



76 South Main Street
Akron, Ohio 44308

Carrie M. Dunn
Attorney

330-761-2352
Fax: 330-384-3875

November 16, 2015

VIA OVERNIGHT FEDERAL EXPRESS

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 2nd Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Re: Pennsylvania Electric Company Final Annual Report to the Pennsylvania
Public Utility Commission and Act 129 Statewide Evaluator
M-2012-2334392

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Enclosed please find an original, a copy and a disk of Pennsylvania Electric Company's Final Annual Report to the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission and Act 129 Statewide Evaluator.

Please date stamp the copy and return to me in the enclosed, postage-prepaid envelope. Should you have any questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Carrie M. Dunn

Enclosures

RECEIVED

NOV 16 2015

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

PENNSYLVANIA ELECTRIC COMPANY PROGRAM YEAR 6 ANNUAL REPORT

Program Year 6: June 1, 2014 – May 31, 2015

Presented to:

PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Pennsylvania Act 129 of 2008
Energy Efficiency and Conservation Plan

Prepared for:

**Pennsylvania Electric Company
Docket No. M-2012-2334392**

November 16, 2015

Prepared by:

**ADM Associates, TetraTech
MA, and Pennsylvania
Electric Company**

RECEIVED

NOV 16 2015

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

PENNSYLVANIA ELECTRIC COMPANY PROGRAM YEAR 6 ANNUAL REPORT

Program Year 6: June 1, 2014 – May 31, 2015

Presented to:

PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Pennsylvania Act 129 of 2008
Energy Efficiency and Conservation Plan

November 16, 2015

Prepared by ADM Associates, Tetra Tech MA, and Penelec

For

Pennsylvania Electric Company

Docket No. M-2012-2334392

November 16, 2015

This page intentionally left blank

RECEIVED

NOV 16 2015

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	I
LIST OF TABLES	IV
LIST OF FIGURES	VII
ACRONYMS	VIII
REPORT DEFINITIONS	IX
1 OVERVIEW OF PORTFOLIO	1
1.1 SUMMARY OF PROGRESS TOWARD COMPLIANCE TARGETS.....	1
1.2 SUMMARY OF ENERGY IMPACTS.....	5
1.3 SUMMARY OF FUEL SWITCHING IMPACTS.....	8
1.4 SUMMARY OF DEMAND IMPACTS	8
1.5 SUMMARY OF PROGRAM YEAR 6 NET-TO-GROSS RATIOS	11
1.6 SUMMARY OF PORTFOLIO FINANCES AND COST-EFFECTIVENESS	12
1.7 SUMMARY OF COST-EFFECTIVENESS BY PROGRAM.....	13
1.8 COMPARISON OF PROGRAM YEAR 6 PERFORMANCE TO APPROVED EE&C PLAN	13
1.9 PORTFOLIO LEVEL/CROSS-CUTTING PROCESS AND IMPACT EVALUATION SUMMARY FOR PROGRAM YEAR 6	14
2 RESIDENTIAL APPLIANCE TURN-IN PROGRAM	16
2.1 PROGRAM UPDATES	16
2.1.1 <i>Definition of Participant</i>	16
2.2 IMPACT EVALUATION GROSS SAVINGS.....	16
2.2.1 <i>Evaluation Methodology</i>	16
2.2.2 <i>Program Sampling</i>	16
2.2.3 <i>On Site Inspections</i>	17
2.3 IMPACT EVALUATION NET SAVINGS	18
2.4 PROCESS EVALUATION.....	18
2.5 STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM	19
2.6 FINANCIAL REPORTING	20
3 ENERGY EFFICIENT PRODUCTS PROGRAM	21
3.1 PROGRAM UPDATES	21
3.1.1 <i>Definition of Participant</i>	21
3.2 IMPACT EVALUATION GROSS SAVINGS.....	21
3.2.1 <i>Evaluation Methodology</i>	21
3.2.1 <i>Program Sampling</i>	24
3.2.1 <i>On-Site Inspections</i>	27
3.3 IMPACT EVALUATION NET SAVINGS	28
3.4 PROCESS EVALUATION.....	29
3.5 STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM	31
3.6 FINANCIAL REPORTING	32
4 RESIDENTIAL HOME PERFORMANCE PROGRAM.....	33
4.1 PROGRAM UPDATES	33
4.1.1 <i>Definition of Participant</i>	33
4.2 IMPACT EVALUATION GROSS SAVINGS.....	33
4.2.1 <i>Evaluation Methodology</i>	33
4.2.2 <i>Program Sampling</i>	36
4.2.1 <i>One Site Inspections</i>	38
4.3 IMPACT EVALUATION NET SAVINGS	40
4.4 PROCESS EVALUATION.....	41
4.5 STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM	43
4.6 FINANCIAL REPORTING	44

5 RESIDENTIAL LOW INCOME PROGRAM.....	45
5.1 PROGRAM UPDATES	46
5.1.1 Definition of Participant.....	46
5.2 IMPACT EVALUATION GROSS SAVINGS.....	46
5.2.1 Evaluation Methodology.....	46
5.2.2 Program Sampling	48
5.2.3 On-Site Inspections	49
5.3 IMPACT EVALUATION NET SAVINGS	50
5.4 PROCESS EVALUATION.....	50
5.5 STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM	52
5.6 FINANCIAL REPORTING	53
6 C/I SMALL ENERGY EFFICIENT EQUIPMENT PROGRAM	54
6.1 PROGRAM UPDATES	54
6.1.1 Definition of Participant.....	54
6.2 IMPACT EVALUATION GROSS SAVINGS.....	54
6.2.1 Evaluation Methodology.....	54
6.2.2 Program Sampling	56
6.2.3 On-Site Inspections	58
6.3 IMPACT EVALUATION NET SAVINGS	60
6.4 PROCESS EVALUATION.....	60
6.5 STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM	62
6.6 FINANCIAL REPORTING	63
7 C/I SMALL ENERGY EFFICIENT BUILDINGS PROGRAM	64
7.1 PROGRAM UPDATES	64
7.1.1 Definition of Participant.....	64
7.2 IMPACT EVALUATION GROSS SAVINGS.....	64
7.2.1 Evaluation Methodology.....	64
7.2.1 On-Site Inspections	67
7.3 IMPACT EVALUATION NET SAVINGS	67
7.4 PROCESS EVALUATION.....	67
7.5 STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM	68
7.6 FINANCIAL REPORTING	69
8 C/I LARGE ENERGY EFFICIENT EQUIPMENT PROGRAM	70
8.1 PROGRAM UPDATES	70
8.1.1 Definition of Participant.....	70
8.2 IMPACT EVALUATION GROSS SAVINGS.....	70
8.2.1 Evaluation Methodology.....	70
8.2.1 Program Sampling	72
8.2.1 On-Site Inspections	75
8.3 IMPACT EVALUATION NET SAVINGS	76
8.4 PROCESS EVALUATION.....	76
8.5 STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM	79
8.6 FINANCIAL REPORTING	80
9 C/I LARGE ENERGY EFFICIENT BUILDINGS PROGRAM	81
9.1 PROGRAM UPDATES	81
9.1.1 Definition of Participant.....	81
9.2 IMPACT EVALUATION GROSS SAVINGS.....	81
9.2.1 Evaluation Methodology.....	81
9.2.1 On-Site Inspections	84
9.3 IMPACT EVALUATION NET SAVINGS	84
9.4 PROCESS EVALUATION.....	84
9.5 STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM	85

9.6 FINANCIAL REPORTING	86
10 GOVERNMENT AND INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAM.....	87
10.1 PROGRAM UPDATES	87
10.1.1 Definition of Participant.....	87
10.2 IMPACT EVALUATION GROSS SAVINGS.....	87
10.2.1 Evaluation Methodology.....	87
10.2.2 Program Sampling	89
10.2.3 On-Site Inspections	90
10.3 IMPACT EVALUATION NET SAVINGS	92
10.4 PROCESS EVALUATION.....	92
10.5 STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM	94
10.6 FINANCIAL REPORTING	95
APPENDIX A EM&V INFORMATION	96
Participant Definitions	96
Program Year 6 Evaluation Activities.....	97
APPENDIX B TRC INCREMENTAL COSTS.....	100
APPENDIX C LOW-INCOME PARTICIPATION IN NON-LOW-INCOME PROGRAMS	106
APPENDIX D RESIDENTIAL LIGHTING UPSTREAM PROGRAM CROSS-SECTOR SALES.....	108
APPENDIX E GLOSSARY OF TERMS.....	110

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1: Phase II Verified Gross Savings and Verified Gross Savings from PY4 Carried Into Phase II	2
Table 1-2: Phase II Verified Gross Lifetime Savings and.....	2
Table 1-3: Phase II Verified Net Savings and Verified Net Savings from PY4 Carried Into Phase II.....	2
Table 1-4: Phase II Verified Net Lifetime Savings and Verified Net Lifetime Savings from PY4 Carried Into Phase II.....	3
Table 1-5: Low-Income Sector Compliance (Number of Measures).....	4
Table 1-6: Low-Income Sector Compliance (Percentage of Savings)	4
Table 1-7: Summary of Phase II Performance by Sector.....	5
Table 1-8: Reported Participation and Gross Energy Savings by Program.....	6
Table 1-9: Verified Gross Energy Savings by Program	7
Table 1-10: Reported Participation and Gross Demand Reduction by Program	10
Table 1-11: Verified Gross Demand Reduction by Program	10
Table 1-12: Program Year 6 NTG Ratios by Program.	11
Table 1-13: Summary of Portfolio Finances.....	12
Table 1-14: PYTD TRC Ratios by Program	13
Table 1-15: Comparison of PY6 Program Expenditures to PY6 EE&C Plan.....	13
Table 1-16: Comparison of PY6 Actual Program Savings to EE&C Plan for PY6	14
Table 1-17: Phase II Process and Impact Evaluation Recommendations from PY6 Evaluations.....	15
Table 2-1: Phase II Residential Appliance Turn-In Reported Results by Customer Sector.....	17
Table 2-2: Residential Appliance Turn-In Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6.....	17
Table 2-3: Program Year 6 Residential Appliance Turn-In Summary of Evaluation Results for Energy	17
Table 2-4: Program Year 6 Residential Appliance Turn-In Summary of Evaluation Results for Demand	17
Table 2-5: Residential Appliance Turn-In Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6 NTG Research	18
Table 2-6: Program Year 6 Residential Appliance Turn-In Summary of Evaluation Results for NTG Research..	18
Table 2-7: Residential Appliance Turn-In Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6.....	19
Table 2-8: Residential Appliance Turn-In Status Report on Process and Impact Recommendations	19
Table 2-9: Summary of Program Finances	20
Table 3-1: Energy Efficient Products Reported Results by Customer Sector.....	24
Table 3-2: Energy Efficient Products Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6	25
Table 3-3: Program Year 6 Energy Efficient Products Program Summary of Evaluation Results for Energy	26
Table 3-4: Program Year 6 Energy Efficient Products Summary of Evaluation Results for Demand	27
Table 3-5: Energy Efficient Products Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6 NTG Research	28
Table 3-6: Program Year 6 Energy Efficient Products Program	29
Table 3-7: Energy Efficient Products Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6	29
Table 3-8: Energy Efficient Products Program Status Report on Process and Impact Recommendations	31
Table 3-9: Summary of Energy Efficient Products Program Finances	32
Table 4-1: Phase II Home Performance Program Reported Results by Customer Sector	37
Table 4-2: Home Performance Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6.....	37
Table 4-3: Program Year 6 Home Performance Program Summary of Evaluation Results for Energy	38
Table 4-4: Program Year 6 Home Performance Program Summary of Evaluation Results for Demand	38
Table 4-5: Home Performance Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6 NTG Research	40
Table 4-6: Program Year 6 Energy Efficient Products Program Summary of Evaluation Results for NTG Research.....	41
Table 4-7: Home Performance Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6.....	42

Table 4-8: Home Performance Program Status Report on Process and Impact Recommendations	43
Table 4-9: Summary of Program Finances	44
Table 5-1: Phase II Residential Low Income Program Reported Results by Customer Sector	48
Table 5-2: Residential Low Income Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6	49
Table 5-3: Program Year 6 Residential Low Income Program Summary of Evaluation Results for Energy	49
Table 5-4: Program Year 6 Residential Low Income Program Summary of Evaluation Results for Demand	49
Table 5-5: Summary of on-site inspection findings for Low Income Direct Install Programs	50
Table 5-6: Residential Low Income Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6	51
Table 5-7: Residential Low Income Program Status Report on Process and Impact Recommendations	52
Table 5-8: Summary of Program Finances	53
Table 6-1: Phase II C/I Small Energy Efficient Equipment Program Reported Results by Customer Sector	57
Table 6-2: C/I Small Energy Efficient Equipment Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6	57
Table 6-3: Program Year 6 C/I Small Energy Efficient Equipment Program	58
Table 6-4: Program Year 6 C/I Small Energy Efficient Equipment Program	58
Table 6-5: C/I Small Energy Efficient Equipment Program	60
Table 6-6: Program Year 6 C/I Small Energy Efficient Equipment Program	60
Table 6-7: C/I Small Energy Efficient Equipment Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6	61
Table 6-8: C/I Small Energy Efficient Equipment Program	62
Table 6-9: Summary of Program Finances	63
Table 7-1: Phase II C/I Small Energy Efficient Buildings Program Reported Results by Customer Sector	65
Table 7-2: C/I Small Energy Efficient Buildings Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6	66
Table 7-3: Program Year 6 C/I Small Energy Efficient Buildings Program	66
Table 7-4: Program Year 6 C/I Small Energy Efficient Buildings Program	67
Table 7-5: Program Year 6 C/I Small Energy Efficient Buildings Status Report on Process and Impact Recommendations	68
Table 7-6: Summary of Program Finances	69
Table 8-1: Phase II C/I Large Efficient Equipment Program Reported Results by Customer Sector	73
Table 8-2: C/I Large Efficient Equipment Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6	73
Table 8-3: Program Year 6 C/I Large Efficient Equipment Program Summary of Evaluation Results for Energy	74
Table 8-4: Program Year 6 C/I Large Efficient Equipment Program Summary of Evaluation Results for Demand	74
Table 8-5: C/I Large Energy Efficient Equipment Program	76
Table 8-6: Program Year 6 C/I Large Energy Efficient Equipment Program	76
Table 8-7: C/I Large Energy Efficient Equipment Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6	77
Table 8-8: C/I Large Energy Efficient Equipment Program Status Report on Process and Impact Recommendations	79
Table 8-9: Summary of Program Finances	80
Table 9-1: Phase II C/I Large Energy Efficient Buildings Program Reported Results by Customer Sector	82
Table 9-2: C/I Large Energy Efficient Buildings Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6	83
Table 9-3: Program Year 6 C/I Large Energy Efficient Buildings Program	83
Table 9-4: Program Year 6 C/I Large Energy Efficient Buildings Program	84
Table 9-5: C/I Large Energy Efficient Buildings Program Status Report on Process and Impact Recommendations	85
Table 9-6: Summary of Program Finances	86
Table 10-1: Phase II Government and Institutional Program Reported Results by Customer Sector	89

Table 10-2: Government and Institutional Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6..... 89

Table 10-3: Program Year 6 Government and Institutional Program Summary of Evaluation Results for Energy 90

Table 10-4: Program Year 6 Government and Institutional Program 90

Table 10-5: Government and Institutional Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6 NTG Research 92

Table 10-6: Program Year 6 Government and Institutional Program 92

Table 10-7: Government and Institutional Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6..... 93

Table 10-8: Government and Institutional Program Status Report on Process and Impact Recommendations 94

Table 10-9: Summary of Program Finances..... 95

Table A-0-1: Program Year 6 Participant Definition by Program 96

Table A-0-2: Program Year 6 Actual Evaluation Activities..... 97

Table A-0-3: Program Year 6 Net Impact and Process Evaluation Activities 99

Table A-0-1: Summary of Incremental Costs 101

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1: Cumulative Portfolio Phase II Inception to Date Verified Gross Energy Impacts.....	1
Figure 1-2: Phase II Portfolio Reported and Verified Demand Reduction	3
Figure 1-3: Government, Nonprofit, and Institutional Sector Phase II Verified Gross Energy Impacts	4
Figure 1-4: PYTD Reported and Verified Gross Energy Savings by Program (MWh/yr)	5
Figure 1-5: Phase II Reported and Verified Gross Energy Savings by Program (MWh/yr)	6
Figure 1-6: PYTD Reported and Verified Gross Demand Reduction by Program.....	9
Figure 1-7: Phase II Reported and Verified Gross Demand Reduction by Program.....	9

ACRONYMS

C&I	Commercial and Industrial
CFL	Compact Fluorescent Lamp
Phase II Verified / (Phase II-VG)	Verified/ Ex-post Cumulative Program/Portfolio Phase II Inception to Date
Phase II Reported	Reported/ Ex-ante Cumulative Program/Portfolio Phase II Inception to Date
Phase II+CO	Cumulative Program/Portfolio Phase II Inception to Date including Carry Over Savings from Phase I (this is cumulative Phase II verified savings)
CSP	Conservation Service Provider or Curtailment Service Provider
DR	Demand Response
EDC	Electric Distribution Company
EE&C	Energy Efficiency and Conservation
EM&V	Evaluation, Measurement, and Verification
GNI	Government, Nonprofit, and Institutional
HVAC	Heating, Ventilating, and Air Conditioning
kW	Kilowatt
kWh	Kilowatt-hour
LED	Light Emitting Diode
LEEP	Low-Income Energy Efficiency Program
LIURP	Low-Income Usage Reduction Program
M&V	Measurement and Verification
MW	Megawatt
MWh	Megawatt-hour
NTG	Net-to-Gross
PUC	Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
PY5	Program Year 2013, from June 1, 2013 to May 31, 2014
PY6	Program Year 2014, from June 1, 2014 to May 31, 2015
PY7	Program Year 2015, from June 1, 2015 to May 31, 2016
PY8	Program Year 2016, from June 1, 2016 to May 31, 2017
PYX QX	Program Year 6, Quarter X
PYTD	Program Year to Date
SEER	Seasonal Energy Efficiency Rating
SWE	Statewide Evaluator
TRC	Total Resource Cost
TRM	Technical Reference Manual

REPORT DEFINITIONS

Note: Definitions provided in this section are limited to terms that are critical to understanding the values presented in this report. For other definitions, please refer to the Act 129 glossary in Appendix E.

REPORTING PERIODS

Phase I

Refers to the Act 129 programs implemented prior to June 1, 2013. Phase I carryover references verified gross Phase I savings in excess of Act 129 Phase I targets.

Phase II

Refers to the period of time from the start of Phase II Act 129 programs on June 1, 2013 through May 31, 2016. Phase II savings are calculated by totaling all program year results, including the current program year-to-date results and subtracting any Phase II savings that expired during the current program year. For example, Phase II results for PY7 Q3 is the sum of PY5, PY6, PY7 Q1, PY7 Q2, and PY7 Q3 results, minus any Phase II savings that expired during PY5, PY6 or PY7.

Program Year-to-Date (PYTD)

Refers to the current reporting program year only. Activities occurring during previous program years are not included. For example, PYTD results for PY7 Q3 will include only results that occurred during PY7 Q1, PY7 Q2, and PY7 Q3; they will not include results from PY5 or PY6.

SAVINGS TYPES

Preliminary

Qualifier used in all reports, except the final annual report, to signify that evaluations are still in progress and that results have not been finalized. Most often used with realization rate or verified gross savings.

Reported Gross

Refers to results of the program or portfolio, determined by the program administrator (e.g., the electric distribution company [EDC] or the program implementer). Also known as ex-ante, or “before the fact” savings (using the annual evaluation activities as the reference point for the post period).

Adjusted Ex-ante Gross

References to Adjusted Ex-ante Gross (or Adjusted Ex-ante) savings in this report refer to reported gross savings from the EDC’s tracking system that have been adjusted, where necessary, to reflect differences between the methods used to record and track savings and the methods in the Technical Reference Manual (TRM), or to correct data capture errors. These corrections are made to the population, prior to EM&V activities. The adjusted ex-ante gross savings are then verified through EM&V activities.

Verified Gross

Refers to the verified gross savings results of the program or portfolio determined by the evaluation activities. Also known as ex-post, or “after the fact” savings (using the annual evaluation activities as the reference point for the post period).

Verified Net

The total change in load that is attributable to an energy efficiency program. This change in load may include, implicitly or explicitly, the effects of spillover, free-riders, energy efficiency standards, changes in the level of energy service, and other causes of changes in energy consumption or demand. Net savings are calculated by multiplying verified savings by a net-to-gross (NTG) ratio.

TOTAL RESOURCE COST COMPONENTS¹

Administration, Management, and Technical Assistance Costs

Includes rebate processing, tracking system, general administration, EDC and CSP program management, general management and legal, and technical assistance.

EDC Costs

Per the Pennsylvania PUC 2013 Total Resource Cost (TRC) Test Order, the total EDC costs refer to EDC-incurred expenditures only. This includes, but is not limited to, administration, management, technical assistance, design & development of EE&C Plans and programs, marketing, evaluation, and incentives.

Participant Costs

Participant Costs as defined by the 2013 Total Resource Cost Test Order.

Total TRC Costs

Total TRC Costs as defined by the 2013 Total Resource Cost Test Order.

Total TRC Benefits

Benefits as defined by the 2013 Total Resource Cost Test Order.

¹ All Total Resource Cost definitions are subject to the Pennsylvania PUC 2013 Total Resource Cost Test Order.

1 OVERVIEW OF PORTFOLIO

Pennsylvania Act 129 of 2008, which was signed on October 15, 2008, mandated energy savings and demand reduction goals for the largest electric distribution companies (EDCs) in Pennsylvania for Phase I (2008 through 2013). In 2009, each EDC submitted energy efficiency and conservation (EE&C) plans pursuant to these goals, which were approved by the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (PUC). Each EDC filed new EE&C plans with the PUC in 2012 for Phase II (June 2013 through May 2016) of the Act 129 programs. These plans were approved by the PUC in 2013.

Implementation of Phase II Act 129 programs began June 1, 2013. This report documents the progress and effectiveness of the Phase II EE&C accomplishments for Pennsylvania Electric Company (Penelec or Company) in Program Year 6 (PY6), defined as June 1, 2014 through May 31, 2015, as well as the cumulative accomplishments of the programs since inception of Phase II. This report additionally documents the energy savings carried over from Phase I. The Phase I carry-over savings count toward EDC savings compliance targets for Phase II.

ADM Associates evaluated the programs, which included measurement and verification of the savings.

1.1 SUMMARY OF PROGRESS TOWARD COMPLIANCE TARGETS

Penelec has achieved 82 percent of the energy savings compliance target, based on cumulative portfolio Phase II inception to date including carryover savings from Phase I ("Phase II+CO") verified gross energy savings, as shown in Figure 1-1.

Figure 1-1: Cumulative Portfolio Phase II Inception to Date Verified Gross Energy Impacts



According to the Phase II Implementation Order, Penelec is allowed by the PUC to "carry over" into Phase II the Phase I verified energy savings that exceeded the Phase I compliance target. Table 1-1

shows the incremental annual MWh savings from Phase I Penelec that are carrying over into Phase II. Table 1-2 shows the lifetime MWh savings from Phase I Penelec that are carried over into Phase II.

Table 1-1: Phase II Verified Gross Savings and Verified Gross Savings from PY4 Carried Into Phase II

Sector	PYTD Verified Gross Savings (MWh)	Phase II Verified Gross Savings (Cumulative Phase II MWh/Yr)	Verified Gross Savings Carried Over from Phase 1 (Cumulative Annual MWh/Yr)	Phase II+CO Verified Gross Savings (Cumulative MWh/Yr)
Residential (non Low Income)	72,137	136,456	NA	136,456
Residential (Low Income)	2,755	7,806	NA	7,806
Total Residential (Non Low Income Plus Low Income)	74,892	144,262	8,042	152,304
Commercial and Industrial	47,548	71,534	8,042	79,576
GNI	11,534	17,391	10,721	28,112
Total	133,973	233,186	26,805	259,991

Table 1-2: Phase II Verified Gross Lifetime Savings and Verified Gross Lifetime Savings from PY4 Carried Into Phase II

Sector	PYTD Verified Gross Savings (Lifetime MWh)	Phase II Verified Gross Savings (Lifetime MWh)	Verified Gross Savings Carried Over from Phase 1 (Lifetime MWh)	Phase II+CO Verified Gross Savings (Lifetime MWh)
Residential (non Low Income)	364,788	849,251	NA	849,251
Residential (Low Income)	18,443	54,411	NA	54,411
Total Residential (Non Low Income Plus Low Income)	383,231	903,662	103,504	1,007,166
Commercial and Industrial	578,538	907,367	103,504	1,010,871
GNI	148,541	215,955	137,983	353,938
Total	1,110,310	2,026,984	344,991	2,371,975

Table 1-3: Phase II Verified Net Savings and Verified Net Savings from PY4 Carried Into Phase II


Sector	PYTD Verified Net Savings (MWh/year)	Phase II Verified Net Savings (Cumulative Phase II MWh/Yr)	Verified Net Savings Carried Over from Phase 1 (Cumulative Phase II MWh/Yr)	Phase II+CO Verified Net Savings (Cumulative Phase II MWh/Yr)
Residential (non Low Income)	52,116	87,330	NA	
Residential (Low Income)	2,755	7,806	NA	
Total Residential (Non Low Income Plus Low Income)	54,871	95,136	8,042	103,178
Commercial and Industrial	34,108	52,660	8,042	60,702
GNI	8,270	11,727	7,687	19,415
Total	97,249	159,523	23,771	183,295

**Table 1-4: Phase II Verified Net Lifetime Savings and
Verified Net Lifetime Savings from PY4 Carried Into Phase II**

Sector	PYTD Verified Net Savings (Lifetime MWh)	Phase II Verified Net Savings (Lifetime MWh)	Verified Net Savings Carried Over from Phase 1 (Lifetime MWh)	Phase II+CO Verified Net Savings (Lifetime MWh)
Residential (non Low Income)	205,197	463,634	NA	
Residential (Low Income)	18,443	54,411	NA	
Total Residential (Non Low Income Plus Low Income)	223,640	518,045	48,780	566,825
Commercial and Industrial	422,191	673,235	106,404	779,638
GNI	106,880	157,319	101,710	259,029
Total	752,710	1,348,599	256,893	1,605,492

In addition, Penelec has achieved 27.7 MW of gross verified demand reduction during Phase II². See Figure 1-2 below. Additional detail on achieved demand reduction by program can be found in Table 1-10 and Table 1-11 of this section.

Figure 1-2: Phase II Portfolio Reported and Verified Demand Reduction



There are 6 measures available at no cost to low-income customers. These measures offered to the low-income sector comprise 15 percent of the total measures offered. As required by the Phase II goal, this exceeds the fraction of the electric consumption of the utility's low-income households divided by the

² Unlike Phase I, there is no compliance target for demand reduction in Phase II. The Commission, however, requires that demand reduction savings in Phase II be reported including line losses, as was one in Phase I.

total electricity consumption in the Penelec territory by 4.8 percent.³ These values are shown in Table 1-5 and Table 1-6.

Table 1-5: Low-Income Sector Compliance (Number of Measures)

	Low-Income Sector	All Sectors	% Low-Income	Goal
# of Measures Offered	6	40	15%	10.2%


Table 1-6: Low-Income Sector Compliance (Percentage of Savings)

	Phase II Gross Verified
Low Income Verified Gross Savings from Low Income Programs (Incremental Annual MWh/Yr)	2,755
Low Income Verified Gross Savings from Other Residential Programs (Incremental Annual MWh/Yr)	29,081
All Low Income Verified Gross Savings [Sum of First Two Rows]	31,836
Progress Towards Low Income Goal [Previous Row divided by Phase II MWh Target]	222%
Goal (MWh/Yr)	14,347

The Phase II verified gross energy savings achieved through programs specifically designed for income-eligible customers are 2,755 MWh/yr and 29,081 MWh/year through other programs; this 222 percent against the 4.5% Phase II total portfolio verified gross energy savings target for the low-income sector.

Penelec achieved 88 percent of the May 31, 2016 energy reduction compliance target for the government, nonprofit, and institutional sector based on cumulative program/portfolio savings from Phase II+CO verified gross energy savings achieved from the inception of Phase II through Program Year 6 and including carry-over savings from Phase I as shown in Figure 1-3.

Figure 1-3: Government, Nonprofit, and Institutional Sector Phase II Verified Gross Energy Impacts



³ Act 129 includes a provision requiring electric distribution companies to offer a number of energy efficiency measures to low-income households that are "proportionate to those households' share of the total energy usage in the service territory." 66 Pa.C.S. §2806.1(b)(i)(G).

A summary of the number of participants, Phase II verified gross energy savings (MWh/Yr), Phase II demand reduction (MW), and incentives paid (\$1,000) are shown in Table 1-7.


Table 1-7: Summary of Phase II Performance by Sector

Sector	Participants	Phase II Verified Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Phase II Verified Gross Demand Reduction (MW)	Incentives (\$1,000)
Residential	801,368	136,456	12.30	12,521
Low-Income	20,229	7,806	0.55	0
Small Commercial and Industrial	5,740	30,717	5.70	3321
Large Commercial and Industrial	277	40,817	5.94	2094
Government, Nonprofit, and Institutional	1,194	17,391	3.18	599
Phase II Total	828,808	233,186	27.67	18,535

1.2 SUMMARY OF ENERGY IMPACTS

A summary of the reported and verified energy savings by program for Program Year 6 is presented in Figure 1-4.

Figure 1-4: PYTD Reported and Verified Gross Energy Savings by Program (MWh/yr)



A summary of the Phase II reported and verified energy savings by program is presented in Figure 1-5.

Figure 1-5: Phase II Reported and Verified Gross Energy Savings by Program (MWh/yr)



Summaries of energy impacts by program through Program Year 6 are presented in Table 1-8 and Table 1-9.

Table 1-8: Reported Participation and Gross Energy Savings by Program

Program	Participants		Reported Gross Impact (MWh/Yr)	
	PYTD	Phase II Verified Gross	PYTD	Phase II
Appliance Turn-In	6,013	12,540	4,273	9,066
Efficient Products	203,579	422,176	22,773	53,853
Home Performance	306,012	366,652	46,590	73,814
Low Income	7,866	20,229	2,905	8,572
Small C/I Equipment	497	888	17,588	33,626
Small C/I Buildings	3,660	5,856	3,736	5,804
Large C/I Equipment	138	239	27,860	42,515
Large C/I Buildings	130	204	9,299	9,373
Gov./Institutional	9	24	190	1,452
TOTAL PORTFOLIO	527,904	828,808	135,214	238,075

Table 1-9: Verified Gross Energy Savings by Program

Program	PYTD Reported Gross Energy Savings (MWh/Year)	PYTD Energy Realization Rate	PYTD Verified Gross Energy Savings (MWh/Year)	PYTD Achieved Precision ^[1]	Phase II Verified Gross Energy Savings (MWh/Year)	Phase II Achieved Precision ^[2]
Appliance Turn-In	4,273	99.2%	4,239	10.2%	8,975	8.3%
Efficient Products	22,773	109.2%	24,877	2.1%	56,677	1.2%
Home Performance	46,590	98.4%	45,828	9.7%	75,223	8.5%
Low Income	2,905	94.9%	2,755	6.7%	7,806	5.1%
Small C/I Equipment	17,588	92.6%	16,284	11.7%	30,862	10.8%
Small C/I Buildings	3,736	108.7%	4,062	13.5%	5,537	11.7%
Large C/I Equipment	27,860	97.1%	27,047	8.6%	38,578	8.4%
Large C/I Buildings	9,299	94.2%	8,762	4.8%	8,839	5.4%
Gov./Institutional	190	62.7%	120	7.2%	687	15.6%
TOTAL PORTFOLIO	135,214	99.1%	133,973	4.1%	233,186	3.4%
Phase 1 Carryover	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	26,805	n/a
Total Ph II+CO	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	259,991	n/a

1.3 SUMMARY OF FUEL SWITCHING IMPACTS

Per Commission Order, the EDCs are to report on the amount of electric to non-electric fuel switching in their annual reports. The following measure categories are those the Fuel Switching working group identified as potential “fuel switching measures”:

- Water Heating
- Heating and Air Conditioning
- Clothes Drying
- Combined Heat and Power Distributed Generation
- Residential Micro Combined Heat and Power.

Solar Water Heaters are the only electric to non-electric fuel switching measure offered in the Company’s approved EE&C Plan for the residential sector. Five solar water heaters were rebated in PY6, with a total energy savings of 8,490 kWh as calculated according to the 2014 TRM. Penelec paid \$2,500 of incentives associated with the two solar water heaters. Absorption chillers and combined heat and power projects may also be eligible under the approved commercial and industrial equipment programs, but no associated rebate applications were approved in PY6.


Measures that could possibly involve non-electric to electric fuel switching are Water Heating, Heating and Air Conditioning and Clothes Drying. The Company only provides incentives under its EE&C Plan for the purchase and installation of efficient electric heat pump water heaters and heat pumps which could involve customers switching from non-electric to electric technologies. The following summarizes participant responses to questions related to natural gas availability and possible non-electric to electric fuel switching during PY6:

- The reported availability of natural gas was limited for the heat pump water heater and heat pump HVAC participants.
- A total of 159 efficient electric water heaters were rebated in PY6. Of the customers surveyed for M&V purposes, 0% reported replacing a gas water heater.
- A total of 633 electric heat pumps were rebated in PY6. Of the customers surveyed for M&V purposes, 16% reported replacing a gas furnace or boiler.

1.4 SUMMARY OF DEMAND IMPACTS


A summary of the reported and verified demand reduction by program for Program Year 6 is presented in Figure 1-6. The impacts below reflect the line loss factors shown in Table 1-14.

Figure 1-6: PYTD Reported and Verified Gross Demand Reduction by Program



A summary of the cumulative reported and verified demand reduction by program is presented in Figure 1-7.

Figure 1-7: Phase II Reported and Verified Gross Demand Reduction by Program



A summary of demand reduction impacts by program through Program Year 6 is presented in Table 1-10 and

Table 1-11.

