RTR Appendix

Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) 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 CPUC Workforce Standards Evaluation Final Report (Opinion Dynamics, Calmac ID #CPU0384.01)

The RTR reports demonstrate SoCalGas' plans and activities to incorporate EM&V evaluation recommendations into programs to improve performance and operations, where applicable. SoCalGas' 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. In cases where reports do not contain a section for recommendations, the SoCalGas 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), SoCalGas 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.

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."

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.

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: CPUC Workforce Standards Evaluation Final Report

Program:

Author: Opinion Dynamics

CALMAC ID: CPU0384.01

ED WO:

Link to Report: Workforce Standards Evaluation Report Final

MANAGEMENT APPROVAL AFTER REVIEW								
	Date							
SoCalGas Programs	Darren Hanway	4/11/2025						
SoCalGas RP&R	Roy Christian	4/17/2025						

Item #	Page #	Findings	Best Practice / Recommendations (Verbatim from Final Report)	Recommenda- tion Recipient	Disposition	Disposition Notes		SCG Propos	ed RTR Impleme	ntation	
			rmariceporty	If incorrect, please indicate and redirect in notes	Choose: Accepted, Re- jected, or Other	Examples: Describe specific program change, give reason for rejection, or indicate that it's under further review.	Next Steps: For each accepted recommendation, outline the steps required for implementation, responsible parties, and deadlines. For each rejected recommendation, document the reason provided for rejection. Outline any potential follow-up actions or considerations for the future.	Timeline: Set deadlines for the completion of each action. Include a start date and end date when possible.	Status: Track the status of each action item (e.g., Not Started, In Progress, Completed).	Notes: Add notes for any additional infor- mation or updates.	Impacted Programs: Identify which programs (program IDs) would be impacted by the action items.
1	58	Conclusion 1: As of April 2023, the Responsible Contractor Policy (SB 350) has yet to be funded. While the CEC is actively working towards securing funding in the next year, implementation has not been initiated	Recommendation 1: We recommend that the CEC review the findings in this report to help inform the development of the Responsible Contractor Policy and Consumer Protection Guidelines.		Other	Existing Contractor and Consumer agency oversight, policies and responsibilities have been resources and references for SoCalGas to rely on for evaluating 3P program design and the potential to manage the programs.	Not applicable	Not applicable			
2	59	Conclusion 2: Currently, CALCTP provides two individual-level training credentials: 1) installer technician training and 2) Acceptance Test Technician (ATT) training. Decision 18-10-008 does not specify which credential is required. C	Recommendation 2: We recommend that the CPUC clarify its preference for the CALCTP installer technician training program as the ALC certification for Workforce Standards as it 1) serves licensed electricians who may be responsible for installing the technologies and 2) can serve as a pre-requisite for the more advanced ATT training program. IOUs should direct 3P implementers to collect the certification number of individuals, and other relevant information (e.g., technician name, contractor name) needed to verify certifications with CALCTP. The CPUC should then direct the IOUs to coordinate with CALCTP			This recommendation is not applicable to SoCalGas					

Item	Page	Findings	Best Practice /	Recommenda-	Disposition	Disposition Notes	SCG Proposed RTR Implementation
#	#		Recommendations	tion Recipient			
			(Verbatim from Final Report)				
			staff to verify the validity of the certifications based on key information (e.g., name, contractor, certification number, date of certification).				
ЗА	59	Conclusion 3: Our review of HVAC credentials that satisfy the Workforce Standards require- ments revealed a lack of con- sistent and uniform standards	Recommendation 3A: While certification is not traditionally within the purview of the CPUC, they have a vested interest in ensuring the development of a qualified workforce to maximize energy savings and greenhouse gas emission reductions. We recommend that the CPUC collaborate with the California Department of Industrial Relations (DIR), California State License Board (CSLB), California Workforce Development Board, HVAC manufacturers, HVAC Distributors, Unions, California Community Chancellor's Office, and other relevant agencies to identify the best pathway forward for an HVAC technician exam that can be used for Workforce Standards.		Other	As referenced in the recommendation, standards exist for certifying technicians, as well as licensing HVAC operators, managed under the purview of the respective agencies to revise and/or set those standards and requirements.	
3B	59	Conclusion 3: Our review of HVAC credentials that satisfy the Workforce Standards require- ments revealed a lack of con- sistent and uniform standards	Recommendation 3B: We recommend that the CPUC ensure that the IOUs require the collection of necessary information (i.e., certification numbers for contractors and installation technicians and individuals' last names and last four digits of SSN for apprentices) to support verification for Workforce Standards enforcement.		Reject	SoCalGas rejects this recommendation, as this information is already collected by other agencies. Collecting personally identifiable and sensitive information by the PAs may be redundant and significantly heighten cybersecurity risks.	
4	59	Conclusion 4: Our analysis of the HVAC apprenticeships in California found that no federally accredited apprenticeship programs or non-union state-accredited programs were actively recruiting individuals. Non-union contractors indicated that there is a gap in the quality and availability of training depending on a company's union affiliation. Non-union companies cannot send their employees to union-sponsored apprenticeship training of-				No recommendation for response.	

