

ALJ/JF2/nd3

Date of Issuance 12/8/2021

Decision 21-12-011 December 2, 2021

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Rulemaking  
Concerning Energy Efficiency Rolling  
Portfolios, Policies, Programs,  
Evaluation, and Related Issues.

Rulemaking 13-11-005

**ENERGY EFFICIENCY ACTIONS TO ENHANCE  
SUMMER 2022 AND 2023 ELECTRIC RELIABILITY**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Title  | Page |
|--|------|
| ENERGY EFFICIENCY ACTIONS TO ENHANCE<br>SUMMER 2022 AND 2023 ELECTRIC RELIABILITY .....                              | 2    |
| Summary .....  | 2    |
| 1. Background .....  | 3    |
| 2. Proposals from Parties .....  | 6    |
| 2.1. Energy Efficiency or Energy Efficiency and Demand Response<br>Activities to Reduce Peak or Net Peak Demand..... | 8    |
| 2.2. Permanent Load Reduction Through Energy Efficiency .....  | 11   |
| 2.3. Beyond-Energy-Efficiency Ideas .....  | 14   |
| 3. Parties' Comments on Proposals.....   | 17   |
| 4. Discussion.....   | 23   |
| 4.1. Approved Actions/Programs.....  | 23   |
| 4.1.1. Market Access Program .....   | 24   |
| 4.1.2. Marin Clean Energy Peak FLEXmarket Program.....   | 30   |
| 4.1.3. Third-Party Solicitation for Additional Reliability-Focused<br>Programs or Measures.....                      | 31   |
| 4.1.4. Single-Stage Solicitations for Reliability-Focused Programs .....   | 34   |
| 4.1.5. Reallocation of Unspent Funds .....   | 35   |
| 4.1.6. Expedited Processes for Reliability-Focused Custom and<br>Site-Level NMEC Projects .....                      | 36   |
| 4.2. Actions to be Addressed in Other Venues.....  | 37   |
| 4.2.1. ACC Modifications .....   | 37   |
| 4.2.2. Energy Savings Assistance Program .....   | 38   |
| 4.2.3. On Bill Financing.....  | 39   |
| 4.2.4. Smart Communicating Thermostat Proposals.....   | 39   |
| 4.2.5. Interconnection and Net Metering Processes.....   | 40   |
| 4.3. Rejected Proposals.....   | 40   |
| 4.3.1. Large Policy Changes .....  | 41   |
| 4.3.2. Specific HVAC Programmatic Proposals .....  | 42   |
| 4.3.3. AB 841 Programs .....   | 43   |
| 4.3.4. Addition of Solar and Storage to Multifamily Programs .....   | 43   |
| 4.3.5. Other Proposals Not Specifically Discussed .....  | 44   |
| 5. Comments on Proposed Decision.....  | 44   |
| 6. Assignment of Proceeding .....  | 52   |
| Findings of Fact.....  | 52   |
| Conclusions of Law .....   | 54   |
| ORDER .....  | 59   |

## **ENERGY EFFICIENCY ACTIONS TO ENHANCE SUMMER 2022 AND 2023 ELECTRIC RELIABILITY**

### **Summary**

This decision approves several initiatives designed to produce emergency peak demand (during 4:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.) and/or net peak (during 7:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.) demand reductions through energy efficiency actions by the summers of 2022 and 2023. The decision was developed in response to Governor Newsom's July 30, 2021 Emergency Proclamation.

This decision approves \$180 million in incremental energy efficiency budgets for program years 2022 and 2023, while also allowing shifting of energy efficiency funds previously allocated to address summer reliability objectives.

Specifically, the decision authorizes the following new or augmented initiatives:

- A new, two-year Market Access program funded at \$150 million statewide, to deliver peak and/or net peak demand savings using the normalized metered energy consumption method of measuring energy and peak demand savings in residential and commercial buildings.
- An additional \$30 million statewide for third-party solicitations designed to produce peak and/or net peak demand savings.
- Authorization for Marin Clean Energy to shift funds to enhance their Peak FLEXmarket program, on which the Market Access program described above is based.
- Authorization to all energy efficiency program administrators to shift funds to reliability-focused programs with notice to the Commission and stakeholders through an advice letter.

Energy efficiency program administrators participating in the summer reliability programs authorized through this decision will be required to meet

reporting standards to accurately forecast and track energy savings achieved through the authorized programs.

The decision also makes several process changes designed to expedite the delivery of programs that will produce peak demand savings. These include:

- Allowing single-stage solicitations to third parties for reliability-focused initiatives and programs; and
- Streamlining and expediting Commission staff review of custom projects and workpapers with summer reliability benefits.

The decision also deems several proposals interesting but more appropriate for consideration in other proceedings, including augmenting the avoided cost calculator with peak demand benefits, combining energy efficiency efforts with the Energy Savings Assistance Program, funding smart communicating thermostat initiatives, and making changes to net metering and interconnection processes and tariffs.

This proceeding remains open.

## **1. Background**

On July 30, 2021, Governor Gavin Newsom issued a Proclamation of a State of Emergency (Proclamation) in response to the significant and accelerating impacts of climate change in California. The Proclamation stated, among other things, that:

2. The California Energy Commission is directed, and the California Public Utilities Commission and the [California Independent System Operator] CAISO are requested, to work with the State's load serving entities on acceleration plans for the construction, procurement, and rapid deployment of new clean energy and storage projects to mitigate the risk of capacity shortages and increase the availability of carbon-free energy at all times of day.

13. The California Public Utilities Commission is requested to exercise its powers to expedited Commission actions, to the maximum extent necessary to meet the purposes and directives of this proclamation, including by expanding and expediting approval of demand response programs and storage and clean energy projects, to ensure that California has a safe and reliable electricity supply through October 31, 2021, to reduce strain on the energy infrastructure, and to ensure increased clean energy capacity by October 31, 2022.

15. The California Energy Commission, in consultation with the California Air Resources Board, the CAISO, and the California Public Utilities Commission, shall identify and prioritize action on recommendations in the March 2021 Senate Bill 100 Joint Agency Report, and any additional actions, that would accelerate the State's transition to carbon-free energy.

In response to the Proclamation, an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) e-mail Ruling was issued in this proceeding on August 6, 2021, seeking input from parties on actions that the Commission could take, specific to energy efficiency and reliability, to help support the Governor's Proclamation and the Commission's overall goals.

The ALJ e-mail Ruling noted that the Commission is undertaking actions in many proceedings to identify opportunities to expedite or accelerate clean energy project development as soon as possible, particularly for the summers of 2022 and 2023. The ruling also noted that Rulemaking (R.) 20-11-003 is the primary venue for general emergency summer reliability activities.

Parties in this proceeding were asked to submit proposals for specific Commission actions that could result in projects installed and delivering benefits by June 1, 2022 and/or June 1, 2023. Proposals were sought that could involve requests for additional funding, funding of alternative or new activities, and/or

requests for changes to Commission rules or requirements, to facilitate the following:

- Augmenting or accelerating energy efficiency projects prior to the summer of 2022 and/or the summer of 2023, resulting in lower overall electricity load, particularly in the peak and net peak hours;<sup>1</sup>
- Adding new energy efficiency programs or measures that target peak and net peak hours;
- Integrating demand response or conservation actions with energy efficiency program actions or investments;
- Integrating other distributed energy resource investments, such as solar or storage, with energy efficiency program actions or investments;
- Integrating energy efficiency investments with Energy Savings Assistance (ESA) Program efforts;
- Augmenting or adding financing options that will accelerate energy efficiency or demand-side investments;
- Removing rules or requirements that may create barriers to expedited or accelerated energy efficiency projects by the summers of 2022 and 2023;
- Working with the California Energy Commission (CEC) to target and accelerate projects for heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning in schools, pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 841 (Stats. 2020, Ch. 372), to reduce electricity load during peak and net peak hours; and/or
- Implementing innovative marketing strategies, and/or market support or equity program approaches, that lead directly to reducing electricity load during the peak and net peak hours.

---

<sup>1</sup> In this decision, we are assuming the peak hours to be 4:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m. daily, with the net peak hours during 7:00 p.m. - 9 p.m. daily.

Parties were asked to respond to the ruling by filing comments with specific proposals for actions the Commission could take by the end of 2021 to address the Governor's Proclamation. Parties were asked to design their comments to be as specific as possible, with reference to necessary funding, modifications to existing Commission decisions or rules, or other detailed actions that the Commission would need to take to bring the proposal to fruition.

Parties were specifically asked to address the following details:

- Description of programmatic approach or value proposition;
- Specific measures or technologies;
- Building type;
- Customer market segment;
- Incremental funding needs, if any;
- Estimated energy savings and/or peak demand savings during the 4:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m. time period;
- Whether the program/approach can be implemented by June 1, 2022 or June 1, 2023 (or both), with specific needs for each time period; and
- A demonstration that the program or project is incremental to and not captured by existing programs or processes.

Parties were asked to file their proposals in comments no later than August 31, 2021. Reply comments were invited by no later than September 10, 2021.

## **2. Proposals from Parties**

In response to the August 6, 2021 ruling, 19 sets of comments with proposals were filed, by the following parties: Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), on behalf of Bay Area Regional Energy Network (BayREN); California Efficiency + Demand Management Council (CEDMC);

County of Los Angeles on behalf of the Southern California Regional Energy Network (SoCalREN); County of Ventura on behalf of the Tri-County Regional Energy Network (3C-REN); East Bay Community Energy (EBCE) and California Choice Energy Authority (CalChoice), jointly; ENGIE North America, Inc. (ENGIE); Enovity, Inc. (Enovity); Gridium, Inc. (Gridium); Google LLC (Google); Institute for Governance & Sustainable Development (IGSD); JouleSmart Solutions, Inc. (JouleSmart); Marin Clean Energy (MCE); Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC); Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E); Recurve Analytics, Inc. (Recurve); San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E); Southern California Edison Company (SCE); Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas); and Synergy Companies (Synergy).

Reply comments were filed by the following parties: BayREN and 3C-REN, jointly; CEDMC; I'm In Control; MCE; NRDC and Sierra Club, jointly; Public Advocates Office at the California Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates); PG&E; Recurve; SCE; SoCalGas; and SoCalREN.