Table 1-10: Reported Participation and Gross Demand Reduction by Program

Program	Participants		Reported Gross Impact (MW)	
	PYTD	Phase II	PYTD	Phase II
Appliance Turn-In	6,013	12,540	0.64	1.33
Efficient Products	203,579	422,176	2.47	4.39
Home Performance	306,012	366,652	5.63	7.03
Low Income	7,866	20,229	0.26	0.58
Small C/I Equipment	497	888	2.61	5.22
Small C/I Buildings	3,660	5,856	0.54	0.99
Large C/I Equipment	138	239	3.53	5.28
Large C/I Buildings	130	204	0.99	1.00
Gov./Institutional	9	24	0.05	0.22
TOTAL PORTFOLIO	527,904	828,808	16.72	26.04

Table 1-11: Verified Gross Demand Reduction by Program

Program	PYTD Reported Gross Demand Savings (MW)	PYTD Demand Realization Rate	PYTD Verified Gross Demand Savings (MW)	PYTD Achieved Precision ^[1]	Phase II Verified Gross Demand Savings (MW)	Phase II Achieved Precision ^[2]
Appliance Turn-In	0.64	103.6%	0.67	9.0%	1.34	7.1%
Efficient Products	2.47	121.0%	2.98	2.4%	5.40	2.9%
Home Performance	5.63	99.3%	5.59	10.9%	7.13	17.2%
Low Income	0.26	99.2%	0.26	6.8%	0.55	5.3%
Small C/I Equipment	2.61	98.2%	2.56	12.5%	5.19	10.9%
Small C/I Buildings	0.54	90.4%	0.49	15.2%	0.75	12.0%
Large C/I Equipment	3.53	117.2%	4.14	10.5%	6.28	10.3%
Large C/I Buildings	0.99	90.6%	0.89	0.5%	0.91	0.6%
Gov./Institutional	0.05	33.7%	0.02	13.0%	0.11	13.5%
TOTAL PORTFOLIO	16.72	105.3%	17.60	4.7%	27.67	5.5%
Phase 1 Carryover	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total Ph II+CO	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	27.67	n/a

1.5 SUMMARY OF PROGRAM YEAR 6 NET-TO-GROSS RATIOS

Per the 2013 TRC Order, EDCs are required to conduct net-to-gross (NTG) research. NTG ratios are not used for compliance purposes, but are used for cost effectiveness reporting and future program planning purposes and should be applied to gross savings in order to calculate net verified energy and demand savings for Table 1-12. Table 1-12 presents a summary of NTG ratios by program. Note that Phase II NTG results are not yet available for all programs or program components as of this writing. The reported values are weighted to reflect the programs that have been evaluated in Phase II. The PY6 net verified savings in Table 1-12 will differ from the corresponding values in Table 1-3 because in Table 1-3, Phase I NTG values or evaluator estimates are used for program components that have not had NTG evaluations in Phase II.

Table 1-12: Program Year 6 NTG Ratios by Program.

Program Name	Free Ridership (%)	Spillover (%)	NTG Ratio Program Year 6	PY6 Verified Net Energy Savings (MWh/Yr)	PY6 Verified Net Demand Savings (MW/Yr)	NTG Categories Included ⁴
Appliance Turn-In	51%	0%	51%	2,162	0.34	Freeridership
Efficient Products	56%	10%	53%	13,286	1.59	Freeridership, Participant Spillover
Home Performance	15%	2%	87%	39,836	4.86	Freeridership, Participant Spillover
Low Income	0%	0%	100%	2,755	0.26	n/a
Small C/I Equipment	38%	12%	75%	12,155	1.91	Freeridership, Participant Spillover
Small C/I Buildings	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Large C/I Equipment	27%	8%	80%	21,697	3.32	Freeridership, Participant Spillover
Large C/I Buildings	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Gov./Institutional	37%	11%	73%	87	0.01	Freeridership, Participant Spillover
(Weighted by program savings for programs reporting NTG Ratios)	27%	6%	78%	91,977	12.30	

⁴ For example, free-ridership, nonparticipant spillover, and participant spillover.

1.6 SUMMARY OF PORTFOLIO FINANCES AND COST-EFFECTIVENESS

A breakdown of the portfolio finances is presented in Table 1-13.

Table 1-13: Summary of Portfolio Finances

Row #	Cost Category	Actual PYTD Costs (\$1,000)	Actual Phase II Costs (\$1,000)
1	Incremental Measure Costs (Sum of rows 2 to 4)	\$18,134	\$34,124
2	EDC Incentives to Participants	\$7,059	\$13,254
3	EDC Incentives to Trade Allies	\$0	\$0
4	Participant Costs (net of incentives/rebates paid by utilities)	\$11,075	\$20,870
5	Program Overhead Costs (Sum of rows 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)	\$9,660	\$21,403
6	Design & Development	\$48	\$180
7	Administration, Management, and Technical Assistance ^[1]	\$7,779	\$17,634
8	Marketing ^[2]	\$917	\$1,757
9	EDC Evaluation Costs	\$710	\$876
10	SWE Audit Costs	\$207	\$957
11	Increases in costs of natural gas (or other fuels) for fuel switching programs	\$0	\$0
12	Total TRC Costs ^[3] (Sum of rows 1, 5 and 11)	\$27,794	\$55,527
13	Total NPV Lifetime Energy Benefits	\$51,627	\$94,371
14	Total NPV Lifetime Capacity Benefits	\$5,792	\$10,508
15	Total NPV TRC Benefits ^[4]	\$57,420	\$104,879
16	TRC Benefit-Cost Ratio ^[5]	2.07	1.89

NOTES

Per PUC direction, TRC inputs and calculations are required in the Annual Report only and should comply with the 2013 Total Resource Cost Test Order. Please see the "Report Definitions" section of this report for more details.

[1] Includes rebate processing, tracking system, general administration, EDC and CSP program management, general management and legal, and technical assistance.

[2] Includes the marketing CSP and marketing costs by program CSPs.

[3] Total TRC Costs includes Total EDC Costs and Participant Costs.

[4] Total TRC Benefits equals the sum of Total Lifetime Energy Benefits and Total Lifetime Capacity Benefits. Based upon verified gross kWh and kW savings. Benefits include: avoided supply costs, including the reduction in costs of electric energy, generation, transmission, and distribution capacity, and natural gas valued at marginal cost for periods when there is a load reduction. NOTE: Savings carried over from Phase I are not to be included as a part of Total TRC Benefits for Phase II.

[5] TRC Ratio equals Total NPV TRC Benefits divided by Total NPV TRC Costs.

1.7 SUMMARY OF COST-EFFECTIVENESS BY PROGRAM

TRC benefit-cost ratios are calculated by comparing the total NPV TRC benefits and the total NPV TRC costs. Table 1-14 shows the TRC ratios by program and other key factors used in the TRC ratio calculation for Phase II programs.

Table 1-14: PYTD TRC Ratios by Program⁵

Program	TRC NPV Benefits (\$1000)	TRC NPV Costs (\$1000)	TRC Benefit-Cost Ratio	Discount Rate	Energy Line Loss Factor	Demand Line Loss Factor
Appliance Turn-In	1,992	971	2.05	7.92%	9.45%	9.45%
Efficient Products	11,017	4,847	2.27	7.92%	9.45%	9.45%
Home Performance	8,802	5,650	1.56	7.92%	9.45%	9.45%
Low Income	1,109	2,072	0.54	7.92%	9.45%	9.45%
Small C/I Equipment	8,856	5,695	1.56	7.92%	9.45%	7.20%
Small C/I Buildings	1,488	899	1.65	7.92%	9.45%	7.20%
Large C/I Equipment	17,672	6,723	2.63	7.92%	7.20%	7.20%
Large C/I Buildings	6,418	738	8.69	7.92%	7.20%	7.20%
Gov./Institutional	65	197	0.33	7.92%	9.45%	7.20%
TOTAL	57,420	27,794	2.07	7.92%	8.51%	8.04%

1.8 COMPARISON OF PROGRAM YEAR 6 PERFORMANCE TO APPROVED EE&C PLAN

Table 1-15 below shows Program Year 6 expenditures compared to the budget estimates set forth in the EE&C plan.

Table 1-15: Comparison of PY6 Program Expenditures to PY6 EE&C Plan

Program	PY6 Budget from EE&C Plan	PY6 Actual Expenditures	% Difference from PY6 EE&C Plan [(Actual – Planned)/Planned]
Appliance Turn-In	\$1,178,733	\$674,181	-43%
Efficient Products	\$3,188,819	\$1,073,119	-66%
Home Performance	\$6,611,017	\$3,260,593	-51%
Low Income	\$3,300,198	\$2,071,841	-37%
Small C/I Equipment	\$3,507,307	\$1,042,144	-70%
Small C/I Buildings	\$1,438,968	\$456,914	-68%
Large C/I Equipment	\$2,252,572	\$656,107	-71%
Large C/I Buildings	\$955,563	\$295,912	-69%
Gov./Institutional	\$531,852	\$128,994	-76%
TOTAL	\$22,965,028	\$9,659,805	-58%

⁵ For reporting purposes, PYTD TRC Ratios by Program should be reported based on the gross verified energy and demand savings.

Table 1-16 show Program Year 6 program savings compare to the energy and demand savings estimates filed in the EE&C plan.

Table 1-16: Comparison of PY6 Actual Program Savings to EE&C Plan for PY6

Program	PY6 MWh Savings Projected in EE&C Plan	Actual Reported PY6 MWh Savings	% Difference [(PY6 Actual – PY6 Planned)/PY6 /Planned]	PY6 MW Savings Projected in EE&C Plan	Actual Reported PY6 MW Savings	% Difference [(PY6 Actual – PY6 Planned)/PY6 /Planned]
Appliance Turn-In	4,164	4,273	3%	0.39	0.64	64%
Efficient Products	20,693	22,773	10%	0.73	2.47	240%
Home Performance	30,865	46,590	51%	2.28	5.63	147%
Low Income	3,542	2,905	-18%	0.69	0.26	-62%
Small C/I Equipment	25,873	17,588	-32%	2.50	2.61	4%
Small C/I Buildings	4,483	3,736	-17%	0.55	0.54	-1%
Large C/I Equipment	14,798	27,860	88%	1.99	3.53	77%
Large C/I Buildings	3,250	9,299	186%	0.35	0.99	178%
Gov./Institutional	638	190	-70%	0.09	0.05	-44%
TOTAL	108,307	135,214	25%	9.56	16.72	75%

The portfolio as a whole met the Company's projections for PY6. Overall, energy savings exceeded targets while costs were below EE&C plan projections. Note, however, that the impacts associated with Home Energy Report are not additive from year to year, and this largely accounts for the apparent over performance for the Home Performance Program. Some of the programs with small budgets and corresponding expected participation rates will have significant variation in participation rates from year to year. The Efficient Buildings programs and the Government and Institutional Program fall in that category. Overall, program participation rates and cost effectiveness values are reasonable and indicate that Phase II Act 129 targets will be met. Program TRC ratios are consistent with EE&C plan projections to a satisfactory level. The smaller programs still exhibit low TRC ratios largely because they have not achieved the scale necessary to dilute the fixed costs associated with program implementation.

1.9 PORTFOLIO LEVEL/CROSS-CUTTING PROCESS AND IMPACT EVALUATION

SUMMARY FOR PROGRAM YEAR 6

PY6 Process evaluation activities included:

1. In-depth interviews with program staff to understand current programs logic, operations, delivery and changes, and to identify research objectives.
 - a. FirstEnergy program staff, n=10 plus (did not track individual follow-up calls as needed)
 - b. ICSP, n=3 group interviews
2. Interviews and surveys with trade allies to assess program operations and effectiveness (including influence on stocking practices and recommendations), and their experiences with the programs.
 - a. HVAC contractors semi-structured interviews, n=4
 - b. HVAC contractors surveys, n=51

- c. Low Income contractors and auditors in-depth interviews, n=5
- 3. Participant surveys to assess program experiences and the influence of programs on energy efficiency decisions.
 - a. Appliance Turn-in, n=45
 - b. Energy Efficient Products, n=131
 - c. Low Income, n=195
 - d. Small Commercial & Industrial Equipment, n=54
 - e. Large Commercial & Industrial Equipment, n=51
 - f. Government & Institutional, n=7
- 4. Program documentation and website reviews, including rebate forms and marketing materials.
- 5. Benchmarking reviews.

The process evaluation effort has resulted in the following cross-cutting recommendations.

Table 1-17: Phase II Process and Impact Evaluation Recommendations from PY6 Evaluations

Applicability	Recommendations
Portfolio Level	Remove references to EDC in equipment descriptions in the T&R system.
Energy Efficient Products	For upstream lighting, report lamp source type, lamp type, wattage, lumens in the T&R system.
Residential Home Performance	For the New Home component, flag homes with greater than 20,000 kWh for a REMRate baseline heating loads vs. heating energy usage review.
Residential Appliance Turn-In	
Residential Low Income	
C/I Small Energy Efficient Equipment	Continue conducting outreach with trade allies and contractors to promote the program when working with commercial customers, and continue incorporating case studies and testimonials into marketing materials provided to customers and trade allies.
C/I Small Efficient Buildings	
C/I Large Energy Efficient Equipment	
C/I Large Energy Efficient Buildings	Seek opportunities to provide contractors and targeted customers with additional literature and marketing materials they can use to convey benefits of the program to management staff.
Governmental and Institutional	Consider using a deemed hours of use of 1,000 hours per year for all comprehensive lighting upgrades at volunteer fire departments.

2 RESIDENTIAL APPLIANCE TURN-IN PROGRAM

Residential customers are eligible for a cash incentive and disposal of up to two large older inefficient appliances (refrigerators or freezers); and two Room Air Conditioners (RAC) per household per calendar year. All units must be working and meet established size requirements.

2.1 PROGRAM UPDATES

No changes to this program during PY6.

2.1.1 Definition of Participant

The participant counts are based on the number of unique account numbers, while measure counts correspond to the number of removed refrigerators, freezers, and RACs.

2.2 IMPACT EVALUATION GROSS SAVINGS

2.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

The reported impacts for this program are based on the energy savings associated with the removal of working refrigerators, freezers and RACs out of service. The gross impact evaluation method includes the following steps:

- 1) Through customer verification surveys, determine the fraction of refrigerators, freezers and RACs that were drawing power from the grid prior to retirement.
- 2) For refrigerators and freezers, also determine the fraction of recycled units that were replaced with Energy Star qualified units, and the fraction that were replaced with standard efficiency units.

The first step above is a basic verification step: Zero savings are credited if an appliance was reported to be non-functional (unable to draw power from the grid) prior to pick-up. The second step helps to select the proper path in the TRM algorithm, as the energy usage of the replacement unit is subtracted from the energy use of the recycled unit. A final step is necessary to avoid double-counting of savings in the case that a refrigerator is replaced with an Energy Star unit and rebated under the Efficient Products program. ADM conducted a database lookup to identify customers that recycled a refrigerator or freezer, and also received rebates for EnergyStar refrigerators or freezers during the same program year. The savings associated with the EnergyStar refrigerators or freezers were then subtracted from the gross verified savings for the program.

The Company updated the reported per-unit savings for refrigerators and freezers by blending the impacts that result from “recycling without replacement” and “recycling with replacement” scenarios. The reported energy savings are heavily weighted to the “recycling with replacement” scenario, to be consistent with past impact evaluation findings. The realization rate for the program is attributable almost entirely to the differences between the ex-ante/ex-ante and ex-post weights for the three replacement type scenarios.

2.2.2 Program Sampling

The sampling approach for this program is a simple random sample. Sample sizes target 90% confidence level and 10% precision.

Table 2-1: Phase II Residential Appliance Turn-In Reported Results by Customer Sector

Sector	Participants	Reported Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Reported Gross Demand Reduction (MW)	Incentives (\$1,000)
Residential	12,540	9,066	1.33	623
Low-Income	0	0.0	0.00	0
Small Commercial and Industrial	0	0.0	0.00	0
Large Commercial and Industrial	0	0.0	0.00	0
Government, Non-Profit, and Institutional	0	0.0	0.00	0
Phase II Total	12,540	9,066	1.33	623

Table 2-2: Residential Appliance Turn-In Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6

Stratum	Population Size	Target Levels of Confidence & Precision	Target Sample Size	Achieved Sample Size	Evaluation Activity
Refrigerators	4,722	12.1%	35	35	CR,S,X
Freezers	1,035	15.9%	20	18	CR,S,X
RACs	256	18.0%	15	15	CR,S
Program Total	6,013	10.1%	70	68	
CR=TRM Calculation Review, S=Survey, X=Cross-check against EE Products to identify potential double-counting of savings for Enregy-Star refrigerators and freezers.					

Table 2-3: Program Year 6 Residential Appliance Turn-In Summary of Evaluation Results for Energy

	Reported Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Energy Realization Rate (%)	Verified Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Observed Coefficient of Variation (C _v) or Proportion in Sample Design	Relative Precision at 85% C.L.
Refrigerators					
Refrigerators	3,353	101.1%	3,390	0.5	12.1%
Freezers	869	93.9%	816	0.5	16.8%
RACs	51	63.3%	32	0.5	18.0%
Program Total	4,273	99.2%	4,239		10.2%

Table 2-4: Program Year 6 Residential Appliance Turn-In Summary of Evaluation Results for Demand

Stratum	Reported Gross Demand Savings (MW)	Demand Realization Rate (%)	Verified Gross Demand Savings (MW)	Observed Coefficient of Variation (C _v) or Proportion in Sample Design	Relative Precision at 85% C.L.
Freezers	0.38	111.6%	0.42	0.5	12.1%
RACs	0.10	97.9%	0.10	0.5	16.8%
Refrigerators	0.16	88.9%	0.15	0.5	18.0%
Program Total	0.64	103.6%	0.67		9.0%

2.2.3 On Site Inspections

No on-site inspections were performed for this program in PY6, because the appliances are removed from customers' homes. ADM performs online and telephone verification surveys with program participants. The verification rate from these surveys are typically above 98%, and variation between

reported and verified impacts primarily is due to differences between ex-ante assumptions and ex-post measurements regarding the fraction of appliances that were replaced.

2.3 IMPACT EVALUATION NET SAVINGS

The evaluation team assessed free ridership using the *Common Approach for Measuring Net Savings for Appliance Retirement Programs* approach. The data collection effort for this evaluation was done in conjunction with the ADM verification survey for impact evaluation. Spillover was not assessed during this effort. The evaluation team plans to conduct this research for this program in PY7.

Table 2-5: Residential Appliance Turn-In Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6 NTG Research

Stratum	Stratum Boundaries	Population Size ⁶	Assumed CV or Proportion in Sample Design	Assumed Levels of Confidence & Precision	Target Sample size	Achieved Sample Size	Percent of Sample Frame Contacted ⁷ to Achieve Sample
Appliance Turn-In	All Measures	6,013	P=0.5	85/15	50	45	6% (N=340)
Program Total		6,013	P=0.5	85/15	50	45	6% (N=340)

Table 2-6: Program Year 6 Residential Appliance Turn-In Summary of Evaluation Results for NTG Research

Target Group or Stratum (if appropriate)	Estimated Free Ridership	Estimated Participant Spillover	NTG Ratio	Observed Coefficient of Variation or Proportion	Relative Precision
Appliance Turn-In	51%	0%	49%	0.5	10.7%
Program Total ⁸	51%	0%	49%	0.5	10.7%

2.4 PROCESS EVALUATION

A robust process evaluation was conducted for this program twice in Phase I. There were no issues identified in those efforts and the program design has not changed for Phase II. Additionally, the FirstEnergy staff in-depth interviews did not reveal any useful researchable topics or issues to pursue. Therefore, a limited process evaluation was conducted for Phase II to assess key participant interactions and to identify if additional research is warranted.

Participating Customer (Household) Surveys

ADM included questions on their impact verification survey to assess:

- Program awareness and marketing.
- Customer satisfaction.
- Decision-making considerations (free-ridership) when recycling equipment.

⁶ The values in this column represent the population as of the time that the process and NTG samples were drawn, and are generally smaller than the end-of-year values shown in the gross impact evaluation tables above.

⁷ Sample frame is a list of contacts that have a chance to be selected into the sample. Percent contacted means of all the sample frame how many were called to get the completes.

⁸ NTG ratio at program level should be developed using stratum weight and stratum NTG ratios.

Table 2-7: Residential Appliance Turn-In Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6

Target Group or Stratum (if appropriate)	Stratum Boundaries (if appropriate)	Population Size	Assumed Proportion or CV in Sample Design	Assumed Levels of Confidence & Precision	Target Sample Size	Achieved Sample Size	Percent of Population Frame Contacted to Achieve Sample	Used For Evaluation Activities (Impact, Process, NTG)
Appliance Turn-In	All Measures	6,013	P=0.5	85/15	50	45	6% (N=340)	Process, NTG
Program Total		6,013	P=0.5	85/15	50	45	6% (N=340)	

Key Findings

- 1) Bill inserts continue to be the most common source of program information. Over 60 percent (106 out of 168) of respondents indicated bill inserts as a source of program information. For the self-identified low-income subgroup of respondents, almost three-quarters (34 out of 46) indicated bill inserts as a source of program information.
- 2) Program satisfaction remains high. Over 80 percent (138 out of 170) of respondents reported they were "Very Satisfied" with program overall, with a mean score of 4.7 out of 5.
- 3) Net-to-Gross for the program is 46 percent. NTG values for individual FirstEnergy EDCs range from 32–57 percent

2.5 STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM

The following recommendations resulted from the process and impact evaluation effort.

Table 2-8: Residential Appliance Turn-In Status Report on Process and Impact Recommendations

Recommendations	EDC Status of Recommendation (Implemented, Being Considered, Rejected AND Explanation of Action Taken by EDC)
Reduce reported savings for RACs to 150 kWh per unit.	Accept
Consider using bill inserts to address recycling concerns outside of the program.	Rejected
Consider adding a message to the rebate check that provides information about other FirstEnergy programs.	Under Consideration

2.6 FINANCIAL REPORTING

A breakdown of the program finances (by program) is presented in Table 2-9.

Table 2-9: Summary of Program Finances

Row #	Cost Category	Actual PYTD Costs	Actual Phase II Costs
		(\$1,000)	(\$1,000)
1	Incremental Measure Costs (Sum of rows 2 to 4)	\$297	\$626
2	EDC Incentives to Participants	\$297	\$626
3	EDC Incentives to Trade Allies	\$0	\$0
4	Participant Costs (net of incentives/rebates paid by utilities)	\$0	\$0
5	Program Overhead Costs (Sum of rows 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)	\$674	\$1,538
6	Design & Development	\$3	\$13
7	Administration, Management, and Technical Assistance ^[1]	\$491	\$1,124
8	Marketing ^[2]	\$146	\$309
9	EDC Evaluation Costs	\$19	\$24
10	SWE Audit Costs	\$15	\$68
11	Increases in costs of natural gas (or other fuels) for fuel switching programs	\$0	\$0
12	Total TRC Costs ^[3] (Sum of rows 1, 5 and 11)	\$971	\$2,163
13	Total NPV Lifetime Energy Benefits	\$1,766	\$3,669
14	Total NPV Lifetime Capacity Benefits	\$227	\$470
15	Total NPV TRC Benefits ^[4]	\$1,992	\$4,139
16	TRC Benefit-Cost Ratio ^[5]	2.05	1.91

NOTES

Per PUC direction, TRC inputs and calculations are required in the Annual Report only and should comply with the 2013 Total Resource Cost Test Order. Please see the "Report Definitions" section of this report for more details.

[1] Includes rebate processing, tracking system, general administration, EDC and CSP program management, general management and legal, and technical assistance.

[2] Includes the marketing CSP and marketing costs by program CSPs.

[3] Total TRC Costs includes Total EDC Costs and Participant Costs.

[4] Total TRC Benefits equals the sum of Total Lifetime Energy Benefits and Total Lifetime Capacity Benefits. Based upon verified gross kWh and kW savings. Benefits include: avoided supply costs, including the reduction in costs of electric energy, generation, transmission, and distribution capacity, and natural gas valued at marginal cost for periods when there is a load reduction. NOTE: Savings carried over from Phase I are not to be included as a part of Total TRC Benefits for Phase II.

[5] TRC Ratio equals Total NPV TRC Benefits divided by Total NPV TRC Costs.

3 ENERGY EFFICIENT PRODUCTS PROGRAM

Through the Residential Energy Efficient Products Program, customers receive incentives for installing ENERGY STAR® qualified appliances, energy efficient HVAC equipment, and energy efficient water heaters. The program also provides incentives to retailers for point of sale price cuts for customers purchasing energy efficient light bulbs. Qualifying appliances include items such as clothes washers, dehumidifiers, and refrigerators. HVAC equipment qualifying as part of the program include central air conditioners, air source heat pumps, ground source heat pumps, and mini-split heat pumps. The program also provides incentives to customers for the maintenance (tune-ups) of existing HVAC equipment. Water heaters rebated under the program include heat pump water heaters and solar water heaters.

3.1 PROGRAM UPDATES

During PY6, room air conditioners were moved into the upstream portion of the program.

3.1.1 Definition of Participant

The count of participants differs from the count of measures for this program. The participant count is the count of unique account numbers in the PY6 tracking and reporting data. The measure count typically exceeds the participant count as some participants complete multiple qualifying measures.

3.2 IMPACT EVALUATION GROSS SAVINGS

3.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

The program can be broadly divided in five components: Upstream Lighting, Upstream Electronics, Efficient HVAC Equipment, HVAC Tune-Ups, and Energy Star Appliances. The details of the methodologies are described in the subsections below.

Gross Impact Evaluation for Upstream Products

The lighting and consumer electronics program components are similar in structure. Both program components provide retailers incentives for point of sale purchases on energy efficient products. The efficient lighting products are discounted to the customers, while consumer electronics are not required to be discounted to the customers by program design. From a gross impact evaluation perspective, the salient shared characteristic between the two program components is that customer contact information is not available.

The similar nature of these programs allows for a similar evaluation approach for consumer electronics and efficient lighting products. The following verification elements were applied to these two program components:

Review of Sales Invoices

ADM conducted a review and obtained invoices for the CFLs, LEDs, LED holiday lights, desktop computers, smart strips, monitors, and televisions sold by participating retailers. These invoices are matched to the tracking and reporting (T&R) system to confirm proper counts and characteristics of the lighting and consumer electronic equipment. For all of the measures discussed in this section, the information in the T&R system was found to be consistent with both the reviewed invoices.

General Review of Tracking and Reporting System

ADM reviewed the T&R system to assure there are no duplicate entries and that all equipment model types are eligible for being counted toward PY6 achievements based on sales dates.

Impact Calculations for Lighting Products

ADM developed an *ex-ante* wattage equivalency map for use by the ICSP. The wattage equivalency was not make/model specific, but was rather designed to facilitate accurate if somewhat conservative, reporting of MWh and MW impacts for the upstream program.

To calculate verified impacts, ADM developed a make/model specific wattage equivalency map. For each unique stock keeping unit (SKU) description, ADM determined the lamp type as one of the following:

- General Service.
- Reflector (with subcategories having different lumen to baseline wattage mappings),
- Globe,
- Decorative,
- 3-Way,
- LED Holiday Lights

For each category, the baseline wattage was determined, according to the TRM, as a function of the efficient lamp's lumen output. With the baseline and efficient watts determined, the impacts for all lamps are determined through TRM algorithms. Cross sector sales adjustments apply to residential lighting. Cross-sector sales determination and the associated adjustments to verified impacts and incentives are discussed in detail in Appendix D.

Impact Calculations for Upstream Electronics

ADM reviewed upstream electronics manufacturer names and model numbers to verify that the models are in the ENERGY STAR® database and to check the ENERGY STAR tier. In the 2014 TRM, the diagonal screen size is a key parameter in the partially deemed savings algorithm for televisions. ADM verified the diagonal screen size and calculated TRM-specified energy and demand impacts, accordingly. ADM applied the protocols of the TRM version that was in effect when the units were sold.

Gross Impact Evaluation for Appliances

The gross impact evaluation for appliances includes the following components:

Invoice and Application Review

ADM obtained invoices and applications from the Company. For each application, ADM verified that the manufacturer name and model number in the T&R system matches those on the invoice and rebate application. In general, all sampled appliances were matched to the qualifying ENERGY STAR® product lists⁹. ADM independently retrieved the attributes necessary for TRM calculations from the ENERGY STAR® database. In certain cases, the make or model numbers were entered in with minor typographic errors or with missing or inserted dashes, spaces, or other delimiting characters. Such occurrences do not pose an evaluation difficulty as ADM concentrates the verification effort on a random sample of rebated appliances, rather than the entirety of the database.

⁹ The only exception involved one water heater for Penelec, which was found to be a standard efficiency model.

Customer Verification Surveys

ADM performed telephone and online surveys on a random sample of customers selected from the T&R data. Nearly all contacted customers verified that they have purchased and installed the stated appliances. The verification rates are used, in part, to inform measure-level realization rates.

Review of Energy Savings and Demand Reduction Calculations

For appliance measures with partially deemed TRM protocols, the T&R system calculated impacts with one savings scenario rather than with specific scenarios that occur in measure implementation. For example, market average values for capacity, efficiency, are used rather than appliance-specific values. For clothes washers, TRM default fractions of electric water heating and clothes drying are used. In general, the per-unit savings reported by the ICSP are rather conservative (the assumed average efficiency levels or capacities are lower than actual average values). For all reviewed records, ADM used site-specific attributes to calculate “On-TRM” impacts.

Gross Impact for Evaluation HVAC Equipment and Tune-Ups

The gross impact evaluation approach for HVAC equipment is similar to that of appliances. The process involves invoice and application reviews, telephone verification surveys, and independent TRM-specific gross impact calculations for sampled items. The three activities are described in more detail below.

Invoice and Application Review

ADM obtained invoices and applications from the Company. For each application, ADM verified that the manufacturer name and model number in the T&R system matches those on the invoice and rebate application. In general, the sampled equipment were verified as more efficient than standard HVAC systems. ADM independently retrieved the attributes necessary for TRM calculations from the AHRI database. In certain cases, the make or model numbers were entered in with minor typographic errors or with missing or inserted dashes, spaces, or other delimiting characters. Such occurrences do not pose an evaluation difficulty as ADM concentrates the verification effort on a random sample of rebated appliances, rather than the entirety of the database. Verified impacts for tune-ups are determined through verification rates from telephone surveys, coupled with average cooling and heating capacities determined from application and invoice reviews.

Customer Verification Surveys

ADM performed telephone and online surveys on a random sample of customers selected from the T&R data. All contacted customers verified that they have purchased and installed the stated HVAC equipment, and all tune-up participants recalled the tune-up event. The telephone surveys are also an opportunity to collect additional data that are exclusive to the T&R system. For example, the installation space and baseline HVAC system types were determined through customer surveys for ductless mini-split heat pumps.

Review of Energy Savings and Demand Reduction Calculations

As with appliances, the ICSP reports energy savings due to market average values for capacity and efficiency, rather than project-specific attributes. The default parameters used in the savings estimations are conservative in the sense that the ICSP systematically underestimates reported impacts. This is particularly true for ground source heat pumps, air source heat pumps, and tune-ups. For all reviewed records, ADM used site-specific attributes to calculate “On-TRM” impacts. The process is somewhat more involved in that the make/model lookups involve the Air Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration Institute (AHRI) certification directory along with using the TRM’s zip-code to archetypal city map to establish equivalent full load hours. For ductless mini-split heat pumps, customer surveys are required to establish equivalent full load hours of operation and a baseline system type. Although

there are at times significant variations between reported and verified savings, the overall variance is insignificant at the program level.

3.2.1 Program Sampling

For the upstream lighting and consumer electronics program components, the census of shipment invoices and the calculations in the T&R system were reviewed to ensure that the energy savings and demand reductions are claimed according to the protocols in the PA TRM.

The sampling approach for the appliance and HVAC program components is stratified random sampling with the stratification defined by measure types. Note that sample sizes may be small for certain small strata, but the overall number of sample points, exclusive of the upstream program components, is sufficient to achieve 90/10 confidence/precision¹⁰. The impacts of certain measures that have an insignificant number of applications such as solar water heaters and mini-split ACs are not verified through surveys or invoice applications, but are rather passed through to verified impacts provided that the per-unit savings are consistent with values from the PA TRM.

Table 3-1: Energy Efficient Products Reported Results by Customer Sector

Sector	Participants	Reported Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Reported Gross Demand Reduction (MW)	Incentives (\$1,000)
Residential	401,598	48,601	3.24	2,315
Low-Income	0	0	0.00	0
Small Commercial and Industrial	20,578	5,252	1.14	60
Large Commercial and Industrial	0	0	0.00	0
Government, Non-Profit, and Institutional	0	0	0.00	0
Phase II Total	422,176	53,853	4.39	2,375

¹⁰ The measure-level sampling stratification results in certain strata with insignificant reported impacts (less than one *per mil* of program impacts). The reported impacts for these strata passed through to verified impacts provided that the per-unit savings are consistent with values from the PA TRM. The associated evaluation activity is designated as "PT" in Table 2-2.

Table 3-2: Energy Efficient Products Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6

Stratum	Population Size	Target Levels of Confidence & Precision	Target Sample Size	Achieved Sample Size	Evaluation Activity
Upstream Lighting	180,979	0%	180,979	180,979	CR,IR,AR,S*
Upstream Televisions	11,385	0%	11,385	11,385	CR,IR,AR
Refrigerators Freezers	4,335	11%	40	40	CR,IR,AR,S
Upstream Computers/Monitors	535	0%	535	535	CR,IR,AR
Heat Pump Water Heaters	102	28%	21	21	CR,IR,AR,S
ASHP	120	16%	18	17	CR,IR,AR,S
Clothes Washers	2,181	11%	40	36	CR,IR,AR,S
GSHP	54	47%	8	8	CR,IR,AR,S
HVAC Tune-Ups	470	10%	45	45	CR,IR,AR,S
Dehumidifiers	1,950	13%	32	30	CR,IR,AR,S
CAC	238	29%	6	6	CR,IR,AR,S
MiniSplit HP	459	10%	48	41	CR,IR,AR,S
Room AC	622	n/a	0	0	CR
Smart Strips	43	0%	43	43	CR,IR,AR
Whole House Fan	0	n/a	0	0	n/a
Electric Resistance Water Heaters	57	31%	5	5	CR,IR,AR,S
Solar Water Heaters	5	64%	1	1	PT
ECM Fans	30	49%	2	2	PT
MiniSplit AC	14	69%	1	1	PT
Pool Pump Motors	0	n/a	0	0	n/a
Program Total	203,579		193,209	193,195	

CR=Calculation Review, IR=Invoice Review, AR=Application Review, S=Survey

S*: Surveys for upstream lighting are used to estimate cross sector sales and low-income participation.

