

THE REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT MONITOR ON THE STATUS OF THE ENERGY EFFICIENCY STAKEHOLDER PROCESS

As directed by Chapter 397 of the 2019 Virginia Acts of the Assembly, as required by § 56-585.1 of the Code of Virginia



2020



JUNE 30, 2020

TO:

The Honorable Ralph S. Northam
Governor, Commonwealth of Virginia

The Honorable Richard L. Saslaw
Chair, Senate Commerce and Labor Committee

The Honorable Jeion A. Ward
Chair, House Labor and Commerce Committee

The Honorable Mark C. Christie
Chair, State Corporation Commission

The Honorable Judith Williams Jagdmann
Commissioner, State Corporation Commission

The Honorable Jehmal T. Hudson
Commissioner, State Corporation Commission

**THE REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT MONITOR
ON THE STATUS OF THE
ENERGY EFFICIENCY STAKEHOLDER PROCESS**

as directed by Chapter 397 of the 2019 Virginia Acts of the Assembly,
as required by § 56-585.1 of the Code of Virginia.

Respectfully Prepared and Submitted by:



The Model for Results that Matter

Ted Kniker, Independent Monitor
Executive Vice President
IMPACT Paradigm Associates, LLC





C O N T E N T S

Glossary of Terms.....	iv
Executive Summary	v
Introduction.....	1
Legislative Requirements.....	1
2020 Legislative Update.....	1
Report on the Status of the Energy Efficiency Stakeholder Process	1
2020 Stakeholder Process	2
Stakeholder Participation.....	2
Meeting Schedule and Participation.....	2
Future 2020 Filing Year Meetings.....	5
Stakeholder Feedback About the Process.....	5
Stakeholder Objectives	7
2020 Program Recommendations.....	9
Stakeholder Recommendations for Phase I Utility - Appalachian Power	10
Status of the 2020 APCo Process.....	11
Stakeholder Recommendations for Phase II Utility – Dominion Energy Virginia.....	12
Status of the 2020 DEV Process.....	13
Status of 2019 Recommendations and Petitions	13
Appalachian Power.....	14
Dominion Energy Virginia	15
Update on 2019 Report Recommendations.....	17
Next Steps.....	18
Appendix I: Virginia Energy Efficiency Stakeholder Process Feedback Survey Results.....	19



GLOSSARY OF TERMS

AC	Alternating current
APCo	Appalachian Power Company
BEM	Building Energy Management
C&I	Commercial and Industrial
Chapter 296	Chapter 296 of the 2018 Virginia Acts of Assembly
Chapter 397	Chapter 397 of the 2019 Virginia Acts of Assembly
Code	Code of Virginia
Commission	Virginia State Corporation Commission
CSP	Competitive Service Provider
DC	Direct Current
DER	Distributed Energy Resources
DEV	Dominion Energy Virginia
DHCD	Department of Housing and Community Development
DI	Digital Input
DMME	Department of Mines, Minerals and Energy
DR	Demand Response
DSM	Demand Side Management
EE	Energy Efficiency
EM&V	Evaluation, Measurement and Verification
General Assembly	Virginia General Assembly
GTSA	Grid Transformation & Security Act, Chapter 296 of the 2018 Acts of Assembly
HSE	Health, Safety, and Environment
IPA	IMPACT Paradigm Associates, LLC
IRP	Integrated Resource Plan
kV	Kilovolt
kW	Kilowatt
kWh	Kilowatt-hour
LED	Light Emitting Diode
LI	Low-income
LMI	Low-Moderate Income
LMP	Locational Marginal Prices
MF	Multi-family
MW	Megawatt
RFP	Request for Proposals
ROE	Return on Equity
ROI	Return on Investment
RPM	Reliability Pricing Model
RPS	Renewable Energy Portfolio Standard
SCC	State Corporation Commission
SF	Single Family
SIR	Savings to Investment Ratio
SMB	Small to Medium Business
TOU	Time of Use
TRM	Technical Reference Manual
TRM	Transmission Reliability Margin
VA	Virginia
WAP	Weatherization Assistance Program
VES	Virginia Energy Sense, a State Corporation Commission consumer education program



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

During the 2018 General Assembly session, legislation was approved relating to electric utility regulation, grid modernization, and energy efficiency requiring Appalachian Power (APCo) and Dominion Energy Virginia (DEV) to each develop a proposed program of energy conservation measures. Each utility is required to utilize a stakeholder process to gather and receive input and feedback for the development of proposed energy efficiency programs to be filed with the State Corporation Commission (SCC) for review and approval. The intended result is to have petitions that are filed with the SCC for its review, that have included the knowledge, expertise, and buy-in of the energy efficiency stakeholders so that implementation will contribute to the desired energy conservation goals of the state.

Chapter 397 of the 2019 Virginia Acts of the Assembly, as directed by § 56-585.1 of the Code of Virginia, mandates that the process must be facilitated by an independent monitor, to ensure representation of stakeholders, progress toward obtaining input and feedback, and to report on the stakeholder process objectives, stakeholder recommendations, the status of the recommendations, and status of petition filings. This report, describing the second year of the stakeholder process, by the independent monitor is submitted in accordance with Chapter 397.

Stakeholder Process

Between July 1, 2019, the submission of the last annual report, and June 30, 2020, the stakeholder groups for Appalachian Power (Phase I Utility) and Dominion Energy Virginia (Phase II Utility) have each met three times. For each utility, one meeting was used to inform stakeholders and solicit their feedback to solidify the proposed program recommendations for the 2019 petition filing. The purpose of the remaining meetings held during this period were to keep stakeholders updated about the status of the 2019 filing and to develop program and portfolio recommendations for the 2020 filing.

During the meetings, stakeholders had multiple opportunities to generate ideas for energy efficiency programs, specific conservation measures, prioritize their recommendations, and offer feedback on initial proposed programs from each utility. To maintain ongoing communication meeting notes have been provided to stakeholders and a collaborative online site, one for each utility-based stakeholder group, is used as a repository to house all documents and communication between the meetings.

