only so much we little people can do. We need our leaders to take the big steps for us.

Regards,  
Suzy Enos  
33 Bahre Corner Rd  
Canton CT

**EECOStar@aol.com**

02/06/2008 11:53 AM  
TO: gdeans@cerc.com

Re: Support "DSM Focus"

Dear Sirs and Madams of the CEAB:

I am writing a brief email in support of the proposal by CL&P and UI to seek out and implement demand side management(DSM) strategies for energy efficiency savings and peak power demand reductions. The noted national energy advisor and advocate Amory Lovins of the Rocky Mountain Institute has long known and maintained that solutions to our national electrical energy needs lie in the "nega-watts" we don't use or need through savings in efficiency. Now, as our state focuses at long last on the multiple environmental and geopolitical problems that come from increasing energy production from finite and dangerous sources, the first and most cost effective strategy comes from managing the demand side of our electrical grid. It is never easy to put the horses,i.e.,kilowatts, back in the barn once they get out, but UI and CL&P have the means and the reach to interact with their customers to create positive changes in energy demand for the sake of air quality and energy security by instituting efficiency incentives and lowering peak power demands.

I encourage the CEAB to support the utilities long overdue proposal to manage the demand side of their grid and once and for all, to take the message of Amory Lovins "nega-watts" to the energy marketplace. Connecticut is becoming a national leader among the states in addressing the dangers of global warming and air pollution emitted from dirty power production. We have put in place renewable energy standards, joined in the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, and now have a real chance of managing the demand side for electricity savings that will show other states the way to a brighter future. I encourage everyone to get behind this simple and infinitely intelligent part of our energy solutions.

Thank you for your work,

Starling W. Childs  
109 Litchfield Rd  
Norfolk, CT 06058  
860 542 5569

"farmernevin" <farmernevin@earthlink.net>  
02/06/2008 11:51 AM

To: gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: Energy Efficiency Spending Proposal

Greetings,

I would like to express my support for CL&P and UI 's proposal to increase spending on energy efficiency programs.

Energy efficiency is the easiest, most cost effective, and quickest thing we can do to improve our energy situation and begin reduction of greenhouse gasses that promote global warming.

I need to scoot out of the house right now so I won't have time for all the details..but you know them.

Thankyou,

Nevin E Christensen  
Simsbury, CT

860-651-5798

**"Kevin Kamps" <kevin@beyondnuclear.org>**  
02/06/2008 11:36 AM

To: gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: Public comments on energy efficiency

G. Deans  
CERC  
805 Brook St., Bldg. 4  
Rocky Hill, CT 06067

Dear G. Deans,

On behalf of our members and supporters in Connecticut, we submit the following comments.

\* The 2007 energy bill made a commitment to meet the state's energy requirements by first procuring all available energy efficiency and demand-side resources that are cost-effective, reliable and feasible.

\* Although the time frame was short to develop such a plan, the utilities built on ongoing cooperative work with the Energy Conservation Management Board (ECMB) and developed a plan that calls for one immediate action item, namely increased investments in energy efficiency programs.

\* We call upon the CEAB members to support the utility plan, and in particular Recommendation 1: Maximize the use of demand side management (DSM), within practical operational and economic limits, to reduce peak load and energy consumption, and to fund the "DSM-Focus" scenario. (emphasis added)

\* The Plan (and ultimately the DPUC) should specifically require the utilities to increase funding for efficiency programs as described in the "DSM-Focus" scenario:

\* The CEAB should support Recommendation 1 and the DSM-Focus Scenario and recommend that the DPUC require that this scenario be funded.

\* Funding increased to at least \$116 million in 2008, \$135 million in 2009, \$177 million in 2010, and on as described

\* This is both the lowest cost pathway for the state and mandated by 2007 energy bill

\* Additional energy efficiency investments should be considered within a framework of total costs, recognizing that they save consumers at least 3 dollars for every dollar invested.

\* Reducing the states energy consumption and peak demand are essential to meeting the state's climate and environmental goals and the increased funding scenario in the proposed plan gets us on that pathway

\* The energy savings will significantly assist the state meet its environmental goals - based marginal emissions in New England the level of energy savings in the DSM-Focus Scenario through 2015 are roughly equivalent to

\* 14 thousand tons of SO<sub>2</sub>, a primary contributor to acid rain

\* 4.4 thousand tons of NO<sub>x</sub>, a primary contributor to ozone, haze, and respiratory health problems

\* 9 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub>, the primary greenhouse gas

\* Other elements of the plan could use improvement but we do not believe this should delay action on the efficiency portion of the plan. Many of the other elements may be best addressed in the 2009 plan.

