

Non-Residential Process Evaluation Study: Attachment 4

Contains:

Evaluability Assessment, and Work Plan

Final Report

CALMAC Study ID SCG0213.05

March 29, 2012

Submitted to:

Southern California Gas Company

Rob Rubin
8306 Century Park Court
San Diego, CA 92123
(858) 654-1244
rrubin@semprautilities.com

Submitted by:



Heschong Mahone Group, Inc.

Gold River | Oakland | Encinitas

Phone: (916) 962-7001

Fax: (916) 962-0101

Douglas Mahone

e-mail: dmahone@h-m-g.com

website: www. h-m-g.com

Content

This booklet contains Attachment 4, of the Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) Nonresidential Process Evaluation for 2010-2012. Specifically, it includes the following files, in the order shown here:

- ◆ Evaluability Assessment
- ◆ Work Plan

The main report volumes (Main Report, Attachment 1 – Portfolio level evaluations, and Attachment 2 – Program-specific evaluations); and Attachment 3 (Data Collection Resources and customer survey frequency tables) are in separate booklets. The report structure is described in more detail in the “Introduction” section of the Main Report.

Background and Limitations of Work Plan and Evaluability Assessment:

The work plan and evaluability assessment were developed early in the study (immediately after the kick off meetings), to guide the bulk of the project. The evaluability assessment was developed in conjunction with the work plan. This assessment describes key characteristics for all nonresidential programs, and identifies which programs would be evaluated in more detail through the study. Note that both files were developed based on limited data collection. The information they contain should be considered with much less weight than the information provided in the main volumes of the report (Main Report, Attachment 1, and Attachment 2), which are based on far more extensive data collection.

Official Name	Program Name	Program Code(s)	2010-2012 Program Revised Budget	Projected Gross Elec Savings (kWh/yr)	Projected Gross Gas Savings (therms/yr)	Program Development Phase	Key stakeholders (Individuals, agencies, etc.)	Key gatekeepers to information (staff member in charge of customer data, savings data - may be more than 1)	Is the program logic model complete? Does it include the following: 1) Set up: Need	Are the marketing materials complete and available?	Are the application forms available?	Is the program participant data available?
SW-IndA - Calculated	Calculated	SCG3611	\$52,350,450	-	34,491,066	Mid Implementation	Debbie Vinluan - SCG program manager, Sempra management, Sector manager	Debbie Vinluan - SCG program manager	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (in program database)
SW-ComA - Calculated		SCG3607	\$7,970,900	-	5,460,498							
SW-AgA - Calculated		SCG3602	\$5,886,576	-	3,456,828							
SW-ComB - Deemed	Deemed	SCG3608	\$15,253,471	-	12,346,061	Mature Implementation	Sempra management, Program manager, ERC (SCG's energy center)	rebate processing center, EM&V/regulatory group center	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SW-IndB - Deemed		SCG3612	\$10,067,596	-	7,207,206							
SW-AgB - Deemed		SCG3603	\$4,561,000	-	4,050,263							
3P-Xc02 - SaveGas - Hot Water Control	Save Gas	SCG3673	\$4,583,364	-	933,345	Early Implementation	Sempra management, program manager,	Alice Beltrane is project manager	Yes	Yes	Not Applicable	Yes (in program database)
3P-Xc05 - Portfolio of the Future (PoF)	Portfolio of the Future	SCG3676	\$4,512,437	-	NR	Completed	Sempra management, Program manager	Results of technology demonstration studies are only data of the program.	Not Applicable	Not Applicable (Internal program)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
3P-Xc04 - California Sustainability Alliance	California Sustainability Alliance	SCG3675	\$3,657,212	-	NR	Mature Implementation	Program staff, contractor, volunteer advisors, related initiatives (AB 32, water policy), local governments	3P program manager, SCG program manager	Yes	Yes. (They offer tools that can be downloaded from website.)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
3P-NRes1 - Steam Trap and Compressed Air Survey	SCG steam trap and compressed air	SCG3660	\$3,176,259	-	NR	Mid Implementation	SCG Program Manager Alice Buczek	Program manager, also Wayne Chi in engineering	No	Don't Know	Don't Know	Don't Know
Local05 - Local Non-Residential BID	Nonres BID	SCG3601	\$3,114,801	-	1,309,959	Design/ Pilot	Debbie Vinluan - Program Manager, Sector manager	Debbie Vinluan has data on the two customers participating in the program.	No	No (Will be created once key sectors identified.)	Don't Know	Don't Know - not in program database
Local01 - OBF	On-Bill Financing	SCG3644	\$2,590,871	-	NR	Mature Implementation	All nonres program managers, sector manager	All nonres program managers	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Program Name	Program Code(s)	Is the program savings data available?	Are the program performance metrics (PPMs) measured?	Are the performance metrics (PPMs) tracked?	Are there additional metrics or Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for monitoring progress towards goals?	What type of information or interviews will be needed for evaluation?	Has the program followed the recommendations provided in the last process evaluation study?	Program evaluation priority	Comments and Evaluation Goals for Program	Med / High Level Eval?	Reason why / why not evaluated at Medium / High level
Calculated	SCG3611 SCG3607 SCG3602	Yes (in program database)	Yes	Yes	NA	Account executives Participants Linkage of Calculated programs with "feeder" programs	No program specific recommendations in last evaluation	Medium	Many of the non-resource programs are designed to direct customers to the Calculated program - assess integration. Benchmark program against other programs both in California and nation-wide. Assess program administrative burden. Identify "bottlenecks" in the participation process that delay approval and implementation	Yes	High savings predicted
Deemed	SCG3608 SCG3612 SCG3603	Yes	Yes (Only year-end, not program cycle)	Yes	No	AEs, CSTs, trade ally/vendors, participating and non-participating customers, segment advisors, vendor relations, ERC, Emerging Tech program managers, OBF program manager, possibly CPUC ED staff	No program specific recommendations in last evaluation	Medium	Obtain market intelligence (from vendors, AEs and customers). Streamline application/processing, help them identify ways to meet goals. Determine whether internal SoCal Gas resources are effectively marketing program and driving participation (e.g., AEs, CSTs, segment advisors, vendor relations), identify potential new measures for the program	Yes	High savings predicted
Save Gas	SCG3673	Yes (in program database)	Not applicable (no PPMs)	Not applicable (no PPMs)	KPIs are in the contract, but we have not seen it.	Interviews with program staff, with EDC the contractor, with participating customers, and any customers who have decided not to do the project but were in discussions with EDC, and AEs	No program specific recommendations in last evaluation	High	Program focus is lodging industry. Program existed in 06-08, but did not take off. Evaluation Goals: This program seems to be taking off with the change in incentives for AEs. The purpose will be to document the progress of the program, identify where the program is working and not working with lodging sector and with AEs, and about performance in other service territories.	Yes	Program may really be taking off now that the AEs are incented. If not, program has bigger problems and an evaluation can identify them
Portfolio of the Future	SCG3676	Not Applicable	Not applicable (no PPMs)	Not applicable (no PPMs)		Need to interview Stephen Lee (engineering lead) concerning qualification of subcontractors.	Don't know. It was evaluated last time.	Low	Program uses a 3P to demonstrate new technologies. Program manager is concerned with timeliness of demonstrations and qualification of subcontractors. Evaluation Goals: Document how 3P's are chosen, and process triggering customer demonstration of EE technologies.	No	Nonresource program, not key to portfolio.
California Sustainability Alliance	SCG3675	Not Applicable (Nonresource based program)	Not applicable (no PPMs)	Not applicable (no PPMs)	KPI is to Track website hits. Program is planning to put pop-up on website to collect demographic data from end users who download tools.	Interview contractor, volunteer advisors, associations (that advisors network through).	No program specific recommendations in last evaluation	Medium	Potential synergy with other programs, may provide useful tools to building owners and managers who want to improve efficiency. But it is not clear whether it is accomplishing any of this. Evaluation Goals: Provide info on contractor's marketing and outreach, data/deliverable tracking, public need of/use of/response to services, ability to integrate with other statewide/municipal programs and goals.	No	Nonresource, and not key program to portfolio
SCG steam trap and compressed air	SCG3660	Don't Know	Not applicable (no PPMs)	Not applicable (no PPMs)	Performance metrics in the PIP are: 1 - customers contacted 2 - audits completed. Conversion rate should also be captured.	Trade allies, program participants, Program engineer Wayne Chi, the implementation contractor (Aerometrics?), Other service providers in the LA area that could do the same work at a lower cost because they are local	No program specific recommendations in last evaluation	High	Program appears expensive and may not be fulfilling original intent. Also unclear why SoCal Gas is looking at compressed air projects - these are electric. Goals: Evaluate program to decide if it should be discontinued. Evaluate costs and timelines for audits; these are done by an out-of-state implementation contractor, which adds cost and time. New program. They've spent much of their budget, but have not met 2010 or 2011 goals. Contact Program Manager, and Wayne Chi at 562-803-7401. He is engineering lead and may have further information on the program. Also, no integration to funnel audits into core, LGP, and 3rd party programs. Review the potential for the project to ramp up to meet goals set in the PIP. Assess if in-state resources are available to complete both the steam trap and compressed air audits. Follow up on program manager's request (sent May 15, 2011) to implementer for a recovery / ramp up plan. UPDATED INFO PROVIDED BY PROGRAM MANAGER MARCH 2012: The program is currently being reviewed, to consider lowering the goals and budget. The integration to funnel audits to other programs is being done once the audits and final reports are complete. There is a wrap up meeting with the customer, contractor and AE to discuss the possibilities of participating in other programs. Tracking mechanism is a Project Status Report spreadsheet that is reviewed weekly by contractor and	No	Nonresource program, not key to portfolio. Consider discontinuing program.
Nonres BID	SCG3601	Don't Know - not in program database	Not applicable (no PPMs)	Not applicable (no PPMs)	Number of project enrolled, number that achieve target	Surveys with companies that can bid: How do they learn about the projects? Would they be profitable? What are some of their risks?	No program specific recommendations in last evaluation	Medium	Program is in its infancy, so insights may positively shape program's direction. Few large commercial participants have significant impact on savings goals. Evaluation Goals: Describe market demand for this program through market surveys. Evaluate if program is on-track to meet savings goals, and potential improvements to data tracking.	Yes	High savings predicted
On-Bill Financing	SCG3644	Not Applicable (Nonresource based program)	Not applicable (no PPMs)	Not applicable (no PPMs)	None specified other than number of loans made. Other potential indicators: trainings held w AEs & contractors, applications submitted.	Interview with AEs, TAs, participants, applicants, rebate customers.	At least partly. The program has increased the maximum payback period for some customer types (gov) from 5 to 10 years.	Medium	Program continues to underperform, although the reasons may be obvious (hard to find gas projects with payback within 5 years). Other possible reasons that could also be explored: failure to market it effectively, overly strict qualification criteria. Evaluation Goals: Understand low level of participation, investigate effectiveness of marketing and coordination with rebate/incentive programs.	No	Studied by CPUC. SDG&E OBF will be evaluated.

Official Name	Program Name	Program Code(s)	2010-2012 Program Revised Budget	Projected Gross Elec Savings (kWh/yr)	Projected Gross Gas Savings (therms/yr)	Program Development Phase	Key stakeholders (Individuals, agencies, etc.)	Key gatekeepers to information (staff member in charge of customer data, savings data - may be more than 1)	Is the program logic model complete? Does it include the following: 1) Set up: Need	Are the marketing materials complete and available?	Are the application forms available?	Is the program participant data available?
3P-NRes3 - Small Industrial Facility Upgrades	Small Industrial GEP	SCG3662	\$2,084,620	-	1,143,315	Early Implementation	Sempra management, program manager, and Implementation contractor - GEP	GEP and Alice Beltrane	Yes	Yes	Don't Know	Yes (but did not see it)
3P-NRes4 - Program for Resource Efficiency in Private Schools	PREPS Private Schools Program k-higher ed	SCG3663	\$1,939,519	-	905,403	Early Implementation	Sempra management, program manager	Liz Nemeth on leave June 10, Susan Apeles lead while Liz on leave; Energy Resource Solutions	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (but did not see it)
SW-IndC - Nonresidential Audits	Nonres audits	SCG3613	\$1,909,380	-	NR	Mid Implementation	Program managers, AEs, Program managers of core programs (since this is a feeder program), To lesser extent - engineering dept, because they conduct some audits	Program manager (Lisa Ann de Hoop) has audit reports.	Yes (as part of sector-level PIP)	Don't Know	Don't Know	Yes
SW-ComC - Nonresidential Audits		SCG3609	\$1,833,302	-	NR							
SW-AgC - Nonresidential Audits		SCG3604	\$176,521	-	NR							
3P-Xc01 - Gas Cooling Retrofit	Gas Cooling	SCG3672	\$1,623,716	-	52,613	Mid Implementation	Management - Kevin, Alice the program manager	Alice Beltrane and the contractor Cypress	Yes	Don't Know	Not Applicable	Yes (in program database)
SW-IndD - Continuous Energy Improvement	Continuous Energy Improvement (CEI)	SCG3614	\$1,337,885	-	NR	Design/ Pilot	Glenda Towns (Prg. Advisor), SCG Account Reps, CPUC (CEI supposed to be key delivery mechanism statewide)	Glenda Towns	Yes	Don't Know (No mass program marketing; contractor may distribute materials at customer recruitment)	Yes (is a "MOU" to "commit" to program)	Don't Know (Can probably get info for 2 customers that did organizational audits from Glenda)
SW-ComD - Continuous Energy Improvement		SCG3610	\$1,029,118	-	NR							
SW-AgE - Continuous Energy Improvement		SCG3606	\$64,223	-	NR							
Local04 - Local Strategic Develop & Integ	Strategic Planning and Integration	SCG3646	\$853,187	-	NR	Other - Pgm has no implementation	Sempra management	program manager	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
3P-NRes2 - Energy Challenger	Energy Challenger	SCG3661	\$481,414	-	NR	Mature Implementation	Program manager, Implementation contractor (EnVinta) Program managers of core programs (since this is a feeder)	EnVinta (3P contractor) has customer data and data on recommended measures	Yes	Yes	Yes (did not see these)	Yes (Should be - need to check with 3P implementer)
Core Statewide Res and Commercial HVAC Programs: Commercial Quality Installation, Commercial Upstream Equipment, Quality Maintenance Program, Technology & Systems Diagnostics, HVAC WE&T, HVAC Core	HVAC Statewide	SCG3651 SCG3652 SCG3653 SCG3654 SCG3655 SCG3656 SCG3657	\$979,794 (total for all 7 programs)	-	NR	Design/ Pilot	Program manager	N/A	Yes, for the statewide model.	Yes	N/A, because pilot stage	N/A, because pilot stage
SW-AgD - Pump Test & Repair	Pump test and repair	SCG3605	\$266,539	-	NR	Early Implementation	Sempra management, Program manager, Service technicians, Managers of core programs (since this is a feeder program), Manager at SCE of pump test and repair program	Program manager; database managed by SCG customer service (Program manager doesn't know name or dept)	Yes (As part of Ag PIP)	No	Don't Know	Yes