The Appalachian Power (APCo) stakeholder group has 107 current members and the Dominion Energy Virginia (DEV) stakeholder group has 195 members, which represent an increase of 11.2 percent and 13.8 percent respectively for each group from the previous year. Each group represents over 20 different types of organizations, including the utilities, SCC, Department of Mines and Minerals and Energy (DMME), local government, energy conservation organizations, energy efficiency organizations, program implementers, and low-income advocacy and assistance organizations.

In 2020, the General Assembly amended and reenacted the governing legislation. The amended legislation now includes the following provisions that directs the stakeholder process to

provide input and feedback on:

- (i) the development of such energy efficiency programs and portfolios of programs;
- (ii) compliance with the total annual energy savings and how such savings affect utility integrated resource plans;
- (iii) recommended policy reforms by which the General Assembly or the Commission can ensure maximum and cost-effective deployment of energy efficiency technology across the Commonwealth; and
- (iv) best practices for evaluation, measurement, and verification for the purposes of assessing compliance with the total annual energy savings.

The revised legislation expanded the identified stakeholder representatives to include participation from

- Relevant directors, deputy directors, and staff members of the Commission [State Corporation Commission] who participate in approval and oversight of utility energy efficiency savings programs.

The legislative changes reflect input provided by stakeholders in the 2018-2019 (2019) stakeholder process and will begin July 1, 2020 for the 2020-2021 (2021) stakeholder process and subsequent years and will be reported in future annual reports.

Stakeholder Objectives

The objectives developed by the stakeholder groups for the 2020 can be summarized into the following thematic areas:

- Develop and propose cost effective programs to help save money and energy that will be approved by the State Corporation Commission.
- Continuously improve the program recommendations and the stakeholder process with innovative and creative ideas and approaches.
- Increase communication and trust between the stakeholders.
- Increase the diversity of representation and participation in the stakeholder groups.
- Obtain input and prioritization for the development of the utilities' 2020 proposed energy efficiency programs/petition filings and facilitate ongoing feedback and discussion about conservation measures.
- Learn more about the process and how it works (from the newer members).

While not listed as specific objectives, each of the stakeholder groups placed importance on three areas they wanted to ensure that the 2020 programs incorporated. These were:

- Increase programs for low-income customers
- Ensure customer engagement and increased education programming
- Enhance and expand non-residential programs.

All of these ideas are integrated into the 2020 program recommendations.



2020 Program Recommendations

In preparation for the 2020 filings, each utility used the stakeholder feedback to develop a request for proposal (RFP) to solicit bids from vendors to for program implementation. APCo’s RFP was launched in April 2020 with proposals due by June 1, and DEV invited bids in May 2020 with proposals due at the end of July. The RFPs covered eight programs for APCo and 19 programs for DEV.

Program Focus Area	APCo Stakeholder Objectives	DEV Stakeholder Objectives
Residential Customer Programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bring Your Own Thermostat • Residential Home Performance Program • Efficient Products Program • Energy Efficiency Kit Program • Online Energy Assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential Bring Your Own Device Program • Residential Energy Efficiency – Smart Home Program • Residential Income and Age Qualifying Energy Efficiency Program • Residential Comprehensive Heat Pump Water Heater Program
Non-Residential/C&I Programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial and Industrial (C&I) Small Business Direct Install Program • Commercial and Industrial (C&I) Lighting • Commercial and Industrial (C&I) Standard 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-Residential Agricultural Energy Efficiency • Non-Residential Energy Efficiency – Building Automation Program • Non-Residential Building Optimization • Non-Residential Energy Efficiency – Health Care Targeted Program • Non-Residential Energy Efficiency – Hotel and Lodging Targeted Program • Non-Residential Engagement Program • Non-Residential Prescriptive Program • Non-Residential Strategic Energy Management • Small Business Behavioral – Non-Residential Customer Engagement & Savings
Program Support		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Umbrella Marketing Services • Rebate / Incentive Fulfillment Services • Call Center Services • Block DSM Implementation Services
Additional Programs		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional Programs

In addition to the its eight programs in the RFP, APCo independently solicited proposals for two additional programs: a Behavioral (education) Program to help customers reduce energy use by encouraging them to alter their electricity usage habits by providing positive reinforcement; and a Volt Variance Optimization program that will reduce energy and demand usage without any needed interaction from the customer.

Once proposals are received, the utilities will immediately analyze and evaluate the offerings to ensure the programs will be cost-effective, and will meet appropriate thresholds as determined by not less than any three of the following four tests:

- The Total Resource Cost Test
- The Utility Cost Test
- The Participant Test
- The Ratepayer Impact Measure Test

The utilities will also review the proposals to ensure the programs meet requirements of the Virginia Clean Economy Act and other

legislative mandates.

Each utility intends to convene at least one more meeting of the stakeholder groups to provide update on the proposed set of programs, based upon successful proposals received, that it will submit in its 2020 petition. It is anticipated that APCo will submit its filing no later than November 30, 2020 and DEV will submit its petition no later than December 2020.

Status of 2019 Petition Filings

The filing of petitions for 2019 occurred after the submission of the previous annual report. This report provides an update on those petitions.



Appalachian Power

On September 30, 2019, Appalachian Power filed a petition for approval of the continued implementation of a rate adjustment clause to recover the costs of its proposed energy efficiency portfolio, as well as for the approval of three new energy efficiency programs for a five-year period, with implementation starting January 1, 2021. The three proposed programs were:

- Low Income Single Family (LISF)
- Low Income Multifamily (LIMF)
- ENERGY STAR Manufactured Housing (ESMH)

In its Order on May 21, 2020, the Commission:

- Approved the LISF and LIMF programs as filed.
- Approved a revised ESMH program with an alternative incentive structure proposed by APCo.
- Required APCo to perform additional sampling and statistical analysis to test the validity of the Technical Requirements Manual (TRM) formulas and the accuracy of the claimed energy savings.
- Agreed with the Hearing Examiner that the LIMF and LISF programs satisfy the requirements of Code 56-596.2:1 and APCo should be permitted to apply the first three years of these programs towards meeting the \$25 million goal established therein.
- Found that the costs associated with the new programs proposed in the Petition should count towards the \$140 million target established for APCo in Code 56-596.2.

With this filing, APCo has proposed approximately \$71 million, or approximately 50.7%, of the required \$140 million target as required in the Grid Transformation and Security Act (GTSA).