Efficiency is the low hanging fruit. There is so much potential. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kevin Kamps  
Radioactive Waste Watchdog  
Beyond Nuclear  
6930 Carroll Avenue, Suite 400  
Takoma Park, Maryland 20912

Office phone: (301) 270-2209

Cell phone: (240) 462-3216

Fax: (301) 270-4000

kevin@beyondnuclear.org

[www.beyondnuclear.org](http://www.beyondnuclear.org)

**Eleanore Milardo <running.water@sbcglobal.net>**

02/06/2008 11:26 AM  
To: gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: efficiency proposal

I support efficiency investment proposal made by UI and CI&P.

Eleanore Milardo in Middletown

**Lily Flannigan <lilyesther@aol.com>**

02/06/2008 02:02 PM  
To: gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: State Electricity Plan

Gentlemen,

As a UI customer I agree that their recent plan presented to the Connecticut Energy Advisory Board (CEAB) identifies efficiency as the lowest cost resource to meet the state's energy needs and recommends significant increases in efficiency spending that are lower cost than equivalent supply resources.

Additional energy efficiency investments save consumers at least 3 dollars for every dollar invested.

As a young woman, I worked for the UI in 1958-1962 when we encouraged major increases of electric use. Now, 50 years later, we need to encourage conservation as we are using up the earth's resources while the world population increases. I want to leave my grandchildren some choices in how they live. "Half a loaf" of energy for today's population may leave "half a loaf" for the future.

I encourage you to encourage efficient use of energy by extending the rebate programs for efficient appliances.

Lily Flannigan  
44 Prospect St.  
Milford, CT 06460  
203-876-9996  
[Lilyesther@aol.com](mailto:Lilyesther@aol.com)

**"jelatus" <jelatus@comcast.net>**

02/06/2008 02:30 PM

To: gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: support utilities' energy efficiency plans

Dear Connecticut Energy Advisory Board members:

I strongly support the energy efficiency investment proposal made by UI & CL&P in their Integrated Resource Plan for Connecticut, and urge that you do the same. The energy savings will significantly assist the state in meeting its environmental goals.

Sincerely,  
Jane Latus  
8 Uplands Dr.  
Canton, CT 06019

**Thomas Adamski <tomadamski@sbcglobal.net>**

02/06/2008 08:58 AM

To: gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: Energy efficiency

I strongly urge CEAB to support the efficiency investment proposal made by UI & CL&P in their Integrated Resource Plan for Connecticut. Energy efficiency should be the first order of business in meeting peak electricity demand in Connecticut.

The CEAB should support Recommendation 1 and the DSM-Focus Scenario and recommend that the DPUC require that this scenario be funded.

Sincerely,

Tom Adamski  
17 Council Dr  
Oxford CT 06478-1663

**christopher petersen <petersentheteacher@yahoo.com>**

02/06/2008 07:52 AM

To: gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: UI & CL&P Integrated Resource Plan

I am writing in support of a plan that reduces peak load energy demands and increases energy efficiency. I support the plan that reduces the amount of carbon that is released into the environment and at the same time reduces the end cost of energy to consumers.

Thank you,

Chris Petersen  
63 Eastbrook Heights Apt. C  
Mansfield, CT 06250

**"kensek" <kensek@cox.net>**

02/05/2008 07:22 PM

To: gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: Efficiency Is Important

Dear Sir,

I am sending this e-mail to let you know that I strongly support the proposal by CL&P and UI to increase spending on energy efficiency programs to eliminate peak demand and energy consumption in Connecticut.

I hope the CEAB members will support the utility plan, and in particular Recommendation 1 and the DSM-Focus scenario and recommend that the DPUC require that this scenario be funded. Funding should be increased to at least \$116 million in 2008, \$135 million in 2009, \$177 million in 2010, and on as described.

The resulting energy savings will significantly assist the state to meet its environmental goals - based marginal emissions in New England the level of energy savings in the DSM-Focus Scenario through 2015 are roughly equivalent to 14,000 tons of SO<sub>2</sub>, 4,400 tons of NO<sub>x</sub>, and 9 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub>. Other elements of the plan could use improvement, but I do not believe this should delay action on the efficiency portion of the plan. Many of the other elements may be best addressed in the 2009 plan.

