

## 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 Impact Evaluation of 2015 San Diego Gas & Electric Home Energy Reports and Manage-Act-Save Programs (Final Report)*** (DNV GL, Calmac ID #CPU0157.01)

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

**Study Title:** Impact Evaluation of 2015 San Diego Gas & Electric Home Energy Reports and Manage-Act-Save Programs (Final Report)  
**Program:** HER and MAS  
**Author:** DNV GL  
**Calmac ID:** CPU0157.01  
**ED WO:**  
**Link to Report:** [http://www.calmac.org/publications/DNVGL\\_SDGE\\_HERs\\_2015\\_final\\_to\\_calmac.pdf](http://www.calmac.org/publications/DNVGL_SDGE_HERs_2015_final_to_calmac.pdf)

Item #	Page #	Findings	Best Practice / Recommendations (Verbatim from Final Report)	Recommendation Recipient	Disposition	Disposition Notes
				If incorrect, please indicate and redirect in notes.	Choose: Accepted, Rejected, or Other	Examples: Describe specific program change, give reason for rejection, or indicate that it's under further review.
1	-	The experimental wave targeting large users produced the highest savings.	Expand the program particularly to high usage customers to achieve the greatest savings from the program.	SDG&E	Accepted	Currently under review with implementer to increase savings potential
2	-	Savings from paper reports tend to produce higher savings than email reports. The email reports may not be as effective as paper reports but it may still be a cost-effective channel since sending email reports is likely cheaper than sending paper reports.	Compare the cost effectiveness of paper and email reports. This requires tracking costs associated to paper and email reports separately.	SDG&E	Accepted	Review of cost-effectiveness and savings generated from both email and print is underway and being evaluated for best practices and potential language revisions.