

ComEd Comments on Plan Year 2 Evaluation Report: All Electric Single Family Home Energy Performance Program (10/5/2010)

Evaluation concerns

1. Starting with first paragraph in Executive Summary and throughout the report, the air sealing pilot is mischaracterized as being part of the initial program, which transitioned into the current direct install with energy report program. This program design was the original program offering with the air sealing and blower door portion a pilot running concurrently with the regular program. The air sealing pilot began later and ended when the participation goals were met. (pages 1, 6, 11, others)
2. Table 3-1 shows default savings with initial program design. Table 3-2 provides original design and changes when Honeywell began purchasing different bulbs toward end of PY2. With ComEd supplying the CFL bulbs in PY3, the program going forward will promote the following replacements:

Measure	Base Incandescent (watts/lamp)	CFL (watts/lamp)	Delta Watt (watts/lamp)
9W CFL replaces 40W	40	9	31
14W CFL replaces 60W	60	14	46
19W CFL replaces 75W	75	19	56

3. Page 16, 2nd paragraph; in discussion of CFL installation rate, the statement is made that the ex ante value of this parameter is assumed to be 1. ComEd had requested that installation rate factors be kept out of measure savings, but assumed .95 in its gross estimates, although it only uses a realization rate of .90 on a portfolio basis.
4. For Table 3-5, please provide assumed coincidence factors for kW analysis.
5. Page 28, 1st paragraph; provide model used to generate savings due to water heater temperature setback.
6. In Table 3-5, the values listed for Ex Ante kWh/home are misleading in that they include an assumed realization rate of 90% for this program. This would make more sense if presented on an Ex Ante measure kWh/home without a portfolio based realization rate applied to it. These values are not recognizable on a measure basis
7. In Tables E-3, 3-18, 3-21, 4-1, and page 54, 2nd paragraph in section 4.1.1; total gross realization rate is listed as 98%. This ratio is based on ComEd's ex ante gross 605 MWh, which includes our assumed realization rate of 90%. Actual realization rate should be based on 672 MWh from measures, resulting in 88.6% or 89%.

In Tables E-3, 3-21 and 4-1, each gross impact realization rate should be multiplied by 90% to reflect its actual realization rate, i.e. compared to installed measure values. In 2nd paragraph, section 4.1.1, the realization rate for faucet aerators should be 67%.

Attached is a spreadsheet showing how ComEd understands the development of the Ex Post Gross and Net MWh values. ComEd suggests the report explain the development of the NTG values in Table 3-21 from the component values in Tables 3-19 and 3-20.

8. Please provide details on CFL bulb weighting for free ridership described in the last paragraph, page 37. For NTG calculations, should the CFL data be stratified by bulbs/home, e.g. 1-4, 5-7, 8-10?
9. The Evaluation Report suggests that program telemarketers “screen” participants who have a positive view on CFLs (e.g. pages 37, 46, 54). Considerable effort is made to enroll participants. The only screen applied is the willingness to pay \$25 for an audit. The phone scripts do mention free CFLs and water measures, but do not eliminate participation based on their pre-disposition (709 of the 760 homes participating accepted at least 1 CFL – therefore 51 did not). Also, the NTG evaluation of CFLs should be unrelated to telemarketing efforts.

Typographical and style edits

1. Table E-2, the PY2 Goal for Net Energy Impact (MWh) should be 399 to align with 671 MWh Gross Goal. These reflect revised PY2 Goals.
2. Table E-3, Gross Impact Realization Rate for showerheads is listed as 9%. Based on comments in Evaluation concerns # 7, this should be 81%. Please check.
3. Page 6, 3rd paragraph; add the following “... joint venture with Nicor Gas company **and Integrys Gas Companies**”.
4. Impact Question #2, page 8; “How much ~~is~~ energy and demand...”
5. Suggested wording changes 3rd paragraph, section 4.1.1 “... ComEd residential ~~upstream~~ **midstream** lighting program...”

General Comments

1. Process recommendations provided in this report were viewed as thorough and helpful for a first year program.