Program Name	Program Code(s)	Is the program savings data available?	Are the program performance metrics (PPMs) measured?	Are the performance metrics (PPMs) tracked?	Are there additional metrics or Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for monitoring progress towards goals?	What type of information or interviews will be needed for evaluation?	Has the program followed the recommendations provided in the last process evaluation study?	Program evaluation priority	Comments and Evaluation Goals for Program	Med / High Level Eval?	Reason why / why not evaluated at Medium / High level
Small Industrial GEP	SCG3662	Yes (but did not see it)	Not Applicable (KPIs)	Not Applicable (KPIs)	Number of participants, savings achieved	Interviews with GEP, with program staff, with AEs, surveys with participating customers and nonparticipating customers	not offered in 06-08	High	Program's 1st year. They have savings goal and target number of participants. They will probably make savings goal, but with fewer participants than targeted. Important to understand what might work for small customers, as they are not doing this. Evaluation Goals: Document program, provide assessment of effect of AE incentive on engagement in the program, (if engagement is not improved, program will not make goals), understand what other reasons beside AE involvement are	No	Early implementation, no progress yet.
PREPS Private Schools Program k-higher ed	SCG3663	Yes (but did not see it)	Not applicable (no PPMs)	Not applicable (no PPMs)	Several KPIs were developed by implementer.	Interviews with program staff and Energy Resource Solutions; interviews with participants and (if available) list with nonparticipants	not offered in 06-08	High	The program model seems to be quite good. Thus it would be good to assess whether they can be effective and whether gas savings are enough to attract customers, as they are not coordinating with SCE. Evaluation Goals: document program, provide assessment of effectiveness of methods for outreach and participation, understand potential given the progress made in first two years.	Yes	Program model is sound, so check if it can be effective, or if coordination with SCE is necessary.
Nonres audits	SCG3613	Not Applicable (Non resource based program)	Yes	Don't know	PPMs are 1) number of audits conducted, which is tracked, and 2) Conversion rate - may be possible to find info, but it's not systematically tracked.	AE interviews, participant interviews, interviews with Deemed and Calculated participants to see if fed from Audit program, manager's spreadsheet tracking audit activity	No program specific recommendations in last evaluation	High	Good potential for feeding customers into core programs, but not integrated into portfolio. Not meeting PPM, because not tracking conversion rate. There is no clear path for coordinating with or feeding into other programs. How could one be created? Research audit quality. Program manager is concerned it is low.	Yes	key feeder program, large budget (across all sectors), but not well integrated with resource based programs
	SCG3609										
	SCG3604										
Gas Cooling	SCG3672	Yes (in program database)	Not applicable (no PPMs)	Not applicable (no PPMs)	There are KPIs (in the contract) and manager reports program is underperforming.	Interview with program staff and with implementation contractor (Cypress) contacts. Unlikely value from talking to participant, but if Cypress has a list of nonparticipants that would be very useful.	not offered in 06-08	Medium	Program started 06-08 but still seems like early implementation. Help management understand why the program is not working. (1 customer in 5 years.) Evaluation Goals: Management wants to cancel the program and needs some basis for doing this other than inactivity. Program manager reports they keep sending in invoices monthly that get paid, but no action.	No	Only 1 customer in 5 years. Address marketing at broader level through cross-cutting Marketing study. Consider discontinuing program.
Continuous Energy Improvement (CEI)	SCG3614	Not Applicable (nonresource based program)	Yes	Yes	No energy plans done or measures installed as of yet, but this will be collected	AEs (determine if very engaged v. less engaged), 4 implementation contractors, customers that have been directly recruited - why aren't they doing technical audits and progressing through program?	not offered in 06-08	Medium	No projects have completed program yet. What is this program's potential in SoCal Gas service territory? Will large C/I/Ag customers participate partially or fully in CEI program? If not, why? If yes, how much staff and monetary resources can they allocate to EE planning, retrofits, and monitoring? Will they actually implement projects, and in what timeframe? How does this program overlap with related statewide efforts and how do those related efforts (that are championed by CPUC) compete with customers limiting participation for CEI?	No	Marketing identified as key issue. Will be addressed at higher level in cross-cutting Marketing study.
	SCG3610										
	SCG3606										
Strategic Planning and Integration	SCG3646	Not Applicable	Not applicable (no PPMs)	Not applicable (no PPMs)	white papers is major result	No evaluation is suggested for this program	No program specific recommendations in last evaluation	Low	This is a department, not part of the program portfolio. Strategic development supports higher level portfolio planning. We recommend contacting manager and requesting some of the position papers written, which are used in program planning. No process evaluation is suggested, since it's not a true program.	No	Not a true program. Not part of program portfolio.
Energy Challenger	SCG3661	Not Applicable (Non resource based program)	Not applicable (no PPMs)	Not applicable (no PPMs)	Conversion rate into core programs would be useful to track. Program manager should have this data eventually, but it isn't available now	Participant database, Interviews with customers, particularly to determine action taken, Implementation contractor	No program specific recommendations in last evaluation	Low	Example of an audit-type program for small (<50K therm) that's operating in a vacuum (not connected to other programs), so unclear what savings result (even indirectly) from it. Recommend strategies for tracking conversion rate and improving tracking conversion rate. No goals from Project Manager, because this program will be replaced with statewide audit tool, and manager is pleased with program.	No	Will be replaced with a statewide program. Also, key issue is follow up with customers for interest in other programs - evaluated through audits, and IT / data tracking
HVAC Statewide	SCG3651 SCG3652 SCG3653 SCG3654 SCG3655 SCG3656 SCG3657	Not Applicable (nonresource based program)	No	No	Development of new programs	N/A, no evaluation recommended	No program specific recommendations in last evaluation	Low	This is a nonresource program for the utility. Their involvement is limited beyond participation in statewide meetings. The only concrete evaluation goal from manager is to identify what gas savings are available and relevant for SCG's market.	No	The HVAC program is part of a core offering if seven sub-programs led by SCE. This is a nonresource program. There is little direct activity for SCG. There are no participants. Evaluation resources should be directed to programs that have more impact on the overall portfolio of offerings.
Pump test and repair	SCG3605	Not Applicable (Nonresource based program)	Yes	Don't know	PPMs are 1) number of tests conducted, which is tracked, and 2) Conversion rate - not systematically tracked. Program manager is currently pulling this together	Interviews with customers Interviews with service technician program database	No program specific recommendations in last evaluation	Medium	Pump test program is old, but energy efficiency was integrated recently. The value of this program is questionable. Is it worth continuing the program? Why does SoCal Gas have a pump test program, since many pumps are electrical? There is also no clear path for coordinating with or feeding into resource-based programs. How could one be created? Marketing - How could we persuade customers to do new types of projects (e.g., incorporate energy efficiency into pump test)?	No	Key issue is how to integrate with portfolio - addressed as IT / data tracking. Consider discontinuing program

SoCal Gas Process Evaluation – Final Work Plan

Non-Residential Programs

HMG Project No: 1111

SoCal Gas Project No: #5660021579

Date: August 4, 2011

Submitted to:

SoCal Gas

Rob Rubin

8306 Century Park Court, 2nd Floor

San Diego, CA 92123

(858) 654-1244

rrubin@semprautilities.com

Submitted by:



Heschong Mahone Group, Inc.

11211 Gold Country Blvd. #103

Gold River, CA 95670

Phone: (916) 962-7001

Fax: (916) 962-0101

e-mail: austin@h-m-g.com

website: www. h-m-g.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	7
1.1 Work Plan Document Organization	8
1.2 Low Priority Evaluations	9
1.3 Proposed Budget.....	9
2. PROGRAMS AND EVALUATION PRIORITIES	12
3. EVALUATION WORK PLANS	17
3.1 Calculated Programs (SW-IndA, ComA, AgA -Calculated)	17
3.1.1 Background	17
3.1.2 Research Issues	17
3.1.3 Data Collection & Analysis	18
3.1.4 Budget	20
3.2 Deemed Programs (SW- ComB, IndB, AgB -Deemed)	20
3.2.1 Background	20
3.2.2 Research Issues	20
3.2.3 Data Collection.....	21
3.2.4 Budget.....	23
3.3 SaveGas – Hot Water Control (3P-Xc02).....	23
3.3.1 Background	23
3.3.2 Research Issues	23
3.3.3 Data Collection.....	24
3.3.4 Analysis	26
3.3.5 Budget.....	26
3.4 Non-Residential Incentive Partnership (Local05 - Local Non-Residential BID).....	27
3.4.1 Background	27
3.4.2 Research Issues	27
3.4.3 Data Collection.....	28
3.4.4 Budget.....	28
3.5 Program for Resource Efficiency in Private Schools, PREPS (3P-NRes4)	29
3.5.1 Background	29
3.5.2 Research Issues	29
3.5.3 Data Collection.....	29

3.5.4	<i>Data Analysis</i>	31
3.5.5	<i>Budget</i>	31
3.6	Non-Residential Audits (SW- IndC, ComC, AgC)	31
3.6.1	<i>Background</i>	31
3.6.2	<i>Research Issues</i>	32
3.6.3	<i>Data Collection</i>	32
3.6.4	<i>Budget</i>	33
3.7	Overarching Surveys and Interviews	33
3.7.1	<i>Background</i>	33
3.7.2	<i>Research issues</i>	33
3.7.3	<i>Data Collection</i>	35
3.7.4	<i>Budget</i>	35
4.	CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES WORK PLANS	36
4.1	IT and Data Tracking Issues.....	36
4.1.1	<i>Background</i>	36
4.1.2	<i>Research Issues</i>	36
4.1.3	<i>Data Collection</i>	36
4.1.4	<i>Budget</i>	37
4.2	Program Best Practices	37
4.2.1	<i>Background</i>	37
4.2.2	<i>Research Issues</i>	37
4.2.3	<i>Data Collection and Analysis</i>	38
4.2.4	<i>Budget</i>	39
4.3	Regulatory Issues	39
4.3.1	<i>Background</i>	39
4.3.2	<i>Research Issues</i>	40
4.3.3	<i>Data Collection</i>	40
4.3.4	<i>Budget</i>	41
4.4	Organizational Issues	41
4.4.1	<i>Background</i>	41
4.4.2	<i>Research Issues</i>	41
4.4.3	<i>Data Collection</i>	41
4.4.4	<i>Budget</i>	43

4.5 Statewide Coordination	43
4.5.1 Background	43
4.5.2 Research Issues	43
4.5.3 Data Collection	44
4.5.4 Budget	44
4.6 Marketing	45
4.6.1 Background	45
4.6.2 Research Issues	45
4.6.3 Data Collection	46
4.6.4 Budget	46
4.7 Third-Party (3P) Implementer Integrations	46
4.7.1 Background	46
4.7.2 Research Issues	47
4.7.3 Data Collection	47
4.7.4 Budget	48
5. APPENDIX. EVALUABILITY ASSESSMENT SUMMARY	49
6. APPENDIX. STATUS OF PORTFOLIO	56

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Estimated Budget for SDG&E and SoCal Gas, Evaluation Tasks 4-7	10
Figure 2: Projected Compared with NTE Budgets	11
Figure 3: SoCal Gas Programs for Medium-High level of evaluation, in decreasing order of program budget	15
Figure 4: SoCal Gas Programs, by Projected Natural Gas Savings	16
Figure 5: Calculated Programs, Data Collection Activity Summary	18
Figure 6: Calculated Programs, Utility and Sector Sampling (sample/unique customers).....	19
Figure 7: Calculated Programs, Evaluation Budget.....	20
Figure 8: Deemed Programs, Data Collection Activity Summary	22
Figure 9: Deemed Programs, Evaluation Budget	23
Figure 10: SaveGas – Hot Water Control, Data Collection Activity Summary	24
Figure 11: SaveGas – Hot Water Control, Evaluation Budget.....	27
Figure 12: Non-Residential Incentive Partnership, Data Collection Activity Summary	28
Figure 13: Non-Residential Incentive Partnership, Evaluation Budget	29
Figure 14: Non-Residential Audits, Data Collection Activity Summary	32
Figure 15: Overarching Data Collection Recommendations.....	35
Figure 16: IT and Data Tracking, Data Collection Activity Summary	37
Figure 17: IT and Data Tracking, Evaluation Budget.....	37
Figure 18: Review of Program Best Practices, Data Collection Activity Summary	38
Figure 19: Review of Program Best Practices, Evaluation Budget.....	39
Figure 20: Regulatory Issues, Data Collection Activity Summary	40
Figure 21: Regulatory Issues, Evaluation Budget.....	41
Figure 22: Review of Organizational Issues, Data Collection Activity Summary	42
Figure 23: Review of Organizational Issues, Evaluation Budget.....	43
Figure 24: Statewide Coordination, Data Collection Activity Summary	44
Figure 25: Statewide Coordination, Evaluation Budget.....	45
Figure 26: 3P Implementer Integrations, Data Collection Activity Summary.....	48