After review of the 19 sets of original comments, we have divided the proposals received into three general categories, as follows:

1. Proposals that are for energy efficiency or energy efficiency combined with demand response that are specific to reducing peak or net peak demand;
2. Proposals for permanent load reduction through energy efficiency, but not specific to peak or net peak demand savings; and
3. Proposals that fall outside of the purview or scope of the energy efficiency proceeding.

Several sets of comments contained multiple proposals and not all proposals fit neatly into one particular category. However, we have used this structure to summarize each of the proposals in this section below, even though it results in



some portions of some parties' proposals appearing in one category that may not be entirely appropriate. We have noted below where some proposals from one party may cut across categories.

**2.1. Energy Efficiency or Energy Efficiency and Demand Response Activities to Reduce Peak or Net Peak Demand**

This section summarizes actions or proposals that primarily involve either energy efficiency or energy efficiency and demand response activities combined that would serve to reduce the peak or the net peak demand, assisting specifically with summer reliability in the electric system during the evening period (4:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.). Each proposal or set of proposals received is summarized briefly below, organized by party or parties making the proposal.

Recurve recommends the following actions:

1. Applying an accelerant to the avoided cost calculator (ACC) to communicate the need for near-term reliability projects;
2. Relying on normalized metered energy consumption (NMEC) and pay-for-performance (PFP) programs, while allowing all qualified providers to bring projects to market using the "Demand FLEX market," rather than just selected implementers;
3. Suspending cost-effectiveness assessments for two years and capping payments at total system benefit (TSB); and
4. Redirecting non-resource program budgets from similarly focused programs, like emerging technologies.

NRDC recommends that the Commission make two changes to facilitate emergency load reduction. First, the Commission should modify the ACC to have a capacity reliability adder, energy reliability adder, and greenhouse gas reliability adder. This would allow programs which manage load during the

reliability hours to claim the adders, which NRDC states could be done automatically via the load shapes. Second, NRDC recommends that the Commission adopt a new definition for “emergency reliability hours” to encourage programmatic focus on these hours.

MCE proposes that the Commission take two actions. First, MCE recommends that the Commission authorize ratepayer funding to scale the Peak FLEXmarket program to deliver increased peak load reduction and grid benefits during the summers of 2022 and 2023. Second, MCE recommends that the energy efficiency cost-effectiveness requirements be modified by moving from the total resource cost (TRC) test to the program administrator cost (PAC) test, and also updating the cost-effectiveness tool to allow for custom load shapes, though these proposals are not necessarily aimed exclusively at peak or peak net savings.

SDG&E’s proposal is to work with the CEC to target and accelerate projects for heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning (HVAC) in schools, pursuant to AB 841, to reduce electricity load during peak and net peak hours.

Google proposes to adopt the smart communicating thermostat (SCT) recommendations from the August 16, 2021 Energy Division Staff Concept Paper issued in the summer reliability proceeding (R.20-11-003), with some recommended changes: allowing SCT installations in all climate zones and prioritizing the hottest climate zones, adding additional requirements for automatic enrollment in demand response programs, and specifying in an upcoming work paper (also known as a “measure package”) that program administrators should use to calculate energy savings.

SCE proposes the following actions, only some of which are exclusively focused on peak or net peak savings:

1. Move third-party solicitations to single-stage solicitations instead of the current two-stage solicitation process, which requires an initial request for abstract before progressing to a request for offers or proposals;
2. For statewide programs, allow non-lead program administrators to fill gaps that the statewide program does not cover;
3. Allow program administrators to request additional funding for cost-effective programs, as part of the budget advice letters, to be used flexibly;
4. Expedite approval of an Indoor Horticulture Lighting workpaper (SWLG019-01);
5. Allow SCE to launch a residential heat pump HVAC fuel substitution emergency program; and
6. Expand strategic energy management (SEM) to be available in the commercial, industrial, agricultural, and public sectors.

PG&E proposes a variety of changes to the Commission's rules and processes to facilitate more energy efficiency capacity online by summer 2022 or 2023, including:

1. Updating the integrated demand side management (IDSM) program rules by approving their proposed IDSM program guidance document;
2. Expanding eligibility for site-level NMEC projects to the industrial and agricultural sectors;
3. Expediting processes for all reliability-focused custom and site-level NMEC projects;
4. Changing rules to treat reliability-focused projects with a baseline assuming accelerated replacement;
5. Go to a one-stage procurement process for third-party programs and allow more flexibility to allow

implementers to enter or exit the market, as needed;  
and

6. Add an additional reliability value to the ACC.

SoCalGas is requesting \$7 million in additional funding annually through the main energy efficiency portfolio to install more smart thermostats, with enrollment into an electric demand response program. SoCalGas first requests approval of new ex ante savings estimates, and then additional funds for direct install measures, if the request for new ex ante savings estimates is denied.

Synergy recommends that contractors promote utility demand response programs when delivering the ESA Program to low-income customers.

IGSD recommends addressing the potential for capacity shortages by reducing the peak demand of cooling devices, with a focus on air conditioning. IGSD notes that this could help accelerate the transition to clean heating by prioritizing the replacement of air conditioning with heat pumps. IGSD argues that doing so could eliminate energy shortfalls during heatwaves and save Californians a considerable amount of money. IGSD states there is no need for incremental funding if the Commission authorizes reallocation of existing program funding from non-cooling devices to categories including cooling.

## **2.2. Permanent Load Reduction Through Energy Efficiency**

This section summarizes party proposals that primarily seek to accelerate, streamline, or expand permanent load reduction through energy efficiency, which may or may not also include peak or net peak demand savings. Each proposal or set of proposals received is summarized briefly below, organized by party or parties making the proposal.

EBCE and CalChoice recommend utilizing the PAC test for cost-effectiveness, to ensure that more programs will be defined as cost effective,

similar to MCE's proposal described above. They reason that this will reduce peak demand by increasing energy efficiency investment generally. According to these community choice aggregator (CCA) representatives, customers install energy efficiency technologies for a number of reasons, so using the full incremental measure cost in the cost-effectiveness test does not consider these factors.

Enovity makes four proposals:

1. Expand on-bill financing (OBF) with no incentives as a statewide program instead of cash incentives, across all utility service areas;
2. Include a resiliency benefit in the ACC;
3. Remove customer costs from the TRC test for all customer opt-in programs; and
4. Revise, streamline, or eliminate the custom project review process.

ENGIE recommends two specific actions. First, expanding funding levels and project eligibility criteria for the OBF programs. Second, ENGIE recommends that the Commission work with the CEC to immediately start phase two of the California Schools Healthy Air, Plumbing, and Efficiency Program, derived from AB 841, with an increased budget and larger scope.

CEDMC proposes a variety of changes to Commission policies and processes, at least on an interim basis for purposes of the Governor's Proclamation. These changes include:

1. Moving to the PAC test for cost-effectiveness, or in lieu of that, move to allow a 0.85 portfolio-level TRC temporarily;
2. Removing incremental measure costs from the TRC calculation;
3. Expediting processes temporarily for reliability-focused custom, site-level NMEC projects;

4. Suspending data requirements for smart power strips, HVAC/plug load measures sold through retailers, distributors, or manufacturers;
5. Implementing interest-rate buydowns for low-income customer programs; and
6. Setting up a “market access” option for implementers as an alternative to the traditional procurement approach.

Gridium proposes a variety of changes to Commission policy guidance, including:

1. Moving to the PAC test immediately for cost-effectiveness. Alternatively, for OBF projects, Gridium suggests only counting the net present value of the interest rate subsidy as the full measures cost;
2. Taking site-level NMEC projects out of the custom review process entirely; and
3. Eliminating program influence review for financing projects.

JouleSmart proposes a “multi-measure” program for the small and medium business sector that would incorporate energy efficiency and distributed energy resource measures in a single program. They represent that this is currently working with BayREN in the small and medium business sector. Their proposal does not address funding needs or peak demand savings.

SoCalGas requests \$35 million in additional funds as part of both the ESA and regular energy efficiency program funds to install more gas tankless water heaters and solar thermal water heaters, an expanded ESA multi-family program, and a new natural gas demand response program for large commercial and industrial customers. SoCalGas is also requesting an accelerated process for custom energy efficiency project review and for workpaper review of ex ante savings estimates.

SDG&E proposes to do the following:

1. Conduct a Request for Information from the third-party energy efficiency program implementers in order to identify additional measures;
2. Integrate energy efficiency investments with ESA program efforts;
3. Provide additional customer support to accelerate installation of energy efficiency measures by increasing the OBF loan cap for non-residential customers; and
4. Increase behavior-based education options focused on reducing electricity usage during peak and net peak hours.

Synergy recommends that the ESA program continue to install light-emitting diode lighting, allow HVAC measures in more climate zones, remove co-pay barriers for multi-family renters, and add air conditioning tune-up as part of the basic package. Synergy does not provide savings estimates, and believes that resulting costs will be minimal.

### **2.3. Beyond-Energy-Efficiency Ideas**

This section includes proposals from parties that are somewhat or totally outside of the traditional purview of the energy efficiency rulemaking and funding. Each proposal or set of proposals received is summarized briefly below, organized by party or parties making the proposal.

3C-REN submitted a proposal that targets three sector areas:

1. Expansion of the residential energy efficiency multi-family program, with \$2 million in additional funding, to include solar and storage measures in a single program, to generate 30 percent peak savings (incremental savings to come from solar and storage) from ten properties in 2022 and 15 properties in 2023;
2. Expansion of existing Energy Assurance program, targeting public, commercial, and workforce, education,

and training (WE&T), into San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara Counties, with an additional \$5 million in funding, to generate 1 megawatt (MW) of peak demand savings and 2.8 MW in 2022 and 2023, respectively (this proposal is actually more appropriate to Section 2.2 above); and

3. Entering the industrial, agricultural, and large commercial sectors (not currently authorized in the 3C-REN portfolio), with \$6 million in additional funding, to provide energy efficiency/demand response measures and solar/storage measures in a single program. Estimated to generate 0.75 MW and 1.25 MW of savings in 2022 and 2023, respectively.

SoCalREN presents a number of recommended program expansions or launches, as well as recommended changes to the Commission's policies or requirements. In the program area, SoCalREN recommends the following programs be launched and/or expanded:

- Commercial Food Desert Energy Equity program;
- Public Energy Resilience Program;
- Public Schools Intelligent Load Management Program;
- Public Water and Wastewater Intelligent Load Control;
- Public Electric Vehicle Peak Load Reduction Project;
- Public Demand Response Enablement and Enrollment Program; and
- Residential Multifamily Distributed Energy Generation Program.