Dominion Energy Virginia

On December 3, 2019, Dominion Energy Virginia filed a petition for approval for 15 programs to begin in January 2021. These were:

- Residential Electric Vehicle Program (EE and DR)
- Residential Electric Vehicle (Peak Shaving)
- Residential Energy Efficiency Kits (EE)
- Residential Energy Efficiency – Home Retrofit (EE)
- Residential Manufactured Housing (EE)
- Residential New Construction (EE).
- Residential Energy Efficiency – Multi-Family Targeted (EE)
- Residential Customer Engagement (EE)
- Residential Smart Thermostat (EE and DR)
- Non-Residential Upstream and Midstream Efficient Products Incentives (EE)
- Non-Residential New Construction (EE)
- Small Business Improvement Enhanced (EE)
- HB 2789 (Heating and Cooling/Health and Safety) (EE)

A public hearing on the Petition was convened by the Hearing Examiner on April 29-30, 2020 and held online due to the COVID-19 pandemic. No opposition to approval of the proposed programs was presented, but questions around specific aspects of several programs were raised. Commission staff had concerns about the rebate structure of Residential New Construction Program. Although DEV held its original position that the homebuilder should get the incentive to help influence the market, if the SCC deems it necessary, in order to resolve Staff's concerns, DEV agreed to modify how the program dollars would flow, with a portion going to the customer. Income Qualifying Program eligibility was also discussed.

A Final Order has not yet been issued and is pending. Approval, if granted, is expected in July 2020, and not later than August 3.

With this filing, DEV has proposed approximately \$344.2 million, or approximately 39.6 percent of the required \$870 million target as

required by the GTSA, within the first two years of the ten-year goal.

Next Steps/Recommendations

The stakeholder process contributed significantly to the development of the initial program recommendations that will be forthcoming in 2020. Through observation of, interaction with, and feedback from the survey sent to all stakeholders in June 2020, the independent monitor offers the following suggestions for the 2021 filing year (October 1, 2020 – September 30, 2021) and beyond.

1. *Utilize the next meetings to plan how the revised legislation will be implemented.* The changes provided in the amended and reenacted legislation address a number of issues that have been raised by some stakeholders. As new requirements, it will be essential to have discussions and agreement on how these can be implemented.
 - a. For example, it will be necessary for the groups to discuss how SCC staff can be involved in discussions, but still remain neutral.
 - b. To the extent possible, plan for earlier meetings in the process (Fall 2020) and reduce meetings held during the General Assembly sessions to increase the participation and diversity of stakeholders represented. It should be noted that program development is complex, and meetings could be necessary in the early months of the year prior to any RFP's being released.
2. *Increase the diversity of the stakeholder group.* This must be an intentional process and effort. The independent monitor, and other stakeholders, could do the following:
 - a. Create an outreach effort to recruit a more diverse pool of stakeholders to the meetings
 - b. Offer an alternative way to solicit and obtain stakeholder feedback, should meetings not be feasible for under-represented groups or populations.
 - c. Have the utilities and other stakeholders align other customer-focused communication efforts to identify and encourage participation of more diverse groups.
3. *Strengthen the longer-term ideas and thinking for the process and its goals.* Coordination with other Commonwealth energy mandates and initiatives, including the 2020 Virginia Clean Energy Act (VCEA), and planning for potential rapid changes in technology, the economy, socio-cultural shifts, and other issues affecting multiple audiences, will be essential for achieving the intended impact of energy efficiency and conservation over a 10-year period. Therefore, incorporating more long-term ideas into the process can support innovative program recommendations and potential pilot programs. In general, the stakeholder groups are supportive of long-term planning, but there is not yet consensus in how to implement it. Several stakeholders have proposed developing a 10-year guiding plan, while others have suggested that a 10-year plan may not be feasible if it is not flexible enough to allow for adaptation to new data and emergent ideas. The independent monitor recommends that the stakeholder groups may want to consider:
 - a. Recruit a set of stakeholders to work as a long-term, strategy committee to provide strategic ideas to the larger stakeholder group. This idea has been raised by multiple stakeholders.
 - b. Identifying experts from different industries, including technology, to provide briefs at the meetings, or webinars, to increase stakeholder awareness of emerging trends and ideas. This could also help in program recommendations.
 - c. Incorporating time in meetings to allow for longer-term ideas and strategic discussions. These could be done more in focus group fashion and facilitated by the independent monitor.
 - d. Consider scenario planning as part of the stakeholder process.
 - e. Be more explicit in the process about addressing "Parking Lot" issues to ensure they are discussed thoroughly.



INTRODUCTION

Legislative Requirements

Chapter 296 [SB 966] of § 56-585.1 of the Code of Virginia established the use of a stakeholder process, facilitated by an independent monitor, to provide input and feedback on the development of a proposed program of energy conservation measures. Any program shall provide for the submission of a petition or petitions for approval to design, implement, and operate energy efficiency programs pursuant to subdivision A 5 of § 56-585.1 of the Code of Virginia. The legislation specifically stated:

- At least five percent of such energy efficiency programs shall benefit low-income, elderly, and disabled individuals.
- The projected costs for the utility to design, implement, and operate such energy efficiency programs, including a margin to be recovered on operating expenses, for the period beginning July 1, 2018, and ending July 1, 2028, including any existing approved energy efficiency programs, shall be no less than an aggregate amount of:
 - \$140 million for Phase I Utility – Appalachian Power (APCo)
 - \$870 million for Phase II Utility – Dominion Energy (DEV)

For the energy efficiency stakeholder process, Chapter 296 directs that the process shall include representatives from:

- Each utility – Phase I (APCo) and Phase II (DEV),
- The State Corporation Commission (SCC),
- The Office of Consumer Counsel of the Attorney General,
- The Department of Mines, Minerals and Energy (DMME),
- Energy efficiency program implementers,
- Energy efficiency providers,
- Residential and small business customers, and
- Any other interested stakeholder who the independent monitor deems appropriate for inclusion in such process.

The initial legislation did not provide details on how often the stakeholder groups meet or processes for obtaining the input

and feedback into the development and/or review of key issues and the proposed energy efficiency programs. The legislation leaves discretion to the SCC, the utilities, the stakeholders, and the independent monitor to determine meeting schedules, times, and operational procedures.