Figure 27 – Current Performance Relative to Projected for all IOUs 56

Figure 28 – SoCal Gas Nonresidential programs: Status and contribution to overall savings 57

1. INTRODUCTION

The Heschong Mahone Group, Inc. (HMG) was contracted by Southern California Gas (SoCal Gas) to lead a team to conduct process evaluation services for their non-residential energy efficiency programs. Besides HMG, the evaluation team includes Research into Action, Navigant Consulting, Evergreen Economics, Energy Market Innovations, and Tetra Tech. Under Contract #5660021579 the study scope includes the following tasks:

- ◆ Task 1: Conduct Project Initiation Meeting
- ◆ Task 2: Conduct Evaluability Assessment
- ◆ Task 3: Develop the Final Research Plan
- ◆ Task 4: Data Collection and Analysis
- ◆ Task 5: Prepare Reports and Database of results
- ◆ Task 6: Presentation of Results
- ◆ Task 7: Project Management and Progress Reporting

This document serves as the deliverable for Task 3. This document provides a workable research plan to lead the actual process evaluations to be carried out. Using the program materials review and staff interview results, we developed a detailed understanding of the status of each of the programs to be evaluated. In this review, we realized this plan will require critical balancing and planning judgment to achieve the best match of evaluation resources and program needs. In preparing the plan, we considered several competing objectives:

- ◆ **Matching Evaluation Resources to Program Importance** - We assume that the more important programs, in terms of savings, customer impact, complexity and other factors, should be evaluated to a higher level of rigor than the smaller, simpler programs.
- ◆ **Adjusting Evaluation Approach to Program Characteristics** - The evaluation approach for each program - data collection strategies, sample sizes, etc. - are adjusted in light of the evaluation resources assigned to the program, the process evaluation needs of the program managers, and the currency of the existing program process information. For example, a stable program that was thoroughly evaluated in the preceding round of process evaluations may not need another detailed evaluation this cycle. On the other hand, a new, innovative and different type of program may require a more in-depth set of interviews and data review in order to provide timely feedback on ways to improve the program.
- ◆ **Coordinating Evaluation of Similar Customer Groups and Program Strategies** - The programs naturally group into market sectors and/or program delivery types. This presents opportunities for a coordinated data collection strategy that could gather sector data more efficiently than possibly duplicating data collection with a strict program-by-program approach. This could also help to guard against survey fatigue or over-contacting of customers who may have taken advantage of more than one program opportunity.

- ♦ **Coordinating Survey Instruments and Data Analysis** – We will keep the number of distinct survey instruments as low as practicable, with a minimum number of specialized, program-specific questions. This will help ensure consistency in the data collection and the subsequent analysis. For example, low-level process evaluations could use a basic survey instrument common to most similar programs, and those programs getting a more in-depth evaluation could have both the basic questions and a set of more advanced, specialized questions.

1.1 Work Plan Document Organization

Section 1 presents the type of evaluations to be conducted and an overview of the scope of work each includes.

Section 2 present the proposed level of evaluation to be included in this effort a rationale for this choice.

Sections 3 and 4 describe the proposed work plans for specific programs and cross-cutting (portfolio-wide) issues, respectively, targeted for evaluation at a medium to high level. In general, each evaluation program/topic includes the following content sub-sections:

- ♦ Program background – Program summary, goals, and current status
- ♦ Research issues - Key issues or research questions that the evaluation will investigate
- ♦ Proposed data collection and analysis methods – Study targets, data needs, and analysis methodology
- ♦ Approach to Interviews – Data collection strategy and coordination activities
- ♦ Estimated budget

The Appendices include:

- ♦ A summary of the Evaluability Assessment table.
- ♦ Savings status analysis of the overall portfolio, and of the nonresidential programs. Based on the most current postings to EEGA (roughly the halfway mark for the 2010-12 cycle), this analysis shows that SoCal Gas has installed 33% of savings and has another 11% savings that is committed.

In addition to program and cross cutting issue-specific data collection, the evaluation team will also collect data from key parties whose perspective and knowledge are relevant across multiple programs and cross-cutting issues. In order to efficiently gather such data and minimize staff disruptions, such ‘overarching’ data collection activity will be consolidated. Section 3.7 describes this planned research in more detail.

This project is being conducted simultaneously for San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E), to leverage cost sharing. Consequently, references to budget for programs or issues that will be evaluated at both utilities are shown in total (both utilities) and for each individually.

1.2 Low Priority Evaluations

Some specific programs are not prioritized in this effort and will be evaluated at a low level, due largely to budget constraints, because the HMG team is also evaluating cross-cutting (portfolio-wide) issues. In addition, a number of these programs are new and/or have little progress to evaluate, or have been cancelled.

For programs evaluated at a low level, the final report will summarize findings based on program manager interviews and the Program Implementation Plans (PIPs) and present the status of the program relative to goals, based on the most recent reporting. This summary will also integrate programs evaluated at the medium-high level, presenting a complete picture of the portfolio.

1.3 Proposed Budget

Because a 'medium to high' evaluation level is somewhat vague, the following labor budget gives a sense of the proposed relative level of effort for each program and cross-cutting issue to be evaluated. For example, the much higher budget for the Calculated programs compared with the Resource Efficiency in Private Schools (PREPS) program reflects the higher level of its proposed evaluation effort.

Sector of Focus	Program Type	Program or Cross Cutting (CC) Issue (Utility)	Pgm Workplan Budget	CC Workplan Budget	Expenses
Commercial	BID	IT and Data Tracking Issues (both)		\$ 41,440	\$ 1,000
		BID Program (both)	\$ 42,165		\$ 9,600
Industrial	Calculated	Comp. Ind. EE (SDGE)	\$ 5,000		
		Calculated Programs (both)	\$ 80,000		\$ 25,000
		Crosscutting Issue, "Statewide Coordination" (both)		\$ 20,000	
Agriculture	Deemed	Deemed (both)	\$ 75,000		\$ 25,000
		Regulatory Crosscutting Issue (both)		\$ 30,000	
Commercial	Direct Install	Direct Install (SDGE)	\$ 46,350		\$ 9,100
		Cross-Cutting Review of Program Best Practices (both)		\$ 35,250	
		Cross-Cutting Review of Organizational Issues (both)		\$ 24,150	
Audits	Audits	Retrocommissioning (SDGE)	\$ 23,600		
		HVAC Tune-up & Quality Installation (SDGE)	\$ 36,450		\$8,400
		Non-Residential Audits Program (both)	\$ 31,070		
		Marketing (both)		\$ 12,850	
3P/Local	3P/Local	3P - SaveGas (both; about same LOE for both utilities)	\$ 56,623		
		Local - On Bill Financing - OBF (SDGE)	\$ 20,308		
		3P - Resource Efficiency in Private Schools (SCG)	\$ 27,851		
All	All	Overarching surveys and interviews			\$ 28,710
		Program management (Task 7)		\$ 20,000	
		Travel expenses for final presentation			\$4,000
		Subtotals for Labor and Expenses		\$ 628,107	\$ 110,810
		TOTAL			\$ 738,917

Figure 1: Estimated Budget for SDG&E and SoCal Gas, Evaluation Tasks 4-7

Figure 2, shows the projected compared with the not-to-exceed (NTE) budgets. These two figures demonstrate that the projected budget is within the NTE budgets for Tasks 4-7

	<i>SDGE</i>		<i>SCG</i>		<i>Combined</i>	
	NTE	Projected	NTE	Projected	NTE	Projected
Labor	\$404,000	\$415,413	\$243,000	\$212,694	\$647,000	\$628,107
Expenses	\$99,688	\$68,702	\$59,813	\$42,108	\$159,501	\$110,810
Total	\$503,688	\$484,115	\$302,813	\$254,802	\$806,501	\$738,917

Figure 2: Projected Compared with NTE Budgets

2. PROGRAMS AND EVALUATION PRIORITIES

This section includes tables documenting the Non-Residential program portfolio and several key parameters (e.g., energy savings), including an assessment of the appropriate level of evaluation to include in this effort. This is based on a summary of the evaluability assessment. The full evaluability assessment is attached as a companion document to this work plan. Because the decision was also based on program savings, this section also lists programs by projected savings.

- ◆ Figure 3: SoCal Gas Programs for Medium-High level of evaluation, in decreasing order of program budget - this also describes the rationale for evaluating / not evaluating a program at the medium/ high level
- ◆ Figure 4: SoCal Gas Programs, by Projected Natural Gas Savings

Program Name	Program Code(s)	2010-2012 Program Revised Budget	Program Development Phase	Evaluate at Med / High Level?	Reason why / why not evaluated at Medium / High level
Calculated	SCG3611	\$52,350,450	Mid Implementation	Yes	High savings predicted
	SCG3607	\$7,970,900			
	SCG3602	\$5,886,576			
Deemed	SCG3608	\$15,253,471	Mature Implementation	Yes	High savings predicted
	SCG3612	\$10,067,596			
	SCG3603	\$4,561,000			
Save Gas	SCG3673	\$4,583,364	Early Implementation	Yes	Program may really be taking off now that the AEs are incented. If not, program has bigger problems and an evaluation can identify them
Portfolio of the Future	SCG3676	\$4,512,437	Completed	No	Nonresource program, not key to portfolio.
California Sustainability Alliance	SCG3675	\$3,657,212	Mature Implementation	No	Nonresource, and not key program to portfolio
Steam trap and compressed air	SCG3660	\$3,176,259	Mid Implementation	No	Nonresource program, not key to portfolio. Consider discontinuing program (more information in Evaluability Assessment).
Nonres BID	SCG3601	\$3,114,801	Early implementation	Yes	High savings predicted
On-Bill Financing	SCG3644	\$2,590,871	Mature Implementation	No	Not key program to portfolio. Studied by CPUC. SDG&E OBF will be evaluated.

Program Name	Program Code(s)	2010-2012 Program Revised Budget	Program Development Phase	Evaluate at Med / High Level?	Reason why / why not evaluated at Medium / High level
Small Industrial GEP	SCG3662	\$2,084,620	Early Implementation	No	Early implementation, no progress yet.
PREPS Private Schools Program k-higher ed	SCG3663	\$1,939,519	Early Implementation	Yes	Program model is sound, so check if it can be effective, or if coordination with SCE is necessary.
Nonres audits	SCG3613	\$1,909,380	Mid Implementation	Yes	Key feeder program, but not well integrated with resource based programs. Also concern that audit quality is very low, which could reflect poorly on SoCal Gas.
	SCG3609	\$1,833,302			
	SCG3604	\$176,521			
Gas Cooling	SCG3672	\$1,623,716	Mid Implementation	No	Only 1 customer in 5 years. Consider discontinuing program (more information in Evaluability Assessment). Address marketing at broader level through cross-cutting Marketing study.
Continuous Energy Improvement (CEI)	SCG3614	\$1,337,885	Early implementation	No	Marketing identified as key issue. Will be addressed at higher level in cross-cutting Marketing study.
	SCG3610	\$1,029,118			
	SCG3606	\$64,223			
Strategic Planning and Integration	SCG3646	\$853,187	Other - Pgm has no implementation	No	Not a true program. Not part of program portfolio.
Energy Challenger	SCG3661	\$481,414	Mature Implementation	No	Will be replaced with a statewide program. Also, key issue is follow up with customers for interest in other programs - evaluated through audits, and IT / data tracking

Program Name	Program Code(s)	2010-2012 Program Revised Budget	Program Development Phase	Evaluate at Med / High Level?	Reason why / why not evaluated at Medium / High level
HVAC Statewide	SCG3651 SCG3652 SCG3653 SCG3654 SCG3655 SCG3656 SCG3657	\$979,794 (total for all 7 programs)	Early implementation	No	The HVAC program is part of a core offering of seven sub-programs led by SCE. This is a nonresource program. There is little direct activity for SoCal Gas. There are no participants. Evaluation resources should be directed to programs that have more impact on the overall portfolio of offerings.
Pump test and repair	SCG3605	\$266,539	Early Implementation	No	Key issue is how to integrate with portfolio - addressed as IT / data tracking. Consider discontinuing program (more information in Evaluability Assessment)

Figure 3: SoCal Gas Programs for Medium-High level of evaluation, in decreasing order of program budget

In the figure below, programs are listed by projected gas savings (highest to lowest).