In addition to these program changes and augmentations, SoCalREN recommends the following changes to Commission requirements:

1. Allowing program administrators to engage in all relevant and appropriate IDSM activities to meet net peak load reduction needs;



2. Allowing ratepayer funded energy efficiency programs to support all significant retrofit opportunities, even if they may be below code, are subject to industry standard practice (ISP) exclusions, and/or are outside of NMEC programs;
3. Expanding the regulatory interpretation of “building” within NMEC programs to include all energy-using public facilities and infrastructure;
4. Setting strict timeframes for project reviews by program administrators to accelerate energy efficiency projects;
5. Modifying interconnection rules to allow for solar and battery storage programs to provide greater value beyond the current meter load; and
6. Imposing a moratorium on net energy metering changes for two years.

BayREN proposes to add \$1 million in additional funding to add solar and storage to existing project in its multifamily program pipeline. BayREN expects this would produce 30 percent peak demand savings for a multifamily property, with 20 total projects completed by 2023.

ENGIE recommends two actions. First, ENGIE recommends expediting Rule 21 project approvals by removing application barriers and approving short-term staffing increases to review projects. Second, ENGIE recommends working with the CEC to increase funding to the Energy Conservation Assistance Act Zero Interest Loan for Schools program to reduce participation barriers and maximize the number of schools that can participate by summer 2022.

Synergy recommends that a certain percentage of self-generation incentive program Equity Resiliency funds be set aside for low-income (*i.e.*, ESA-eligible) customers, and that eligibility for the single-family affordable solar homes program be extended to all ESA-eligible customers.

SDG&E proposes several additional ideas in this category, going beyond energy efficiency. First, SDG&E recommends considering a program concept that includes not only energy efficiency and demand response aspects, but also potentially a microgrid. Second, SDG&E recommends exploring expanding the scope of SDG&E's existing third-party-implemented multifamily, small commercial, and large commercial programs, adding a demand response enrollment step to any smart thermostat installation measure. Finally, SDG&E recommends integrated with other distributed energy resource investments, such as solar and storage, with energy efficiency program actions or investments.

### **3. Parties' Comments on Proposals**

In reply comments, parties commented on each others' opening proposals in response to the ALJ e-mail Ruling.

BayREN and 3C-REN filed joint reply comments, urging the Commission generally to "de-silo" demand-side programs and allow for broader program/measure integration (*e.g.*, energy efficiency with solar and storage) to meet peak demand needs in the future.

CEDMC, in its reply comments, reiterated the points in opening comments on the PAC test and proposed the alternative of moving to 0.85 TRC ratio as a threshold for energy efficiency portfolios generally. CEDMC supported the Gridium proposal for a reliability/resiliency benefit and the Enovity proposal to deeply reform or eliminate the Custom Review Process. In addition, CEDMC supported PG&E's proposals to expedite project reviews and tighten the timing of review and baseline modeling periods for custom projects and NMEC projects, as well as the proposal to treat all reliability-focused custom projects as accelerated replacement projects. Finally, CEDMC supported Gridium's

recommendation to change how the TRC test is calculated for on-bill-financing projects.

MCE's reply comments offered additional arguments for why the commission should approve and fund the FLEXmarket program. MCE also supported parties' comments regarding modifications to cost effectiveness tests. In addition, MCE supported proposals to modify the ACC to reflect the true value of load reduction during peak hours. Finally, MCE recommended that the Commission authorize funding and implementation for any approved program proposals through a decision on the ALJ e-mail Ruling.

NRDC and Sierra Club, in reply comments, supported expediting SCE's Indoor Horticulture Lighting workpaper and SCE's emergency heat pump program. They also supported approval of MCE's Peak FLEXmarket program and additional funding for it. NRDC and Sierra Club recommended rejecting SoCalGas' request for incentives for natural gas equipment as inconsistent with state policy goals.

Cal Advocates' reply comments recommended that Commission consider the use of a one-stage Request for Proposals process for expediting solicitations tied to the Governor's Proclamation. They also recommended, to the maximum extent feasible, that the Commission require program administrators to shift funds from underperforming energy efficiency programs to reliability-focused programs, rather than authorize new collections that would increase rates. Finally, Cal Advocates noted that proposals for broad energy efficiency policy changes are beyond the scope set by the ALJ e-mail Ruling in response to the Governor's Proclamation and should be denied. Cal Advocates argued that a market access-type proposal such as Recurve's should be proposed using other channels outside of this specific reliability-focused context, to provide more

opportunity for discovery, workshops, further record development, and opportunity to request hearings, in order to avoid undermining the procurement process.

PG&E's reply comments supported NRDC's (and other parties') proposals to develop a reliability adder to the ACC. PG&E opposed wholesale changes to cost effectiveness that would span the entire energy efficiency portfolios, but supported items that would be more limited to summer reliability purposes. PG&E stated that items like large-scale changes to cost-effectiveness would benefit from further discussion with stakeholders and regulators and should be done in the integrated distributed energy resources (IDER) proceeding (R.14-10-003). PG&E also recommended that the Commission consider the energy efficiency reliability proposals holistically with reliability proposals in R.20-11-003, R.19-09-009, and R.12-11-005. Finally, PG&E recommended that the Commission reject proposals that are not within the scope of energy efficiency. For example, PG&E stated that any ESA reliability proposals would be better considered in the ESA proceeding, although no such open proceeding currently exists. In particular, PG&E stated that Synergy's ESA reliability proposal has factual errors in its assumptions and would not yield the level of savings indicated by Synergy.

Recurve's reply comments supported a market access model, as stated in opening comments and reiterated by other parties (MCE, PG&E). Recurve noted that numerous parties, including Recurve, CEDMC, MCE, NRDC, EBCE, Enovity, and Gridium all recommend a temporary or permanent change or suspension of the TRC for cost-effectiveness. Recurve supported the proposal for expansion of MCE's Peak FLEXmarket program and the OBF program.

SCE's reply comments supported proposals from PG&E, SoCalREN, and CEDMC to expand NMEC eligibility to the industrial and agricultural sectors. In response to SoCalREN's proposals, SCE commented that they contain a lot of items not related to energy efficiency and should be considered in the emergency reliability rulemaking, and not in this energy efficiency proceeding. SCE also commented that SoCalREN's energy efficiency proposals should be considered as part of the regular planning processes for 2024 and beyond.

SCE also commented that SoCalGas' proposals should be rejected because they do not meet the goals of the Governor's Proclamation and are misaligned with California's decarbonization goals.

With respect to adding any avoided cost grid benefits to the ACC, SCE commented that such options should only be considered in the IDER proceeding. SCE stated, though, that cost-effectiveness requirements could be relaxed in the energy efficiency context for reliability-focused programs and projects.

Regarding the ENGIE and Enovity recommendations to impose changes on all OBF programs, SCE stated that those proposals should be rejected to preserve each program administrator's discretion to administer their portfolios. SCE also stated that Gridium's request to change the TRC evaluation for OBF programs is better addressed in R.20-08-022, which is addressing financing for demand-side investments.

SCE also commented that the Commission should reject SoCalREN's request to impose a moratorium on net-metering rate changes. Finally, SCE recommended that Synergy's proposal to change weather stations used for HVAC be rejected, because such a change would be too costly and would have uncertain (and possibly low) benefits.

SoCalGas' reply comments proposed prioritizing developing more detail for the proposals. For example, SoCalGas suggests making sure that NRDC's ACC adder proposal is given the same rigor as the overall ACC changes process and ensuring that SCE's residential heat pump proposal has more detail (since the original proposal did not include total savings or budget). SoCalGas also supported SDG&E's proposal to streamline the workpaper approval process.

SoCalREN, in reply comments, supported proposals by CEDMC, Enovity, PG&E, and SDG&E that rapidly advance the completion of energy efficiency and grid reliability projects to support the grid's needs during extreme weather conditions. SoCalREN also supported requests that remove ISP requirements for projects that meet emergency reliability needs.

SoCalREN also specifically supported PG&E's proposal that the use of NMEC methods should be expanded to include non-building projects. In addition, SoCalREN agreed with SCE that the Commission should allow SEM to be expanded across additional sectors. SoCalREN stated that it does not agree that SEM should be limited to existing third-party SEM implementers as suggested by SCE, but rather should be utilized by all program administrator's serving those market sectors. SCE, in its comments on the proposed decision, clarified that its proposal was not intended to limit other program administrators or third-party implementers from using SEM-like features in their program designs.

Finally, SoCalREN agreed with SCE that the Commission should approve proposals presented in response to this ruling rather than waiting for program administrators to request additional funding in the 2022-2023 budget advice letters.

In its reply comments, I'm In Control responded to a number of other parties' proposals, as follows. First, I'm In Control supported Enovity's proposals to expand OBF as well as to include a resiliency benefit in the ACC to further integrate energy efficiency and demand response benefits and programs. I'm In Control also supported eliminating or at least streamlining the custom project review process, which I'm In Control stated is tied to their most significant recommendation, which is to eliminate the paperwork barrier for qualified projects.

I'm In Control also supported Gridium's proposal to move from the TRC to the PAC as the primary cost-effectiveness test. I'm In Control stated that programs must be implemented to align value for the customer with their financial decision whether to take on a project. I'm In Control also stated that "influence review" should be eliminated for financed projects.

In addition, I'm In Control referenced BayREN's comments in its opinion that energy efficiency and all aspects of demand response should be fully integrated in every decision by the Commission and the CEC. In this vein, I'm In Control supported MCE's Peak FLEXmarket approach and request for additional funding, because the program fully integrates energy efficiency and demand response flexibility, minimizes paperwork, and relies on actual performance, and thus does not require up-front custom calculations.

I'm In Control also supported PG&E's suggestions on how to effectively integrate energy efficiency and demand response programs to accelerate uptake, stating that reform of IDSM rules is one useful aspect. I'm In Control stated that program fragmentation makes it difficult for customers to understand and access the benefits of integrated, multi-measure solutions, also supporting similar statements by ENGIE. I'm In Control also supported ENGIE's proposals to

increase funding and reduce participation barriers for the AB 841 program in schools.

Finally, in its reply comments, I'm In Control includes prior comments it had submitted as a "public comment" in this rulemaking, discussing how to improve energy efficiency in older and smaller commercial buildings, without central boilers or chillers and without (or with broken) building management systems. I'm In Control included in its reply comments a number of very specific program-level implementation recommendations for these types of buildings.

