

COMMENTS OREGON UM1622

July 22, 2014

Oregon Public Utility Commission 3930 Fairview Industrial Dr SE Salem, OR 97302-1166

PO Box 1088 Salem, OR 97308-1088

RE: First Round Comments -UM1622 Gas Cost Effectiveness Measures

Clean Energy Works (CEW) appreciates the opportunity to submit comments on UM 1622 Gas Cost Effectiveness Measures as follows:

Non-Energy Benefits:

There is significant national discussion on the topic of the non-energy benefits (NEBs) resulting from efficiency measures in whole home programs. The discussion is presented in part, in the "Energy Trust Report – Cost Effectiveness Review for Specific Gas Measures and Programs" - Appendix A. Additional findings and recommendations are well represented in the "Resource Value Framework" a recent paper sponsored by the National Home Performance Council and "Recognizing the Full Value of Energy Efficiency Benefits" ² prepared by the Regulatory Assistance Project.

In Oregon, more than 5,000 homeowners have invested in whole home energy retrofits in recent years for benefits well beyond energy efficiency alone. This evidence would support the application of an exception to whole house energy retrofits under the provision of UM551 condition 'A' citing "significant non-quantifiable non-energy benefits".

Basic Utility Service:

The Energy Trust Report proposes development of a set of measures as a Basic Utility Service. We believe this concept has merit and deserves additional study. While this proposal is focused on

¹ National Home Performance Council "Resource Value Framework", March 28, 2014 http://www.synapse-energy.com/Downloads/SynapseReport.2014-03.0.Resource-Value-Framework.14-027.pdf

Regulatory Assistance Project "Recognizing the Full Value of Energy Efficiency" file:///Users/scotdavidson/Downloads/RAP LazarColburn LayerCakePaper 2013 Sept 9%20(2).pdf

measures most challenged for cost effectiveness, we would alternatively propose it focus on <u>minimum home performance standards</u>. In this case, the service design is based on outcomes, not necessarily the targeted measures. This is more likely to be a blend of cost effective and non cost-effective discrete measures.

This approach may be well supported by utilities. In an October 2011 Technical Brief by the State and Local Energy Efficiency Action Network³, evidence is presented that utility customers view their utility more favorably if they offer efficiency programs whether they participate or not.

Clean Energy Works believes this concept has merit and deserves further study.

Measure and Fuel Type Aggregation:

The trend toward highly discrete measures, each held to an individual standard of cost effectiveness may not be serving ratepayers and homeowners effectively when applied to comprehensive home energy retrofits. In terms of HVAC, homes function as systems and weatherization measures work together to achieve a level of home performance that is both efficient and safe. While individual measures should be part of the landscape, whole home programs should be viewed more as single interventions. A recent decision to combine rim joist insulation with wall insulation under UM1696 is an example of this thinking. We propose weatherization measures be lifted to a higher level of aggregation. This approach may be further appropriate when considering weatherization as a basic utility service.

As part of this conversation we are uncertain of the benefits to segregate measures by fuel type for home weatherization. In practical terms, homeowners have limited choice in fuel type. Additionally weatherization measures outlive average remaining occupancy by some four times. Any residential ratepayer may or may not enjoy the future benefits of avoided costs by fuel type.

Workforce Standards:

The quality of measure installations and resulted energy savings is hinged on the quality of the workforce and contractor base. The California Public Utility Commission recently commissioned a study released May 2014 that specifically looking at workforce issues in energy efficiency, which found that: "By establishing and enforcing criteria for contractor and worker eligibility in the incentive programs, the IOUs can support quality work, thus increasing energy savings and more effectively utilizing ratepayer subsidies. The IOUs can also drive demand for higher performance standards in energy efficiency construction and over time contribute to the development of a high-performing EE industry that inspires consumer confidence after incentives are no longer offered."

http://www1.eere.energy.gov/seeaction/pdfs/ratepayer_efficiency_customersatisfaction.pdf

