

Kimberly A. Klock
Senior Counsel

PPL
Two North Ninth Street
Allentown, PA 18101-1179
Tel. 610.774.5696 Fax 610.774.4102
KKlock@pplweb.com



January 16, 2018

FEDERAL EXPRESS

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

RECEIVED

JAN 16 2018

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

**Re: Semi-Annual Report for the Period June 1, 2017
through May 31, 2018, Program Year Nine (9) of
PPL Electric Utilities Corporation's Act 129 Plan
Docket No. M-2015-2515642**

Dear Ms. Chiavetta:

Enclosed on behalf of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation ("PPL Electric") is the Semi-Annual Report for Program Year Nine (9) of PPL Electric's Act 129 Plan.

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 1.11, the enclosed document is to be deemed filed on January 16, 2018, which is the date it was deposited with an overnight express delivery service as shown on the delivery receipt attached to the mailing envelope.

In addition, please date and time-stamp the enclosed extra copy of this letter and return it to me in the envelope provided.

Respectfully submitted,

Kimberly A. Klock

Enclosure

cc: Greg Clendenning (GDS Associates, Inc. Act 129 Statewide Evaluator)
Salil Gogte

Semi-Annual Report to the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission

Phase III of Act 129

Program Year 9

(June 1, 2017 – May 31, 2018)

For Pennsylvania Act 129 of 2008

Energy Efficiency and Conservation Plan

Prepared by Cadmus

For

PPL Electric Utilities

January 15, 2018

Table of Contents

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2	SUMMARY OF ACHIEVEMENTS	2
2.1	CARRYOVER SAVINGS FROM PHASE II OF ACT 129.....	2
2.2	PHASE III ENERGY EFFICIENCY ACHIEVEMENTS TO DATE	3
2.3	PHASE III DEMAND RESPONSE ACHIEVEMENTS TO DATE.....	6
2.4	PHASE III PERFORMANCE BY CUSTOMER SEGMENT	8
3	UPDATES AND FINDINGS.....	9
3.1	IMPLEMENTATION UPDATES AND FINDINGS.....	9
3.2	EVALUATION UPDATES AND FINDINGS.....	10
4	SUMMARY OF PARTICIPATION BY PROGRAM	13
5	SUMMARY OF ENERGY IMPACTS BY PROGRAM	15
6	SUMMARY OF DEMAND IMPACTS BY PROGRAM.....	17
6.1	ENERGY EFFICIENCY	17
6.2	DEMAND RESPONSE	19
7	SUMMARY OF FINANCES.....	20
7.1	PROGRAM FINANCIALS.....	20
7.2	COST RECOVERY	21

Figures

FIGURE 1: CARRYOVER SAVINGS FROM PHASE II OF ACT 129	2
FIGURE 2: EE&C PLAN PERFORMANCE TOWARD PHASE III PORTFOLIO COMPLIANCE TARGET	4
FIGURE 3: EE&C PLAN PERFORMANCE TOWARD PHASE III LOW-INCOME COMPLIANCE TARGET	5
FIGURE 4: EE&C PLAN PERFORMANCE AGAINST PHASE III GNE COMPLIANCE TARGET	6
FIGURE 5: EVENT PERFORMANCE COMPARED TO 85% PER-EVENT TARGET	7
FIGURE 6: PYTD REPORTED GROSS ENERGY SAVINGS BY PROGRAM	15
FIGURE 7: PSA ENERGY SAVINGS BY PROGRAM FOR PHASE III	15
FIGURE 8: PYRTD GROSS DEMAND SAVINGS BY ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAM	17
FIGURE 9: PSA DEMAND SAVINGS BY ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAM FOR PHASE III	18

Tables

TABLE 1: P3TD SAVINGS CALCULATION EXAMPLE	v
TABLE 2: PY9 DEMAND RESPONSE PYVTD PERFORMANCE BY EVENT	7
TABLE 3: PY9 SUMMARY STATISTICS BY CUSTOMER SEGMENT	8
TABLE 4: PHASE III SUMMARY STATISTICS BY CUSTOMER SEGMENT	8
TABLE 5: EE&C PLAN PARTICIPATION BY PROGRAM	13
TABLE 6: EFFICIENT LIGHTING PARTICIPANT ESTIMATES	14
TABLE 7: ENERGY SAVINGS BY PROGRAM (MWh/YEAR)	16
TABLE 8: PEAK DEMAND SAVINGS BY ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAM (MW/YEAR)	18
TABLE 9: VERIFIED GROSS DEMAND RESPONSE IMPACTS BY PROGRAM	19
TABLE 10: PROGRAM YEAR TO DATE FINANCIALS	20
TABLE 11: PHASE III TO DATE FINANCIALS	21
TABLE 12: EE&C PLAN EXPENDITURES BY COST-RECOVERY CATEGORY (\$1,000)	22

Acronyms

BDR	Behavioral Demand Response
C&I	Commercial and Industrial
CFL	Compact Fluorescent Lamp
CSP	Conservation Service Provider or Curtailment Service Provider
DLC	Direct Load Control
DR	Demand Response
EDC	Electric Distribution Company
EDT	Eastern Daylight Time
EE&C	Energy Efficiency and Conservation
EM&V	Evaluation, Measurement, and Verification
EUL	Effective Useful Life
GNE	Government, Non-Profit, Education
HVAC	Heating, Ventilating, and Air Conditioning
ICSP	Implementation Conservation Service Provider
kW	Kilowatt
kWh	Kilowatt-hour
LED	Light-Emitting Diode
LIURP	Low-Income Usage Reduction Program
M&V	Measurement and Verification
MW	Megawatt
MWh	Megawatt-hour
NTG	Net-to-Gross
P3TD	Phase III to Date
PA PUC	Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
PSA	Phase III to Date Preliminary Savings Achieved; equal to VTD + PYTD
PSA+CO	PSA savings plus Carryover from Phase II
PY	Program Year: e.g. PY8, from June 1, 2016, to May 31, 2017
PYRTD	Program Year Reported to Date
PYVTD	Program Year Verified to Date
RTD	Phase III to Date Reported Gross Savings
SWE	Statewide Evaluator
TRC	Total Resource Cost
TRM	Technical Reference Manual
VTD	Phase III to Date Verified Gross Savings

Types of Savings

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

Net Savings: The total change in energy consumption and/or peak demand that is attributable to an EE&C program. Depending on the program delivery model and evaluation methodology, the net savings estimates may differ from the gross savings estimate due to adjustments for the effects of free riders, changes in codes and standards, market effects, participant and nonparticipant spillover, and other causes of changes in energy consumption or demand not directly attributable to the EE&C program.

Reported Gross: Also referred to as *ex ante* (Latin for “beforehand”) savings. The energy and peak demand savings values calculated by the EDC or its program Implementation Conservation Service Providers (ICSP), and stored in the program tracking system.

Verified Gross: Also referred to as *ex post* (Latin for “from something done afterward”) gross savings. The energy and peak demand savings estimates reported by the independent evaluation contractor after the gross impact evaluation and associated M&V efforts have been completed.

Verified Net: Also referred to as *ex post* net savings. The energy and peak demand savings estimates reported by the independent evaluation contractor after application of the results of the net impact evaluation. Typically calculated by multiplying the verified gross savings by a net-to-gross (NTG) ratio.

Annual Savings: Energy and demand savings expressed on an annual basis, or the amount of energy and/or peak demand an EE&C measure or program can be expected to save over the course of a typical year. Annualized savings are noted as MWh/year or MW/year. The Pennsylvania TRM provides algorithms and assumptions to calculate annual savings, and Act 129 compliance targets for consumption reduction are based on the sum of the annual savings estimates of installed measures.

Lifetime Savings: Energy and demand savings expressed in terms of the total expected savings over the useful life of the measure. Typically calculated by multiplying the annual savings of a measure by its effective useful life. The TRC Test uses savings from the full lifetime of a measure to calculate the cost-effectiveness of EE&C programs.

Program Year Reported to Date (PYRTD): The reported gross energy and peak demand savings achieved by an EE&C program or portfolio within the current program year. PYTD values for energy efficiency will always be reported gross savings in a semi-annual or preliminary annual report.

Program Year Verified to Date (PYVTD): The verified gross energy and peak demand savings achieved by an EE&C program or portfolio within the current program year.

Phase III to Date (P3TD): The energy and peak demand savings achieved by an EE&C program or portfolio within Phase III of Act 129. Reported in several permutations described below.

Phase III to Date Reported (RTD): The sum of the reported gross savings recorded to date in Phase III of Act 129 for an EE&C program or portfolio.

Phase III to Date Verified (VTD): The sum of the verified gross savings recorded to date in Phase III of Act 129 for an EE&C program or portfolio, as determined by the impact evaluation finding of the independent evaluation contractor.

Phase III to Date Preliminary Savings Achieved (PSA): The sum of the verified gross savings (VTD) from previous program years in Phase III where the impact evaluation is complete plus the reported gross savings from the current program year (PYTD). For PY8, the PSA savings will always equal the PYTD savings because PY8 is the first program year of the phase (no savings will be verified until the PY8 final annual report).

Phase III to Date Preliminary Savings Achieved + Carryover (PSA+CO): The sum of the verified gross savings from previous program years in Phase III plus the reported gross savings from the current program year plus any verified gross carryover savings from Phase II of Act 129. This is the best estimate of an EDC's progress toward the Phase III compliance targets.

Table 1 lists savings values for a hypothetical EDC as of the PY10 semi-annual report, when the first six months of PY10 reported savings are available. The calculations below are then used to illustrate the differences between various savings values.

Table 1: P3TD Savings Calculation Example

Program Period	Reported Gross (MWh/year)	Verified Gross (MWh/year)
Phase II (Carryover)	N/A	400
PY8	800	700
PY9	900	850
PY10 (Q1+Q2)	500	N/A

$$\text{PYRTD (PY10)} = 500 \text{ MWh/year}$$

$$\text{RTD} = 800 + 900 + 500 = 2,200 \text{ MWh/year}$$

$$\text{VTD} = 700 + 850 = 1,550 \text{ MWh / year}$$

$$\text{PSA} = 1,550 + 500 = 2,050 \text{ MWh/year}$$

$$\text{PSA} + \text{CO} = 2,050 + 400 = 2,450 \text{ MWh/year}$$

1 Introduction

Pennsylvania Act 129 of 2008, 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). Phase II of Act 129 began in 2013 and concluded in 2016. In late 2015, each EDC filed a new energy efficiency and conservation (EE&C) plan with the PA PUC detailing the proposed design of its portfolio for Phase III. These plans were updated based on stakeholder input and subsequently approved by the PUC in 2016.

Implementation of Phase III of the Act 129 programs began on June 1, 2016. This report documents the progress and effectiveness of the Phase III EE&C accomplishments for PPL Electric Utilities in Program Year 9 (PY9), as well as the cumulative accomplishments of the Phase III programs since inception. This report additionally documents the energy savings carried over from Phase II. The Phase II carryover savings count towards EDC savings compliance targets for Phase III.

This report details the participation, spending, and reported gross impacts of the energy efficiency programs in PY9. Compliance with Act 129 savings goals are ultimately based on verified gross savings. PPL Electric Utilities has retained Cadmus as an independent evaluation contractor for Phase III of Act 129. Cadmus is responsible for the measurement and verification of the savings and calculation of verified gross savings. The verified gross savings for PY9 energy efficiency programs will be reported in the final annual report, to be filed on November 15, 2018.

Phase III of Act 129 includes a demand response goal for PPL Electric Utilities. Demand response events are limited to the months of June through September, which are the first four months of the Act 129 program year. Because the demand response season is completed early in the program year, it is possible to complete the independent evaluation of verified gross savings for demand response sooner than is possible for energy efficiency programs. Section 6.2 of this report includes the verified gross demand response impacts for PY9 as well as the cumulative demand response performance of this EE&C program to date for Phase III of Act 129.

2 Summary of Achievements

2.1 CARRYOVER SAVINGS FROM PHASE II OF ACT 129

PPL Electric Utilities does not have carryover savings from Phase II. Figure 1 compares PPL Electric Utilities' Phase II verified gross savings total to the Phase II compliance target to illustrate the carryover calculation.

Figure 1: Carryover Savings from Phase II of Act 129



The Commission's Phase III Implementation Order¹ also allowed EDCs to carry over savings in excess of the overall (portfolio) Phase II savings compliance target, in excess of the Phase II GNE savings compliance target and in excess of the Phase II low-income savings compliance target.² PPL Electric Utilities did not have carry over savings for the portfolio but did exceed its Phase II compliance targets for GNE and low-income. However, in the August 3, 2017,

¹ Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, *Energy Efficiency and Conservation Program Implementation Order*, at Docket No. M-2014-2424864, (*Phase III Implementation Order*), entered June 11, 2015.

² Proportionate to those savings achieved by dedicated low-income programs in Phase III.

Compliance Order,³ the PA PUC determined that because PPL Electric Utilities did not obtain Phase II savings in excess of its Phase II consumption reduction requirement, PPL Electric Utilities was not entitled to any GNE or low-income sector carryover savings into Phase III.

2.2 PHASE III ENERGY EFFICIENCY ACHIEVEMENTS TO DATE

Since the beginning of Program Year 9 on June 1, 2017, PPL Electric Utilities has claimed:

- 167,420 MWh/yr of reported gross electric energy savings (PYRTD)
- 23.43 MW/yr of reported gross peak demand savings (PYRTD) from energy efficient programs
- 115.64 MW/yr of reported gross peak demand savings (PYRTD) from demand response programs

Since the beginning of Phase III of Act 129 on June 1, 2016, PPL Electric Utilities has achieved:

- 547,449 MWh/yr of reported gross electric energy savings (RTD)
- 124.24 MW/yr of reported gross peak demand savings (RTD) from energy efficiency programs
- 115.64 MW/yr of reported gross peak demand savings (RTD) from demand response programs
- 498,764 MWh/yr of gross electric energy savings (PSA). This total includes verified gross savings from previous Phase III program years⁴ and the PYTD reported gross savings from PY9.
 - 27,432 MWh/yr from PY8 remain unverified, thus are not included in PSA.
- 70.24 MW/yr of gross peak demand savings (PSA) from energy efficiency programs
- 126.68 MW/yr of verified gross peak demand savings (PSA) from demand response programs

PPL Electric Utilities has achieved:


- 498,764 MWh/yr of PSA+CO energy savings recorded to date in Phase III⁵
 - This represents 35 percent of the May 31, 2021, energy savings compliance target of 1,443,035 MWh/yr.

³ The Order addresses the EDCs' compliance with the Phase II energy reduction targets and the Petitions for reconsideration of the April 6, 2017, Compliance Order filed by Duquesne, PECO, and PPL Electric Utilities. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission. Act 129 Phase II Final Compliance Order. Docket No. M-2012-2289411. Adopted August 3, 2017. Available online: http://www.puc.pa.gov/filing_resources/issues_laws_regulations/act_129_information/energy_efficiency_and_conservation_e_e_c_program.aspx

⁴ Verified savings from previous program years have been adjusted to account for Home Energy Education Program energy savings uplift (see Appendix C in the PY8 Annual Report). Uplift results in savings counted in more than one program; therefore, an adjustment is made to prevent double counting. Unverified savings from PY8 are not included in PSA.

⁵ Verified savings from previous program years have been adjusted to account for Home Energy Education Program energy savings uplift (see Appendix C in the PY8 Annual Report). Uplift results in savings counted in more than one program; therefore, an adjustment is made to prevent double counting. Unverified savings from PY8 are not included in PSA.


Figure 2: EE&C Plan Performance Toward Phase III Portfolio Compliance Target



The Phase III Implementation Order directed EDCs to offer conservation measures to the low-income customer segment based on the proportion of electric sales attributable to low-income households. The proportionate number of measures target for PPL Electric Utilities is 9.95%. PPL Electric Utilities offers a total of 95 EE&C measures to its residential and non-residential customer classes. There are 21 measures available to the low-income customer segment at no cost to the customer. This represents 22% of the total measures offered in the EE&C plan and exceeds the proportionate number of measures target.


The PA PUC also established a low-income energy savings target of 5.5% of the portfolio savings goal. The low-income savings target for PPL Electric Utilities is 79,367 MWh/yr and is based on verified gross savings. Figure 3 compares the PSA+CO performance to date for the low-income customer segment to the Phase III savings target. Based on the latest available information, PPL Electric Utilities has achieved 28% of the Phase III low-income energy savings target.