#### **4. Discussion**

In this section of the decision, we discuss the disposition of the ideas brought forth by parties for Commission consideration and additional initiatives that we will approve to address the Governor's Proclamation. This section is organized into proposals we approve, proposals that we generally support but that should be addressed in another venue, and proposals that we are rejecting at this time.

##### **4.1. Approved Actions/Programs**

In deciding what proposals to approve for this decision to address the reliability issues in the summers of 2022 and 2023, our primary criterion was to select actions that could result in immediate or at least very rapid deployment achieving peak and net peak demand savings. Thus, we have prioritized programs that have already been proven to deliver savings, and where the infrastructure is already in place to support additional projects.

In addition, we are approving actions that can be clearly shown to be incremental to existing programs, either because additional funding will allow for more projects to be funded and/or because the approved actions represent



changed approaches compared to activities contained within the prior approved portfolios.

We also have kept in mind the potential for approaches that could later be rolled into the overall energy efficiency portfolio after the summers of 2022 and 2023, to create sustainable action to support reliability needs in the hours when the electric system needs demand reduction the most.

With these principles in mind, the next subsections detail the actions we take in this decision.

#### **4.1.1. Market Access Program**

The first program that we will approve in this decision represents a combination and slight modification of similar proposals from Recurve, MCE, CEDMC, and to some degree, PG&E. We will refer to it as the Market Access program in this decision, though program administrators and implementers may wish to rebrand it or call it by a different name during the implementation stage.

The concept behind this program is that it utilizes population-level NMEC rules and a PFP concept to incentivize implementers to find energy efficiency projects that deliver measurable peak or net peak demand savings. In this sense, it is similar to the FLEXmarket program that MCE is already running as part of the general energy efficiency portfolio, but with an emphasis on delivering peak and net peak benefits. The major benefits of the program are that funds are only expended for portfolios of projects that deliver verifiable energy savings at peak times. In addition, any implementers that can deliver those savings and meet standardized eligibility criteria will be able to participate in this type of standardized program.

The basic structure of the program will be to set upfront criteria to allow implementers to be approved for participation through an existing program

administrator. Examples of these criteria may include such things as building type, end-use/project type, number of years in business, licenses and certifications, demonstrated ability to complete energy efficiency projects, and/or other criteria. Interested program implementers would submit appropriate information to be reviewed for approval by the program administrator. Once approved, implementers would be able to begin energy efficiency upgrades and project submissions, according to processes established by the program administrator.

Then, project-level energy savings will be paid for based on the TSB delivered by the project, discounted to account for program administration costs, and adjusted to include a “kicker” for peak and net peak savings delivered in June through September of 2022 and 2023. Payment to implementers will be based on measured TSB and will be made in accordance with rules outlined in the NMEC Rulebook<sup>2</sup> and processes set by the program administrator.

This program should be designed to achieve net peak savings that are incremental to the energy efficiency goals adopted in D.21-09-037. Program administrators will develop program requirements to ensure that eligible projects are targeted to deliver savings at net peak times. Program administrators will implement compensation structures designed to encourage implementers to achieve specific amounts of measured net peak savings across the implementer’s project portfolio, with performance payment penalties or bonuses applied to that threshold.

---

<sup>2</sup> Available at the following link:

<https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/industries-and-topics/electrical-energy/demand-side-management/energy-efficiency/rolling-portfolio-program-guidance>. Link directly to the rulebook: <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/-/media/cpuc-website/files/legacyfiles/n/6442463694-nmec-rulebook2-0.pdf>.

For purposes of the two-year period of 2022 and 2023, we will waive cost-effectiveness threshold requirements for this program as an emergency program. This means that costs and benefits from this program will not be included in an energy efficiency program administrator's portfolio-level cost-effectiveness calculations. Instead, this program will operate on a stand-alone basis, completely separate from the energy efficiency portfolios of the program administrators for program years 2022 and 2023.

This is reasonable because these reliability needs for 2022 and 2023 were unforeseen during the development of our current avoided costs, which were based on load forecasts from 2019.<sup>3</sup> The Governor's Proclamation itself points to the need to bring additional sources of energy (or demand reductions) online in time to address an "unforeseen" shortfall of capacity, and asks the Commission to do all we can to facilitate new resource contributions by "expanding" and "expediting" approval of clean energy projects. In addition, this type of program is very low risk to ratepayers regardless of cost-effectiveness score, because actual energy savings are measures based on NMEC methods, payments to aggregators are made based on performance, and spending is limited by the TSB actually achieved. Therefore, it is reasonable to suspend cost-effectiveness rules for this purpose for this unforeseen emergency situation in response to the Governor's Proclamation.

This decision and its approved programs are intended as incremental to the energy efficiency portfolio overall and provide additional cushion in the event of extreme heat. As such, any load reduction generated from these

---

<sup>3</sup> See the following link for documentation on the current ACC:  
[ftp://ftp.cpuc.ca.gov/gopher-data/energy\\_division/EnergyEfficiency/CostEffectiveness/2021%20ACC%20Documentation%20v1b.pdf](ftp://ftp.cpuc.ca.gov/gopher-data/energy_division/EnergyEfficiency/CostEffectiveness/2021%20ACC%20Documentation%20v1b.pdf).

programs will be excluded from crediting in the context of the resource adequacy program and should not impact any peak load forecast analysis of the CEC.

In addition, the Market Access program budget will not be applied to the third-party threshold requirements, since this program is being considered and approved outside of that structure.

Projects participating in this program will be required to be installed by no later than August 1, 2023. Program administrators may propose to extend the program beyond that date, but should include such proposals in their four-year portfolio filings due in February 2022 and/or in future filings.

In assessing the appropriate budget cap for this program, we evaluated the proposal of Recurve that was based on MCE's current program and territory size (in terms of customers and energy usage on their system). On that basis, a statewide budget of approximately \$300 million per year would be warranted, but given that we have not yet authorized such a program on this scale, we will be more conservative. While we want to set a funding cap for this initiative at a level that spurs investment and fast activity in the market, we also want it to be realistic.

We will have a later opportunity to extend this approach beyond 2023 later if it proves successful. For now, we will assign a total budget statewide not to exceed \$150 million for 2022 and 2023. This allows for a ramp up, with smaller expenditures likely for 2022 benefits and a more robust response in 2023. We will further consider the appropriate funding level when we evaluate all of the program administrators' four-year portfolio proposals to be filed in February 2022.

Each utility program administrators' proportion of the \$150 million statewide should be calculated based on the proportions contained in Decision

(D.) 19-12-021, Table 1, with the proportions adjusted for the fact that SoCalGas is not required to contribute, since this decision concerns only electric peak and net peak demand savings.<sup>4</sup>

While the budget allocation will necessarily be by utility service territory, MCE is also authorized to administer this program within their geographic area. Only the utility program administrators and MCE, among existing and experienced program administrators, are invited to submit advice letters seeking to reserve funding (and with additional details specified below). If the total amount of funding requested exceeds the initial \$150 million outlined in this decision, we may choose to pro-rate the requests, once we see the response from the program administrators. If the full amount of funding is not approved in the first round of advice letters, utility program administrators and MCE may request future allocation via advice letters in a subsequent tranche. The process for any subsequent tranche may be defined by Energy Division staff in the disposition of the initial round of advice letters.

To encourage a coordinated approach in northern California, we require PG&E and MCE to meet and confer, since they have overlapping territories, to discuss coordination and total budget allocation, prior to submitting the advice letter described below. We also clarify, in response to comments on the proposed decision, that MCE shall have an exclusive right to administer this program in its geographic area. MCE has earned this designation on this program, since it was pioneered there. In addition, this provision will serve to reduce customer confusion and speed deployment in MCE's area. This provision will be in place through the end of 2023 only as part of the Market Access

---

<sup>4</sup> Available at:

<https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Published/G000/M321/K507/321507615.PDF>.

program approach approved in this decision and is not intended as precedent for other programs or situations.

Then, each electric utility program administrator and MCE shall submit a Tier 2 advice letter within 60 days after the issuance of this decision. Each advice letter shall contain at least the following information:

- Requested budget;
- Anticipated net peak demand savings and TSB, for both 2022 and 2023;
- Description of compensation structure to encourage net peak demand reductions and any bonuses or penalties that will be applied;
- Description of how programs will apply a “kicker” for peak and net peak times, in June through September of 2022 and 2023;
- Description of the reporting processes, including at least monthly reporting specific to these programs;
- Description of any plans to integrate long-lasting energy efficiency deployment with other opportunities like demand response, and including a description of how measurement of energy efficiency and other savings will be disaggregated and paid for;
- Description of how programs will be designed to achieve savings that is incremental to savings in the main energy efficiency portfolio; and
- Description of plan for launching the program in time to deliver savings during Summer 2022.

Prior to program launch, Market Access program administrators must post an implementation plan to the Commission’s California Efficiency Data and Reporting System (CEDARS) website. While implementation plans will not be subject to Commission or staff approval, they must conform with information submitted in advice letter filings and must include a program-level measurement

and verification plan that meets the requirements in the NMEC Rulebook. Any other coordination of M&V methods to address both energy efficiency and demand response may be coordinated through the NMEC working group.

There is no need to specify other energy savings requirements or measure-level calculations, since savings will be calculated using NMEC methods. Program administrators will be required to report the incremental savings achieved as part of their regular reporting requirements, including Annual Reports. In addition, all summer reliability efforts will be required to provide weekly or monthly savings reporting to the Commission, including up-to-date forecasts of peak or net peak savings, based on completed installations and enrolled customers. We delegate to Commission staff to determine the reporting process for the summer reliability efforts described in this decision, with a focus on forecasted peak demand impacts.

#### **4.1.2. Marin Clean Energy Peak FLEXmarket Program**

MCE, as part of its proposal, requested to use approximately \$11 million in unspent funding to scale the Peak FLEXmarket program to deliver increased load reduction and grid benefits during the summer of 2022 and 2023. MCE also proposes to implement this change in concert with their other FLEXmarket programs. In reply comments on the proposed decision, MCE also suggests it be authorized to align the rules of its existing programs with the Market Access program discussed above.