As a resident of Connecticut, I believe that we must do something now, and you are in a position to help take that first step.

Thank you.

Kenneth S. Sek  
285 Griffin Road  
South Windsor, CT 06074-1356  
(860) 644-9405  
[KenSek@Cox.net](mailto:KenSek@Cox.net)

**Janet Heller <janet.heller@snet.net>**

02/05/2008 01:22 PM  
To: gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: Support for Energy Efficiency Investment proposal by CL&P and UI

To: the Connecticut Energy Advisory Board  
From: Janet Heller Manchester CT  
Re: The draft state energy plan

To whom it may concern:

I strongly support maximizing our investments in energy efficiency to meet our power needs. I am totally opposed to new coal or nuclear power plants. Energy efficiency needs to be our primary and most cost effective method of managing our energy needs and reducing our dependence on foreign fossil fuels while reducing the ever more serious problems associated with global warming. We need to greatly increase investment in renewable energy sources.

I support the efficiency investment proposal submitted by CL&P and UI in their integrated resource plan for CT. These programs are by far the most cost effective way to reduce energy usage, save money for consumers and tax payers and protect our climate and environment. I took part in a "Home energy solutions" program for my house and it was helpful. I was already working hard to reduce energy use. For people who have not yet taken such steps these programs need to be advertised and spread so many others can reap the advantages and benefit us all. Please make sure the funding for such programs is adequate going forward.

Thank you,  
Janet Heller

**Miriam Kurland <mimbck@yahoo.com>**

02/05/2008 12:38 PM

gdeans@cerc.com

support the efficiency investment proposal

I would like to express my support of the efficiency investment proposal made by UI & CL&P in their Integrated Resource Plan for Connecticut. This 2007 energy bill made a commitment to meet the state's energy requirements by first procuring all available energy efficiency and demand-side resources that are cost-effective, reliable and feasible.

Although the time frame was short to develop such a plan, the utilities built on ongoing cooperative work with the Energy Conservation Management Board (ECMB) and developed a plan that calls for one immediate action item, namely increased investments in energy efficiency programs.

I would like to call upon the CEAB members to support the utility plan, and in particular Recommendation 1: Maximize the use of demand side management (DSM), within practical operational and economic limits, to reduce peak load and energy consumption, and to fund the "DSM-Focus" scenario.

The Plan (and ultimately the DPUC) should specifically require the utilities to increase funding for efficiency programs. Reducing the states energy consumption and peak demand are essential to meeting the state's climate and environmental goals.

The energy savings will significantly assist the state meet its environmental goals - based marginal emissions in New England the level of energy savings in the DSM-Focus Scenario through 2015 are roughly equivalent to

**14 thousand tons of SO<sub>2</sub>, a primary contributor to acid rain**

**4.4 thousand tons of NO<sub>x</sub>, a primary contributor to ozone, haze, and respiratory health problems**

**9 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub>, the primary greenhouse gas**

Other elements of the plan could use improvement but we do not believe this should delay action on the efficiency portion of the plan. Many of the other elements may be best addressed in the 2009 plan. For one, nuclear energy should not be included in any energy plan. Besides the obvious dangers, waste problems, and environmental and health concerns with nuclear energy, it is extremely more cost effective to develop renewable, natural energy sources and encourage local public energy initiatives to accomplish it.

Thank you, Miriam Kurland

**christopher zurcher <cjzurcher@yahoo.com>**

02/04/2008 04:13 PM

To: gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: support of energy efficiency proposal by CLP and UI

I'm writing to express my support of the proposal by CL&P and UI to increase spending on energy efficiency programs to eliminate peak demand and energy consumption in the state.

Their recent plan presented to the Connecticut Energy Advisory Board (CEAB) identifies efficiency as the lowest cost resource to meet the state's energy needs and recommends significant increases in efficiency spending that are lower cost than equivalent supply resources.

I don't think I will be able to make it to the public hearing February 11th at 4:00 PM in Hartford at the Legislative Office Building (Room 2D), so Please accept my comments as a public comment on the uccompanies' plan.

Thank you very much.