Figure 3: EE&C Plan Performance Toward Phase III Low-Income Compliance Target



The Phase III Implementation Order established a government, non-profit, and educational energy savings target of 3.5% of the portfolio savings goal. The GNE savings target for PPL Electric Utilities is 50,507 MWh/yr and is based on verified gross savings. Figure 4 compares the PSA+CO performance to date for the GNE customer segment to the Phase III savings target. Based on the latest available information, PPL Electric Utilities has achieved 100% of the Phase III GNE energy savings target.

Figure 4: EE&C Plan Performance Against Phase III GNE Compliance Target



2.3 PHASE III DEMAND RESPONSE ACHIEVEMENTS TO DATE

The Phase III demand response performance target for PPL Electric Utilities is 92 MW per event hour. Compliance targets for demand response programs are based on average performance across events and were established at the system level, which means the load reductions measured at the customer meter must be escalated to reflect transmission and distribution losses.

Act 129 demand response events are triggered by PJM's day-ahead load forecast. When the day-ahead forecast is above 96% of the peak load forecast for the year, a demand response event is initiated for the following day. In PY9, there were three demand response events called. Table 2 lists the days that DR events were called along with the verified gross demand reductions achieved by each program. Table 2 also lists the average DR performance for PY9 and for Phase III to date. PPL Electric Utilities' average DR performance to date is above the Phase III compliance reduction target by 38%.


Table 2: PY9 Demand Response PYVTD Performance by Event

Event Date	Start Hour	End Hour	Small CI Load Curtailment	Large CI Load Curtailment	GNE Load Curtailment	Portfolio MW/event Impact ^[1]
June 13	14	17	3.0	113.9	3.5	120.3
July 20	14	17	0.2	127.0	4.7	131.8
July 21	14	17	-	123.0	4.9	127.9
PYVTD - Average PY9 DR Event Performance						126.7
VTD - Average Phase III DR Event Performance						126.7

^[1] Portfolio MW/event may not equal sum of customer segment MW/event because of rounding error.

The Commission's Phase III Implementation Order also established a requirement that EDCs achieve at least 85% of the Phase III compliance reduction target in each DR event. For PPL Electric Utilities, this translates to a 78.2 MW minimum for each DR event. Figure 5 compares the performance of each of the DR events in PY9 to the event-specific minimum and average targets.

Figure 5: Event Performance Compared to 85% Per-Event Target



Note: The load impacts reported in this figure are based on Cadmus analysis of participant AMI consumption data and have been grossed up to reflect transmission and distribution losses.

2.4 PHASE III PERFORMANCE BY CUSTOMER SEGMENT

Table 3 presents the participation, savings, and spending by customer sector for PY9. The residential, small C&I, large C&I sectors are defined by EDC tariff and the residential low-income and governmental/educational/non-profit sector were defined by statute (66 Pa. C.S. § 2806.1). The residential low-income segment is a subset of the residential customer class and the GNE segment will include customers who are part of the small C&I or large C&I rate classes. The savings, spending, and participation values for the LI and GNE segments have been removed from the parent sectors in Table 3.

Table 3: PY9 Summary Statistics by Customer Segment

Parameter	Residential ^[1]	Low-Income	Small C&I ^[1]	Large C&I	GNE	Total ^[2]
Number of Participants	156,279	9,770	9,159	259	715	176,182
PYRTD MWh/yr	65,514	10,630	47,255	28,030	15,991	167,420
PYRTD MW/yr (Energy Efficiency)	8.40	0.93	8.23	3.76	2.10	23.43
PYVTD MW/yr (Demand Response) ^[3]	-	-	1.05	121.29	4.34	126.68
Incentives (\$1000)	\$4,892	\$0	\$1,049	\$2,447	\$1,125	\$9,514

^[1] 17,817 of reported MWh/yr from Efficient Lighting are attributed to Small C&I.
^[2] Total may not sum due to rounding.
^[3] Savings are presented as the average of the total demand response savings per event across the June 13, July 20, and July 21 Act 129 events.

Table 4 summarizes plan performance by sector since the beginning of Phase III.

Table 4: Phase III Summary Statistics by Customer Segment

Parameter	Residential ^[1]	Low Income	Small C&I ^[1]	Large C&I	GNE	Total ^[2]
Number of Participants	705,919	24,366	28,004	441	1,263	759,993
PSA MWh/yr ^[3]	239,108	22,284	116,125	75,125	50,517	503,159
PSA MW/yr (Energy Efficiency)	32.06	2.09	19.97	9.48	6.64	70.24
Phase III MW/yr (Demand Response) ^[4]	-	-	1.05	121.29	4.34	126.68
Incentives (\$1000)	\$17,073	\$0	\$5,209	\$6,002	\$3,688	\$31,972

^[1] 50,588 of PSA MWh/yr and from Efficient Lighting are attributed to Small C&I.
^[2] Total may not sum due to rounding.
^[3] The residential verified savings included in PSA MWh/yr have not been adjusted to account for energy savings uplift (double counting) in the Home Energy Education Program
^[4] Savings are presented as the average of the total demand response savings per event across the June 13, July 20, and July 21 Act 129 events.

3 Updates and Findings

3.1 IMPLEMENTATION UPDATES AND FINDINGS

The Pennsylvania Utility Commission approved PPL Electric Utilities' revised EE&C plan on October 26, 2017. This plan combined budgets and savings for the nonresidential custom and efficient equipment programs into a single program.

- **Appliance Recycling:** Customers continue to provide PPL Electric with positive feedback for this program. There were over 7,000 participants in PY9 and over 18,000 participants phase to date who recycled refrigerators, freezers, and room air conditioners. Dehumidifiers were added to the program for PY9. A small appliance recycling event was well received by customers; it provided a convenient drop-off location for room air conditioners and dehumidifiers without the necessity of including a large appliance.
- **Custom:** There continues to be a significant number of CHP projects, especially from the GNE customer sector. Due to the high demand by the GNE sector, a waitlist will begin on 1/15/2018.
- **CEI:** The program launched successfully. There are four new school districts participating with a total of 17 schools and four school districts who had participated in the program in Phase II, with a total of 27 schools in Phase III.
- **Demand Response:** PPL Electric Utilities' ICSP enrolled 93 customers' facilities in the program either through their prime ICSP, CPower, or sub-contractors during PY8 (June 1, 2016, to May 31, 2017). Due to PJM forecasts, PPL Electric Utilities initiated three events during the summer of PY9. The average performance of the three events was 126 MWs, exceeding the program performance requirement of 92 MW per event and a minimum of 78.2 MWs per event.
- **Efficient Equipment Distributor Discount:** The number of distributors continues to grow from 14 in PY8 to 25 in PY9. The number of projects completed through this channel in PY9 are approximately double that of PY8. PPL Electric Utilities' ICSP continues to improve QA/QC for projects and education to distributors to improve program performance. A SPIFF was offered to drive participation and awareness of the program. Additional eligible items are in the process of being added to the catalog for the program.
- **Efficient Equipment Prescriptive Equipment:** Additional enhancements have been added to the customer facing website and online rebate portal to enhance the tracking of projects as they move through the rebate verification process. Regular webinars for contractors and customers have been held to increase awareness of the eligible measures.
- **Efficient Equipment Prescriptive Lighting:** Direct Discount continues to be a key driver for this program. While Direct Discount is available for several measures, lighting is the primary measure installed through this program. Customers continue to participate in the prescriptive lighting program for larger projects.
- **Efficient Lighting:** PPL Electric has seen strong LED bulb sales over the first year of the program with sales exceeding 3,500,000 bulbs. This is the highest level of sales in a single year, even with increasing competition from non-program bulbs (inexpensive, non-Energy Star LEDs). Over 5,000,000 bulbs were sold phase-to-date. PPL Electric intentionally slowed down lighting significantly to avoid exhausting the budget too early. There was a diverse mix of bulbs sold – General Service 70%, Reflector 17%, Specialty 11%, and Indoor Fixtures 2%. A connected lighting pilot will be launched in early 2018. The kit will

consist of one central hub (Wink 2) and five pre-configured bulbs, including three A19 general service bulbs and two BR30 reflector bulbs used for recessed lighting.

- **Energy-Efficiency Kits and Education:** The Energy Efficiency Kits and Education program launched June 1, 2016, and targets income eligible customers. The program is on target with over 17,000 kits delivered through direct mail or one of the 20 participating agencies. The program enjoys an extremely high customer satisfaction level at 99%.
- **Energy Efficient Home:** Phase-to-date, over 24,000 customers have completed the online assessment and over 8,000 received an energy efficiency kit for their home. The online rebate application portal has been well received by customers and a new mobile responsive portal was launched in November. Ductless heat pumps are the most popular HVAC measure with more than 800 projects in PY9. A baseboard electric smart thermostat pilot was launched in March 2017 with a goal of 20 thermostats installed before winter – to date 10 applications were received. There is significant interest in efficient new home construction with 346 homes in PY9; there were a total of 518 in all of Phase 2. Measures included PV, duct sealing, air sealing, high-efficiency HVAC systems, Energy Star appliances, high-performance windows, and insulation.
- **Home Energy Education:** This program sends Home Energy Reports to customers; it is not a rebate program. Program savings were 15% less than expected in PY8, but customers continue to provide positive feedback about the improvements made to the Home Energy Reports in Phase III. Customers like the new look and feel, comparisons are more accurate, recommendations are personalized, and there has been a much lower opt out rate. Electronic versions of the Home Energy Reports were implemented to augment the paper report.
- **Low-Income WRAP:** The program for income eligible customers launched June 1, 2016 with a seamless transition for customers from Phase II to Phase III. Customer interest and satisfaction remains high. The program has completed approximately 7,000 jobs, including participants in the Manufactured Home initiative. Interest in WRAP for multifamily buildings has generated over 4,000 completed or pending jobs with a queue of over 6,000 individual low-income tenants (combination of individual and master-metered).
- **Student Energy Efficient Education:** The program was fully subscribed for PY9 and reached over 24,000 children at approximately 200 schools, including over 24,000 kits distributed to participating children. Two pilots will run in PY9, one for high school students that includes a Tier II power strip and one for middle school students that introduces an app aimed at increasing installation rates.

3.2 EVALUATION UPDATES AND FINDINGS

This section summarizes evaluation activities occurring within each program during PY9. For each program offered in PY9, Cadmus updated the evaluation plans, and submitted them to PPL Electric Utilities and the SWE.

- **Appliance Recycling:** Cadmus received participant data from PPL Electric Utilities' tracking database for Q1 and Q2 and confirmed that it contains the necessary data for evaluation activities. Cadmus is preparing the PY9Q2 data request for SWE. Cadmus launched customer satisfaction surveys in November 2017.

- **Custom:** Cadmus verified savings for five PY9 large sample projects and two PY8 projects that were originally presented as “unverified” in the PY8 Annual Report (savings that were claimed in PY8 for projects that were installed and operating in PY8, but for which M&V activities were not completed in PY8.) Ongoing evaluation activities, including review of project documentation, creation of site-specific measurement and verification plans, deployment of evaluator installed metering equipment, determination of project savings using a high-rigor approach, and presenting finalized savings in a verification report, are currently underway for three small sample projects and approximately 40 large stratum projects. Cadmus launched online quarterly customer satisfaction surveys in November 2017.
- **CEI:** Cadmus drafted the stakeholder interview guide and expects to conduct the interviews in late January or early February 2018. Cadmus received participant data from CLEAResult and requested participants’ AMI billing data from PPL. We expect to receive the billing data in January and will build the baseline models to estimate energy consumption in absence of the program during the program year, to estimate savings.
- **Demand Response:** Cadmus met with PPL Electric Utilities and the program implementer to discuss program design and changes. Cadmus reviewed the program materials and received participant data, and completed the target number (10) of participant interviews. Cadmus estimated load impacts for each of 93 participant facilities during event hours of the June 13, July 21, and July 22 Act 129 events. Cadmus completed the PY9 annual report and delivered the annual report and data request on January 15, 2018.
- **Efficient Equipment Distributor Discount:** Cadmus received the PY9Q1 database for the Distributor Discount program and confirmed that it contains the necessary information for evaluation activities. Cadmus selected an evaluation sample and requested project data from the implementer. Cadmus received and reviewed the PY9Q1 sample project data and scheduled site visits, and is conducting verification site visits for a sample of 20 lighting projects. Cadmus received the PY9Q2 database and is preparing the PY9Q2 data request.
- **Efficient Equipment Prescriptive Equipment (Standard Path):** Cadmus received the PY9Q1 database for the Prescriptive Equipment program and confirmed that it contains the necessary information for evaluation activities. Due to the small number of Q1 projects, Cadmus will combine Q1 and Q2 projects to select the first PY9 evaluation project sample. Cadmus received the PY9Q2 database and is preparing the combined PY9Q1-Q2 data request. Online quarterly customer satisfaction surveys launched in November 2017.
- **Efficient Equipment Prescriptive Lighting (Standard Path and Direct Discount):** Cadmus received the PY9Q1 database for the Prescriptive Lighting program component and confirmed that it contains the necessary information for evaluation activities. Cadmus selected a Standard Path and Direct Discount evaluation sample and requested project data from the implementer. Cadmus received and reviewed the PY9Q1 sample project data, scheduled and conducted over 20 verification site visits. Cadmus received the PY9Q2 database and is preparing the PY9Q2 data request. Online quarterly customer satisfaction surveys launched in November 2017.
- **Efficient Lighting:** Cadmus received Q1 and Q2 data from PPL Electric Utilities’ tracking database, and copies of invoices and tracking data from the ICSP for Q1. Cadmus provided data to the SWE to fulfill the PY9Q1 data request and is preparing the PY9Q2 data request.

- **Energy-Efficiency Kits and Education:** Cadmus received Q1 enrollment and survey data from the ICSP, and expects to receive Q2 enrollment and survey data in early January 2018. Cadmus reviewed the PY9Q1 and Q2 tracking data from PPL Electric Utilities' tracking database, and will conduct a records review with Q1 and Q2 data provided by the subcontracting ICSP.
- **Energy Efficient Home:** Cadmus developed the equipment, online assessment, in-home audit, and weatherization participant survey instruments and began fielding the surveys in November 2017. Cadmus received the PY9Q1 data for all program components and confirmed that it contains the necessary data for evaluation activities. Cadmus selected samples for Efficient Equipment, and New Homes components, and requested data from the implementer, and is preparing the PY9Q2 data request for the SWE.
- **Home Energy Education:** Cadmus met with the ICSP and program subcontractor to discuss PY9 program implementation changes and data QC procedures. PPL Electric Utilities decided to reinstate the two Phase II low-income waves at the end of PY8, and plans to continue the low-income treatment sometime in PY9; currently the ICSP has not sent treatment to low-income customers in PY9. Cadmus revised the PY9 evaluation plan reflecting changes to the program implementation and included the low-income waves in the impact evaluation activities. As a benchmarking activity, PPL Electric requested a comparison of vendors that offer similar real-time (AMI) usage data and customer engagement products/programs.
- **Low-Income WRAP:** Cadmus met with the ICSP and PPL Electric Utilities to discuss PY9 evaluation plan changes and PY9 evaluation methodology. Cadmus received Q1 enrollment and survey data from the ICSP, and expects to receive Q2 enrollment and survey data in early January 2018. Cadmus reviewed the PY9 Q1 and Q2 data, and will conduct a thorough records review.
- **Student Energy Efficient Education:** The ICSP provides program data once per year, in PY9Q3.

4 Summary of Participation by Program

Participation is defined differently for each program depending on the program delivery channel and data tracking practices. The nuances of the participant definition vary by program and are summarized by program in Table 5. The table provides the current participation totals for PY9 and Phase III.