This approach is largely the model for the larger Market Access program approved in this decision. As mentioned above, this type of program is very low risk to ratepayers, because it requires measurement of actual energy savings using NMEC methods, payments are based on performance, and program

spending is limited by total system benefit achieved. So far, the MCE version appears to have been performing well, as evidenced by its budget oversubscription as of May 2021, exceeding MCE's initial enrollment forecasts.<sup>5</sup> Many parties, including MCE, Recurve, and PG&E also support the program and/or the program concept in comments in this proceeding. The program structure is already operating and does not need additional time to scale up. MCE also can utilize unspent funds without the need to increase collections from ratepayers. For all of these reasons, we see no reason why MCE should not be authorized to augment their program and this decision approves this portion of the MCE proposal. MCE is also authorized to align the rules for its programs with the Market Access program adopted herein. MCE will be required to report the increased load reduction and grid benefits as a result of this additional funding authorization separately to the Commission according to the reporting requirements to be developed by Commission staff for summer reliability purposes.

#### **4.1.3. Third-Party Solicitation for Additional Reliability-Focused Programs or Measures**

SDG&E, as part of their comments, proposed to hold a third-party solicitation, presumably through their normal third-party solicitation process, for programs and measures that would deliver peak and/or net peak demand savings in the summers of 2022 and 2023.

While to some degree such an effort could end up overlapping with the Market Access program approved in this decision, we generally support the idea of going to the energy efficiency market for additional ideas from third parties

---

<sup>5</sup> See MCE Advice Letter 49-E, filed May 2021.



where a need is identified. There may be measures or program approaches that we have overlooked in the short timeframe utilized for the development of this decision. We also recognize, however, that it will be a challenge to conduct a solicitation, execute contracts, submit and receive approval for contracts, as applicable, according to the normal third-party solicitation process, and get programs on the ground for the summer of 2022. Still, there may be value for 2023, and therefore we still find this to be a valid concept worthy of funding and effort.

Therefore, in this decision we approve a total statewide incremental budget to conduct an additional third-party solicitation to result in programs launched before summer 2023, focused on delivering peak and/or net peak demand savings either through energy efficiency or IDSM activities. In determining the total statewide budget, we have taken into account the size of the effort we are approving for the Market Access program, the size of the utilities' current third-party solicitation efforts over the next few years, and the fact that it is likely that this will be a budget for one year's worth of benefits. Based on this rationale, we approve a statewide budget of \$30 million<sup>6</sup> for an additional third-party solicitation by each utility program administrator to support peak and/or net peak benefits associated with energy efficiency or IDSM.

Each of the utility program administrators will be required to develop a single solicitation plan and schedule to be reviewed by their independent evaluators (IEs) and presented jointly to their procurement review groups (PRGs). To streamline the process as much as possible for bidders, the electric

---

<sup>6</sup> Budget proportions should be based on the allocation included in D.19-12-021, Table 1, excluding SoCalGas.

utilities should collaborate to develop a common solicitation document and hold a joint PRG meeting across all of the utilities. Each utility may follow a single-stage solicitation process, as described further in the next section, and shall launch the solicitation no later than April 1, 2022.

Each utility may execute multiple contracts from the solicitation, as long as criteria and process for selection of bids to move to contract negotiation, as well as the contract negotiation process, adheres to a variation on the normal third-party solicitation process, where solicitation plans and processes involve each utility's IE and the results are presented to the PRG in advance of executing the process. Each utility should fully leverage the existing third-party solicitation process, including the PRGs and IEs, and should submit by Tier 2 advice letter any contract that meets the threshold criteria in D.18-01-004, by no later than November 15, 2022.

We also direct the utility program administrators to prioritize programs that use a pay-for-performance structure in the selection process. All projects resulting from the solicitation must be launched (*i.e.*, open for participants) with sufficient lead time, as proposed by the bidder and reviewed by each utility and discussed with the IE and PRG) to ensure installation and operation of energy efficiency measures by August 1, 2023, to achieve energy savings during peak and net peak hours of summer 2023.

The intent of this decision is that the energy efficiency summer reliability programs resulting from this solicitation should be incremental to the energy efficiency savings already forecasted for the general energy efficiency portfolios. New contracts executed for this solicitation shall be designed not to impact other already-executed third-party contracts or other energy efficiency programs already launched from realizing their forecasted savings and the opportunity to

earn payments according to established terms. Likewise, the intent with this solicitation is not to encourage existing contracted implementers to find more favorable contract terms to deliver the same savings they are already being paid to deliver with prior contracts, thus suggesting the savings would not be truly incremental.

In that regard, because the intention of this new third-party solicitation is to produce incremental energy savings, the programs are not required to meet a cost-effectiveness threshold, for similar reasons to those described above in Section 4.1.1 related to the Market Access program. Like the Market Access program, this new solicitation is a stand-alone program, completely separate from the already-authorized energy efficiency portfolios and budgets for program years 2022 and 2023. We expect the solicitation to result in new, innovative, integrated approaches that would not otherwise be eligible for the existing energy efficiency portfolio. Though there will be no threshold TRC and PAC cost-effectiveness requirements, we will still require SDG&E to include TRC and PAC calculations in their reporting processes and advice letter submittals, as applicable. For the same reasons, the program savings resulting from this solicitation will be considered incremental to existing energy efficiency forecasts. Thus, energy savings shall not count towards the utility energy efficiency savings goals, nor will budgets for the incremental reliability effort count toward the third-party solicitation targets established by D.16-08-019 and as subsequently modified.

#### **4.1.4. Single-Stage Solicitations for Reliability-Focused Programs**

Several parties, including SCE and PG&E, proposed allowing the utilities, who are already in the process of conducting third-party solicitations to comply

with their third-party requirements, to move to a single-stage solicitation process for reliability-focused programs.

While in general the two-stage process has been implemented in a way that takes longer than necessary, it seems reasonable that moving to a single-stage solicitation can save additional time. We urge the utility program administrators to continue to streamline the process even for the two-stage solicitations.

The key question here is to determine the criteria to apply to the solicitations that are reliability-focused and can be converted to a single-stage solicitation. None of the proposals from the utilities around third-party solicitations contained a great deal of detail on how the solicitation process would be structured. Given that, we will approve here the concept of a single-stage solicitation process for the reliability-focused solicitations, and require the utility program administrators to present to their PRG within 60 days of issuance of this decision which solicitations will move to a single-stage process, how these solicitations are reliability-focused, and how the solicitation and contracts will be structured to achieve savings specific to peak and/or net peak demand and not affect savings anticipated or opportunities for payments to implementers of recently-signed third-party contracts.

#### **4.1.5. Reallocation of Unspent Funds**

SCE, in its comments, asked for increased budget flexibility to reallocate to reliability-focused programs or projects where they find opportunities. While this proposal was not terribly specific, we find merit in the concept that any program administrator should be encouraged to reprioritize its budget in such a way as to maximize reliability benefits, especially for the summers of 2022 and 2023.

Therefore, we include in this decision authorization for any program administrator to submit a Tier 2 advice letter at any time through June 2023 with notification that they intend to reallocate funds, and how, to new programs that address summer reliability purposes. This does not authorize any increase in program funding, but rather ensures maximum utilization of any unspent funds from prior years and/or from less-successful programs, taking into account direction in D.21-01-004 for implementation of AB 841, to focus priority on summer reliability peak and/or net peak demand reduction purposes.

Advice letters requesting reallocation of funding must clearly demonstrate how the new program receiving reallocated funding will support summer reliability. Because these advice letters will require timely approval, a clear and unequivocal demonstration of energy savings during the net peak summer hours from the programs will be required to avoid rejection. Any rejected proposals will be without prejudice to the ability of a program administrator to propose the program in an application for a full portfolio filing. Programs receiving reallocated funding shall still count towards overall portfolio cost-effectiveness calculations for the program administrator. Unlike the Market Access program and reliability-focused solicitation described in the previous sections, the programs receiving reallocated funding will be operating within the previously-authorized energy efficiency budgets for program years 2022 and 2023, and therefore will be subject to all existing energy efficiency program rules.

#### **4.1.6. Expedited Processes for Reliability-Focused Custom and Site-Level NMEC Projects**

There were several proposals from parties that concerned the process around site-level NMEC and custom projects. In general, we agree with the need

to expedite a number of items to ensure that projects that will produce reliability benefits can come online by summer 2022 and 2023.

In general, we urge the program administrators to streamline and expedite review, whenever possible, while adhering to the standards needed to support the custom project review process, of any projects in their pipeline that will result in peak or net peak savings as soon as possible. Retrofit custom projects already slated for installation in the large commercial, industrial, and agricultural sectors seem particularly suited for prioritized treatment.

Along similar lines, we intend to ensure that our involvement in the custom project process is as streamlined as possible. In particular, Commission staff will prioritize the review of any custom projects selected for review if they have summer reliability impacts, through at least the summer of 2023. Review and approval of any measure packages, including but not limited to the indoor lighting workpaper mentioned by SCE in its comments, will also be prioritized. We will also take into account Gridium's suggestion to consider site-level NMEC changes as part of the NMEC working group and rulebook updates.<sup>7</sup>

#### **4.2. Actions to be Addressed in Other Venues**

This section discusses concepts proposed by parties where we have a generally favorable view of the proposal, but where it is more appropriate to take up those ideas in another venue.

##### **4.2.1. ACC Modifications**

The first proposal we consider is related to introducing an “adder” or an “accelerant” to the ACC for peak and/or net peak hours, to recognize the

---

<sup>7</sup> Updates will be posted to this web page:  
<https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/industries-and-topics/electrical-energy/demand-side-management/energy-efficiency/rolling-portfolio-program-guidance>.

enhanced value of energy efficiency or demand reduction impacts during these key hours for purposes of system reliability. This concept, or one similar to it, was introduced in comments from NRDC, Recurve, Enovity, and PG&E.

While we agree there is merit to considering this type of change to the ACC to reflect the importance of the peak and/or net peak period for system reliability, the ACC modifications are not usually within the scope of this proceeding, but rather are typically addressed in the IDER proceeding (R.14-10-003). This type of change to assumptions would also have impacts that are more far-reaching than the limited purpose of this decision, which is reliability impacts for the summer of 2022 and 2023. In addition, there are more parties represented in R.14-10-003 that can contribute to a more robust consideration of changes to the ACC that may assist with summer reliability benefits. For all of these reasons, we defer consideration of ACC modifications to further discussion in R.14-10-003.