Program Code	Program Name	Projected Gas Savings (gross therms/yr)	Evaluated at Med / High level?
SCG3611	SW-IndA - Calculated	34,491,066	Y
SCG3608	SW-ComB - Deemed	12,346,061	Y
SCG3612	SW-IndB - Deemed	7,207,206	Y
SCG3607	SW-ComA - Calculated	5,460,498	Y
SCG3603	SW-AgB - Deemed	4,050,263	Y
SCG3602	SW-AgA - Calculated	3,456,828	Y
SCG3601	Local05 - Local Non-Residential BID	1,309,959	Y
SCG3662	3P-NRes3 - Small Industrial Facility Upgrades	1,143,315	No
SCG3673	3P-Xc02 - SaveGas – Hot Water Control	933,345	Y
SCG3663	3P-NRes4 - Program for Resource Efficiency in Private Schools	905,403	Y
SCG3672	3P-Xc01 - Gas Cooling Retrofit	52,613	No
ALL OTHER PROGRAMS HAVE 0 PROJECTED SAVINGS			

Figure 4: SoCal Gas Programs, by Projected Natural Gas Savings

3. EVALUATION WORK PLANS

The following section includes work plans for programs targeted for evaluation at a medium to high level. The CPUC designator code is listed below the program title and SoCal Gas designation. Programs are listed in order of program budget (highest to lowest).

3.1 Calculated Programs (SW-IndA, ComA, AgA –Calculated)

CPUC codes: SCG3602, SCG3607, SCG3611

3.1.1 Background

This is a statewide non-residential energy efficiency incentive program targeting large customers within the commercial, industrial and agricultural sectors. It provides incentives for customized energy efficiency projects and, in some cases, design/audit assistance. Incentive levels are paid based on the lower amount of two methods; 1) per annual Therms saved and may include a measurement and verification (M&V) procedure, or 2) Customers can receive up to 50 percent of incremental measure costs, not to exceed a predetermined project site cap. Savings calculations are generated by program software or alternatively from other engineering sources.

3.1.2 Research Issues

Key issues and research questions to be investigated include those in the following list. Depending on the evaluation team's initial research, efforts will be optimized and not all topics areas here will necessarily be pursued.

- ◆ Program goals
 - How have program goals changed over time (are they dynamic)? Have they evolved with the market and regulatory environment, such as with development of the strategic energy plan or standardized program tracking database (2006 – 2008 evaluation cycle)?
 - How are leads being generated for the program, and what roles do AEs and other sources play in developing projects for the program? Are these channels sufficient to meet program goals?
 - Are PPMs correct for this program and are they being met? What market transformation indicators (MTIs) are applicable to the program?
- ◆ Market actors
 - How do trade allies currently view the program and how has this changed over time?
 - Should trade allies be utilized more effectively to meet program goals and, if so, how?
 - What support do participating customers receive from program staff and is it optimal?
- ◆ Previous evaluation issues and recommendations

- Previous evaluation highlighted confusion amongst customers when dealing with multiple staff with varying responsibilities.
 - Do program administrative issues remain a barrier to participation or lead to customer dissatisfaction?
 - What has happened to barriers cited in previous evaluations?
 - Have new barriers developed since the last evaluation?
- ♦ Program development
 - How are new technologies being introduced to the program and what is the link to the Portfolio of the Future program?
 - Is there training for new program staff/AEs/trade allies? Is the training adequate?
- ♦ Program operations
 - Are QA/ QC processes effective, particularly for certain measures?
 - Data tracking
 - Is there a system enabling customers/trade allies/AE to track project status?
 - Is there redundancy between CRM and other trackers? Is CRM sufficient?
 - Is program reporting adequate to properly assist program operations?
 - Are the state-mandated PPMs and MTIs being tracked? How are they being tracked?
 - How do the SoCal Gas and SDGE programs compare to those of other California IOUs or other customized programs nation-wide?

3.1.3 Data Collection & Analysis

To address the identified research issues, the evaluation team will conduct data collection activities described in this section and summarized in Figure 5, below.

Data Collection Activity	Respondent Type	Time Per Activity	Number Planned
Telephone Surveys	Program participant	15-30 minutes	70 surveys
In-depth Interviews	Program participant	30 minutes	10 interviews (pending survey findings)
In-depth Interviews	Drop-out customers	30 minutes	~ 5 interviews (TBD)
In-depth Interview with utility Program Managers	Utility Staff	30 minutes	2
In-depth Interviews	Trade allies	30 minutes	~ 5 interviews (TBD)
Literature Review	NA	NA	NA

Figure 5: Calculated Programs, Data Collection Activity Summary

The in-depth interviews will be semi-structured telephone interviews conducted by experienced consulting staff. Topic guides will be developed and reviewed by Program staff prior to any of the interviews.

The telephone surveys will be conducted by trained interviewing staff using structured computer-assisted telephone interview (CATI) software.

Requested data/access supporting the planned data collection described here includes the following:

- ◆ Detailed program documentation (Program Procedures, Book of Business, various available reports, process flowcharts, program advisor handbook)
- ◆ QA/QC documentation (if any, customer and trade ally satisfaction)
- ◆ Detailed program database from 2009-2010 (and 2011 to date, if possible)
- ◆ Participant data from CRM with links to feeder programs
- ◆ Follow-up interviews with AEs and market segment managers, as needed
- ◆ List of program drop outs
- ◆ Customer satisfaction surveys completed by the utilities for quality control

Program Staff and Materials

Follow-up, in-depth interviews with program staff will review the current program logic models and gather feedback about needed model updates to reflect current program practices. In addition, available program materials (database, marketing materials, FAQ brochures) will be reviewed to inform recommendations for their potential improvement.

Relevant Other Customized Programs

A best practices literature review will be conducted to compare and contrast SoCal Gas programs to those of other California IOUs or other custom programs nation-wide. It will include a mixture of internet searches and secondary research of sources such as program websites, the DSIRE database, conference white papers, and regulatory filings.

Program Participants

Although this evaluation will look at all three sectors, our focus will be the industrial sector, which has the largest savings per project and total savings. The telephone surveys will assess program satisfaction and identify barriers to participation from the participants' perspective. Follow-up, in-depth interviews are planned with key customers to be determined by initial survey findings. Figure 6, below, shows planned sampling of participating customers across the SoCal Gas and SDG&E Calculated programs.

SCG - AG	SCG - COMM	SCG – IND	SDGE – AG	SDGE - COMM	SDGE – IND
2/7	10/29	30/51	Not Available	25/125	3/14

Figure 6: Calculated Programs, Utility and Sector Sampling (sample/unique customers)

In addition, interviews with drop outs/non-participants can be conducted, provided contact information is available and budget limitations do not arise

Trade Allies

We will coordinate with SoCal Gas program staff to obtain a list of trade allies for each program and sector. Select trade allies will be interviewed in-depth to assess their perspective on program support and overall program satisfaction as well as to identify any barriers to participation.

AEs

Interviews with AEs will be conducted as part of the overarching surveys.

3.1.4 Budget

The estimated budget to perform planned evaluation work for these programs for SoCal Gas and SDGE is \$105,000 (\$65,000 for SDG&E and \$40,000 for SoCal Gas) in Navigant labor costs and expenses. Figure 7, below, provides additional detail.

	Hours	Budget
NCI Labor Budget:	500	\$80,000
Data Collection Expenses :		\$25,000
Total:	500	\$105,000

Figure 7: Calculated Programs, Evaluation Budget

3.2 Deemed Programs (SW– ComB, IndB, AgB –Deemed)

CPUC codes: SCG3608, SCG3612, SCG3603

3.2.1 Background

Formerly known as Express Efficiency, this is a mature program that offers prescriptive rebates for a variety of energy efficiency measures/products. It has a fair degree of market and customer awareness of its offerings, with AEs and contractors doing a lot of the program marketing. Program managers tend to focus on rebate processing and inspections, since the program is high-volume. Statewide, deemed programs are the non-residential sector energy savings workhorse – accounting for the majority of gas savings.

3.2.2 Research Issues

The major program issues include measure ex post savings degradation, additional measure complexity in DEER, and identifying new measures. Secondary issues include inefficiencies in rebate processing, regulatory complexity, lack of ability to track program savings due to IT

constraints, changes in DEER inputs, and inconsistent inspection policies across SoCal Gas and SDG&E (SDG&E does many more.)

Identified research objectives include the following:

- ◆ Identify barriers to participation and determine how to address them to increase program participation
 - Determine awareness of the program among non-participants and non-participating contractors and interest in/barriers to participation
 - Obtain feedback from aware/participating customers, contractors and AEs and service technicians on how to market the program to customers and increase participation
 - Identify potential new measures and delivery strategies for the program to consider offering
 - Assess the effectiveness of the use of a 3P contractor to drive participation
 - Determine how the benchmarking requirement is impacting participation
- ◆ Identify process improvements that will increase program efficiency and ultimately customer/vendor satisfaction and participation
 - Explore ways to increase the efficiency of rebate processing and improve the turn-around time for customers
 - Identify ways to optimize inspections
 - Obtain feedback from customers, contractors and AEs and service technicians on how to make it easier for customers to apply for rebates
 - Identify ways to address cross-cutting issues through related research, including IT, organizational constraints (e.g., staff turn-over, lack of integration among departments), regulatory complexity and uncertainty, best practices assessment (done in detail for all programs evaluated) (e.g., new gas measures to consider, use of new program delivery strategies such as point of sale, online and streamlined rebate applications)

3.2.3 Data Collection

To address the identified research issues, the evaluation team will conduct the data collection activities described in this section and summarized in Figure 8, below.

Data Collection Activity	Respondent Type	Time Per Activity	Number Planned
Program materials review	NA – rebate forms, processing diagrams/ documents, inspections P&Ps/ diagrams	40 hours	1
Surveys	Participants	30 minutes	600 surveys
	Nonparticipants	See Figure 15, Section 3.7	
Interviews	SoCal Gas staff – CST/IST manager or representatives, SoCal Gas audit department, inspections department, rebate processing department	60 minutes	10 interviews
	PG&E and SCE Deemed program managers	30 minutes	2
	Participating vendors (contractors)	30 minutes	30 active vendors, 15 inactive vendors
	Nonparticipating vendors (contractors)	See Section 3.7	
	AEs	See Section 3.7	

Figure 8: Deemed Programs, Data Collection Activity Summary

The planned activities include the following:

- ◆ Program materials review – we will obtain and review all relevant program materials, including internal documents that describe the rebate processing and inspection processes.
- ◆ Participant survey design and implementation – we will conduct a survey with participating customers to determine their overall satisfaction with the program and identify areas for improvement.
- ◆ In-depth interviews – we will conduct in-depth interviews with utility program staff, utility support staff and participating and non-participating vendors (e.g., contractors that promote or could promote the program directly to customers.) We will use the interviews to gain a more in-depth understanding of how the program is delivered, gauge satisfaction with the program, solicit suggestions for improvement and for non-participating vendors we will additionally determine awareness and interest in promoting the program.
- ◆ Analysis and Reporting – we will analyze the quantitative and qualitative data/information collected by the above tasks and assess the following issues, which will be documented in a written report section:
 - Rebate processing

- Optimized inspections
- Market barriers
- New measures/delivery strategies
- Other process improvements
- Coordinate with cross-cutting issues assessment for Deemed program

3.2.4 Budget

The estimated budget for evaluating both SoCal Gas and SDG&E's Deemed program is \$75,000 (\$46,500 for SDGE, and \$28,500 for SoCal Gas) in Evergreen labor costs plus \$25,000 (500 @ \$50/each) in direct costs for CATI surveys.

	Hours	Budget
Evergreen Labor Budget:		\$75,000
Data Collection Expenses :		\$25,000
Total:		\$100,000

Figure 9: Deemed Programs, Evaluation Budget

Note that this estimate excludes the overarching research tasks that are being conducted across the portfolio – e.g., non-participating customer and non-participating vendor/trade ally interviews.

3.3 SaveGas – Hot Water Control (3P–Xc02)

CPUC codes: SCG3673

3.3.1 Background

This third-party (3P) program implements domestic hot water control systems in hotels, motels, resorts, senior care facilities, and other associated hot water end uses. It offers direct installation of measures to overcome the market barriers of low consumer information and finances and lack of available installation providers. SoCal Gas AEs identify potential targets in the SoCal Gas database. The 3P implementer coordinates the activities of on-site technicians (auditors) and installation contractors.

The program manager explained that the program has “low participation” rates, and errors in site data prevent the utility from claiming program savings.

3.3.2 Research Issues

Research objectives include the following:

- ♦ Examine SoCal Gas's oversight of the 3P implementer
- ♦ Assess the quality of the 3P implementation firm's marketing and online demonstration processes

- ♦ Investigate the reasons for the errors in site data and what can be done to improve site data
- ♦ Investigate participants' and non-participants' experience with, and perceptions of, the program. In particular, investigate reasons for the low participation rates.

This evaluation also will investigate, as a cross-cutting issue, the ability of the 3P implementer to help achieve SoCal Gas's savings goals.

3.3.3 Data Collection

We will seek information on program processes from SoCal Gas program and the 3P implementer staff, program participants, and nonparticipants to which the implementer has marketed the program but who have not enrolled. Key implementation staff from whom we will solicit information include the SoCal Gas program manager (additional questions beyond those already covered in the preliminary interview held in May), the 3P implementation manager, the SoCal Gas AEs assigned to the market segments this program serves, and the technicians that perform onsite surveys of hot water systems. We will contact the SoCal Gas and 3P program managers as well as identify appropriate AEs to interview. We expect that interviewing a sample of four technicians and four AEs will provide a reasonable range of responses from each group. Figure 10, below, summarizes the data collection plan.