Item	Page	Findings	Best Practice /	Recommenda-	Disposition	Disposition Notes	SCG Proposed RTR Implementation		
#	#		Recommendations	tion Recipient					
			(Verbatim from Final Report)						
		ferings, so they view the require- ment of a completed apprentice- ship in Workforce Standards as a significant barrier to accepting EE projects							
5	60	Conclusion 5: Contractors mentioned the need for more equitable credentialing standards for technicians, specifically identifying language and learning disabilities as barriers to pursuing credentials that require written examination for some of their employees.	Recommendation 5: As stated in D.18-10-008, the CPUC is "concerned that these requirements [do] not create barriers to disadvantaged workers participation in the programs." Following this guidance, we encourage the CPUC to provide a memo to sister agencies, DIR and CSLB, and training provider CALTCP that draws attention to requests uncovered in this research for training and examination opportunities in multiple languages and providing additional accommodation options for individuals with disabilities, such as additional time for examinations or allowing frequent breaks to make them accessible to a broader community of installers.		Other	This recommendation is directed to the CPUC.			
5A	60	Conclusion 5.2: In alignment with the 2018 decision, the IOUs integrated the language and requirements into any program contract that began on or after July 1, 2019. Due to the shift to 3P programs, the IOUs were no longer responsible for implementing the program and instead passed that responsibility on to the 3P implementers. Third-party implementers were required to develop an implementation plan that included how they would implement, track, and report on Workforce Standards. However, many of these programs were programs in which implementers were not responsible for hiring contractors or performing the work. To account for this, many of the 3P implementers focused on including Workforce Standards language and requirements in their contracts with program customers, associated contractors, and subcontractors. As a re-	Recommendation 5.2: Instead of 3P program designs allowing customers to hire their own contractor when participating in a program, we recommend that 3P program designs integrate the use of a preferred qualified contractor network. To develop this network, program staff would recruit and vet contractors and technicians to ensure that the installers meet the associated Workforce Standards requirements. Staff would then provide a list of these vetted installers for customers to choose from. The utilization of a preferred contractor/technician network in existing 3P programs (e.g., Trade Professional Alliance Network) can be beneficial to 1) ensure individuals and their teams hold the desired qualifications required by the CPUC and 2) streamline the process of submitting necessary program documentation.		Reject	SoCalGas rejects this recommendation. Selection of preferred contractor/technician is a decision that has been left to customers, relying on industry specific guidelines, advisories, recommendations and requirements provided by agencies familiar to consumer/businesses.			

Item	Page	Findings	Best Practice /	Recommenda-	Disposition	Disposition Notes	SCG Proposed RTR Implementation	
#	#	Tillulings	Recommendations	tion Recipient	Disposition	Disposition Notes	Sed Proposed RTR Impellientation	
			(Verbatim from	·				
			Final Report)					
		sult, the final onus of responsibil-						
		ity for implementation fell on customers, which is not what the						
		CPUC envisioned in 2018 when						
		the CPUC established these						
		standards						
			Recommendation 6: We recom-		Other	Given the existing role of government		
			mend that the CPUC formally		2 3.1.2.	assigned agencies for enforcing con-		
			designate the IOUs as the entity			tractor compliance with industry-wide		
			responsible for enforcing Work-			workforce standards, the CPUC direct-		
			force Standards and provide ex-			ing IOUs to only request implementers		
			plicit guidance on what that means for the PAs in their inter-			demonstration of compliance to appropriate workforce standards, seems		
			actions with 3P implementers.			most efficient and would avoid confu-		
			The CPUC historically and cur-			sion for implementers.		
			rently holds the IOUs accounta-					
		Conclusion 6: The standardized	ble for achieving desired out-					
		terms and conditions provided in	comes (e.g., energy savings),					
		Appendix B of D.18-10-008 di-	and thus, the IOUs are responsi-					
		rected the IOUs to request a	ble for ensuring all their pro-					
		demonstration of Workforce Standards compliance at least	grams are successful in accomplishing these goals even if they					
		once a year from implementers;	are outsourcing the design and					
6	61	however, none of the PAs inter-	implementation of these pro-					
		viewed believed it was their re-	grams to third-party implement-					
		sponsibility to enforce or police	ers. As stated in D.18-10-008,					
		Workforce Standards. As a result,	"The Commission does not have					
		there has been minimal enforce- ment of Workforce Standards	experience with the practical implications of requiring work-					
		since they were enacted in	force standards." While this re-					
		2019	port provides evidence of some					
			challenges in implementing					
			workforce standards, we recog-					
			nize that everyone is learning.					
			As the IOUs take on the respon-					
			sibility of enforcing Workforce Standards, the IOUs should pre-					
			sent lessons learned and recom-					
			mendations on how to make it					
			work to the CPUC in an ongoing					
			dialog.					
			Recommendation 7: While the		Accept	SoCalGas accepts this recommendation.		
		Conclusion 7: Due to the timing	CPUC aimed to ensure that			Program designs that can easily be im-		
		of Workforce Standards and the	there were equal opportunities			plemented and adherence with con-		
		shift in IOU portfolios to include	for implementers to secure con-			tractor and workforce standards that		
		more 3P programming, we found	tracts to implement 3P pro-			exist under the purview of the respec- tive industry agencies would seem less		
7	61	that the role of IOU program	grams, we recommend that the Procurement Review Group			administratively burdensome to smaller		
	••	managers shifted from managing	(PRG) explore additional oppor-			entities.		
		the program's implementation to managing the contract and en-	tunities to support 3P imple-					
		suring that 3P implementers	menters—especially smaller					
		meet performance deadlines.	firms—with the data collection					
			and verification requirements					
			associated with Workforce					