³ State and Local Energy Efficiency Action Network, "Impacts of Energy Efficiency Programs on Customer Satisfaction," Technical Brief, October 2011,

Workforce standards include skills certification, contractor selection criteria, and compensation standards. They are common in other industries, including healthcare, architecture, engineering, and other construction fields and are effective in establishing a high bar for performance in a particular field. CEW asks OPUC to consider how the energy efficiency industry, utility ratepayers, and Oregon communities could benefit from more rigorous training, wage, and utilization standards for activities where ratepayer funds are invested.

It is our observation that there are important and significant linkages among the four considerations presented in this submittal. We recommend careful consideration of intelligent combinations that can lead to improved results for ratepayers, utilities and all Oregon residents.

Respectfully submitted

/electronically submitted/

Derek Smith CEO Clean Energy Works derek.smith@cewo.org 503-201-5157

Prepared by:

Scot Davidson Clean Energy Works scot.davidson@cewo.org 360-608-4040

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day caused Comments of Clean Energy Works regarding OPUC Docket No. UM 1622 to be served by electronic mail to those parties whose email addresses appear on the attached service list, and by First Class Mail, postage prepaid and properly addressed, to those parties on the service list who have not waived paper service.

DATED this 24th day of July, 2014.

Scot Davidson

VP Strategy and Market Development

Clean Energy Works

Portland, Oregon

SERVICE LIST UM1622

W	SANDY FLICKER	5779 BASIL ST NE SALEM OR 97317 s_flicker@comcast.net
w	*OREGON DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	
	KACIA BROCKMAN SENIOR ENERGY POLICY ANALYST	625 MARION ST NE SALEM OR 97301-3737 kacia.brockman@state.or.us
w	AVISTA UTILITIES	
	SHAWN BONFIELD	PO BOX 3727 SPOKANE WA 99220-3727 shawn.bonfield@avistacorp.com
W	CASCADE NATURAL GAS	
	MONICA COWLISHAW	1600 IOWA ST BELLINGHAM WA 98229 monica.cowlishaw@cngc.com
	MICHAEL PARVINEN MANAGER - REGULATORY AFFAIRS & GAS SUPPLY	8113 W GRANDRIDGE BLVD KENNEWICK WA 99336 michael.parvinen@cngc.com
w	CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION	
	JIM ABRAHAMSON	8113 W. GRANDRIDGE BLVD KENNEWICK WA 99336 jim.abrahamson@cngc.com
w	CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD OF OREGON	
	ROBERT JENKS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	610 SW BROADWAY, STE 400 PORTLAND OR 97205 bob@oregoncub.org
W	ENERGY TRUST OF OREGON	
	DEBBIE GOLDBERG MENASHE SENIOR COUNSEL	421 SW OAK ST, STE. 300 PORTLAND OR 97204 debbie.goldbergmenashe@energytrust.org
w	HOME PERFORMANCE GUILD OF OREGON	
	DON MACODRUM	PO BOX 42290 PORTLAND OR 97242 don@hpguild.org
w	NORTHWEST NATURAL	

JENNIFER GROSS TARIFF & REGULATORY AFFAIRS CONSULTANT 220 NW 2ND AVENUE PORTLAND OR 97209 jennifer.gross@nwnatural.com

W NW ENERGY COALITION

WENDY GERLITZ SENIOR POLICY ASSOCIATE 1205 SE FLAVEL PORTLAND OR 97202 wendy@nwenergy.org

W PUBLIC UTILITY
COMMISSION OF OREGON

JULIET JOHNSON SR. UTILITY ANALYST PO BOX 1088 SALEM OR 97308-1088 juliet.johnson@state.or.us

W PUC STAFF--DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

MICHAEL T WEIRICH ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES SECTION 1162 COURT ST NE SALEM OR 97301-4096 michael.weirich@state.or.us