2020 Legislative Update

In the 2020 General Assembly session, under House Bill 575, § 56-585.1 relating to energy efficiency was amended and reenacted. The amended legislation now includes the following provisions that directs the stakeholder process to provide input and feedback on:

- the development of such energy efficiency programs and portfolios of programs;
- compliance with the total annual energy savings and how such savings affect utility integrated resource plans;
- recommended policy reforms by which the General Assembly or the Commission can ensure maximum and cost-effective deployment of energy efficiency technology across the Commonwealth; and
- best practices for evaluation, measurement, and verification for the purposes of assessing compliance with the total annual energy savings.

The revised legislation expanded the identified stakeholder representatives to include participation from

- Relevant directors, deputy directors, and staff members of the Commission [State Corporation Commission] who participate in approval and oversight of utility energy efficiency savings programs

The legislative changes reflect input provided by stakeholders in the 2018-2019 (2019) stakeholder process and will begin July 1, 2020 for the 2020-2021 (2021) stakeholder process and subsequent years and will be reported in future annual reports. The legislation did not change any of the requirements for the independent monitor's Annual Report.

REPORT ON THE STATUS OF THE ENERGY EFFICIENCY STAKEHOLDER PROCESS

Chapter 397 [H 2293] amended Chapter 296 to direct the independent monitor to:

- Convene meetings of participants in the stakeholder process not less frequently than twice each calendar year during the period beginning July 1, 2019 and ending July 1, 2028.
- Provide a status report of the energy efficiency program stakeholder process to the Governor, the State Corporation Commission, and the Chairmen of the House and Senate Commerce and Labor Committees beginning on July 1, 2019, and annually thereafter through July 1, 2028.

The energy efficiency stakeholder process report shall include the status of:

- the objectives established by the stakeholder group during this process related to programs to be proposed,
- recommendations related to programs to be proposed that result from the stakeholder process, and
- the status of those recommendations, in addition to the petitions filed and the determination thereon.

¹ <https://lis.virginia.gov/cgi-bin/legp604.exe?181+sum+SB966>

² <https://lis.virginia.gov/cgi-bin/legp604.exe?201+ful+HB575ER2>



2020 STAKEHOLDER PROCESS

The 2020 Virginia Energy Efficiency Stakeholder Process began on October 1, 2019 through the option of the second year of the independent monitor contract awarded by the SCC to IMPACT Paradigm Associates, LLC (IPA), a Virginia-based woman-owned small business, in 2018. The option allowed for a seamless transition between the first and second year to capitalize on the progress and momentum made by the stakeholder groups. The independent monitor maintained the practice set previously of open inclusion to the process, so all who express interest or are recommended by current stakeholders are added to the contact list for the appropriate utility. As the process has progressed, additional participants have been added over the year, also expanding the types of organizations represented. The current number of stakeholder participants represent an increase of 11.2 percent for APCo and 13.8 percent for DEV from the previous year.

STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION

The stakeholder participation for each utility represents over 20 types of stakeholder affiliations, including those cited in the legislation. Table 1 below depicts the total number of stakeholders and the distribution of stakeholder participants by affiliation type for each of the utilities.⁴

Affiliation	Phase I Utility	Phase II Utility
Current Number of Stakeholder Process Participants	107	195
Utility Company or COOP	6.5%	12.3%
Government - State	12.1%	12.8%
Government – Local Municipality	7.5%	5.6%
Government – Federal	0.0%	0.0%
Energy Service Company	2.8%	0.5%
Energy Conservation Interest Group	4.7%	9.7%
Environmental Organization/Advocacy Group	5.6%	10.3%
Elderly/Disabled Advocacy Group	0.9%	1.0%
Low Income Advocacy Group	4.7%	3.1%
Housing Related Organization	10.3%	6.2%
Program Implementer	23.4%	13.3%
Weatherization Provider	1.9%	0.0% ⁵
Charitable Organization	2.8%	0.0%
Law Firm	0.9%	7.2%
Educational Institution or Institute	2.8%	0.5%
Public Health/Hospital	0.0%	0.0%
Residential/Business Customer/Interested Individual	4.7%	2.6%
Other	8.4%	14.9%
TOTAL PERCENTAGE	100.0%	100.0%

MEETING SCHEDULE AND PARTICIPATION

For the period of October 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020⁶, the independent monitor facilitated at least two meetings for each utility. This report also lists the meetings that were facilitated between July 1, 2019 and September 30, 2019, which were not included in the previous annual report and were held to finalize stakeholder feedback for the 2019 filing and begin setting up objectives and ideas for the 2020 filing year. The meeting dates, purpose and number of attendees is listed on the next page in Table 2 for each utility.

It is anticipated the independent monitor will facilitate at least one more meeting for each of the stakeholder groups after July 1, 2020, so that the utilities will be able to update stakeholders on the results of their RFPs and provide additional information about next steps for the 2020 petition filings. The independent monitor recommends that these meetings be used to set expectations for the inclusion of SCC staff as directed in the amended legislation and to address the new legislative requirements.

³ <http://lis.virginia.gov/cgi-bin/legp604.exe?191+ful+CHAP0397+hil>

⁴ Representation percentage is based upon the type of organization for which individual stakeholders either self-identify or the independent monitor has categorized based on organizational mission. The program implementer and other categories contain multiple types of organizations and it is recommended that in future reporting, the types of organizations be further categorized.

⁵ Weatherization Providers do participate in the stakeholder process but may have self-identified as program implementers.

⁶ This timeframe represents the beginning of the second program year up to submission of this report.



