

**Memo to:**  
Lori Lewis, CT EEB Consultant

**Memo No.:** C9 SBEA Impact-01

**From:** Thomas Ledyard

**Date:** April 29, 2014

**Copied to:**

**Prep. by:** Thomas Ledyard

### **Final SBEA Impact Report**

DNV GL received comments on the Draft Impact Evaluation of the Connecticut Small Business Energy Advantage Program submitted for review in March, 2014. These comments included a memo from United Illuminating dated April 2, 2014 and a memo from CL&P also dated April 2, 2014. We discuss the comments received from each utility below.

#### **CL&P**

The SBEA impact report contains a recommendation that the COP used to calculate interactive savings associated with lighting be revised upward to a value of 2.9 to better reflect current practice. CL&P noted in their comments that the more current PSD contains a revision to the COP assumed in the calculation of interactive effects for lighting measures. The COP revision undertaken between the 2012 and 2013 PSD resulted in a new assumption of 3.5. As a result of this change, we have noted in the report that the revision had occurred prior to delivery of the report as part of UI and CL&Ps ongoing effort to improve the program.


CL&P also requested that a forward looking realization rate be calculated based on the implementation of the current PSD assumption of 3.5. Our understanding of this request is that it would require the re-calculation of the 2011 SBEA lighting tracking data to reflect this new COP value so that it could be used as the basis for estimating a new realization rate. Unfortunately, the budget for this study has been recently expended. If CL&P, UI and the EEB believe this exercise is warranted, we can provide a budget for performing this added scope item.

However, we were able to do a very high level assessment of the impact of this change and ensuing realization rate. To do this, we used the PSD formula to remove the estimated portion of the total tracked lighting savings based on the 2.4 COP assumption and added in the estimate of lighting interactive effects based on a COP assumption of 3.5. Based on this approximate calculation, we estimate that an overall lighting measure realization rate based on a tracking value calculated with lighting interaction COP of 3.5 would be approximately 107%.

#### **UI**

United Illuminating structured their comments to address each conclusion and recommendation provided in the report. We address only those comments provided where UI expressed a concern, request or clarification. There were several comments where UI agreed or otherwise took the conclusion and recommendation under advisement.

In response to conclusion and recommendation #3, UI requested their portion of the data sample to better evaluate where disparity exists (between the billing analysis and M&V based analysis) and to improve program adherence. Unfortunately, the billing analysis performed modeled all sites together in a Pooled Fixed Effects framework. As such, we are unable to provide individual site results for comparison to the on-site M&V results.



**Page 2 of 2**

In response to conclusion and recommendation #4, UI requested their portion of the data that had the largest discrepancy between estimated and tracking winter demand savings. DNV GL has put together a summary dataset comprised of the UI sample. This dataset includes the tracking winter kW and on-site M&V based winter kW savings estimate for UI's consideration. The name of the spreadsheet is UI Requested Data.xls and is available on the project SharePoint site.

In response to conclusion and recommendation #5, UI requests two items. The first is a list of UI sample data where lighting interactive savings occurred in the absence of mechanical cooling. In the spreadsheet cited above, we provide a flag to indicate those sites where this event occurred. There was only one UI site where this occurred.

The second item UI requested in response to conclusion and recommendation #5 was a recalculation of the overestimated savings to reflect the adjusted COP which should reduce the reduction in savings. As discussed above in the CL&P response section, this recalculation is a fairly significant undertaking that would necessitate additional funding given the current status of the budget. However, in the CL&P section above we do provide a rough estimate of what this realization rate might look like given the change in COP.