Christopher Zurcher

[www.cjzurcher.com](http://www.cjzurcher.com)

[www.ctenvironmentalheadlines.com](http://www.ctenvironmentalheadlines.com)

(203) 886-5905

-----

**Dawn Kruger <ddmtkruger@comcast.net>**

02/06/2008 02:56 PM  
To: gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: Energy efficiency

Mr. Deans

Im an concerned citizen of Connecticut writing to request that you support the proposed CL&P and UI increased spending on energy efficiency i believe that every dollar spent on energy efficiency saves many dollars and helps meet our goals for clean, water, air and reduced green house gas emissions. The people of our state are ready and want to support actions that will help insure a stable clean energy supply.

Sincerely,

Dawn Kruger,

171 Ridgewood Rd.

West Hartford CT

**"Barbara Backman" <barbara\_backman@missporters.org>**

02/06/2008 03:22 PM  
gdeans@cerc.com

Please support DSM-Focus

I urge the CEAB to support Recommendation 1 and the DSM-Focus Scenario and I recommend that the DPUC require that this scenario be funded.

This is both the lowest cost pathway for the state and mandated by 2007 energy bill

Additional energy efficiency investments should be considered within a framework of total costs, recognizing that they save consumers at least 3 dollars for every dollar invested.

Reducing the states energy consumption and peak demand are essential to meeting the state's climate and environmental goals and the increased funding scenario in the proposed plan gets us on that pathway

Thank you,

Barbara Backman  
PO Box 1065  
Canton, CT 06019  
[bback@att.net](mailto:bback@att.net)  
860-693-2538

"Shelley Reuben" <shelley.reuben@snet.net>

02/06/2008 04:08 PM

To: gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: Please Support Energy Efficiency Programs

I am writing you this message in support of the proposal by CL&P and UI to increase spending on energy efficiency programs to eliminate peak demand and energy consumption in the state. Their recent plan presented to the Connecticut Energy Advisory Board identifies efficiency as the lowest cost resource to meet the state's energy needs and recommends significant increases in efficiency spending that are lower cost than equivalent supply resources.

The 2007 energy bill made a commitment to meet the state's energy requirements by first procuring all available energy efficiency and demand-side resources that are cost-effective, reliable and feasible.

Although the time frame was short to develop such a plan, the utilities built on ongoing cooperative work with the Energy Conservation Management Board (ECMB) and developed a plan that calls for one immediate action item, namely increased investments in energy efficiency programs.

Please support the utility plan, and in particular Recommendation 1: Maximize the use of demand side management (DSM), within practical operational and economic limits, to reduce peak load and energy consumption, and to fund the "DSM-Focus" scenario.

The Plan (and ultimately the DPUC) should specifically require the utilities to increase funding for efficiency programs as described in the "DSM-Focus" scenario:

The CEAB should support Recommendation 1 and the DSM-Focus Scenario and recommend that the DPUC require that this scenario be funded.

Funding increased to at least \$116 million in 2008, \$135 million in 2009, \$177 million in 2010, and on.

Additional energy efficiency investments should be considered within a framework of total costs, recognizing that they save consumers at least 3 dollars for every dollar invested.

Reducing the states energy consumption and peak demand are essential to meeting the state's climate and environmental goals and the increased funding scenario in the proposed plan gets us on that pathway.

The energy savings will significantly assist the state meet its environmental goals - based marginal emissions in New England the level of energy savings in the DSM-Focus Scenario through 2015 are roughly equivalent to

- 14 thousand tons of SO<sub>2</sub>, a primary contributor to acid rain
- 4.4 thousand tons of NO<sub>x</sub>, a primary contributor to ozone, haze, and respiratory health problems
- 9 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub>, the primary greenhouse gas

Other elements of the plan could use improvement but we do not believe this should delay action on the efficiency portion of the plan. Many of the other elements may be best addressed in the 2009 plan.

Thank you,

Rochelle Reuben

"Theresa Barger" <theresasb@sbcglobal.net>

02/07/2008 01:44 PM

gdeans@cerc.com

invest in energy efficiency

Dear Connecticut Energy Advisory Board members,

I'm writing in support of a proposal by CL&P and UI to increase spending on energy efficiency programs to eliminate peak demand and energy consumption in the state.

\* The 2007 energy bill made a commitment to meet the state's energy requirements by first procuring all available energy efficiency and demand-side resources that are cost-effective, reliable and feasible.

\* The utilities built on ongoing cooperative work with the Energy Conservation Management Board (ECMB) and developed a plan that calls for one immediate action item, namely increased investments in energy efficiency programs.