Table 2: 2020 Stakeholder Process Meetings

Utility	Filing Year	Meeting Date	Purpose	Number of Attendees
APCo	2019	August 1, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain stakeholder consensus and planned support for APCo 2019 Energy Efficiency filing. Create awareness and obtain feedback about HB 2789. Identify initial priorities for 2020 stakeholder process and focus. 	18
	2020	January 30, 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update stakeholders on the 2019 Energy Efficiency filing. Review process and anticipated timing the 2020 filing. Identify initial priorities for 2020 stakeholder process and focus. 	14
		March 5, 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update stakeholders on the 2019 Energy Efficiency filing. Continue Stakeholder input for 2020 stakeholder process and program focus. 	24
DEV	2019	September 5, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update stakeholders on process and progress of energy efficiency programs and obtain feedback. Inform stakeholders about progress toward VA Clean Economy Act 10 Percent Goal. Capture initial thoughts on priorities and approach for Year 2 (2019-2020) 	59
	2019/2020	October 28, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inform stakeholders about progress toward Virginia Clean Economy Act 10 Percent Goal. Update stakeholders on progress and results of cost/benefit testing for DSM 8 energy efficiency programs and obtain feedback. Begin planning for next several filings. 	53
	2020	February 6, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update stakeholders on DSM 8 Filing. Review, discuss and continue working on stakeholder recommendations for DSM 9 filing. 	48

For the 2020 filing year, both utilities planned to release requests for proposals (RFPs) to obtain bids for program implementation, so the process was designed to obtain feedback from stakeholders that:

- Considered program recommendations generated in the previous year that had not been petitioned in 2019. Stakeholders were provided review documents with their previous ideas taken from The Report of the Independent Monitor on the Status of the Energy Efficiency Stakeholder Process.
- Considered ideas and comments generated in the previous year that had been placed in the “Parking Lot” for review in the future. Several of the Parking Lot issues were incorporated into review materials or posed as questions to guide objectives development and further conversation for program recommendations.
- Considered programs from each utility that had expired, been proposed and rejected in the past, or existing programs that needed expansion or enhancement. Each of the utilities provided briefings on previous and existing programs in at least one meeting with the stakeholders.
- Considered new ideas developed by the stakeholders for the 2020 filing based upon their expertise and experience. Similar to the previous year, individual reflection and small group work with full stakeholder group review was the utilized methodology.
- Prioritized final recommendations by the stakeholder groups for the 2020 filing.



To assist in the development of program recommendations, the independent monitor provided the stakeholders who attended the meeting, as well as all stakeholders through the Trello site and by email, with a program recommendation template document. The template was intended to be used by stakeholders to provide actionable information that each utility could communicate in an RFP to potential implementers for detailed bids, thereby empowering the stakeholder groups to craft a significant portion of the program recommendations themselves. During the process, the stakeholders were also instructed that they could provide new ideas on their own, if they were unable to attend meetings, by submitting templates to the independent monitor, the utility, and/or on the Trello site. The submitted templates were used in subsequent meetings for review and further refinement for the final program recommendations.

During the 2020 stakeholder process, the independent monitor introduced the use of Mentimeter, an online presentation and voting software, that allows large groups to generate or prioritize ideas anonymously in real time using their smart phone, tablet, or laptop. Ideas generated by the groups could be presented on screen for everyone to view and then captured and printed for further use during the meetings. Most stakeholders reported the use of Mentimeter enhanced the stakeholder experience, with several stakeholders noting they would take the tool back to their own organizations.

To streamline the feedback and recommendation process for the DEV stakeholder group, due its large size, the independent monitor and the DEV team experimented with having the stakeholders divide into working groups. This idea stemmed from recommendations by the stakeholders last year documented in the Report of the Independent Monitor and from observing best practices in other state-based energy efficiency stakeholder processes. The intent was to have stakeholders work through particular areas that they had identified as necessary to advance energy conservation and efficiency in Virginia and to be able to further work together as focused groups between the facilitated meetings to provide in-depth recommendations. Four work groups were organized around the following topic areas:

- **Income-Qualifying Programs** – To create the next generation of income-qualifying programs and lay the foundation for meeting legislative goals.
- **Non-Residential Programs** - Commercial programs are an area of high potential savings, but, because of the variety of commercial entities that exist, developing measures that are targeted to specific segments is a necessity and have stakeholder input on the viability of custom measures and those that are applicable to the wide variety of pumps and motors that are used in various commercial activities.
- **Gap Assessment** - Customer segments have varying abilities to participate in existing Demand Side Management (DSM) programs, an important part of developing future plans is

to assess gaps in existing and planned program offerings to develop a set of logical focus areas for new, expanded, and extended programs.

- **Innovative Approaches** - Given the pace of certain changes in technology, it is valuable to identify how selected evolving technologies may play a role in future DSM proposals in existing programs and the near-term, as well as those that may become viable within five years or beyond.

In the previous year, the independent monitor established a collaborative website for each stakeholder group using Trello.com to maintain transparency in the stakeholder process and to share information with all stakeholders. The sites were continued and updated for the 2020 filing year. Each collaborative site includes information about the process, meeting schedules, agendas and notes, program ideas and recommendations, and allows stakeholders to post suggestions and have online discussions. The site allows stakeholders unable to participate in the meetings to keep updated on the progress of the process. The sites are open to anyone interested who may join by using the links below.

APCo Trello Collaborative Website: <https://trello.com/invite/b/byDis70H/0e1db0a2e8bc981c447ffd4f64196acf/apco-energy-efficiency-stakeholder-group>

DEV Trello Collaborative Website: <https://trello.com/invite/b/mdnEciZk/9489778105354f9c17bffb8856c46f5d/dominion-energy-energy-efficiency-stakeholder-group>

Access is also granted to each site for any interested party by a simple email request to the independent monitor at ted.kniker@ipa-llc.org.

Unfortunately, due to organizational IT security restrictions, several stakeholders, including the Commission and the utilities, do not have access to the Trello sites. The independent monitor has discussed the use of alternatives with the SCC and utilities, including Basecamp and Asana, but these also have restricted access. For the time being, Trello will remain the collaborative site and stakeholders without access privilege are encouraged to use a non-work-related email address to access the sites. In addition, the independent monitor sends all new information to the stakeholder groups via email and is available to answer questions, forward ideas, and concerns, and to engage stakeholders at any time as they request.



FUTURE 2020 FILING YEAR MEETINGS

Both stakeholder groups anticipate meeting in late summer and possibly the fall. These meetings may need to be held remotely depending on the status of the COVID-19 pandemic. The independent monitor is prepared to utilize an online platform that can accommodate all stakeholders, allow for interactive participation, and record the meetings with transcripts should that be necessary.

STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK ABOUT THE PROCESS

To obtain feedback about the 2020 Stakeholder Process year so far and this report, the independent monitor conducted an online survey between June 1, 2020 and June 16. An email invitation was sent to 226 stakeholders, 81 of whom provided input for a response rate of 35.8 percent. The full set of frequency distributions (responses) are provided in Appendix I.

Nearly two-thirds of the survey respondents who participated in the stakeholder process in both years, reported that the 2019-2020 process was “Better” or “Much Better” than the 2018-2019 process in three areas:

- The collaborative environment between the stakeholders and the utility in 2019-2020 compared to 2018-2019. (63.6%)
- The progress made by the stakeholder process in 2019-2020 compared to 2018-2019. (64.4%)
- The recommendations made by the stakeholder group in 2019-2020 compared to 2018-2019. (65.2%)

Responses from the stakeholders to other questions indicate that the process is improving in key areas. Analysis of the data shows a consistent pattern that those who participated in both years of the process, and even the second year only, demonstrate higher levels of satisfaction and agreement about the process. Based on the data, one can conclude that those who commit to attendance, are engaged, and participate more frequently are more satisfied with the process and its results. Table 3 contains several examples of this finding.



Table 3: Stakeholder Response by Participation Years

How the Stakeholder Process Facilitates		Response Statement		% of Respondents by Participation Years	
		All Survey Respondents	Both 2020 and 2019	2020 Year Only	2019 Year Only
Better energy efficiency & conservation	Agreement that based on the information up to this point, they believe the stakeholder process will lead to better energy efficiency conservation in Virginia.	81.0%	88.1%	71.4%	25.0%
Stakeholder input to the utility	Agreement that the stakeholder process allows stakeholders to provide energy efficiency recommendations directly to the utility.	82.0%	88.1%	84.6%	50.0%
Stakeholder input opportunities	Satisfaction with the opportunities to provide my input and recommendations throughout the entire process.	73.3%	82.9%	53.9%	33.3%
Perceived value of stakeholder input	Agreement with the Energy Efficiency Stakeholders' input and recommendations are valued throughout the process.	67.2%	70.7%	76.9%	25.0%
Building trust between stakeholders and utilities	Agreement with the Virginia Energy Efficiency Stakeholder Process is increasing trust and collaboration between stakeholders and the utility(ies).	63.9%	68.3%	61.5%	50.0%
Productivity of the process	Overall, how productive do you think the process has been?	78.5%	88.4%	78.6%	20.0%
Overall satisfaction with the process	How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the Virginia Energy Efficiency Stakeholder Process?	67.2%	74.4%	69.2%	20.0%
Satisfaction with program recommendations	Satisfaction with the resulting program recommendations from the process.	63.3%	70.73%	53.8%	33.3%
Improvement of measures for the stakeholder's specific niche	Agreement with So far, the Virginia Energy Efficiency Stakeholder Process has improved the energy efficiency measures recommendations for energy efficiency areas that I work in.	58.1%	64.3%	61.5%	25.0%
Ability to trace recommendations to the utility programs	Agreement with seeing stakeholder results in Energy Efficiency RFPs or Programs developed by the utilities.	59.67%	73.2%	53.9%	25.0%

In general, the Virginia Energy Efficiency Stakeholder process compares well to processes in other states. Over a quarter (27.5%) have participated in energy efficiency-related in 25 other states, the most frequently cited being North Carolina, New York, California, and Pennsylvania. Comparing the Virginia Energy Efficiency Stakeholder process to other state-based and Federal processes:

- 50.0% of the Virginia stakeholders who have participated in multiple state processes reported the Virginia process to be “Much Better” or “Better” regarding the resulting program recommendations from the Virginia process. Another 31.3 percent reported results were “About the Same”.
- 43.8% of the Virginia stakeholders reported the Virginia process to be “Much Better” or “Better” regarding their ability to provide

input and recommendations throughout the entire process. An other 43.8 percent reported the Virginia process and other processes were “About the Same”.

- 43.8% of the Virginia stakeholders reported the Virginia process to be “Much Better” or “Better” regarding the diversity of stakeholders represented in the process. Another 37.5 percent reported the Virginia process to be “About the Same” as other processes.
- 37.5% of the Virginia stakeholders reported the Virginia process to be “Much Better” or “Better” regarding the extent to which their input/recommendations are considered during the process. Another 43.8 percent reported the Virginia process to be “About the Same” as other processes.



STAKEHOLDER OBJECTIVES

(i) the objectives established by the stakeholder group during this process related to programs to be proposed

During the first set of meetings for each utility, the independent monitor asked the members present to provide what objectives they would like to achieve for the 2020 filing year. These objectives are provided in Tables 4 and 5.

Table 4: 2020 Stakeholder Objectives for Phase I Utility - APCo

Phase I Utility – APCo

- Save money
- Be engaged
- Be a voice for low-income weatherization
- See partnership strengthened, shore up any weaknesses in the process
- Find ways to best bring in different audiences
- Learn more about the process
- Receive stakeholder input on the filing recommendations
- Support the filing
- Share ideas for improvement
- Get more perspectives into the process
- Identify which programs to continue and improve



Table 5: 2020 Stakeholder Objectives for Phase II Utility - DEV

Phase II Utility – DEV Objectives	Specific Objectives Mentioned
Develop and Propose Cost Effective Programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Find/propose cost effective programs (6 comments) • Develop cost beneficial programs for all customers • Develop more efficient programs
Propose and Implement Successful Programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help DEV implement successful programs • Develop successful programs • Make sure programs deliver actual savings • Repeat 100% proposal pass rate with the SCC • Make better/stronger recommendations • Move programs faster • Hone in on ideas for an RFP • Develop a solid portfolio of programs to propose to the SCC
Develop innovative ideas/programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generate creative ideas • Evolve our thinking about programs to move forward • Develop innovative ideas including workforce development • Take lessons learned from existing programs and continuously improve existing programs through the process
Increase communication between stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate mutual understanding among stakeholders and with the utility • Provide opportunity for stakeholder conversation • Contribute my knowledge to the process
Learn More About the Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Journey of discovery • Learn about the stakeholder process (3 comments) • Learn about proposed programs • Learn about the upcoming RFP • Learn how this process dovetails with other Virginia energy initiatives
Increase residential programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More residential programs • Expand non-residential programs and new technology use • More non-residential program ideas
Increase low income programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase low income programs (3 comments) • Develop program for low income children • Separate low income into single family and multifamily programs
Improve data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtain the data to support the programs • Set metrics to help achieve Governor’s climate initiative • Get a baseline of where we are
Customer Focus and Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure programs are representative of diverse audiences • Make programs successful through increased and targeted marketing • Have clarity and consistency of messaging to consumers
Specific Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combine traditional EE approaches with new technology • Work on energy disaggregation • Explore fuel switching



While not listed as specific objectives, each of the stakeholder groups placed importance on three areas they wanted to ensure that the 2020 programs incorporated. These were:

- Increase programs for low-income customers
- Ensure customer engagement and increased education programming
- Enhance and expand non-residential programs.