#### **4.2.2. Energy Savings Assistance Program**

Another set of proposals, including from Synergy, recommend inserting demand response and/or reliability messages or requirements into the ESA program addressing low-income customers. We are open to making modifications in the ESA context to allow for more emphasis on peak demand reduction and reliability. However, the Commission has recently established an ESA working group,<sup>8</sup> which would be a more appropriate venue for this type of focus for ESA to be discussed and implemented. Thus, we defer any ESA-related requirements to the ESA working group venue for further discussion and consideration.

---

<sup>8</sup> See D.21-06-015 at 518, Ordering Paragraphs 177 and 178.

#### **4.2.3. On Bill Financing**

Several parties proposed modifications to the funding levels, project eligibility criteria, or project size caps for the OBF program, including ENGIE, Enovity, and SDG&E. Gridium also proposed only to count the net present value of the interest rate subsidy as the full measure cost in OBF.

We note that by the terms of D.19-03-001, the utility program administrators already have some flexibility to modify the terms of their OBF Programs by submitting a Tier 2 advice letter, within certain limitations. All of the changes proposed by commenters here could be accomplished through that mechanism, with the exception of Gridium's proposed changes. Changes to the calculations for cost-effectiveness have broader implications and should be taken up in this proceeding more broadly in the future. Otherwise, we invite the utility program administrators to offer more OBF project flexibility within the parameters already authorized in D.19-03-001.

#### **4.2.4. Smart Communicating Thermostat Proposals**

Google commented on adopting the SCT recommendations from the Energy Division staff concept paper that was issued in the summer reliability rulemaking (R.20-11-003), recommending allowing SCT installations in all climate zones and prioritizing the hottest climate zones, with additional requirements for demand response automatic enrollment and prioritization of the approval of certain work papers.

All of these issues are being taken up in R.20-11-003 and therefore we will not adopt any of these recommendations here. We also note that the workpaper review, which is normally handled by Commission staff that work on this proceeding, is already underway.



SoCalGas also requested \$7 million per year to install more SCTs with enrollment into an electric demand response program. SoCalGas also requested associated approval of new savings estimates, as well as additional funds for direct install measures. Since these are complex proposals with electric benefits that would be produced by a gas utility, we prefer to consider this proposal as part of SoCalGas' proposed portfolio due to be submitted in February 2022.

#### **4.2.5. Interconnection and Net Metering Processes**

Several parties, including ENGIE and SoCalREN, discussed the need to expedite interconnection of distributed energy resources in order to meet summer reliability objectives. This is another area that the Commission has been pursuing for some time, but that is taking place in other venues. Rule 21 interconnection process improvements and upgrades are underway as a result of two recent decisions (D.21-06-002 and D.20-09-035) and therefore we will not undertake further discussion of these issues related to interconnection rules and processes here.

SoCalREN also proposed that the Commission suspend changes to the net metering tariffs for a period of two years, presumably to allow projects to proceed under the existing rules and thereby have greater certainty of estimated bill savings. This is another proposal that is not appropriate to consider in this rulemaking that is designed for the energy efficiency program context alone. The Commission has a net metering rulemaking (R.20-08-020) where it would be more appropriate to take up this suggestion.

#### **4.3. Rejected Proposals**

In this section, we describe the proposals that the Commission is not approving in this decision and our rationale.

#### **4.3.1. Large Policy Changes**

A number of the proposals put forward by parties in response to the ALJ e-mail Ruling addressed policy change recommendations for the Commission. Many of these proposals have far-reaching implications for the energy efficiency portfolio as a whole and are not laser-focused on near-term summer reliability benefits, and as such, this decision is not the appropriate place to make such changes. The particular proposals we reject are discussed below, along with our rationale.

The first of these proposals involves changing the entire energy efficiency portfolio to using the PAC test instead of the TRC test for cost-effectiveness assessments. This is a policy issue that has been raised many times already in this proceeding and we understand that many parties prefer this alternative for numerous reasons. Whatever the rationale, it is clear that such a change, all other things being equal, would have an immediate effect of increasing the number of activities that would be considered cost-effective, thereby raising the budgets for energy efficiency. While we are not closed to such a result, far-reaching changes to long-standing cost-effectiveness policy need to be done thoughtfully and therefore this proposal is not something we will approve in response to the emergency proclamation.

Another proposal from PG&E suggested treating all reliability-focused projects with an accelerated replacement baseline. While it is our hope that the urgency of the focus on summer reliability inspires many customers to accelerate their projects, that is not guaranteed. This is another area where we are reluctant to deviate from established policy that was painstakingly developed over several years not very long ago. Without additional vetting, it is not clear if such a change could have unintended negative consequences for ratepayers without

necessarily producing proportional benefits. Therefore, we will not approve an accelerated replacement baseline for reliability-focused projects in this decision.

#### **4.3.2. Specific HVAC Programmatic Proposals**

IGSD, in its comments, proposed a major initiative focused on HVAC conversions to heat pumps to save peak demand from cooling devices. IGSD's proposal assumes that a great deal of existing funding for other energy efficiency programs could be reallocated to this initiative. IGSD also projects an impact that is very large compared to the savings that our most recent energy efficiency potential study identified as cost-effective for this particular type of project. This would also involve a large redirection of funding for the program administrators on short notice with negative implications for the rest of the portfolio. Therefore, while we are certainly interested in focusing efforts on HVAC replacements and upgrades in the portfolio, this is a proposal that is more appropriately taken up when we evaluate the next four-year portfolio from the program administrators due to be filed in February 2022.

SCE also proposed a major new initiative focused on installing residential HVAC heat pumps, covering air-conditioning and substituting for heating fueled by natural gas. SCE estimated a large amount of savings from the launch of this emergency program. Similar to the IGSD proposal, while this fuel substitution initiative may have merit, we prefer to look at it in the context of SCE's overall program portfolio to be filed in February 2022.

Finally, we have already discussed and rejected for now the HVAC proposal by SoCalGas above, pending additional consideration when SoCalGas makes its portfolio proposal in February 2022.

#### **4.3.3. AB 841 Programs**

ENGIE and SDG&E both proposed to augment the AB 841 school initiatives being administered by the CEC to target ventilation projects that could produce peak and/or net peak demand savings. While we agree conceptually with the notion that adding to existing programs already underway but adding a focus on peak demand reduction is a logical strategy, the reality is that the AB 841 program is already very complex and has many statutory requirements that are not related to energy efficiency. Furthermore, the CEC has authority to oversee the program and development implementation details, while our responsibility is to authorize the funding. For all these reasons, we reject this proposal and do not authorize additional requirements for the AB 841 program at this time. We do encourage the CEC to consider the ideas brought forward by ENGIE in their implementation of the AB 841 program as it can be a key channel for resources to these schools and potentially load flexibility opportunities to address needs at net peak to support reliability and equity.

#### **4.3.4. Addition of Solar and Storage to Multifamily Programs**

3C-REN and BayREN both proposed to expand their residential energy efficiency multifamily building programs with additional funding to include the installation of solar and storage. The rationale behind this proposal is both to integrate distributed energy resources as well as to generate benefits during peak and net peak periods.

While we are generally in favor of integration of demand-side solutions for customers, in this particular case, multifamily buildings may be among the most difficult places to accomplish this goal. The challenges of installing solar and storage in multifamily buildings are numerous, involving navigating the net metering and virtual net metering tariff rules and other restrictions involving

installations behind- or in-front-of the meter. Therefore, due to this complexity, we decline to approve this program proposal because it appears unlikely that the benefits could materialize in time for the summers of 2022 and 2023.

#### **4.3.5. Other Proposals Not Specifically Discussed**

In the case of any particular proposals not already specifically mentioned and discussed above in this decision, we decline to approve those proposals as well. In most cases, there was not enough detail or specificity submitted by the proposing party to allow us to approve the proposal without further record development. In some other cases, program administrators proposed to augment programs that may not have a sufficient track record that warranted giving them additional funding and/or the program administrator may have a large amount of unspent funding already, making it unclear how they could effectively utilize a large amount of additional funding in a short period of time for summer reliability purposes.

Proposals that we can adopt in this decision needed to have sufficient detail, rationale, and track record already developed to be able to be self-explanatory and essentially self-executing, once approved. Since that was not the case for many proposals, they will be denied in this decision, but may be further considered with the filing and consideration of the program portfolios by the program administrators that will be proposed in February 2022.

#### **5. Comments on Proposed Decision**

The proposed decision of ALJ Fitch in this matter was mailed to the parties in accordance with Section 311 of the Public Utilities Code and comments were allowed under Rule 14.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Comments were filed on November 18, 2021 by the following parties: BayREN and 3C-REN, jointly; Cal Advocates; CalChoice; CEDMC; EBCE; Gridium; MCE;

Peninsula Clean Energy (PCE); PG&E; Recurve; SCE; SDG&E; SoCalGas; and SoCalREN.

Reply comments were filed on November 23, 2021 by the following parties: BayREN and 3C-REN, jointly; Cal Advocates; CalChoice; CEDMC; EBCE; I'm In Control; MCE; PCE; PG&E; Recurve; SCE; and SoCalREN.

This section discusses the comments topically, along with our response to them. Where warranted and discussed here, changes have also been made in the text of the decision to address the comments from parties.

### **3C-REN Energy Assurance Program**

Cal Advocates' comments take issue with the proposed decision's inclusion of funding for the 3C-REN Energy Assurance Program, to expand into two additional counties. Cal Advocates points out that the current program is run by the County of Santa Barbara and not 3C-REN, a fact that was not apparent from the original 3C-REN proposal. In addition, because the program is focused on surveys, audits, and technical assistance, and would be expanding into sectors not currently covered by 3C-REN, we have eliminated this program from our funding authorization here, in response to the Cal Advocates' comments. We see potential in the program, however, so our elimination of its funding from this decision is without prejudice. We welcome 3C-REN making a similar proposal in its energy efficiency portfolio filing due in 2022. But at this time, it appears that this program is not well suited to providing the immediate energy savings that we are looking for from programs funded through this decision.

### **Market Access Program**

The majority of comments in response to the proposed decision were addressing aspect of the Market Access program. We discuss the comments about this program thematically.

The first issue concerns which program administrators will be authorized to administer the Market Access program. EBCE notes that it has a pending advice letter where it is electing to administer energy efficiency funds for two programs, and being allowed to access the Market Access program funding in this decision would allow additional projects to go forward in its area. PCE represents that it has been developing a similar program. CalChoice proposes that a joint administrator be allowed to access funds and administer the program on behalf of smaller CCAs who may not have the capacity to administer such a program at the start. Further, SCE, in its comments, questions the appropriateness of RENs being authorized to administer funds for this program, given that the purpose of RENs is either to fill gaps and/or to serve hard-to-reach markets.

