

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 Exploratory Comparative Assessment of the California Advanced Homes Program (CAHP) (Res-Intel, Calmac ID #SCE0424.01)</i>

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: An Exploratory Comparative Assessment of the California Advanced Homes Program (CAHP)
Program: CAHP
Author: Res-Intel
Calmac ID: SCE0424.01
Link to Report: http://calmac.org/publications/SCE_CAHP_FINAL_Report.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	3 & 15	Twenty-six builders in the CAHP were included in the analysis. The temporal coverage of the study is from May 2011 to December 2014 and the geographic coverage concentrated in the Los Angeles–San Bernardino metropolitan area. The distributions suggest two builders were significantly more efficient than their peers and two others less efficient. Builders seem to construct SFR that are similar in terms of energy efficiency. Further examining the few builders that different from their peers may lead to uncovering relevant factors of interest for improving the construction of energy efficient SFR. Some of the limitations of the study were data availability for key variables such as home occupancy rates. Lastly, the current research design is not fully robust to certain phenomena such as geographical clustering factors which may drive a portion of the results.	This study identified the builders that differ significantly from their peers in the energy efficiency of their residential projects. The next step would be to analyze in more detail the particular characteristics of these builders and practices to identify what is driving the disparity. In addition, further robustness checks could be explored to discern builder effects from other factors such as geographic or demographic considerations. Learning what makes these builders construct more energy efficient residential units could lead to developing best practices or adapt program policies to incorporate these evidence-based effective building techniques.	SCE	Rejected	In the time since this study was conducted there have been three Title-24 energy code updates which have significantly impacted how builders construct energy-efficient homes. The CAHP has also changed significantly in the time since and the assumptions made in this study are no longer valid. In addition, CAHP is going to be administered by third party by 2020 and SCE will no longer be involved in the program design.