

# U.S. Department of Energy The “Recovery Act” and California

## Evaluation, Measurement, & Verification, & Reporting

# DOE “Recovery Act” Funding for California

Over \$ 3 billion in Recovery Act funding for projects in California.

<b>CA Overall Summary</b>	
Number of Selections - not EECBG	192
Number of EECBG Selections	307
\$ of Selections (\$M)	\$3,086

<b>Program summary</b>		
Program	Number of Selections	\$ of Selections (\$M)
EERE	377	\$1,130
FE	16	\$572
LGPO	1	\$535
OE	22	\$393
SC	66	\$372
ARPA-E	15	\$60
EM	2	\$24

# Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy “Recovery Act” Funding for California

The Weatherization & Intergovernmental Program (WIP) administers three major DOE programs: WAP, SEP, and EECBG.

CA-CALIFORNIA	Total Award (\$)	Obligated by Grantees (\$)	Payments (\$) as of 6/10	Payments % of Award	Notes	
<b>Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP)</b>	\$185,811,061	N/A	\$19,575,584	10.5%	43,400 units planned; 6,636 completed thru April 2010	
<b>State Energy Program (SEP)</b>	\$226,093,000	\$169,600,000	\$26,101,629	11.5%	100% NEPA CX'd	
<b>Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant (EECBG) Program</b>						
	<b>Government Type</b>	<b># of Recipients</b>	<b>Total Award (\$)</b>	<b>Obligated by Grantees (\$)</b>	<b>Payments (\$) as of 6/7</b>	<b>Payments % of Award</b>
	City	215	\$242,492,900	\$92,965,114	\$23,898,221	9.9%
	County	13	\$59,562,600	\$28,497,215	\$2,298,225	3.9%
	SEO	1	\$49,603,400	\$1,810,762	\$340,098	0.7%
	Tribe	90	\$3,489,800	\$289,521	\$289,521	8.3%
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>319</b>	<b>\$355,148,700</b>	<b>\$123,562,612</b>	<b>\$26,826,065</b>	<b>7.6%</b>

# State Energy Program in California

- Total Funding: \$226.1 million (1<sup>st</sup> of 56 states and territories)
- Total CX'd: \$226.1 million (100%)
- Total Obligated by State as of 6/10: \$169.6 million (75%)
  - DOE Target is 80% (\$181M) by June 30
- Total Spent as of 6/10: \$26.1 million (11.5%; 7<sup>th</sup> place)
  - DOE Target is 20% (\$45.2M) by September 30
- Status:
  - California is pursuing some of the most innovative and transformative projects in the nation.
  - California's lengthy procurement process is deliberate but contributes to the prevention of waste, fraud, and abuse.
- Major Activities:
  - Energy Efficiency Retrofits & Clean Energy Systems in the Residential, Non-residential, and Industrial Sectors: \$193 million total; \$136.5 million obligated.
  - Green Jobs Workforce Training Program: \$20 million total; 100% obligated.

## DOE has issued Guidelines for States

- In March 2010, DOE published State Guidelines for ARRA Evaluation. We strongly encourage states to evaluate their ARRA programs.
- Guidelines are consistent with standards used in State Energy Program National Evaluation.
- Guidelines specify four metrics to focus on:
  - Job creation (including number, type, and duration)
  - Energy and demand savings
  - Renewable energy capacity and generation
  - Carbon emission reductions

- The Guidelines are not intended to prescribe specific methodologies or approaches.
- Rather, they outline standards that will ensure useful, reliable results.
- Two-part guidelines:
  1. Evaluation administration and management
  2. Technical standards for general design and objectivity, and for more specific guidelines regarding study design and application.

1. Administration and management guidelines include:
  - Importance of independently conducted studies
  - Accurate attribution of program effects
  - Budget
  - Timing
  
2. Technical evaluation standards cover issues such as:
  - Study rigor and reliability
  - Addressing threats to validity
  - Ensuring unbiased assessment
  - Report outline
  - Sampling
  - Design and conduct of surveys and interviews
  - Calculation of cost effectiveness

The standards reference several protocols for conducting rigorous, state-of-the-art evaluations (including California's) and recommend the use of the in-field M&V procedures specified in the International Performance Measurement and Verification Protocols (IPMVP).

On June 16, DOE will offer a webinar for the states to walk them through the SEP Evaluation Guidelines, answer questions, and discuss any evaluation issues important to the States.

For more information, and to register for the webinar:

[http://apps1.eere.energy.gov/news/events\\_detail.cfm/events\\_id=4352](http://apps1.eere.energy.gov/news/events_detail.cfm/events_id=4352)

The SEP Evaluation Guidelines for States are available at:

[http://ww1.eere.energy.gov/wip/pdfs/sep\\_arra\\_reporting\\_requirements.pdf](http://ww1.eere.energy.gov/wip/pdfs/sep_arra_reporting_requirements.pdf); see Attachment 3.

- California is at the forefront of EV&M. The Public Utilities Commission has decided to allow California's investor owned utilities to count savings generated by behavior-based programs, like OPOWER's, toward their efficiency goals. This decision makes California the third state to count behavior-based efficiency, joining Minnesota and Massachusetts.
- In its decision, California recognized the central role behavior must play in its efficiency portfolio. As Commissioner Dian M. Grueneich put it, "It is essential that we create a regulatory environment in which potential game-changing efforts such as these innovative behavioral-based strategies can flourish."  
**California is to be commended for its decision to use behavioral EE savings to reduce the cost of EE.**

- With its discrete beginning and end, the “Recovery Act” offers an extremely promising opportunity for statistically significant EV&M.
- DOE is sensitive to the cost of EV&M. The State Energy Efficiency Action Network co-led by EPA and DOE (see [action.energy.gov](http://action.energy.gov)) is addressing these very issues. Dian Grueneich was essential in starting this working group (originally it was part of NAPEE – the National Action Plan for Energy Efficiency).

- Think hard up front about what metrics will be needed later.
- Evaluation takes time. Sometimes we have to use deemed savings estimates or estimated benefits rather than verified ones. DOE is interested in ways to calculate real time impacts more quickly.
- Keep in mind the purpose of the funds – e.g., the purpose of the “Recovery Act” was to create jobs and save energy, so jobs and energy savings should be reported together!
- Think carefully about overlap between state, county, and utility programs. While you are collecting data, you can help identify overlap in projects and programs.