

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 Process Evaluation of the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments Energy Watch Local Government Partnership Program (Evergreen Economics, Calmac ID #SCG0218.07, ED WO #2115)

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 Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments Energy Watch Local Government Partnership Program
Program: LGP
Author: Evergreen Economics
Calmac ID: SCG0218.07
ED WO: 2115
Link to Report: http://calmac.org/publications/LGP_AMBAG_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	36-38	While AMBAG EW is not currently active in the Reach Code activity area, AMBAG staff participate in regional green building committees to share information with other organizations working to improve the energy efficiency of their building stock. The AMBAG EW staff member noted that in the more rural areas of AMBAG territory, the focus is more on meeting existing codes as opposed to going beyond them.	AMBAG EW should consider setting Reach Code Support goals in future program years in order to build on the prior successful efforts to educate local governments about existing code. This effort can be tailored to local governments in AMBAG's territory based on their understanding and enforcement of existing codes. This would allow local governments to move forward with reach codes based on the experience and resources they have.	AMBAG, PG&E	Accepted	PG&E supports this recommendation in general as it is consistent with the goals set forth for Local Government in California's Long Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan.
2	36-38	AMBAG EW has been successful in improving energy efficiency in wastewater treatment plants.	We also recommend that AMBAG EW look into extending its effort with wastewater treatment plants and engage with additional special districts including transportation, flood control and mosquito districts. This would allow AMBAG EW to expand upon its successful efforts working with wastewater treatment plants and to achieve additional energy savings.	AMBAG, PG&E	Accepted	PG&E is in full support of this recommendation. PG&E has been working with AMBAG to navigate the regulatory challenges to serving smaller wastewater facilities. PG&E also supports the expansion of AMBAG's resource programs into special districts.