

RTR Appendix

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

RTR for the PY 2013-2014 Regional Energy Networks Value and Effectiveness Study
(Opinion Dynamics Corporation, Calmac ID #CPU0114.01)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Study Title: PY 2013-2014 Regional Energy Networks Value and Effectiveness Study
Program: Multiple
Author: Opinion Dynamics Corporation
Calmac ID: CPU0114.01
Link to Report: http://calmac.org/publications/Regional_Energy_Networks_Value_and_Effectiveness_Report_FINAL_2016_01_05.pdf

Item #	Page #	Findings	Best Practice / Recommendations	Recommendation Recipient	PG&E (if applicable)		SCE (if applicable)		SCG (if applicable)		SDG&E (if applicable)		REN (if applicable)	
					Disposition (Accepted, Rejected, or Other)	Disposition Notes (e.g. Description of specific program change or Reason for rejection or Under further review)	Disposition (Accepted, Rejected, or Other)	Disposition Notes (e.g. Description of specific program change or Reason for rejection or Under further review)	Disposition (Accepted, Rejected, or Other)	Disposition Notes (e.g. Description of specific program change or Reason for rejection or Under further review)	Disposition (Accepted, Rejected, or Other)	Disposition Notes (e.g. Description of specific program change or Reason for rejection or Under further review)	Disposition (Accepted, Rejected, or Other)	Disposition Notes (e.g. Description of specific program change or Reason for rejection or Under further review)
1	77	Both the BayREN PAYS program and the two SoCalREN software packages within are new and their full potential is uncertain. SoCalREN software packages are providing value now in the form of new technologies and BayREN's PAYS with savings via a water-energy nexus, but both have few participants. Tracking uptake will help the RENs determine whether customers find the program designs appealing enough to participate or if design changes are necessary	The RENs should maintain their new programs and document customer response.	RENS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		See REN notes within Responses tab sheet within the REN response matrix for specifics.
2	76	The RENs provide value that they demonstrate to their constituencies in several important areas: technical expertise, targeting hard-to-reach markets, and linkages with other utility offerings. While the study found value as described, this study is indeterminate on whether the RENs should continue as program administrators (in either a probationary or a permanent status).	The RENs should continue	CPUC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Other	Energy Division will defer to CPUC decision makers who would decide this issue when the timing is deemed appropriate.
3	77	The ED plans for three additional studies on the RENs that will help provide a more complete picture of the value and effectiveness of these two new program administrators. While those studies have a set of research objectives, the Consultant Team suggests the three upcoming studies also consider the specific areas noted within this study report, but outside this study's scope.	The ED should sponsor additional studies to gauge the long-term effectiveness and viability of the REN program administrator models.	CPUC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Accepted	ED proposes to initiate multiple new studies in 2016 that would address the RENs. These would include one dedicated process study and one dedicated impact study.
4	77	The RENs believe that their relationships with local governments (and with community organizations) increase long-term energy savings. For example, looking at BayREN Home Upgrade conversion rates (which increased from 4% in 2013 to 19% in 2014), when compared to conversion rates by SoCalREN and the IOUs, presents a clearer picture of the presence or absence of an advantageous influence of the RENs relationship.	The RENs and IOUs should ensure tracking of key pilot metrics in order to compare activities across program administrators.	RENS plus IOUs	Accepted	IOUs agree that it is important to track key pilot metrics to ensure that activities are comparable across PAs. The IOUs believe that each PA needs to track their own metrics in order to respond quickly if changes in the metrics suggest a need for changing program operations. In addition, the IOUs recognize that the types of metrics that become achievable will vary with the length of the period that Programs are in place.	Accepted	Agreed. IOUs recognize value in tracking key pilot metrics to ensure that activities are comparable across PAs. IOUs recognize merit of each PA tracking its own metrics.	Accepted	Agreed. SCG agrees that it is important to track key comparable metrics to ensure activities are comparable across PAs. SCG believes that each PA needs to track their own metrics in order to respond quickly if changes in the metrics suggest a need for changing program operations.	Accepted	Agreed. IOUs agree that it is important to track key comparable metrics to ensure activities are comparable.	Accepted	See IOU notes here within Responses tab sheet and REN response matrix for specifics.
5	77	A BayREN member government indicated that a marketing effort with information for both BayREN and the IOU programs fell flat and confused customers. This same member county indicated customer confusion occurs especially in small towns, where customers typically learn about the programs via word-of-mouth. While half of the BayREN Home Upgrade Advisor program customers indicated confusion, they tempered that statement by indicating that the Advisor helped reduce their confusion.	A future study should determine the full level of customer and contractor confusion and, if found, provide better approaches to mitigate it	CPUC plus IOUs	Accepted	Recent findings from focus groups conducted as part of the evaluation of the ME&O program also found signs of lack of recognition of RENs by customers. We accept and support this recommendation for further research to better understand the specific actions/messages that are confusing customers and also seek to identify possible solutions the IOUs and RENs might take to minimize any confusion.	Accepted	Agree with the recommendation that future study is needed.	Accepted	Agreed. SCG agrees with this recommendation. Even though this finding focused on only BayRen HU program, SCG supports a future study across BayRen and SoCalRen programs. Furthermore, Recent findings from focus groups conducted as part of the evaluation of the Marketing, Education & Outreach (ME&O) program also found signs of confusion and a lack of recognition of the RENs. SCG supports further exploration of this issue within the ME&O evaluation work order.	Accepted	Agree with the recommendation that future study is needed.	Accepted	See IOU notes here within Responses tab sheet for specifics.