Data Collection Activity	Respondent Type	Hours / Activity	Number Planned
Conduct & Code Depth Interviews	3P Staff	3	2
Conduct & Code Depth Interviews	AE	3	6
Conduct Surveys	Participants/Partial	1	35

Figure 10: SaveGas – Hot Water Control, Data Collection Activity Summary

Program Staff

We will first develop separate interview guides for the program managers (beyond issues already discussed in the preliminary interview held in May), AEs, and field technicians. Upon finalization of the interview guides, we will contact the SoCal Gas program manager to arrange to notify the 3P program manager and technicians of the interviews to obtain their cooperation. At the same time, we will discuss with the 3P program manager the need for a list of all organizations that the implementer has contacted to attempt to enroll in the program, including both those that have had enrolled and those that declined. AEs will be interviewed as part of the overarching interviews.

Once the interviewees are notified, we will contact them first by email and then by telephone to schedule interviews. We will explain the purpose of the interview and the expected duration. At the appointed time, we will complete the interviews.

Program manager interviews are expected to take 45-60 minutes and will, at a minimum, address the following topics:

- ◆ Role and responsibilities
- ◆ Communication with other program staff and stakeholders
- ◆ Program progress
- ◆ Marketing activities, including line program demonstration
- ◆ The role of AEs, 3P staff experience in working with AEs, and issues to explore in interviews with AEs
- ◆ 3P's process for scheduling audits and completing installations
- ◆ Procedures for ensuring quality site data
- ◆ 3P integration (cross-cutting issue)
- ◆ Barriers to enrollment (including those not otherwise addressed)

AE interviews will be conducted so that they address various programs. For this program, they will address the following topics:

- ◆ How AEs identify high-value targets in the CRM database
- ◆ How AEs resolve customer issues relating to the program
- ◆ AEs' experiences working with the 3P (cross-cutting issue)

Technician interviews are expected to take 15-20 minutes and will, at a minimum, address the following topics:

- ◆ Questions potential participants have during the audit and how those are answered
- ◆ What technicians believe could be done to increase participation rate, including what additional role the technician could play
- ◆ Challenges and workaround activities with the audit process
- ◆ Procedures for ensuring quality site data

We will conduct phone interviews of SoCal Gas and 3P implementation firm staff from a list of contacts provided by SoCal Gas. During our implementation staff interviews, we will request contact information for program audit technicians. If necessary, we will work with the SoCal Gas evaluation manager to identify appropriate criteria for selecting technicians to interview.

Program Participants and Nonparticipants

The program targets portfolio asset managers or persons responsible for multiple utility accounts across a range of commercial property types (hotels, senior homes, resorts, etc.). The PIP sets a target of installing hot water controls in 3,000 hotel or motel rooms, 1,200 senior care dwelling units, and 15 laundries or kitchens. This may amount to approximately 60 buildings, but probably fewer building owners. However, the program so far has enrolled only two participants. We will attempt to interview those participants and any others (up to five, total) that have enrolled since.

Defining the nonparticipant population as those targeted for enrollment who have declined and assuming that population is as many as 100 building owners to date, we will need to survey up to 30 nonparticipants to achieve 90/10 confidence/precision.

We will develop survey guides for participants and nonparticipants and submit them to SoCal Gas for review. These telephone surveys will likely require 15-20 minutes to complete and will, at a minimum include the following topics:

- ◆ How participants and nonparticipants were recruited to the program
- ◆ Participants' experience with the online demonstration
- ◆ Participants' experience with the staff and the enrollment process
- ◆ Reasons why nonparticipants did not participate

We will require a contact list of program participants and nonparticipants from the 3P implementation firm. To prevent sample bias, we will randomize the lists prior to drawing samples.

AEs and Contractors/Vendors

In addition to interviewing SoCal Gas AEs assigned to market segments served by this program, we will draft two to three questions about 3P integration with SoCal Gas core programs to include in overarching surveys of AEs and contractors/vendors.

3.3.4 Analysis

We will code open-ended responses from the staff, AE, and technician interviews using software designed specifically for qualitative analysis. We will conduct phone interviews with a web-based Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) tool. We will carry out quantitative analyses of close-ended responses with SPSS. We will code open-ended responses into content categories for either qualitative or quantitative analysis.

We will document and include our results as part of the overall evaluation report. Our discussion will include a brief introduction and description of the methodology, followed by results and recommendations. One section will concern an evaluation of program implementation and processes written from our analysis of interviews with SoCal Gas staff, 3P staff, and technicians. A second section will concern marketing effectiveness and participant experiences based on analysis of participant and partial participant survey data.

3.3.5 Budget

The estimated budget to perform planned evaluation work for the program at both SDGE and SoCal Gas is \$56,623 (\$29,211 for SDGE, \$27,412 for SoCal Gas) in Research Into Action labor costs and expenses. Note that the budgets for the two utilities will be roughly equal for this program evaluation, because this program focuses on gas savings. (For most other evaluations shared by both utilities, the level of effort will be higher for SDGE.)

	Hours	Budget
Research Into Action Labor Budget:	271	\$56,623

Data Collection Expenses :		NA
	271	\$256,623

Figure 11: SaveGas – Hot Water Control, Evaluation Budget

3.4 Non-Residential Incentive Partnership (Local05 – Local Non-Residential BID)

CPUC code: SCG3601

3.4.1 Background

The LNRP program provides incentives for energy-efficient retrofits or replacements of existing equipment at SoCal Gas customer sites. A qualifying project, also known as a contract, must have annual savings of at least 1,000,000 therms. Measures applied for through the program cannot overlap other incentive programs.

This program enables the customer/project sponsor to propose incentive amounts for their project. Incentives are negotiated and may cover up to 100% of the incremental project costs. New to this program cycle, the program will offer adders that will incent customers to act expeditiously on enrolled projects.

The final incentive is verified annual energy savings. Verification can occur through an approved M&V study conducted by the project sponsor or by SoCal Gas's M&V subcontractor.

3.4.2 Research Issues

Initial interviews and data collection have identified the following research issues. Depending on findings of planned research activities, efforts will be optimized and not all topics areas here will necessarily be pursued. Based on the staff interviews and review of program material, the following research objectives for the study are to determine:

- ◆ Understanding how the program interacts with potential and current participants
 - Characterization of the current commercial retrofit market sector structure
 - Characterization of program projects
 - Identification of market barriers and successful market intervention strategies
 - Perceptions of vendor and participant satisfaction with the program
- ◆ Determining effectiveness and possible improvements to the program implementation/process
 - Staff organization structure
 - Perceptions of program procedures
 - Customer applications
 - Energy analysis / savings calculations
 - Incentive structure
 - Verification process
- ◆ Analyzing the ability to effectively track and report program results and outcomes

- Data system usage expectations and actual outcomes, both short and long term
- Recommendations to increase data systems effectiveness and contributions to program results
- ♦ Reviewing recent program implementation changes and how they relate to the following:
 - Process at each stage
 - Savings calculations
 - Staff roles, responsibilities
 - Customer / vendor roles, responsibilities

3.4.3 Data Collection

To address the identified research issues, the evaluation team will collect data as described in this section and summarized in Figure 12, below.

Data Collection Activity	Respondent Type	Time Per Activity	Number Planned
In-depth interviews	Program staff	30 minutes	5
Telephone surveys	Participants	15 minutes	2 customers
			1 vendors
Telephone surveys	Nonparticipants	15 minutes	5 customers
			5 vendors

Figure 12: Non-Residential Incentive Partnership, Data Collection Activity Summary

Program staff interviews – Beyond the interview already conducted with the program manager, we will identify other key program staff (approximately 5 individuals) and recruit each for an interview that will draw out detailed information about program activities, issues, and goals.

Participant interviews – For each participant, we will conduct a short interview to understand the decision-making participation process, program influence, market guidance, program improvement recommendations, and other program-specific feedback.

Nonparticipant interviews – For each nonparticipant, we will conduct a short interview to collect information on program awareness and influence, as well as better understanding of market practices.

3.4.4 Budget

The estimated budget to perform planned evaluation work for this program is \$19,671 in HMG labor costs and expenses. Figure 13, below, provides additional detail.

	Hours	Budget
--	-------	--------

Labor Budget:	104	\$16,023
Data Collection Expenses		\$3,648
Total:	104	\$19,671

Figure 13: Non-Residential Incentive Partnership, Evaluation Budget

3.5 Program for Resource Efficiency in Private Schools, PREPS (3P–NRes4)

CPUC code: SCG3663

3.5.1 Background

This 3P program installs energy saving measures in private schools and educates end-users about energy efficient practices. It offers direct installation of measures to overcome the market barriers of low consumer information and finances and lack of onsite staff to deal with efficiency measures. The program has been slowed by “mixed support” from SoCal Gas AEs, and outreach to schools only began in 2010. The SoCal Gas program manager wants to better understand market interest.

3.5.2 Research Issues

Identified research objectives include the following:

- ♦ Examine communication and coordination between SoCal Gas and the 3P implementer
- ♦ Assess quality of program’s marketing and outreach tactics
- ♦ Gauge market interest in the program
- ♦ Evaluate program alignment with SoCal Gas’s strategic plan
- ♦ Investigate program progress in enrolling schools and educating end-users
- ♦ Assess participants’ experience with the program, including program’s educational activities

This evaluation also will investigate, as a cross-cutting issue, the ability of the 3P implementer to help achieve SoCal Gas’s savings goals. This will include addressing the implementer’s ties to and knowledge of the SoCal Gas service territory.

3.5.3 Data Collection

We will seek information on program processes from SoCal Gas program and the 3P implementer staff, program participants, and nonparticipants to which the implementer has marketed the program but have not enrolled.

Program and Implementation Staff

The key implementation staff include the SoCal Gas program manager, the 3P implementer, and the SoCal Gas AEs. We expect that interviewing a sample of six AEs will provide a reasonable range of responses for each group.

Program manager interviews are expected to take 45-60 minutes and will, at a minimum, address the following topics:

- ◆ Role and responsibilities
- ◆ Communication with other program staff and stakeholders
- ◆ Marketing activities
- ◆ Progress – how many schools have been signed up and what has been done at each so far?
- ◆ Process for scheduling audits and completing installations
- ◆ Delivery of energy efficiency education to participant schools
- ◆ Outreach to SoCal Gas AEs and the role of AEs in program promotion
- ◆ Issues to explore in AE interviews
- ◆ Barriers to enrollment (including those not otherwise addressed)

AEs

AEs will be interviewed as part of the overarching interviews. Questions specific to this program are expected to take about 20 minutes and will, at a minimum, address the following topics:

- ◆ AEs' interactions with program staff.
- ◆ How AEs promote the PREPS program.
- ◆ How AEs identify high-value targets in the CRM database.
- ◆ What kinds of end-user issues do the AEs deal with for the PREPS program.

Program Participants and Nonparticipants

We will survey both participating and nonparticipating schools. This will enable us to describe the market's interest in PREPS and document attitudes toward energy efficiency and energy efficiency education at the schools with and without program involvement. Comparing participating schools with non-participating ones will enable us to gauge the effectiveness of energy efficiency education offered through this program.

Program documentation does not show the number of participating and nonparticipating schools. There are at least 500 private primary and secondary schools and perhaps 100 or more private colleges and universities in Southern California. Depending on how that population is divided between participating and nonparticipating schools, it could require a combined sample of more than 100 schools to achieve 90/10 confidence/precision in both samples, which would be beyond the budget constraints of this evaluation. We have budgeted for a total sample of 75 schools. We will work with the SoCal Gas evaluation manager to determine how best to divide this sample between the participating and nonparticipating schools.

Surveys by telephone of participating and non-participating schools are expected to take 20 minutes and will include the following topics:

- ◆ How participants were recruited to the program
- ◆ How participants and non-participants prefer to be contacted
- ◆ Participants' experience with the enrollment and implementation process.
- ◆ Participants' and non-participants' level of energy efficiency knowledge and activities
- ◆ Participants' changes in campus activities following PREPS participation

We will request contact list of program participants and nonparticipants from the 3P implementer. To prevent sample bias, we will randomize the lists prior to drawing samples.

3.5.4 Data Analysis

We will code open-ended responses from the staff, AE, and technician interviews using software designed specifically for qualitative analysis. We will conduct phone interviews with a web-based Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) tool. We will carry out quantitative analyses of close-ended responses with SPSS. We will code open-ended responses into content categories for either qualitative or quantitative analysis.

We will develop a report documenting our evaluation's research, results, and recommendations. One section will concern program implementation and processes, based on analysis of our interviews with SoCal Gas and 3P staff. A second section will concern marketing effectiveness, participant experiences, and program educational effectiveness based on analysis of participant and non-participant survey data.

3.5.5 Budget

The estimated budget to perform planned evaluation work for this program is \$27,851 in Research Into Action labor costs and expenses.

3.6 Non-Residential Audits (SW- IndC, ComC, AgC)

CPUC codes: SCG3613, SCG3609, SCG3604

3.6.1 Background

The Non-Residential Audits (NRA) program is designed to deliver a coordinated statewide integrated demand side management that promotes energy efficiency, demand response, distributed generation and emerging technologies. The Non-Residential Audit programs are non-resource programs and therefore, do not directly claim savings credits. Instead, these programs are intended to act as "funnels" or "feeders", encouraging participants to take part in other resource programs (e.g., the Calculated or Deemed programs). According to the program manager, an audit is required before participation in the Deemed program. In the preliminary program manager interview, the program manager raised concern over the quality of audits conducted, as well as conversion rates.

3.6.2 Research Issues

With this background in mind, our evaluation will address the following research questions:

- ♦ Are the program's marketing efforts effective? Are there any sub-sectors that are not being reached?
- ♦ Are the audits offered through the program comprehensive and accurate? If not, how can they be improved?
- ♦ Are the findings from the audits easily understood by participants? Do they offer clear guidance on next steps?
- ♦ Do the audit findings offer clear direction on which additional programs from which customers may benefit?
- ♦ How could the program efficiently track which audit participants move on to participate in other resource programs?
- ♦ What is the current estimated conversion rate? How could the program improve this rate?
- ♦ How satisfied are customers with the Non-Residential Audit offerings?