PT=Pass Through (certain measures that account for less than 0.1% of reported impacts are passed through to verified impacts, on the condition that the reported savings per unit are reasonably close to TRM values.)

Table 3-3: Program Year 6 Energy Efficient Products Program Summary of Evaluation Results for Energy

Stratum	Reported Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Energy Realization Rate (%)	Verified Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Observed Coefficient of Variation (C _v) or Proportion in Sample Design	Relative Precision at 85% C.L.
Upstream Lighting	20,259	110.8%	22,445	0.5	2.3%
Upstream Televisions	591	82.6%	488	0.5	0.0%
Refrigerators / Freezers	519	108.9%	566	0.5	11.3%
Upstream Computers/Monitors	20	100.3%	20	0.5	0.0%
Heat Pump Water Heaters	157	137%	215	1.0	28.0%
ASHP	74	141%	104	0.5	16.2%
Clothes Washers	198	124%	245	0.5	11.9%
GSHP	152	62%	95	1.0	47.0%
HVAC Tune-Ups	61	129%	79	0.5	10.2%
Dehumidifiers	319	83%	265	0.5	13.0%
CAC	38	100%	38	0.5	29.0%
MiniSplit HP	344	82%	280	0.5	10.7%
Room AC	9	86%	7	0.5	100.0%
Smart Strips	3	96.3%	3	0.5	0.0%
Whole House Fan	0	n/a	0	0.5	100.0%
Electric Resistance Water Heaters	7	67%	5	0.5	30.8%
Solar Water Heaters	8	n/a	8	0.5	64.4%
ECM Fans	13	n/a	13	0.5	49.2%
MiniSplit AC	0	n/a	0	0.5	69.4%
Pool Pump Motors	0	n/a	0	0.5	100.0%
Program Total	22,773	109%	24,877	n/a	2.1%

Table 3-4: Program Year 6 Energy Efficient Products Summary of Evaluation Results for Demand

Stratum	Reported Gross Demand Savings (MW)	Demand Realization Rate (%)	Verified Gross Demand Savings (MW)	Observed Coefficient of Variation (C_v) or Proportion in Sample Design	Relative Precision at 85% C.L.
Upstream Lighting	1.934	126.1%	2.439	0.5	2.3%
Upstream Televisions	0.090	82.8%	0.075	0.5	0.0%
Refrigerators / Freezers	0.059	108.9%	0.065	0.5	11.3%
Upstream Computers/Monitors	0.001	249.3%	0.003	0.5	0.0%
Heat Pump Water Heaters	0.013	135%	0.018	1.0	28.0%
ASHP	0.013	339%	0.044	0.5	16.2%
Clothes Washers	0.032	100%	0.032	0.5	11.9%
GSHP	0.032	61%	0.019	1.0	47.0%
HVAC Tune-Ups	0.114	44%	0.050	0.5	10.2%
Dehumidifiers	0.034	56%	0.019	0.5	13.0%
CAC	0.026	171%	0.044	0.5	29.0%
MiniSplit HP	0.076	178%	0.135	0.5	10.7%
Room AC	0.037	100%	0.037	0.5	100.0%
Smart Strips	0.000	99.4%	0.000	0.5	0.0%
Whole House Fan	0.000	n/a	0.000	0.5	100.0%
Electric Resistance Water Heaters	0.001	67%	0.000	0.5	30.8%
Solar Water Heaters	0.001	n/a	0.001	0.5	64.4%
ECM Fans	0.003	n/a	0.003	0.5	49.2%
MiniSplit AC	0.002	n/a	0.002	0.5	69.4%
Pool Pump Motors	0.000	n/a	0.000	0.5	100.0%
Program Total	2.468	121%	2.985	n/a	2.4%

3.2.1 On-Site Inspections

The program ICSP, Honeywell, conducts on-site inspections for rebated HVAC units. Honeywell randomly selects approximately 5% of rebated HVAC units for on-site inspections. Inspections are also performed on the first 2 installations by a newly enrolled contractor, units installed by a non-participating contractor, self-installs, and multiple unit installations. There are three possible outcomes of the on-site inspection:

Case 1: The reported HVAC unit is found to be installed as described in rebate application materials

Case2: A new, efficient HVAC unit is found, but there are discrepancies related to specific model number, capacity, or efficiency of the unit

Case 3: No efficient HVAC unit is installed at the residence

The on-site inspections occur prior to rebate approval. The great majority (95%)¹¹ of QA/QC inspections correspond to Case 1 above. Approximately 4% of on-site inspections result in a “Case 2” finding. In such cases, the application materials are updated to reflect the as-found equipment, and the rebate application is processed accordingly. This may involve an adjustment to the rebate amount, if the equipment is found to be in a higher or lower efficiency tier. If there is a failure to verify the equipment, the rebate application is not approved. Based on Honeywell’s historical records, this scenario occurs approximately 1% of the time.

3.3 IMPACT EVALUATION NET SAVINGS

The NTG research was conducted in conjunction with the process evaluation effort for the PY6 sample frame.

The program downstream measure categories – HVAC and water-heating, and appliances - were evaluated using the *Common Framework for Downstream NTG Evaluation* self-report method and assessed free ridership and spillover. We targeted 35 participating household completed surveys for each of the two strata: (1) HVAC and water heating, and (2) appliances. This was more than sufficient to meet a minimum confidence and precision requirement of 85% $\pm$ 15% at the program level. In addition to the household surveys, we also conducted HVAC contractor in-depth interviews and surveys. This qualitative information was used in conjunction with the HVAC household surveys to assess program influence on the household decision to purchase more energy efficient equipment.

The program upstream lighting and midstream consumer electronics measure categories evaluation is currently underway and will not be completed for this Annual report. Therefore, the program level free ridership, spillover, and NTG values in Table 2-6 represent only those strata for which NTG research has been completed thus far in Phase II.

Table 3-5: Energy Efficient Products Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6 NTG Research

Stratum	Population Size ¹²	Assumed CV or Proportion in Sample Design	Assumed Levels of Confidence & Precision	Target Sample size	Achieved Sample Size	Percent of Sample Frame Contacted ¹³ to Achieve Sample
HVAC & Water Heating	673	P=0.5	85/15	70	65	37% (N=246)
Appliance	5,806	P=0.5	85/15	70	66	4% (N=214)
Program Total	6,479	P=0.5	85/15	140	131	7% (N=460)

¹¹ Percentages here apply to all four FirstEnergy Pennsylvania EDCs.

¹² The values in this column represent the population as of the time that the process and NTG samples were drawn, and are generally smaller than the end-of-year values shown in the gross impact evaluation tables above.

¹³ Sample frame is a list of contacts that have a chance to be selected into the sample. Percent contacted means of all the sample frame how many were called to get the completes.

**Table 3-6: Program Year 6 Energy Efficient Products Program
Summary of Evaluation Results for NTG Research**

Target Group or Stratum (if appropriate)	Estimated Free Ridership	Estimated Participant Spillover	NTG Ratio	Observed Coefficient of Variation or Proportion	Relative Precision
Upstream Lighting	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Upstream Electronics	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
HVAC and Water Heating	58.9%	13.3%	54.4%	0.37	6.6%
Appliances	52.0%	3.7%	51.7%	0.35	6.2%
Program Total ¹⁴	56.3%	9.7%	53.4%		4.7%

3.4 PROCESS EVALUATION

For the EEP downstream measure categories process evaluation – HVAC and water-heating, and appliances – the evaluation team conducted the following activities:

FirstEnergy and Program Implementer Staff In-depth Interviews

Tetra Tech and ADM conducted in-depth interviews with program staff at FirstEnergy to discuss Phase II design and implementation updates, program goals, and key researchable issues of interest for the Phase II evaluation. The interviews assessed the effectiveness of the program's current operations, detailed program implementation practices, and identified key researchable topics.

Participating Customer (Household) Surveys

Tetra Tech conducted a quantitative participant survey effort by phone and by web for this evaluation for the Year 5 (PY5) sample frame. The surveys collected feedback on the following key researchable areas:

- Program infrastructure and participating household satisfaction
- Program communication and processes
- Free-ridership and spillover
- Demographics.

Table 3-7: Energy Efficient Products Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6

Target Group or Stratum (if appropriate)	Population Size	Assumed Proportion or CV in Sample Design	Assumed Levels of Confidence & Precision	Target Sample Size	Achieved Sample Size	Percent of Population Frame Contacted to Achieve Sample	Used For Evaluation Activities (Impact, Process, NTG)
HVAC & Water Heating	673	P=0.5	85/15	70	65	37% (N=246)	Process, NTG
Appliance	5,806	P=0.5	85/15	70	66	4% (N=214)	Process, NTG
Program Total	6,479	P=0.5	85/15	140	131	7% (N=460)	

¹⁴ NTG ratio at program level should be developed using stratum weight and stratum NTG ratios.

Participating HVAC Contractor Web Surveys and In-depth Interviews

The focus of the contractor web survey was to assess how the program is working for contractors from their perspectives. The following key researchable areas were assessed:

- Program Infrastructure and participating contractor satisfaction
- Program communication and processes
- Program influence
- Firmographics.

Contractors were selected at random from the list of participating contractors provided by the ICSP and 51 contractors completed the web survey. We also completed four in-depth interviews with participating contractors.

Key Findings*Participating Households*

- 1) Participants are highly satisfied with the program overall with a mean score greater than 4 on a 1-point to 5-point scale. Most HVAC and Appliance subprogram components also had a mean score of 4 or higher on this scale.
- 2) Almost half of participants in the Appliance subprogram are hearing about program rebates from the retailer and about half the HVAC subprogram participants are hearing about program rebates from the contractor. When asked to identify several preferred methods to hear about programs in the future, customers identified utility mail and web contact as the most preferred approaches, with 76 percent and 34 percent support respectively.
- 3) Participants largely understand program eligibility requirements, but about 7 percent of HVAC participants do not understand the HVAC tune-up or heat pump requirements.

Participating program contractors (HVAC subprogram only)

- 1) Contractors have a slightly lower mean score for overall program satisfaction (3.7) than program participants. Contractors scored their mean satisfaction the lowest on Technical Support (3.1) and Program Training (3.1). In-depth interviews with contractors suggested they prefer to receive program information through more personalized means, such as one-on-one meetings or direct calls with their ICSP representative. Contractors value these one-on-one program interactions with their ICSP representative.
- 2) Twenty percent (11) of surveyed contractors rate the paperwork requirements as “difficult” and eight percent (4) voiced concern about the time between their submission of rebate paperwork and the notification when the ICSP determined that paperwork submitted was incomplete and required contractor follow-up.
- 3) Only about half of the contractors responding to the survey report receiving the contractor newsletter and only three were aware of the ICSP contractor portal.
- 4) Contractors are the primary vehicle for communicating the HVAC subprogram to customers. Nearly half of the HVAC participants report hearing about the program from their contractor; contractors estimate less than 25 percent of their customers know about the program before he or she introduces the customer to program options.

3.5 STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM

The following recommendations resulted from the process and impact evaluation effort.

Table 3-8: Energy Efficient Products Program Status Report on Process and Impact Recommendations

Recommendations	EDC Status of Recommendation (Implemented, Being Considered, Rejected AND Explanation of Action Taken by EDC)
Review rebate paperwork processes to identify opportunities to streamline documentation requirements and notify contractors and/or customers more quickly if project documentation is incomplete.	Being Considered
Increase one-on-one communication and improve response time between participating program contractors and their ICSP representative.	Being Considered
Use one-on-one communication to increase contractor awareness of program communication tools – such as the newsletter and/or portal – that already exist.	Being Considered
Consider annual or bi-annual calls or meetings with participating contractors – in lieu of or in addition to webinars – to provide specific information on program offerings and/or changes that are relevant to them, and provide the opportunity for contractor feedback.	Being Considered
Continue to use individual Appliance and HVAC subprogram NTG ratios during planning, rather than the overall program NTG ratio.	Implemented
For upstream lighting, report lamp source type, lamp type, wattage, lumens in the T&R system.	Being Considered
Remove the EDC name from equipment descriptions	Being Considered

3.6 FINANCIAL REPORTING

A breakdown of the program finances (by program) is presented in Table 3-9. Penelec's Efficient Products program had higher cost-benefit ratios than corresponding programs for other FirstEnergy EDCs in Pennsylvania. The higher than average TRC is primarily attributed to lower relative fractions of HVAC equipment and clothes washer rebates.

Table 3-9: Summary of Energy Efficient Products Program Finances

Row #	Cost Category	Actual PYTD Costs	Actual Phase II Costs
		(\$1,000)	(\$1,000)
1	Incremental Measure Costs (Sum of rows 2 to 4)	\$3,774	\$7,009
2	EDC Incentives to Participants	\$983	\$2,375
3	EDC Incentives to Trade Allies	\$0	\$0
4	Participant Costs (net of incentives/rebates paid by utilities)	\$2,791	\$4,634
5	Program Overhead Costs (Sum of rows 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)	\$1,073	\$2,535
6	Design & Development	\$4	\$18
7	Administration, Management, and Technical Assistance ^[1]	\$781	\$2,062
8	Marketing ^[2]	\$163	\$241
9	EDC Evaluation Costs	\$106	\$122
10	SWE Audit Costs	\$19	\$92
11	Increases in costs of natural gas (or other fuels) for fuel switching programs	\$0	\$0
12	Total TRC Costs ^[3] (Sum of rows 1, 5 and 11)	\$4,847	\$9,544
13	Total NPV Lifetime Energy Benefits	\$9,928	\$22,378
14	Total NPV Lifetime Capacity Benefits	\$1,089	\$2,090
15	Total NPV TRC Benefits ^[4]	\$11,017	\$24,468
16	TRC Benefit-Cost Ratio ^[5]	2.27	2.56

NOTES

Per PUC direction, TRC inputs and calculations are required in the Annual Report only and should comply with the 2013 Total Resource Cost Test Order. Please see the "Report Definitions" section of this report for more details.

[1] Includes rebate processing, tracking system, general administration, EDC and CSP program management, general management and legal, and technical assistance.

[2] Includes the marketing CSP and marketing costs by program CSPs.

[3] Total TRC Costs includes Total EDC Costs and Participant Costs.

[4] Total TRC Benefits equals the sum of Total Lifetime Energy Benefits and Total Lifetime Capacity Benefits. Based upon verified gross kWh and kW savings. Benefits include: avoided supply costs, including the reduction in costs of electric energy, generation, transmission, and distribution capacity, and natural gas valued at marginal cost for periods when there is a load reduction. NOTE: Savings carried over from Phase I are not to be included as a part of Total TRC Benefits for Phase II.

[5] TRC Ratio equals Total NPV TRC Benefits divided by Total NPV TRC Costs.

4 RESIDENTIAL HOME PERFORMANCE PROGRAM

Through the Residential Home Performance Program, customers incentivized to improve the energy efficiency performance of their homes. The home performance program components includes a whole house direct install component, direct delivery of energy conservation kits (including a new school education component), efficient residential new home, and home energy usage reports. Through the whole house direct install program component, customers receive diagnostic assessments, followed by the direct installation of low-cost measures or incentivized installation of building shell measures. . Customers that received energy efficiency kits either completed an online audit, phone audit, or submitted an online or telephonic request. The new home component provides incentives to builders that choose to build new homes to higher efficiencies through the installation of efficient building shell measures, HVAC systems, appliances, lighting, or other features. The home energy reports provide customers with comparative electric energy usage data and offer tips and advice on behavioral and low-cost energy saving measures.

4.1 PROGRAM UPDATES

In PY6 Residential New Homes program added a new rebate tier which allowed incentives for non-ENERGY STAR homes in the program if they were built at 30% or more above code.

4.1.1 Definition of Participant

The participant counts for this program are determined based on the unique customer receiving a kit or the unique rebate number in the T&R database for the other program components.

4.2 IMPACT EVALUATION GROSS SAVINGS

4.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

The gross Evaluation Methodology for each program component is discussed below.

Gross Impact Evaluation for Home Energy Audit Conservation Kits

Two separate types of energy conservation kits were sent to customers depending on their hot water fuel source. The kit provided to customers with electric water heating consists of CFLs, LED night lights, aerators and aerator adapters, a furnace whistle, and an energy saving showerhead. The kit provided to customers with non-electric water heating consists of CFLs, LED night lights, a furnace whistle.

In evaluating the gross impact analysis for the energy conservation kits in PY6, four items must be determined:

1. The average energy savings and demand reduction for the kit elements that are installed;
2. The number and type of kits mailed to customers during PY6,
3. The installation rate for the various kit elements
4. The delivery rate, or percentage of reported kits sent to customers that were not received by customers, either because of shipping problems, customer moving, or other such scenarios.

The first item has been determined through application of the partially deemed savings protocols in the 2014 TRM. The second item, the total number and type of kits mailed to customers in PY6, is determined by reviewing the program T&R system

The third item, installation rates, are determined through online customer, except for CFLs which are given "deemed" installation rates of 0.97 (later multiplied by the kit receipt rate as determined through surveys), consistent with the TRM.

For a particular site in a sample, the installation rate for each kit element takes on a binary value of 1, if the element is installed in accordance to the principles that define that element as an energy efficiency measure, and 0 otherwise¹⁵. In particular, faucet aerators and energy saving showerheads are only counted as “installed” if they are installed in a home that has electric water heating.

The final item, the delivery rate is determined through the online and phone survey instrument. Online and phone survey respondents are asked to indicate whether they received the conservation kit that was mailed to them. The reported in-service rates reflect the kit non-receipt rate as they are calculated as the ratio of the number of items installed to the number of items claimed to be delivered.

The survey instrument that was used to verify that the shipped energy conservation kits were installed asks a series of questions that determine how many of each item was installed and where each item was installed. The accuracy of the survey instrument was verified in prior program years through supplementary on-site data collection activities of a nested sample of the survey respondents. The results of this analysis indicate that the variance in savings attributable to this program is primarily a result of installation rates. This variance is best captured in the survey instrument, as it allows for a large sample size not easily obtained through on-site data collection. As with the Low-Income kits and the Schools kits, the average kit receipt rates and measure-level in service rates are closely correlated across all four FirstEnergy PA EDCs. EDC-specific variations are explicable primarily due to statistical variation in survey responses, which may account for a $\pm 10\%$ uncertainty in final verified impacts at the EDC-level. Due to this, average statewide in service rates are used for all four FirstEnergy EDCs. This reduces the likelihood that one particular EDC will receive an unusually high or low realization rate due solely to statistical fluctuations, and is generally consistent with the PA TRM’s treatment of in-service rates, which are uniform across the state. The statistical precision for this program component is based on the EDC-specific number of customers that completed survey responses.

Gross Impact Evaluation for Schools Kits

The Schools kit program component is similar in construct to the Home Energy Audit conservation kit component, but the program is targeted to families with children who attend schools in the Company’s service territory. The school kits contents include CFLs and LED night lights. The information available for review includes invoices, shipment lists, and results from a survey that was included in the kit. The invoices and shipment lists were reviewed to verify the accuracy of the T&R system, and were all found to be consistent. The surveys included in the kits were found to be appropriate for M&V purposes, with one minor modification discussed below. The survey results were analyzed for program measure installation practices and were found to be consistent with ADM’s survey results for the Home Energy Audit conservation kits. However, ADM made one modification to the survey results. The “kit receipt rate” could not be used, as only those who received the kit would receive the survey invite. Due to the similarity of the programs and the consistency of the results of both surveys, the energy conservation kit receipt rate of 97.1% was applied to the school kits program.

Gross Impact Evaluation for New Homes

This program contributes a relatively small portion of the program level savings for PY6. For the PY6 evaluation, ADM focused on conducting engineering reviews of a sample of projects. The engineering review involved inspection of the REM/Rate models associated with the rebated buildings. For each sampled home, ADM analysts ran the REM/Rate input files and made the following considerations:

¹⁵ LED night lights are the only exception to this rule. If a nightlight is reported to be installed, the night light ISR may take on a value of 1 if the night light replaces a preexisting incandescent model, a 0 if the night light is a new installation, and a 0.5 if the customer reports to have installed the nightlight, but does not specify whether it supplanted an incandescent night light.

1. Are the baseline specifications in accordance to those in the 2014 PA TRM?
2. Are the claimed impacts attributable to improved construction practices and premium efficiency HVAC systems and appliances, or do they result from modifications that are not supportable by the PA TRM¹⁶
3. Is the REM/Rate modeling performed correctly and does it provide accurate results¹⁷?
4. Are the participating HERS raters accurately describing the homes in the REM/Rate models and HERS ratings?

The first three topics can be resolved through a REM/Rate model review. To determine the correspondence of the model inputs to actual building characteristics, ADM reviews detailed notes, photographs, and measurements from the ICSP's on-site Quality Assurance/ Quality Control (QA/QC) inspections.

For each sampled project, ADM recalculates energy and demand impacts if the above steps result in adjustments to model parameters.

Gross Impact Evaluation for Whole House Direct Install Measures

This program component is divided into three sub-components for evaluation purposes. Most participants in the direct install component receive an initial home audit which includes installation of low-cost measures by the auditor. The auditor may also recommend capital cost energy savings improvements, and a relatively small number of customers follow through with comprehensive measures that include attic insulation, air sealing, and replacement of HVAC and water heating equipment. Most of the impacts associated with whole house component are attributable to measures such as CFLs, low-flow showerheads and faucet aerators, and hot water pipe insulation. For these "light measures", ADM reviewed a sample of applications and invoices were reviewed for accuracy and also reviewed the T&R system to verify that the proper TRM algorithms are applied. Customers that received comprehensive measures were placed into two savings strata: Those with reported savings above 2.0 MWh and those with reported savings below 2 MWh. ADM performed an exploratory billing analysis for the former set. The main intention of the billing analysis is to provide a feasibility check against a small number of customers that are reported to save well over 5 MWh. Although the small sample size results in significant uncertainties in the billing analysis results, the main conclusion for the high-savings homes is that the apparent bill reductions are large and significant, but are also somewhat lower than reported savings amount. The second stratum of comprehensive measure customers - those with savings below 2 MWh, account for about one *per mil* of reported program savings. The reported impacts for these customers are passed through to verified impacts.

Gross Impact Evaluation for Home Energy Reports

This program component results in significant energy savings, but has a one-year measure life. The savings reported in PY6 do not contribute to the achievement against the May 31, 2016 compliance target. ADM's subcontractor, NMR Group, Inc. (NMR) conducted an independent billing analysis in PY6. The billing analysis focused solely on customers that were added in late PY5¹⁸, and therefore are not

¹⁶ For example, it would not be appropriate to claim energy savings based on differences in the 'reference' and 'as built' models' thermostat settings, or by virtue of using different heating or cooling degree days in the two models.

¹⁷ There can be relatively minor variations in savings because the HERS raters may have different versions of REM/Rate. ADM used version 14.4.1 to conduct the simulation for most model reviews.

¹⁸ These customers are referred to here as "Wave 2" customers, while "Wave 1" customers were enrolled at the start of Phase II.

directly comparable to the ICSP's (OPower) M&V results, which include all Phase II customers. NMR's independent billing analysis verified that the ICSP's M&V results are reasonable and that the customers added in late PY5 are likely to achieve the targeted energy savings during PY7. ADM also conducted a billing analysis of the entire set of Phase II participants. The analysis was conducted independently, although the underlying dataset was the same dataset used by OPower to report results, and thus had been prepared by OPower¹⁹. The combination of the ADM and NMR billing analyses was generally consistent with the results reported by OPower, with EDC-specific results agreeing within at most 7%, and 1% agreement if data from all four PA EDCs are pooled together.

The impacts as reported by the ICSP are accepted for the PY6 annual report, with the understanding that the impacts are reset to zero each year for Phase II compliance purposes. The independent billing analysis for PY7 will include all active Phase II customers and will result in a formal realization rate for this program component.

4.2.2 Program Sampling

The five program components are treated as separate sub-programs, each with distinct populations, samples, and realization rates.

Home Energy Audit Conservation Kits

The sampling approach for the Home Energy Audits energy conservation kits program component is random sampling. Randomly selected customers are invited to complete online surveys, with gift cards offered to the first 200 to complete surveys.

Stratification by kit type was done to ensure that appropriate realization rates are determined for the two individual kit types. The sample size for verification surveys was sufficiently large to determine gross impact with $\pm 10\%$ relative precision at the 90% confidence level. This large sample size is motivated by the fact that installation rates for some items in the kit are relatively low that only a large sample can accurately capture a true estimate of the installation rate. This is the main advantage of a survey instrument as compared to on-site data collection for this program.

Schools Conservation Kits

There is no direct sampling effort for the Schools energy conservation kits program: All recipients are invited to complete the survey. As discussed above the Schools Conservation Kit survey results are in excellent agreement with the Home Energy Audit kit survey results, despite the different survey design and recruitment practices.

New Home

The sampling approach for this program is simple random sampling. The sample size is sufficient to determine this program's gross impact with $\pm 35\%$ relative precision at the 85% confidence level. ADM sampled homes that been selected for quality control inspections by the program implementer. It is important to note that the implementer does not overwrite the energy savings for homes that undergo the QC process. This facilitates ADM's evaluation effort because the both the ex-ante savings estimates before and after the QA/QC process are both available. The program's realization rates generally use the ex-ante values that were available prior to QA/QC in the denominator.

Whole House Direct Install

There were very few whole house projects completed in PY6. As described in the methodology section, the projects under this program component are placed into three categories. Projects that solely

¹⁹ Data preparation involves 'truing-up' estimated reads as actual meter reads become available, removing severe data outliers (e.g. 100MWh usage per month), and creating data fields that summarize each home's energy usage during the heating and cooling seasons in the benchmark in period.

involve low-cost measures are tracked by measure in the T&R system, and ADM performs calculation review on the census of projects. Comprehensive upgrade projects are placed into two strata, with the high-savings stratum evaluated by billing analysis, and the low-savings stratum evaluated solely through a T&R system review²⁰.

Home Energy Reports

Sampling is not required for this program's evaluation. Essentially all participant and control group households are considered by the billing analysis.

Table 4-1: Phase II Home Performance Program Reported Results by Customer Sector

Sector	Participants	Reported Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Reported Gross Demand Reduction (MW)	Incentives (\$1,000)
Residential	366,652	73,814	7.03	5,151
Low-Income	0	0.0	0.00	0
Small Commercial and Industrial	0	0.0	0.00	0
Large Commercial and Industrial	0	0.0	0.00	0
Government, Non-Profit, and Institutional	0	0.0	0.00	0
Phase II Total	366,652	73,814.0	7.03	2,668

Table 4-2: Home Performance Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6

Stratum	Population Size	Target Levels of Confidence & Precision	Target Sample Size	Achieved Sample Size	Evaluation Activity
HEA Kits	50,614	10.0%	200	149	CR,S
School Kits	1,311	10.0%	50	347	CR,S
New Home	2	50.0%	0	0	CR,DR/OS
Direct Install, Prescriptive Measures	39	10.0%	39	39	CR
Weatherization, > 2MWh	4	100.0%	4	4	B
Weatherization, < 2MWh	0	100.0%	0	0	PT
Home Energy Reports*	254,042	100.0%	254,042	254,042	EBA*
Program Total	306,012	3.7%	254,335	254,581	

CR=TRM Calculation Review, S=Survey, DR/OS=Desk Review of REM/Rate Models, On-Site QA/QC findings, PT=Pass Through to Verified, EBA=Exploratory Billing Analysis – reported results not adjusted.

*Home Energy Reports have 1-year measure life, the impacts are reported here, but are not included in the table sums because they do not contribute to the compliance metric associated with the May 31 2016 gross verified energy savings target.

²⁰ This evaluation stratum accounts for less than 0.02% of program impacts.

Table 4-3: Program Year 6 Home Performance Program Summary of Evaluation Results for Energy

Stratum	Reported Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Energy Realization Rate (%)	Verified Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Observed Coefficient of Variation (C _v) or Proportion in Sample Design	Relative Precision at 85% C.L.
HEA Kits	17,009	95.3%	16,210	0.5	5.9%
School Kits	435	109.7%	477	0.5	3.3%
New Home	4	100.0%	4	0.5	n/a
Direct Install, Prescriptive Measures	44	98.2%	43	0.5	0.0%
Weatherization, > 2MWh	20	76.5%	15	n/a	100.0%
Weatherization, < 2MWh	0	100.0%	0	0.5	100.0%
Home Energy Reports	29,077	100.0%	29,077	n/a	15.0%
Program Total	46,590	98.4%	45,828		9.7%

Table 4-4: Program Year 6 Home Performance Program Summary of Evaluation Results for Demand

Stratum	Reported Gross Demand Savings (MW)	Demand Realization Rate (%)	Verified Gross Demand Savings (MW)	Observed Coefficient of Variation (C _v) or Proportion in Sample Design	Relative Precision at 85% C.L.
HEA Kits	1.52	98%	1.50	0.5	5.9%
School Kits	0.04	77.4%	0.03	0.5	3.3%
New Home	0.00	100%	0.00	0.5	n/a
Direct Install, Prescriptive Measures	0.00	84%	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Weatherization, > 2MWh	0.03	77%	0.02	n/a	100.0%
Weatherization, < 2MWh	0.00	100%	0.00	0.5	100.0%
Home Energy Reports	4.04	100%	4.04	n/a	15.0%
Program Total	5.63	99%	5.59		10.9%

4.2.1 One Site Inspections

The ICSP for the Residential Energy Audits and New Home program components, Performance Systems Development (PSD) conducts on-site QA/QC inspections for both program components. The QA/QC processes for each component is described below.

Whole House Comprehensive Audits

The intent of QA/QC inspections is to ensure work performed under FirstEnergy's Residential Energy Audit Program conforms to program requirements and BPI technical standards related to health and safety requirements, improvement installation, and energy efficiency analysis. PSD reviews all electronic files submitted to the program by participating contractors. PSD also conducts a variety of onsite assessments for each contractor throughout the program year:

- SA = Shadow Audit with contractor during audit for 1 of first 5 audits for program
- QC = Quality Control inspection performed post-audit prior to installation for 5% of audits
- QA = Quality Assurance inspection performed post-installation of major measure improvements for 10% of jobs

Substantial issues found during an electronic file review or an onsite assessment will lead to increased inspection levels for the associated contractor. PSD assigns a QA score that ranges from 0 to 4, with “0” requiring immediate corrective action and “4” given to jobs that meet or exceed all required standards.

PSD’s QA/QC site visit reports contain Pass or Fail scores in the following broad categories:

- Verification of Direct-Install Measures
- Review of auditor recommendations
- Building model accuracy
- Health and safety

ADM reviewed 45 QA/QC visit inspection forms from PSD, distributed among the four FirstEnergy PA Companies and found that 41 of them resulted in general verification of measure installation²¹. The average AQ/QC score for these 45 sites was 3.4 on a scale of 0 to 4.

Residential New Homes

The intent of QA/QC inspections is to ensure work performed under FirstEnergy’s Energy Efficient New Homes Program conforms to program requirements and RESNET standards for energy efficiency analysis. PSD reviews all electronic rating files (including REM-Rate simulation models) submitted by participating raters and conducts on-site QA inspections of at least 10 percent of each rater’s submissions. PSD conduct two types of onsite inspections.

- Visual Inspections – Inspection focuses on RESNET minimum rated features including, but not limited to, building dimensions; insulation type and thickness (where accessible); fixture lighting types; appliance efficiencies; and mechanical equipment efficiencies for 8% of all annual submissions. The high frequency of inspections leads to program visibility and opportunities for program participant interaction with PSD technical staff.
- Diagnostic Inspections—Inspections are comprehensive and include visual inspection components as well as building performance measurements using a blower door, duct pressurization, and ventilation airflow devices for 2% of all annual submissions. The lower frequency of inspections allows for a deeper evaluation of performance testing criteria.

Substantial issues found during electronic file review or on-site inspection will lead to increased levels of QA for the associated contractor. PSD assigns a QA score that ranges from 0 to 4, with “0” requiring immediate corrective action and “4” being given to jobs that meet or exceed all required standards.

PSD’s QA/QC site visit reports contain Pass or Fail scores in the following broad categories:

- Non-compliance with program standards
- Building model accuracy

ADM reviewed a total of 19 QA/QC site inspection reports from PSD, distributed among the four FirstEnergy PA Companies. The average AQ/QC score for these 19 sites was 3.2 on a scale of 0 to 4.

²¹ It is important to note that a “Pass” score is awarded only if the entirety of the project is verified. ADM found examples of inspections where measures such as insulation and duct sealing were verified, but CFLs were not found to be installed. ADM would categorize this job as “mostly installed” while PSD gave the contractor a failing score. The QA/QC process for the Residential Energy Audits does not affect or inform the gross realization rate for the program, as ADM’s verified impacts are based on calculation reviews and billing analyses.

Importantly, PSD retains both initial and post-QC reported impacts for each home. This enables ADM to include the results of PSD's on-site QA/QC findings in the gross impact evaluation effort. Only one of 19 reviewed homes required a formal update to ex-ante savings prior to project approval.

4.3 IMPACT EVALUATION NET SAVINGS

The NTG research for the In-Home Energy Audit, On-line Audit, Opt-in Kits, and School Kits components of the Home Performance Program were conducted in conjunction with the process evaluation effort for the PY6 sample frame.

The NTG research used the *Common Framework for Downstream NTG Evaluation* self-report method and assessed free ridership and spillover. We targeted 35 participating household completed web surveys for the On-line Audit, Opt-in Kits, and School Kits program components and 12 completed surveys for the In-Home Energy Audit component. This was more than sufficient to meet a minimum confidence and precision requirement of 85% $\pm$ 15% at the program level.

The Home Energy Reports program component impact evaluation produces net verified savings; therefore, net-to-gross research is not required. The Home Performance New Homes component evaluation is currently underway and results are not available for the PY6 annual report. Therefore, the program level free ridership, spillover, and NTG values in represent only those strata for which NTG research has been completed thus far in Phase II. Also in Table 4-6, the HEA Kits combine the Opt-in Kits and Online Audit Kits components for reporting and cost effectiveness assessment.