Table 5: EE&C Plan Participation by Program

Program	Participant Definition	PY9TD Participation	P3TD Participation
Appliance Recycling (ARP)	Unique job number; corresponds with each unique appliance decommissioned through the program during the program year	7,125	18,493
Demand Response	Unique job number; corresponds to a customer that participated in a demand response event	93	93
Nonresidential Energy Efficiency	Lighting and Equipment: Unique job number; corresponds to each unique job that received a rebate Custom: Unique job number; commercially operable job that received an incentive payment during the reporting period; only includes those projects that contribute to program savings; incentive adjustment jobs with zero savings, where the MeasureCode field has a value of "IncAdjust" are not included in the participant counts Distributor Discount: Unique job number; corresponds to each purchase of discounted products	2,346 ^[1]	4,168 ^[1]
Efficient Lighting	Person or business purchasing discounted bulbs. Because of the upstream design of the Efficient Lighting Program, the identities of purchasers are not known. The proportional breakdown of bulbs between the residential and small commercial sectors was estimated in PY8, as were bulbs-per-customer counts. These metrics were derived from residential and commercial customer data collected in a general population telephone survey. Participation is estimated by dividing the total number of bulbs discounted or given away by the bulbs-per-customer estimates.	147,171	483,392
Energy-Efficiency Kits and Education ^[2]	Unique job number; corresponds to an energy-savings kit delivered to an income-eligible customer through the agency or the direct-mail delivery channel	5,354	17,471
Energy Efficient Home (EE Home)	Unique job number; corresponds to a rebated project Households could have more than one rebated project	9,659	21,060
Home Energy Education (HEE)	Unique bill account number and household that receives a home energy report	0 ^[1]	184,257 ^[1]

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT TO THE PA PUC – PROGRAM YEAR 9

Program	Participant Definition	PY9TD Participation	P3TD Participation
Low-Income Winter Relief Assistance Program (WRAP)	Unique bill account number; corresponds to an income-eligible household that receives an audit and program services. In PY8, a participant was defined as a unique job, but the updated definition is applied retroactively here. Therefore, the P3TD total will not match the PY8 total plus PY9TD.	4,434	6,914
Student Energy Efficient Education (SEEE)	Number of participants is counted as the number of kits delivered	0 ^[1]	24,145 ^[1]
Portfolio Total		176,182	759,993

^[1] Participants in the Continuous Energy Improvement, Home Energy Education and Student Energy Efficient Education programs are not yet available and will be reported later in PY9

^[2] Participation is determined by the unique job numbers. Returned kits are assigned two unique job numbers: one for the distributed kit, and one for the returned kit.

Because of the upstream design of the Efficient Lighting Program, the identities of purchasers are not known. The proportional breakdown of bulbs between the residential and small commercial sectors was estimated in PY8, as were bulbs-per-customer counts. These metrics were derived from residential and commercial customer data collected in a general population telephone survey. Participation is estimated by dividing the total number of bulbs discounted or given away by the bulbs-per-customer estimates.

Table 6: Efficient Lighting Participant Estimates

Year	Delivery Channel	Residential Quantity	Small C&I Quantity	Total Quantity	Bulbs per Small C&I Customer	Bulbs per Residential Customer	Estimated Small C&I Participants	Estimated Residential Participants	Total Estimated Participants
PY8	Retail Buy Down	3,174,906	352,767	3,527,673	20.21	9.96	17,455	318,766	336,221
PY9	Retail Buy Down	1,388,180	154,242	1,542,422			7,632	139,375	147,007
PY9	Giveaway	1,632	0	1,632			0	164	164
Total		4,564,718	507,010	5,071,727			25,087	458,305	483,392

5 Summary of Energy Impacts by Program

Figure 6 presents a summary of the PYTD reported gross energy savings by program for Program Year 9. The energy impacts in this report are presented at the meter level and do not reflect adjustments for transmission and distribution losses.

Figure 6: PYTD Reported Gross Energy Savings by Program





Figure 7 presents a summary of the PSA gross energy savings by program for Phase III of Act 129. PSA savings include verified gross savings from previous program years and the PYTD savings from the current program year.

Figure 7: PSA Energy Savings by Program for Phase III



A summary of energy impacts by program through the current reporting period is presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Energy Savings by Program (MWh/Year)

Program Name	PYTD MWh/yr	RTD MWh/yr	VTD MWh/yr	Unverified Savings from PY8 MWh/yr	PSA MWh/yr ^[1]
Appliance Recycling	7,449	19,484	11,844		19,293
Efficient Lighting	67,009	217,384	145,929		212,938
Energy Efficiency Kits and Education	4,779	15,199	9,219		13,999
Energy Efficient Home	8,356	18,977	9,943		18,299
Home Energy Education	0	40,467	34,326		34,326
Low Income WRAP	6,437	9,928	2,652	16	9,089
Non-Residential Energy Efficiency	73,390	220,891	117,285	27,417	190,675
Student Energy Efficient Education	0	5,118	4,539		4,539
Portfolio Total ^[2]	167,420	547,449	335,739	27,432	503,159
Adjustment for Home Energy Education Double-Counted Savings			(4,395)		(4,395)
Adjusted Portfolio Savings ^[2]			331,344		498,764

^[1] 50,588 of PSA MWh/yr from Efficient Lighting are attributed to Small C&I.
^[2] Portfolio total does not equal total of column due to rounding.

6 Summary of Demand Impacts by Program

PPL Electric Utilities' Phase III EE&C programs achieve peak demand reductions in two ways. The first is through coincident reductions from energy efficiency measures and the second is through dedicated demand response programs that exclusively target temporary demand reductions on peak days. Energy efficiency reductions coincident with system peak hours are reported and used in the calculation of benefits in the TRC Test, but do not contribute to Phase III peak demand reduction compliance goals. Phase III peak demand reduction targets are exclusive to demand response programs.

The two types of peak demand reduction savings are also treated differently for reporting purposes. Peak demand reductions from energy efficiency are generally additive across program years, meaning that the P3TD savings reflect the sum of the first-year savings in each program year. Conversely, demand response goals are based on average portfolio impacts across all events so cumulative DR performance is expressed as the *average* performance of each of the DR events called in Phase III to date. Because of these differences, demand impacts from energy efficiency and demand response are reported separately in the following sub-sections.

6.1 ENERGY EFFICIENCY

Act 129 defines peak demand savings from energy efficiency as the average expected reduction in electric demand from 2:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. EDT on non-holiday weekdays from June to August. The peak demand impacts from energy efficiency in this report are presented at the meter level and do not reflect adjustments for transmission and distribution losses. Figure 8 presents a summary of the PYRTD reported gross peak demand savings by energy efficiency program for Program Year 9.

Figure 8: PYRTD Gross Demand Savings by Energy Efficiency Program





Figure 9 presents a summary of the PSA gross demand savings by energy efficiency program for Phase III of Act 129.

Figure 9: PSA Demand Savings by Energy Efficiency Program for Phase III



A summary of the peak demand impacts by energy efficiency program through the current reporting period are presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Peak Demand Savings by Energy Efficiency Program (MW/Year)

Program Name	PYTD MW/yr	RTD MW/yr	VTD MW/yr	Unverified Savings from PY8 MW/yr	PSA MW/yr ^[1]
Appliance Recycling	1.05	2.70	1.63		2.67
Efficient Lighting	9.69	31.83	19.82		29.51
Energy-Efficiency Kits and Education	0.35	1.10	0.88		1.23
Energy Efficient Home	1.67	3.62	1.78		3.46
Home Energy Education	0.00	54.39	6.75		6.75
Low-Income WRAP	0.64	0.98	0.29	0.00	0.93
Non-Residential Energy Efficiency	10.03	29.15	15.17	3.09	25.20
Student Energy Efficient Education	0.00	0.46	0.49		0.49
Portfolio Total ^[2]	23.43	124.24	46.81	3.09	70.24

^[1] 10.79 of PSA MW from Efficient Lighting are attributed to Small C&I.

^[2] Portfolio total does not equal total of column due to rounding.

6.2 DEMAND RESPONSE

Act 129 defines peak demand savings from demand response as the average reduction in electric demand during the hours when a demand response event is initiated. Phase III DR events are initiated according to the following guidelines:

- 1) Curtailment events shall be limited to the months of June through September.
- 2) Curtailment events shall be called for the first six days of each program year (starting in PY9) in which the peak hour of PJM's day-ahead forecast for the PJM RTO is greater than 96% of the PJM RTO summer peak demand forecast for the months of June through September.
- 3) Each curtailment event shall last four hours.
- 4) Each curtailment event shall be called such that it will occur during the day's forecasted peak hour(s) above 96% of PJM's RTO summer peak demand forecast.
- 5) Once six curtailment events have been called in a program year, the peak demand reduction program shall be suspended for that program year.

The peak demand impacts from demand response in this report are presented at the system level and reflect adjustments to account for transmission and distribution losses. PPL Electric Utilities uses the following line loss percentages/multipliers by sector.

- Residential = [8.75% or 1.0875]
- Small C&I = [8.75% or 1.0875]
- Large C&I = [4.2% or 1.0420]

Table 9 summarizes the PYVTD and VTD demand reductions for each of the demand response programs in the EE&C plan and for the demand response portfolio as a whole. VTD demand reductions are the average performance across all Phase III demand response events independent of how many events occurred in a given program year. The relative precision columns in Table 9 indicate the margin of error (at the 90% confidence interval) around the PYVTD and VTD demand reductions.

Table 9: Verified Gross Demand Response Impacts by Program

Program	PYVTD Gross MW	Relative Precision (90%) [1]	VTD Gross MW	Relative Precision (90%) [1]
Demand Response	126.68	3%	126.68	3%
Portfolio Total	126.68	3%	126.68	3%

[1] Precision accounts for the covariance of a participant facility's savings over hours of an event; however, it does not account for the covariance of a participant facility's savings across events.

7 Summary of Finances

Section 7 provides an overview of the expenditures associated with PPL Electric Utilities' portfolio and the recovery of those costs from ratepayers.

7.1 PROGRAM FINANCIALS

Program-specific and portfolio total finances for PY9 are shown in Table 10. The columns in Table 10 and Table 11 are adapted from the 'Direct Program Cost' categories in the Commission's EE&C Plan template⁶ for Phase III. EDC Materials, Labor, and Administration includes costs associated with an EDC's own employees. ICSP Materials, Labor, and Administration includes both the program implementation contractor and the costs of any other outside vendors and EDCs employs to support program delivery.

Table 10: Program Year to Date Financials

Program	Incentives to Participants and Trade Allies	EDC Materials, Labor, and Administration	ICSP Materials, Labor, and Administration	EM&V	Total ^[1]
Appliance Recycling Program	\$197	\$23	\$875	-	\$1,094
Demand Response Program	\$980	\$39	\$267	-	\$1,285
Efficient Lighting Program	\$3,947	\$28	\$560	-	\$4,535
Energy Efficiency Kits & Education Program ^[2]	-	\$24	\$810	-	\$834
Energy Efficient Home Program	\$1,165	\$30	\$1,437	-	\$2,633
Home Energy Education Program	-	\$10	\$1,023	-	\$1,033
Low-Income WRAP Program ^[2]	-	\$97	\$3,465	-	\$3,562
Non-Residential Energy Efficiency	\$3,225	\$90	\$2,584	-	\$5,900
Student Energy Efficiency Education Program	-	\$23	\$667	-	\$690
Common Portfolio Costs ^[3]	-	\$1,972	\$431	\$2,617	\$5,020
Portfolio Total ^[4]	\$9,514	\$2,336	\$12,118	\$2,617	\$26,585
SWE Costs ^[5]	-	-	-	-	\$200
Total ^[1]	\$9,514	\$2,336	\$12,118	\$2,617	\$26,785

^[1] Total may not equal sum of column due to rounding.

^[2] Costs associated with low income program measures provided to customers at no cost are categorized as administrative costs.

^[3] Common Portfolio Costs are costs applicable to more than one customer class, to more than one program, or those that provide portfolio-wide benefits. These include PPL Electric labor and materials, costs related to the EEMIS tracking system, EE&C plan development, etc.

^[4] Portfolio Total and Total may not equal total of column due to rounding.

^[5] Statewide Evaluation costs are outside of the 2% spending cap.

⁶ Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission Phase III Energy Efficiency and Conservation Plan Template (Docket No. M-2014-2424864) dated July 21, 2015. (<http://www.puc.pa.gov/pcdocs/1372426.doc>)

Program-specific and portfolio total finances since the inception of Phase III are shown in Table 11.

Table 11: Phase III to Date Financials

Program	Incentives to Participants and Trade Allies	EDC Materials, Labor, and Administration	ICSP Materials, Labor, and Administration	EM&V	Total ^[5]
Appliance Recycling Program	\$538	\$60	\$2,441	-	\$3,039
Demand Response Program	\$980	\$187	\$765	-	\$1,932
Efficient Lighting Program	\$15,460	\$122	\$2,115	-	\$17,697
Energy Efficiency Kits & Education Program ^[1]	-	\$86	\$2,641	-	\$2,728
Energy Efficient Home Program	\$2,899	\$104	\$4,567	-	\$7,570
Home Energy Education Program	-	\$49	\$1,829	-	\$1,878
Low-Income WRAP Program ^[1]	-	\$384	\$7,190	-	\$7,574
Non-Residential Energy Efficiency	\$12,096	\$358	\$8,076		\$20,530
Student Energy Efficiency Education Program	-	\$118	\$1,477	-	\$1,595
Common Portfolio Costs ^[2]	-	\$4,337	\$2,878	\$4,727	\$11,942
Portfolio Total ^{[3] [5]}	\$31,972	\$5,804	\$33,981	\$4,727	\$76,484
SWE Costs ^[4]	-	-	-	-	\$900
Total ^[5]	\$31,972	\$5,804	\$33,981	\$4,727	\$77,384

¹ Costs associated with low income program measures provided to customers at no cost are categorized as administrative costs.

² Common Portfolio Costs are costs applicable to more than one customer class, to more than one program, or those that provide portfolio-wide benefits. These include PPL Electric labor and materials, costs related to the EEMIS tracking system, EE&C plan development, etc.

³ Portfolio Total may not equal total of column due to rounding.

⁴ Statewide Evaluation costs are outside of the 2% spending cap.

⁵ Total may not equal sum of column due to rounding.

Cost-effectiveness testing for Act 129 EE&C programs is performed using the TRC Test. Benefit cost modeling is conducted annually using verified gross and verified net savings once the results of the independent impact evaluation are completed. TRC test results for PY9 will be presented in the final annual report to the PA PUC on November 15, 2018 along with a more granular breakdown of portfolio costs.

7.2 COST RECOVERY

Act 129 allows Pennsylvania EDCs to recover EE&C plan costs through a cost-recovery mechanism. PPL Electric Utilities' cost-recovery charges organized separately by customer sectors to ensure that the electric rate classes that finance the programs are the rate classes that receive the direct energy and conservation benefits. Cost-recovery is necessarily tied to the way customers are metered and charges for electric service. Readers should be

mindful of the differences between Table 12 and Section 2.4. For example, the low-income customer segment is a subset of PPL Electric Utilities' residential tariff(s) and therefore not listed in Table 12.


Table 12: EE&C Plan Expenditures by Cost-Recovery Category (\$1,000)

Cost Recovery Customer Sector	Rate Schedules Included	PYTD Spending	P3TD Spending
Residential & Low Income	Residential (primarily RS)	\$15,029	\$42,626
Small Commercial and Industrial (Small C&I)	Small C&I (primarily GS1 & GS3)	\$2,427	\$8,887
Large Commercial and Industrial (Large C&I)	Large C&I (primarily LP4 & LP5)	\$4,181	\$10,692
GNE	Residential, Small C&I, and Large C&I	\$1,991	\$6,421
No Sector ^[1] ^[2]	N/A	\$3,157	\$8,758
Portfolio Total ^[3]	-	\$26,785	\$77,384

^[1] Costs not collected at the sector level, including both direct program costs and common portfolio costs. These costs will be allocated to the sectors at the conclusion of Phase III.

^[2] Includes SWE costs.

^[3] Portfolio total may not equal sum of rows due to rounding.



