

Memorandum

To: Lisa Skumatz and Scott Dimetrosky; CT EEB Evaluation Consultant
CC: Craig Diamond, CT EEB Executive Secretary
From: Glenn Reed, CT EEB Residential Technical Consultant
Date: 6/16/2014
Re: Additional Residential Technical Consultant comments on the Draft CL&P Year 2 Home Energy Report (HER) Process and Impact Evaluation Report (R2)

Provided below are additional comments on the HER evaluation draft report. These are in addition to those contained in the marked-up draft report previously submitted. Most of these comments are included in the marked-up draft report, but are provided here as a high level summary and for emphasis.

1) There is no comparison of the key impact evaluation findings, i.e., the annual savings in both kWh/yr. and % bill reductions to those derived by OPower. Nor is there any discussion as to how the billing analysis performed by the evaluation contractors differs from the savings methodology employed by OPower and how such differences might contribute to any differences in savings estimates.

2) As part of their analysis of the ratio of program expenditures to savings (yield rates) the evaluation team makes the statement several times that expanding the program to all customers may not be cost effective. They then go one to state that CL&P must carefully weigh social equity concerns which might argue for such an expansion regardless. Rather than make such statements the team should either request CL&P to perform the necessary cost-effectiveness screening or request a copy of the CL&P screening tool and do perform the screening themselves.

3) Much of the studies resources were expended to determine the persistence of HER savings after reports are no longer received. While there appears to be significant persistence for at least a year, there is no discussion as to how this information could be used to inform program design and/or savings claims. Would it inform measure life assumptions? If so, how does one avoid double counting of savings in future years? Should CL&P start and stop HER delivery? Probably not, but then what?

4) Studies in other states have indicated that HERs may increase the uptake of major measures. While there are some survey questions directed to the treatment group on this topic, there is no way to compare their actions to those of the control group as control group surveys were not done. This seems to be a possible failing of the study. Should such surveys be performed in the future?

5) The report notes the low incidence of participants following web links embedded in their HER. The report states that **CL&P should be hesitant to move to a web-based design** and that **the savings reported here could not be generalized to a web- or email-based design, be that design opt-in or opt-out**. However is OPower (or others) implementing web-based HERs successfully? If so, what savings per household are they obtaining and how do these savings compare to mailed HERs?

6) In the 2014-2015 Plan update CL&P is proposing to provide HERs to 317,000 customers. Of these participants 200,000 will receive hardcopy mailed reports and another 117,000 will receive emailed reports. Further, CL&P is planning to use a two year measure life for their efforts when claiming lifetime savings. Average savings per participant of 87 kWh/HH are assumed in 2014 (likely reflecting program ramp up and partial year savings). In 2015 savings are estimated to be 142kWh/HH. Do the evaluation report's findings support these assumptions?