Several of the CCAs, including MCE, also propose, in their comments, that CCAs have exclusive rights to administer the program in their geographic areas.

Cal Advocates, in reply comments, recommends that only existing program administrators should have the opportunity to administer the Market Access program; to do otherwise would circumvent the Commission's rules for CCAs to access program funds. Recurve, on the other hand, recommends that all CCAs have access to the Market Access program funds.

These comments have caused us to re-evaluate how this program should be structured, given that its purpose is for a time-limited program to seek as much in the way of peak and net peak demand savings as possible for the next two summers.

As a preliminary matter, CCAs who elect to administer energy efficiency funds are not energy efficiency program administrators, under our current rules and general energy efficiency regulatory oversight. Access to funds for these

CCAs comes from statutory authorization, and they are subject to minimal program oversight from the Commission. This is qualitatively different from CCAs, such as MCE, which are program administrators in their own right after having their proposals go through a full application process and with experience in implementation going back several years, with associated regulatory and reporting responsibilities.

The purpose of the Market Access program authorized here is limited and targeted, designed to elicit peak demand savings in a short timeframe. Therefore, this program is best suited to pre-existing program administrators with experience deploying these types of programs, and where the Commission can exercise oversight. With these principles in mind, we have revised the decision to allow access to the Market Access program funding only for MCE exclusively in its geographic area and for the utility program administrators at this time. This is not to say that we would not authorize funding for other CCAs or RENs in the future, if this program mechanism proves successful. But for the limited purpose which is served by this decision, we will include this authorization for the utilities and MCE only. We will also explicitly authorize the program exclusively to MCE in their area, since they pioneered the program, and we also wish to cut down on the potential for customer confusion in the short timeframe for implementation of this decision. We will not, at this time, authorize MCE to administer the program on behalf of other CCAs, though we may be open to such arrangements proposed by CalChoice in the future.

CEDMC and Recurve, in their comments, pointed out that administrative costs to administer the Market Access program and manage the market should also be explicitly allowable costs that may be paid before savings is measured. We agree and have made revisions to reflect this point. However, total



expenditures, inclusive of these administrative costs, must still not exceed the measured TSB at the conclusion of the program.

Recurve also suggested extending the final installation deadline to September 1, 2023 in order to capture as many possible projects as possible. In setting the deadline, we are attempting to balance summer reliability needs with program availability. We have therefore revised the due date to be August 1, 2023, which should still capture the majority of net peak months where we are concerned about reliability in 2023. To be clear, we are also expecting projects to address summer peak needs in 2022, as much as possible.

In addition, Recurve suggested removing the peak demand threshold requirement as a criterion for aggregator eligibility, though potentially leaving this as part of the compensation structure to implementers. We agree and have made these modifications.

PG&E suggested coordination across proceedings, particularly with demand response programs included in R.20-11-003, to minimize customer confusion and prevent overlapping offerings. We agree with this point and have made modifications in the decision to reflect this. In reply comments, MCE expresses concern that this runs counter to the integrated approach sought in response to the Governor's Proclamation. Our intent in encouraging coordination across different types of programs and proceedings is not in any way meant to discourage demand response elements in the programs authorized here, though energy efficiency is still the focus.

MCE, in reply comments, also seeks authority to align its existing FLEXmarket programs to align with the rules and procedures adopted herein for the Market Access program, in order not to put MCE programs at a disadvantage. We agree and have included the language suggested by MCE.

PG&E also suggested M&V coordination across proceedings and with NMEC rules. We have included direction that this coordination may occur in the NMEC working group.

PG&E also suggested more generally that the Commission require the development of guidelines for new reliability programs in 2022 and 2023. On this point we disagree, as we fear that such a process will take too long and result in delays to implementation. We may consider this suggestion more fully in the rulemaking overall, but not for purposes of the limited programs we authorize here.

Cal Advocates also suggested that the Market Access program include a provision for refunding if activities do not result in incremental savings. SCE, CEDMC, and others, in reply comments, opposed this suggestion because it would have a chilling effect on program interest. We agree and do not make the changes requested by Cal Advocates.

Finally, SCE suggests that the timeframe for the initial Market Access program advice letters be extended to 90 days to allow program planning and conferring among administrators to occur. We have revised the deadline to 60 days, since only PG&E and MCE must confer ahead of this schedule.

### **Third-Party Solicitation for Additional Reliability Measures or Programs**

SDG&E's comments included two suggestions for the third-party solicitation portion of the funding authorized. First, SDG&E suggested that it may not be in the best position to be the statewide administrator for such a solicitation because its service territory does not contain as many of the larger commercial and industrial customers that may be targeted in such a peak-focused approach. SDG&E instead suggested one of the larger utilities as the statewide administrator. CEDMC, in reply comments, nominates PG&E because

of the size and diversity of their customer base and their experience with these types of programs.

SCE, in opening and reply comments, suggested that each utility should administer its own separate third-party solicitation. At this stage, this appears to be the most practical suggestion, because it will likely result in more diversity of approaches being submitted, while allowing existing processes to be expedited. We have made modifications to accomplish this outcome, including SCE's suggested streamlining, which includes joint consultation with the independent evaluators and procurement review groups of each utility.

SDG&E also suggested that the timing for the third-party solicitation deadlines be adjusted to add 60 days, to make the deadlines more realistic. We agree and have made these changes.

SCE, in its comments, asked for clarification about the counting of the third-party solicitations towards its third-party goals for the energy efficiency portfolios overall, seeking assurance that the funding in this decision is not counted as part of its regular energy efficiency budget. We agree that the incremental funding herein of \$30 million for the new third-party solicitation is separate from the program administrators' regular energy efficiency portfolio budgets, and, as such, the funding shall not be counted as part of the numerator or the denominator when calculating each utility's percentage of third-party contracts as part of its overall portfolio.

In addition, we clarify that this decision and its programs are intended as incremental to the energy efficiency portfolio overall. As such, any load reduction generated from these programs will be excluded from crediting in the context of the resource adequacy program and also should not impact any peak load forecast analysis of the CEC.

### **SEM Program**

SCE, in its comments, asked for clarification that it is appropriate to expand its SEM program through the fund-shifting mechanism discussed in Section 4.1.5, though the SEM expansion proposal was not specifically authorized in the proposed decision. In response, we clarify that this decision makes no change to the rules that SCE would need to follow to propose SEM expansion into other sectors as part of its energy efficiency portfolio. As SCE cites in its comments, D.21-05-031 still requires a Tier 2 advice letter for a program making a change to a market sector. We also encourage SCE to propose this expanded approach in its portfolio application in 2022 for a full vetting and discussion.

### **Fund-Shifting Toward Reliability Programs**

SCE also suggests, in its comments, that program administrators be allowed to reprioritize budgets for reliability-focused programs without advice letters being required for fund-shifting within the same program year. This is not what we intended, since we would still like to see the program administrators' proposals for what their new reliability-focused programs will entail. Therefore, we decline to make the changes SCE suggests. However, we do provide clarity and emphasize the need for timely review of these advice letters.

### **OBF Program**

SDG&E's comments noted that because, unlike the other utilities, its OBF program is integrated with other energy efficiency programs that offer incentives, it is not currently authorized to raise the loan cap to \$250,000. This is consistent with our understanding, but we do not remove the loan cap for

customers receiving other incentives at this time. Instead, we suggest SDG&E make this proposal in its portfolio filing in 2022.

### **Other Programs Not Approved in Proposed Decision**

Several parties, including SoCalGas, BayREN, and SoCalREN, urge us, in their comments, to reconsider approving their program proposals originally submitted in response to the Governor's Proclamation. We decline to do so here, but encourage those program administrators to propose their program ideas in the other venues available to them, including the portfolio applications due in 2022.

### **6. Assignment of Proceeding**

Genevieve Shiroma is the assigned Commissioner and Julie A. Fitch and Valerie U. Kao are the assigned ALJs in this proceeding.

### **Findings of Fact**

1. Governor Newsom issued a Proclamation of a State of Emergency on July 30, 2021, in response to significant and accelerating impacts of climate change in California.
2. The Governor's Proclamation requested that the Commission identify and prioritize deployment of clean energy and storage projects to mitigate the risk of capacity shortage and increase the availability of carbon-free energy at all times of day.
3. Energy efficiency and other clean demand-side investments identified as part of the Governor's Proclamation are currently most valuable during peak and net peak demand hours (4:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m., respectively), particularly for the summers of 2022 and 2023.
4. Proposals received from parties in this proceeding in response to the Governor's Proclamation generally fell into three categories: activities that

reduce peak or net peak demand, activities that result in permanent load reductions, and activities that generally fall outside of the scope of the proceeding.

5. A program such as the Market Access program, which is based on a similar program already being run by MCE, measures savings based on population-level NMEC measurement and pays aggregators based on verified performance delivering energy savings.

6. MCE has already demonstrated growing aggregator participation and multi-party support for its FLEXmarket programs, which pay for energy savings delivered utilizing a PFP structure and based on NMEC population-based methods.

7. Under the Market Access program adopted in this decision, funds will be expended on project portfolios that demonstrate actual energy savings using NMEC methods. Total expenditures, inclusive of administrative costs to manage the program, will not exceed the measured TSB at the conclusion of the program.

8. Both customers and the market benefit from consistent rules across programs under the Market Access framework.

9. MCE can quickly deploy additional projects through its existing FLEXmarket program by reallocating \$11 million in otherwise unspent funds to this program in 2022 and 2023.

10. The Commission has been pursuing a policy of outsourcing energy efficiency program design and implementation responsibilities to third parties for several years, reflected in D.16-08-019 and D.18-10-008, among other recent decisions.

11. A single-stage solicitation process for reliability-focused programs in 2022 and 2023 is likely to save time and allow programs to be deployed more quickly.

12. The Commission typically considers modifications to the ACC in the IDER rulemaking, in order to account for the impacts on all demand-side programs and measures.

13. The Commission recently established an ESA working group in D.21-06-015.

14. D.19-03-001 gave the utility program administrators with OBF programs some flexibility to adjust their programs by filing a Tier 2 advice letter, but still limits a loan cap to \$250,000 when a customer is also separately receiving an incentive from another energy efficiency program.

