

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:

<p><i>RTR for the Process Evaluation of the Riverside County Local Government Partnership Program</i> (Evergreen Economics, Calmac ID #SCG0218.04, ED WO #2115)</p>

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: Process Evaluation of the Riverside County Local Government Partnership Program
Program: LGP
Author: Evergreen Economics
Calmac ID: SCG0218.04
ED WO: 2115
Link to Report: http://calmac.org/publications/LGP_Riverside_County_Report_091717.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	31	A major setback to the Riverside County LGP is the complete depletion of the revolving conservation fund due to solar project delays, resulting in little to no internal sources of funding for projects eligible for utility program incentives.	We recommend that Riverside County LGP staff classify the revolving conservation fund as a current activity on the Strategic Plan Support menu for future program years, which could allow the Riverside County LGP to devote resources and establish goals to replenish the fund.	Riverside County, SCE, SCG	Rejected	We wish to clarify that the revolving fund is currently active and still being replenished. This Strategic Plan Menu activity is intended to help County staff design and gain approval for a revolving fund as a vehicle or mechanism to set aside EE rebates for reinvestment in EE projects. LGP Program dollars cannot be used to provide the funds themselves. Instead, the funds have been and are currently being replenished using rebates earned from EE projects or from other sources that the county directs. The IOUs do not control how customers spend their rebates; use of the funds is directed by the County. Depletion of these funds is not due to its classification in the Strategic Plan Support menu. Further, these and all Strategic Plan Support activities were established with ED guidance and approval.
2	32	SCE and SoCalGas noted there may be opportunities to engage directly with all Riverside County departments, which could lead to increased partnership benefits and reduce the burden on EDA staff (the primary Riverside County LGP contact).	We recommend that the Riverside County LGP partners engage directly with all Riverside County departments that could benefit from the partnership and explain the services that the Riverside County LGP provides. This will mitigate against missed project opportunities and help coordinate efforts across Riverside County departments. This will help keep the revolving conservation fund replenishment a priority.	Riverside County, SCE, SCG	Accepted	SCG/SCE has already been working with the County partner to identify those departments that would like to be contacted directly.