

## 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:

<p><b><i>RTR for the Process Evaluation of the Los Angeles County Local Government Partnership Program</i></b> (Evergreen Economics, Calmac ID #SCG0218.02, ED WO #2115)</p>
--

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) Plan<sup>1</sup> and CPUC Decision (D.) 07-09-043<sup>2</sup>.

Individual RTR reports consist of a spreadsheet for each evaluation study. Recommendations were copied verbatim from each evaluation’s “Recommendations” section.<sup>3</sup> 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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>.

<sup>2</sup> 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.”

<sup>3</sup> 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:** Process Evaluation of the Los Angeles County Local Government Partnership Program  
**Program:** LGP  
**Author:** Evergreen Economics  
**Calmac ID:** SCG0218.02  
**ED WO:** 2115  
**Link to Report:** [http://calmac.org/publications/LGP\\_LA\\_County\\_Report\\_092217.pdf](http://calmac.org/publications/LGP_LA_County_Report_092217.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.
1a	32	LA County staff identified the length of time that it takes for review of custom projects at the IOUs and the CPUC as a challenge that has led to delayed projects or to LA County moving ahead with projects without prior approval and assuming the risk of the project being denied. LA County requires that the LA County LGP complete projects within a fiscal year of LA County project approval. While there have not been any project cancellations, LA County staff explained that uncertainty about project review timelines is challenging for project planning.	Based on the evaluation results, we recommend that SCE, SoCalGas, the CPUC and LA County work together in the following ways to address the issues related to the length of the custom process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We recommend LA County continue to participate in future Ex-ante Working Group meetings to share experience and provide inputs as it relates to Task 6. Task 6 aims to compile suggestions to streamline the custom review process and while an agreement to established fixed timeframes has been reached, there are still plans for further refinement. It would be useful for LA County to continue to participate in these discussions.</li> </ul>	LA County		
1b			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We recommend that LA County make internal deadlines clear to both the IOUs and the CPUC during the custom review process.</li> </ul>	LA County, CPUC, SCE, SCG	Accepted	SCG/SCE supports the communication of County deadlines to the CPUC during the custom review process and notes that LA County has already been sharing with the CPUC a matrix showing the status of LA County projects along with their associated internal deadlines.
1c			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We recommend that SCE and SoCalGas share their internal tracking of the CPUC review process with the LA County staff so that staff are aware of which projects may be delayed in the approval process longer than projects that were not selected for review by the CPUC.</li> </ul>	LA County, SCE, SCG	Accepted	SCG/SCE supports the tracking and communication of County project deadlines and currently meets with the County staff every two weeks to discuss the status of projects, including what SCG/SCE knows of the status of the CPUC approval review.