\* Please support the utility plan, and in particular Recommendation 1: Maximize the use of demand side management (DSM), within practical operational and economic limits, to reduce peak load and energy consumption, and to fund the "DSM-Focus" scenario.

\* The Plan (and ultimately the DPUC) should specifically require the utilities to increase funding for efficiency programs as described in the "DSM-Focus" scenario: This is both the lowest cost pathway for the state and mandated by 2007 energy bill.

\* Additional energy efficiency investments should be considered within a framework of total costs, recognizing that they save consumers at least \$3 for every dollar invested.

\* Reducing the state's energy consumption and peak demand are essential to meeting the state's climate and environmental goals and the increased funding scenario in the proposed plan gets us on that pathway. If consumers could lower their electric bills by running appliances during off-peak hours, budget-conscious consumers would do so, thereby reducing peak load and energy consumption. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Theresa Sullivan Barger  
8 Pond Road  
Canton, CT 06019

**"Starr, Leslie" <lstarr@wesleyan.edu>**

02/07/2008 12:55 PM

To: "gdeans@cerc.com" <gdeans@cerc.com>

Subject: Comment on draft state energy plan

Dear Mx. Dean:

I am writing to support the proposal by CL&P and UI to increase their spending on energy efficiency programs. As a concerned citizen, these programs will be most effective in helping all of us conserve energy, and that is much smarter than trying to find or build new energy sources. I am a fan of energy audits, CFL bulbs, insulation, and sweaters.

The plan that I understand is best for this is recommendation 1 -- to maximize the use of "demand side management" to reduce peak load and energy consumption, and to fund the "DSM-Focus" scenario. Funding should be increased to at least \$116 million in 2008, \$135 million for 2009, \$177 million in 2010, and so on as described in the scenario.

If there is any other information I should include to support this recommendation, please let me know. Thank you for considering my message.

Leslie Starr  
11 Clark Road  
Haddam, CT 06438  
(860) 345-3538 home  
(860) 685-7725 work

**Don Watson <lakesidedj@aol.com>**

02/07/2008 12:19 PM

To: gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: Support CL&P/UI plan for DSM-Focus scenario

I support and urge acceptance and funding of the CL&P/UI to increase DSM actions to maximum.

Donald Watson, Architect  
member, Town of Trumbull Conservation Commission

**ALBERT GRANT** <albert\_grant@sbcglobal.net>

02/07/2008 11:42 AM

To: gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: energy bill

I am writing to voice my support for immediate action in energy efficiency programs by the utility companies and that they increase funding towards that end. This should be a first step toward meeting the state's energy requirements.

I urge CEAB members to support the utility plan and in particular Recommendation 1: Maximize the use of demand side management (DSM) within practical operational and economic limits, to reduce peak load and energy consumption and to fund the DSM-Focus scenario.

Efficiency is the lowest cost resource to meet the state's energy needs and efficiency spending costs are lower than equivalent supply resources.

Reducing the state's energy consumption and peak demand is also essential in meeting the state's climate and environmental goals.

Sincerely,

Donna Grant  
128 Melrose Rd.  
Melrose CT 06016

**Denise Clapsaddle <denisemay@yahoo.com>**

02/07/2008 10:56 AM

Subject: gdeans@cerc.com

To: Connecticut Energy Plan

I am writing to support the efficiency investment proposal made by UI & CL&P in their Integrated Resource Plan for Connecticut. I know firsthand that a small investment in efficiency can reap big results.

I am a CL & P customer who participated in the 2007 Summer Saver program. During the summer billing period, I cut my consumption of electricity by 26.52%.

My investment was relatively small. I purchased a new room air conditioner to replace an old one that had broken, and replaced most of my incandescent light bulbs with compact fluorescent bulbs. In addition, I eliminated a second room air conditioner. Instead of running an air conditioner in my living room, I replaced my curtains with darker colored ones at a cost of about \$20 total, and kept the curtains closed when the sun shone directly on the windows. Most days I met or exceeded my goal of keeping the house at 78 degrees F or cooler. A couple of days when the temps outside reached 100 F or more, the warmest part of the house was 80 degrees F for a few hours, but it still felt nice and cool when we came in from outside.

Imagine if every Connecticut power user cut their electricity usage by 26.52 % or more during the peak usage times.

