

ComEd Comments on Plan Year 2 Evaluation Report: Nonresidential New Construction (9/14/2010)

Evaluation concerns

1. Page 10, paragraph 3, report states that, "...some program level adjustments were made to the implementer assumptions...". Please provide information on assumptions adjusted and reasons for the adjustments.
2. Page 12, 1st paragraph, discusses the indirect influence of the program because incentive hunters use "prototypical designs" to satisfy many different utility programs. How did the concern of this direct impact affect the NTG calculation? Without incentives from this program, would the customer have proceeded with the energy efficiency measures?
3. The implementation team would like to request more information on the Net-to-Gross (NTG) assessment of the program.
 - a. Identify the three projects that were excluded from the net calculation.
 - b. Identify the team member who was interviewed for each of these projects.
 - c. Include a detailed explanation of the reasons or logic employed for their exclusion.
 - d. Provide a copy of the interview transcripts for each of the excluded projects.
 - e. Include a Table (similar to Table 3-1) showing the NTG adjustment per project, changes to the algorithm, and the size of adjustments.
4. The Sampling Plan, section 2.2, indicates that most highly engaged individual, identified by implementation team was contacted, but when unavailable other people were called for interviews. New Construction projects maintain large project teams with rotating staff as needed. For this reason, not interviewing the best person from a team may not fully represent the programs influence. Why wasn't implementation team contacted to provide the most appropriate contact?
5. Project Number 10 in Table 3-2 had no ex post savings. ECW has indicated that there were plans and specs covering approximately 76% of the store's square footage, and would expect revised kWh savings of 81,239. Please review and provide information/reasons why we wouldn't receive partial savings as determined by ECW. For additional information, see attached ECW memo, page 2.
6. Please provide explanation for zero realization rate for Project 9 in Table 3-3.
7. EIE adjustments are mentioned on page 16, paragraph 4. Were EIE adjustments included in Table 3-3 results and in which values?
8. Page 30, 2nd paragraph quote; this indicates possible spillover due to the training sessions, but is there any spillover included in the NTG value? What is the spillover contribution to NTG?

9. ComEd suggests that the PY3 Evaluation Plan include formal evaluation of education and training efforts and measure their impact on spillover.
10. The report indicates that 3 participants, who represented 30% of expected savings (page 2) were free riders. Since all PY2 participants were in the Systems Track, would the NTG value (.59) be as applicable to the comprehensive and small buildings tracks for planning purposes?
11. ComEd would like to note that regarding Impact recommendations, section 4.2.1, a centralized on-line database is now being used and minimum codes and standards are specifically identified in the site verification report.
12. In reviewing the interview section for free ridership, not all ECW previous suggestions were incorporated. ComEd feels that wording for questions FR1 and FR6b are more applicable for retrofit projects than new construction. These questions should be revised going forward. See attached ECW memo (pages 4-5) for additional background.

Typographical and style edits

1. Page 1, under Impacts heading, reference source is needed.