3.6.3 Data Collection

To address the identified research issues, the evaluation team will conduct the data collection activities described in this section and summarized in detailed in Figure 14, below.

Data Collection Activity	Respondent Type	Time Per Activity	Number Planned
Interviews	Audit Providers	20 minutes	10 per IOU
Interviews	AEs	60 minutes	2 per IOU
Telephone survey	Participants	15 minutes	70 per IOU
Database Analysis	NA	NA	NA

Figure 14: Non-Residential Audits, Data Collection Activity Summary

The in-depth interviews will be semi-structured telephone interviews conducted by experienced consulting staff. Topic guides will be developed and reviewed by Program staff prior to any of the interviews.

The telephone surveys will be conducted by trained interviewing staff using structured computer-assisted telephone interview (CATI) software.

Audit Providers

Audit providers will be interviewed to identify audit process barriers and assess challenges that exist to conducting comprehensive audits.

Participants

Program participants will be interviewed to assess their satisfaction with the audit process, identify barriers to participation, and classify the most effective marketing channels for

reaching these customers. These interviews will also assess the audit program's conversion rate by asking which, if any, additional programs the respondent has participated in as a result of the audit program.

AEs

Interviews with the AEs (as part of cross-cutting interviews with this group) will assess their perception of the audit quality and conversion rates.

Data Management Tools

We also plan to review the program manager's spreadsheet tracking audit activity in conjunction with the CRM database review. This review will attempt to identify efficient and effective methods for accurately assessing the conversion rate without follow-up interviews with program participants.

3.6.4 Budget

The estimated budget to perform planned evaluation work for SoCal Gas and SDG&E Non-Residential Audit programs is \$31,070 total (\$19,263 for SDG&E, \$11,807 for SoCal Gas) in direct Tetra Tech labor costs and expenses. There will be additional expenses for conducting the telephone surveys of 70 participants in each territory.

3.7 Overarching Surveys and Interviews

3.7.1 Background

The evaluation team will conduct surveys and interviews for several key parties to the SoCal Gas portfolio that affect various programs and cross-cutting issues. Questions will be compiled across all program-specific and cross-cutting issues work plans.

3.7.2 Research issues

Research questions for the overarching surveys include the following:

- ♦ Nonparticipating customers:
 - Awareness/perceptions of the program
 - Interest in participating
 - Interaction with vendors
 - Barriers to participation
- ♦ Measure developers
 - How they work with the EE programs, what is their process for identifying potential new measures to add to the portfolio, what resources do they use to identify new measures
 - Suggestions for new measures for programs
 - Barriers to getting new measures into programs

- Suggestions for improving the process to get more measures and integrate them more quickly into programs
- ◆ Other SoCal Gas staff
 - Customer application process
 - Incentive structure
 - Verification process
 - Data system usage expectations and actual outcomes
- ◆ Vendor relations/liaison
 - how often and how do they communicate with vendors
 - how do they identify potential vendors, what sources do they use
 - what types of vendors seem to be most/least responsive and why
 - what type of feedback do they typically get from vendors about each program evaluated
 - how could more vendors be reached by SoCal Gas
 - how to increase the number of participating vendors and getting those that have signed agreements to get customers to install program-qualifying equipment
 - suggestions for improving the each program evaluated to increase participation
- ◆ Account Executives
 - How do they target customers?
 - How do you typically educate customers about the EE programs available to them? How often do you do this?
 - Are customers typically aware of the programs that are available from SoCal Gas before you speak with them?
 - In your experience, how effective are the marketing materials provided by the programs? Which programs' materials are working well? Which could use the most improvement?
 - In your experience, how do customers most prefer to learn about EE programs available to them?
 - Suggestions for improving the each program evaluated to increase participation
- ◆ CPUC staff
 - Awareness of the regulatory burden on program staff and how that has changed (i.e., increased) over time, e.g., estimate of how much time they think program staff spend on various regulatory issues
 - Justification for IOU program staff time spent on the various regulatory issues – what are the objectives for each and expected outcomes, do those outcomes link to higher energy savings, strategic plan, etc.
 - What they think are the highest priority regulatory items that program staff should prioritize (and which should be lower priority)
 - Feedback on their relationship with IOU program managers, what type of relationship do they have (is it contentious, are there open lines of communication, is it productive), what are the main reasons that CPUC and IOU program staff interact, how the relationship could be improved
- ◆ Nonparticipating vendors: Same as non-participating customers

3.7.3 Data Collection

The proposed interviews and surveys include the following:

Data Collection Activity	Respondent Type	Time Per Activity	Number Planned
Surveys	Nonparticipants	30 minutes	200 across portfolio
Interviews	SoCal Gas staff – measure developers, vendor relations/liaison	60 minutes	5 across portfolio
	Portfolio level CPUC staff	30 minutes	5 across portfolio
	Nonparticipating vendors (contractors)	30 minutes	40 across portfolio
	AEs	TBD – forum or interviews	TBD

Figure 15: Overarching Data Collection Recommendations

3.7.4 Budget

The approximate budget for the overarching interviews and surveys for both SDG&E and SoCal Gas is \$28,710 (\$17,944 for SDGE, \$10,766 for SoCal Gas).

4. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES WORK PLANS

In addition to evaluating specific programs, our team will investigate selected issues that cut across the portfolio to affect multiple programs. These cross-cutting issues were rated by SoCal Gas staff and evaluators as high priority research topics. They will be evaluated jointly for SoCal Gas and SoCal Gas, because all cross-cutting issues relate to both utilities. Issues are listed according to evaluation budget (highest to lowest).

4.1 IT and Data Tracking Issues

4.1.1 Background

Through initial data collection, the evaluation team has identified widespread difficulty and problems with program databases, especially the customer tracking database (CRM). While portfolio-level SoCal Gas staff indicate that dumping the entire system is probably not an option, this cross-cutting topic will address the portfolio-wide issues with data management and tracking in an effort to identify potential for improvement.

Overall, the database tracking system is burdened by a lack of standardization and an abundance of customization. Quality control functions are not enabled within CRM due to customization. Unclear data rules and field names lead to inconsistent interpretations of their intent, and thus data is not uniform. (Based on preliminary staff interviews, the IT department is currently developing a data dictionary to increase uniformity.) Many program AE managers track their program activities using Excel spreadsheets they created. Such tracking of program data individually and then entering it into CRM creates additional work for staff, and increases the likelihood of errors and/or incomplete information transfer. Audit program data is not tracked at all in CRM—program managers manually track conversion of audit recommendations to core program projects.

4.1.2 Research Issues

Based on initial data collection and the challenges described above, the evaluation team has identified the following research issues for this cross-cutting topic.

- ◆ Perceptions of data systems effectiveness
- ◆ Data systems expected and actual usage, both short and long term
 - Types of program data elements
 - Types of program data reporting
- ◆ Brief review of current data dictionary project
- ◆ Recommendations for better integration of audit type programs
- ◆ Recommendations to increase data system effectiveness and its contribution to program results

4.1.3 Data Collection

Planned data collection activities are summarized in Figure 16, below.

Data Collection Activity	Respondent Type	Time Per Activity	Number Planned
Interviews	IT staff; Sector managers	20 minutes	18 interviews
Online Surveys	Program Managers	5 minutes	40 surveys

Figure 16: IT and Data Tracking, Data Collection Activity Summary

4.1.4 Budget

The estimated budget to perform planned evaluation work for this cross-cutting topic is \$42,440 total (\$26,313 for SDG&E, \$15,827 for SoCal Gas) HMG labor costs and expenses. Figure 17, below, provides additional detail.

	Hours	Budget
Labor Budget:	312	\$41,440
Data Collection Expenses		\$1,000
Total:	312	\$42,440

Figure 17: IT and Data Tracking, Evaluation Budget

4.2 Program Best Practices

4.2.1 Background

In this study, we will develop a best practices review for all SoCal Gas non-residential programs being evaluated at the medium to high level. For programs that were evaluated as part of the 2006-08 Non-Residential Evaluation, we will update the review. Each evaluation chapter will contain a review assessing individual program adherence to industry best practices. Best practices will be based on findings in the SoCal Gas 2006-2008 Non-Residential Evaluation, the 2004 National Energy Efficiency Best Practices Study, and primary research.

4.2.2 Research Issues

Research questions for this cross-cutting best practice analysis include the following:

- ♦ Does the overall SoCal Gas non-residential portfolio adhere to identified best practices for energy-efficiency programs?
- ♦ Do individual programs within the non-residential portfolio observe identified best practices for energy-efficiency programs?

Program implementation will be assessed based on common best practices for the three main program types in the SoCal Gas non-residential portfolio:

1. Calculated programs (including BID program)
2. Deemed programs
3. Audit programs

3P programs will be included in these categories where possible, but we will also separately review best practices in implementing 3P programs.

For programs that may not fit cleanly into the above categories, best practices will be developed, as appropriate, on an ad hoc basis. Because the evaluation budget does not allow for an in-depth review of best practices for every program, the priority and level of effort of the best practices assessment for each program will be based on results of the individual program evaluations and discussions with SoCal Gas staff.

The evaluation team will conclude the best practice review with an overview of the non-residential portfolio's overall adherence to the identified best practices.

4.2.3 Data Collection and Analysis

To address the identified research issues, the evaluation team will collect data as described in this section and summarized in Figure 18, below.

Data Collection Activity	Respondent Type	Time per Activity	Number Planned	Expenses
In-Depth Interviews	SoCal Gas staff, evaluation contractors and other industry experts	20 Minutes	15	N/A

Figure 18: Review of Program Best Practices, Data Collection Activity Summary

The primary data collection activity will be interviews with SoCal Gas staff, evaluation team members, and other appropriate industry experts to help refine and update the best practices used for the comparison analysis.

Data collection and analysis tasks include the following:

- ♦ Review previous evaluation
 - We will perform a detailed review of the 06-08 SoCal Gas process evaluation, matching current programs to those previously assessed.
- ♦ Identify, document, and update applicable best practices
 - Best practices outlined in the above previous evaluation will serve as the starting point for our analysis, where possible and appropriate.

- For new programs or those not explicitly assessed in the 06-08 evaluation, we will identify the most applicable set of best practices. Where possible, best practices related to one of the four categories listed in the above section will be used.
- We will interview program staff, evaluation team members, and other industry experts to support updating best practices. For programs where established best practices are not apparent, our team will develop them based on the 2004 best practices study and relevant primary research.
- ♦ Compare current programs' operation with documented best practices
 - Once a set of best practices is established for each relevant program type, we will assess the level at which programs evaluated by the team adhere to them.
- ♦ Cross-cutting analysis
 - Finally, we will synthesize program-specific results and assess the level of best practice adherence across the entire non-residential portfolio.

4.2.4 Budget

The estimated budget to perform planned evaluation work for this cross-cutting topic is \$35,250 total (\$21,855 for SDG&E, \$13,395 for SoCal Gas) in Energy Market Innovations (EMI) labor costs and expenses. Figure 19, below, provides additional detail.

	Hours	Budget
EMI Labor Budget:	235	\$35,250
Data Collection Expenses:		\$0
Total:	235	\$35,250

Figure 19: Review of Program Best Practices, Evaluation Budget

4.3 Regulatory Issues

4.3.1 Background

Regulatory complexity and burden arose as a cross-cutting research issue during interviews with SoCal Gas staff. Interviewees mentioned that a substantial portion of time is spent meeting regulatory requirements, which often shift and evolve over time. For example, there were significant complaints about the new DEER measure reporting requirements and the additional work required to meet them. Program staff indicate they are uncertain of what should be prioritized and have little time to actually run their program.

Often, staff are not able to proactively manage the regulatory priorities – such as PPMs – which are being reported in aggregate by a few EM&V staff as they are due. Staff would like

the opportunity to better utilize such metrics for understanding their market and managing their program.

4.3.2 Research Issues

Based on initial data collection, the evaluation team has identified the following research issues and objectives for this cross-cutting topic.

- ♦ Identify and document the major regulatory requirements and priorities that impact program staff, and estimate how much time is dedicated to them
- ♦ Determine the objectives (or spirit) of the regulatory requirements/priorities and assess whether those goals are being met, and if not, why not
- ♦ Determine if/how the regulatory burden on program managers could be either reduced or better managed, to the benefit of program results

4.3.3 Data Collection

Planned data collection activities are outlined in this section and in Figure 20, below.

Data Collection Activity	Respondent Type	Time Per Activity	Number Planned
Document review	NA – review regulatory filings, interview notes	80 hours	1
Database review	NA – review DEER, other regulatory reporting databases/reports	40 hours	1
Interviews	Evaluators on our team – ask them to interview program staff with a short battery; discuss results	60 minutes	6
	SoCal Gas staff – key senior/policy staff, follow-up	60 minutes	5
	CPUC ED staff	60 minutes	2

Figure 20: Regulatory Issues, Data Collection Activity Summary

Tasks to complete data collection for this topic include the following:

- ♦ Regulatory document and database review – we will request and review relevant documents such as filings and internal documents that relate to utility program staff regulatory (e.g., CPUC mandated) requirements and responsibilities to gain an in-depth understanding of the objectives, intended outcomes and impact on staff workload.
- ♦ In-depth interviews – we will review notes from evaluator interviews with program staff and follow-up with informal interviews with evaluators to gain the utility program staff perspective on the value and workload impact from meeting various regulatory requirements. We may also follow-up with senior utility staff and CPUC

Energy Division staff to supplement our understanding and obtain additional perspective.