Demand Response Program Annual Evaluation

**Phase III of Act 129
Program Year 9
(June 1, 2017—May 31, 2018)
for Pennsylvania Act 129 of 2008
Energy Efficiency and Conservation Plan**

**Prepared by Cadmus for
PPL Electric Utilities**

January 15, 2018

The Cadmus Group LLC

An Employee-Owned Company • www.cadmusgroup.com

Table of Contents

1	Demand Response Program	1
1.1	Executive Summary.....	1
1.2	Background	1
1.3	Progress Toward Phase III Projected Savings.....	2
1.4	Participation and Reported Savings by Customer Segment	3
1.4.1	<i>Definition of a Participant.....</i>	<i>3</i>
1.4.2	<i>Program Participation and Reported Impacts</i>	<i>3</i>
1.5	Gross Impact Evaluation	4
1.6	Verified Savings Estimates	6
1.7	Process Evaluation	7
1.7.1	<i>Research Objectives</i>	<i>7</i>
1.7.2	<i>Evaluation Activities.....</i>	<i>7</i>
1.7.3	<i>Summary of Process Evaluation Findings</i>	<i>10</i>
1.8	Cost-Effectiveness Reporting	11
1.9	Status of Recommendations	12
1.9.1	<i>Status of Recommendations for Program.....</i>	<i>14</i>
	Appendix A. Evaluation Detail–Demand Response Program	A-1

Figures

Figure 1. Gross Verified Savings in Comparison to Act 129 Targets	1
Figure 2. Gross Verified Savings in Comparison to Act 129 Targets	5
Figure 3. Overall Program Experience	10
Figure A-1. Enrolled Demand Response Capacity by Customer Segment	A-2
Figure A-2. Distribution of Demand Response Program Enrolled Capacity	A-2
Figure A-3. Demand Response Program Savings	A-3
Figure A-4. Average kW per GNE Participant Facility in PY9	A-7
Figure A-5. Average kW per Large C&I Participant Facility in PY9	A-8
Figure A-6. Average kW per Small C&I Participant Facility in PY9	A-9
Figure A-7. Predictive Accuracy of Regression Baseline Facilities	A-14
Figure A-8. Predictive Accuracy of Day-Matching Baseline Facilities	A-15
Figure A-9. PPL Electric Utilities Act 129 Gross Verified Demand Savings	A-16
Figure A-10. June 13, 2017 – Hourly Load Impacts	A-18
Figure A-11. July 20, 2017 – Hourly Load Impacts	A-19
Figure A-12. July 21, 2017 – Hourly Load Impacts	A-19
Figure A-13. June 13, 2017 – GNE Participants	A-20
Figure A-14. July 20, 2017 – GNE Participants	A-21
Figure A-15. July 21, 2017 – GNE Participants	A-21
Figure A-16. June 13, 2017 – Large C&I Participants	A-22
Figure A-17. July 20, 2017 – Large C&I Participants	A-22
Figure A-18. July 21, 2017 – Large C&I Participants	A-23
Figure A-19. June 13, 2017 – Small C&I Participants	A-24
Figure A-20. July 20, 2017 – Small C&I Participants	A-24
Figure A-21. Illustration of June 12 Notification Day Impacts for Large C&I Participant Facility	A-26
Figure A-22. Illustration of June 12 Notification Day Impacts for Large C&I Participant Facility	A-26
Figure A-23. Illustration of July 19 Notification Day Impacts for Large C&I Participant Facility	A-27
Figure A-24. Illustration of July 19 Notification Day Impacts for Participant Facility	A-28
Figure A-25. Illustration of July 19 Notification Day Impacts for Participant Facility	A-28
Figure A-26. Illustration of July 19 Notification Day Impacts for Participant Facility	A-29
Figure A-27. Event Savings Realization Rates	A-30
Figure A-28. Maximum Event Duration	A-36

Tables


Table 1. PY9 Demand Response Program Estimated and Verified Savings	3
Table 2. PY9 Demand Response Program Participation and Reported Impacts ^[1]	3
Table 3. PY9 Demand Response Program Gross Impact Sample Design	4
Table 4. PY9 Demand Response Program Gross Impact Results for Demand	6
Table 5. PYTD and P3TD Demand Savings Summary	7
Table 6. PY9 Demand Response Program Process Evaluation Activities	7
Table 7. Process Evaluation Sampling Strategy	9
Table 8. Summary of Demand Response Program Finances—Gross Verified.....	12
Table 9. Status of Recommendations	15
Table A-1. PY9 Program Sampling Strategy	A-1
Table A-2. Data Sources	A-4
Table A-3. Energy Data Summary	A-5
Table A-4. Sample Summary Statistics.....	A-6
Table A-5. Baseline Regression Model Specifications.....	A-12
Table A-6. Number of Facilities by Baseline Modeling Approach.....	A-13
Table A-7. PY9 Act 129 Events Dates and Times.....	A-15
Table A-8. Event Demand Savings and Baseline Demand.....	A-17
Table A-9. Process Evaluation Sampling Strategy	A-31
Table A-10. Participant Interview Sampling Plan and Response Rate	A-32
Table A-11. Demand Response Program Logic Model Review	A-33
Table A-12. Participant and Respondent Profile.....	A-33
Table A-13. Load Reduction Strategies	A-37
Table A-14. Further Load Reduction Opportunities.....	A-37
Table A-15. Demand Response Program Strengths.....	A-38
Table A-16. Demand Response Participant Interview Sample Attrition Table	A-39

1 Demand Response Program

1.1 Executive Summary

PPL Electric Utilities' Act 129 Demand Response Program operated effectively in PY9 and PPL Electric Utilities is on track to meet its Phase III Act 129 Demand Reduction Compliance target. Figure 1 summarizes the evaluation impact findings for PY9.

Figure 1. Gross Verified Savings in Comparison to Act 129 Targets



Note: The load impacts reported in this figure are based on Cadmus analysis of participant AMI consumption data and have been grossed up to reflect transmission and distribution losses.

In PY9, verified peak load reductions were 126.7 MW (average over the three demand response events) which exceeds the Phase III compliance target of 92 MW (average over all Phase III demand response events). In addition, PPL Electric Utilities met its per-event compliance target of at least 78.2 MW (85% of the total compliance target) in each demand response event.

1.2 Background

During Phase III, PPL Electric Utilities operated the Demand Response Program for commercial and industrial (C&I) customers and for government, nonprofit, and education (GNE) customers. Participating customers entered into contracts with the program's implementation conservation services provider (ICSP) to voluntarily reduce electricity demand during Act 129 demand response events. A total of 93 PPL Electric Utilities customers participated in Act 129 demand response events during program year 9 (PY9).

CPower was the program's ICSP. PPL Electric Utilities managed the ICSP and provided overall strategic direction for the program. The ICSP enrolled and contracted with customers, initiated events during the summer (June–September 2017) of PY9, and made performance-based payments to participants.

In PY9, PPL Electric Utilities initiated three load curtailment events, which occurred on June 13, July 20, and July 21 of 2017. Each event occurred on non-holiday, weekdays between 2:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. PPL Electric Utilities initiated each event in accordance with Act 129 demand response rules, which require a 4-hour event on the following day when at least one hour of the PJM RTO day-ahead forecast exceeds 96% of the PJM's forecast of summer peak demand. Per Act 129 demand response rules, there can be a maximum of six events per program year, and there were three events in PY9.

The ICSP notified participants between 10:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on the day before the event, and most participants received notification in the morning or early afternoon. Before the start of each event, the ICSP received a commitment from these notified customers to participate in the event for specific hours. To enroll in an event, participants selected specific hours for enrollment on the ICSP's online platform, which served as the primary enrollment and feedback channel for the program. Participants had the option of participating for all or a subset of event hours. Across all events and customers, only four times did a customer participate for a subset of hours.

To comply with the PaPUC's Act 129 Phase III demand response compliance targets, PPL Electric Utilities' Demand Response Program must reduce its system load by an average of 92 MW (measured at the generator level) over all demand response events during the last four years of Phase III (PY9–PY12).¹ In addition, PPL Electric Utilities is required to achieve a minimum of 85% of the 92 MW compliance target or 78.2 MW during each event.

Compliance targets for demand response programs were established at the generator level, which means the load reductions measured at the customer meter must be increased to reflect transmission and distribution losses (line losses). The peak demand impact estimates presented in this report have been adjusted for these line losses. PPL Electric Utilities uses the following line loss percentages/multipliers by sector.

- Small C&I = [8.75% or 1.0875]
- Large C&I = [4.2% or 1.0420]

1.3 Progress Toward Phase III Projected Savings

PPL Electric Utilities designed the Demand Response Program for approximately 115 MW, to exceed its 92 MW Act 129 demand response compliance target to account for various operational and evaluation uncertainties. In PY9, PPL Electric Utilities achieved verified peak demand reductions that averaged 126.7 MW over all event hours, which are 11.7 MW (~10%) greater than estimated in the EE&C Plan and approximately 38% greater than the 92 MW target for Phase III

Table 1 shows the program's verified gross peak demand reductions and progress toward its Phase III totals, as filed in the EE&C plan.

¹ Program objectives are stipulated on PPL Electric Utilities' revised EE&C Plan (Docket No. M-2015-2515642) filed with the Pennsylvania PUC on June 6, 2017.

Table 1. PY9 Demand Response Program Estimated and Verified Savings

Event	PY9 Only			Phase III: PY8–PY12 ^[1]		
	EE&C Plan Estimate ^[2] (MW)	Verified ^[3] (MW)	Percentage of Estimated	EE&C Plan Estimate ^[2] (MW)	Verified (MW)	Percentage of Estimated
Demand response capacity	115	126.7	110.2%	115	126.7	110.2%

^[1] All demand reductions are averages across all events. The planned reductions are not summed across years, since the sum of demand reductions across years is not a meaningful concept. There were no demand response events in PY8. The first demand response events occurred in PY9.

^[2] Planned savings are based on PPL Electric Utilities' revised EE&C plan (Docket No. 2015-2515642) filed with the Pennsylvania PUC on June 6, 2017. Estimated demand reduction is shown per event hour.

^[3] Verified savings are the average demand response savings per event during the June 13, July 20, and July 21 Act 129 events.

1.4 Participation and Reported Savings by Customer Segment

1.4.1 Definition of a Participant

A participant in PPL Electric Utilities' Demand Response Program in PY9 is defined as customer (unique account number) that participated in at least one of PPL Electric Utilities' Act 129 demand response events.

1.4.2 Program Participation and Reported Impacts

Table 2 presents the participation counts, reported demand reduction, and incentive payments for the Demand Response Program in PY9 by customer segment and Act 129 event.

The program reported demand savings of approximately 101 MW on June 13, 2017, 125 MW on July 20, 2017, and 121 MW on July 21, 2017. Large C&I customers accounted for 96% to nearly 100% of the reported demand savings for these events.

Table 2. PY9 Demand Response Program Participation and Reported Impacts ^[1]

Parameter	Small C&I (Non-GNE)	Large C&I (Non-GNE)	GNE	Total ^[2]
PYTD # Participants	60	23	10	93
June 13, 2017 Reported MW	(0.74)	101.27	0.34	100.87
July 20, 2017 Reported MW	0.11	121.23	3.92	125.26
July 21, 2017 Reported MW	-	116.69	4.11	120.80
Total Average Reported MW	(0.31)	113.06	2.79	115.6
PY9 Incentives (\$1000)	\$0.35	\$956	\$23	\$980

^[1] The load impacts reported in this table have been grossed up to reflect transmission and distribution losses.

^[2] Total may not equal total of row due to rounding.

1.5 Gross Impact Evaluation

The impact evaluation sampling strategy is summarized in Table 3. Cadmus analyzed consumption data to estimate Act 129 load impacts for the population of participants. There was no sampling. The number and composition of participants varied between events, because the ICSP called upon different sets of customers for each event.

Table 3. PY9 Demand Response Program Gross Impact Sample Design

Stratum	Event	Population Size	Assumed Proportion or Cv in Sample Design	Achieved Sample Size	PYRTD MW	Impact Evaluation Activity
Small C&I	June 13, 2017	59	N/A (Census)	59	(0.74)	Individual customer impact analysis
	July 20, 2017	1	N/A (Census)	1	0.11	Individual customer impact analysis
	July 21, 2017	0	N/A (Census)	0	-	Individual customer impact analysis
Large C&I	June 13, 2017	22	N/A (Census)	22	101.27	Individual customer impact analysis
	July 20, 2017	18	N/A (Census)	18	121.23	Individual customer impact analysis
	July 21, 2017	18	N/A (Census)	18	116.69	Individual customer impact analysis
GNE	June 13, 2017	9	N/A (Census)	9	0.34	Individual customer impact analysis
	July 20, 2017	10	N/A (Census)	10	3.92	Individual customer impact analysis
	July 21, 2017	10	N/A (Census)	10	4.11	Individual customer impact analysis
Program Total	June 13, 2017	90	N/A (Census)	90	100.87	Individual customer impact analysis
	July 20, 2017	29	N/A (Census)	29	125.26	Individual customer impact analysis
	July 21, 2017	28	N/A (Census)	28	120.80	Individual customer impact analysis


Note: The load impacts reported in this table have been grossed up to reflect transmission and distribution losses.

Before the start of PY9, Cadmus collected 15-minute advanced metering infrastructure (AMI) interval consumption data from 2016 for recruited facilities and conducted an individual facility analysis to identify the most accurate baseline calculation method for Cadmus' determination of verified peak reductions for each participant. Cadmus evaluated the predictive accuracy of a range of day-matching methods such as the "three previous non-holiday, non-event weekdays" or "seven days of previous 10 non-holiday, non-event weekdays with the highest loads" and a variety of regression model specifications. Cadmus then used the most accurate baseline model to determine the verified peak load reductions during three Act 129 demand response events in summer 2017. Cadmus determined the verified peak load reductions for each customer during each event hour and the average load reduction for each event. Additional details about the evaluation methodology are in *Appendix A*.

The research activities in PY9 were consistent with the evaluation plan except that Cadmus determined that for small C&I or GNE facilities day-matching produced event hour consumption baselines that were too low. Day-matching did not account for the positive correlation between Act 129 event days and facility electricity demand for air conditioning. Instead of day-matching, Cadmus used regression to estimate baselines for all GNE and small C&I facilities.

Table 4 shows that in PY9 the Demand Response Program verified average demand reduction is 126.7 MW. This yields a realization rate of 110% relative to the reported (*ex ante*) load reduction. The verified average demand savings exceeded by 34.7 MW PPL Electric's Act 129 goal for Phase III. As Figure 2 shows, PPL Electric Utilities is on track to meet the Phase III goal of an average of 92 MW per event hour.

Figure 2. Gross Verified Savings in Comparison to Act 129 Targets



Note: The load impacts reported in this figure are based on Cadmus analysis of participant AMI consumption data and have been grossed up to reflect transmission and distribution losses.

PPL Electric Utilities achieved verified demand savings of 120.3 MW on June 13, 2017, 131.8 MW on July 20, 2017, and 127.9 MW on July 21, 2017, yielding realization rates of, respectively, 119%, 105%, and 106%.

The following factors may have led to differences between the reported and verified savings and realization rates that deviated from 100%:

- **Different treatment of estimated readings.** PPL Electric Utilities estimated about 2% of all hourly interval readings for participant facilities between April 1, 2017, and July 21, 2017. Cadmus replaced these estimated readings with missing values and did not include them in the analysis sample. It was not possible to estimate demand savings for one small C&I facility because all of its kWh readings for event hours were estimated.
- **Allowance of event notification days in basis window.** Cadmus excluded event notification days from consideration for the basis window when calculating customer baselines. This exclusion was justified because Cadmus' analysis of load impacts on notification days showed that many

customers increased or decreased their loads in response to event notifications. (See *Appendix A*.) The ICSP did not exclude event notification days when calculating customer baselines.

- **Different methods for calculating customer baselines.** To the extent possible, the ICSP attempted to align its baseline calculation method with Cadmus' method. However, for all small C&I and GNE facilities and approximately half of large C&I facilities, Cadmus employed regression analysis to calculate the baseline while the ICSP employed day-matching. The ICSP reasoned that day-matching was easier for participants to understand than regression; Cadmus believed that regression yielded more accurate predictions of customer consumption.

The large C&I sector produced most of the program's demand savings. Large C&I participants provided average demand savings per hour of 113.9 MW on June 13, 2017, 127.0 MW on July 20, 2017, and 123.0 MW on July 21, 2017, or about 95% of the total verified savings.

Table 4. PY9 Demand Response Program Gross Impact Results for Demand

Stratum	Event	PYRTD MW	Demand Realization Rate	PYVTD MW ^[1]	Sample C, or Error Ratio	Relative Precision at 90% C.L. ^[2]
Small C&I	June 13, 2017	(0.74)	-404%	2.97	NA	17%
	July 20, 2017	0.11	162%	0.17	NA	13%
	July 21, 2017	-	0%	-	NA	NA
Large C&I	June 13, 2017	101.27	112%	113.86	NA	6%
	July 20, 2017	121.23	105%	126.99	NA	5%
	July 21, 2017	116.69	105%	123.01	NA	5%
GNE	June 13, 2017	0.34	1022%	3.46	NA	16%
	July 20, 2017	3.92	119%	4.65	NA	18%
	July 21, 2017	4.11	120%	4.92	NA	17%
Event	June 13, 2017	100.87	119%	120.29	NA	6%
	July 20, 2017	125.26	105%	131.81	NA	5%
	July 21, 2017	120.80	106%	127.93	NA	5%
Average		115.64	110%	126.68	NA	3%

^[1] Based on Cadmus analysis of participant AML consumption data. MW were grossed up to reflect transmission and distribution losses.

