

## 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 Sierra Nevada Energy Watch Local Government Partnership Program*** (Evergreen Economics, Calmac ID #SCG0218.08, 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) 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:** Process Evaluation of the Sierra Nevada Energy Watch Local Government Partnership Program  
**Program:** LGP  
**Author:** Evergreen Economics  
**Calmac ID:** SCG0218.08  
**ED WO:** 2115  
**Link to Report:** [http://calmac.org/publications/LGP\\_SNEW\\_Report\\_091517.pdf](http://calmac.org/publications/LGP_SNEW_Report_091517.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	33	Local government budgets are typically set on an annual basis, and it may take more than a year to begin the implementation phase of a project.	Evergreen recommends that PG&E consider strategies for freezing measure eligibility and incentives (if it is authorized to do so) at the time of an energy assessment measure recommendation for a certain time period (possibly through the following fiscal year) for local government retrofit projects. This may be a good candidate to include in the development of the next Program Implementation Plan after the Public Sector Business Plan is approved. This would avoid confusion about program changes that may invalidate a measure that was once approved.	PG&E	Accepted	PG&E is committed to identifying strategies to help mitigate the disruptive nature of a fluid measure eligibility list. PG&E acknowledges that the volatility of eligible measures can be a major barrier to implementation of municipal projects given the generally longer project approval processes and timelines common in local government. PG&E will evaluate the regulatory feasibility of freezing measure eligibility and incentives at the time they are identified for a specified amount of time. Furthermore, PG&E is considering the value of aligning municipal EE program cycles with the fiscal year, which may include strategies that directly address this recommendation.
2	33	One SBC staff member reported having a difficult time accessing data from PG&E on local government facilities due to the amount of back and forth required if a meter number is not a correct match.	We recommend that the PG&E staff member that supports SNEW facilitate a discussion between SBC staff and the PG&E data staff lead, to discuss how to speed up the local government data delivery process such as including instructions on how to resolve issues identified by the PG&E data management staff. This will help the development of EAPs and will make it easier to update EAPs in the future.	SBC, PG&E	Accepted	PG&E is currently working on clarifying and refining the Customer Data Release Governance process. This includes data requests from Energy Watch Partners. The outcomes from this work will address the concerns central to this recommendation (speed up and effectively troubleshoot data requests). PG&E acknowledges that data sharing challenges greatly inhibit our Partners' ability to effectively engage in energy management and planning activities, such as the creation of EAPs.