4.3.4 Budget

The estimated budget to perform planned evaluation work for this cross-cutting topic is \$30,000 total (\$18,600 for SDG&E, \$11,400 for SoCal Gas) in Evergreen Economics labor costs and expenses. Figure 21, below, provides a summary.

	Hours	Budget
Labor Budget:		\$30,000
Data Collection Expenses		\$0
Total:		\$30,000

Figure 21: Regulatory Issues, Evaluation Budget

4.4 Organizational Issues

4.4.1 Background

The primary purpose of this cross-cutting topic is to identify issues that persist across numerous or all of the SoCal Gas non-residential programs and to identify potential means of resolving them.

4.4.2 Research Issues

Identifying and prioritizing key research issues will be a primary activity in this evaluation. While this analysis has not yet been performed, initial interviews with SoCal Gas program staff have identified a list of potential key issues, including the following:

- ◆ Staff retention and turn over
- ◆ Transfer of institutional knowledge
- ◆ Clarification of roles and responsibilities
- ◆ Organizational differences between utilities
- ◆ Efficient use of resources
- ◆ Internal program coordination

4.4.3 Data Collection

Planned data collection activities supporting are described in this section and summarized in below.

To address the identified research issues, the evaluation team will collect data as described in this section and summarized in Figure 22, below. Other data collection will be required, and the scope of this will be developed after initial interviews with SoCal Gas staff.

Data Collection Activity	Respondent Type	Time per Activity	Number Planned
Group interviews	SoCal Gas staff (n=2)	1 hour	2

Figure 22: Review of Organizational Issues, Data Collection Activity Summary

Data collection analysis for this cross-cutting topic will occur in two main phases. The first will be to identify and refine the team's understanding of the main organizational issues. Following we will work closely with SoCal Gas to prioritize these issues. Once issues are identified, refined, and prioritized, we will collect and analyze relevant data in order to develop recommendations for improvement.

The main steps towards completing our analysis include the following:

- ♦ Interview group(s) of key SoCal Gas staff. The evaluation team will organize up to two group interviews with key SoCal Gas staff to identify and prioritize cross-cutting organizational issues. These interviews will either be administered to two different groups, or to the same group at two different times. This will allow for collecting different points of view or to evaluating the persistence of issues over time.
- ♦ Inventory and categorize key organizational issues. The evaluation team will analyze the results of staff interviews as well as the results of individual program and cross-cutting evaluations (as they are developed) to identify, define and categorize the key organizational issues for the SoCal Gas non-residential programs.
- ♦ Prioritize critical issues with SoCal Gas. Once key issues are identified, the evaluation team will work with SoCal Gas staff to prioritize which should be examined and to what extent. At this stage the evaluation team will also work with SoCal Gas staff to identify an analysis approach and data collection activities to support each activity.
- ♦ Collect and analyze data. Key additional data will then be collected and analyzed to assess the persistence of key organizational issues and to inform recommendations for overcoming them. Examples of potential data collection activities include in-depth interviews with key stakeholders, brief surveys, or process mapping workshops. Where necessary, the evaluation team leads for specific programs will be consulted regarding how specific organizational issues persist in their evaluated programs, and the effect of such issues on these programs.

In addition to the planned group interviews described above, further necessary data collection will be identified and conducted after developing the prioritized list of issues. The evaluation team will work with SoCal Gas to develop a research plan appropriate to addressing each issue. A significant amount of the evaluation budget is reserved for data collection and analysis to support these to-be-determined data collection activities. Where possible, overarching surveys and interviews performed to support the program evaluations will be leveraged to support this topic.

4.4.4 Budget

The estimated budget to perform planned evaluation work for this cross-cutting topic is \$24,150 total (\$21,855 to SDG&E, \$13,395 to SoCal Gas) in Energy Market Innovations (EMI) labor costs and expenses. Figure 23, below, provides additional detail.

	Hours	Cost
EMI Labor Budget:	161	\$24,150
Data Collection Expenses:	0	\$0
Total:	161	\$24,150

Figure 23: Review of Organizational Issues, Evaluation Budget

4.5 Statewide Coordination

4.5.1 Background

There are numerous obligations for all program managers to comply with various statewide reporting requirements. The process takes extensive staff time and effort, and there are questions among utility staff as to the value of this time and work commitment. For example, one program manager named this as his/her major complaint. Other frequent complaints include priority given to the goals of the other utilities, meetings often based in Northern California, and gas savings often discussed as an afterthought to electric savings.

4.5.2 Research Issues

Key evaluated issues and research objectives may include the following:

- ◆ Define where statewide coordination is occurring, how the process is operating, what are the benefits and value, and what is the labor and cost associated with this activity
- ◆ Determine linkages between Demand Side Management (DSM) programs and the strategic plan or other policy or legislative initiative
- ◆ Methodologies for meeting compliance requirements, whether these methodologies have been optimized and reporting requirements are being met
- ◆ Investigate how the new statewide energy efficiency brand, Engage 360, can best be leveraged
- ◆ Investigate if the utility EE programs are designed appropriately to achieve the statewide market transformation goals
- ◆ Investigate the linkage to the reporting metrics (PPMs) and if they are being tracked
- ◆ Identify barriers to greater statewide coordination
- ◆ Identify ways to improve the statewide coordination process and make it more valuable to SDG&E and its staff
- ◆ Investigate how workforce education and training (WE&T) programs and the utility's demonstration centers feed into core EE program offerings

4.5.3 Data Collection

To address the identified research issues, the evaluation team will collect data as described in this section and summarized in Figure 24, below.

Data Collection Activity	Respondent Type	Time Per Activity	Number Planned
In-Depth Interviews	CPUC staff, Engage 360 staff, SDGE and SoCal Gas staff, other utility staff such as SCE and PG&E	60 minutes	15 interviews
Literature Review	NA	NA	NA

Figure 24: Statewide Coordination, Data Collection Activity Summary

Interviews

The in-depth interviews will be semi-structured telephone interviews conducted by experienced consulting staff. Topic guides will be developed and reviewed by Program staff prior to any of the interviews.

Proposed interviewees include California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) staff and Engage 360, SDGE, SoCal Gas, and other utility program managers.

Literature Review

The literature review will include relevant aspects of the current and past strategic plans and utility PIPs, including but not limited to the following:

- ◆ History of strategic plan
- ◆ Strategic plan intent, implementation strategies and overlap with utility EE plans

Metric Tracking

In order to determine reporting compliance, we will review PPM and strategic goals tracking for all programs for which they are available and that are being evaluated. PPMs will be gathered from the team member evaluating programs described in Section 3 of this document.

4.5.4 Budget

The estimated budget to perform planned evaluation work for this cross-cutting topic is \$20,000 total (\$12,400 for SDG&E, \$11,400 for SoCal Gas) in Navigant labor costs and expenses. Figure 25, below, provides additional detail.

	Hours	Budget
Navigant Labor Budget:	125	\$20,000
Expenses:		\$0
Total:	125	\$20,000

Figure 25: Statewide Coordination, Evaluation Budget

4.6 Marketing

4.6.1 Background

The effectiveness of SoCal Gas's marketing efforts will be evaluated through this cross-cutting topic. Although marketing is typically program-targeted, there are company-level researchable issues that can be addressed.

Segment advisors will also be engaged in marketing strategies to enhance results. They will be responsible for marketing offerings available to segments, but not for marketing efforts of specific programs.

4.6.2 Research Issues

This cross-cutting evaluation will assess a number of issues. Example research questions / issues include the following:

- ◆ Are customers aware that SoCal Gas offers demand side management solutions and financial incentives for implementing those solutions? How are customers most likely to learn of the offerings?
- ◆ What is the most effective means for communicating opportunities to SoCal Gas's C&I customers? Do the effectiveness of these methods or modes vary by sector or by type of program offering?
- ◆ Do the utilities understand and effectively utilize the internal and external marketing channels?
- ◆ Are internal marketing channels (e.g., account managers) and external marketing channels (e.g., energy champions) being effectively utilized?
- ◆ Are there groups of the target population being missed? If so, why and what can be done to meet that gap?
- ◆ Is the approach of segmenting AEs based on geography effective in targeting and serving customers? Why or why not? What are the advantages / disadvantages compared with the SDG&E approach (based on market sector)?
- ◆ Do the utilities have sufficient market-based information to market to their customers? Do the segment advisors have sufficient information to target marketing strategies to specific segments?
- ◆ Are there other marketing opportunities not being taken advantage of?
- ◆ Are programs effectively cross-marketing? If not, why not?

- ♦ Are customers, based on prior experience, creating an informal marketing mechanism by referring other customers into the programs?
- ♦ What do the utilities need to consider regarding the timing of the marketing, particularly as it relates to participants' planning cycle? How does that timing vary by different customer segments?

4.6.3 Data Collection

To most cost-effectively deliver on this cross-cutting evaluation issue, the evaluation team will leverage data collection activities being completed through other program-specific or cross-cutting evaluations. These activities include the following:

- ♦ Participating customer surveys: Participant surveys will assess means for awareness and preferred way to learn about programs and offerings. Participant surveys will also assess exposure to internal and external marketing channels as well as potential for word-of-mouth program referrals.
- ♦ Participating contractor surveys: C&I programs are often marketed through the mid-stream channels, including trade allies and firms providing technical assistance. Participating contractor interviews will assess means of awareness, preferred way to learn about the programs and offerings, and opportunities for marketing improvements.
- ♦ Nonparticipant surveys will assess awareness of SoCal Gas's programs in general, means of awareness, and preferred means for receiving information from the utilities.
- ♦ Account manager interviews will identify interactions with customers, how they market to customers, their assessment of marketing materials, and areas needing improvement.
- ♦ SoCal Gas Segment advisor interviews will cover their marketing initiatives, barriers of marketing, and perception of marketing effectiveness and gaps.

In addition to analysis of data resulting from the above activities, the evaluation team will review marketing literature provided by the programs and/or utilities as well as the utilities' websites, to assess the ease of accessing program information.

4.6.4 Budget

The estimated budget to perform planned evaluation work for this cross-cutting topic is \$12,850 total (\$7967 for SDG&E, \$4883 for SoCal Gas). This assumes no additional primary data collection activity and that analysis can utilize data gathered through complementary evaluation activities planned for specific programs and other cross-cutting topics.

4.7 Third-Party (3P) Implementer Integrations

4.7.1 Background

As part of our 3P program evaluations, we will explore how SoCal Gas's 3P programs are integrated into the larger portfolio. Specifically, we will investigate the 3P implementers'

ability to help achieve SoCal Gas savings goals. In preliminary interviews, program managers expressed the desire for a deeper understanding of their 3P implementer processes, interactions with SoCal Gas AEs, and marketing activities.

4.7.2 Research Issues

We will address the following cross-cutting 3P research objectives during the course of our targeted 3P program-specific evaluations.

- ◆ Describe how 3P staff and AEs coordinate prospect/project development
- ◆ Evaluate quality of 3P customer database management and maintenance of data concerning end-user engagement
- ◆ Explore marketing and process challenges 3P have in implementing programs
 - Are they following guidelines concerning use of 3P logos and SoCal Gas and SCD&G logos
 - Are marketing efforts consistent with other SoCal Gas program marketing efforts
 - Are 3P Firms using acceptable measurement and verification practices
- ◆ Evaluate the quality of customer experience with 3P Implementation firms
 - How do 3P firms deal with customer complaints/inquiry
 - Are contractors' activities acceptable to the end-user
 - Do 3P firms have enough authority to deal with specific issues that arise during project implementation
- ◆ Determine the level of local resource 3P implementation firms have allocated to SoCal Gas programs

4.7.3 Data Collection

Data collection for this cross-cutting topic will be incorporated into relevant program-specific evaluations described in Section 3 of this document. Figure 26, below, summarizes planned data collection activities. Because these interview questions will be incorporated into program-specific interviews, the time for each is short. (In other words, this shows incremental time for the cross cutting questions.)

Activity	Respondent Type	Hours / Activity	Number Planned
Interviews	3P Staff	0.1	5
Interviews	AEs	0.1	8
Interviews	Program managers	0.1	5
Surveys	Program Participants	0.1	67

Figure 26: 3P Implementer Integrations, Data Collection Activity Summary

4.7.4 Budget

Budget for this cross-cutting topic is incorporated into the 3P program-specific evaluation budgets described in Section 3 of this document.

5. APPENDIX. EVALUABILITY ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

The following is a summary of the evaluability assessment table. The full evaluability assessment is delivered as a companion document, as an excel workbook. Note that NR = Nonresource program.