^[2] Precision accounts for covariances of savings across hours of each event, but not for covariances of savings between events.

1.6 Verified Savings Estimates

In Table 5, the realization rates determined by Cadmus are applied to the reported demand savings estimates to calculate the verified savings estimates for the Demand Response Program in PY9. In future years, these and future estimates of verified demand reductions and will be averaged to calculate the P3TD program impacts.

Table 5. PYTD and P3TD Demand Savings Summary

Savings Type	Demand (MW) ^{[1] [2]}
PYRTD	115.64
PYVTD Gross	126.68
PYVTD Net ^[3]	-
P3RTD	115.64
P3VTD Gross	126.68
P3VTD Net ^[3]	-
^[1] Savings are presented as the average of the total demand response reductions per event across the June 13, July 20, and July 21 Act 129 events.	
^[2] Total may not match due to rounding.	
^[3] There are no net savings because neither free riders nor spillover apply to this program. C&I and GNE participants are not expected to curtail their loads without notification of PPL Electric system peaks and without compensation.	

1.7 Process Evaluation

1.7.1 Research Objectives

The process evaluation assessed program implementation and customer satisfaction. The main research objectives focused on these areas:

- Customer recruitment and motivation
- Customer satisfaction and response to event notification
- Customer response to payment
- Program design and implementation
- Customer perspective about program benefits and costs
- Customer action to reduce loads

1.7.2 Evaluation Activities

Table 6 lists the PY9 process evaluation activities for the Demand Response Program.

Table 6. PY9 Demand Response Program Process Evaluation Activities

Activity	Achieved Target
PPL Electric Utilities and ICSP program manager interview	2
Telephone participant interviews	10
Review program logic model	N/A

Considering the smaller than expected participant sample frame, 26 unique companies managed the 93 participating facilities, Cadmus altered the target number of completed participant interviews from 70 to 10 and opted for telephone surveys instead of a mix of online and telephone surveys. Furthermore, because of the small sample size, Cadmus could not estimate population parameters with 90% confidence and +/- 10% precision.

The five largest participating companies in the Demand Response Program represent ~75% of the total enrolled peak reductions (MW). Despite multiple attempts to contact high priority participants (ranked by enrolled MW load reduction) via email and phone calls, Cadmus completed interviews with 3 of the

top 10 participants. Although Cadmus met the evaluation target of 10 participant interviews, none of the top five participants agreed to an interview, which limited the representative enrolled MW of interview respondents to 12.4% of the total enrolled MW in the program. Therefore, the responses are representative of small (by MW) participants.

Table 7 lists the process evaluation sampling strategy. Additional details about sampling methodology are included in *Appendix A*.

Table 7. Process Evaluation Sampling Strategy

Stratum	Stratum Boundaries	Mode	Population Size	Assumed Proportion or Cv in Sample Design	Target Sample Size	Achieved Sample Size	Number of Records Selected for Sample Frame ^[1]	Percent of Sample Frame Contacted to Achieve Sample ^[2]
PPL Electric Utilities Program and ICSP Staff	Staff	Telephone in-depth Interview	2	N/A	2	2	N/A	100%
Participant Surveys	Participating Companies ^[3]	Telephone in-depth interviews	26	N/A	10	10	26	100%
Program Total								
^[1] Sample frame is a list of participants with contact information who have a chance to complete the survey. The final sample frame includes unique records in the PPL Electric Utilities database. ^[2] Percent contacted means the percentage of the sample frame called to complete surveys. ^[3] 26 unique companies managed the 93 participating facilities. See <i>Appendix A, Process Evaluation</i> , for additional discussion.								


1.7.3 Summary of Process Evaluation Findings

Overall, program managers and participants said the program is working well and as intended.² The program met the Act 129 demand reduction target and most customers are satisfied with the program, plan on participating in 2018, and said the program was worthwhile from a business standpoint. PPL Electric's and the ICSP's substantial upfront investment in a detailed operations manual and program design likely resulted in participant satisfaction with the program overall and with key design elements. The program did encounter minor issues with customer enrollment and performance during the first event. These issues were properly addressed for the second and third event. In interviews with 10 program participants, representing roughly 12% of the total enrolled MW load reduction, respondents said payment timing is the primary challenge facing the program.

1.7.3.1 Participant Satisfaction

Overall, participants were satisfied with PPL Electric Utilities' Demand Response Program. Out of 10 interview respondents, six said they were *very satisfied* with the program, and two said they were *somewhat satisfied* (Figure 3). None of the participants Cadmus interviewed said they were dissatisfied with the program overall.

Figure 3. Overall Program Experience



Source: Interview question D1, "Thinking about your overall experience with the PPL Electric Utilities Demand Response Program, how would you rate your satisfaction" (n=10)

² As previously noted, the five largest participating companies in the Demand Response Program represent ~75% of the total enrolled peak reductions (MW). However, none of the top 5 participating companies provided input to the process evaluation. Therefore, the findings are representative of the smaller participating companies that comprise ~12% of the Demand Response Program's MWs.

1.7.3.2 Program Benefits and Costs

Cadmus asked interview respondents whether it was worthwhile from a business standpoint to shut down or curtail operations in order to participate in the program. Eight of 10 respondents said the program benefits outweighed the costs and the program was worthwhile. The other two respondents had reduced their peak load by shifting to backup generators and had not yet compared the generator fuel costs to the expected incentive. One of these respondents said the benefits of PPL Electric Utilities' Demand Response Program were not good enough and compared poorly to PJM's program, which offered higher incentives.

Most respondents said the expected incentive amount was adequate. The ICSP waits for the annual evaluation to determine verified peak reductions before processing incentive payments. Since the program ICSP had not yet paid the incentive as of December 2017, two participants were anxious about recouping incurred operational costs. These two respondents said they were concerned by the delay in incentive payments and viewed the payment timing as inadequate compared to PJM's quarterly payment structure. The other respondents did not identify payment timing as a concern.

1.7.3.3 Design and Implementation

All 10 respondents said that the timing of event notifications was adequate for them to prepare, and 3 respondents identified the 24-hour event notification as the primary strength of the program. Also, respondents did not view the duration or frequency of events as major challenges, with all 10 reporting that the duration and frequency of the events did not affect their ability to participate.

Two respondents said they found the online platform difficult to use for the first event. Neither fully understood how to enroll for all hours of the event and how to interpret the performance reports on the online platform, and one did not fully understand how the final MW reduction was calculated for all four hours. In both instances, subsequent communication with the ICSP answered their questions and mitigated user difficulty for the second and third events.

Additional detail regarding findings from process evaluation activities and their methodology is in *Appendix A.3.1 Process Evaluation*.

1.8 Cost-Effectiveness Reporting

A detailed breakdown of program finances and cost-effectiveness is presented in Table 8. Total resource cost (TRC) benefits were calculated using gross verified impacts. Per the TRC Order, 75% of the customer incentive payment is used as a proxy for the participant cost when calculating the TRC ratio for the program. PYTD values represent PY9 costs and benefits, and P3TD values represent phase costs and benefits up to PY9. Net present value (NPV) PYTD costs and benefits are expressed in PY9 dollars. NPV costs and benefits for P3TD financials are expressed in PY8 dollars.

Table 8. Summary of Demand Response Program Finances—Gross Verified

Row #	Cost Category	PYTD (\$1,000)		P3TD (\$1,000) ^[6]	
1	EDC Incentives to Participants	\$980		\$910	
2	EDC Incentives to Trade Allies	-		-	
3	Participant Costs (net of incentives/rebates paid by utilities)	(\$245)		(\$228)	
4	Incremental Measure Costs (Sum of rows 1 through 3) ^[1]	\$735		\$683	
		EDC	CSP	EDC	CSP
5	Design & Development ^[2]	-	-	-	-
6	Administration, Management, and Technical Assistance ^[3]	\$39	-	\$184	-
7	Marketing ^[4]	-	-	-	-
8	Program Delivery ^[5]	-	\$267	-	\$746
9	EDC Evaluation Costs	-		-	
10	SWE Audit Costs	-		-	
11 ^[6]	Program Overhead Costs (Sum of rows 5 through 10) ^{[1], [6]}	\$305		\$931	
12	NPV of increases in costs of natural gas (or other fuels) for fuel switching programs	-		-	
13	Total NPV TRC Costs (Net present value of sum of rows 4, 11, and 12) ^{[1], [7]}	\$1,040		\$1,613	
14	Total NPV Lifetime Electric Energy Benefits				
15	Total NPV Lifetime Electric Capacity Benefits	\$6,188		\$5,749	
16	Total NPV Lifetime Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Benefits	-		-	
17	Total NPV Lifetime Non-Electric Benefits (Fossil Fuel, Water)	-		-	
18	Total NPV TRC Benefits ^[8] (Sum of rows 14 through 17) ^{[8], [1]}	\$6,188		\$5,749	
19	TRC Benefit-Cost Ratio ^[9]	5.95		3.56	

^[1] May not sum to total due to rounding.

^[2] All costs for Plan Design and Development are portfolio level costs and are assigned to customer sectors at the end of the phase. These portfolio costs are not assigned to specific programs.

^[3] Includes rebate processing, tracking system, general administration, program management, general management and legal, and technical assistance.

^[4] Includes the marketing ICSP and marketing costs by program ICSPs.

^[5] Includes CSP rebate processing, direct program management, customer support, technical assistance to customers, site visits, legal, QA/QC documentation. These costs cannot be quantified separately and are included as "Program Delivery" costs.

^[6] P3TD amounts are discounted back to PY8.

^[7] Total TRC Costs includes Total EDC Costs and Participant Costs.

^[8] Total TRC Benefits equals the sum of Total Lifetime Electric and Non-Electric Benefits. 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.

^[9] TRC Ratio equals Total NPV TRC Benefits divided by Total NPV TRC Costs.

1.9 Status of Recommendations

Overall, the Demand Response Program is on track to meet the Act 129 demand reduction goal for Phase III. PPL Electric Utilities averaged 126.7 MW per event hour during PY9 and exceeded the required minimum demand savings for each event of 85% of 92 MW or 78.2 MW. The program is cost-effective,

with P3TD TRC Benefit-Cost ratio of 3.6. Participants are predominantly satisfied with the program overall and with all program design and implementation aspects.

The impact and process evaluation activities in PY9 led to the following findings and recommendations from Cadmus to PPL Electric Utilities, along with a summary of how PPL Electric Utilities plans to address the recommendation in program delivery (Table 9).

Finding: Participants are satisfied with the program overall. Of the 10 respondents interviewed, six said they were *very satisfied* with the program, and two said they were *somewhat satisfied*. No participants said they were dissatisfied with the program overall. (See *Participant Satisfaction* section). Interview respondents said the program is working as intended and that the notification timing is a main strength of the program. Respondents said the duration and frequency of events did not hinder their ability to participate.

Conclusion: Customer satisfaction with the program design and implementation are indicative of the upfront investment by PPL Electric Utilities and the ICSP to develop detailed operational plans. Participation in the program, once initial training is completed, is straightforward with well-defined protocols. The program is well designed to provide adequate flexibility and transparency to participants while also ensuring that minimum load reduction targets are met.

Finding: As of December 2017, participants have not yet received the incentive payment because the ICSP waits for the annual evaluation to determine verified peak reductions before processing incentive payments. Two interview respondents said the payment timing was inadequate, particularly in comparison to the quarterly incentive payments they receive through PJM's program. (See

Program Benefits and Costs section.)

Conclusion: The lengthy period between event participation and incentive payment is a concern for some customers, particularly those that incur participation costs as higher production costs because of the curtailment of business operations or backup generator fuel costs.

Recommendation #1: The ICSP should clearly communicate to customers when they should expect to receive the incentive payment. The ICSP could consider paying the incentive earlier, in installments, or within a timeframe amenable to each customer's financial considerations.

Finding: Small C&I and GNE customers produced higher demand savings than the ICSP reported, as shown in Table 4.

Conclusion: Though each small C&I and GNE customer provided a relatively small amount of demand response capacity, together these customers performed as expected and contributed a small but significant share of the achieved savings.

Recommendation #2: The ICSP could consider enrolling more small C&I and GNE customers as a hedge against possible under-performance of large C&I customers with significant enrolled capacity.

Finding: Baselines for many small C&I and GNE facilities that the ICSP estimated by day-matching tended to be underestimated, as *Appendix A* explains. Cadmus employed individual regressions to estimate baselines for all GNE and small C&I facilities and limited the baseline days to 30 non-holiday, non-event weekdays with the highest PJM day-ahead forecasts.

Conclusion: The *ex ante* savings reported by the ICSP underestimated the achieved demand savings.

Recommendation #3: In future evaluations, Cadmus plans to employ regression analysis to estimate baselines of small C&I and GNE customers or any customer with significant air conditioning loads. The ICSP could reconsider its baseline estimation approach for small C&I and GNE customers to better account for the impacts of weather on loads.

Finding: Some participants with large enrolled capacity appear to have adjusted their consumption of electricity on the day before an event in response to receiving advance notifications. *Appendix A* analyzes load impacts on notification days.

Conclusion: The Evaluation Framework for Pennsylvania Act 129 Phase III Programs gave evaluators discretion about whether to include notification days in the basis window. Since electricity consumption on notification days was outside the normal or expected range for many participant facilities, Cadmus concluded notification days should not be included in the customer baseline basis window. Cadmus excluded these days from the basis window when estimating baselines.

Recommendation #4: Cadmus plans to exclude notification days from the basis window in future evaluations.

Finding: The savings realization rate was close to 100%, and, for large C&I participants, which supplied 95% of the demand savings, Cadmus' savings estimates were close to the ICSP's. This may be attributed to the alignment of baseline calculations methods, particularly for the largest savers, between the ICSP and Cadmus. *Appendix A* presents savings realization findings.

Conclusion: Alignment of the ICSP and Cadmus' baseline calculation methods for large C&I facilities using day matching produced similar savings estimates, resulting in a realization rate near 100%.

Recommendation #5: If requested by PPL Electric Utilities and the ICSP, Cadmus plans to continue to perform an analysis of baseline calculation methods for new participants and share its findings with ICSP, so there is opportunity for alignment.

1.9.1 Status of Recommendations for Program

Table 9 contains the status of each PY9 recommendation made to PPL Electric Utilities.

Table 9. Status of Recommendations

Demand Response Program		
Recommendation Number	Recommendation	EDC Status of Recommendation (Implemented, Being Considered, Rejected and Explanation of Action Taken by EDC)
1	The ICSP should clearly communicate to customers when they should expect to receive the incentive payment. The ICSP could consider paying the incentive earlier, in installments, or within a timeframe amenable to each customer's financial considerations	Being considered
2	The ICSP could consider enrolling more small C&I and GNE customers as a hedge against possible under-performance of large C&I customers with significant enrolled capacity.	Being considered, although PPL and the ICSP may want to consider enrolling a few larger customers, instead of numerous smaller customers, as a hedge.
3	In future evaluations, Cadmus plans to employ regression analysis to estimate baselines of small C&I and GNE customers or any customer with significant air conditioning loads. The ICSP could reconsider its baseline estimation approach for small C&I and GNE customers to better account for the impacts of weather on loads.	Being considered
4	Cadmus plans to exclude notification days from the basis window in future evaluations.	Implemented (agree)
5	If requested by PPL Electric Utilities and the ICSP, Cadmus plans to continue to perform an analysis of baseline calculation methods for new participants and share its findings with ICSP, so there is opportunity for alignment.	Implemented (agree)

Appendix A. Evaluation Detail–Demand Response Program

A.1 Gross Impact Evaluation

The principal objective of the Demand Response Program impact evaluation was to estimate participant load impacts from Act 129 events and to determine whether PPL Electric Utilities complied with the demand response load reduction targets of Act 129. During PY9, Pennsylvania initiated three Act 129 demand response events on June 13, 2017, July 20, 2017, and July 21, 2017.

This appendix describes the methodology, including sampling and savings estimation, for estimating the program load impacts.

A.1.1 Methodology

EM&V Sampling Approach

In PY9, 93 facilities participated in one or more Act 129 demand response events. Table A-1 shows the number of participant facilities by customer type stratum. About two-thirds of participants were small commercial facilities. Cadmus estimated load impacts for all participant facilities except one. As discussed further below, it was not possible to estimate savings for one small C&I facility because this facility's readings were estimates, not actuals, during event hours.


