

Thanks Pacific Gas and Electric developed Responses to Recommendations (RTR) contained in the evaluation studies of the 2013-2015 Energy Efficiency Program Cycle and beyond. This Appendix contains the Responses to Recommendations in the report:

RTR for the Local Third-Party Programs Evaluation, Program Year 2022 (DNV, Calmac ID # CPU00369.01,
ED WO # GroupA_L3PP_YR5 - Group A PY2022 Local Third-Party Program Evaluation

The RTR reports demonstrate PG&E’s plans and activities to incorporate EM&V evaluation recommendations into programs to improve performance and operations, where applicable. PG&E’s approach is consistent with the CPUC Decision (D.) 07-09-043¹ and the Energy Division-Investor Owned Utility Energy Efficiency Evaluation, Measurement and Verification (EM&V) Plan² for 2013 and beyond.

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

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

¹ Attachment 7, page 4, “Within 60 days of public release, program administrators will respond in writing to the final report findings and recommendations indicating what action, if any, will be taken as a result of study findings as they relate to potential changes to the programs. Energy Division can choose to extend the 60 day limit if the administrator presents a compelling case that more time is needed and the delay will not cause any problems in the implementation schedule, and may shorten the time on a case-by-case basis if necessary to avoid delays in the schedule.”

² Page 336, “Within 60 days of public release of a final report, the program administrators will respond in writing to the final report findings and recommendations indicating what action, if any, will be taken as a result of study findings. The IOU responses will be posted on the public document website.” The Plan is available at <http://www.energydataweb.com/cpuc>.

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

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

Study Title: Local Third-Party Programs Evaluation, Program Year 2022
Program(s): Public Government and K-12 Comprehensive (GK12 – PGE_Pub_009); Residential Multifamily Energy Savings Program (MESP – PGE_Res_003)
Author: DNV
Calmac ID: CPU00369.01
ED WO: GroupA_L3PP_YR5 - Group A PY2022 Local Third-Party Program Evaluation
Link to Report: [CPUC_GroupA_L3PP_PY2022_Final_report_CALMAC.pdf](#)

MANAGEMENT APPROVAL AFTER REVIEWING ALL IOU RESPONSES		
Name		Date
PG&E	Michael Burger, Senior Manager	6/10/2024
PG&E	Billy Roderick, Manager	6/20/2024

Item #	Page #	Findings	Best Practice / Recommendations (Verbatim from Final Report)	Recommendation Recipient	PG&E (if applicable)	
					Disposition	Disposition Notes
				If incorrect, please indicate and redirect in notes.	Choose: Accepted, Rejected, or Other	Examples: Describe specific program change, give reason for rejection, or indicate that it's under further review.
1	68	Program attribution is high or on par with claimed values, indicating the programs are reaching the intended population segments. Program delivery performance also improved or remained stable. Programs that had difficulties meeting energy savings and spending goals and were cost-ineffective in PY2021 performed better in PY2022. Programs that performed well in all three areas continued to do so in PY2022.	Other programs should consider emulating the strategies these programs have taken to achieve success, including offering measures that better align with customer preferences, such as electrification and deeper gas usage-saving measures, and employing more effective outreach strategies, such as direct multi-language outreach and community engagement (e.g., events).	All	<u>GK12</u> Accepted <u>MESP</u> Accepted	<u>GK12</u> The ability to offer and execute multiple project pathways to align with customer needs and business models has been a benefit of this program in this diverse segment. <u>MESP</u> The MESP Program closed in June 2023. Therefore, future 3P implementers can consider this in future program design.
2	68	Multifamily programs run by implementers of local 3PPs face systemic challenges that have resulted in the closure of two of these programs. Challenges included the inability to make inroads in the multifamily sector, possible competition from other PAs, inadequate funds for direct install activities, and limited measure options that programs can offer participants.	PAs could consider offering multifamily programs as equity rather than resource acquisition programs. Such an approach would allow them to provide higher incentives to property owners that reduce split incentive barriers and offer more measures attractive to multifamily participants. They could also consider requiring core measures for tenant units to improve renter equity.	All	<u>GK12</u> N/A <u>MESP</u> Accepted	<u>GK12</u> N/A <u>MESP</u> The MESP Program closed in June 2023. Therefore, PG&E can consider this in future program design.
3	68	There is inadequate data (KPIs) to track the impact of local 3PP innovations.	Given the heightened focus on innovation, PAs should develop and require standardized metrics to record and track the success of local 3PP innovations in all areas, including outreach and program delivery. For example, programs should track their outreach efforts: when, where, what, how, and who they reached.	All	<u>GK12</u> Accepted <u>MESP</u> Accepted	<u>GK12</u> As a result of a substantially increased collaboration with Local Government Partnerships and developed relationships with community-based organizations, GK12 is successfully evolving toward a more innovative outreach approach. Use of CalEnviroScreen data enables Geo-Targeted Bundling with HTR advocates to reach HTR customers. GK12 focus on engaging customers as a collaborator for Climate Action Plans and resultant electrification opportunities goes beyond standard audit/proposal strategies. <u>MESP</u> The MESP Program closed in June 2023. Therefore, future 3P implementers can consider this in future program design.

Item #	Page #	Findings	Best Practice / Recommendations (Verbatim from Final Report)	Recommendation Recipient	PG&E (if applicable)	
					Disposition	Disposition Notes
4	68	The program implementers did not track efforts to obtain input from HTR/DAC communities, making it impossible to evaluate their efforts at procedural equity.	Track efforts to obtain input from HTR/DAC communities and track HTR/DAC community input. It is essential to track when outreach includes two-way communication that allows communities to provide feedback.	All	<u>GK12</u> Accepted <u>MESP</u> Accepted	<u>GK12</u> GK12 has since exceeded its target of 40% of sites served being HTR/DAC customers. In addition to customer surveys, GK12 does gather feedback from communities via city councils and CBOs. It is a valid observation that more detailed reporting can occur to document these activities. <u>MESP</u> The MESP Program closed in June 2023. Therefore, future 3P implementers can consider this in future program design.
5	68	Outreach performance of local 3PPs to HTR customers and DACs remained consistent year-over-year with improved reach of DAC customers in PY2022.	Existing and developing local 3PPs should take note of the marketing and outreach innovations that have continued to work for this pool of programs year-over-year: direct outreach and strategic partnerships.	All	<u>GK12</u> Accepted <u>MESP</u> Accepted	<u>GK12</u> The broad offering of GK12 and its close coordination with small customer referral programs, such as local government partnerships working through public agencies helps the program establish credibility with this segment and geographies. <u>MESP</u> The MESP Program closed in June 2023. Therefore, future 3P implementers can consider this in future program design.
6	69	The evaluated programs do not meet all the equity standards embedded in the CPUC ESJ goals and other equity frameworks because the programs were designed and contracted before any equity plans were in place.	The next time PAs negotiate contracts with local 3PP implementers, they should include terms that cover a standardized equity framework.	All	<u>GK12</u> Accepted <u>MESP</u> Accepted	<u>GK12</u> Recent contract update includes flexible incentives, an HTR/DAC kicker to encourage participation, use of CalEnviroScreen data to target customers, EEaaS (energy efficiency as a service) financing to avoid up-front costs and expanded language program materials to improve customer experience and equity of outcome. <u>MESP</u> The MESP Program closed in June 2023. Therefore, PG&E can incorporate this recommendation in future 3P implementer contracts.