

DEEP Comments on Energy Opportunities Impact and Process Evaluation

ES-2-3 State the number of projects included in the sample (or footnote Table 2-2, p. 8).

ES-4 Study should clarify whether “Lighting” projects are “Lighting Only” or whether they include lighting. Similarly, are gas projects “gas only”? How are the comprehensive projects represented in the sample? It would be helpful to have text that explains and a table that separates out these types of project categories and indicates number of projects.

ES-4 and ES-5 In the case of summer seasonal demand and winter peak demand, the confidence level indicates a wide range of demand savings. What is the explanation for this?

ES-4 The 84% realization rate for gas programs show that gas is the underperforming program. What is the explanation for this? The low realization rate was not explained on pp. 27-28 or p. 32.

Pp. 6-7. Explain how the forward-looking realization rates were calculated using the 2013 PSD. (EMI may need to have some time with the C&I/Evaluation committee to explain how the revisions get made.)

P. 11. The study should provide a footnote to explain the type, specification and performance of the multiple regression model.

p. 25. The results for electric savings on Table 3-6 are puzzling. Overall energy savings realization rate is 98%, but electric summer demand and winter demand savings are substantially above 100% (127% and 174%, respectively). Although MW and MWh savings are not the same, does higher than expected peak savings translate into lower than expected non-peak savings, if the overall MWh realization rate is approximately 100%? Table 3-9 has similar results for Lighting Program savings.

Pp. 28-29. The study does not make clear the rationale for the revisions to the PSD. (The details may be in Appendix E) The main question is: are the revisions due to the technical revisions in equipment or due to the impact analysis of this study? It would be helpful for the research consultants to explain the basis for the revisions to the committee.

Pp. 35+ The study gave useful and concrete recommendations with regard to process improvements. At the February 11 EEB C&I meeting, the PAs pointed out that this study looks at program data from 2011-2012; many of these recommendations have already been implemented. It will be useful to have a focused discussion of the specific recommendation at a future C&I meeting (or a technical session that addresses this study) to discuss how the PAs have addressed each of these recommendations.

As discussed at the C&I meeting, the fact that the process improvement recommendations are based on outdated data should be brought to the attention of the Evaluation Consultants (SERA) to inform the study design of the next EO process and impact evaluation. Since the EO impact analysis needs a year or more, the process component of an EO evaluation should be done either at the tail end of the study, or as a separate study.