There is so much more my family and others like it can do to reduce our consumption, such as purchase energy star appliances, or dry our clothes outside on the line. (We do one or two loads per day on average, and always use an electric dryer.)

Conservation is a powerful tool that can help our state meet its energy needs in the future, but it needs strong support to make it succeed.

Denise Clapsaddle  
18 Hill Street  
Riverton, CT 06790  
(860) 618-3114

JFriedeco@aol.com

02/07/2008 10:50 AM

gdeans@cerc.com

Supporting the Energy Efficiency Investment Proposal

**PACE (PEOPLE'S ACTION FOR CLEAN ENERGY, INC.) IS STRONGLY IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSAL BY CL&P AND UI TO INCREASE SPENDING ON ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAMS TO ELIMINATE PEAK DEMAND AND ENERGY CONSUMPTION IN CONNECTICUT.**

**IT IS THE FEELING OF EACH OF OUR MEMBERS THAT ENERGY EFFICIENCY IS THE SAFEST, CLEANEST, FASTEST AND LEAST-COST SOLUTION TO THE CHALLENGES THAT WE FACE.**

**WE BELIEVE THAT EVERY EFFORT SHOULD BE MADE TO PROCURE ALL AVAILABLE DEMAND-SIDE RESOURCES THAT ARE RELIABLE AND PRACTICAL.**

**THE PLAN SHOULD REQUIRE THE UTILITIES TO INCREASE FUNDING FOR EFFICIENCY PROGRAMS (DSM-FOCUS).**

**SINCE MANY OF OUR CITIZENS SUFFER FROM HEALTH PROBLEMS AND WILL SUFFER IN THE FUTURE, WE URGE CEAB TO USE THIS OPPORTUNITY...ESPECIALLY SINCE IT IS THE CHEAPEST AND ALSO MANDATED BY THE 2007 ENERGY BILL.**

**THANK YOU FOR YOUR WORK AND FOR THIS IMPORTANT ECONOMIC, HEALTH AND SAFETY OPPORTUNITY! ENERGY-EFFICIENCY IS THE WIN-WIN OPTION!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!**

Judi Friedman

*Green is the new red, white and blue*

**jeanthorsen@comcast.net**

02/07/2008 08:44 AM  
To: gdeans@cerc.com

To: Energy Conservation

The CEAB should support Recommendation 1 and the DSM-Focus scenario and recommend that the DPUC require that this scenario be funded.

**Jordanna Hertz <hertzjms@aol.com>**

02/06/2008 11:35 PM  
To: gdeans@cerc.com

Re. draft state electricity plan

To Whom It May Concern at the Connecticut Energy Advisory Board;

I am writing to let you know that I support the efficiency recommendations put forth in the Integrated Resource Plan for Connecticut and call upon the CEAB members to support the utility plan. In addition to increasing spending on energy efficiency programs, I am opposed to building new coal or nuclear power plants in the state.

The 2007 energy bill made a commitment to meet the state's energy requirements by first procuring all available energy efficiency and resources that are cost-effective, reliable and feasible.

Thank you for your careful consideration on this urgent issue.

Sincerely,  
Jordanna Hertz  
West Hartford, CT

"Colin Ryan" <colinryan02@gmail.com>

02/06/2008 09:00 PM  
To: gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: Comprehensive Electricity Resource Plan

To the CEAB,

As a Connecticut resident I urge you to support an increase in statewide energy efficiency and demand side management as laid out in the proposal that CL&P and UI recently presented to the CEAB. The 2007 state energy bill made a commitment to pursue these options as a cost-effective and feasible means of reducing Connecticut's energy demands. Energy efficiency is the quickest means of generating substantial savings for our economy and would also serve to prevent the emissions of 9 million tons of CO2 through 2015.

Proper funding will be essential to ensure that the Comprehensive Electricity Resource Plan can be carried out with maximum efficacy. Specifically, recommendation 1 of the proposal should be followed in order to reduce the state's energy consumption, ease the economic burden of our future energy demands, and meet our state's climate and environmental goals. With every dollar invested in energy efficiency yielding an impressive three dollars of return in energy savings, this is a strategy we cannot afford to ignore.

Sincerely,

Colin Ryan

83 Summerhill Rd.

Wallingford, CT 06492

Junior pursuing an economics major at Southern Connecticut State University

**Patricia Shaskin <pat7288@yahoo.com>**

02/06/2008 08:38 PM  
To: gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: CL&P efficiency proposal

hello.