These themes are integrated into the 2020 program recommendations in each utility's RFP.

2020 PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

(ii) recommendations related to programs to be proposed that result from the stakeholder process recommendations related to programs to be proposed that result from the stakeholder process

The large amount of input and feedback provided by stakeholders in the 2019 filing year process enabled the stakeholders to start with a rich set of ideas for the 2020 filing year. Each utility was able to craft and disseminate an RFP consisting primarily of recommendations from the respective stakeholder groups. This report provides the final set of program recommendations as solicited by the writing of this report. Iterations of the recommendations are available on the Trello collaborative sites for those who may want to explore the evolution of the development of the recommendations.



STAKEHOLDER RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PHASE I UTILITY - APPALACHIAN POWER

The APCo stakeholder group proposed 10 programs for the 2020 filing year. The 10 programs are:

Table 5: 2020 Stakeholder Objectives for Phase II Utility - DEV

Program Title	Program Description
Bring-Your-Own Smart Thermostat Program	The objective of the program is to utilize Wi-Fi-enabled thermostats to support a summer based air conditioner / heat pump (“A/C” or “HVAC”) demand response (“DR”) program for residential customers served by Appalachian Power Company (“APCo” or “Company”). Thermostats under this program will be customer-owned and self-installed, either on their own or through a contractor of their choice.
Commercial and Industrial (C&I) Small Business Direct Install Program	The objective of the Small Business Direct Install (SBDI) program is to deliver targeted, cost-effective energy efficiency measures to small business customers served at retail by Appalachian Power Company (“APCo” or “Company”). Provide customer with an energy assessments and no-cost direct installation of low-cost energy saving measures along with financial incentives to encourage the installation of additional measures.
Commercial and Industrial (C&I) Lighting	The objective is to generate energy savings for non-residential customers served at retail by Appalachian Power Company (“APCo” or “Company”) through the promotion of high-efficiency lighting and lighting technology. Address the initial-cost barrier for customers to increase the installation rate of high-efficiency lighting and technologies.
Commercial and Industrial (C&I) Standard	The objective of the program is to generate energy savings for non-residential customers served at retail by Appalachian Power Company (“APCo” or “Company”) through the promotion non-lighting energy efficient measures. The program is designed to address the initial-cost barrier for customers to increase the installation rate non-lighting energy efficient prescriptive measures.
Efficient Products Program	The objective of the program is to generate energy savings for customers served by Appalachian Power Company (“APCo” or “Company”) through the promotion of high efficiency electric lighting and appliances through local retail presence. The program will increase the purchase of LED high-efficiency lighting and ENERGY STAR® certified appliances. The program will also provide education to residential customers about the energy and money saving benefits associated with efficient appliances and lighting products and equip market providers to communicate those benefits directly to their customers.
Online Energy Assessment	The objective of this program to generate energy savings for customers served by Appalachian Power Company (“APCo” or “Company”) by providing energy efficiency kits to all residential customers who have completed the Online Energy Assessment. The kits will provide cost-effective energy savings for customers while promoting other programs in APCo’s energy efficiency portfolio.
Residential Home Performance Program	The objective of this program is to generate energy savings for customers served by Appalachian Power Company (“APCo” or “Company”) through the promotion of energy efficiency homes. The primary objective for this program is to produce long term electric energy reduction in the residential sector.
Behavioral Program	This program helps customers to reduce energy use by encouraging them to alter their electricity usage habits by providing positive reinforcement. The report may be shared with the customer via email or other electronic media (e.g. smartphone apps, web, or social media) to compare participant’s energy usage with similar homes. This comparison should motivate customers to take action to save energy and maintain those savings through positive reinforcement. For example, the participant is provided a list of simple actions to follow to reduce electricity usage and promote other energy efficiency programs in which they can participate. The behavioral program will focus on delivering persistent savings through a digital based home energy savings & education report on an ongoing basis.
Volt Var Optimization	Volt Var Optimization (VVO) is a demand side management program that will reduce energy and demand usage without any needed interaction from the customer. By more closely controlling the voltage that is delivered to the meter and, subsequently, to the customer’s end-use electrical devices, customers will realize lower consumption and lower electric bills. No direct customer intervention is required.



STATUS OF THE 2020 APCO PROCESS

In April 2020, APCo issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) to prospective vendors to obtain pricing, suggestions for cost effective program design, and potential energy efficiency measures to be included for specific programs. Eight of the 10 programs were contained in the RFP. The Behavioral Program and the Volt Var Optimization Program were solicited independently. Responses to the RFP were due June 1, 2020 and APCo received proposals from 10 vendors as of June 1, some of whom applied to multiple programs.

APCo will utilize responses to the RFP to determine if the proposed programs are cost effective based upon the net present value of the benefits exceeding the net present value of the costs as determined by not less than any three of the following four tests:

- The Total Resource Cost Test
- The Utility Cost Test
- The Participant Test
- The Ratepayer Impact Measure Test

APCo will also review the proposals to ensure the programs meet any other requirements of the Virginia Clean Economy Act.

APCo anticipates selecting initial contractors by the end of July 2020 and holding a meeting with the stakeholder group sometime in August or September to provide further updates.