The In-home Audits component, although a small contributor to overall program savings, warrants additional discussion around the spillover value. The 60% estimate is the result of additional insulation installed outside of the program but that is attributable to the program based on survey respondents (n=8). A review of the data set confirmed that these cases did not receive a rebate for insulation from Penelec. Also, these 'insulation installation' cases were not unique to a single auditor. This speaks to the success of the In-home Audit program component in driving more savings through additional actions recommended by home energy auditors participating in the program

Table 4-5: Home Performance Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6 NTG Research

Stratum	Population Size ²²	Assumed CV or Proportion in Sample Design	Assumed Levels of Confidence & Precision	Target Sample size	Achieved Sample Size	Percent of Sample Frame Contacted ²³ to Achieve Sample
Residential In-Home Audit	40	P=0.5	85/15	12	22	100%
Online Audit	2,053	P=0.5	85/15	35	41	6%
Opt-In Kit	30,730	P=0.5	85/15	35	33	<1%
School Kit	940	P=0.5	85/15	35	31	12%
Program Total	33,763	P=0.5	85/15	117	127	2%

²² The values in this column represent the population as of the time that the process and NTG samples were drawn, and are generally smaller than the end-of-year values shown in the gross impact evaluation tables above.

²³ Sample frame is a list of contacts that have a chance to be selected into the sample. Percent contacted means of all the sample frame how many were called to get the completes.

**Table 4-6: Program Year 6 Energy Efficient Products Program
Summary of Evaluation Results for NTG Research**

Target Group or Stratum (if appropriate)	Estimated Free Ridership	Estimated Participant Spillover	NTG Ratio	Observed Coefficient of Variation or Proportion	Relative Precision
HEA Kits	39.9%	4.9%	65.0%	0.50	8.4%
School Kits	37.0%	3.0%	66.0%	0.35	9.1%
New Construction	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
In-Home Audits	40.0%	60.0%	120.0%	0.27	8.3%
Home Energy Reports	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	n/a	0.0%
Program Total ²⁴	15.0%	1.9%	86.9%		8.1%

4.4 PROCESS EVALUATION

For the In-Home Energy Audit, On-line Audit, Opt-in Kits, and School Kits components of the Home Performance Program, the evaluation team conducted the following activities:

FirstEnergy and Program Implementer Staff In-depth Interviews

Tetra Tech and ADM conducted in-depth interviews with program staff at FirstEnergy to discuss Phase II design and implementation updates, program goals, and key researchable issues of interest for the Phase II evaluation. The interviews assessed the effectiveness of the program's current operations, detailed program implementation practices, and identified key researchable topics.

Participating Customer (Household) Surveys

Tetra Tech conducted a quantitative participant survey effort by web for this evaluation for the Year 6 (PY6) sample frame. The surveys collected feedback on the following key researchable areas:

- Program infrastructure and participating household satisfaction
- Program communication and processes
- Free-ridership and spillover
- Familiarity with LED bulbs
- Demographics.

The Home Performance New Homes component evaluation is currently underway and results are not available for the PY6 annual report. The Home Energy Reports component underwent a robust process evaluation in Phase I and is not scheduled for a process evaluation in Phase II. A robust process evaluation is planned for Phase III.

²⁴ NTG ratio at program level should be developed using stratum weight and stratum NTG ratios.

Table 4-7: Home Performance Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6

Target Group or Stratum (if appropriate)	Population Size	Assumed Proportion or CV in Sample Design	Assumed Levels of Confidence & Precision	Target Sample Size	Achieved Sample Size	Percent of Population Frame Contacted to Achieve Sample	Used For Evaluation Activities (Impact, Process, NTG)
Residential In-Home Audit	40	P=0.5	85/15	12	22	100%	Process, NTG
Online Audit	2,053	P=0.5	85/15	35	41	6%	Process, NTG
Opt-In Kit	30,730	P=0.5	85/15	35	33	<1%	Process, NTG
School Kit	940	P=0.5	85/15	35	31	12%	Process, NTG
Program Total	33,763	P=0.5	85/15	117	127	2%	Process, NTG

Participating Home Energy Auditor In-depth Interviews

Tetra tech completed 9 in-depth interviews with participating energy auditors. The focus of the Auditor interviews was to assess how the program is working for auditors from their perspectives. The following key researchable areas were assessed:

- Program infrastructure
- Participating auditor experiences
- Program measures and goals.

Program Material Review

Program documentation reviews included program plans, the program website, and enrollment e-mail communications.

Key Findings*Program participants*

- Program participants are highly satisfied with the program overall.
- Participants indicate they want to be notified about future program options via e-mail.
- Most participants are familiar with LEDs and are currently using them in their homes.

Participating program auditors (Residential In-Home Audit subprogram only)

- Auditors welcome the opportunity for business through the program and are enthusiastic program promoters.
- Auditors report receiving inquiries about the program because of marketing efforts by FirstEnergy. Auditors mention noticing customer interest in the audit program that they attribute to FirstEnergy marketing efforts; specifically, bill inserts and Home Energy Reports generated by the Behavior subprogram. Two auditors mentioned the Behavior subprogram as being effective, and one reported that 60 percent of their referrals are attributed to this program. Auditors shared that “solving a problem” for the customer is more effective than focusing on deficiencies of the house itself or pointing out how much money they will save.

- Satisfaction with field-use of the Surveyor tool is mixed. Some auditors reported both confusion as to how the savings values are generated and frustration with the perceived limitations of the reports generated from Surveyor, such as the inability to upload pictures of problem areas in the house, needing to select inputs from dropdowns instead of entering more specific values, and the need to be connected to the internet while in the field. Auditors indicate they often augment its reports and/or calculate energy savings on their own.
- Auditors feel that the follow-through with audit recommendations can be low because of the rebate structure for recommended upgrades. Auditors reported that although much of the cost of the audit is rebated for the customer, the incentives for implementing recommended upgrades are often not sufficient to prompt implementation of recommended improvements. Additionally, auditors explained that it is especially difficult to identify the requisite 350 kWh in savings if a home has non-electric heating and/or water heating.
- Auditors are pleased with the support provided by the ICSP. Auditors expressed satisfaction with their interaction with ICSP staff, commenting that they are “doing a great job” and that they are responsive to their needs and inquiries.

4.5 STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM

Table 4-8: Home Performance Program Status Report on Process and Impact Recommendations

Recommendations	EDC Status of Recommendation (Implemented, Being Considered, Rejected AND Explanation of Action Taken by EDC)
For the New Homes component, flag homes with greater than 20,000 kWh for a REMRate baseline heating loads vs. heating energy usage review.	In Progress.
For the conservation kits, consider including fewer 9W globes. Customers are slower to install those than any other lamps included in the kits.	Being Considered
Collect customer e-mail addresses during customer contact opportunities such as program feedback, rebate forms, and calls to the Customer Contact Center (CCC), etc., to use in future marketing campaigns. Be sure the language included permits future solicitation. Provide a “subscribe to EE program updates” on the FirstEnergy and ICSP websites.	Being Considered
Consider revising the rebate structure for the audit-recommended improvements to adjust the focus of the program more towards encouraging implementation of efficiency upgrades.	Being Considered
Consider other energy savings modeling tools that may have advantages over Surveyor. Holding an informational seminar on how the savings values are determined may also be beneficial for auditors.	Being Considered
Continue to market the program through bill inserts and steer customers to the program via the Behavior subprogram Home Energy Reports. Communicating how the program can solve energy-related problems for the customer may drive more participation, according to auditors.	Being Considered

4.6 FINANCIAL REPORTING

A breakdown of the program finances (by program) is presented in Table 4-9.

Table 4-9: Summary of Program Finances

Row #	Cost Category	Actual PYTD Costs	Actual Phase II Costs
		(\$1,000)	(\$1,000)
1	Incremental Measure Costs (Sum of rows 2 to 4)	\$2,390	\$5,075
2	EDC Incentives to Participants	\$2,483	\$5,151
3	EDC Incentives to Trade Allies	\$0	\$0
4	Participant Costs (net of incentives/rebates paid by utilities)	-\$93	-\$76
5	Program Overhead Costs (Sum of rows 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)	\$3,261	\$7,890
6	Design & Development	\$17	\$54
7	Administration, Management, and Technical Assistance ^[1]	\$2,818	\$6,782
8	Marketing ^[2]	\$293	\$677
9	EDC Evaluation Costs	\$55	\$93
10	SWE Audit Costs	\$77	\$284
11	Increases in costs of natural gas (or other fuels) for fuel switching programs	\$0	\$0
12	Total TRC Costs ^[3] (Sum of rows 1, 5 and 11)	\$5,650	\$12,966
13	Total NPV Lifetime Energy Benefits	\$8,044	\$19,663
14	Total NPV Lifetime Capacity Benefits	\$758	\$1,800
15	Total NPV TRC Benefits ^[4]	\$8,802	\$21,464
16	TRC Benefit-Cost Ratio ^[5]	1.56	1.66

NOTES

Per PUC direction, TRC inputs and calculations are required in the Annual Report only and should comply with the 2013 Total Resource Cost Test Order. Please see the "Report Definitions" section of this report for more details.

[1] Includes rebate processing, tracking system, general administration, EDC and CSP program management, general management and legal, and technical assistance.

[2] Includes the marketing CSP and marketing costs by program CSPs.

[3] Total TRC Costs includes Total EDC Costs and Participant Costs.

[4] Total TRC Benefits equals the sum of Total Lifetime Energy Benefits and Total Lifetime Capacity Benefits. Based upon verified gross kWh and kW savings. Benefits include: avoided supply costs, including the reduction in costs of electric energy, generation, transmission, and distribution capacity, and natural gas valued at marginal cost for periods when there is a load reduction. NOTE: Savings carried over from Phase I are not to be included as a part of Total TRC Benefits for Phase II.

[5] TRC Ratio equals Total NPV TRC Benefits divided by Total NPV TRC Costs.

5 RESIDENTIAL LOW INCOME PROGRAM

The Low Income Program provides basic to comprehensive whole building measures at no cost to low-income households. This program also educates customers about their home's energy use and ways to save energy. The program is broadly organized into three different delivery types: direct install, giveaway and direct delivery kit programs.

The Direct Install component is comprised of the WARM Plus, WARM Extra Measures and WARM Multifamily programs. These programs included an onsite home energy audit for income qualified customers and the direct install of energy efficient measures at no cost to participants by the Company's implementation contractor. The WARM Multifamily program was introduced this year to provide energy efficient measures to customers who live in multifamily housing units. Appliance replacements were also expanded in Phase II. Measures installed under these programs include²⁵:

- CFLs
- Smart Power Strips
- Furnace whistles
- Faucet aerators
- Energy-saving showerheads
- LED nightlights
- Heat pump water heaters
- ENERGY STAR refrigerators
- Energy-efficient freezers
- Energy-efficient resistance water heaters
- Programmable thermostats
- Pipe insulation for hot water pipes

The efficiency of refrigerators and freezers were also tested during the in-home audit process. If these appliances were found to be inefficient, customers had the option to have their old units removed and replaced with energy-saving appliances through the program.

The Giveaway component, which is a subset of the Low Income Low Use Program, was targeted to low income customers at community events. CFLs, and limited numbers of faucet aerators, furnace whistles and energy-saving showerheads, were either distributed directly by the Company or sent to non-profit organizations contracted by the Company that then distributed the items to Company customers.

Low Income, Low Use Program (LILU) kits were directly mailed to income-qualified customers. There were two types of kits: the first type was for homes with electric water heaters, the second type for homes with non-electric water heaters. These kits were identical to the ones sent out by the Home Energy Audit (HEA) program. Items in these kits (depending on the recipients' water heater type) may have included:

- CFLs
- LED nightlights
- Faucet aerators
- Energy-saving showerhead
- Adapters for faucet aerators.

²⁵ Many other energy saving measures are provided to customers through the program; however, the expected savings from these other measures are nominal. No ex-ante savings were claimed for measures outside of this list.

5.1 PROGRAM UPDATES

The WARM Program's electronic application process went live March 2015. Customers now have the opportunity and ability to sign up for the WARM program and submit an application on-line simply by accessing the energysavePA.com website.

5.1.1 Definition of Participant

For the WARM Plus, Multifamily, and WARM Extra Measure programs, a participant is defined as a unique rebate ID in the tracking and reporting database. This has essentially a direct correspondence with unique homes that received direct install measures, but there is a small amount of overlap (two separate rebates for some customers) as "WARM Extra Measures" can overlap with WARM Plus. For the Giveaway component the participant is defined as a family unit who received the energy efficiency measures, such as faucet aerator or a CFL. In the LILU kit program, a participant is defined as a home to which a kit was delivered.

5.2 IMPACT EVALUATION GROSS SAVINGS

This section provides details of evaluation findings, including reported savings, sample design, and verified savings for the components of the Residential Low Income Program.

5.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

Gross Impact Evaluation for Direct Install Components

During Phase I, verified savings from the WARM Program were determined using a billing analysis of prior-year participants' billing data. This is not possible for Phase II because the Phase II program has been redesigned, and is not represented by the Phase I program or the general WARM LIURP program.

ADM's verification activities for these direct install programs included a review of tracking data and a review of on-site verification forms completed by third party quality assurance contractors. These verification forms noted any discrepancy between what was listed as installed by the implementation contractor and what was still installed in the home. ADM used these forms to verify installation rates for energy efficiency measures and to calculate verified impacts. The on-site QA/QC inspection process is described in greater detail at the end of this section. In general, the inspectors found high in-service rates for the direct install program. The primary source of discrepancy between reported and verified savings is due to a possible synchronization issue regarding the definition of one unit, or the per-unit energy savings for hot water pipe wrap. The PY6 TRM transitioned from a 10-foot measure unit to a 1-foot measure unit for this measure. As such, participating contractors report the number of units by the foot, rather than in 10-foot increments. For the first month of PY6 (June 2014), the associated savings in the tracking reporting system corresponded to 10-foot increments. ADM has confirmed that the tracking and reporting system uses the correct value. The realization rate for the direct install component reflects ADM's correction. A small number of homes received envelope improvement measures with impacts that are not readily calculable through TRM algorithms. The Company did not report any impacts for these measures.

Gross Impact Evaluation for Giveaway Events

The Company provided to ADM their list of invoices and measures given out through the Low Income Giveaway program component. ADM checked the invoice list against the quantities of give-away items listed in the Company's official tracking database. ADM did not find any discrepancies between the invoice list and the tracking database. However, the in-service rates for certain measures are not directly knowable, and the historically verified in-service rates for measures such as energy saving

showerheads and aerators are below the TRM defaults. ADM applied to night lights, aerators, and showerheads, the in-service rates derived from the LILU direct delivery program. ADM also calculated energy savings values for all distributed CFLs. The Company reported energy savings according to the correct EDC-specific “waste heat factors” from the TRM. The in-service rate used in the calculation of reported savings was 96%, while the 2014 PA TRM uses a 97% in-service rate. This adjustment resulted in an approximate 101% realization rate for the giveaway events.

Gross Impact Evaluation for LILU Energy Conservation kits

Two separate energy conservation kits were sent to customers depending on their hot water fuel source. The kit provided to customers with electric water heating consists of CFLs, LED night lights, aerators and aerator adapters, a furnace whistle, and an energy-saving showerhead. The kit provided to customers with non-electric water heating consists of CFLs, LED night lights, and a furnace whistle.

In evaluating the gross impact analysis for the energy conservation kits in PY6, four items must be determined:

1. The average energy savings and demand reduction for the kit elements that are installed;
2. The number and type of kits mailed to customers during PY6,
3. The installation rate for the various kit elements
4. The delivery rate, or percentage of reported kits sent to customers that were not received by customers, either because of shipping problems, customer moving, or other such scenarios.

The first item has been determined through application of the partially deemed savings protocols in the 2014 TRM. The second item, the total number and type of kits mailed to customers in PY6, is determined by reviewing the program T&R system. Specifically, the T&R system is checked to ensure that duplicate shipments to the same physical address are not double counted and that all kits being claimed for PY6 are eligible based on shipment dates.

The third item, installation rates, are determined through customer surveys, except for CFLs which are given “deemed” installation rates of 0.97 (later multiplied by the kit receipt rate as determined through surveys), consistent with the TRM.

For a particular site in a sample, the installation rate for each kit element takes on a binary value of 1, if the element is installed in accordance to the principles that define that element as an energy efficiency measure, and 0 otherwise²⁶. In particular, faucet aerators and low flow showerheads are only counted as “installed” if they are installed in a home that has electric water heating.

The final item, the delivery rate is determined through the customer surveys. Survey respondents are asked to indicate whether they received the conservation kit that was mailed to them. The reported in-service rates reflect the kit non-receipt rate as they are calculated as the ratio of the number of items installed to the number of items claimed to be delivered.

The survey instrument that was used to verify that the shipped energy conservation kits were installed asks a series of questions that determine how many of each item was installed and where each item was installed.

As with the Home Energy Audit kits and the Schools kits, the average kit receipt rates and measure-level in service rates are closely correlated across all four FirstEnergy PA EDCs. EDC-specific variations are explicable primarily due to statistical fluctuations, which may account for a $\pm 10\%$ uncertainty in final verified impacts at the EDC-level. Due to this, the average statewide in service rate is used for all four

²⁶ LED night lights are the only exception to this rule. If a nightlight is reported to be installed, the night light ISR may take on a value of 1 if the night light replaces a preexisting incandescent model, a 0 if the night light is a new installation, and a 0.5 if the customer reports to have installed the nightlight, but does not specify whether it supplanted an incandescent night light.

FirstEnergy EDCs. The combination of survey results reduces the likelihood that one particular EDC will receive an unusually high or low realization rate due to such statistical fluctuations, and is generally consistent with the PA TRM's treatment of in-service rates, which are uniform across the state. The statistical precision for this program component is based on the number of Penelec customers that completed survey responses.

5.2.2 Program Sampling

The three program components are treated as separate sub-programs, each with distinct populations, samples, and realization rates.

LILU Conservation Kits

The sampling approach for LILUs energy conservation kits program component is random sampling, but with specific targets for data acquisition modes and kit types. While the Home Energy Audit kit surveys were administered online, ADM used both telephone and online surveys for this program evaluation. The primary reason for using telephone surveys is that only about 30% of LILU customers provided emails addresses to the Company. As such, a 2:1 telephone to online survey ratio was targeted.

Stratification by kit type was done to ensure that appropriate realization rates are determined for the two individual kit types. The sample size for verification surveys was sufficiently large to determine gross impact with $\pm 10\%$ relative precision at the 90% confidence level. This large sample size is motivated by the fact that installation rates for some items in the kit are relatively low that only a large sample can accurately capture a true estimate of the installation rate. This is the main advantage of a survey instrument as compared to on-site data collection for this program.

Giveaway Events

Sampling was not conducted for the giveaway event evaluation. ADM reviewed invoices and calculations for all reported measures.

Direct Install Programs

The Company's QA/QC contractor performs random on-site verification inspections. ADM received from the Company a list of on-site inspections, and then requested the data collection forms and on-site notes for projects that are in the PY6 program population.

Table 5-1: Phase II Residential Low Income Program Reported Results by Customer Sector

Sector	Participants	Reported Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Reported Gross Demand Reduction (MW)	Incentives (\$1,000)
Residential	0	0	0.00	0
Low-Income	20,229	8,572	0.58	0
Small Commercial and Industrial	0	0.0	0.00	0
Large Commercial and Industrial	0	0.0	0.00	0
Government, Non-Profit, and Institutional	0	0.0	0.00	0
Phase II Total	20,229	8,572	0.58	0

Table 5-2: Residential Low Income Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6

Stratum	Population Size	Target Levels of Confidence & Precision	Target Sample Size	Achieved Sample Size	Evaluation Activity
Direct Install	2,769	11.6%	38	36	DR, OS
CFL Give-away	2,406	0.0%	2,406	2,406	DR
LILU Standard Kits	2,266	7.0%	100	79	DR,S
LILU All Electric Kits	425	10.3%	44	44	DR,S
Program Total	7,866	0.0%	2,588	2,565	

DR=Desk Review, S=Survey, OS=On-Site Verification

Table 5-3: Program Year 6 Residential Low Income Program Summary of Evaluation Results for Energy

Stratum	Reported Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Energy Realization Rate (%)	Verified Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Observed Coefficient of Variation (C _v) or Proportion in Sample Design	Relative Precision at 85% C.L.
Direct Install	1,613	90.9%	1,466	0.5	11.9%
CFL Give-away	404	101.0%	408	0.5	0.0%
LILU Standard Kits	737	99.3%	732	0.5	8.0%
LILU All Electric Kits	151	99.1%	150	0.5	10.3%
Program Total	2,905	94.9%	2,755		6.7%

Table 5-4: Program Year 6 Residential Low Income Program Summary of Evaluation Results for Demand

Stratum	Reported Gross Demand Savings (MW)	Demand Realization Rate (%)	Verified Gross Demand Savings (MW)	Observed Coefficient of Variation (C _v) or Proportion in Sample Design	Relative Precision at 85% C.L.
Direct Install	0.14	98.5%	0.14	0.5	11.9%
CFL Give-away	0.04	101.1%	0.04	0.5	0.0%
LILU Standard Kits	0.07	100.6%	0.07	0.5	8.0%
LILU All Electric Kits	0.01	94.9%	0.01	0.5	10.3%
Program Total	0.26	99.2%	0.26		6.8%

5.2.3 On-Site Inspections

The Company has contracted with Action Housing, Inc. to conduct quality assurance / quality control (QA/QC) inspections for direct install measures. The QA/QC contractor conducted 423 inspections for the Act 129 Multifamily, WARM Plus, and Warm Extra Measures program components. ADM sampled 35 of these inspections for impact evaluation purposes. The table below summarizes the on-site inspection findings.

Table 5-5: Summary of on-site inspection findings for Low Income Direct Install Programs

Measure	Quantity in Database	Verified Quantity by Inspection	In-Service Rates (ISRs)	Resolution of Discrepancies
Faucet Aerators	21	20	95%	n/a
CFLs	253	229	91%	n/a
LED Night Lights	58	53	91%	n/a
Water Heater Pipe Insulation	283	277	98%	n/a
Refrigerator/Freezer Replacement	8	8	100%	n/a
Showerheads	13	12	92%	n/a
Smarts Strips	30	30	100%	n/a
Other Measures (Water Heaters, Furnace Whistles)	6	3	50%	Only faucet aerators were not verified. These may have been removed by customer, or even missed by inspector. ADM will review subsequent inspections to assess the significance of this finding.
Total	672	632	94%	

5.3 IMPACT EVALUATION NET SAVINGS

NTG research is not required and was not conducted for the Low Income program.

5.4 PROCESS EVALUATION

The following activities were completed for the evaluation of the WARM Extra Measures, WARM Plus, and Multifamily low income subprograms:

FirstEnergy Program Staff In-depth Interviews

Tetra Tech and ADM conducted in-depth interviews with program staff at FirstEnergy to discuss Phase II design and implementation updates, program goals, and key researchable issues of interest for the Phase II evaluation. The interviews assessed the effectiveness of the program's current operations, detailed program implementation practices, and identified key researchable topics.

Customer (Household) Phone Surveys for WARM Extra Measures, WARM Plus, and Multifamily Subprograms

Tetra Tech conducted phone surveys with participating households to assess awareness of program, program components effectiveness in meeting customer needs, and satisfaction. The sample frame included PY5 through PY6 Quarter 1.

LILU Kits Subprogram Participating Customer (Household) Phone Surveys

For the LILU Kits subprogram, Tetra Tech coordinated with ADM to add a limited set of process-related questions to their web and phone verification survey to assess customer satisfaction, usefulness of the educational material included within the kit, and other items households would like to see in the kit.

Table 5-6: Residential Low Income Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6

Target Group or Stratum (if appropriate)	Stratum Boundaries (if appropriate)	Population Size ²⁷	Assumed Proportion or CV in Sample Design	Assumed Levels of Confidence & Precision	Target Sample Size	Achieved Sample Size	Percent of Population Frame Contacted to Achieve Sample	Used For Evaluation Activities (Impact, Process, NTG)
WARM Extra Measures	Extra Measures	2,273	P=0.5	85/15	35	26	3% (N=77)	Process, NTG
WARM Plus	WARM Plus	913	P=0.5	85/15	35	36	8% (N=77)	Process, NTG
Multifamily	Multifamily	31	P=0.5	85/15	12	10	100% (N=31)	Process, NTG
LILU Kit	Kits	2,740	P=0.5	85/15	144	123	43% (N=1,175)	Process, NTG
Program Total		5,957	P=0.5	85/15	82	195	23% (N1,360)	

In-depth Interviews with Participating Contractors and Auditors

Tetra Tech conducted in-depth interviews with contractors and auditors participated in the WARM Extra Measures, WARM Plus and Multifamily subprograms. The contractors and auditors were selected from the PY6 program participant data files. The focus of the contractor interviews was to assess the operation of the program at the contractor and auditor level.

Secondary Research to Benchmark LILU Kit Subprogram Contents

Tetra Tech conducted a secondary benchmarking review on kit programs to determine how the FirstEnergy's LILU program's measures compare to other similar low income programs administered across the country to inform future program design.

Key Findings

- 1) Satisfaction is high with households and contractors participating in the low income programs. LILU kit participants are highly satisfied with kit contents and the instructions for installation.
- 2) The WARM Plus, Multifamily and WARM Extra Measures programs are leading to additional energy saving activities in the household, in order of most mentioned to least: turning off the lights when leaving the room, washing laundry in cold water, turning down the thermostat in the winter, unplugging electronics and appliances when not in use, sealing up leaky windows or doors, installing more CFLs, changing the furnace filter, and lowering the water heater temperature.

More than 40 percent of households report that direct install measures received through the WARM Extra Measures, WARM Plus, and Multifamily subprograms were not installed or only partially installed by the energy specialist, or auditor

²⁷ The values in this column represent the population as of the time that the process and NTG samples were drawn, and are generally smaller than the end-of-year values shown in the gross impact evaluation tables above.

5.5 STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM

The following recommendations resulted from the process and impact evaluation effort.

Table 5-7: Residential Low Income Program Status Report on Process and Impact Recommendations

Recommendations	EDC Status of Recommendation (Implemented, Being Considered, Rejected AND Explanation of Action Taken by EDC)
Enhance quality assurance reviews and follow-up with those contractors for whom households report measures are more frequently "left behind" for future installation.	Implemented
For the conservation kits, consider including fewer 9W globes. Customers are slower to install those than any other lamps included in the kits.	Being Considered

5.6 FINANCIAL REPORTING

A breakdown of the program finances (by program) is presented in Table 5-8.

Table 5-8: Summary of Program Finances

Row #	Cost Category	Actual PYTD Costs	Actual Phase II Costs
		(\$1,000)	(\$1,000)
1	Incremental Measure Costs (Sum of rows 2 to 4)	\$0	\$0
2	EDC Incentives to Participants	\$0	\$0
3	EDC Incentives to Trade Allies	\$0	\$0
4	Participant Costs (net of incentives/rebates paid by utilities)	\$0	\$0
5	Program Overhead Costs (Sum of rows 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)	\$2,072	\$4,624
6	Design & Development	\$10	\$47
7	Administration, Management, and Technical Assistance ^[1]	\$1,892	\$4,145
8	Marketing ^[2]	\$1	\$17
9	EDC Evaluation Costs	\$129	\$160
10	SWE Audit Costs	\$40	\$254
11	Increases in costs of natural gas (or other fuels) for fuel switching programs	\$0	\$0
12	Total TRC Costs ^[3] (Sum of rows 1, 5 and 11)	\$2,072	\$4,624
13	Total NPV Lifetime Energy Benefits	\$1,022	\$2,918
14	Total NPV Lifetime Capacity Benefits	\$87	\$198
15	Total NPV TRC Benefits ^[4]	\$1,109	\$3,116
16	TRC Benefit-Cost Ratio ^[5]	0.54	0.67
NOTES Per PUC direction, TRC inputs and calculations are required in the Annual Report only and should comply with the 2013 Total Resource Cost Test Order. Please see the "Report Definitions" section of this report for more details.			
[1] Includes rebate processing, tracking system, general administration, EDC and CSP program management, general management and legal, and technical assistance.			
[2] Includes the marketing CSP and marketing costs by program CSPs.			
[3] Total TRC Costs includes Total EDC Costs and Participant Costs.			
[4] Total TRC Benefits equals the sum of Total Lifetime Energy Benefits and Total Lifetime Capacity Benefits. Based upon verified gross kWh and kW savings. Benefits include: avoided supply costs, including the reduction in costs of electric energy, generation, transmission, and distribution capacity, and natural gas valued at marginal cost for periods when there is a load reduction. NOTE: Savings carried over from Phase I are not to be included as a part of Total TRC Benefits for Phase II.			
[5] TRC Ratio equals Total NPV TRC Benefits divided by Total NPV TRC Costs.			

6 C/I SMALL ENERGY EFFICIENT EQUIPMENT PROGRAM

This program provides for the implementation of cost effective, high efficiency measures through lighting, HVAC, Motors and Drives, Specialty Equipment, and Custom incentive programs. The program also offers appliance recycling, and the program component is operated in a similar manner to the residential appliance recycling program.

6.1 PROGRAM UPDATES

There were no updates to this program in PY6.

6.1.1 Definition of Participant

Each separate rebated project is counted as a participant.

6.2 IMPACT EVALUATION GROSS SAVINGS

6.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

The program has two categorical components: Equipment incentives and appliance recycling. The majority of the gross reported energy savings for this program were attributable to lighting measures, followed by custom projects and then prescriptive HVAC and appliance projects. The M&V methodology for this program is described below.

Gross Impact Evaluation for Efficient Equipment Incentives

For each sampled project, the gross impact evaluation process starts with a desk review, and often continues to an on-site verification visits, metering or logging, and data analysis. The steps are described below for lighting projects, custom projects, and prescriptive (HVAC and food service) projects.

Lighting Projects

Each sampled lighting project first undergoes a desk review. The desk review includes reconciliation of invoices, fixture specification sheets (cut sheets), and re-calculating reported savings using TRM algorithms and/or ex-ante assumptions, and identifying key parameters to be researched in the M&V plan.

Evaluation of all but the simplest of projects requires an M&V plan. The first step in the M&V planning process is to check that the project is sufficiently documented. For example, contractors working on large projects often have detailed, space-by-space inventories of the baseline and new lighting fixtures. If such detailed information is found to be lacking, ADM analysts will contact the applicant or the contractor directly, or through a request to the ICSP, and ask if such documentation is available. For large lighting projects, the M&V plan may call for sampling within the project. In such cases, the targeted precision level is $\pm 20\%$ at the 90% confidence level (90/20), with the sampling unit as the line item in the lighting calculator.

The desk review and M&V plan inform the data acquisition activities needed to evaluate the project. For most lighting projects, the default activities are on-site verification and logging hours of use. Most

lighting projects are metered unless there is a good reason *not* to meter^{28,29}. In rare cases, the desk review process may indicate that an on-site visit would not add sufficient value to the evaluation effort. In such cases, a verification interview may suffice to reduce uncertainty regarding the project. Data analysis is finalized upon the retrieval of loggers. Billing analysis is a viable option for certain projects, and in some cases the verified results are determined wholly or partially by billing analysis.

As a final step in lighting project analysis, ADM analysts determine the incremental material and labor costs, and “dual-baseline” energy savings in cases that involve T12 lamps. In estimating the material and labor costs, preference is given first to invoices, then to the SWE incremental cost database, and then to the cost values from the CA DEER database, then to other sources as needed and described in Appendix A.

Custom Commercial and Industrial Projects

As with lighting projects, each sampled custom project undergoes a desk review prior to M&V plan construction. The desk review includes a full documentation review and if needed, additional topical research. Evaluation of most projects requires an M&V plan³⁰. The first step in the M&V planning process is to check that the project is sufficiently documented, and that the evaluation engineer can articulate the mechanism or process that will yield the expected energy savings. ADM engineers are encouraged to contact the applicant early on in the M&V planning process to ask for additional documentation, clarification, or even to seek feedback on the feasibility of the proposed data acquisition and analysis methodology. The desk review and M&V plan will depend on the opportunities and constraints posed by each project. However, some defaults or “modes” are discussed for certain categories of projects below:

Air Compressor Projects: In many cases, vendors perform a baseline metering study prior to air compressor upgrades. The data collected from such studies are very useful, provided that they appear to be consistent with the overall project documentation. In many cases it is possible to use metered flow data or power data along with compressor curves to establish the facility’s compressed air load profile. The energy usage of the proposed air compressor may then be derived from application of compressor curves to the compressed air load profile. Additional activities such as post-installation metering or a billing analysis may be recommended, depending on project specifics. In some cases baseline meter data are not available. In these cases ADM will meter the new air compressor and use compressor curves to establish the underlying compressed air load profile, and then determine the baseline usage through application of the baseline compressor curves and (if needed) compressor staging practices.

²⁸ The most frequent reasons are that the affected lights are installed outdoors and controlled by photocells or time clocks. Increasingly, high quality trending data are available from energy management systems, and the data may be used in-lieu of logging. Other rate cases may be customer-driven, such as the requirement for explosion proof loggers in a chemical plant.

²⁹ Primary and secondary schools are the general exception. TRM hours of use are applied to whole-school lighting upgrades, but logging is still recommended for projects that are confined to just one location such as a gym or library.

³⁰ Some projects already have transparent M&V documentation including baseline and post-implementation meter data and production records. In such cases the M&V focus shifts to analysis, rather than new research and data collection.

Water Pumping Projects: Pumping projects are typically evaluated through billing analysis, using water throughput as the normalizing variable.

General Process Improvements: For general process improvements, the evaluation determines the change in the energy usage intensity associated with the creation or maintenance of one production unit³¹.

General Space and Process Cooling Improvements: Data acquisition for such projects involves the determination of independent variables that predict the cooling load (units produced, degree-days, etc.) along with utility bills, EMS trending data, or sub-metering. The data analysis may involve regressions or energy simulation models.

Prescriptive Non-Lighting Projects

These projects are evaluated at the basic level of rigor because they tend to represent an insignificant amount of reported impacts in the program-level sampling scheme. The process verification involves a desk review and an on-site verification or verification by interview and review of invoices and other documentation.

As with lighting projects, incremental costs are evaluated as the gross impact evaluation nears completion. In estimating the material and labor costs, preference is given first to invoices, then to the SWE incremental cost database, and then to the cost values from the CA DEER database, then to other sources as needed and described in Appendix A.