Table A-1. PY9 Program Sampling Strategy

Stratum	Population Size	Target Levels of Confidence & Precision	Target Sample Size	Achieved Sample Size	Evaluation Activity
GNE	10	N/A	10	10	Analysis of load impact data
Large Commercial and Industrial	23	N/A	23	23	Analysis of load impact data
Small Commercial	60	N/A	60	59	Analysis of load impact data
Program Total	93	N/A	93	92	Analysis of load impact data

As Figure A-1 shows, although they represented 65% of participant facilities, small commercial facilities contracted for only 3.7 MW or 2.6% of the program's enrolled capacity.³ Large C&I customers contracted for 133.4 MW or 94% of the program's enrolled capacity. GNE customers contracted for the remaining capacity of 4.7 MW.


³ Contracted capacity refers to the capacity committed by the facility to CPower and enrolled in the program. The capacity provided by the facility during Act 129 events may have differed from the contracted amount.

Figure A-1. Enrolled Demand Response Capacity by Customer Segment



As Figure A-2 shows, most enrolled demand response capacity was provided by a small number of facilities. Of 93 participants, 69, or 74%, each contracted for less than 250 kW. Only 17 facilities contracted to supply one or more megawatts. Collectively, these facilities contracted for 94% of the program's enrolled capacity.

Figure A-2. Distribution of Demand Response Program Enrolled Capacity



Note: To protect the identity of participants, this figure does not display bins above 5 MW.

Ex Post Verified Savings Methodology


Cadmus analyzed AMI interval consumption data for individual participant facilities. A facility was defined as the area over which the participant's electricity consumption was metered and the load reductions measured during PY9 Demand Response Program period (June 1, 2017–September 30, 2017). Cadmus estimated the facility load impacts as the difference between baseline electricity demand and metered demand, as shown in this equation:

$$\text{kW impact} = \text{Baseline kW} - \text{Metered kW}$$

Baseline demand is a counterfactual and represents what the facility's load would have been if the load curtailment event had not been called. The baseline is unobservable and must be estimated. Accurate estimation of load impacts requires establishing a valid baseline.

Figure A-3 illustrates the demand response event savings estimation for a hypothetical participant facility (Customer A). The shaded area shows the event window between 2:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. The solid line shows the metered consumption, and the gray lines shows the estimated baseline. The demand savings shown as blue bars represent the reduction in demand relative to the baseline caused by the event. Also, Figure A-3 depicts an increase in load, or snapback, after the event, shown as metered load lying above the baseline during hours 18 through 20. The average demand savings per event hour are calculated as the average of the estimated hourly load reductions between 2:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m.

Figure A-3. Demand Response Program Savings



Data Collection

Cadmus collected data from several sources to evaluate the PY9 Demand Response Program impacts. Table A-2 lists the data and sources.

Table A-2. Data Sources

Data	Population	Period	Variables	Source
Customer information system data	Demand Response Program participant facilities	From beginning of enrollment to end of summer 2017	Customer name, account number, business segment, ICSP baseline calculation method, enrolled MW, event hour participation indicators and reported load reductions, advance notification times, PJM economic market participation dates	CPower (ICSP)
PJM day-ahead forecasts and Act 129 event dates and hours	PPL Electric Utilities Demand Response Program participants	Summer 2017	Event dates and hours	PPL Electric Utilities, CPower (ICSP), PJM Interconnection LLC website
Facility interval consumption data	PPL Electric Utilities Demand Response Program participants	April 1, 2017–September 30, 2017	15 minute or hour interval kWh, estimated read indicator	PPL Electric Utilities
Weather	11 weather stations in PPL Electric Utilities service area	June 2017–August 2017	Dry-bulb temperature	NOAA
Line losses	Commercial and industrial electric utility customers	Phase III Act 129	Line loss factor	PA Technical Resource Manual (2016), Table 1-4

PPL Electric Utilities provided 15-minute or one-hour interval consumption data between April 1, 2017, and September 30, 2017, for 93 participant facilities. Cadmus aggregated all facility 15-minute interval data to the hour level. The energy consumption data included a very small percentage (0.1%) of missing readings. Also, a small percentage of intervals was estimated or included one or more estimated or missing 15-minute intervals. Cadmus flagged these observations and set them to missing for the analysis. Estimated readings were not used in the calculation of facility baselines or in estimating savings. In fact, it was not possible to estimate demand savings for one small commercial facility because its consumption was estimated during each event hour in PY9.

Cadmus also screened the data for outliers but did not remove any observations. Before June 1, 2017, a small number of big box stores had negative readings during a small number of morning hours, but Cadmus inferred from the time of day and outside temperature as well as corroborating articles in the press about solar panel installations by participating big box store chains that these probably

represented negative net demand for utility supplied electricity because of on-site solar generation of electricity.

Table A-3 summarizes the outcome of the kWh data cleaning process.

Table A-3. Energy Data Summary

Observations	Number	Percentage
Participant facilities	93	100%
Total observations	408,456	100%
Obs. with missing kWh readings	261	0.1%
Obs. with estimated kWh readings	7,407	1.8%
Obs. in final analysis sample	400,788	98.1%

The ICSP provided Cadmus information about each participant facility's business segment, customer baseline calculation method, enrolled MW, participation in each event hour, and event advance notification times. The ICSP also provided information about facilities that had participated in the PJM economic market. During PY9, three Act 129 participant facilities participated in the PJM market.

Cadmus located the closest National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) weather station and mapped hourly temperature data to the kWh data. We mapped weather data to participant facilities from 11 stations across the PPL Electric Utility service area. The average temperature during event hours was 90.2°F. Table A-4 shows summary statistics for the analysis sample, including weekday event and non-event hours between 2:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. for all facilities and by customer segment. Participants consumed an average of 0.93 MWh per event hour per facility, although there was significant variation in consumption between customer segments. Large C&I facilities consumed about 2.4 MWh per hour per facility, while small C&I participants consumed about one-tenth of this amount.

The ICSP estimated average savings per participant facility per event hour of 2.4 MW, but on average, only 52% of facilities participated in each event hour. Small C&I facilities participated in only 33% of event hours because only one of 60 facilities participated in the July 20 event and none participated in the July 21 event.


Table A-4. Sample Summary Statistics

	All Facilities	GNE	Large C&I	Small C&I
Panel A: Event Hours				
kWh/hour	936.4 (2294.3)	1339.3 (2080.4)	2408.7 (3950.0)	281.2 (125.5)
Outside Temperature (°F)	90.2 (4.2)	91.1 (3.4)	91.3 (2.8)	89.6 (4.6)
Event Participation (=1 if Yes, =0 if No)	0.52 (0.50)	0.93 (0.25)	0.83 (0.37)	0.33 (0.47)
CPower Savings Estimate	2384.4 (5813.4)	283.0 (543.7)	5896.8 (8056.6)	-11.0 (64.8)
PJM Economic Participation	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
N	1,116	120	276	720
Panel B: Non-event Hours				
kWh/hour	2041.4 (5058.5)	1467.7 (1787.9)	6802.1 (8324.8)	262.3 (122.4)
Outside Temperature (°F)	74.3 (9.8)	75.1 (9.8)	74.5 (9.8)	74.1 (9.8)
Event Participation (=1 if Yes, =0 if No)	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0
CPower Savings Estimate	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0
PJM Economic Participation	0.003 (0.05)	0.000 0.00	0.011 (0.10)	0.000 0.00
N	46,132	4,960	11,408	29,764
Note: All summary statistics are sample hourly averages for hours between 2:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. on event and non-event days between April 1, 2017 and September 30, 2017. Sample standard deviations in parentheses.				

For GNE, large C&I, and small C&I facilities, Figure A-4, Figure A-5, and Figure A-6 show the average kWh per hour per facility on event days, “almost Act 129 event days,” and all other non-holiday weekdays between June 1, 2017, and September 30, 2017, that were not notification days. Almost-event days were July 12, 2017, and July 13, 2017. In PY9, these days had the highest day-ahead PJM forecasts that did not qualify them as Act 129 days and provide a natural baseline for assessing the impact of Act 129 events. These figures show demand at the meter and do not account for line losses.

For GNE facilities, the Act 129 event impacts between 2:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. are clearly evident as a reduction in load relative to demand on almost-event days. On average, demand on non-event days was significantly less than was demand on event or almost-event days, and the difference was greatest during the late morning and early afternoon. Event days tended to be warmer, and space conditioning was a major electricity end use in GNE facilities. The difference between event and non-event days suggests that many of the non-event days may not provide an accurate baseline for event days.

Figure A-4. Average kW per GNE Participant Facility in PY9



The impacts of Act 129 events between 2:00 and 6:00 p.m. on loads of large C&I facilities are also evident in Figure A-5. Average demand per facility during non-event hours (outside the 2:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. window) was significantly less on event days than on non-event or almost-event days. This suggests that at least some participants may have reduced their loads in preparation for the events on the days before events or the event days in response to receiving event notifications. On non-event days, average demand per facility was constant and suggests demand was not sensitive to weather. On almost-event days, there was a reduction in load relative to non-event days between 2:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. This may have been the result of PJM market economic program participation by several Act 129 participants. Four large C&I participants with significantly more than 20 MW of combined enrolled demand response capacity participated in the PJM market on July 12 or July 13.

Figure A-5. Average kW per Large C&I Participant Facility in PY9





Figure A-6 shows loads for small C&I facilities on the June 13 event, non-event days, and almost-event days. Fifty-nine small C&I facilities participated in the June 13 event. Loads on non-event days were lower than on event and almost-event days and do not exhibit a shape suggestive of significant energy consumption for air conditioning, again suggesting that some non-event days may not provide a valid baseline.

Figure A-6. Average kW per Small C&I Participant Facility in PY9



Baseline Calculation Approach

Day-Matching Customer Baselines and Regression Baselines

Cadmus estimated individual consumption baseline for each participant facility and event using either a day-matching approach or regression. Day-matching identifies a set of nearby, non-event, non-holiday weekdays for each event day, referred to as the *basis window*. For each event hour, the baseline is the average consumption during the same hour of the days or subset of days in the basis window. Cadmus considered a variety of general day-matching methods for estimating the baselines of participating facilities:

- *Y Previous Days*: This is the average load of Y days in the CBL basis window.
- *X Highest of Y Previous Days*: This is the average load of the X days with highest loads of Y days in the basis window.
- *Y Previous Days of Same Day Type*: This is the average load of Y days of the same day type (e.g., Wednesday) in the basis window. For example, if Y=3 and the event occurs on a Wednesday, the CBL basis window would only include three previous Wednesdays.

When applying a day-matching method, Cadmus excluded the following types of days from the basis window:

- Weekend days
- Days with average load between 2 p.m. and 6 p.m. less than 25% of the average load of all days in the baseline window. This exclusion follows PJM protocol and should result in the exclusion of most days when a facility had abnormally low consumption. Cadmus replaced excluded days with the next permissible day.
- Holidays
- Facility closures
- Previous event days
- Weekdays more than 45 days before the event day
- PJM economic participation days
- Act 129 notification days

Cadmus did not make any adjustments to the estimated baseline based on the difference between the baseline and the metered load during hours preceding the event. Adjustments of this kind were not permitted because PPL Electric Utilities' Demand Response Program involved day-ahead notification of Act 129 events.⁴ Below, Cadmus provides evidence that some participant facilities adjusted their loads in response to the advance notifications.

Day matching was the method employed by the ICSP to estimate impacts and make settlement calculations. By aligning, to the extent possible, its day matching baseline calculation methods with Cadmus, the ICSP eliminated a possible source of difference between the reported and evaluation impact estimates.

Cadmus employed regression analysis as the second baseline calculation approach. Regression involves estimating an equation to predict hourly consumption as a function of multiple independent variables such as day of the week, hour of the day, and weather. Regression controls for the impacts of weather on energy consumption better than day-matching and is expected to be superior to day-matching especially for facilities with weather-sensitive loads.

Selection Facility Baseline Calculation Method

For large C&I participant facilities, Cadmus tested the predictive accuracy of different day-matching and regression baseline calculation methods and selected the most accurate method for each facility.

⁴ See Goldberg, Miriam, and G. Kennedy Agnew. *Measurement and Verification for Demand Response*. Prepared for the National Forum on the National Action Plan on Demand Response: Measurement and Verification Working Group. 2013. The exception to this rule would be an adjustment based on an exogenous variable such as weather or the PJM day-ahead forecast of load or actual load.

Cadmus used the selected methods to calculate customer baseline demand for the Act 129 demand response events in 2017.

To identify the most accurate baseline method for large C&I participant facilities, Cadmus used AMI meter data from summer 2016 to test the predictive accuracy of different day-matching and regression baseline calculation methods.⁵ Cadmus tested the accuracy of each baseline method by comparing predicted baseline consumption to metered consumption in each hour between 2:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. on 38 non-holiday weekdays between June 15, 2016, and September 1, 2016. The difference between the estimated baseline and the metered consumption was the prediction error. This error is expected to be zero if the baseline predicts accurately since there were no Act 129 events in 2016.

For each facility, Cadmus selected the day-matching or regression baseline method that performed best in terms of accuracy, bias, and variability (risk). It assessed the accuracy of the baseline using several statistics including relative root mean squared error (RRMSE), mean absolute percentage error (MAPE), and median percentage prediction error. Cadmus also calculated and plotted the distribution of errors to see if there were a small number of hours where models predicted poorly.

For each large C&I facility, Cadmus tested the predictive accuracy of 10 day-matching methods and two regression models:

- 2 previous days
- 3 previous days
- 4 previous days
- 5 previous days
- 10 previous days
- 3 of 5 previous days with highest average load during event hours
- 4 of 5 previous days with highest average load during event hours
- 7 of 10 previous days with highest average load during event hours
- 3 previous days of the same day type (e.g., Wednesdays)
- 4 previous days of the same day type
- Regression 1
- Regression 2

The first regression model included as regressors interactions between indicator variables for each hour between 2:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. and indicator variables for day of the week and a cubic polynomial in outdoor temperature. The second substituted a cooling degree hour (CDH) variable and a heat buildup

⁵ Cadmus tested the predictive accuracy of the model for each hour between 2:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. on summer, non-holiday weekdays in 2016 that would have qualified as Act 129 days.

variable for the temperature variables but was otherwise the same.⁶ Cadmus applied data filters to the regressions like those applied to day-matching data.⁷

Cadmus subjected large C&I facilities selected for regression to additional specification testing by testing the predictive accuracy of 17 different regression model specifications, including the original ones, on 30 non-holiday, non-event weekdays in 2017 that had highest PJM day-ahead forecasts but that did qualify as Act 129 demand response days. Cadmus selected the specification that predicted best to estimate the event day baselines for the facility. The regression specifications are described in Table A-5. Models 1 and 2 correspond to the specifications from the original round of testing.

Table A-5. Baseline Regression Model Specifications

Model	Dependent Variable	Class Variables	Independent Variables	Intercept
1	kWh/Hour	Day Hour	Day*Hour Temp Temp ² Temp ³	No
2	kWh/Hour	Day Hour	Day*Hour CDD75 CDD75_Buildup	No
3	kWh/Hour	Day	Day	No
4	kWh/Hour	Day Hour	Hour Day	No
5	kWh/Hour	Day Hour	Hour Day CDD75	No
6	kWh/Hour	Day Hour	Hour Day CDD75_Buildup	No
7	kWh/Hour	Day	Day CDD75	No
8	kWh/Hour	Day	Day CDD75 CDD75_Buildup	No
9	kWh/Hour	Day	Day CDD75_Buildup	No
10	kWh/Hour	Hour	Hour	No
11	kWh/Hour	Hour	Hour CDD75	No
12	kWh/Hour	Hour	Hour CDD75_Buildup	No
13	kWh/Hour	Hour	Hour CDD75_Buildup	No
14	kWh/Hour		CDD75	Yes
15	kWh/Hour		CDD75 CDD75_Buildup	Yes
16	kWh/Hour		CDD75_Buildup	Yes
17	kWh/Hour	Day Hour	Day Hour CDD75 CDD75_Buildup	No

Originally, Cadmus subjected GNE and small C&I participant facilities to the same baseline testing process. Regression analysis provided the most accurate baselines for many, but not all, such facilities. However, Cadmus determined that the day-matching calculation methods selected for small GNE and small C&I customers appeared to substantially under-predict the counterfactual baseline on event days

⁶ The heat buildup variable was the weighted average of CDHs in the preceding 24 hours. The weights were normalized to sum to one and the weight assigned to hour t-1 was 90% of the weight assigned to hour t, so that more recent hours received greater weight.