I support the efficiency investment proposal made by UI & CL&P in their Integrated Resource Plan for Connecticut. It makes wonderful sense and is a WIN-WIN.

Patricia Shaskin  
590 Oak Street  
East Hartford CT 06118

**"The Kerr Family" <ckerr8@tampabay.rr.com>**

02/06/2008 07:17 PM  
To: <gdeans@cerc.com>

From: the Draft Connecticut Electricity Plan

In regards to the Draft Connecticut Electricity Plan,

I agree with your investment in home energy efficiency before new power plants are built, but it sounds to me that this plan is not a change at all, but just a pretty package with the same nonsense. Why do we fear change so much? Instead of helping people turn to solar, wind and even wave power, we are still looking at old sources that are very dangerous and polluting. Maybe they don't pollute the air, but they do create nuclear waste that can be used as nuclear weapons and are radioactive for thousands of years. Where are we going to put this stuff? The second choice is Coal? Where are we going to store all of the coal slag that will come from the by product of processing the coal. I don't see any change in your thought process in terms of renewable energy. What we should be doing is giving people tax incentives to go solar.

Why are we so afraid if the electric companies go out of business, there will always be something else to replace it? We need to change what we have been doing, not just readjusting a statement.

Thank you for taking my statement,  
Regina Mastrogiacomo

**David H Fields <dormfields@juno.com>**

02/06/2008 07:08 PM

To: gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: ENERGY EFFICIENCY IS THE WIN/WIN ALTERNATIVE

Dear Mr. Deans,

I am about to sign a contract for a PV electrical system that will produce about 80% of my electrical needs. I am able to afford this because I shall be getting help of about 50% of the needed funds from state and federal incentives. My part of the cost is approximately \$23,000. My system will produce electricity for at least 25-40 years that will NOT put any greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. This is the direction CT must go if we are to be the progressive state we like to think we are.

I want to thank those who made this venture possible and encourage all those who made this possible to continue to do the things that will build a better CT. The CEAB seeks to increase the efficiency of energy use. I want to encourage you to see that efforts to increase efficiency of energy use is of prime importance in CTs future.

The CEAB should support Recommendation 1 and the DSM-Focus Scenario and recommend that the DPUC require that this scenario be funded. to at least \$116 million in 2008, \$135 million in 2009, and \$177 million in 2010 and on as described.

Thanks for listening and your anticipated support of this important effort,

Sincerely,

David Fields  
403 Babcock Hill Road  
Lebanon CT 06249  
dormfields@juno.com  
860-642-6189

**"David Nelson" <davencathy@charter.net>**

02/06/2008 07:09 PM  
<gdeans@cerc.com>

CEAB recommendation to DPUC

I urge the CEAB to recommend to the DPUC that Recommendation 1 be funded to allow the utilities to manage demand in an efficient way.

Rev. David Nelson  
1 Ft. Griswold La.  
Mansfield Center, CT. 06250

**Melinda Tuhus <tuhus.dubrow@snet.net>**

02/06/2008 06:06 PM

gdeans@cerc.com

energy efficiency

Hello,

We support the proposal by CL&P and UI to increase spending on energy efficiency programs, since this is the best (least expensive, least wasteful of energy) way to make our energy resources go farther.

We understand that the window of opportunity is only a few years before irrevocable, negative changes will result from global warming (affecting biodiversity, availability of water, and other impacts on humans and other creatures). Taking this step would contribute to efforts to reduce global warming impacts.

Sincerely,

Melinda Tuhus  
Robert Dubrow  
103 Carmalt Rd.  
Hamden, CT 06517  
203.287.9811

**Susan Begin <psbegin@aol.com>**

02/07/2008 04:26 PM

To: gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: Integrated Resource Plan - DSM Support

***Dear CEAB:***

***I am writing to encourage your support of investment in energy efficiency programs proposed by CL&P and UI in their Integrated Resource Plan.***

***Reducing energy consumption, and especially peak demand, through Demand Side Management strategies is a low cost, low risk, environmentally responsible investment to make.***

***Susan Begin  
1686 Boulevard  
West Hartford, CT 06107  
(860) 521-5398***

**SKrivit@genre.com**

02/07/2008 04:11 PM

To: gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: Comments on Draft CT Energy Plan

I am the Chairman of the Redding Clean Energy Committee, part of the "20% by 2010" campaign across the state. We are primarily focused on signing up residents for renewable energy, but we realize that many other programs need to be in place to adequately respond to global warming. Perhaps our greatest opportunity is in the area of conservation, a major component of which is lowering energy consumption.