Gross Impact Evaluation for Appliance Recycling

Appliance recycling represents an insignificant amount of the program's reported impacts. The default evaluation is a database review to verify that the per-unit impacts are consistent with verified impacts from the Residential Appliance Turn-In program.

6.2.2 Program Sampling

ADM evaluated the commercial and industrial programs using stratified ratio estimation. Lighting projects with expected savings above 800 MWh, and other projects with expected savings above 400 MWh, were automatically selected for evaluation prior to rebate approval, and were thus placed in a 'certainty' or non-sampling stratum.

At the end of the second and fourth quarter ADM reviewed tracking data to define a discrete list of rebates that became the sample population for that quarter. Once separated into their respective operating companies and programs, this population was then stratified according to qualitative measure categories, and then by quantitative subcategories defined by expected energy savings. ADM used a coefficient of variation (CV) of 0.5 for all projects.

³¹ The production unit depends on the project and is determined through documentation review and interviews with the applicant. Examples include a ton of steel produced by a mill, a desired level of dissolved oxygen in a wastewater treatment plan, a ton of refrigeration, and a day of snowmaking at a ski park.

Table 6-1: Phase II C/I Small Energy Efficient Equipment Program Reported Results by Customer Sector

Sector	Participants	Reported Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Reported Gross Demand Reduction (MW)	Incentives (\$1,000)
Residential	0	0	0.00	0
Low-Income	0	0	0.00	0
Small Commercial and Industrial	688	25,394	3.76	1,745
Large Commercial and Industrial	0	0	0.00	0
Government, Non-Profit, and Institutional	200	8,232	1.46	197
Phase II Total	888	33,626	5.22	1,942

Table 6-2: C/I Small Energy Efficient Equipment Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6

Stratum	Population Size	Target Levels of Confidence & Precision	Target Sample Size	Achieved Sample Size	Evaluation Activity
CFL Kits-1	0	n/a	0	0	n/a
Lighting-Certainty	1	0.0%	1	1	DR,OS,L,B
Lighting-2	14	22.2%	6	6	DR,OS,L,B
Lighting-3	51	23.4%	8	8	DR,OS,L,B
Lighting-4	248	25.0%	8	8	DR,OS,L,B
Custom-Certainty	1	0.0%	1	1	DR,OS,M,B,ES
Custom-2	3	58.8%	1	1	DR,OS,M,B,ES
Custom-3	20	70.2%	1	1	DR,OS,M,B,ES
HVAC and DHW-1	0	n/a	0	0	DR,OS,M,B,ES
HVAC and DHW-2	45	71.2%	1	1	DR,OS,S
Appliance Turn-in-1	109	71.7%	1	1	DR
Kitchen/Appliances-1	5	64.4%	1	1	DR
Program Total	497	11.6%	29	29	

DR=Desk Review, S=Survey, OS=On-Site Verification, L=Logging, M=Metering, B=Billing Analysis, ES=Energy Simulation. At least one, but not all activities are performed for each sampled project.

**Table 6-3: Program Year 6 C/I Small Energy Efficient Equipment Program
Summary of Evaluation Results for Energy**

Stratum	Reported Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Energy Realization Rate (%)	Verified Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Observed Coefficient of Variation (C _v) or Proportion in Sample Design	Relative Precision at 85% C.L.
CFL Kits-1	0	100.0%	0	0.5	100.0%
Lighting-Certainty	1,270	100.0%	1,270	0.5	0.0%
Lighting-2	4,505	78.8%	3,551	0.5	22.2%
Lighting-3	5,004	99.3%	4,967	0.5	23.4%
Lighting-4	4,996	91.8%	4,588	0.5	25.0%
Custom-Certainty	535	98.1%	525	0.5	0.0%
Custom-2	403	100.0%	403	0.5	58.8%
Custom-3	594	117.9%	700	0.5	70.2%
HVAC and DHW-1	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
HVAC and DHW-2	153	100.0%	153	0.5	71.2%
Appliance Turn-in-1	89	100.0%	89	0.5	71.7%
Kitchen/Appliances-1	40	100.0%	40	0.5	64.4%
Program Total	17,588	92.6%	16,284		11.7%

**Table 6-4: Program Year 6 C/I Small Energy Efficient Equipment Program
Summary of Evaluation Results for Demand**

Stratum	Reported Gross Demand Savings (MW)	Demand Realization Rate (%)	Verified Gross Demand Savings (MW)	Observed Coefficient of Variation (C _v) or Proportion in Sample Design	Relative Precision at 85% C.L.
CFL Kits-1	0.00	100.0%	0.00	0.5	100.0%
Lighting-Certainty	0.17	59.2%	0.10	0.5	0.0%
Lighting-2	0.55	97.5%	0.53	0.5	22.2%
Lighting-3	0.78	104.3%	0.82	0.5	23.4%
Lighting-4	0.85	101.0%	0.86	0.5	25.0%
Custom-Certainty	0.06	100.0%	0.06	0.5	0.0%
Custom-2	0.04	99.7%	0.04	0.5	58.8%
Custom-3	0.06	88.8%	0.06	0.5	70.2%
HVAC and DHW-1	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
HVAC and DHW-2	0.08	100.0%	0.08	0.5	71.2%
Appliance Turn-in-1	0.02	100.0%	0.02	0.5	71.7%
Kitchen/Appliances-1	0.00	100.0%	0.00	0.5	64.4%
Program Total	2.61	98.2%	2.56		12.5%

6.2.3 On-Site Inspections

The Company's ICSP, CLEAResult, conducts QA/QC on-site inspections for 5% of pending rebate applications. The QA/QC visits are conducted prior to rebate approval, and can occur prior to or after

measure installation³². Nonresidential energy efficiency projects typically involve complex or numerous energy efficiency measures. It is therefore inadequate to classify inspections in a binary (e.g. Pass/Fail) manner. Site inspections may result in three general outcomes:

Case 1: The reported energy efficiency measures are found to be installed as described in rebate application materials

Case2: The energy efficiency project is completed, but there may be minor discrepancies between the installed measures and the associated documentation. These can include:

- A discrepancy in the quantities for some or all of the energy efficiency measures
- A discrepancy in the description of the energy efficiency measure (e.g. fixture wattage, HVAC system capacity or efficiency, motor horsepower or efficiency)
- A discrepancy in the baseline equipment
- A mischaracterization of equipment operation (e.g. lighting hours of use or control type, VFD control feedback mechanism, space heating and cooling set points)

Case 3: The energy efficiency project is not completed, or there are major discrepancies in the attributes discussed above in Case 2.

The on-site inspections occur prior to rebate approval. Approximately (34%)³³ of QA/QC inspections correspond to Case 1 above. Approximately 66% of on-site inspections result in a “Case 2” finding. In such cases, the application materials are updated to reflect the as-found equipment, and the rebate application is processed accordingly. Note that most “Case 2” findings do not result in material changes to the ex-ante savings³⁴ – the high proportion of site-visits that fall into this case is mostly a function of Case 1 being reserved for perfection.

This may involve an adjustment to the rebate amount and to the reported impacts in CLEAResult’s tracking and reporting system³⁵. In the event of a Case 3 finding, the rebate application is cancelled. Based on CLEAResult’s historical records, this scenario occurs approximately 0% of the time.

These QA/QC activities are exclusive of ADM’s on-site verification activities. ADM’s independent evaluation activities are described in the preceding section, and the program realization rates are informed, in part, by on-site findings. The primary source of variance between reported and verified impacts are not due to failures in verification, but rather to differences between planning assumptions and ex-post measurements in key parameters that describe operational characteristics. These include hours of use for lighting, both hours of use and part-load conditions for HVAC, refrigeration, and motors.

³² In cases where baseline conditions are critical to the overall project energy savings calculation CLEAResult staff may conduct baseline on-site inspections. These inspections may also involve metering to help determine baseline lighting hours of use or other attributes that may correlate with the project’s energy savings.

³³ Percentages here apply to all CLEAResult administered programs for all four FirstEnergy Pennsylvania EDCs.

³⁴ ADM reviewed summary of 110 on-site inspections conducted by CLEAResult in PY6, and developed a ‘QC realization rate’ to help inform the annual report. The QC realization rate was 98%, with a CV of 0.39. The adjustments made by CLEAResult accounted for variations in hours of use as well as variations in equipment specification.

³⁵ Adjustments to the Company’s tracking and reporting are not necessary because QA/QC inspections occur prior to rebate approval.

6.3 IMPACT EVALUATION NET SAVINGS

Tetra Tech conducted the NTG research according to the Common Approach, Statewide Evaluator Guidance Memos GM-024 (Consistent Freeridership methodology) and GM-025 (Consistent Spillover methodology) using the participant self-report method. Participant data for Phase II, PY6 (Q1-Q4) was first aggregated to the level of individual participants based on account number and multiple record accounts were identified. After the multiple accounts were sampled, the final random sample was selected. The NTG research was conducted in conjunction with the process evaluation effort.

**Table 6-5: C/I Small Energy Efficient Equipment Program
Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6 NTG Research**

Stratum	Population Size	Assumed CV or Proportion in Sample Design	Assumed Levels of Confidence & Precision	Target Sample size	Achieved Sample Size	Percent of Sample Frame Contacted ³⁶ to Achieve Sample
Lighting	314	P=0.5	85/15	22	33	n/a
Custom	24	P=0.5	85/15	2	1	n/a
HVAC and DHW	45	P=0.5	85/15	3	8	n/a
Kitchen/Appliances	114	P=0.5	85/15	8	12	n/a
Program Total	497		85/15	35	54	24%(N=121)

**Table 6-6: Program Year 6 C/I Small Energy Efficient Equipment Program
Summary of Evaluation Results for NTG Research**

Target Group or Stratum (if appropriate)	Estimated Free Ridership	Estimated Participant Spillover	NTG Ratio	Observed Coefficient of Variation or Proportion	Relative Precision
Lighting	36.4%	12.2%	75.8%	0.37	8.9%
Custom	50.0%	16.0%	66.0%	0.49	69.2%
HVAC and DHW	59.4%	9.1%	49.8%	0.41	18.9%
Kitchen/Appliances	50.0%	9.2%	59.2%	0.41	16.2%
Program Total ³⁷	37.9%	12.5%	74.6%		10.0%

6.4 PROCESS EVALUATION

Tetra Tech conducted the process evaluation in conjunction with the NTG research. These activities included:

FirstEnergy and Program Implementer Staff In-depth Interviews

Tetra Tech and ADM conducted in-depth interviews with FirstEnergy program staff and the ICSP to discuss Phase II design and implementation updates, program goals, and key researchable issues of

³⁶ Sample frame is a list of contacts that have a chance to be selected into the sample. Percent contacted means of all the sample frame how many were called to get the completes.

³⁷ NTG ratio at program level should be developed using stratum weight and stratum NTG ratios.

interest for the Phase II evaluation. The interviews assessed the effectiveness of the program's current operations, detailed program implementation practices, and identified key researchable topics. In addition, both FirstEnergy and ICSP staff provided input on the types of information that would be most beneficial to design and implementation efforts.

Participant Surveys

The participant surveys gathered data and information related to assess free-ridership and spillover and process related topics. The topic areas included:

- Program awareness and marketing
- The company's decision-making process in regards to new equipment
- Energy efficiency at the company
- Program satisfaction

Participant data for Phase II, PY6 (Q1-Q4) was first aggregated to the level of individual participants based on account number and multiple record accounts were identified. After the multiple accounts were sampled, the final random sample was selected. The process evaluation survey research was conducted in conjunction with the NTG research.

Table 6-7: C/I Small Energy Efficient Equipment Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6

Target Group or Stratum (if appropriate)	Population Size	Assumed Proportion or CV in Sample Design	Assumed Levels of Confidence & Precision	Target Sample Size	Achieved Sample Size	Percent of Population Frame Contacted to Achieve Sample	Used For Evaluation Activities (Impact, Process, NTG)
Lighting	314	P=0.5	85/15	22	33	n/a	Process, NTG
Custom	24	P=0.5	85/15	2	1	n/a	Process, NTG
HVAC and DHW	45	P=0.5	85/15	3	8	n/a	Process, NTG
Kitchen/Appliances	114	P=0.5	85/15	8	12	n/a	Process, NTG
Program Total	497		85/15	35	54	24%(N=121)	

Key Findings³⁸

- 1) Participants report high levels of satisfaction with all aspects of the program. Program participants are highly satisfied with the overall program and more than 90 percent of customers said they would likely participate in the program again in the future. Each individual aspect of the program received an average rating of "highly satisfied," with the exception of the incentive amount, which received a mean satisfaction just shy of "highly satisfied". Most participants said they did not experience any obstacles or barriers while implementing their project (89 percent) – and those that had difficulties, the issues were typically internal to the

³⁸ Key findings are reported in aggregate for the four FirstEnergy PA EDCs. Results were very similar for each EDC and for each program.

customer (e.g. convincing management to fund initial costs). Lastly, two-thirds of customers have recommended the program to colleagues in their industry.

- 2) Almost all aspects of program satisfaction rated higher in Phase II than Phase I. When compared with results from the Phase I C&I evaluation, all aspects of program satisfaction increased in average score between Phase I and Phase II, with the exception of the incentive offered, which decreased marginally.
- 3) The participant information files are improved from Phase I. Interview staff reported high levels of survey completion on their first attempt to contact respondents, which is atypical for C&I studies. The high quality sample information resulted in above-average numbers of participants calling the survey lab to complete the survey, a fact that is directly correlated with the advance letter reaching the correct individual within the firm.
- 4) Although customers' stated preference of receiving information about energy efficiency via email or direct mail, contractors are successfully marketing the programs to customers. Two-thirds (67 percent) of respondents indicated their preferred method of communication is email newsletters, while 30 percent said they preferred direct mail from their EDC. However, more than half (54 percent) of respondents learned about the program through their contractor.
- 5) Budget and financial plans fall into two planning periods. Almost 45 percent of customers indicated their firm creates budgets/financial plans of one year or less, while 35 percent of customers said their business' budgets/financial plans span five years or longer. Responses differed between strata – large C&I customers are more likely to create plans spanning more than 5 years (47 percent), while small C&I and GNI customers typically plan in one-year increments (50 percent and 53 percent, respectively).
- 6) The budget cycle was a primary factor for when projects can be implemented. Of the 45 percent of respondents who indicated that they had business or production cycles that affect planning and implementation of efficiency projects, more than half of respondents (53 percent) have budget and financial planning cycles that affect when projects can be planned and implemented. Customers' budget and financial planning periods overwhelmingly fall into two categories, under one year or five years and longer. Customers often cited financial plans and budgets as a driving force behind whether energy improvements could be pursued, highlighting the crucial role of working alongside customers during their planning and budgeting periods.

6.5 STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM

The following recommendations resulted from the process and impact evaluation effort.

**Table 6-8: C/I Small Energy Efficient Equipment Program
Status Report on Process and Impact Recommendations**

Recommendations	EDC Status of Recommendation (Implemented, Being Considered, Rejected AND Explanation of Action Taken by EDC)
Ensure continued engagement with past participants as they are likely to participate in the future.	Implemented
If participation is lacking in the future, consider a referral/recruitment award program from past participants.	Being Considered

6.6 FINANCIAL REPORTING

A breakdown of the program finances (by program) is presented in Table 6-9.

Table 6-9: Summary of Program Finances

Row #	Cost Category	Actual PYTD Costs	Actual Phase II Costs
		(\$1,000)	(\$1,000)
1	Incremental Measure Costs (Sum of rows 2 to 4)	\$4,653	\$9,393
2	EDC Incentives to Participants	\$1,041	\$1,942
3	EDC Incentives to Trade Allies	\$0	\$0
4	Participant Costs (net of incentives/rebates paid by utilities)	\$3,612	\$7,451
5	Program Overhead Costs (Sum of rows 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)	\$1,042	\$2,030
6	Design & Development	\$6	\$22
7	Administration, Management, and Technical Assistance ^[1]	\$761	\$1,523
8	Marketing ^[2]	\$131	\$210
9	EDC Evaluation Costs	\$119	\$155
10	SWE Audit Costs	\$26	\$119
11	Increases in costs of natural gas (or other fuels) for fuel switching programs	\$0	\$0
12	Total TRC Costs ^[3] (Sum of rows 1, 5 and 11)	\$5,695	\$11,422
13	Total NPV Lifetime Energy Benefits	\$7,857	\$15,471
14	Total NPV Lifetime Capacity Benefits	\$999	\$2,120
15	Total NPV TRC Benefits ^[4]	\$8,856	\$17,591
16	TRC Benefit-Cost Ratio ^[5]	1.56	1.54

NOTES

Per PUC direction, TRC inputs and calculations are required in the Annual Report only and should comply with the 2013 Total Resource Cost Test Order. Please see the "Report Definitions" section of this report for more details.

[1] Includes rebate processing, tracking system, general administration, EDC and CSP program management, general management and legal, and technical assistance.

[2] Includes the marketing CSP and marketing costs by program CSPs.

[3] Total TRC Costs includes Total EDC Costs and Participant Costs.

[4] Total TRC Benefits equals the sum of Total Lifetime Energy Benefits and Total Lifetime Capacity Benefits. Based upon verified gross kWh and kW savings. Benefits include: avoided supply costs, including the reduction in costs of electric energy, generation, transmission, and distribution capacity, and natural gas valued at marginal cost for periods when there is a load reduction. NOTE: Savings carried over from Phase I are not to be included as a part of Total TRC Benefits for Phase II.

[5] TRC Ratio equals Total NPV TRC Benefits divided by Total NPV TRC Costs.

7 C/I SMALL ENERGY EFFICIENT BUILDINGS PROGRAM

This program has two broad components. The first component is energy conservation kits delivered by mail to nonresidential customers. The second component includes custom “whole building” projects such as new construction, retro-commissioning, and building envelope improvements.

7.1 PROGRAM UPDATES

The program had no major updates in PY6.

7.1.1 Definition of Participant

Each separate rebated project is counted as a participant.

7.2 IMPACT EVALUATION GROSS SAVINGS

7.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

The projects rebated under this program include energy conservation kits as well as custom projects that involve new construction, retro-commissioning, building envelope improvements. The M&V methodology for this program is described below.

Gross Impact Evaluation for Conservation Kits

The program distributed conservation kits consisting of 13W and 23W or 26W CFLs to commercial and industrial customers, and kits consisting of 13W and 20W CFLs, and a pair of LED night lights, to apartment complexes.

ADM’s evaluation strategy is to first place the CFLs into one of the following categories

- 1) Whereabouts unknown: The customer did not receive the CFL conservation kit
- 2) The CFL was found to be broken upon arrival
- 3) The CFL has arrived, and is installed in a non-residential setting
- 4) The CFL has been taken to business owner’s residence for residential use, or has been distributed to an employee, parishioner, etc. for residential use.
- 5) The CFL is in storage, and will likely replace other CFLs that arrived in the kit
- 6) The CFL is in storage, and will likely replace other, non-kit lamps as they burn out.

CFLs that are determined to be in categories 1, 2, and 5 above are credited zero kWh and kW impacts. CFLs that are in category 4 are evaluated according to the 2013 TRM protocols for CFLs in the residential sector. CFLs in category 3 are evaluated with nonresidential TRM protocols, and with hours of use and coincidence factors as determined from the 2014 Metering Study conducted by the SWE³⁹. CFLs in category 6 are evaluated as CFLs in category 3. The fractions of distributed CFLs in each of the above six categories are determined primarily through surveys. ADM conducted 96 surveys among all four FirstEnergy PA EDCs and used the results to formulate in-service rates by facility type. The stratification followed facility types because the number of eligible sockets for screw-based lamps varies considerably with facility types, and the in-service rates tend to vary according to the number of available sockets.

³⁹ Pennsylvania Statewide ACT 129 2014 Commercial & Residential Light Metering Study, Table 4-13 for Interior Screw-Base CFLs and LEDs.

The nonresidential TRM protocols also include HVAC interactive effects. ADM applied the 12% and 34% values for energy and demand respectively, but also included HVAC applicability factors at the sector level to account for CFLs that are not installed in air conditioned space.

As a last step, ADM identified the fraction of CFLs that were originally sent to a business, but were later distributed for residential use by the business owner. This “cross sector” migration percentage accounts for the participants and impacts reported in the residential sector below. For this program component, cross-sector migration tends to reduce energy savings and demand reductions because the residential sector has lower lighting hours of use and coincidence factors. Portfolio level cross-sector sales determination and the associated adjustments to verified impacts and incentives are discussed in detail in Appendix D.

Gross Impact Evaluation for Efficient Equipment Incentives

Sampling and project-level gross impact evaluation methodologies for efficient equipment and building upgrade measures are identical to the methodology described in Section 6 for the C/I Small Efficient Equipment Program. The projects in this program tend to involve new construction, retro-commissioning, and other controls or envelope upgrades that tend to affect the systemic energy usage performance of the involved facilities. Data acquisition for such projects involves the determination of independent variables that predict the heating and cooling loads along with utility bills, EMS trending data, or sub-metering. The data analysis may involve regressions or energy simulation models.

Table 7-1: Phase II C/I Small Energy Efficient Buildings Program Reported Results by Customer Sector

Sector	Participants	Reported Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Reported Gross Demand Reduction (MW)	Incentives (\$1,000)
Residential	933	810	0.15	64
Low-Income	0	0	0.00	0
Small Commercial and Industrial	4,137	3,691	0.71	143
Large Commercial and Industrial	0	0	0.00	0
Government, Non-Profit, and Institutional	786	1,304	0.13	6
Phase II Total	5,856	5,804	0.99	213

Table 7-2: C/I Small Energy Efficient Buildings Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6

Stratum	Population Size	Target Levels of Confidence & Precision	Target Sample Size	Achieved Sample Size	Evaluation Activity
CFL Kits-1	3,651	11.3%	40	22	S
Lighting-Certainty	0	n/a	0	0	DR,OS,L,B
Lighting-2	0	n/a	0	0	DR,OS,L,B
Lighting-3	0	n/a	0	0	DR,OS,L,B
Lighting-4	0	n/a	0	0	DR,OS,L,B
Custom-Certainty	0	n/a	0	0	DR,OS,M,B,ES
Custom-2	3	29.4%	2	2	DR,OS,M,B,ES
Custom-3	6	65.7%	1	1	DR,OS,M,B,ES
HVAC and DHW-1	0	n/a	0	0	DR,OS,M,B,ES
HVAC and DHW-2	0	n/a	0	0	DR,OS,S
Appliance Turn-in-1	0	n/a	0	0	DR
Kitchen/Appliances-1	0	n/a	0	0	DR
Program Total	3,660	10.7%	43	25	

DR=Desk Review, S=Survey, OS=On-Site Verification, L=Logging, M=Metering, B=Billing Analysis, ES=Energy Simulation. At least one, but not all activities are performed for each sampled project.

Table 7-3: Program Year 6 C/I Small Energy Efficient Buildings Program Summary of Evaluation Results for Energy

Stratum	Reported Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Energy Realization Rate (%)	Verified Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Observed Coefficient of Variation (C _v) or Proportion in Sample Design	Relative Precision at 85% C.L.
CFL Kits-1	2,936	93.1%	2,734	0.5	15.3%
Lighting-Certainty	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
Lighting-2	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
Lighting-3	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
Lighting-4	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
Custom-Certainty	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
Custom-2	592	189.0%	1,120	0.5	29.4%
Custom-3	207	100.0%	207	0.5	65.7%
HVAC and DHW-1	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
HVAC and DHW-2	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
Appliance Turn-in-1	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
Kitchen/Appliances-1	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
Program Total	3,736	108.7%	4,062		13.5%

**Table 7-4: Program Year 6 C/I Small Energy Efficient Buildings Program
Summary of Evaluation Results for Demand**

Stratum	Reported Gross Demand Savings (MW)	Demand Realization Rate (%)	Verified Gross Demand Savings (MW)	Observed Coefficient of Variation (C _v) or Proportion in Sample Design	Relative Precision at 85% C.L.
CFL Kits-1	0.54	90.4%	0.49	0.5	15.3%
Lighting-Certainty	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Lighting-2	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Lighting-3	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Lighting-4	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Custom-Certainty	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Custom-2	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Custom-3	0.00	100.0%	0.00	0.5	65.7%
HVAC and DHW-1	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
HVAC and DHW-2	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Appliance Turn-in-1	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Kitchen/Appliances-1	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Program Total	0.54	90.4%	0.49		15.2%

7.2.1 On-Site Inspections

This program has two components: Conservation Kits and downstream rebates for commercial and industrial energy efficiency projects. There are no on-site visits conducted for the conservation kits. All other projects are eligible for on-site QA/QC inspections. These QA/QC inspections are identical in process as the effort described for the C/I Small Energy Efficient Equipment Program.

As with other nonresidential programs, CLEAResult's QA/QC activities are exclusive of ADM's on-site verification activities. ADM's independent evaluation activities are described in the preceding section. The program realization rates are informed, in part, by on-site findings. The primary source of variance between reported and verified impacts are not due to failures in verification, but rather to differences between planning assumptions and ex-post measurements in key parameters that describe operational characteristics. This program may involve projects that involve relatively complex calculations, including building energy simulations and engineering calculations. In many cases, discrepancies between reported and verified impacts result from differences in calculation methodologies and data sources. The impact evaluation effort has the benefit of having access to post-installation utility meter data, trending data, or logger data, and often the newly available information helps to improve project savings estimates.

7.3 IMPACT EVALUATION NET SAVINGS

A NTG evaluation was not conducted for this program in PY6.

7.4 PROCESS EVALUATION

A process evaluation was not conducted for this program in PY6.

7.5 STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM

Table 7-5: Program Year 6 C/I Small Energy Efficient Buildings Status Report on Process and Impact Recommendations

Recommendations	EDC Status of Recommendation (Implemented, Being Considered, Rejected AND Explanation of Action Taken by EDC)
In Phase III, consider subsuming this program into the C/I Small Energy Efficient Equipment Program to reduce administrative costs and to ensure adequate budget is available in case participation levels increase significantly.	Under consideration

7.6 FINANCIAL REPORTING

A breakdown of the program finances (by program) is presented in Table 7-6.

Table 7-6: Summary of Program Finances

Row #	Cost Category	Actual PYTD Costs	Actual Phase II Costs
		(\$1,000)	(\$1,000)
1	Incremental Measure Costs (Sum of rows 2 to 4)	\$443	\$519
2	EDC Incentives to Participants	\$213	\$339
3	EDC Incentives to Trade Allies	\$0	\$0
4	Participant Costs (net of incentives/rebates paid by utilities)	\$230	\$179
5	Program Overhead Costs (Sum of rows 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)	\$457	\$922
6	Design & Development	\$3	\$10
7	Administration, Management, and Technical Assistance ^[1]	\$338	\$691
8	Marketing ^[2]	\$87	\$148
9	EDC Evaluation Costs	\$18	\$22
10	SWE Audit Costs	\$11	\$51
11	Increases in costs of natural gas (or other fuels) for fuel switching programs	\$0	\$0
12	Total TRC Costs ^[3] (Sum of rows 1, 5 and 11)	\$899	\$1,440
13	Total NPV Lifetime Energy Benefits	\$1,386	\$1,772
14	Total NPV Lifetime Capacity Benefits	\$102	\$175
15	Total NPV TRC Benefits ^[4]	\$1,488	\$1,947
16	TRC Benefit-Cost Ratio ^[5]	1.65	1.35

NOTES

Per PUC direction, TRC inputs and calculations are required in the Annual Report only and should comply with the 2013 Total Resource Cost Test Order. Please see the "Report Definitions" section of this report for more details.

[1] Includes rebate processing, tracking system, general administration, EDC and CSP program management, general management and legal, and technical assistance.

[2] Includes the marketing CSP and marketing costs by program CSPs.

[3] Total TRC Costs includes Total EDC Costs and Participant Costs.

[4] Total TRC Benefits equals the sum of Total Lifetime Energy Benefits and Total Lifetime Capacity Benefits. Based upon verified gross kWh and kW savings. Benefits include: avoided supply costs, including the reduction in costs of electric energy, generation, transmission, and distribution capacity, and natural gas valued at marginal cost for periods when there is a load reduction. NOTE: Savings carried over from Phase I are not to be included as a part of Total TRC Benefits for Phase II.

[5] TRC Ratio equals Total NPV TRC Benefits divided by Total NPV TRC Costs.

8 C/I LARGE ENERGY EFFICIENT EQUIPMENT PROGRAM

This program provides for the implementation of cost effective, high efficiency measures through lighting, HVAC, Motors and Drives, Specialty Equipment, and Custom incentive programs. In addition to rebates, the program distributed conservation kits consisting of CFLs and smart power strips to several master metered multi-family communities. The program also offers appliance recycling, and the program component is operated in a similar manner to the residential appliance recycling program.

8.1 PROGRAM UPDATES

There were no updates to this program in PY6.

8.1.1 Definition of Participant

Each separate rebated project is counted as a participant.

8.2 IMPACT EVALUATION GROSS SAVINGS

8.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

The projects rebated under this program include equipment upgrades and custom projects that often involve hardware and process improvements at industrial facilities. The M&V methodology for this program is described below.

Gross Impact Evaluation for Efficient Equipment Incentives

For each sampled project, the gross impact evaluation process starts with a desk review, and often continues to an on-site verification visits, metering or logging, and data analysis. The steps are described below for lighting projects, custom projects, and prescriptive (HVAC and food service) projects.

Lighting Projects

Each sampled lighting project first undergoes a desk review. The desk review includes reconciliation of invoices, fixture specification sheets (cut sheets), and re-calculating reported savings using TRM algorithms and/or ex-ante assumptions, and identifying key parameters to be researched in the M&V plan.

Evaluation of all but the simplest of projects requires an M&V plan. The first step in the M&V planning process is to check that the project is sufficiently documented. For example, contractors working on large projects often have detailed, space-by-space inventories of the baseline and new lighting fixtures. If such detailed information is found to be lacking, ADM analysts will contact the applicant or the contractor directly, or through a request to the ICSP, and ask if such documentation is available. For large lighting projects, the M&V plan may call for sampling within the project. In such cases, the targeted precision level is $\pm 20\%$ at the 90% confidence level (90/20), with the sampling unit as the line item in the lighting calculator.

The desk review and M&V plan inform the data acquisition activities needed to evaluate the project. For most lighting projects, the default activities are on-site verification and logging hours of use. Most

lighting projects are metered unless there is a good reason to *not* to meter^{40,41}. In rare cases, the desk review process may indicate that an on-site visit would not add sufficient value to the evaluation effort. In such cases, a verification interview may suffice to reduce uncertainty regarding the project. Data analysis is finalized upon the retrieval of loggers. Billing analysis is a viable option for certain projects, and in some cases the verified results are determined wholly or partially by billing analysis.

As a final step in lighting project analysis, ADM analysts determine the incremental material and labor costs, and “dual-baseline” energy savings in cases that involve T12 lamps. In estimating the material and labor costs, preference is given first to invoices, then to the SWE incremental cost database, and then to the cost values from the CA DEER database, then to other sources as needed and described in Appendix A.

Custom Commercial and Industrial Projects

As with lighting projects, each sampled custom project undergoes a desk review prior to M&V plan construction. The desk review includes a full documentation review and if needed, additional topical research. Evaluation of most projects requires an M&V plan⁴². The first step in the M&V planning process is to check that the project is sufficiently documented, and that the evaluation engineer can articulate the mechanism or process that will yield the expected energy savings. ADM engineers are encouraged to contact the applicant early on in the M&V planning process to ask for additional documentation, clarification, or even to seek feedback on the feasibility of the proposed data acquisition and analysis methodology. The desk review and M&V plan will depend on the opportunities and constraints posed by each project. However, some defaults or “modes” are discussed for certain categories of projects below:

Air Compressor Projects: In many cases, vendors perform a baseline metering study prior to air compressor upgrades. The data collected from such studies are very useful, provided that they appear to be consistent with the overall project documentation. In many cases it is possible to use metered flow data or power data along with compressor curves to establish the facility’s compressed air load profile. The energy usage of the proposed air compressor may then be derived from application of compressor curves to the compressed air load profile. Additional activities such as post-installation metering or a billing analysis may be recommended, depending on project specifics. In some cases baseline meter data are not available. In these cases ADM will meter the new air compressor and use compressor curves to establish the underlying compressed air load profile, and then determine the baseline usage through application of the baseline compressor curves and (if needed) compressor staging practices.

⁴⁰ The most frequent reasons are that the affected lights are installed outdoors and controlled by photocells or time clocks. Increasingly, high quality trending data are available from energy management systems, and the data may be used in-lieu of logging. Other rate cases may be customer-driven, such as the requirement for explosion proof loggers in a chemical plant.

⁴¹ Primary and secondary schools are the general exception. TRM hours of use are applied to whole-school lighting upgrades, but logging is still recommended for projects that are confined to just one location such as a gym or library.

⁴² Some projects already have transparent M&V documentation including baseline and post-implementation meter data and production records. In such cases the M&V focus shifts to analysis, rather than new research and data collection.

Water Pumping Projects: Pumping projects are typically evaluated through billing analysis, using water throughput as the normalizing variable.

General Process Improvements: For general process improvements, the evaluation determines the change in the energy usage intensity associated with the creation or maintenance of one production unit⁴³.

General Space and Process Cooling Improvements: Data acquisition for such projects involves the determination of independent variables that predict the cooling load (units produced, degree-days, etc.) along with utility bills, EMS trending data, or sub-metering. The data analysis may involve regressions or energy simulation models.

Prescriptive Non-Lighting Projects

These projects are evaluated at the basic level or rigor because they tend to represent an insignificant amount of reported impacts in the program-level sampling scheme. The process verification involves a desk review and an on-site verification or verification by interview and review of invoices and other documentation. As with lighting projects, incremental costs are evaluated as the gross impact evaluation nears completion. In estimating the material and labor costs, preference is given first to invoices, then to the SWE incremental cost database, and then to the cost values from the CA DEER database, then to other sources as needed and described in Appendix A.

8.2.1 Program Sampling

ADM evaluated the commercial and industrial programs using stratified ratio estimation. Lighting projects with expected savings above 800 MWh, and other projects with expected savings above 400 MWh, were automatically selected for evaluation prior to rebate approval, and were thus placed in a 'certainty' or non-sampling stratum.