⁷ Cadmus excluded weekends, holidays, the day immediately preceding the test day as it was analogous to the notification day, and days with average load during event hours less than 25% of the average load during event hours across all days in the basis window. In addition, the number of days eligible for the window was increased from 45 days to 60 days.

and led to demand savings estimates that were too low. The underprediction was consistent with the patterns between event and non-event days evident in Figure A-4 and Figure A-6.

As a result, Cadmus implemented two changes to the evaluation plan for calculating baselines for GNE and small C&I facilities. First, Cadmus used regression analysis to construct the baseline for all GNE and small commercial facilities. Second, it limited the days used in estimating the baseline model to the 30 non-holiday weekdays with the highest PJM day-ahead forecasts that were neither event days nor event notification days. This corresponded to days with PJM day-ahead forecasts for one or more hours that were 81% or more of the PJM summer peak demand forecast. Cadmus tested the sensitivity of the savings estimates to different PJM forecast cutoffs and found that the results were not sensitive to the number between 15 and 30 of included non-qualifying days with the highest day-ahead forecasts.

Table A-6 shows counts of participant facilities by baseline modeling approach for all facilities, by customer segment, and for 17 facilities with capacity enrollments greater than or equal to 1 MW. The large MW facilities accounted for 94% of enrolled capacity.

Table A-6. Number of Facilities by Baseline Modeling Approach

Baseline	All facilities	GNE	Large C&I	Small C&I	DR Capacity ≥ 1 MW
2 OF 2	3	0	3	0	2
3 OF 3	1	0	1	0	1
3 OF 5	1	0	1	0	1
4 OF 4	0	0	0	0	0
4 OF 5	1	0	1	0	1
5 OF 5	1	0	1	0	1
7 OF 10	3	0	3	0	3
10 OF 10	1	0	1	0	1
Day of Week 4 of 4	1	0	1	0	1
Day of Week 3 of 3	0	0	0	0	0
Regression	80	10	11	59	6
Total	92	10	23	59	17


Note: Cadmus could not estimate savings for one facility because all of its kWh readings during event hour were estimated.

Among large C&I facilities, regression was the most frequently-chosen baseline modeling method. Cadmus used regression analysis for almost half (N=11) of such facilities. Many large C&I facilities used day-matching approaches because they had highly variable day-to-day consumption between 2:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m., and regression did not predict well. For these facilities, the best predictor of consumption was consumption in recent previous days, so many large C&I facilities selected X-of-Y-previous-day baseline methods.

Cadmus estimated the predictive accuracy of selected baseline methods on non-event, non-holiday, and non-notification weekdays in summer 2017 for hours between 2:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. For facilities with regression baselines, the testing was limited to the 30 days with highest PJM day-ahead forecasts. For facilities with day-matching baselines, the testing was conducted on all qualifying days between June 1,

2017, and September 30, 2017. Figure A-7 shows the RRMSE for hourly kWh predictions for facilities with regression baselines.


Figure A-7. Predictive Accuracy of Regression Baseline Facilities



Of 79 participant facilities with regression baselines, 70 had RRMSE less than 0.2, which is considered the upper bound of the desired range. Eight of the nine remaining facilities had RRMSE between 0.2 and 0.4, slightly higher than what is considered desirable. Overall, the regressions used to predict baseline consumption demonstrated high predictive accuracy.

Figure A-8 shows the RRMSE for day-matching facilities. The predictive accuracy of the day-matching baselines was not as high as that for the regression baselines. Eight of 12 facilities had RRMSE less than 0.4, but four facilities had RRMSE greater than 0.5. However, although the predictive accuracy of the day-matching baselines for some facilities was less than desired, the day-matching baselines still provided greater accuracy than regression baselines for these facilities.

Figure A-8. Predictive Accuracy of Day-Matching Baseline Facilities



Standard Errors of Demand Savings Estimates

Cadmus calculated 90% confidence intervals for the gross verified demand savings from the standard errors for the savings estimates of individual facilities. For facilities with regression baselines, Cadmus estimated the standard errors for the estimates of average demand savings per event hour using the estimated variances and co-variances of the hourly demand savings estimates. For facilities with day-matching baselines, Cadmus followed SWE's and PJM's guidance to predict loads on non-event days in 2017 and to estimate the margin of error at the 90% confidence level as the root mean square error (RMSE). Cadmus calculated the RMSE for the day-matching baseline using baseline predictions for hours between 2:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. on non-holiday, non-event and non-notification days between June 1, 2017, and September 30, 2017.

Act 129 Events in Program Year 9

Table A-7 presents the Act 129 event dates, hours, advance notification date and times, and the average outside temperature during events in PY9.

Table A-7. PY9 Act 129 Events Dates and Times


Event Date	Event Hours	Advance Notification Date and Time	Average Outside Temperature (°F) During Event
Tuesday, June 13, 2017	2:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.	June 12, 2017, 10:33 a.m.	92.4
Thursday, July 20, 2017	2:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.	July 19, 2017, 10:02 a.m.	90.8
Friday, July 21, 2017	2:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.	July 20, 2017, 11:02 a.m.	89.5
Note: Advance notification times were obtained from CPower through Cadmus data request.			

Note that the second and third events were on consecutive days. Participants received notification of the July 21, 2017 event before the start of the July 20 event. This may have caused some large C&I customers not to resume normal business operations after the July 20 event ended because another event would occur during the next day.

Discussion of Results

The estimates of program and customer segment demand savings by Act 129 event date are presented in Table 4 and Table 5 in the main body. In Figure A-9, Cadmus also presents the results graphically. Unless noted otherwise, all demand load impacts have been adjusted for line losses.

Figure A-9. PPL Electric Utilities Act 129 Gross Verified Demand Savings



Notes: Estimates based on Cadmus analysis of AMI interval consumption data for participant facilities. Error bars show 90% confidence intervals. The Phase III demand response target for PPL Electric Utilities is 92 MW. All savings estimates were adjusted for line losses.

PPL Electric Utilities achieved demand savings of 120 MW on June 13, 2017, 132 MW/ on July 20, 2017, and 128 MW on July 21, 2017, easily exceeding the Act 129 target for each event of 78.2 MW. Furthermore, across the three events, PPL Electric Utilities averaged 126.7 MW, putting the program on track to exceed PPL Electric's target of 92 MW for Phase III of Act 129. As Figure A-9 shows, large C&I customers were responsible for more than 95% of the demand response savings.

Table A-8 reports the evaluation estimated demand savings, metered demand, estimated baseline demand, and the percentage demand savings by event for each customer segment and the program.

Table A-8. Event Demand Savings and Baseline Demand

	Event	Demand Savings (MW/hour)	Metered Demand (MW/hour)	Baseline Demand (MW/hour)	Relative Precision at 90% C.L.	Percentage Demand Savings
Small C&I	June 13, 2017	3.0	16.7	19.7	15%	15.1%
	July 20, 2017	0.2	0.0	0.2	13%	81.7%
	July 21, 2017	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Large C&I	June 13, 2017	113.9	42.7	156.6	6%	72.7%
	July 20, 2017	127.0	52.0	179.0	5%	71.0%
	July 21, 2017	123.0	58.4	181.4	5%	67.8%
GNE	June 13, 2017	3.5	9.8	13.3	16%	26.1%
	July 20, 2017	4.7	14.2	18.8	18%	24.7%
	July 21, 2017	4.9	14.0	18.9	17%	26.1%
Event	June 13, 2017	120.3	69.2	189.5	6%	63.5%
	July 20, 2017	131.8	66.2	198.0	5%	66.6%
	July 21, 2017	127.9	72.4	200.3	5%	63.9%
Average		126.7	69.3	196.0	3%	64.6%

Notes: Estimates based on Cadmus analysis of AMI interval consumption data for participant facilities. Percentage demand savings were estimated as the ratio of the estimated demand savings to estimated baseline demand.


Across event hours, the program saved about 65% of participant electricity demand during event hours. Large C&I customers saved significantly more demand as a percentage of the baseline (about 70%) than small C&I customers (about 15%) and GNE customers (about 25%).

Load Impacts by Event Day

Figure A-10, Figure A-11, and Figure A-12 present metered demand, the estimated baseline demand, and the estimated load impacts of participant facilities by hour of the day for the three Act 129 demand response event days. The error bars for the load impacts show 90% confidence intervals. The event window is shaded.


On June 13, 2017, electricity demand of participants was slightly below the expected level, as shown by metered demand lying below baseline demand before the event. Only some of these differences are statistically significant, however, as shown by the 90% confidence intervals for the load impacts that include zero. Below, Cadmus presents evidence that several facilities with large demand response capacity (>5 MW) reduced their loads below normal on the day before the event. This load reduction on June 12, 2017 may have carried over into the event day. After the event ended, energy demand remained below normal through the end of the day.

Figure A-10. June 13, 2017 – Hourly Load Impacts




The load impacts on July 20 appear like those on July 13. Demand was slightly below normal before the start of the event and did not return to normal after the event ended before the end of the day. Demand remained below normal because during the late morning or early afternoon of July 20, participants received notification that another Act 129 event would occur on the following day. Many large C&I participants did not resume normal consumption of utility-supplied electricity.

Figure A-11. July 20, 2017 – Hourly Load Impacts



In the early morning of July 21, demand of Act 129 participants was over 33% below the expected level. After the event ended, demand increased but did not return to normal levels before the end of the day.

Figure A-12. July 21, 2017 – Hourly Load Impacts



Overall, these results suggest that Act 129 demand response events produced significant effects on electricity consumption during non-event hours on event days. Energy consumption was below normal

during event and non-event hours, resulting in savings of utility-supplied electricity. Some participants reported that they maintained business operations during events by substituting on-site backup generation for utility-supplied electricity, while others reported curtailing operations, reducing electricity consumption, and shifting loads to non-event hours and days.

Event Day Load Impacts by Customer Segment

Figure A-13 through Figure A-20 show the load impacts by hour of each event day for GNE, large C&I, and small C&I participant customers. There was only one small C&I customer that participated in the July 20, 2017 event, and no small C&I customers participated in the July 21, 2017 event.

In the GNE and small C&I customer segments, some customers appear to have shifted loads from event hours to non-event hours. This load shifting is manifested as higher than normal demand in hours before and after events. GNE and small C&I customers could shift air conditioning loads by cooling their facilities to a lower temperature before the start of the event. Day-ahead notification of Act 129 events allowed participants to manage their loads. After the events ended, electricity consumption snapped back, as the energy management system returned the facility's interior temperature to normal settings.

Figure A-13. June 13, 2017 – GNE Participants




Figure A-14. July 20, 2017 – GNE Participants




Figure A-15. July 21, 2017 – GNE Participants




Figure A-16 through Figure A-18 show load impacts for large C&I participants. Since these participants accounted for 95% of the event demand savings, Figure A-16 through Figure A-18 look very much like

Figure A-13 through Figure A-15. As expected, the loads of large C&I customers do not appear very weather-sensitive. Loads only trended up slightly across hours of the day.

Figure A-16. June 13, 2017 – Large C&I Participants




Figure A-17. July 20, 2017 – Large C&I Participants




Figure A-18. July 21, 2017 – Large C&I Participants




Figure A-19 and Figure A-20 show the load impacts for small C&I customers on June 13 and July 20. As noted above, only one small C&I customer participated in the July 20 event. Both figures show that electricity consumption rebounded significantly after the event ended.

Figure A-19. June 13, 2017 – Small C&I Participants





Figure A-20. July 20, 2017 – Small C&I Participants



Analysis of Notification Day Load Impacts

Cadmus also analyzed the load impacts of event notifications on notification days. The analysis shows that consumption of many large C&I participant facilities on notification days was outside the normal range, suggesting that they adjusted their loads in response to either event notifications or other factors. The Evaluation Framework for Pennsylvania Act 129 Phase III Programs gave evaluators discretion about whether to include notification days in the basis window. Since electricity consumption on notification days was outside the normal or expected range for many participant facilities, Cadmus decided not to include these days in the basis window. This analysis supports our decision to exclude event notification days and partially explains the difference in the reported and evaluated savings.

As Table A-7 indicates, participants received advance notifications of Act 129 events in the morning or early afternoon of the preceding day. There were three events, but since the July 20 and July 21 events occurred on consecutive days, the event notification for July 21 was given on an event day, and any load impacts of the event notification would be confounded with those from the event. For the June 12 and July 19 notification days, Cadmus estimated facility baseline consumption and compared it to metered consumption in the hours after customers received the event notification. It looked for changes in energy demand that suggested the facility adjusted its consumption in response to the event notification or that were otherwise unexpected. Cadmus focused the analysis on the 17 facilities that contracted to supply at least one MW of demand response capacity.

First, several facilities, including two supplying well over 5 MW of demand response capacity, appear to have ramped up or down their consumption shortly before or after receiving event notifications on June 12, 2017. Figure A-21 through Figure A-26 show load impacts on notification days for different facilities supplying at least 1 MW of capacity. The shaded areas show post-event notification hours. Cadmus removed the y-axis labels to protect the confidentiality of the participants since the consumption could be used to identify them. The dotted lines show the 90% confidence intervals for the estimated baselines. When metered consumption lies outside the confidence interval, it suggests that facility's demand was not in the expected range.

Figure A-21. Illustration of June 12 Notification Day Impacts for Large C&I Participant Facility




Figure A-22. Illustration of June 12 Notification Day Impacts for Large C&I Participant Facility





Figure A-23. Illustration of July 19 Notification Day Impacts for Large C&I Participant Facility



In addition, several facilities appear to have curtailed loads on event notification days as if an event was scheduled for the notification day. This includes one facility that enrolled more than 5 MW of demand response capacity. According to ICSP's records, this facility did not participate in the PJM economic market on this day.

Another potential explanation for these notification day impacts is that on June 12 and July 19, the PJM region experienced two of five coincident peaks (SCP) in 2017, which are days between June 1 and September 30 with the five highest daily unrestricted RTO peak loads. EDCs calculate customer peak load contributions and demand charges based on customer consumption during these hours. It is possible some customers attempted to manage their loads on these days to reduce their peak demand charges.

Figure A-24. Illustration of July 19 Notification Day Impacts for Participant Facility




Figure A-25. Illustration of July 19 Notification Day Impacts for Participant Facility






Figure A-26. Illustration of July 19 Notification Day Impacts for Participant Facility



A.2 Realization Rate Findings

Figure A-27 shows the savings realization rate—the ratio of gross verified to gross reported savings—for each Act 129 event and the average across events. The realization rates ranged from 105% for the July 20 event to 119% for the June 13 event. Across all events, the savings realization rate was 110%. The biggest discrepancies between gross reported and verified savings occurred for GNE and small commercial participants. For the June 13 event, Cadmus estimated savings of 3.1 MW for small C&I participants while the ICSP estimated savings of -0.7 MW. Similarly, for the same event, Cadmus estimated savings of 3.5 MW for GNE participants while the ICSP estimated savings of 0.3 MW.

Figure A-27. Event Savings Realization Rates



Note: Realization rates estimated based on Cadmus analysis of AMI interval consumption data for participant facilities and ICSP reported demand savings.

For the June 13 event, Cadmus estimated savings approximately 20% higher than the ICSP (CPower) for two reasons. First, as noted above, the day matching estimator that the ICSP used for the GNE and small C&I facilities substantially underpredicted baseline demand and therefore demand savings during events. Second, Cadmus excluded event notification days from the basis window while the ICSP did not. As shown above, several large C&I facilities with large enrolled capacity may have reduced their consumption in response to the June 12 event notification. Including notification days has the effect of reducing the estimated baseline and savings.

A.3 Process Evaluation

The process evaluation assessed program processes to provide possible recommendations for improving program operation. Cadmus' process evaluation for the Demand Response Program assessed participant motivation, participant satisfaction, challenges and processes that worked well.

A.3.1 Process Evaluation Methodology

To accomplish these objectives, Cadmus interviewed PPL Electric Utilities and ICSP program staff, conducted participant interviews, reviewed program materials, and reviewed the program logic model.