Program Name	Program Code(s)	2010-2012 Program Revised Budget	Projected Gross Gas Savings (therms/yr)	Program Development Phase	Comments and Evaluation Goals for Program	Med /High Level Eval?	Reason why / why not evaluated at Medium / High level
Calculated	SCG3611	\$52,350,450	34,491,066	Mid Implementation	Many of the non-resource programs are designed to direct customers to the Calculated program - assess integration. Benchmark program against other programs both in California and nation-wide. Assess program administrative burden. Identify "bottlenecks" in the participation process that delay approval and implementation	Yes	High savings predicted
	SCG3607	\$7,970,900	5,460,498				
	SCG3602	\$5,886,576	3,456,828				
Deemed	SCG3608	\$15,253,471	12,346,061	Mature Implementation	Obtain market intelligence (from vendors, AEs and customers). Streamline application/processing, help them identify ways to meet goals. Determine whether internal SoCal Gas resources are effectively marketing program and driving participation (e.g., AEs, CSTs, segment advisors, vendor relations), identify potential new measures for the program	Yes	High savings predicted
	SCG3612	\$10,067,596	7,207,206				
	SCG3603	\$4,561,000	4,050,263				
Save Gas	SCG3673	\$4,583,364	933,345	Early Implementation	Program focus is lodging industry. Program existed in 06-08, but did not take off. Evaluation Goals: This program seems to be taking off with the change in incentives for AEs. The purpose will be to document the progress of the program, identify where the program is working and not working with lodging sector and with AEs, and about performance in other service territories.	Yes	Program may really be taking off now that the AEs are incented. If not, program has bigger problems and an evaluation can identify them

Program Name	Program Code(s)	2010-2012 Program Revised Budget	Projected Gross Gas Savings (therms/yr)	Program Development Phase	Comments and Evaluation Goals for Program	Med /High Level Eval?	Reason why / why not evaluated at Medium / High level
Portfolio of the Future	SCG3676	\$4,512,437	NR	Completed	Program uses a 3P to demonstrate new technologies. Program manager is concerned with timeliness of demonstrations and qualification of subcontractors. Evaluation Goals: Document how 3P's are chosen, and process triggering customer demonstration of EE technologies.	No	Nonresource program, not key to portfolio.
California Sustainability Alliance	SCG3675	\$3,657,212	NR	Mature Implementation	Potential synergy with other programs, may provide useful tools to building owners and managers who want to improve efficiency. But it is not clear whether it is accomplishing any of this. Evaluation Goals: Provide info on contractor's marketing and outreach, data/deliverable tracking, public need of/use of/response to services, ability to integrate with other statewide/municipal programs and goals.	No	Nonresource, and not key program to portfolio
SoCal Gas steam trap and compressed air	SCG3660	\$3,176,259	NR	Mid Implementation	Program appears expensive and may not be fulfilling original intent. Also unclear why SoCal Gas is looking at compressed air projects - these are electric. Goals: Evaluate program to decide if it should be discontinued. Evaluate costs and timelines for audits; these are done by an out-of- state implementation contractor, which adds cost and time. New program. They've spent much of their budget, but have not met 2010 or 2011 goals. Contact Program Manager, and Wayne Chi at 562-803-7401. He is engineering lead and may have further information on the program. Also, no integration to funnel audits into core, LGP, and 3rd party programs. Review the potential for the project to ramp up to meet goals set in the PIP. Assess if in-state resources are available to complete both the steam trap and compressed air	No	Nonresource program, not key to portfolio. Consider discontinuing program.

Program Name	Program Code(s)	2010-2012 Program Revised Budget	Projected Gross Gas Savings (therms/yr)	Program Development Phase	Comments and Evaluation Goals for Program	Med /High Level Eval?	Reason why / why not evaluated at Medium / High level
					audits. Follow up on program manager's request (sent May 15, 2011) to implementer for a recovery / ramp up plan. UPDATED INFO PROVIDED BY PROGRAM MANAGER MARCH 2012: The program is currently being reviewed, to consider lowering the goals and budget. The integration to funnel audits to other programs is being done once the audits and final reports are complete: There is a wrap up meeting with the customer, contractor and AE to discuss the possibilities of participating in other programs. Tracking mechanism is a Project Status Report spreadsheet that is reviewed weekly by contractor and program manager.		
Nonres BID	SCG3601	\$3,114,801	1,309,959	Design/ Pilot	Program is in its infancy, so insights may positively shape program's direction. Few large commercial participants have significant impact on savings goals. Evaluation Goals: Describe market demand for this program through market surveys. Evaluate if program is on-track to meet savings goals, and potential improvements to data tracking.	Yes	High savings predicted
On-Bill Financing	SCG3644	\$2,590,871	NR	Mature Implementation	Program continues to underperform, although the reasons may be obvious (hard to find gas projects with payback within 5 years). Other possible reasons that could also be explored: failure to market it effectively, overly strict qualification criteria. Evaluation Goals: Understand low level of participation, investigate effectiveness of marketing and coordination with rebate/incentive programs.	No	Not key to portfolio. Studied by CPUC. SDG&E OBF will be evaluated.
Small Industrial	SCG3662	\$2,084,620	1,143,315	Early Implement	This is program's 1st year. They have savings goal and target number of participants. They will probably	No	Early implementation, no progress yet.

Program Name	Program Code(s)	2010-2012 Program Revised Budget	Projected Gross Gas Savings (therms/yr)	Program Development Phase	Comments and Evaluation Goals for Program	Med /High Level Eval?	Reason why / why not evaluated at Medium / High level
GEP				ation	make their savings goal, but with fewer participants than targeted. Important to understand what might work for small customers, as they are not doing this. Evaluation Goals: Document the program, provide assessment of effect of AE incentive on engagement in the program, (if engagement is not improved the program will not make its goals), understand what other reasons beside AE involvement are needed.		
PREPS Private Schools Program k-higher ed	SCG3663	\$1,939,519	905,403	Early Implementation	The program model seems to be quite good. Thus it would be good to assess whether they can be effective and whether gas savings are enough to attract customers, as they are not coordinating with SCE. Evaluation Goals: document program, provide assessment of effectiveness of methods for outreach and participation, understand potential given the progress made in first two years.	Yes	Program model is sound, so check if it can be effective, or if coordination with SCE is necessary.
Nonres audits	SCG3613	\$1,909,380	NR	Mid Implementation	Good potential for feeding customers into core programs, but not integrated into portfolio. Not meeting PPM, because not tracking conversion rate. There is no clear path for coordinating with or feeding into other programs. How could one be created? Research audit quality. Program manager is concerned it is low.	Yes	Key feeder program, but not well integrated with resource based programs. Also concern that audit quality is very low, which could reflect poorly on SoCal Gas.
	SCG3609	\$1,833,302	NR				
	SCG3604	\$176,521	NR				

Program Name	Program Code(s)	2010-2012 Program Revised Budget	Projected Gross Gas Savings (therms/yr)	Program Development Phase	Comments and Evaluation Goals for Program	Med /High Level Eval?	Reason why / why not evaluated at Medium / High level
Gas Cooling	SCG3672	\$1,623,716	52,613	Mid Implementation	Program started 06-08 but still seems like early implementation. Help management understand why the program is not working. Evaluation Goals: Management wants to cancel the program and needs some basis for doing this other than inactivity. Program manager reports they keep sending in invoices monthly that get paid, but no action. The program is reported on track to achieve savings goals (55,000 therms are reported installed). However, there is no verification in the program, so there is some concern that these savings cannot ultimately be claimed. Also, if the program does not recruit more customers, there will be no further savings. The 1 enrolled project was able to achieve the savings goals for this program. So it is possible that, through targeted marketing that brings in another large customer or two, and the addition of a verification procedure, the program could be worth continuing.	No	Only 1 customer in 5 years. Consider discontinuing program. Address marketing at broader level through cross-cutting Marketing study.
Continuous Energy Improvement (CEI)	SCG3614	\$1,337,885	NR	Design/ Pilot	No projects have completed program yet. What is this program's potential in SoCal Gas service territory? Will large C/I/Ag customers participate partially or fully in CEI program? If not, why? If yes, how much staff and monetary resources can they allocate to EE planning, retrofits, and monitoring? Will they actually implement projects, and in what timeframe? How does this program overlap with related statewide efforts and how do those related efforts (that are championed by CPUC) compete with customers limiting participation for CEI?	No	Marketing identified as key issue. Will be addressed at higher level in cross-cutting Marketing study.
	SCG3610	\$1,029,118	NR				
	SCG3606	\$64,223	NR				

Program Name	Program Code(s)	2010-2012 Program Revised Budget	Projected Gross Gas Savings (therms/yr)	Program Development Phase	Comments and Evaluation Goals for Program	Med /High Level Eval?	Reason why / why not evaluated at Medium / High level
Strategic Planning and Integration	SCG3646	\$853,187	NR	Other - Pgm has no implementation	This is a department, not part of the program portfolio. Strategic development supports higher level portfolio planning. We recommend contacting manager and requesting some of the position papers written, which are used in program planning. No process evaluation is suggested.	No	Not a true program. Not part of program portfolio.
Energy Challenger	SCG3661	\$481,414	NR	Mature Implementation	Example of an audit-type program that's operating in a vacuum (not connected to other programs), so unclear what savings result (even indirectly) from it. Recommend strategies for tracking conversion rate and improving tracking conversion rate. No goals from Project Manager, because this program will be replaced with statewide audit tool, and manager is pleased with program.	No	Will be replaced with a statewide program. Also, key issue is follow up with customers for interest in other programs - evaluated through audits, and IT / data tracking.
HVAC Statewide	SCG3651 SCG3652 SCG3653 SCG3654 SCG3655 SCG3656 SCG3657	\$979,794 (total for all 7 programs)	NR	Design/ Pilot	This is a nonresource program for the utility. Their involvement is limited beyond participation in statewide meetings. The only concrete evaluation goal from manager is to identify what gas savings are available and relevant for SoCal Gas's market.	No	The HVAC program is part of a core offering if seven sub-programs led by SCE. This is a nonresource program. There is little direct activity for SoCal Gas. There are no participants. Evaluation resources should be directed to programs that have more impact on the overall portfolio of offerings.

Program Name	Program Code(s)	2010-2012 Program Revised Budget	Projected Gross Gas Savings (therms/yr)	Program Development Phase	Comments and Evaluation Goals for Program	Med /High Level Eval?	Reason why / why not evaluated at Medium / High level
Pump test and repair	SCG3605	\$266,539	NR	Early Implementation	Pump test program is old, but energy efficiency was integrated recently. The value of this program is questionable. Is it worth continuing the program? Why does SoCal Gas have a pump test program, since many pumps are electrical? There is also no clear path for coordinating with or feeding into resource-based programs. How could one be created? Marketing – How could we persuade customers to do new types of projects (e.g., incorporate energy efficiency into pump test)?	No	Key issue is how to integrate with portfolio - addressed as IT / data tracking. Consider discontinuing program.

6. APPENDIX. STATUS OF PORTFOLIO

A summary of performance for all IOUs based on the most recent filings to EEGA is presented below. This information is based on savings through May for SDG&E, June for SoCal Gas, June for PG&E, and April for SCE. Because the total projected savings are for program cycle 2010-12, this status shows progress at roughly the halfway mark.

As shown in Figure 27, SoCal Gas has installed 33% of savings and has another 11% savings that is committed.

IOU	Portfolio Projected kWh (2010-12)	Installed Savings kWh	Total Committed kWh	Savings Installe d - kWh (%)	Savings Committ ed - kWh (%)	Portfolio Projected therms (2010-12)	Installed Savings therms	Total Committed therms	Savings Installed - therm (%)	Savings Committe d - therm (%)
SDGE	794,440,714	755,230,856	234,898,420	95%	30%	11,658,919	535,516	1,497,682	5%	13%
SCG	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	115,207,058	38,210,492	12,497,841	33%	11%
PGE	4,372,582,691	2,883,148,439	436,205,120	66%	10%	65,379,405	38,957,353	137,599,526	60%	210%
SCE	4,952,314,983	3,256,025,748	594,174,058	66%	12%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Figure 27 – Current Performance Relative to Projected for all IOUs

The next figure shows the nonresidential programs only with projected therm savings, listed from highest to lowest projected savings. Other types of programs (e.g., Residential, Local Government Partnerships – LGPs) are not shown. Nonresidential Nonresource programs are also not shown.

Program Code	Program Name	Program Projected (2010-12)	Installed Savings	Total Committed	Installed savings Relative to projected	Committed savings Relative to projected	Projected savings contribution for Portfolio (%)
SCG3611	SW-IndA - Calculated	34,491,066	13,191,824	1,944,053	38%	4%	30%
SCG3608	SW-ComB - Deemed	12,346,061	2,020,629	50,873	16%	0%	11%
SCG3612	SW-IndB - Deemed	7,207,206	5,310,665	174,312	74%	2%	6%
SCG3607	SW-ComA - Calculated	5,460,498	1,491,551	4,230,638	27%	4%	5%
SCG3603	SW-AgB - Deemed	4,050,263	407,763	-	10%	0%	4%
SCG3602	SW-AgA - Calculated	3,456,828	239,986	2,676,197	7%	0%	3%
SCG3601	Local05 - Local Non-Residential BID	1,309,959	-	3,180,347	0%	0%	1%
SCG3662	3P-NRes3 - Small Industrial Facility Upgrades	1,143,315	-	-	0%	0%	1%
SCG3673	3P-Xc02 - SaveGas – Hot Water Control	933,345	80,095	-		0%	1%
SCG3663	3P-NRes4 - Pgm for Resource Effic in Private Schools	905,403	-	-	0%	0%	1%
SCG3672	3P-Xc01 - Gas Cooling Retrofit	52,613	58,361	-	111%	0%	0%
	Total Energy Efficiency for Nonres programs only	71,356,557	22,800,874	12,256,420	32%	17%	62%
	Total Energy Efficiency Portfolio for ALL Programs (e.g., Nonres, Res, LGP)	115,207,058	38,210,492	12,497,841	33%	11%	

Figure 28 – SoCal Gas Nonresidential programs: Status and contribution to overall savings

As the figure shows, 62% of the projected savings should be delivered by Nonresidential programs. The nonresidential programs have installed 32% of projected savings, with another 17% committed. Figure 28 also shows that the two programs with the highest projected gas savings are Calculated Industrial and Deemed Commercial. The Calculated Industrial program is fairly on track, but the Deemed Commercial has only 16% of its projected savings installed or committed.