At the end of the second and fourth quarter ADM reviewed tracking data to define a discrete list of rebates that became the sample population for that quarter. Once separated into their respective operating companies and programs, this population was then stratified according to qualitative measure categories, and then by quantitative subcategories defined by expected energy savings. ADM used a coefficient of variation (CV) of 0.5 for all projects.

⁴³ The production unit depends on the project and is determined through documentation review and interviews with the applicant. Examples include a ton of steel produced by a mill, a desired level of dissolved oxygen in a wastewater treatment plan, a ton of refrigeration, and a day of snowmaking at a ski park.

Table 8-1: Phase II C/I Large Efficient Equipment Program Reported Results by Customer Sector

Sector	Participants	Reported Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Reported Gross Demand Reduction (MW)	Incentives (\$1,000)
Residential	0	0	0.00	0
Low-Income	0	0	0.00	0
Small Commercial and Industrial	0	0	0.00	0
Large Commercial and Industrial	174	37,145	4.38	1,405
Government, Non-Profit, and Institutional	65	5,370	0.91	54
Phase II Total	239	42,515	5.28	1,460

Table 8-2: C/I Large Efficient Equipment Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6

Stratum	Population Size	Target Levels of Confidence & Precision	Target Sample Size	Achieved Sample Size	Evaluation Activity
CFL Kits-1	0	n/a	0	0	n/a
Lighting-Certainty	6	0.0%	6	6	DR,OS,L,B
Lighting-2	9	21.5%	5	2	DR,OS,L,B
Lighting-3	13	18.5%	7	7	DR,OS,L,B
Lighting-4	81	31.2%	5	5	DR,OS,L,B
Custom-Certainty	3	0.0%	3	3	DR,OS,M,B,ES
Custom-2	4	62.4%	1	1	DR,OS,M,B,ES
Custom-3	10	68.3%	1	1	DR,OS,M,B,ES
HVAC and DHW-1	12	68.9%	1	1	DR,OS,M,B,ES
HVAC and DHW-2	0	n/a	0	0	DR,OS,S
Appliance Turn-in-1	0	n/a	0	0	DR
Kitchen/Appliances-1	0	n/a	0	0	DR
Program Total	138	6.7%	29	26	

**Table 8-3: Program Year 6 C/I Large Efficient Equipment Program
Summary of Evaluation Results for Energy**

Stratum	Reported Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Energy Realization Rate (%)	Verified Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Observed Coefficient of Variation (C _v) or Proportion in Sample Design	Relative Precision at 85% C.L.
CFL Kits-1	0	100.0%	0	0.5	100.0%
Lighting-Certainty	12,359	101.3%	12,526	0.5	0.0%
Lighting-2	4,573	85.2%	3,894	0.5	44.9%
Lighting-3	3,574	98.2%	3,510	0.5	18.5%
Lighting-4	3,734	98.6%	3,682	0.5	31.2%
Custom-Certainty	1,579	91.0%	1,436	0.5	0.0%
Custom-2	1,006	100.0%	1,006	0.5	62.4%
Custom-3	761	86.0%	655	0.5	68.3%
HVAC and DHW-1	274	123.9%	339	0.5	68.9%
HVAC and DHW-2	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
Appliance Turn-in-1	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
Kitchen/Appliances-1	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
Program Total	27,860	97.1%	27,047		8.6%

**Table 8-4: Program Year 6 C/I Large Efficient Equipment Program
Summary of Evaluation Results for Demand**

Stratum	Reported Gross Demand Savings (MW)	Demand Realization Rate (%)	Verified Gross Demand Savings (MW)	Observed Coefficient of Variation (C _v) or Proportion in Sample Design	Relative Precision at 85% C.L.
CFL Kits-1	0.00	100.0%	0.00	0.5	100.0%
Lighting-Certainty	1.76	98.0%	1.72	0.5	0.0%
Lighting-2	0.50	140.1%	0.70	0.5	44.9%
Lighting-3	0.29	145.2%	0.42	0.5	18.5%
Lighting-4	0.52	153.8%	0.80	0.5	31.2%
Custom-Certainty	0.22	104.4%	0.23	0.5	0.0%
Custom-2	0.05	100.1%	0.05	0.5	62.4%
Custom-3	0.02	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
HVAC and DHW-1	0.18	123.9%	0.22	0.5	68.9%
HVAC and DHW-2	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Appliance Turn-in-1	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Kitchen/Appliances-1	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Program Total	3.53	117.2%	4.14		10.5%

8.2.1 On-Site Inspections

The Company's ICSP, CLEAResult, conducts QA/QC on-site inspections for 5% of pending rebate applications. The QA/QC visits are conducted prior to rebate approval, and can occur prior to or after measure installation⁴⁴. Nonresidential energy efficiency projects typically involve complex or numerous energy efficiency measures. It is therefore inadequate to classify inspections in a binary (e.g. Pass/Fail) manner. Site inspections may result in three general outcomes:

Case 1: The reported energy efficiency measures are found to be installed as described in rebate application materials

Case2: The energy efficiency project is completed, but there may be minor discrepancies between the installed measures and the associated documentation. These can include:

- A discrepancy in the quantities for some or all of the energy efficiency measures
- A discrepancy in the description of the energy efficiency measure (e.g. fixture wattage, HVAC system capacity or efficiency, motor horsepower or efficiency)
- A discrepancy in the baseline equipment
- A mischaracterization of equipment operation (e.g. lighting hours of use or control type, VFD control feedback mechanism, space heating and cooling set points)

Case 3: The energy efficiency project is not completed, or there are major discrepancies in the attributes discussed above in Case 2.

The on-site inspections occur prior to rebate approval. Approximately (34%)⁴⁵ of QA/QC inspections correspond to Case 1 above. Approximately 66% of on-site inspections result in a "Case 2" finding. In such cases, the application materials are updated to reflect the as-found equipment, and the rebate application is processed accordingly. Note that most "Case 2" findings do not result in material changes to the ex-ante savings⁴⁶ – the high proportion of site-visits that fall into this case is mostly a function of Case 1 being reserved for perfection.

This may involve an adjustment to the rebate amount and to the reported impacts in CLEAResult's tracking and reporting system⁴⁷. In the event of a Case 3 finding, the rebate application is cancelled. Based on CLEAResult's historical records, this scenario occurs approximately 0% of the time.

These QA/QC activities are exclusive of ADM's on-site verification activities. ADM's independent evaluation activities are described in the preceding section, and the program realization rates are informed, in part, by on-site findings. The primary source of variance between reported and verified impacts are not due to failures in verification, but rather to differences between planning assumptions

⁴⁴ In cases where baseline conditions are critical to the overall project energy savings calculation CLEAResult staff may conduct baseline on-site inspections. These inspections may also involve metering to help determine baseline lighting hours of use or other attributes that may correlate with the project's energy savings.

⁴⁵ Percentages here apply to all CLEAResult administered programs for all four FirstEnergy Pennsylvania EDCs.

⁴⁶ ADM reviewed summary of 110 on-site inspections conducted by CLEAResult in PY6, and developed a 'QC realization rate' to help inform the annual report. The QC realization rate was 98%, with a CV of 0.39. The adjustments made by CLEAResult accounted for variations in hours of use as well as variations in equipment specification.

⁴⁷ Adjustments to the Company's tracking and reporting are not necessary because QA/QC inspections occur prior to rebate approval.

and ex-post measurements in key parameters that describe operational characteristics. These include hours of use for lighting, both hours of use and part-load conditions for HVAC, refrigeration, and motors.

8.3 IMPACT EVALUATION NET SAVINGS

Tetra Tech conducted the NTG research according to the Common Approach, Statewide Evaluator Guidance Memos GM-024 (Consistent Freeridership methodology) and GM-025 (Consistent Spillover methodology) using the participant self-report method. The complete participant dataset for Phase II, PY6 (Q1-Q4) was used for this evaluation effort.

**Table 8-5: C/I Large Energy Efficient Equipment Program
Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6 NTG Research**

Stratum	Population Size	Assumed CV or Proportion in Sample Design	Assumed Levels of Confidence & Precision	Target Sample size	Achieved Sample Size	Percent of Sample Frame Contacted ⁴⁸ to Achieve Sample
Lighting	109	P=0.5	85/15	21	37	n/a
Custom	17	P=0.5	85/15	3	9	n/a
HVAC and DHW	12	P=0.5	85/15	2	5	n/a
Kitchen/Appliances	0	P=0.5	85/15	0	0	n/a
Program Total	138		85/15	26	51	59%(N=81)

**Table 8-6: Program Year 6 C/I Large Energy Efficient Equipment Program
Summary of Evaluation Results for NTG Research**

Target Group or Stratum (if appropriate)	Estimated Free Ridership	Estimated Participant Spillover	NTG Ratio	Observed Coefficient of Variation or Proportion	Relative Precision
Lighting	27.4%	7.7%	80.3%	0.37	7.2%
Custom	23.6%	6.7%	83.1%	0.49	16.2%
HVAC and DHW	70.0%	5.0%	35.0%	0.41	20.1%
Kitchen/Appliances	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.41	100.0%
Program Total ⁴⁹	27.3%	7.6%	80.2%		6.6%

8.4 PROCESS EVALUATION

Tetra Tech conducted the process evaluation in conjunction with the NTG research. These activities included:

FirstEnergy and Program Implementer Staff In-depth Interviews

Tetra Tech and ADM conducted in-depth interviews with FirstEnergy program staff and the ICSP to discuss Phase II design and implementation updates, program goals, and key researchable issues of interest for the Phase II evaluation. The interviews assessed the effectiveness of the program's current

⁴⁸ Sample frame is a list of contacts that have a chance to be selected into the sample. Percent contacted means of all the sample frame how many were called to get the completes.

⁴⁹ NTG ratio at program level should be developed using stratum weight and stratum NTG ratios.

operations, detailed program implementation practices, and identified key researchable topics. In addition, both FirstEnergy and ICSP staff provided input on the types of information that would be most beneficial to design and implementation efforts.

Participant Surveys

The participant surveys gathered data and information related to assess free-ridership and spillover and process related topics. The topic areas included:

- Program awareness and marketing
- The company's decision-making process in regards to new equipment
- Energy efficiency at the company
- Program satisfaction

The complete participant dataset for Phase II, PY6 (Q1-Q4) was used for this evaluation effort.

Table 8-7: C/I Large Energy Efficient Equipment Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6

Target Group or Stratum (if appropriate)	Population Size	Assumed Proportion or CV in Sample Design	Assumed Levels of Confidence & Precision	Target Sample Size	Achieved Sample Size	Percent of Population Frame Contacted to Achieve Sample	Used For Evaluation Activities (Impact, Process, NTG)
Lighting	109	P=0.5	85/15	21	37	n/a	Process, NTG
Custom	17	P=0.5	85/15	3	9	n/a	Process, NTG
HVAC and DHW	12	P=0.5	85/15	2	5	n/a	Process, NTG
Kitchen/Appliances	0	P=0.5	85/15	0	0	n/a	Process, NTG
Program Total	138		85/15	26	51	59%(N=81)	

Key Findings⁵⁰

- 1) Participants report high levels of satisfaction with all aspects of the program. Program participants are highly satisfied with the overall program and more than 90 percent of customers said they would likely participate in the program again in the future. Each individual aspect of the program received an average rating of "highly satisfied," with the exception of the incentive amount, which received a mean satisfaction just shy of "highly satisfied". Most participants said they did not experience any obstacles or barriers while implementing their project (89 percent) – and those that had difficulties, the issues were typically internal to the customer (e.g. convincing management to fund initial costs). Lastly, two-thirds of customers have recommended the program to colleagues in their industry.
- 2) Almost all aspects of program satisfaction rated higher in Phase II than Phase I. When compared with results from the Phase I C&I evaluation, all aspects of program satisfaction increased in average score between Phase I and Phase II, with the exception of the incentive offered, which decreased marginally.

⁵⁰ Key findings are reported in aggregate for the four FirstEnergy PA EDCs. Results were very similar for each EDC and for each program.

- 3) The participant information files are improved from Phase I. Interview staff reported high levels of survey completion on their first attempt to contact respondents, which is atypical for C&I studies. The high quality sample information resulted in above-average numbers of participants calling the survey lab to complete the survey, a fact that is directly correlated with the advance letter reaching the correct individual within the firm.
- 4) Although customers' stated preference of receiving information about energy efficiency via email or direct mail, contractors are successfully marketing the programs to customers. Two-thirds (67 percent) of respondents indicated their preferred method of communication is email newsletters, while 30 percent said they preferred direct mail from their EDC. However, more than half (54 percent) of respondents learned about the program through their contractor.
- 5) Budget and financial plans fall into two planning periods. Almost 45 percent of customers indicated their firm creates budgets/financial plans of one year or less, while 35 percent of customers said their business' budgets/financial plans span five years or longer. Responses differed between strata – large C&I customers are more likely to create plans spanning more than 5 years (47 percent), while small C&I and GNI customers typically plan in one-year increments (50 percent and 53 percent, respectively).

The budget cycle was a primary factor for when projects can be implemented. Of the 45 percent of respondents who indicated that they had business or production cycles that affect planning and implementation of efficiency projects, more than half of respondents (53 percent) have budget and financial planning cycles that affect when projects can be planned and implemented. Customers' budget and financial planning periods overwhelmingly fall into two categories, under one year or five years and longer. Customers often cited financial plans and budgets as a driving force behind whether energy improvements could be pursued, highlighting the crucial role of working alongside customers during their planning and budgeting periods.

8.5 STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM

The following recommendations resulted from the process and impact evaluation effort.

**Table 8-8: C/I Large Energy Efficient Equipment Program
Status Report on Process and Impact Recommendations**

Recommendations	EDC Status of Recommendation (Implemented, Being Considered, Rejected AND Explanation of Action Taken by EDC)
Continue conducting outreach with trade allies and contractors to promote the program when working with commercial customers, and continue incorporating case studies and testimonials into marketing materials provided to customers and trade allies.	Implemented
Seek opportunities to provide contractors and targeted customers with additional literature and marketing materials they can use to convey benefits of the program to management staff.	Being Considered
Continue working closely with contractors and business owners to establish time periods during which project installations occur.	Implemented

8.6 FINANCIAL REPORTING

A breakdown of the program finances (by program) is presented in Table 8-9.

Table 8-9: Summary of Program Finances

Row #	Cost Category	Actual PYTD Costs	Actual Phase II Costs
		(\$1,000)	(\$1,000)
1	Incremental Measure Costs (Sum of rows 2 to 4)	\$6,067	\$10,560
2	EDC Incentives to Participants	\$1,460	\$2,198
3	EDC Incentives to Trade Allies	\$0	\$0
4	Participant Costs (net of incentives/rebates paid by utilities)	\$4,607	\$8,362
5	Program Overhead Costs (Sum of rows 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)	\$656	\$985
6	Design & Development	\$2	\$7
7	Administration, Management, and Technical Assistance ^[1]	\$372	\$615
8	Marketing ^[2]	\$41	\$69
9	EDC Evaluation Costs	\$233	\$256
10	SWE Audit Costs	\$8	\$38
11	Increases in costs of natural gas (or other fuels) for fuel switching programs	\$0	\$0
12	Total TRC Costs ^[3] (Sum of rows 1, 5 and 11)	\$6,723	\$11,545
13	Total NPV Lifetime Energy Benefits	\$15,684	\$22,233
14	Total NPV Lifetime Capacity Benefits	\$1,988	\$3,062
15	Total NPV TRC Benefits ^[4]	\$17,672	\$25,295
16	TRC Benefit-Cost Ratio ^[5]	2.63	2.19

NOTES

Per PUC direction, TRC inputs and calculations are required in the Annual Report only and should comply with the 2013 Total Resource Cost Test Order. Please see the "Report Definitions" section of this report for more details.

[1] Includes rebate processing, tracking system, general administration, EDC and CSP program management, general management and legal, and technical assistance.

[2] Includes the marketing CSP and marketing costs by program CSPs.

[3] Total TRC Costs includes Total EDC Costs and Participant Costs.

[4] Total TRC Benefits equals the sum of Total Lifetime Energy Benefits and Total Lifetime Capacity Benefits. Based upon verified gross kWh and kW savings. Benefits include: avoided supply costs, including the reduction in costs of electric energy, generation, transmission, and distribution capacity, and natural gas valued at marginal cost for periods when there is a load reduction. NOTE: Savings carried over from Phase I are not to be included as a part of Total TRC Benefits for Phase II.

[5] TRC Ratio equals Total NPV TRC Benefits divided by Total NPV TRC Costs.

9 C/I LARGE ENERGY EFFICIENT BUILDINGS PROGRAM

This program includes energy conservation kits consisting of CFLs, and custom “whole building” projects such as new construction, retro-commissioning, and building envelope improvements.

9.1 PROGRAM UPDATES

In PY6 the program included several custom projects in addition to conservation kits.

9.1.1 Definition of Participant

Each separate rebated project is counted as a participant.

9.2 IMPACT EVALUATION GROSS SAVINGS

9.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

The projects rebated under this program include energy conservation kits as well as custom projects that involve new construction, retro-commissioning, building envelope improvements. The M&V methodology for this program is described below.

Gross Impact Evaluation for Conservation Kits

The program distributed conservation kits consisting of 13W and 23W or 26W CFLs to commercial and industrial customers, and kits consisting of 13W and 20W CFLs, and a pair of LED night lights, to apartment complexes.

ADM’s evaluation strategy is to first place the CFLs into one of the following categories

- 1) Whereabouts unknown: The customer did not receive the CFL conservation kit
- 2) The CFL was found to be broken upon arrival
- 3) The CFL has arrived, and is installed in a non-residential setting
- 4) The CFL has been taken to business owner’s residence for residential use, or has been distributed to an employee, parishioner, etc. for residential use.
- 5) The CFL is in storage, and will likely replace other CFLs that arrived in the kit
- 6) The CFL is in storage, and will likely replace other, non-kit lamps as they burn out.

CFLs that are determined to be in categories 1, 2, and 5 above are credited zero kWh and kW impacts. CFLs that are in category 4 are evaluated according to the 2013 TRM protocols for CFLs in the residential sector. CFLs in category 3 are evaluated with nonresidential TRM protocols, and with hours of use and coincidence factors as determined from the 2014 Metering Study conducted by the SWE⁵¹. CFLs in category 6 are evaluated as CFLs in category 3. The fractions of distributed CFLs in each of the above six categories are determined primarily through surveys. ADM conducted 96 surveys among all four FirstEnergy PA EDCs and used the results to formulate in-service rates by facility type. The stratification followed facility types because the number of eligible sockets for screw-based lamps varies considerably with facility types, and the in-service rates tend to vary according to the number of available sockets. The nonresidential TRM protocols also include HVAC interactive effects. ADM applied the 12% and 34% values for energy and demand respectively, but also included HVAC applicability factors at the sector level to account for CFLs that are not installed in air conditioned space.

⁵¹ Pennsylvania Statewide ACT 129 2014 Commercial & Residential Light Metering Study, Table 4-13 for Interior Screw-Base CFLs and LEDs.

As a last step, ADM identified the fraction of CFLs that were originally sent to a business, but were later distributed for residential use by the business owner. This “cross sector” migration percentage accounts for the participants and impacts reported in the residential sector below. For this program component, cross-sector migration tends to reduce energy savings and demand reductions because the residential sector has lower lighting hours of use and coincidence factors. Portfolio level cross-sector sales determination and the associated adjustments to verified impacts and incentives are discussed in detail in Appendix D.

Gross Impact Evaluation for Efficient Equipment Incentives

Sampling and project-level gross impact evaluation methodologies for efficient equipment and building upgrade measures are identical to the methodology described in Section 6 for the C/I Small Efficient Equipment Program. The projects in this program tend to involve new construction, retro-commissioning, and other controls or envelope upgrades that tend to affect the systemic energy usage performance of the involved facilities. Data acquisition for such projects involves the determination of independent variables that predict the heating and cooling loads along with utility bills, EMS trending data, or sub-metering. The data analysis may involve regressions or energy simulation models.

Table 9-1: Phase II C/I Large Energy Efficient Buildings Program Reported Results by Customer Sector

Sector	Participants	Reported Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Reported Gross Demand Reduction (MW)	Incentives (\$1,000)
Residential	6	862	0.09	1
Low-Income	0	0	0.00	0
Small Commercial and Industrial	0	0	0.00	560
Large Commercial and Industrial	97	6,832	0.72	2
Government, Non-Profit, and Institutional	101	1,680	0.19	1
Phase II Total	204	9,373	1.00	565

Table 9-2: C/I Large Energy Efficient Buildings Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6

Stratum	Population Size	Target Levels of Confidence & Precision	Target Sample Size	Achieved Sample Size	Evaluation Activity
CFL Kits-1	124	23.1%	9	11	S
Lighting-Certainty	0	n/a	0	0	DR,OS,L,B
Lighting-2	0	n/a	0	0	DR,OS,L,B
Lighting-3	0	n/a	0	0	DR,OS,L,B
Lighting-4	0	n/a	0	0	DR,OS,L,B
Custom-Certainty	2	0.0%	2	2	DR,OS,M,B,ES
Custom-2	0	n/a	0	0	DR,OS,M,B,ES
Custom-3	4	62.4%	1	1	DR,OS,M,B,ES
HVAC and DHW-1	0	n/a	0	0	DR,OS,M,B,ES
HVAC and DHW-2	0	n/a	0	0	DR,OS,S
Appliance Turn-in-1	0	n/a	0	0	DR
Kitchen/Appliances-1	0	n/a	0	0	DR
Program Total	130	7.7%	12	14	

Table 9-3: Program Year 6 C/I Large Energy Efficient Buildings Program
Summary of Evaluation Results for Energy

Stratum	Reported Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Energy Realization Rate (%)	Verified Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Observed Coefficient of Variation (C _v) or Proportion in Sample Design	Relative Precision at 85% C.L.
CFL Kits-1	108	115.2%	125	0.5	20.7%
Lighting-Certainty	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
Lighting-2	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
Lighting-3	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
Lighting-4	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
Custom-Certainty	8,045	99.1%	7,969	0.5	0.0%
Custom-2	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
Custom-3	1,146	58.3%	668	0.5	62.4%
HVAC and DHW-1	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
HVAC and DHW-2	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
Appliance Turn-in-1	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
Kitchen/Appliances-1	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
Program Total	9,299	94.2%	8,762		4.8%

**Table 9-4: Program Year 6 C/I Large Energy Efficient Buildings Program
Summary of Evaluation Results for Demand**

Stratum	Reported Gross Demand Savings (MW)	Demand Realization Rate (%)	Verified Gross Demand Savings (MW)	Observed Coefficient of Variation (C _v) or Proportion in Sample Design	Relative Precision at 85% C.L.
CFL Kits-1	0.02	114.1%	0.02	0.5	20.7%
Lighting-Certainty	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Lighting-2	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Lighting-3	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Lighting-4	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Custom-Certainty	0.88	98.6%	0.87	0.5	0.0%
Custom-2	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Custom-3	0.08	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
HVAC and DHW-1	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
HVAC and DHW-2	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Appliance Turn-in-1	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Kitchen/Appliances-1	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Program Total	0.99	90.6%	0.89		0.5%

9.2.1 On-Site Inspections

This program has two components: Conservation Kits and downstream rebates for commercial and industrial energy efficiency projects. There are no on-site visits conducted for the conservation kits. All other projects are eligible for on-site QA/QC inspections. These QA/QC inspections are identical in process as the effort described for the C/I Large Energy Efficient Equipment Program.

As with other nonresidential programs, CLEAResult's QA/QC activities are exclusive of ADM's on-site verification activities. ADM's independent evaluation activities are described in the preceding section. The program realization rates are informed, in part, by on-site findings. The primary source of variance between reported and verified impacts are not due to failures in verification, but rather to differences between planning assumptions and ex-post measurements in key parameters that describe operational characteristics. This program may involve projects that involve relatively complex calculations, including building energy simulations and engineering calculations. In many cases, discrepancies between reported and verified impacts result from differences in calculation methodologies and data sources. The impact evaluation effort has the benefit of having access to post-installation utility meter data, trending data, or logger data, and often the newly available information helps to improve project savings estimates.

9.3 IMPACT EVALUATION NET SAVINGS

A NTG evaluation was not conducted for this program in PY6.

9.4 PROCESS EVALUATION

A process evaluation was not conducted for this program in PY6.

9.5 STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM

The following recommendations resulted from the process and impact evaluation effort.

Table 9-5: C/I Large Energy Efficient Buildings Program Status Report on Process and Impact Recommendations

Recommendations	EDC Status of Recommendation (Implemented, Being Considered, Rejected AND Explanation of Action Taken by EDC)
In Phase III, consider subsuming this program into the C/I Small Energy Efficient Equipment Program to reduce administrative costs and to ensure adequate budget is available in case participation levels increase significantly.	Under consideration

9.6 FINANCIAL REPORTING

A breakdown of the program finances (by program) is presented in Table 9-6. This program achieved a very high cost-benefit ratio in PY6. The high TRC ratio is attributable to one very large new construction project that achieved energy savings primarily through the installation of fewer lighting fixtures than the permitted by code. Therefore, the incremental cost for the project was likely negative, but considered to be zero for cost effectiveness calculations.

Table 9-6: Summary of Program Finances

Row #	Cost Category	Actual PYTD Costs	Actual Phase II Costs
		(\$1,000)	(\$1,000)
1	Incremental Measure Costs (Sum of rows 2 to 4)	\$443	\$445
2	EDC Incentives to Participants	\$565	\$568
3	EDC Incentives to Trade Allies	\$0	\$0
4	Participant Costs (net of incentives/rebates paid by utilities)	-\$122	-\$123
5	Program Overhead Costs (Sum of rows 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)	\$296	\$498
6	Design & Development	\$1	\$5
7	Administration, Management, and Technical Assistance ^[1]	\$234	\$381
8	Marketing ^[2]	\$32	\$50
9	EDC Evaluation Costs	\$22	\$34
10	SWE Audit Costs	\$6	\$29
11	Increases in costs of natural gas (or other fuels) for fuel switching programs	\$0	\$0
12	Total TRC Costs ^[3] (Sum of rows 1, 5 and 11)	\$738	\$944
13	Total NPV Lifetime Energy Benefits	\$5,880	\$5,900
14	Total NPV Lifetime Capacity Benefits	\$537	\$542
15	Total NPV TRC Benefits ^[4]	\$6,418	\$6,443
16	TRC Benefit-Cost Ratio ^[5]	8.69	6.83

NOTES

Per PUC direction, TRC inputs and calculations are required in the Annual Report only and should comply with the 2013 Total Resource Cost Test Order. Please see the "Report Definitions" section of this report for more details.

[1] Includes rebate processing, tracking system, general administration, EDC and CSP program management, general management and legal, and technical assistance.

[2] Includes the marketing CSP and marketing costs by program CSPs.

[3] Total TRC Costs includes Total EDC Costs and Participant Costs.

[4] Total TRC Benefits equals the sum of Total Lifetime Energy Benefits and Total Lifetime Capacity Benefits. Based upon verified gross kWh and kW savings. Benefits include: avoided supply costs, including the reduction in costs of electric energy, generation, transmission, and distribution capacity, and natural gas valued at marginal cost for periods when there is a load reduction. NOTE: Savings carried over from Phase I are not to be included as a part of Total TRC Benefits for Phase II.

[5] TRC Ratio equals Total NPV TRC Benefits divided by Total NPV TRC Costs.

10 GOVERNMENT AND INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAM

This program provides for the implementation of cost effective, high efficiency measures through lighting, HVAC, appliances, multifamily and audit programs. Participation in most measures are restricted to certain rate classes that are designated for nonprofit organizations. GNI customers in other rate classes participate through other C/I programs.

10.1 PROGRAM UPDATES

There were no updates to this program in PY6.

10.1.1 Definition of Participant

Each separate rebated project is counted as a participant.

10.2 IMPACT EVALUATION GROSS SAVINGS

10.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

This program offers all measures included in the other nonresidential programs, but eligibility is restricted to certain rate classes that are designated for nonprofit organizations. The program has limited participation due to the rate class eligibility restriction. Historically, most of the projects rebated under this program involve lighting upgrades, and a small percentage of impacts are attributable to HVAC replacements or other non-lighting projects. The participants are often volunteer fire departments, municipalities, and religious organizations.

Gross Impact Evaluation for Efficient Equipment Incentives

For each sampled project, the gross impact evaluation process starts with a desk review, and often continues to an on-site verification visits, metering or logging, and data analysis. The steps are described below for lighting projects and prescriptive (HVAC and food service) projects. There were no custom projects in this program in PY6.

Lighting Projects

Each sampled lighting project first undergoes a desk review. The desk review includes reconciliation of invoices, fixture specification sheets (cut sheets), and re-calculating reported savings using TRM algorithms and/or ex-ante assumptions, and identifying key parameters to be researched in the M&V plan.

Evaluation of all but the simplest of projects requires an M&V plan. The first step in the M&V planning process is to check that the project is sufficiently documented. For example, contractors working on large projects often have detailed, space-by-space inventories of the baseline and new lighting fixtures. If such detailed information is found to be lacking, ADM analysts will contact the applicant or the contractor directly, or through a request to the ICSP, and ask if such documentation is available. For large lighting projects, the M&V plan may call for sampling within the project. In such cases, the targeted precision level is $\pm 20\%$ at the 90% confidence level (90/20), with the sampling unit as the line item in the lighting calculator.

The desk review and M&V plan inform the data acquisition activities needed to evaluate the project. For most lighting projects, the default activities are on-site verification and logging hours of use. Most lighting projects are metered unless there is a good reason to *not* to meter^{52,53}. In rare cases, the desk review process may indicate that an on-site visit would not add sufficient value to the evaluation effort. In such cases, a verification interview may suffice to reduce uncertainty regarding the project. Data analysis is finalized upon the retrieval of loggers. For projects that involve formal samples, only the sampled line items are included in the realization rate calculation. This reduces uncertainty and subjectivity from the process of assigning hours of use from loggers to line items in the calculator.

As a final step in lighting project analysis, ADM analysts determine the incremental material and labor costs, and “dual-baseline” energy savings in cases that involve T12 or incandescent lamps. In estimating the material and labor costs, preference is given first to invoices, then to the SWE incremental cost database, and then to the cost values from the CA DEER database.

Prescriptive Projects

These projects are evaluated at the basic level of rigor because they tend to represent an insignificant amount of reported impacts in the program-level sampling scheme. The process verification involves a desk review and an on-site verification or verification by interview and review of invoices and other documentation.

As with lighting projects, incremental costs are evaluated as the gross impact evaluation nears completion. In estimating the material and labor costs, preference is given first to invoices, then to the SWE incremental cost database, and then to the cost values from the CA DEER database, then to other sources as needed and described in Appendix A.

Program-Specific Evaluation Considerations

The Government and Institutional Program tends to have volatile realization rates, in part due to low participation rates, and in part due to inaccuracies in the rebate applications related to lighting hours of use and baseline fixture types. The lighting hours of use in this sector, in particular for volunteer fire departments, are quite low – perhaps 1,000 hours per year or less. A second issue is that some of the customers or their contractors may not be familiar with “standard” lighting fixture types and codes, and may enter incorrect baseline fixture types. For these customers, ADM tends to supplement on-site data collection activities with a review of utility meter data. In many cases, the facilities’ consumption history helps to provide reasonable upper limits on the project energy savings, and can help to guide baseline fixture specification in cases where physical evidence of baseline fixture types may not exist.

⁵² The most frequent reasons are that the affected lights are installed outdoors and controlled by photocells or time clocks. Increasingly, high quality trending data are available from energy management systems, and the data may be used in-lieu of logging. Other rate cases may be customer-driven, such as the requirement for explosion proof loggers in a chemical plant.

⁵³ Primary and secondary schools are the general exception. TRM hours of use are applied to whole-school lighting upgrades, but logging is still recommended for projects that are confined to just one location such as a gym or library.

10.2.2 Program Sampling

ADM did not sample for this year's impact evaluation. All rebated projects were selected for evaluation.

Table 10-1: Phase II Government and Institutional Program Reported Results by Customer Sector

Sector	Participants	Reported Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Reported Gross Demand Reduction (MW)	Incentives (\$1,000)
Residential	0	0	0.00	0
Low-Income	0	0	0.00	0
Small Commercial and Industrial	0	0	0.00	0
Large Commercial and Industrial	0	0	0.00	0
Government, Non-Profit, and Institutional	24	1,270	9.17	45
Phase II Total	24	1,270	9.17	45

Table 10-2: Government and Institutional Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6

Stratum	Population Size	Target Levels of Confidence & Precision	Target Sample Size	Achieved Sample Size	Evaluation Activity
CFL Kits-1	0	n/a	0	0	n/a
Lighting-Certainty	0	n/a	0	0	DR,OS,L,B
Lighting-2	3	0.0%	3	3	DR,OS,L,B
Lighting-3	6	20.8%	4	4	DR,OS,L,B
Lighting-4	0	n/a	0	0	DR,OS,L,B
Custom-Certainty	0	n/a	0	0	DR,OS,M,B,ES
Custom-2	0	n/a	0	0	DR,OS,M,B,ES
Custom-3	0	n/a	0	0	DR,OS,M,B,ES
HVAC and DHW-1	0	n/a	0	0	DR,OS,M,B,ES
HVAC and DHW-2	0	n/a	0	0	DR,OS,S
Appliance Turn-in-1	0	n/a	0	0	DR
Kitchen/Appliances-1	0	n/a	0	0	DR
Program Total	9	9.8%	7	7	

Table 10-3: Program Year 6 Government and Institutional Program Summary of Evaluation Results for Energy

Stratum	Reported Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Energy Realization Rate (%)	Verified Gross Energy Savings (MWh/yr)	Observed Coefficient of Variation (C _v) or Proportion in Sample Design	Relative Precision at 85% C.L.
CFL Kits-1	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
Lighting-Certainty	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
Lighting-2	101	77.7%	78	0.5	0.0%
Lighting-3	90	46.0%	41	0.5	20.8%
Lighting-4	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
Custom-Certainty	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
Custom-2	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
Custom-3	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
HVAC and DHW-1	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
HVAC and DHW-2	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
Appliance Turn-in-1	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
Kitchen/Appliances-1	0	n/a	0	0.5	0.0%
Program Total	190	62.7%	120		7.2%

Table 10-4: Program Year 6 Government and Institutional Program Summary of Evaluation Results for Demand

Stratum	Reported Gross Demand Savings (MW)	Demand Realization Rate (%)	Verified Gross Demand Savings (MW)	Observed Coefficient of Variation (C _v) or Proportion in Sample Design	Relative Precision at 85% C.L.
CFL Kits-1	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Lighting-Certainty	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Lighting-2	0.02	27.6%	0.01	0.5	0.0%
Lighting-3	0.03	38.8%	0.01	0.5	20.8%
Lighting-4	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Custom-Certainty	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Custom-2	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Custom-3	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
HVAC and DHW-1	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
HVAC and DHW-2	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Appliance Turn-in-1	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Kitchen/Appliances-1	0.00	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.0%
Program Total	0.05	33.7%	0.02		13.0%

10.2.3 On-Site Inspections

The Company's ICSP, CLEAResult, conducts QA/QC on-site inspections for 5% of pending rebate applications. The QA/QC visits are conducted prior to rebate approval, and can occur prior to or after

measure installation⁵⁴. Nonresidential energy efficiency projects typically involve complex or numerous energy efficiency measures. It is therefore inadequate to classify inspections in a binary (e.g. Pass/Fail) manner. Site inspections may result in three general outcomes:

Case 1: The reported energy efficiency measures are found to be installed as described in rebate application materials

Case2: The energy efficiency project is completed, but there may be minor discrepancies between the installed measures and the associated documentation. These can include:

- A discrepancy in the quantities for some or all of the energy efficiency measures
- A discrepancy in the description of the energy efficiency measure (e.g. fixture wattage, HVAC system capacity or efficiency, motor horsepower or efficiency)
- A discrepancy in the baseline equipment
- A mischaracterization of equipment operation (e.g. lighting hours of use or control type, VFD control feedback mechanism, space heating and cooling set points)

Case 3: The energy efficiency project is not completed, or there are major discrepancies in the attributes discussed above in Case 2.