Program Staff and ICSP Interviews

In November of 2017, Cadmus conducted interviews with the program managers from PPL Electric Utilities and the ICSP. The interviews focused on the following:

- Gathering insights into program design and delivery
- Identifying areas working well (successes)
- Identifying areas that could be improved (challenges)
- Assessing perceived customer experience including satisfaction

Participant Interviews

Cadmus conducted telephone interviews with participating customers between November and December of 2017. The interviews focused on:

- Program satisfaction
- Motivations for participating in the program and perceived benefits and costs
- Satisfaction with event advance notification and feedback about achieved load reductions
- Abilities and strategies for shifting of loads from event to non-event hours
- Recommendations for program improvements and other process issues
- Program processes that are working well

To prepare the interview contact list, Cadmus included all 93 facilities participating in the PY9 Demand Response Program. Because seven participating companies managed multiple facilities, including 63 retail facilities managed by just 3 companies, Cadmus created a contact list of 26 unique participating companies. This contact list ensured that there was no personnel overlap between individuals we contacted. Cadmus considered participating companies that were co-owned and represented by a single energy manager, as a single company.

Because the top 10 customers, ranked by enrolled MW load reduction, accounted for 91% of the program's total load reduction, Cadmus prioritized interviewing these top 10 customers, followed by customers with an enrolled load reduction of 1 MW or more, and lastly all remaining customers.

Table A-9. Process Evaluation Sampling Strategy

Enrolled Demand Reduction (MW)	Percentage of Contracted MW	Number of Unique Participating Companies	Number Contacted	Number Achieved
128.5	91%	10	10	3
8.4	6%	7	7	5
4.9	3%	9	9	2

Following an introductory email from the ICSP, Cadmus contacted and requested an interview with the individual responsible for managing participating facilities' load reduction during Act 129 events and for enrolling the company as a Demand Response Program participant. For situations where these responsibilities were shared by multiple individuals, Cadmus reached out to all parties. Despite multiple

attempts to contact high priority participants via email and phone calls, and considerable staff flexibility scheduling interviews, Cadmus completed interviews with 3 of the top 10 participants. Although Cadmus met the evaluation target of 10 participant interviews, none of the top five participants agreed to an interview, which limited the representative enrolled MW of interview respondents to 12.4% of the total enrolled MW in the program.

Table A-10 shows the total participant population size and the response rate as a percentage of unique participants.

Table A-10. Participant Interview Sampling Plan and Response Rate

Survey Mode and Audience	Population	Participating Companies	Target Sample Size	Achieved Sample Size	Response Rate
Participant Telephone Interviews	93 facilities	26 companies	10	10	38%

See Section A.3.3 *Sample Cleaning and Attrition for Participant Interviews* for sampling cleaning and attrition.

A.3.2 Additional Findings

This section presents additional findings from the participant interviews.

Program Delivery

The Demand Response Program is designed to reduce PPL Electric Utilities' system load by an average of 92 MW as mandated by the PaPUC's Act 129 requirements. Participants were primarily recruited through the ICSP's existing customer base and through targeted outreach to other large customers in PPL Electric Utilities' service territory. To ensure that the minimum load reduction threshold was met during the first performance year, the ICSP over-subscribed the program, resulting in between 110 MW and 130 MW reduction per event.

From June to September 2017, the ICSP identified three program events during which PPL Electric Utilities' projected peak system load was expected to meet or exceed 96% of total capacity for at least one hour. Events were identified at 9:45 a.m. the day before and were scheduled to last four consecutive hours, which were selected by the ICSP. Events were limited to non-holiday weekdays, two of which were scheduled consecutively.

By 10:30 a.m. on the day prior to the event, the ICSP provided advance notice to PPL Electric Utilities and PJM followed by email, text, and phone notifications to program participants. Participants were encouraged to enroll by 3:00 p.m. of the day prior to the event but could choose to enroll up to the event start time. Participants could also choose to enroll for a portion of the four-hour event. To enroll in an event, participants selected specific hours for enrollment on the ICSP's online platform. On the day of the event, the ICSP sent a reminder to enrolled participants and a final notification to unenrolled program participants and actively managed participants to optimize peak reductions for the event. Load reductions were estimated in real time using the ICSP's online platform. After the event, the ICSP and PPL Electric Utilities reviewed event performance and data.

Logic Model Review

Cadmus reviewed the Demand Response Program's logic model and determined this program is operating as expected. Table A-11 summarizes the outcome of the logic model review.

Table A-11. Demand Response Program Logic Model Review

Expected PY9 Outcome	Logic Model Element	Actual PY9 Outcome
ICSP recruits eligible C&I customers, identifies event days and sends notifications, estimates peak reductions for each participant, prepares to process incentives	Program Activities	Program activities conducted as planned
ICSP successfully recruits customers, customers enroll in events, and incentives paid	Outputs Produced by Program Activities	Delivered most outputs as expected in PY9; incentive payments delayed
Act 129 demand reduction requirements met	Short-term Outcomes	Produced short-term outcomes (PY9)
Proven reliability of the Demand Response Program to deliver demand reductions, compliance with the PaPUC's Act 129 demand response rules	Intermediate Outcomes (second and third program year)	On track to produce intermediate outcomes
PPL Electric Utilities meets the PaPUC's Act 129 DR requirements, customers are satisfied with the program and with PPL	Long-term Outcomes (end of Phase III)	On track to produce long-term outcomes

Participant Profile

Most participating companies (16 of 26) in PPL Electric Utilities' Demand Response Program are large C&I customers with the remaining participation equally divided between small C&I and GNE customers (Table A-12). Manufacturing, the predominant participant industry, contributes roughly 94% of the total load reduction, followed by the retail industry. Event load reduction is largely driven by a select few participants—the top five participants, ranked by enrolled MW load reduction, represent 74% of the total enrolled MW, and the top 10 participants represent 92%.

Table A-12. Participant and Respondent Profile

Sector	Unique Participating Companies	Interview Respondents
Large C&I	16	6
Small C&I	5	3
GNE	5	1
Total	26	10

Participant Satisfaction

Respondents were satisfied with the program ICSP, with 3 respondents reporting that they were *very satisfied* and 5 reporting that they were *somewhat satisfied* with their interactions with the ICSP.

Considering that all program participants (all 93 participating facilities) have also participated in at least one other demand response program (PJM), including two respondents who participate in multiple

demand response programs throughout the country, respondents voluntarily compared PPL Electric Utilities' program to these other programs during the interviews. Respondents predominantly indicated that, although the Act 129 program requirements are stricter than PJM's, PPL Electric Utilities' Act 129 program incorporates several design advantages, such as the timing of notifications and the frequency of events, which contributes to their overall satisfaction with the program.

Communications

Cadmus asked respondents if they had received feedback from the ICSP regarding their achieved load reduction and seven of nine said they had. Of the respondents who did receive feedback, six of seven said the feedback they received about their load reduction was useful, but all six said the feedback did not affect how they curtailed their load during the following events. For one customer, feedback from the ICSP alerted them to an issue in the facility's automated load reduction system, and subsequent communications helped to identify the specific issue. Of the two respondents who had not received feedback, one was unaware that the company had been removed from the called-upon participant list because of poor load reduction performance during the first event.

Respondents were satisfied with their communications with ICSP – four respondents said that they were *very satisfied*, and four respondents said that they were *somewhat satisfied*. The remaining two respondents said they were *not too satisfied* with their communications with the ICSP. One participant said there was no communication after the event ended; this participant tried reaching out to the ICSP to discuss the facility's performance but was unable to reach them it after multiple attempts. Another participant said the ICSP's communication was too "automated and impersonal" compared to a different CSP the participant had worked with.

Cadmus asked respondents to provide suggestions to improve communications with the program ICSP. The majority (7) of respondents did not provide any suggestions for improving communication. One participant (n=10) would appreciate more upfront training on how to use the ICSP's online platform, and two participants requested more frequent and more detailed feedback from the ICSP about their performance. The lower satisfaction ratings for communications with the program ICSP were provided by participants with enrolled MW load reduction <1 MW.

Participant Motivation

Cadmus asked respondents to identify the factors that motivated their participation in the program. All 10 respondents said the program incentive was the primary reason for participating. Three participants also said that, because they participate in PJM's demand response program, they already had the internal protocols in place for load reduction and that signing up for and participating in PPL Electric Utilities' Act 129 events was easy and made sense financially. One respondent said that because the probability of Act 129 events occurring was higher than PJM events, enrolling in both programs increased the likely incentive payments for a single season. Two customers who shed load, rather than shifting to backup generators, also said the benefit of reducing their electric bill was a factor in their decision to participate. One participant said that participating in the Act 129 program helped them lower the baseline kWh price they pay their CSP.

None of the respondents, regardless of load reduction strategy, said they had to be convinced to sign up; the program was viewed as financially and operationally attractive, even in comparison to participating in PJM's program.

Program Benefits and Costs

Incentives allow companies to recoup the opportunity costs incurred when normal business operations are curtailed. The largest expected incentive was roughly \$60,000 for the group of participants interviewed, and \$270,000 for all program participants. Two manufacturing customers who were interviewed expressed the greatest concern over the delayed incentive payment, as did one other participant that enrolled a large amount of megawatts for event load reduction.

Nine of 10 respondents said that they will likely participate in the Demand Response Program in 2018. One respondent who was unlikely to participate said that generator fuel costs and the internal labor needed for participation outweighed the incentives. Nevertheless, this participant said the facility would continue participating in PJM's program because the incentives were higher. Another respondent was concerned about how the program affected the facility's calculated Peak Load Contribution (PLC) value for PJM's program, and as long as the PLC value was not negatively affected, this participant planned to continue participation in PPL Electric Utilities' program.

Event Notification


All 10 respondents said that the timing of event notifications was adequate for them to prepare for an event. For comparison, PJM events can be called with as few as 30 minutes of advance notification. Five of the respondents said they could respond to an event with an hour or less of advance notification and three said four hours or less was adequate. Two said they needed 24 hours advanced notice; these were also the two largest participants interviewed in terms of enrolled megawatts.

Two respondents said that, even if they could accommodate less than 24 hours' notice, they appreciated as much advance notice as possible, particularly if events were called back-to-back, so they could plan the facility's production schedule around the event hours and incorporate all necessary components of their load reduction plan to hit their reduction target.

Event Duration and Frequency

Respondents did not view the duration or frequency of events as major challenges—all 10 respondents said that the duration and frequency of the events did not affect their ability to participate. Seven of 10 were capable of participating in events longer than four hours (Figure A-28). Of all 26 participating companies, three enrolled for the partial duration of an event, and one of these cited a generator issue as the reason for partial participation.

Figure A-28. Maximum Event Duration



Source: Interview question B5, "How, if at all, did the duration and frequency of events affect your ability to participate?" (n=10)

Generally, respondents said that, although participating in events on two or more consecutive days was challenging, they could meet their load reduction target given enough advance warning (24 hours). Nevertheless, some respondents voiced concern about their ability to reliably perform during consecutive events. One respondent was highly dependent on having the right personnel present for an event, and that back-to-back events were more likely to coincide with critical personnel absences. Another respondent said that fluctuating production requirements could dictate the facility's ability to participate in consecutive events. All respondents dispatched by the ICSP for the back-to-back events in July did participate in both events.

Nine of 10 respondents also said they would probably participate in events called four days in a row if given sufficient notice. However, their definition of sufficient notice changed for four consecutive events. Seven of 10 customers would participate in events called four days in a row if the current notification schedule (24 hours notice) was used. Generally, respondents said that as the number of possible consecutive event days increases, the need for more advanced notification becomes more pronounced.

Respondents who reduced load through automated systems that do not affect business operations did not hesitate about participating in consecutive events. Two of these respondents had prior demand response experience in other markets with programs that frequently called events three or more days in a row; they said they would be well-equipped to participate in consecutive events called for PPL Electric Utilities' Demand Response Program. However, respondents who had to shut down business operations during events were generally more hesitant to commit to participate in multiple consecutive events.

Load Reduction

Respondents use a variety of strategies to reduce their load during events, ranging from simple automatic light dimming and HVAC cycling to the complex process of shutting down melting furnaces

and kilns. Strategies fall into three main categories (Table A-13). Five of the respondents said it was difficult to meet the expected load reduction threshold, and these respondents were represented within all three types of load reduction strategies. Reported difficulties included generator issues and the high cost of restarting certain equipment when an event was called during a production cycle.

Table A-13. Load Reduction Strategies

How Load is Reduced	Number of Respondents
Shift (generator)	3
Shed with same business functionality	3
Shed with reduced business functionality	4
Source: Interview question, "What did your facility do to reduce or shift its load?"	

Participants did not report any significant pre-event ramp-up or post-event snap-back load effects. Only one respondent reported taking any specific actions to prepare for the event; the action involved pre-chilling the air-conditioned space the night before an event. After an event, four respondents restarted equipment shut off during the events, two restored HVAC or production equipment to normal temperature settings, and four respondents took no specific load-modifying action other than cycling off generators or resuming business operations.

None of the respondents thought they could significantly reduce load further during a single event, but some offered ideas for additional, but minimal, load reduction (Table A-14). No respondents indicated any willingness to pursue any of these opportunities.

Table A-14. Further Load Reduction Opportunities

Possible Ideas to Reduce Load	Number of Responses
Install higher HVAC equipment	3
Use a generator to shift load	1
Change hours of business activities	1
Shift to dimmable LEDs	1
Shift small lighting loads and reduce battery charging	1
Source: Interview question C4, "Do you think that your facility could reduce load further during a single event?" (n=7, multiple responses allowed)	

Program Strengths

Cadmus asked respondents to identify specific aspects of the Demand Response Program that worked well. In general, respondents reported that the program performed as expected and that the 24-hour event notification and the online platform were key strengths of the program (Table A-15).

Table A-15. Demand Response Program Strengths

Aspects Working Well	Number of Responses
24-hour notification	3
Everything functioned as intended	3
Online platform	2
Program easy to understand	1
Good number of events	1
Act 129 worked well with established protocol	1
Source: Interview question D5, "Again, thinking about the program, what aspect of the program worked particularly well?" and other comments provided throughout the interview. (n=10; multiple responses allowed)	

Suggested Program Improvements

Cadmus asked respondents for recommendations to improve the program. In general, respondents said the program worked well as is and there is minimal room for improvement. Nevertheless, respondents identified a few specific areas that could be improved during next year's program. Three respondents said the ICSP should improve the timing of incentive payments and make it more comparable to PJM's payment policy. One respondent said the payment procedure should be clearly explained prior to participating. Other suggestions included requests for additional training on how to use the online platform and having the ICSP fix the "Historical Usage" and "Financial Data" pages on the platform.

Two respondents were also concerned with how the program would affect their PLC value. They were unaware that they could discuss PLC baseline adjustments to account for load reduction during Act 129 events with the ICSP.

A.3.3 Sample Cleaning and Attrition for Participant Interviews

To prepare the contact list, Cadmus included all 26 unique participating companies in the PY9 Demand Response Program. See *Participant Interviews* section for a description of the contact list preparation.

Table A-16 lists total numbers of records contacted and the outcome (final disposition) of each record.

Table A-16. Demand Response Participant Interview Sample Attrition Table

Description of Telephone Call Outcomes	Count
Population (number of unique companies)	26
Removed: incomplete or bad phone number, inactive customer, completed survey in past 3 months, on "do not contact" list, opted out of survey, selected for a different survey, duplicate contact	0
Survey Sample Frame (used for telephone interview calls)	26
Not attempted	0
Records Attempted	26
Refusal	1
No answer/answering machine/phone busy/no response	15
Non-specific or specific callback scheduled	0
Partial complete (not included in survey findings analysis)	0
Completed Surveys	10
Response Rate (completed surveys divided by number of records attempted)	38%

ORIGIN ID:ABEA (610) 774-6256
KIMBERLY KLOCK
PPL CORPORATION
2 N 9TH STREET

(610) 774-6256

ALLENTOWN, PA 18101
UNITED STATES US

SHIP DATE: 16JAN18
ACTWGT: 2.00 LB
CAD: 109920348/NET3920

BILL SENDER

TO ROSEMARY CHIAVETTA, SECRETARY
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISS
COMMONWEALTH KEYSTONE BLDG
400 NORTH ST
HARRISBURG PA 17120


(717) 772-7777

REF ID: A6734617-811(2) & 734617-013

INV
PO

DEPT

545J16D40104C



177117091303602

WED - 17 JAN 10:30A
PRIORITY OVERNIGHT

TRK#
0201

7712 3022 1493

EN MDTA

17120
MDT