15. Net metering processes and tariffs are being addressed in R.20-08-020.

16. Interconnection processes have been recently addressed in D.20-09-035 and D.21-06-002.

17. The concept of using the PAC test instead of the TRC test as the primary test for main energy efficiency portfolio cost-effectiveness has been rejected numerous times already in this proceeding, most recently in D.21-05-031.

### **Conclusions of Law**

1. Energy efficiency programs fall under the clean energy requests in the Governor's Proclamation as activities that should be expedited if they can contribute to system reliability and mitigate the risk of capacity shortages.

2. Proposals that generally fall outside of the scope of the energy efficiency rulemaking are not appropriate for approval in this decision unless a nexus with energy efficiency can be shown.

3. It is reasonable for the Commission to prioritize energy efficiency and related actions that can result in immediate or rapid deployment of projects to achieve peak and net peak demand savings for summers 2022 and 2023.

4. It is reasonable to prioritize additional funding for programs that have already been proven to deliver savings and where infrastructure is already in place to support rapid deployment of additional projects.

5. It is reasonable for the Commission to seek to ensure that energy and peak demand savings for new activities are incremental to existing activities, and not just representing activities that would have already been conducted anyway within existing funding and programs.

6. It is reasonable for the Commission to encourage coordination between programs in this proceeding and other relevant proceedings including R.20-11-003.

7. It is reasonable for the Commission to suspend the cost-effectiveness requirements for the Market Access program approved in this decision because the program only pays aggregators who deliver actual savings, mitigating the need for up front cost-effectiveness estimates in favor of actual savings measured with NMEC methods. In addition, it is an emergency approach designed to respond to the Governor's Proclamation.

8. It is also reasonable for the Commission to suspend cost-effectiveness thresholds for the third-party solicitation required in this decision because it is intended to be incremental to the main energy efficiency portfolio efforts, and is also an emergency order in response to the Governor's Proclamation.

9. It is reasonable for the Commission to budget up to \$150 million in incremental funds for the Market Access program because of its statewide potential to be deployed quickly and effectively to address summer reliability needs in 2022 and 2023, to address the unforeseen reliability situation described in the Governor's Proclamation.



10. MCE should be approved to utilize \$11 million in existing unspent program funds for 2022 and 2023 to augment its FLEXmarket program, to address the unforeseen reliability situation described in the Governor's Proclamation.

11. Aligning rules across new and existing programs under the Market Access framework adopted in this decision will avoid customer confusion and benefit the market.

12. It is reasonable to go to the market for third-party implementers in California for additional program ideas and strategies for garnering peak and/or net peak demand savings for summers 2022 and 2023. The utility program administrators should be directed collectively to allocate an additional \$30 million statewide in 2022 and 2023 for this purpose, to address the unforeseen reliability situation described in the Governor's Proclamation.

13. It is reasonable to request each utility program administrator to conduct a third-party solicitation for reliability-focused programs in 2022 to allow for regional expertise and diversity of approaches.

14. It is reasonable that budgets associated with the Market Access program and new reliability solicitations authorized by this decision will not be counted in a utility program administrators' overall energy efficiency portfolio budget for purposes of calculating third-party threshold requirements.

15. Any third-party solicitations that are focused on summer reliability should be authorized to be converted to a single-stage solicitation process for 2022 and 2023.

16. It is reasonable to allow any energy efficiency program administrator to reallocate unspent and/or uncommitted energy efficiency funds to maximize reliability benefits and peak and/or net peak demand savings in 2022 and 2023.

17. Tier 2 advice letters are the appropriate vehicles to allow program administrators to reserve funds from the additional energy efficiency budgets authorized in this decision, in proportions by utility service territory reflected in D.19-12-021, Table 1,<sup>9</sup> as well as to propose certain implementation details for the Market Access and third-party solicitation proposals. A Tier 2 advice letter is also appropriate for reallocating unspent funds from prior years or other programs to reliability-focused programs in 2022 and 2023.

18. It is reasonable for Commission staff to prioritize review of workpapers related to programs that will produce summer reliability benefits and consideration of site-level NMEC changes in 2022 and 2023.

19. It is reasonable for changes to the ACC, including augmented or accelerated values for peak and/or net peak demand impacts, to be considered in the IDER proceeding.

20. It is reasonable for integration issues associated with the ESA program to be handled by the ESA working group set up in D.21-06-015.

21. Many of the suggestions of parties in this proceeding with respect to modifications to OBF programs may be handled by the utility program administrators according to the provisions of D.19-03-001, except for the loan cap of \$250,000 when a customer is also receiving an incentive or rebate through another energy efficiency program.

22. Smart communicating thermostat program ideas for 2022 and 2023 should be taken up in R.20-11-003.

23. Net metering suggestions should be considered in R.20-08-020.

24. Rule 21 interconnection rules are outside the scope of this proceeding.

---

<sup>9</sup> See <https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Published/G000/M321/K507/321507615.PDF>.

25. It is not appropriate to make wholesale policy changes affecting the entire energy efficiency portfolio, such as cost-effectiveness rules and baseline rules, in a decision addressing emergency summer reliability needs for 2022 and 2023.

26. The Commission should not require augmentation of the AB 841 schools programs for purposes of summer 2022 and 2023 reliability, as the CEC has authority to oversee the program and develop implementation details, while the Commission's authority is to authorize funding.

27. While the concept of adding energy storage and solar generation to existing energy efficiency projects in multifamily buildings is conceptually interesting, there are numerous challenges associated with the multifamily context that make this a poor fit for rapid deployment in 2022 and 2023 and therefore the Commission should not approve additional funds for this purpose.

28. Program proposals from parties that did not contain sufficient detail, rationale, or track record should not be approved by the Commission for additional funding or deployment at this time.

29. Since this decision is in response to the Governor's Proclamation, it is reasonable to require at least monthly savings reporting from any program authorized in this decision, and to delegate to Commission staff to determine the exact timing and nature of the reporting requirements.

30. The programs authorized in this decision should be coordinated with demand-side programs authorized in R.20-11-003, to avoid duplication of programs and customer confusion.

31. Energy savings in 2022 and 2023 resulting from the Market Access program and new reliability solicitation authorized in this decision should be considered incremental to the regular energy efficiency portfolios and should not

be counted toward any resource adequacy obligations nor reflected in the CEC's peak demand forecasts.

## **O R D E R**

**IT IS ORDERED** that:

1. An incremental budget of \$150 million in the territories of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E), and Southern California Edison Company (SCE) shall be allocated, according to the proportions included in Decision 19-12-021, Table 1, and subtracting Southern California Gas Company's portion, during energy efficiency program years 2022 and 2023 for a Market Access program as described in this decision. PG&E shall meet and confer with Marin Clean Energy (MCE) to discuss program collaboration and budget allocation. To access these funds, PG&E, SCE, SDG&E, and MCE may file a Tier 2 advice letter within 60 days after the effective date of this decision, containing the following information:

- (a) Requested budget;
- (b) Anticipated net peak demand savings and total system benefits, for both 2022 and 2023;
- (c) Description of compensation structure to encourage net peak demand reductions and any bonuses or penalties that will be applied;
- (d) Description of how programs will apply a "kicker" or peak and net peak times, for June through September of 2022 and 2023;
- (e) Description of the reporting process, including at least monthly reporting specific to these programs;
- (f) Description of any plans to integrate long-lasting energy efficiency deployment with near-term opportunities like demand response, and including a description of how energy efficiency and other savings will be disaggregated and paid for;

- (g) Description of how programs will be designed to achieve savings that are incremental to the main energy efficiency portfolio; and
- (h) Description of plan for launching program in time to deliver savings during summer 2022.

Prior to program launch, each authorized program administrator shall post an implementation plan with a program-level measurement and verification plan that meets the requirements in the Normalized Metered Energy Consumption Rulebook. If all funds are not reserved with the first round of advice letters, additional funds may be allocated, up to the total limit, in a subsequent set of advice letters. The process for any subsequent tranche may be defined by Energy Division staff in the disposition of the initial round of advice letters.

2. Marin Clean Energy (MCE) is authorized to redeploy \$11 million in unspent energy efficiency funds to augment its Peak FLEXmarket program budget in 2022 and 2023. MCE is further authorized to modify its FLEXmarket programs to align with the rules and procedures adopted for the Market Access program in Ordering Paragraph 1.

3. An incremental budget of \$30 million in the territories of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E), and Southern California Edison Company (SCE) shall be allocated during energy efficiency program years 2022 and 2023 for a single-stage third-party solicitation for reliability-focused programs to deliver peak and/or net peak demand savings. This program shall be funded in the proportions identified in Decision 19-12-021, Table 1, after subtracting the proportion of Southern California Gas Company. PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E shall be the administrators

and shall develop coordinated solicitation plans and schedules to be reviewed by their independent evaluators and presented to their procurement review groups for energy efficiency. PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E shall each launch their solicitations no later than April 1, 2022 and file a Tier 2 advice letter with the results no later than November 15, 2022.

4. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company shall be authorized to conduct single-stage solicitations for third-party programs during 2022 and 2023 for programs focused on delivering summer reliability benefits and peak/net peak demand savings. To implement this authorization, each utility shall present to their energy efficiency procurement review group within 60 days of the effective date of this decision, which solicitations will move to a single-stage process, how these solicitations will be reliability-focused, and how the solicitation and contract will be structured to achieve savings specific to peak and/or net peak demand and will not affect savings anticipated from or opportunities for payments to implementers of recently-signed third-party contracts.

5. Any existing energy efficiency program administrator is authorized to reallocate unspent and/or uncommitted energy efficiency funding, taking into account direction in Decision 21-01-004 with respect to the School Energy Efficiency Stimulus Program, to 2022 and 2023 reliability-focused programs or measures. To implement this authorization, any energy efficiency program administrator may submit a Tier 2 advice letter at any time through the end of June 2023 with notification that they intend to reallocate funds, how, and why, to produce additional summer reliability benefits as specified in this decision.

6. All programs authorized in this decision shall report savings impacts to the Commission at least monthly. Commission staff are authorized to determine

further requirements for this reporting with a focus on essential peak demand performance data.

7. Rulemaking 13-11-005 remains open.

This order is effective today.

Dated December 2, 2021, at San Francisco, California.

MARYBEL BATJER

President

MARTHA GUZMAN ACEVES

CLIFFORD RECHTSCHAFFEN

GENEVIEVE SHIROMA

DARCIE HOUCK

Commissioners