

RTR Appendix

Southern California Edison, Pacific Gas and Electric, Southern California Gas, and San Diego Gas and Electric (“Joint Utilities” or “Joint IOUs”) developed Responses to Recommendations (RTR) contained in the evaluation studies of the 2013-2015 Energy Efficiency Program Cycle. This Appendix contains the Responses to Recommendations in the report:

<i>RTR for the Net-to-Gross Evaluation of 2013–14 Commercial Quality Maintenance Programs (HVAC3)</i> (DNV GL, Calmac ID #CPU0117.02, ED WO #ED_D_HVAC_3)

The RTR reports demonstrate the Joint Utilities’ plans and activities to incorporate EM&V evaluation recommendations into programs to improve performance and operations, where applicable. The Joint IOUs’ approach is consistent with the 2013-2016 Energy Division-Investor Owned Utility Energy Efficiency Evaluation, Measurement and Verification (EM&V) Plan¹ and CPUC Decision (D.) 07-09-043².

Individual RTR reports consist of a spreadsheet for each evaluation study. Recommendations were copied verbatim from each evaluation’s “Recommendations” section.³ In cases where reports do not contain a section for recommendations, the Joint IOUs attempted to identify recommendations contained within the evaluation. Responses to the recommendations were made on a statewide basis when possible, and when that was not appropriate (e.g., due to utility-specific recommendations), the Joint IOUs responded individually and clearly indicated the authorship of the response.

The Joint IOUs are proud of this opportunity to publicly demonstrate how programs are taking advantage of evaluation recommendations, while providing transparency to stakeholders on the “positive feedback loop” between program design, implementation, and evaluation. This feedback loop can also provide guidance to the evaluation community on the types and structure of recommendations that are most relevant and helpful to program managers. The Joint IOUs believe this feedback will help improve both programs and future evaluation reports.

¹ Page 336, “Within 60 days of public release of a final report, the program administrators will respond in writing to the final report findings and recommendations indicating what action, if any, will be taken as a result of study findings. The IOU responses will be posted on the public document website.” The Plan is available at <http://www.energydataweb.com/cpuc>.

² Attachment 7, page 4, “Within 60 days of public release, program administrators will respond in writing to the final report findings and recommendations indicating what action, if any, will be taken as a result of study findings as they relate to potential changes to the programs. Energy Division can choose to extend the 60 day limit if the administrator presents a compelling case that more time is needed and the delay will not cause any problems in the implementation schedule, and may shorten the time on a case-by-case basis if necessary to avoid delays in the schedule.”

³ Recommendations may have also been made to the CPUC, the CEC, and evaluators. Responses to these recommendations will be made by Energy Division at a later time and posted separately.

Response to Recommendations (RTR) in Impact, Process, and Market Assessment Studies

Study Title: Net-to-Gross Evaluation of 2013–14 Commercial Quality Maintenance Programs (HVAC3)
Program: HVAC
Author: DNV GL
Calmac ID: CPU0117.02
ED WO: ED_D_HVAC_3
Link to Report: http://calmac.org/publications/HVAC3_NTG_Final_Report_2016-12-07.pdf

Item #	Page #	Findings	Best Practice / Recommendations (Verbatim from Final Report)	Recommendation Recipient	Disposition	Disposition Notes
				If incorrect, please indicate and redirect in notes.	Choose: Accepted, Rejected, or Other	Examples: Describe specific program change, give reason for rejection, or indicate that it's under further review.
1	29		Recommend improving the quality of the tracking data. The lack of well-populated customer and contractor contact information in the tracking database impacted this study, and also the gross impact study. It has not only cost the evaluation more time (and budget) doing additional data requests and looking up missing information, but also impacted the sample size (and result precision) since some contractors could not be reached at all.	PG&E, SCE, SDG&E	Accepted	The IOU's intent is to continuously improve the program. The IOUs currently collect and organize extensive customer and contractor contact information. Further clarity on the missing information would help to inform improvement opportunities. Any changes to required instrumentation or data collection by participating contractors would need to be evaluated for cost-effectiveness, costs imposed on contractors or customers, and potential program participation barriers.
2	29		Recommend a non-participant baseline study of HVAC maintenance standard practice. It would be important to coordinate with the gross impact study, and for both studies to incorporate standard practice baseline studies during the same evaluation cycle for consistency. As mentioned, care will need to be taken to create a non-participant contractor sample with similar characteristics to the program participant contractors.	CPUC		