The on-site inspections occur prior to rebate approval. Approximately (34%)⁵⁵ of QA/QC inspections correspond to Case 1 above. Approximately 66% of on-site inspections result in a “Case 2” finding. In such cases, the application materials are updated to reflect the as-found equipment, and the rebate application is processed accordingly. Note that most “Case 2” findings do not result in material changes to the ex-ante savings⁵⁶ – the high proportion of site-visits that fall into this case is mostly a function of Case 1 being reserved for perfection.

This may involve an adjustment to the rebate amount and to the reported impacts in CLEAResult’s tracking and reporting system⁵⁷. In the event of a Case 3 finding, the rebate application is cancelled. Based on CLEAResult’s historical records, this scenario occurs approximately 0% of the time.

These QA/QC activities are exclusive of ADM’s on-site verification activities. ADM’s independent evaluation activities are described in the preceding section, and the program realization rates are informed, in part, by on-site findings. The primary source of variance between reported and verified impacts are not due to failures in verification, but rather to differences between planning assumptions and ex-post measurements in key parameters that describe operational characteristics. These include hours of use for lighting, both hours of use and part-load conditions for HVAC, refrigeration, and motors.

⁵⁴ In cases where baseline conditions are critical to the overall project energy savings calculation CLEAResult staff may conduct baseline on-site inspections. These inspections may also involve metering to help determine baseline lighting hours of use or other attributes that may correlate with the project’s energy savings.

⁵⁵ Percentages here apply to all CLEAResult administered programs for all four FirstEnergy Pennsylvania EDCs.

⁵⁶ ADM reviewed summary of 110 on-site inspections conducted by CLEAResult in PY6, and developed a ‘QC realization rate’ to help inform the annual report. The QC realization rate was 98%, with a CV of 0.39. The adjustments made by CLEAResult accounted for variations in hours of use as well as variations in equipment specification.

⁵⁷ Adjustments to the Company’s tracking and reporting are not necessary because QA/QC inspections occur prior to rebate approval.

10.3 IMPACT EVALUATION NET SAVINGS

Tetra Tech conducted the NTG research according to the Common Approach, Statewide Evaluator Guidance Memos GM-024 (Consistent Freeridership methodology) and GM-025 (Consistent Spillover methodology) using the participant self-report method. The complete participant dataset for Phase II, PY6 (Q1-Q4) was used for this evaluation effort

**Table 10-5: Government and Institutional Program
Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6 NTG Research**

Stratum	Population Size ⁵⁸	Assumed CV or Proportion in Sample Design	Assumed Levels of Confidence & Precision	Target Sample size	Achieved Sample Size	Percent of Sample Frame Contacted ⁵⁹ to Achieve Sample
Lighting	25	P=0.5	85/15	6	18	n/a
Custom	0	P=0.5	85/15	0	0	n/a
HVAC and DHW	2	P=0.5	85/15	1	0	n/a
Kitchen/Appliances	0	P=0.5	85/15	0	0	n/a
Program Total	27		85/15	7	18	89%(N=24)

**Table 10-6: Program Year 6 Government and Institutional Program
Summary of Evaluation Results for NTG Research**

Target Group or Stratum (if appropriate)	Estimated Free Ridership	Estimated Participant Spillover	NTG Ratio	Observed Coefficient of Variation or Proportion	Relative Precision
Lighting	54.2%	11.7%	57.5%	0.37	6.7%
Custom	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.49	100.0%
HVAC and DHW	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.41	100.0%
Kitchen/Appliances	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.41	100.0%
Program Total ⁶⁰	53.8%	11.6%	57.1%		6.7%

10.4 PROCESS EVALUATION

Tetra Tech conducted the process evaluation in conjunction with the NTG research. These activities included:

FirstEnergy and Program Implementer Staff In-depth Interviews

Tetra Tech and ADM conducted in-depth interviews with FirstEnergy program staff and the ICSP to discuss Phase II design and implementation updates, program goals, and key researchable issues of

⁵⁸ Due to the low number of participants in this program, NTG and process evaluation results are reported by combining statistics across the four FirstEnergy EDCs in PA.

⁵⁹ Sample frame is a list of contacts that have a chance to be selected into the sample. Percent contacted means of all the sample frame how many were called to get the completes.

⁶⁰ NTG ratio at program level should be developed using stratum weight and stratum NTG ratios.

interest for the Phase II evaluation. The interviews assessed the effectiveness of the program's current operations, detailed program implementation practices, and identified key researchable topics. In addition, both FirstEnergy and ICSP staff provided input on the types of information that would be most beneficial to design and implementation efforts.

Participant Surveys

The participant surveys gathered data and information related to assess free-ridership and spillover and process related topics. The topic areas included:

- Program awareness and marketing
- The company's decision-making process in regards to new equipment
- Energy efficiency at the company
- Program satisfaction

The complete participant dataset for Phase II, PY6 (Q1-Q4) was used for this evaluation effort.

Table 10-7: Government and Institutional Program Sampling Strategy for Program Year 6

Target Group or Stratum (if appropriate)	Population Size	Assumed Proportion or CV in Sample Design	Assumed Levels of Confidence & Precision	Target Sample Size	Achieved Sample Size	Percent of Population Frame Contacted to Achieve Sample	Used For Evaluation Activities (Impact, Process, NTG)
Lighting	25	P=0.5	85/15	6	18	n/a	Process, NTG
Custom	0	P=0.5	85/15	0	0	n/a	Process, NTG
HVAC and DHW	2	P=0.5	85/15	1	0	n/a	Process, NTG
Kitchen/Appliances	0	P=0.5	85/15	0	0	n/a	Process, NTG
Program Total	27		85/15	7	18	89%(N=24)	

Key Findings⁶¹

- 1) Participants report high levels of satisfaction with all aspects of the program. Program participants are highly satisfied with the overall program and more than 90 percent of customers said they would likely participate in the program again in the future. Each individual aspect of the program received an average rating of "highly satisfied," with the exception of the incentive amount, which received a mean satisfaction just shy of "highly satisfied". Most participants said they did not experience any obstacles or barriers while implementing their project (89 percent) – and those that had difficulties, the issues were typically internal to the customer (e.g. convincing management to fund initial costs). Lastly, two-thirds of customers have recommended the program to colleagues in their industry.
- 2) Almost all aspects of program satisfaction rated higher in Phase II than Phase I. When compared with results from the Phase I C&I evaluation, all aspects of program satisfaction increased in

⁶¹ Key findings are reported in aggregate for the four FirstEnergy PA EDCs. Results were very similar for each EDC and for each program.

average score between Phase I and Phase II, with the exception of the incentive offered, which decreased marginally.

- 3) The participant information files are improved from Phase I. Interview staff reported high levels of survey completion on their first attempt to contact respondents, which is atypical for C&I studies. The high quality sample information resulted in above-average numbers of participants calling the survey lab to complete the survey, a fact that is directly correlated with the advance letter reaching the correct individual within the firm.
- 4) Although customers' stated preference of receiving information about energy efficiency via email or direct mail, contractors are successfully marketing the programs to customers. Two-thirds (67 percent) of respondents indicated their preferred method of communication is email newsletters, while 30 percent said they preferred direct mail from their EDC. However, more than half (54 percent) of respondents learned about the program through their contractor.
- 5) Budget and financial plans fall into two planning periods. Almost 45 percent of customers indicated their firm creates budgets/financial plans of one year or less, while 35 percent of customers said their business' budgets/financial plans span five years or longer. Responses differed between strata – large C&I customers are more likely to create plans spanning more than 5 years (47 percent), while small C&I and GNI customers typically plan in one-year increments (50 percent and 53 percent, respectively).
- 6) The budget cycle was a primary factor for when projects can be implemented. Of the 45 percent of respondents who indicated that they had business or production cycles that affect planning and implementation of efficiency projects, more than half of respondents (53 percent) have budget and financial planning cycles that affect when projects can be planned and implemented. Customers' budget and financial planning periods overwhelmingly fall into two categories, under one year or five years and longer. Customers often cited financial plans and budgets as a driving force behind whether energy improvements could be pursued, highlighting the crucial role of working alongside customers during their planning and budgeting periods

10.5 STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM

The following recommendations resulted from the process and impact evaluation effort.

Table 10-8: Government and Institutional Program Status Report on Process and Impact Recommendations

Recommendations	EDC Status of Recommendation (Implemented, Being Considered, Rejected AND Explanation of Action Taken by EDC)
Continue conducting outreach with trade allies and contractors to promote the program when working with commercial customers, and continue incorporating case studies and testimonials into marketing materials provided to customers and trade allies.	Implemented
Seek opportunities to provide contractors and targeted customers with additional literature and marketing materials they can use to convey benefits of the program to management staff.	Being Considered
Continue working closely with contractors and business owners to establish time periods during which project installations occur.	Implemented
Consider stipulating an annual indoor lighting hours of use of 1,000 hours for all program participants	Being Considered

10.6 FINANCIAL REPORTING

A breakdown of the program finances (by program) is presented in Table 10-9. This program's TRC benefit-cost ratio is relatively low primarily because the program has not yet achieved the scale necessary to dilute fixed costs associated with implementation.

Table 10-9: Summary of Program Finances

Row #	Cost Category	Actual PYTD Costs	Actual Phase II Costs
		(\$1,000)	(\$1,000)
1	Incremental Measure Costs (Sum of rows 2 to 4)	\$68	\$497
2	EDC Incentives to Participants	\$18	\$54
3	EDC Incentives to Trade Allies	\$0	\$0
4	Participant Costs (net of incentives/rebates paid by utilities)	\$50	\$443
5	Program Overhead Costs (Sum of rows 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)	\$129	\$382
6	Design & Development	\$1	\$4
7	Administration, Management, and Technical Assistance ^[1]	\$92	\$311
8	Marketing ^[2]	\$24	\$36
9	EDC Evaluation Costs	\$8	\$9
10	SWE Audit Costs	\$5	\$22
11	Increases in costs of natural gas (or other fuels) for fuel switching programs	\$0	\$0
12	Total TRC Costs ^[3] (Sum of rows 1, 5 and 11)	\$197	\$879
13	Total NPV Lifetime Energy Benefits	\$60	\$366
14	Total NPV Lifetime Capacity Benefits	\$5	\$51
15	Total NPV TRC Benefits ^[4]	\$65	\$417
16	TRC Benefit-Cost Ratio ^[5]	0.33	0.47

NOTES

Per PUC direction, TRC inputs and calculations are required in the Annual Report only and should comply with the 2013 Total Resource Cost Test Order. Please see the "Report Definitions" section of this report for more details.

[1] Includes rebate processing, tracking system, general administration, EDC and CSP program management, general management and legal, and technical assistance.

[2] Includes the marketing CSP and marketing costs by program CSPs.

[3] Total TRC Costs includes Total EDC Costs and Participant Costs.

[4] Total TRC Benefits equals the sum of Total Lifetime Energy Benefits and Total Lifetime Capacity Benefits. Based upon verified gross kWh and kW savings. Benefits include: avoided supply costs, including the reduction in costs of electric energy, generation, transmission, and distribution capacity, and natural gas valued at marginal cost for periods when there is a load reduction. NOTE: Savings carried over from Phase I are not to be included as a part of Total TRC Benefits for Phase II.

[5] TRC Ratio equals Total NPV TRC Benefits divided by Total NPV TRC Costs.

APPENDIX A | EM&V INFORMATION

Participant Definitions

Table A-0-1: Program Year 6 Participant Definition by Program⁶²

Program	Participant Definition	Can there be more than one measure per participant?	Sample Defined By:
EE Products: Upstream Lighting	One package of lamps	Yes	Achieved Census
EE Products: Upstream Televisions	One Television	Yes	Achieved Census
EE Products: Refrigerators / Freezers	Unique Rebate ID	Yes	Each Appliance
EE Products: Heat Pump Water Heaters	Unique Rebate ID	Yes	Each Appliance
EE Products: ASHP	Unique Rebate ID	Yes	Each Appliance
EE Products: Clothes Washers	Unique Rebate ID	Yes	Each Appliance
EE Products: GSHP	Unique Rebate ID	Yes	Each Appliance
EE Products: HVAC Tune-Ups	Unique Rebate ID	Yes	Each Appliance
EE Products: Dehumidifiers	Unique Rebate ID	Yes	Each Appliance
EE Products: CAC	Unique Rebate ID	Yes	Each Appliance
EE Products: Mini-split HP	Unique Rebate ID	Yes	Each Appliance
EE Products: RAC	Unique Rebate ID	Yes	Each Appliance
EE Products: Smart Strips	Unique Rebate ID	Yes	Each Appliance
EE Products: Upstream Smart Strips	Unique Rebate ID	Yes	Achieved Census
EE Products: Electric Resistance Water Heaters	Unique Rebate ID	Yes	Each Appliance
EE Products: Upstream Computers/Monitors	Unique Rebate ID	Yes	Achieved Census
EE Products: Solar Water Heaters	Unique Rebate ID	Yes	Each Appliance
EE Products: ECM Fans	Unique Rebate ID	Yes	Each Appliance
EE Products: Dishwashers	Unique Rebate ID	Yes	Each Appliance
EE Products: Mini-split AC	Unique Rebate ID	Yes	Each Appliance
EE Products: Tune-Up with ECM	Unique Rebate ID	Yes	Each Appliance
Appliance Turn-In: Refrigerators	Unique Rebate ID	No	Each Appliance
Appliance Turn-In: Freezers	Unique Rebate ID	Yes	Each Appliance
Appliance Turn-In: RACs	Unique Rebate ID	Yes	Each Appliance
HEA: HEA Kits	Unique Rebate ID	No (although the kit itself does have several measures)	Each Kit
HEA: School Kits	Unique Rebate ID	No (the kit is the measure)	Each Kit
HEA: New Construction	Unique Rebate ID	No (the home is the measure)	Each Home
HEA: Direct Install, Prescriptive Measures	Unique Rebate ID	Yes	Each itemized measure
HEA: Weatherization, > 2MWh	Unique Rebate ID	Yes	Each home
HEA: Weatherization, < 2MWh	Unique Rebate ID	Yes	Each home
HEA: Home Energy Reports	Unique Rebate ID	No	Each home

⁶² EDCs can modify table as necessary to provide additional granularity.

Low-Income - Lighting Giveaway	One lamp	No	Achieved Census
Low-Income - Furnace Whistle Giveaway	One Furnace Whistle	No	Achieved Census
Low-Income - Showerhead Giveaway	One Showerhead	No	Achieved Census
Low-Income - LED Night Light Giveaway	One LED Night Light	No	Achieved Census
Low-Income - Aerator Giveaway	One Aerator	No	Achieved Census
Low-Income - Direct Install	One Home	Yes	Each Home
Low-Income - LILU Conservation kits	One Kit	No	Each Kit
Nonresidential Programs – Conservation Kit	One Kit	Yes	Each Kit
Nonresidential Programs – Appliance Recycling	Unique Rebate ID	Yes	Each rebate
Nonresidential Programs – All other projects	Unique Rebate ID	Yes	Each rebate

Program Year 6 Evaluation Activities

Table A-0-2: Program Year 6 Actual Evaluation Activities

Programs (Sub Programs if necessary)	Sectors	Records Review	Participant Surveys ⁶³	Site Visits	Meterin g or EMS Data	Billing Analysis or Energy Simulation
Refrigerators	Res Appliance Turn-In	Census	35	0	0	0
Freezers	Res Appliance Turn-In	Census	18	0	0	0
RACs	Res Appliance Turn-In	Census	15	0	0	0
Upstream Lighting	Residential EE Products	Census	1000	0	0	0
Upstream Televisions	Residential EE Products	Census	0	0	0	0
Refrigerators / Freezers	Residential EE Products	24	16	0	0	0
Upstream Computers/Monitors	Residential EE Products	Census	0	0	0	0
Heat Pump Water Heaters	Residential EE Products	4	17	0	0	0
ASHP	Residential EE Products	6	12	0	0	0
Clothes Washers	Residential EE Products	13	27	0	0	0
GSHP	Residential EE Products	4	4	0	0	0
HVAC Tune-Ups	Residential EE Products	39	6	0	0	0
Dehumidifiers	Residential EE Products	15	17	0	0	0
CAC	Residential EE Products	2	4	0	0	0
MiniSplit HP	Residential EE Products	20	28	0	0	0

⁶³ Nonparticipant surveys were not conducted for impact evaluation.

Programs (Sub Programs if necessary)	Sectors	Records Review	Participant Surveys ⁶³	Site Visits	Meterin g or EMS Data	Billing Analysis or Energy Simulation
Room AC	Residential EE Products	0	0	0	0	0
Smart Strips	Residential EE Products	Census	0	0	0	0
Whole House Fan	Residential EE Products	0	0	0	0	0
Electric Resistance Water Heaters	Residential EE Products	4	1	0	0	0
Solar Water Heaters	Residential EE Products	1	0	0	0	0
ECM Fans	Residential EE Products	2	0	0	0	0
MiniSplit AC	Residential EE Products	1	0	0	0	0
Pool Pump Motors	Residential EE Products	0	0	0	0	0
HEA Kits	Res Home Energy Audits	Census	149	0	0	0
School Kits	Res Home Energy Audits	Census	347	0	0	0
New Construction	Res Home Energy Audits	0	0	0	0	0
Direct Install, Prescriptive	Res Home Energy Audits	Census	0	0	0	0
Weatherization, > 2MWh	Res Home Energy Audits	0	0	0	0	4 (billing)
Weatherization, < 2MWh	Res Home Energy Audits	Census (Tracking Data Review)	0	0	0	0
Home Energy Reports	Res Home Energy Audits	0	0	0	0	2 (billing)
Giveaway Measures	Low-Income Res	Census	0	0	0	0
Direct Install	Low-Income Res	36	0	0	36	0
Conservation Kits	Low-Income Res	Census	123	0	0	0
C/I Lighting	C/I	53	0	40	41	5
C/I Custom	C/I	14	0	10	12	6
C/I HVAC and DHW	C/I	2	0	2	2	0
C/ I Kitchen/Appliances	C/I	1	0	0	0	0
C/I Appliance Recycling	C/I	1	0	0	0	0
C/I CFL Kits	C/I	Census	33	0	0	0

Table A-0-3: Program Year 6 Net Impact and Process Evaluation Activities

Programs (Sub Programs if necessary)	Program Staff Interviews	ICSP Interviews	Participant Surveys	Nonpartitpant Surveys	Trade Ally Surveys
Appliance Turn-In	No	No	45	0	0
Efficient Products	Yes	Yes	131	0	55
Home Performance	Yes	No	127	0	9
Low Income	Yes	n/a	195	0	5
Small C/I Equipment	Yes	Yes	54	0	0
Small C/I Buildings	Yes	Yes	0	0	0
Large C/I Equipment	Yes	Yes	51	0	0
Large C/I Buildings	Yes	Yes	0	0	0
Gov./Institutional	Yes	Yes	7	0	0

APPENDIX B | TRC INCREMENTAL COSTS

Incremental costs for most measures offered in the residential sector are taken from the Incremental Cost Database provided by the SWE (SWE IC DB). To facilitate TRC calculations for certain programs, the verified impacts and incremental costs are calculated individually for all evaluated measures, and then are cast into per-unit average impacts and incremental costs, with the incremental costs weighted by gross verified energy savings. For example, the first line in the table below shows a cost of \$7.70 for the average package of lamps sold through the upstream lighting program. Exact costs are known for certain measures such as energy conservation kits in the residential sector.

For early replacement measures, exact costs from invoices are preferred to other cost estimates. In the residential sector, exact costs are known for the energy conservation kits distributed by the Home Performance Program and the Low-Income Low-Use program component and are as provided by the Company. Though the costs of the low-income audits are known, they are incorporated into TRC costs as program administration costs rather than participant costs. For appliance recycling, the incentive cost is taken to approximate the incremental cost of participation, as it is assumed that the incentive is equal to the residual value of the appliance.

For nonresidential measures, ADM develops a project-specific incremental cost for each evaluated project. The program-level incremental cost is developed through the application of the same sample weights as those used to determine verified gross impacts. For nonresidential projects, the order of preference for material and labor costs is as follows: Invoices, SWE IC DB, DEER 2008 Incremental Cost Database (escalated 15% to account for inflation) and industry research. The incremental material cost for most projects is derived from invoices. The SWE IC DB provides costs for the most frequently encountered fixture types, but there are many relatively rare fixture types that are not listed. To expand the applicability of the SWE IC DB to all fixture types listed in the TRM Appendix C, ADM modeled the linear fluorescent fixture costs in the SWE IC DB as a function of wattage, the number of lamps, and lamp types, then applied the modeled costs to all linear fluorescents listed in Appendix C. A similar process, starting with the DEER 2008 incremental cost database, yielded costs for all HID lamp types.

Incremental costs for new construction lighting projects were derived in a two-step process. First, the actual cost of installed fixtures was determined (almost exclusively from invoices). The cost of meeting the baseline lighting power density allowance with typical fixtures (T5, T8, HID, as appropriate for the space type) was then calculated from the aforementioned per-fixture cost models. The incremental cost is taken as the actual cost of the installed fixtures minus the cost of the baseline fixtures. Projects that achieved savings through more efficient application of lamps, rather than relying on premium efficiency lamps, have negative incremental costs (e.g. a customer could have installed 100 fixtures, but installed 77 instead).

Incremental costs for Non lighting measures were taken from SWE IC DB costs in 'replace on burnout' scenarios, and from invoices for early replacement measures. If labor costs were not available in invoices, ADM used labor to material cost fractions as published in or extrapolated from the DOE Report, *Process Equipment Cost Estimation, Final Report*⁶⁴.

⁶⁴ *Process Equipment Cost Estimation, Final Report*, H.P. Loh, Jennifer Lyons, and Charles White, III. DOE/NETL-2002.1169, 2002. The labor factors in Table 6 are extrapolated to other equipment such as air compressors.

Table A-0-1: Summary of Incremental Costs

Program	Measure	Incremental Cost	Incremental Cost Source
Residential Appliance Turn-In	Refrigerators	\$50.00	Assume Incentive = Incremental Cost
Residential Appliance Turn-In	Freezers	\$50.00	Assume Incentive = Incremental Cost
Residential Appliance Turn-In	RACs	\$25.00	Assume Incentive = Incremental Cost
Residential EE Products	Upstream Lighting	\$8.37	SWE DB (Weighted Average per Package)
Residential EE Products	Upstream Televisions	\$1.00	EE&C Plan
Residential EE Products	Refrigerators / Freezers	\$27.26	SWE DB (Weighted for Freezer/Frig Mix)
Residential EE Products	Upstream Computers/Monitors	\$1.00	EE&C Plan
Residential EE Products	Heat Pump Water Heaters	\$1,045.00	SWE DB
Residential EE Products	ASHP	\$1,841.26	SWE DB (Weighted for tonnage, HSPF)
Residential EE Products	Clothes Washers	\$150.00	SWE DB
Residential EE Products	GSHP	\$10,897.00	SWE DB
Residential EE Products	HVAC Tune-Ups	\$88.00	SWE DB
Residential EE Products	Dehumidifiers	\$20.00	SWE DB
Residential EE Products	CAC	\$2,136.42	SWE DB (Weighted for tonnage, SEER)
Residential EE Products	MiniSplit HP	\$447.75	SWE DB
Residential EE Products	Room AC	\$50.00	SWE DB
Residential EE Products	Smart Strips	\$21.00	SWE DB
Residential EE Products	Whole House Fan	\$490.00	SWE DB
Residential EE Products	Electric Resistance Water Heaters	\$89.40	SWE DB
Residential EE Products	Solar Water Heaters	\$7,414.00	SWE DB
Residential EE Products	ECM Fans	\$360.00	SWE DB
Residential EE Products	MiniSplit AC	\$447.75	SWE DB
Residential EE Products	Pool Pump Motors	\$750.00	SWE DB
Residential Home Performance	HEA Kits	\$45.53	Invoices
Residential Home Performance	School Kits	\$26.35	Invoices

Program	Measure	Incremental Cost	Incremental Cost Source
Residential Home Performance	New Construction	\$2,561.00	SWE DB
Residential Home Performance	Weatherization, > 2MWh - Per kWh saved	\$1.06	invoice review
Residential Home Performance	Weatherization, > 2MWh - Per kWh saved	\$1.06	invoice review
Residential Home Performance	Air Sealing (per home)	\$1,050.00	SWE DB
Residential Home Performance	20W CFL	\$2.50	SWE DB
Residential Home Performance	13W CFL	\$2.50	SWE DB
Residential Home Performance	Attic Insulation	\$1.85	SWE DB
Residential Home Performance	23W CFL	\$3.00	SWE DB
Residential Home Performance	Dimmable CFL (27W)	\$3.00	SWE DB
Residential Home Performance	3 Way CFL	\$3.00	SWE DB
Residential Home Performance	Energy-Savings Surge Protector	\$21.00	SWE DB
Residential Home Performance	DHW Pipe Insulation 1ft	\$3.00	SWE DB
Residential Home Performance	Showerhead	\$6.00	SWE DB
Residential Home Performance	LED Night Light	\$2.00	SWE DB
Residential Home Performance	Bath Aerator	\$2.00	SWE DB
Residential Home Performance	Furnace Whistle	\$2.00	SWE DB
Residential Home Performance	Kitchen Aerator	\$2.00	SWE DB
Residential Home Performance	Windows (per 100 sqft)	\$325.00	SWE DB
Residential Home Performance	Test Out	\$250.00	Estimate - based on incentive
Residential Home Performance	Test In	\$250.00	Estimate - based on incentive
Residential Home Performance	DHW Pipe Insulation - WPP	\$3.00	SWE DB
Residential Home Performance	Showerhead - WPP	\$6.00	SWE DB
Residential Home Performance	13W CFL - WPP	\$2.50	SWE DB
Residential Home Performance	Bath aerator - WPP	\$2.00	SWE DB
Residential Home Performance	Energy-Savings Surge Protector - WPP	\$21.00	SWE DB
Residential Home Performance	20W CFL - WPP	\$2.50	SWE DB
Residential Home	23W CFL - WPP	\$3.00	SWE DB

Program	Measure	Incremental Cost	Incremental Cost Source
Performance			
Residential Home Performance	Kitchen aerator - WPP	\$2.00	SWE DB
Residential Home Performance	3 Way CFL - WPP	\$3.00	SWE DB
Residential Home Performance	LED Night Light - WPP	\$2.00	SWE DB
Residential Home Performance	Home Energy Rerports	\$0.00	All costs reported as admin costs
Low-Income Program	All Measures	\$0.00	All measures paid for by program
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-164463 Lighting-4	\$1,544.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: SWE DB
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-164473 Lighting-2	\$57,054.22	Material: SWE DB, Labor: SWE DB
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-166844 Lighting-2	\$153,120.00	Material: SWE DB, Labor: SWE DB
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-167735 Lighting-Certainty	\$221,477.00	Material: SWE DB, Labor: SWE DB
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-194556 Custom-3	\$12,190.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: Invoice
Government	CR_PRJ-199676 Lighting-3	\$6,464.97	Material: Invoice, Labor: SWE DB
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-201013 Lighting-3	\$33,258.00	Material: SWE DB, Labor: SWE DB
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-204597 Lighting-3	\$27,347.00	Material: SWE DB, Labor: SWE DB
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-206017 Lighting-2	\$74,045.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: ADM analysis for new constriction
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-206792 Lighting-3	\$68,837.00	Material: SWE DB, Labor: SWE DB
Small C/I Buildings	CR_PRJ-209106 Custom-2	\$45,967.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: Invoice
Small C/I Buildings	CR_PRJ-209123 Custom-2	\$45,967.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: Invoice
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-211407 Lighting-2	\$34,668.00	Material: SWE DB, Labor: SWE DB
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-213162 Lighting-4	\$37,668.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: SWE DB
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-213780 Lighting-4	\$19,556.00	Material: SWE DB, Labor: SWE DB
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-213852 Lighting-Certainty	\$52,137.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: Invoice
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-214664 Lighting-4	\$8,469.00	Material: SWE DB, Labor: SWE DB
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-215218 Lighting-2	\$61,711.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: Invoice
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-215749 Lighting-3	\$14,215.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: SWE DB
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-217175 Lighting-3	\$32,501.59	Material: Invoice, Labor: SWE DB
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-217533 Lighting-2	\$75,901.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: SWE DB
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-218175 Lighting-2	\$121,335.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: SWE DB
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-218182 Lighting-2	\$103,595.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: SWE DB
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-218195 Lighting-2	\$282,864.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: SWE DB
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-218357 Custom-Certainty	\$131,669.36	Material: Invoice, Labor: Invoice
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-218530 Lighting-4	\$443.12	Material: Invoice, Labor: SWE DB
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-218974 Lighting-4	\$576.06	Material: Invoice, Labor: SWE DB
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-220175 Custom-Certainty	\$116,870.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: Invoice
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-223772 Lighting-3	\$32,872.00	Material: SWE DB, Labor: SWE DB

Program	Measure	Incremental Cost	Incremental Cost Source
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-224263 Lighting-3	\$76,870.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: Invoice
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-224643 Kitchen/Appliances-1	\$3,635.46	Material: Customer Estimate, Labor: ADM analysis for new constriction
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-225848 Lighting-3	\$13,170.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: SWE DB
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-225878 Lighting-3	\$13,185.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: SWE DB
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-230974 HVAC and DHW-2	\$1,791.00	Material: SWE DB, Labor: SWE DB
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-233981 Custom-Certainty	\$566,407.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: Invoice
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-237732 Lighting-2	\$44,864.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: invoice
Large C/I Buildings	CR_PRJ-239213 Custom-Certainty	\$342,000.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: invoice
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-239308 Lighting-3	\$25,094.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: invoice
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-246168 Lighting-3	\$20,170.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: SWE DB
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-247144 Lighting-4	\$9,550.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: SWE DB
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-248865 Custom-3	\$92,508.85	Material: Invoice, Labor: DOE Report
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-251673 Lighting-Certainty	\$45,396.00	Material: SWE DB, Labor: ADM analysis for new constriction
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-253664 Lighting-Certainty	\$317,085.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: invoice
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-253980 Lighting-Certainty	\$731,724.00	Material: SWE DB, Labor: ADM analysis for new constriction
Government	CR_PRJ-256505 Lighting-3	\$3,989.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: invoice
Government	CR_PRJ-256510 Lighting-3	\$4,375.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: invoice
Government	CR_PRJ-256519 Lighting-2	\$9,000.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: Invoice
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-256601 Lighting-3	\$31,935.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: SWE DB
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-256688 Custom-2	\$12,500.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: invoice
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-257602 Lighting-4	\$30,048.00	Material: SWE DB, Labor: SWE DB
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-259061 Lighting-3	\$13,543.00	Material: SWE DB, Labor: SWE DB
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-259062 Lighting-2	\$54,475.00	Material: SWE DB, Labor: SWE DB
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-259817 Lighting-Certainty	\$93,925.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: invoice
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-260079 HVAC and DHW-1	\$244,082.00	Material: SWE DB, Labor: SWE DB
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-260760 Custom-Certainty	\$106,000.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: invoice
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-261560 Lighting-4	\$34,242.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: SWE DB
Government	CR_PRJ-265938 Lighting-2	\$17,346.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: SWE DB
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-267107 Lighting-3	\$41,542.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: Invoice
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-268757 Lighting-4	\$6,322.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: SWE DB
Large C/I Buildings	CR_PRJ-281413 Custom-Certainty	\$0.00	Material: ADM analysis for new constriction, Labor: ADM analysis for new constriction
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-300414 Lighting-Certainty	\$433,670.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: invoice
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-305268 Lighting-4	\$9,967.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: invoice
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-323378 Lighting-3	\$10,512.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: invoice

Program	Measure	Incremental Cost	Incremental Cost Source
Large C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-326567 Custom-2	\$48,063.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: DOE Report
Government	CR_PRJ-330859 Lighting-3	\$8,390.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: SWE DB
Government	CR_PRJ-333298 Lighting-2	\$17,551.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: SWE DB
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-336851 Lighting-4	\$15,289.00	Material: SWE DB, Labor: SWE DB
Small C/I Buildings	CR_PRJ-340661 Custom-3	\$5,760.00	Material: Invoice, Labor:
Small C/I Equipment	CR_PRJ-368034 Lighting-4	\$3,314.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: invoice
Large C/I Buildings	CR_PRJ-247864 Custom-3	\$34,060.00	Material: Invoice, Labor: Invoice
Small C/I Equipment	JACO-3560903 Appliance Turn-in-1	\$50.00	Material: SWE DB, Labor: SWE DB

APPENDIX C | LOW-INCOME PARTICIPATION IN NON-LOW-INCOME PROGRAMS

For PY6 surveys, the evaluation team added income questions in each residential survey effort to assess low income participation in non-low income specific programs.