Item	Page	Findings	Best Practice /	Recommenda-	Disposition	Disposition Notes	SCG Proposed RTR Impleme	ntation	
#	#		Recommendations	tion Recipient	2.0pco.u.c.i	20,000.00	оссторования пиропи		
			(Verbatim from						
			Final Report) Standards. This may include but				I I		
			is not limited to discussions						
			around the proportion of con-						
			tracts associated with pay-for-						
			performance models, utilization						
			of fixed fees to support the						
			ramp-up phase of the program,						
			and additional support mecha-						
			nisms during the contract negotiation process. Additionally, we						
			recommend that the CPUC de-						
			velop a regular feedback mecha-						
			nism to solicit 3P implementer						
			feedback on program effective-						
			ness and challenges and inte-						
			grate implementer feedback						
			into updates to the contracting						
			process, program design, or						
			measurement and verification						
			processes.						
			Recommendation 8: We recom-			Not applicable to SoCalGas			
			mend that the CPUC ensure that there is a standardized defini-						
			tion for what constitutes "light-						
			ing controls". We recommend						
			that the CPUC consider using						
			the definition developed by the						
			CALCTP Board to include: 1) oc-						
			cupancy and photosensors for						
			both indoor and outdoor appli-						
		Conclusion 8: In identifying pro-	cations; 2) low and line voltage dimming systems; 3) demand						
		jects that triggered Workforce	response control systems, in-						
		Standards, we identified discrep-	cluding Energy Management						
		ancies in the measure descrip-	and Control Systems (EMCS)						
8	62	tions provided and their rele-	with Direct Response (DR) func-						
		vance to lighting control	tionality/modules; 4) track light-						
		measures to determine whether	ing systems including current						
		Workforce Standards would be	limiting devices; and 5) time-						
		triggered.	based scheduling systems, in- cluding automatic time						
			switches, programmable lighting						
			control panels, and part-night						
			lighting.57 Additionally, the						
			CPUC should direct all the IOUs						
			to utilize this definition when re-						
			cording project measures in the						
			CEDARS database. We recom-						
			mend that there be a filter or						
			flag for lighting controls within CEDARS.						
-		Canalysian O. At the time of the	020/110.		045	Miletia this management of the control of			
9	62	Conclusion 9: At the time of this retrospective study, there was in-	Recommendation 9: We recom-		Other	While this recommendation is not directed at SoCalGas, standards exist for			
		sufficient data to measure the	mend that the CPUC take the			recieu at Joeandas, Standards Exist IOI			
	1	James and to mediate the			l	1	1		<u>l</u>

Item #	Page #	Findings	Best Practice / Recommendations	Recommenda- tion Recipient	Disposition	Disposition Notes	SCG Proposed RTR Implementation
#	#		(Verbatim from	tion Recipient			
			Final Report)				
		impact of Workforce Standards	following actions to better sup-			certifying technicians, as well as licens-	
		on project quality and energy	port the implementation and			ing HVAC operators, managed under	
		savings. Moving forward, a retro-	evaluation of Workforce Stand-			the purview of the respective agencies	
		spective impact analysis of Work-	ards: 1) direct the IOUs to de-			to revise and/or set those standards	
		force Standards will not be possi-	velop a process to enforce			and requirements.	
		ble until 1) a standard definition	Workforce Standards using the				
		of what constitutes lighting con-	lessons learned codified in this				
		trols that is utilized by the IOUs	report and the findings from the				
		and tracked in the CEDARS data-	discussions called for in Recom-				
		base, 2) a statewide HVAC tech-	mendation 3A and 3B above, 2)				
		nician certification that can be	ensure a standard definition of				
		used for Workforce Standards, 3)	what constitutes lighting con-				
		the ability for IOUs and 3P imple-	trols is defined and utilized by				
		menters to obtain certification	the IOUs and tracked in the CE-				
		information from credentialing	DARS database, 3) continue to				
		providers to verify that HVAC and	collaborate with other state				
		ALC installers meet Workforce	agencies (e.g., CWDB, CSLB, DIR)				
		Standards requirements, and 4)	on relevant workforce certifica-				
		improved IOU and 3P imple-	tions for HVAC and lighting tech-				
		menter capacity to track install-	nicians.				
		ers on qualifying projects.					