To that end we encourage you to increase funding for the Demand Side Management focus outlined in your draft.

Best Regards,

Susanne Krivit  
Chairman Redding Clean Energy Committee

**Darek Shapiro <darek@envarch.com>**

02/07/2008 04:01 PM

To: gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: Untapped Energy Savings

Darek Shapiro, Architect + Energy Integrator

**Energy Independence Now LLC**

23 Atlantic ST., Stamford, CT. 06901

[darek@addictedtoenergy.com](mailto:darek@addictedtoenergy.com)

telephone: (203) 321-0222

Dear Members of the CEAB  
c/o G.Deans  
CERC  
805 Brook St.  
Rocky Hill, CT 06067

My name is Darek Shapiro I'm an architect and energy integrator. The mission of my company Energy Independence Now LLC. is to cut our customers energy requirements first by conservation and then by renewable and cleaner energy sources. In many case conservation is all that is necessary.

It is common knowledge that funds spent on energy electric energy conservation yeilds at least a four to one ratio on ROI. What is not understood is that this ROI can be considerably higher than that when multiplied by new technologies like LED bulbs and swithching from electric to other sources of heating.

Helping companies conserve energy will improve the now ailing economic health of the state two ways: One, we will stop loosing tax revenue from businesses and manufacturers that are leaving CT for cheaper operations and production locations, and secondly instead of loosing the brains that run these companies they will build new industry right here, selling conservation and renewable energy systems and services worldwide.

At this crucial time increasing the funds allocated to the ECMB for energy conservation by 300% is not only frugal business practice and the best use of taxpayer money, but will stimulate the States economy and improve our environmental health. Anyone needing better health's knows that it's priceless.

The mother-load of untapped energy in Connecticut is in the form of energy waste flowing out of windows and uninsulated walls. Billions of dollars of natural gas wasted because of lack of leadership and incentives.

**Elizabeth Murphy <lizasmurphy@snet.net>**

02/07/2008 03:53 PM

To: gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: Message for CEAB

Dear People at CEAB,

I support the proposal by CL&P and UI to increase spending on energy efficiency programs.

Thank you for this most important work !

Sincerely,

Elizabeth S. Murphy  
47 Crescent Place  
Monroe, CT 06468

**Dewey Foito <dfoito1@att.net>**

02/07/2008 05:05 PM

gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: energy efficiency

I support the proposal by CL&P and UI to increase spending on energy efficiency programs.

Valerie Foito  
203-268-5561

**Dewey Foito <dfoito1@att.net>**

02/07/2008 05:06 PM

To: gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: energy

I would like to say that, as a CT citizen, I support the proposal to increase spending on energy efficiency by UI and CL&P.

Dewey L. Foito  
203-268-5561

**Maureen Hart <mhart@sustainablemeasures.com>**

02/08/2008 05:47 AM

To: gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: supporting the efficiency investment proposal made by UI & CL&P

Dear G. Deans

Please add my voice to those of others supporting an increased emphasis on energy conservation as a primary strategy for ensuring that energy needs can be met in the future in the most sustainable manner. Decreasing demand for energy is the most sustainable answer.

Sincerely,  
Maureen Hart

Sustainable Measures  
PO Box 502  
West Hartford, CT 06137

mhart@sustainablemeasures.com  
www.sustainablemeasures.com  
(860) 808-7487

We are what we measure.  
It's time to measure what we want to be.

**Jane Maher <snootyfood2@att.net>**

02/08/2008 10:28 AM

gdeans@cerc.com

Subject: Support for Integrated Resource Plan

To whom it may concern:

In light of the world's energy crisis, and the part that Connecticut will play amidst this crisis in the future, I fully support the efficiency investment proposal made by UI and CL & P in their Integrated Resource Plan for CT.

As a mother, and as a small business owner that aspires for growth along with environmental responsibility, this is especially important to me.

Sincerely,  
**Jane C Maher**  
**CEO**  
**Snootyfood LLC**  
**83 Prokop Road**  
**Oxford, CT 06478**  
**203-231-5109**  
[www.snootyfood.com](http://www.snootyfood.com)