Table 1 provides the 2014 income ranges by household sizes, based on 2015 Federal Poverty Level (FPL). The income ranges will be updated annually. The survey will be programmed so that the interviewer reads the annual income ranges associated with their household sizes as listed in Table 1, supporting determination of whether the household is above or below 150% of FPL.⁶⁵ For example, if the respondent answers that three people lived in the household in 2014/2015, the interviewer will then ask Responses 1 through 5 for Household Size equals 3 as stated in Table 1.

Q1 Including yourself, how many people live in your household? _____ People

Q2 Including all money earned from wages, salaries, tips, commissions, workers' compensation, unemployment insurance, child support, or other sources, about how much was your total annual household income before taxes? Was it less than \$XX [FILL RESPONSES FOR MAX 150% FROM TABLE 1]?

If no, was it over \$YY [FILL RESPONSES FOR MIN 200% FROM TABLE 1]? (PROBE: IF R DOESN'T KNOW ANNUAL RANGE, PROMPT WITH MONTHLY RANGE)

- 1 Less than or equal to 150% poverty
- 2 151%-200% poverty
- 3 Over 200% poverty
- D Don't know
- R Refused

Table 1. Income Range Table (2015)⁶⁶

Household Size	Response 1 (≤50% FPL)	Response 2 (51%-100% FPL)	Response 3 (101%-150 FPL)	Response 4 (151%-200% FPL)	Response 5 (>200% FPL)
1	≤\$5,885	\$5,885 - \$11,770	\$11,770 - \$17,655	\$17,655 - \$23,540	≥\$23,540
2	≤\$7,965	\$7,965 - \$15,930	\$15,930 - \$23,895	\$23,895 - \$31,860	≥\$31,860
3	≤\$10,045	\$10,045 - \$20,090	\$20,090 - \$30,135	\$30,135 - \$40,180	≥\$40,180
4	≤\$12,125	\$12,125 - \$24,250	\$24,250 - \$36,375	\$36,375 - \$48,500	≥\$48,500
5	≤\$14,205	\$14,205 - \$28,410	\$28,410 - \$42,615	\$42,615 - \$56,820	≥\$56,820
6	≤\$16,285	\$16,285 - \$32,570	\$32,570 - \$48,855	\$48,855 - \$65,140	≥\$65,140
7	≤\$18,365	\$18,365 - \$36,730	\$36,730 - \$55,095	\$55,095 - \$73,460	≥\$73,460
8	≤\$20,445	\$20,445 - \$40,890	\$40,890 - \$61,335	\$61,335 - \$81,780	≥\$81,780

The low-income participation in upstream CFLs was determined from a survey in September 2015. The survey included the same questions as above with the annual income ranges rounded to the nearest

⁶⁵ Monthly income (annual/12) will be programmed for cases where the respondent answers "Don't know" to the annual value.

⁶⁶ Source: <http://aspe.hhs.gov/poverty/15poverty.cfm>

\$1,000 to facilitate the telephone survey effort. Respondents were categorized as low-income qualified if the stated incomes were below 150% of FPL.

APPENDIX D | RESIDENTIAL LIGHTING UPSTREAM PROGRAM CROSS-SECTOR SALES

It is well known and reasonable that some lamps in the upstream programs are purchased and installed in nonresidential settings. As a result, these lamps experience higher annual hours of use and higher peak demand impacts. In September 2015, ADM conducted a “random digit dial” (RDD) telephone survey for residential customers to assess the impact of cross sector sales. The surveys focused on customers that have purchased either CFLs and LEDs in the last 12 months, from stores that participate in the upstream lighting programs offered by the four FirstEnergy EDCs in Pennsylvania.

The extrapolation from the residential surveys is straightforward. Out of 980 completed survey responses (11,118 efficient lamps purchased in the last 12 months), 36 reported installing a total of (646) CFLs or LEDs in non-residential settings. The fraction of efficient lamps that are installed in non-residential settings is $646/11118=5.81\%$.

There are incremental demand reductions and incremental energy savings associated with the crossover of CFLs from the residential sector to the nonresidential sector. The hours of use and demand coincidence factors applied to the cross-sector CFLs are taken from the 2014 Metering Study conducted by the SWE⁶⁷.

PY6 Upstream Cross Sector Sales Impact Calculation Parameters

Building Type	Hours	Hours	CF	Space Cooling Likelihood
Auto Related	15%	2,001	31%	50%
Education - Primary School	3%	2,944	36%	50%
Education - Secondary School	1%	2,944	36%	50%
Education - University	0%	2,944	36%	80%
Medical - Clinic	2%	2,476	42%	90%
Lodging - Common Spaces	2%	2,925	37%	90%
Nursing Home	4%	2,476	42%	90%
Police and Fire Station - Unmanned	4%	1,456	22%	80%
Religious Worship	8%	1,456	22%	80%
Restaurant - Sit-Down	9%	3,054	57%	90%
Retail - Large	8%	2,383	50%	90%
Retail - Small	10%	2,383	50%	90%
Storage /Warehouse	4%	2,815	44%	20%

The nonresidential TRM protocols also include HVAC interactive effects. ADM applied the 12% and 34% values for energy and demand respectively, but also included applicability factors to account for our the fact that not all of the CFLs are installed in air conditioned space. The HVAC applicability factors are presented in the last column of the above table, and are estimates based on ADM’s on-site evaluation experience in Pennsylvania.

⁶⁷ Pennsylvania Statewide ACT 129 2014 Commercial & Residential Light Metering Study, Table 4-13 for Interior Screw-Base CFLs and LEDs.

Cross sector sales imply that a some amount of incentives that were intended for the residential sector also migrated to the nonresidential sector. The table below shows the overall amount of incentives associated with upstream lighting, the amount that remained in the residential sector, and the amount that migrated to the commercial (presumably the small commercial) sector.

Incentive shifts to account for Residential to Small C/I crossover CFLs.

EDC	Total Incentives for Upstream Lighting	Total Incentives for Residential Sector (95.07%)	Total Incentives for Small Commercial Sector (4.93%)
Met-Ed	\$453,104	\$426,777	\$26,327
Penelec	\$452,462	\$426,172	\$26,290
Penn Power	\$114,721	\$108,055	\$6,666
West Penn	\$489,260	\$460,832	\$28,428

Note that the Companies also included CFLs in their nonresidential sector programs. Based on customer surveys, a portion of CFLs distributed to small commercial customers in the C/I Small Energy Efficient Buildings Program were subsequently redistributed to employees, members, or parishioners for use in their homes. The TRM residential lighting protocols are used to evaluate the energy and demand impacts associated with these “crossover” CFLs. The table below also shows the budget shifts needed to account for the crossover.

Incentive shifts to account for Small C/I to Residential crossover CFLs.

EDC	Total Incentives for CFL Kits in the “Small Buildings” Programs	Total Incentives Small Commercial Sector	Total Incentives for Residential Sector
Met-Ed	\$100,634	\$75,675	\$24,959
Penelec	\$154,754	\$116,764	\$37,990
Penn Power	\$60,452	\$45,643	\$14,809
West Penn	\$151,260	\$107,449	\$43,810

Similarly, some participants of the CFL kits program component in the C/I Large Energy Efficient Buildings Program also reported CFL migration to the residential sector. The table below shows the necessary budget shifts to account for this migration.

Incentive shifts to account for Large C/I to Residential crossover CFLs.

EDC	Total Incentives for CFL Kits in the “Large Buildings” Programs	Total Incentives Large Commercial Sector	Total Incentives for Residential Sector
Met-Ed	\$14,051	\$10,805	\$3,246
Penelec	\$5,724	\$5,079	\$645
Penn Power	\$1,440	\$1,215	\$225
West Penn	\$6,300	\$5,427	\$873

The net funding shift for each EDC is summarized in the table below. The net flow of funding is in the opposite direction of CFL flow.

Net funding shifts between sectors to account for crossover CFLs.

EDC	Monies to be shifted from Small C/I to Residential Energy Efficient Products	Monies to be shifted from Residential EE Products to Small C/I Buildings	Monies to be shifted from Residential to Large C/I Buildings
Met-Ed	\$1,368	\$0	\$3,246
Penelec	\$0	\$11,700	\$645
Penn Power	\$0	\$8,143	\$225
West Penn	\$0	\$15,382	\$873

APPENDIX E | GLOSSARY OF TERMS

This Glossary of Terms was provided by the SWE.

-A-

Administration Management and Technical Assistance Costs: Includes rebate processing, tracking system, general administration, EDC and CSP program management, general management and legal, and technical assistance.

Avoided Cost: In the context of energy efficiency, the costs that are avoided by the implementation of an energy efficiency measure, program, or practice. Such costs are used in benefit/cost analyses of energy efficiency measures and programs as defined by the Pennsylvania PUC in the 2013 TRC Test Order.

-B-

Baseline: Conditions that would have occurred without implementation of the subject measure or project. Baseline conditions are sometimes referred to as “business-as-usual” conditions and are used to calculate program-related efficiency or emissions savings. Baselines can be defined as either project-specific baselines or performance-standard baselines (e.g., building codes). For the purposes of Act 129, baselines are defined in the Pennsylvania TRM, in approved custom protocols, and in TRM interim approved protocols.

Baseline Data: The information representing the systems being upgraded before the energy efficiency activity takes place.

Benefit/Cost Ratio: The mathematical relationship between the benefits and costs associated with the implementation of energy efficiency measures, programs, or practices. The benefits and costs are typically expressed in dollars. This is the ratio of the discounted total benefits of the program to the discounted total costs over the expected useful life of the energy efficiency measure. The explicit formula for use in Pennsylvania is set forth in the TRC Order. Also see *Benefit-Cost Test*.

Benefit-Cost Test: Also called *Cost-Effectiveness Test*, defined as the methodology used to compare the benefits of an investment to the costs. For programs evaluated under Act 129, the TRC Test is the required benefit-cost test as established in the TRC Order.

Bias: The extent to which a measurement, sampling, or analytic method systematically underestimates or overestimates a value. Some examples of types of bias include engineering model bias; meter bias; sensor bias; an inadequate or inappropriate estimate of what would have happened absent a program or measure installation; a sample that is unrepresentative of a population; and selection of other variables in an analysis that are too correlated with the savings variable (or each other) in explaining the dependent variable (such as consumption).

-C-

Coefficient of Variation: The mean (average) of a sample divided by its standard error.

Coincident Demand: The demand of a device, circuit, or building that occurs at the same time as the system peak demand. For purposes of Act 129 reporting, the coincident demand is during the peak period as defined in the TRM (June through August, excluding weekends and holidays between 2 and 6 PM).

Coincidence Factor: The ratio, expressed as a numerical value or as a percentage of connected load, of the coincident demand of an electrical appliance or facility type to the system peak.

Completed Project: A project in which the energy conservation measure has been installed and is commercially operable, and for which an incentive has been provided.

Confidence: An indication of the probability that an estimate is within a specified range of the true value of the quantity in question. Confidence is the likelihood that the evaluation has captured the true value of a variable within a certain estimated range. Also see *Precision*.

Correlation: For a set of observations, such as for participants in an energy efficiency program, the extent to which values for one variable are associated with values of another variable for the same participant. For example, facility size and energy consumption usually have a high positive correlation.

Cost-Benefit and Cost-Effectiveness Analysis: See *Benefit-Cost Test*.

Cost-Effectiveness: An indicator of the relative performance or economic attractiveness of an investment or practice. In the energy efficiency field, the present value of the estimated benefits produced by an energy efficiency program is compared to the estimated total costs to determine if the proposed investment or measure is desirable from a variety of perspectives (e.g., whether the estimated benefits exceed the estimated costs consistent with definitions in the TRC Order. See *Benefit-Cost Test*.

Cost-Effectiveness Test: See *Benefit-Cost Test*.

Cumulative Energy Savings: The summation of energy savings associated with multiple projects or programs over a specified period of time.

Custom Program: An energy efficiency program intended to provide efficiency solutions to unique situations not amenable to common or prescriptive solutions addressed by the Pennsylvania TRM. Each custom project is examined for its individual characteristics, savings opportunities, efficiency solutions, and often, customer incentives. Under Act 129, these programs fall outside of the jurisdiction of the Pennsylvania TRM, and thus the M&V protocols for each should be approved by the SWE.

-D-

Deemed Savings: An estimate of energy or demand savings for a single unit of an installed energy efficiency measure that: (1) has been developed from data sources and analytical methods that are widely considered acceptable for the measure and purpose, and (2) is applicable to the situation being evaluated. Individual parameters or calculation methods can also be deemed. Deemed savings for measures implemented under Act 129 are stipulated in the Pennsylvania TRM, which undergoes an annual review and update process, as well as in the Interim TRM Measures, which are subject to interim approval by the SWE.

Defensibility: The ability of evaluation results to stand up to scientific scrutiny. Defensibility is based on assessments by experts of the evaluation's validity, reliability, and accuracy. Under Act 129, it is the role of the SWE to determine the defensibility of the verified savings estimates reported by each of the EDCs.

Delta Watts: The difference in the connected load (wattage) between existing or baseline equipment and the energy-efficient replacement equipment, expressed in Watts or kilowatts.

Demand: The rate of energy flow. Demand usually refers to the amount of electric energy used by a customer or piece of equipment over a defined time interval (e.g., 15 minutes), expressed in kW (equals kWh/h). Demand can also refer to natural gas usage over a defined time interval, usually as Btu/hr, kBtu/hr, therms/day, or ccf/day.

Demand Reduction: See *Demand Savings*.

Demand Response: The reduction of customer energy usage at times of peak usage in order to help system reliability, to reflect market conditions and pricing, or to support infrastructure optimization or deferral of additional infrastructure. Demand response programs may include contractually obligated or voluntary curtailment, direct load control, and pricing strategies.

Demand Savings: The reduction in electric demand from the demand associated with a baseline system to the demand associated with the higher-efficiency equipment or installation. Demand savings associated with energy efficiency measures implemented under Act 129 are calculated according to the approved calculation methods stipulated in the TRM or subsequently approved through alternative methods (e.g., interim measures, custom protocols).

Demand-side Management: Strategies used to manage energy demand including energy efficiency, load management, fuel substitution, and load shedding.

-E-

Energy Efficiency and Conservation (EE&C) Plan: Plan as filed by the EDC and approved by the PUC.

EE&C Plan Estimate for Program Year: An estimate of the energy savings or demand reduction for the current program year as filed in the EDC EE&C plans.

Effective Useful Life: An estimate of the median number of years that efficiency measures installed under a program are still in place and operable. For measures implemented under Act 129, it is required that the effective useful life or 15 years, whichever is less, be used to determine measure assessments.

Electric Distribution Company (EDC): In reference to Act 129, there are seven EDCs with at least 100,000 customers that are required to adopt a plan to reduce energy and demand consumption within their service territory in accordance with 66 Pa. C.S. § 2608. The seven EDCs are: Duquesne Light, Pennsylvania Electric Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company, Pennsylvania Power Company, PECO Energy Company, PPL Electric Utilities and West Penn Power.

End Use: An appliance, activity, system, or equipment that uses energy.

Energy Conservation: Using less of a service in order to save energy. The term often is used unintentionally instead of *energy efficiency*.

Energy Efficiency: The use of less energy to provide the same or an improved level of service to the energy consumer; or the use of less energy to perform the same function.

Energy Efficiency Measure: An installed piece of equipment or a system, modification of equipment systems, or modified operations in customer facilities that reduce the total amount of electrical or gas energy and the capacity that otherwise would have been needed to deliver an equivalent or improved level of comfort or energy service.

Energy Savings: A reduction in electricity use (kWh) or in fossil fuel use in thermal unit(s).

Evaluation: The conduct of any of a wide range of assessment studies and other activities aimed at documenting an enhanced understanding of a program or portfolio, including determining the effects of a program, understanding or documenting program performance, program-related markets and market operations, program-induced changes in energy efficiency markets, levels of potential demand or energy savings, and/or program cost-effectiveness. Market assessments, monitoring and evaluation, and M&V are aspects of evaluation.

Ex-ante Savings Estimate: Forecasted savings used for program and portfolio planning purposes.

Ex-post Savings Estimate: Savings estimate reported by an evaluator after the energy impact evaluation has been completed.

-F-

Free Driver: A program nonparticipant who adopted a particular efficiency measure or practice as a result of the evaluated program. Also see *Spillover*.

Free-Rider: A program participant who would have implemented the program measure or practice in the absence of the program. Free-riders can be: (1) total, in which the participant's activity would have completely replicated the program measure; (2) partial, in which the participant's activity would have partially replicated the program measure; or (3) deferred, in which the participant's activity would have completely replicated the program measure, but after the program's timeframe.

Free-Ridership Rate: The percent of savings attributable to free-riders.

-G-

Gross Impact: See *Gross Savings*.

Gross Savings: The change in energy consumption and/or demand that results directly from program-related actions taken by participants in an efficiency program, regardless of why they participated.

Gross kW: Expected demand reduction based on a comparison of standard or replaced equipment with equipment installed through an energy efficiency program.

Gross kWh: Expected kWh reduction based on a comparison of standard or replaced equipment with equipment installed through an energy efficiency program.

-H, I-

Impact Evaluation: An evaluation of the program-specific, directly induced quantitative changes (kWh, kW, and therms) attributable to an energy efficiency program.

Incremental Cost: The difference between the cost of an existing or baseline equipment or service and the cost of an alternative energy efficient equipment or service.

Incremental Energy Savings: The difference between the amount of energy savings associated with a project or a program in one period and the amount of energy savings associated with that project or program in a prior period.

-J, K-

Kilowatt (kW): A measure of the rate of power used during a pre-set time period (e.g., minutes, hours, days, months) equal to 1,000 Watts.

Kilowatt-Hour (kWh): A common unit of electric energy; one kilowatt-hour is numerically equal to 1,000 Watts used for one hour.

-L-

Lifetime kW: The expected demand savings over the lifetime of an installed measure, equal to the annual peak kW reduction associated with a measure multiplied by the expected lifetime of that measure. It is expressed in units of kW-years.

Lifetime MWh: The expected electrical energy savings over the lifetime of an installed measure, calculated by multiplying the annual MWh reduction associated with a measure by the expected lifetime of that measure.

Lifetime Supply Costs: The net present value of avoided supply costs associated with savings, net of changes in energy use that would have happened in the absence of the program over the life of the energy efficiency measure, factoring in persistence of savings. See *Avoided Cost*.

Load Factor: A percentage indicating the ratio of electricity or natural gas used during a given timeframe to the amount that would have been used if the usage had stayed at the highest demand the whole time. The term is also used to indicate the percentage of capacity of an energy facility, such as a power plant or gas pipeline, that is utilized for a given period of time.

Load Management: Steps taken to reduce power demand at peak load times or to shift some of it to off-peak times. Load management may coincide with peak hours, peak days, or peak seasons. Load management may be pursued by persuading consumers to modify behavior or by using equipment that regulates some electric consumption. This may lead to complete elimination of electric use during the period of interest (load shedding) and/or to an increase in electric demand in the off-peak hours as a result of shifting electric usage to that period (load shifting).

-M-

Market Assessment: An analysis that provides an assessment of how and how well a specific market or market segment is functioning with respect to the definition of well-functioning markets or with respect to other specific policy objectives. Generally includes a characterization or description of the specific market or market segments, including a description of the types and number of buyers and sellers in the market, the key factors that influence the market, the type and number of transactions that occur on an annual basis, and the extent to which market participants consider energy efficiency as an important part of these transactions. This analysis may also include an assessment of whether a market has been sufficiently transformed to justify a reduction or elimination of specific program interventions. Market assessments can be blended with strategic planning analysis to produce recommended program designs or budgets. One particular kind of market assessment effort is a baseline study, or the characterization of a market before the commencement of a specific intervention in the market, for the purpose of guiding the intervention and/or assessing its effectiveness later.

Measurement and Verification (M&V): A subset of program impact evaluations that are associated with the documentation of energy savings at individual sites or projects using one or more methods that can involve measurements, engineering calculations, statistical analyses, and/or computer simulation modeling.

Measurement Error: In the evaluation context, a reflection of the extent to which the observations conducted in the study deviate from the true value of the variable being observed. The error can be random (equal around the mean) or systematic (indicating bias).

Megawatt (MW): A unit for measuring electricity equal to 1,000 kilowatts or one million Watts.

Megawatt-Hour (MWh): A unit of electric energy numerically equal to 1,000,000 Watts used for one hour.

Metered Data: Data collected over time through a meter for a specific end use, energy-using system (e.g., lighting, HVAC), or location (e.g., floors of a building, a whole premise). Metered data may be collected over a variety of time intervals. Usually refers to electricity or gas data.

Metering: The collection of energy consumption data over time through the use of meters. These meters may collect information about an end use, a circuit, a piece of equipment, or a whole building (or facility). *Short-term metering* generally refers to data collection for no more than a few weeks. *End-use metering* refers specifically to separate data collection for one or more end uses in a facility, such as lighting, air conditioning, or refrigeration. *Spot metering* is an instantaneous measurement (rather than over time) to determine equipment size or power draw.

Monitoring: The collection of relevant measurement data over time at a facility, including but not limited to energy consumption or emissions data (e.g., energy and water consumption, temperature, humidity, volume of emissions, and hours of operation) for the purpose of conducting a savings analysis or to evaluate equipment or system performance.

-N-

Net Impact: See *Net Savings*.

Net Present Value: The discounted value of the net benefits or costs over a specified period of time (e.g., the expected useful life of the energy efficiency measure).

Net Savings: The total change in load that is attributable to an energy efficiency program. This change in load may include, implicitly or explicitly, the effects of spillover, free-riders, energy efficiency standards, changes in the level of energy service, and other causes of changes in energy consumption or demand. Net savings are calculated by multiplying verified savings by a NTG ratio.

Net-to-Gross (NTG): A factor representing net program savings divided by gross program savings that is applied to gross program impacts to convert them into net program load impacts.

Nonparticipant: Any consumer who was eligible but did not participate in the subject efficiency program in a given program year.

-O-

Off-Peak Energy kWh Savings: The kWh reduction that occurs during a specified period of off-peak hours for energy savings (see the PA TRM Table 1-1).

On-Peak Energy kWh Savings: The kWh reduction that occurs during a specified period of on-peak hours for energy savings (see the PA TRM Table 1-1).

-P-

Participant: A utility customer partaking in an energy efficiency program, defined as one transaction or one rebate payment in a program. For example, a customer receiving one payment for two measures within one program counts as one participant. A customer receiving two payments in two programs counts as two participants. A customer partaking in one program at two different times receiving two separate payments counts as two participants.

Participant Costs: Costs incurred by a customer participating in an energy efficiency program.

Peak Demand: The maximum level of metered demand during a specified period, such as a billing month or a peak demand period.

Peak Load: The highest electrical demand within a particular period of time. Daily electric peaks on weekdays typically occur in the late afternoon and early evening. Annual peaks typically occur on hot summer days.

Percent of Estimate Committed: The program year-to-date total committed savings as a percent of the savings targets established in each EDC EE&C Plan, calculated by dividing the PYTD total committed by the EE&C Plan program year estimate.

Portfolio: Can be defined as: (1) a collection of programs addressing the same market (e.g., a portfolio of residential programs), technology (e.g., motor efficiency programs), or mechanisms (e.g., loan programs); or (2) the set of all programs conducted by one or more organizations, such as a utility or program administrator, and which could include programs that cover multiple markets, technologies, etc.

Precision: An indication of the closeness of agreement among repeated measurements of the same physical quantity. It is also used to represent the degree to which an estimated result in social science (e.g., energy savings) would be replicated with repeated studies.

Preliminary Program Year-to-Date (PYTD) Net Impact: Net impacts reported in quarterly reports. These net impacts are preliminary in that they are based on preliminary realization rates.

Preliminary Program Year-to-Date (PYTD) Verified Impact: Verified impacts reported in quarterly reports. These verified impacts are preliminary in that they are based on preliminary realization rates.

Preliminary Realization Rate: Realization rates reported in quarterly reports based on the results of M&V activities conducted on the sample to date. These results are preliminary because the sample-to-date is likely not to have met the required levels of confidence and precision.

Prescriptive Program: An energy efficiency program focused on measures that are one-for-one replacements of the existing equipment and for which anticipated similar savings results across participants.

Process Evaluation: A systematic assessment of an energy efficiency program for the purposes of documenting program operations at the time of the examination and identifying and recommending improvements to increase the program's efficiency or effectiveness for acquiring energy resources, while maintaining high levels of participant satisfaction.

Program Administrator: Those entities that oversee the implementation of energy efficiency programs. This generally includes regulated utilities, other organizations chosen to implement such programs, and state energy offices.

Program Year Energy Savings Target: Energy target established for the given program year as approved in each EDC EE&C Plan.

Program Year Sample Participant Target: Estimated sample size for evaluation activities in the given program year.

Program Incentive: An incentive, generally monetary, that is offered to a customer through an energy efficiency program to encourage their participation. The incentive is intended to overcome one or more barriers that keep the customer from taking the energy efficiency action on their own.

Program Participant: A consumer that received a service offered through an efficiency program in a given program year. The term “service” can refer to one or more of a wide variety of services, including financial rebates, technical assistance, product installations, training, energy efficiency information, or other services, items, or conditions.

Program Year-to-Date (PYTD): Beginning June 1 of the current program year through the end of the current quarter (February 28/29, May 31, August 31, or November 30).

Program Year-to-Date (PYTD) Net Impact: The total change in load that is attributable to an energy efficiency program from June 1 of the current program year through the end of the current quarter (February 28/29, May 31, August 31, or November 30).

Program Year-to-Date (PYTD) Participants: The number of utility customers participating in an energy efficiency program beginning June 1 of the current program year through the end of the current quarter (February 28/29, May 31, August 31, or November 30).

Program Year-to-Date (PYTD) Reported Gross Impact: The change in energy consumption and/or demand that results directly from program-related actions taken by participants in an efficiency program, regardless of why they participated, beginning June 1 of the current program year through the end of the current quarter (February 28/29, May 31, August 31, or November 30). This value is unverified by an independent third-party evaluator.

Program Year-to-Date (PYTD) Sample Participants: Total participant sample beginning June 1 of the current program year through the end of the current quarter (February 28/29, May 31, August 31, or November 30).

Program Year-to-Date (PYTD) Total Committed: The estimated gross impacts, including reported impacts and in-progress impacts, beginning June 1 of the current program year through the end of the current quarter (February 28/29, May 31, August 31, or November 30), calculated by adding PYTD reported gross impacts for projects in progress.

Project: An activity or course of action involving one or multiple energy efficiency measures at a single facility or site.

Projects in Progress: Energy efficiency and demand response projects currently being processed and tracked by the EDC, but that are not yet complete at the time of the report. See *Completed Project*.

-Q,R-

Realization Rate: The term is used in several contexts in the development of reported program savings. The primary applications include the ratio of project tracking system savings data (e.g., initial estimates of project savings) to savings that: 1) are adjusted for data errors, and 2) incorporate the evaluated or verified results of the tracked savings.

Rebate Program: An energy efficiency program in which the program administrator offers a financial incentive for the installation of energy-efficient equipment.

Rebound Effect: Also called “snap back,” defined as a change in energy-using behavior that yields an increased level of service that is accompanied by an increase in energy use and occurs as a result of taking an energy efficiency action. The result of this effect is that the savings associated with the direct energy efficiency action are reduced by the resulting behavioral change.

Regression Analysis: Analysis of the relationship between a *dependent variable* (response variable) to specified *independent variables* (explanatory variables). The mathematical model of their relationship is the *regression equation*.

Regression Model: A mathematical model based on statistical analysis where the dependent variable is quantified based on its relationship to the independent variables that are believed to determine its value. In so doing, the relationship between the variables is estimated statistically from the data used.

Reliability: The quality of a measurement process that would produce similar results on: (1) repeated observations of the same condition or event, or (2) multiple observations of the same condition or event by different observers.

Renewable Energy: Energy derived from resources that are naturally replenishing. They are virtually inexhaustible in duration but limited in the amount of energy that is available per unit of time. Renewable energy resources include biomass, hydro, geothermal, solar, wind, ocean thermal, wave action, and tidal action.

Reported Gross Impact: The change in energy consumption and/or demand that results directly from program-related actions taken by participants in an efficiency program, regardless of why they participated. This value is unverified by an independent third-party evaluator. Also referred to as “ex-post” impact.

Reporting Period: The time following implementation of an energy efficiency activity during which results are to be determined.

Representative Sample: A sample that has approximately the same distribution of characteristics as the population from which it was drawn.

Rigor: The level of effort expended to minimize uncertainty due to factors such as sampling error and bias. The higher the level of rigor, the more confidence there is that the results of the evaluation are accurate and precise.

-S-

Sample: In program evaluation, a portion of the population selected to represent the whole. Differing evaluation approaches rely on simple or stratified samples (based on some characteristic of the population).

Sample Design: The approach used to select the sample units.

Sampling Error: The error in estimating a parameter caused by the fact that all of the disturbances in the sample are not zero.

Savings Factor (SVG): The percent of time the lights are off due to lighting controls relative to the baseline controls system (typically a manual switch). Also referred to as the *lighting controls savings factor*.

Simple Random Sample: A method for drawing a sample from a population such that all samples of a given size have an equal probability of being drawn.

Snap Back: See *Rebound Effect*.

Simulation Model: An assembly of algorithms that calculate energy use based on engineering equations and user-defined parameters.

Spillover: Reductions in energy consumption and/or demand caused by the presence of an energy efficiency program, beyond the program-related gross savings of the participants and without financial or technical assistance from the program. There can be participant and/or nonparticipant spillover. *Participant spillover* is the additional energy savings that occur when a program participant independently installs energy efficiency measures or applies energy-saving practices after having participated in the efficiency program as a result of the program's influence. *Nonparticipant spillover* refers to energy savings that occur when a program nonparticipant installs energy efficiency measures or applies energy-saving practices as a result of a program's influence.

Spillover Rate: An estimate of energy savings attributable to spillover effects expressed as a percent of savings installed by participants through an energy efficiency program.

Standard Error: A measure of the variability in a data sample indicating how far a typical data point is from the mean of a sample. In a large sample, approximately two-thirds of observations lie within one standard error of the mean, and 95% of observations lie within two standard errors.

Statistically Adjusted Engineering Models: A category of statistical analysis models that incorporate the engineering estimate of savings as a dependent variable. The regression coefficient in these models is the percentage of the engineering estimate of savings observed in changes in energy usage. For example, if the coefficient of the statistically adjusted engineering term is 0.8, the customers are, on average, realizing 80% of the savings from their engineering estimates.

Stipulated Values: See *Deemed Savings*.

Stratified Random Sampling: The population is divided into subpopulations, called *strata*, that are non-overlapping and together comprise the entire population. A simple random sample of each stratum is taken to create a sample based on stratified random sampling.

Stratified Ratio Estimation: A sampling method that combines a stratified sample design with a ratio estimator to reduce the coefficient of variation by using the correlation of a known measure for the unit (e.g., expected energy savings) to stratify the population and allocate a sample from the strata for optimal sampling.

-T-

Takeback Effect: See *Rebound Effect*.

Total Resource Cost (TRC) Test: A cost-effectiveness test that measures the net direct economic impact to the utility service territory, state, or region. The TRC Order details the method and assumptions to be used when calculating the TRC Test for EE&C portfolios implemented under Act 129. The results of the TRC Test are to be expressed as both a net present value and a benefit-cost ratio.

Total Resource Cost (TRC) Test Benefits: Benefits calculated in the TRC Test that include the avoided supply costs, such as the reduction in transmission, distribution, generation, and capacity costs, valued at a marginal cost for the periods when there is a consumption reduction. The PA TRC benefits will consider avoided supply costs, such as the reduction in forecasted zonal wholesale electric generation prices, ancillary services, losses, generation capacity, transmission capacity, and distribution capacity. The avoided supply costs will be calculated using net program savings, defined as the savings net of changes in energy use that would have happened in the absence of the program. The persistence of savings over time will also be considered in the net savings.

Total Resource Cost (TRC) Test Costs: The costs calculated in the TRC Test will include the costs of the various programs paid for by an EDC (or by a default service provider) and the participating

customers, and costs that reflect any net change in supply costs for the periods in which consumption is increased in the event of load shifting. Note that the TRC Test should use the incremental costs of services and equipment. Thus, for example, this would include costs for equipment, installation, operation and maintenance, removal (less salvage value), and administrative tasks, regardless of who pays for them.

-U-

Uncertainty: The range or interval of doubt surrounding a measured or calculated value within which the true value is expected to fall with some degree of confidence.

Upstream Program: A program that provides information and/or financial assistance to entities in the delivery chain of high-efficiency products at the retail, wholesale, or manufacturing level. Such a program is intended to yield lower retail prices for the products.

-V-

Verification: An independent assessment of the reliability (considering completeness and accuracy) of claimed energy savings or an emissions source inventory.

Verified Gross Impact: Calculated by applying the realization rate to reported gross impacts. Also referred to as “ex-ante” impact.

-W-

Watt: A unit of measure of electric power at a point in time as capacity or demand. One Watt of power maintained over time is equal to one Joule per second. The Watt is named after Scottish inventor James Watt, and is shortened to W and used with other abbreviations, as in kWh (kilowatt-hours).

Watt-Hour: One Watt of power expended for one hour, or one-thousandth of a kilowatt-hour.

Whole-Building Calibrated Simulation Approach: A savings measurement approach (defined in the International Performance Measurement and Verification Protocol Option D and in the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers Guideline 14) that involves the use of an approved computer simulation program to develop a physical model of the building in order to determine energy and demand savings. The simulation program is used to model the energy used by the facility before and after the retrofit. The pre- or post-retrofit models are developed by calibration with measured energy use, demand data, and weather data.

Whole-building Metered Approach: A savings measurement approach (defined in the International Performance Measurement and Verification Protocol Option C and in the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers Guideline 14) that determines energy and demand savings through the use of whole-facility energy (end-use) data, which may be measured by utility meters or data loggers. This approach may involve the use of monthly utility billing data or data gathered more frequently from a main meter.

References

PAH Associations, prepared by Paul Horowitz. Facilitated by the Northeast Energy Efficiency Partnerships. Glossary of Terms Version 1.0. A project of the Regional Evaluation, Measurement and Verification Forum. March 2009.