Anticipated Calendar for the APCo 2020 EE-RAC Filing

Based on this analysis, the final slate of programs to be filed in APCo's 2020 EE-RAC filing will be determined. From the Order issued in Case No. PUR-2019-00122, APCo's next EE-RAC filing will take place on or before November 30, 2020. APCo will continue to fulfill the reporting requirements agreed to with Commission staff in the form of a pre-filed exhibit(s). APCo will also continue to work with Commission staff to prepare such a pre-filed exhibit(s). At that time, APCo will also update its progress toward meeting the \$140 million target of proposed energy efficiency programs to meet the requirements of Senate Bill 966 and the Virginia Clean Economy Act.



STAKEHOLDER RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PHASE II UTILITY – DOMINION ENERGY VIRGINIA

The DEV stakeholder process yielded group proposed 19 programs for the 2020 filing year. The 19 programs are:

Table 7: 2020 Program Stakeholder Recommendations - Phase II Utility - DEV

Program Area	Program Title	Program Description
Residential Programs	Residential Income and Age Qualifying Energy Efficiency Program	This program would provide no-cost energy assessment, energy-saving measures, and installation services incentives to customers who meet specific income, age, and other qualifications.
	Residential Energy Efficiency – Smart Home Program	This program would incentivize the purchase of home automation products. A demand response component may also be proposed for this program; however, separate design information should be provided for the demand response component.
	Residential Bring Your Own Device Program	This program would provide an incentive for customers to purchase a device and allow the Company to remotely control the load connected to the device. The device must be owned and installed by the participating customer. The Company would not own or install the device but could provide an incentive to purchase the device and/or an incentive for the customer to allow ongoing remote control by the Company. Note that it may be possible to combine this program with other programs.
Non- Residential Programs	Non-Residential Agricultural Energy Efficiency	This program would provide incentives to apply energy efficiency measures associated with measures applicable to agricultural, silvicultural, or aquacultural activities, or interests.
	Non-Residential Energy Efficiency – Building Automation Program	Program to encourage the installation and optimization of new building management and mechanical systems to drive energy savings. If appropriate, a demand response may be included; however, separate design information must be provided for the energy efficiency and demand response components.
	Non-Residential Building Optimization	This program would facilitate the optimization of building management and optimize mechanical systems to drive energy savings.
	Non-Residential Energy Efficiency – Health Care Targeted Program	This program would identify and target health care facilities.
	Non-Residential Energy Efficiency – Hotel and Lodging Targeted Program	This program would identify and target hotel and other lodging facilities.
	Non-Residential Engagement Program	This program would allow for engagement of non-residential customers and establish a long-term ability to derive energy savings from retrofit and behavioral measures.
	Non-Residential Prescriptive Program	Program to allow for continuation of prescriptive program with enhanced measures to reach additional potential savings opportunities.
	Non-Residential Strategic Energy Management	This program would provide incentives to customers to engage in strategic energy management in a way that is measurable and verifiable.
	Small Business Behavioral– Non-Residential Customer Engagement & Savings	Program to allow for non-residential end customers to engage and establish a longer-term relationship to drive energy savings from both retrofit and behavioral measures. Note that proposals may be combined with a larger non-residential behavioral program or may be separately targeted toward small businesses as the Supplier believes appropriate.



Program Area	Program Title	Program Description
Residential Programs	Residential Comprehensive Heat Pump Water Heater Program	This program would allow for deeper market penetrations of Heat Pump Domestic Water Heaters and to capture both energy savings and peak reduction value from participants.
Program Support	Umbrella Marketing Services	These services would provide full-scale marketing to support all of the DEV's current and future demand side management programs.
	Rebate / Incentive Fulfillment Services	To provide rebate fulfillment services individually or bundled with marketing and/or call center services. DEV envisions that rebate fulfillment services would involve providing rebates to designated customers based on securely transmitted information to the rebate fulfillment center.
	Call Center Services	Call center services in support of the DEV's portfolio of DSM programs. The services would include supporting all of DEV's DSM programs that are active at any given time. Depending upon the type and number of active programs, the scope may be adjusted from time to time as needed. Proposed compensation should be aligned with this business requirement.
	Block DSM Implementation Services	DEV is considering purchasing block implementation services as an alternative. The Company envisions that these services would be purchased for a specified period of time under a general scope of work focused on providing specific implementation services; however, the scope of work would be modified as programs are added and removed from the Company's portfolio.
Additional Programs	Additional Programs	Submissions for new DSM programs not identified by Dominion Energy in the RFP. Any new proposed DSM program will be reviewed by Dominion Energy and if selected, will be subject to regulatory approval.

STATUS OF THE 2020 DEV PROCESS

In May 2020, DEV issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) by invitation only to over 40 firms. Firms wanting to be added to the list could contact DEV and provide demonstration of their relevant capabilities to receive the RFP. Responses to the RFP are due in late June. As of the writing of this report, the number of proposals is not yet known. DEV will begin to evaluate the proposals immediately upon receipt and will continue throughout preparation and review of the filing for approval. Attempts are made to correct or modify program designs that have minor issues; proposals that are deficient, not credible, not cost-effective, or otherwise flawed are rejected. It is possible that awards may not be made until final program approval.

Anticipated Calendar for DEV 2020 DSM Filing

Once DEV has done an initial assessment of bids, the plan is to meet with Stakeholders in August to review high-level submittals and what is initially looking promising (without final cost benefit results). Another meeting will be held in the Fall to review the cost benefit results and what DEV plans to file in December. Also, with the expanded responsibilities of the stakeholder process, time will be set aside in those meetings to discuss these new duties and how to best deliver results in those areas. In addition, continued program brainstorming for new program ideas or program expansions of current programs will occur the Summer and Fall meetings.

STATUS OF 2019 RECOMMENDATIONS AND PETITIONS

(iii) the status of those recommendations, in addition to the petitions filed and the determination thereon

As a component of the discussions for the 2019 filing year that occurred after the June 28, 2019 submission of [The Report of the Independent Monitor](#), the independent monitor facilitated discussions with the stakeholder groups on how they could support the petition filings of the utilities. Stakeholders were provided with ideas and a template to create ways to show their support, or provide additional feedback, for the filings and hearings.



APPALACHIAN POWER

On September 30, 2019, Appalachian Power filed a petition for approval of the continued implementation of a rate adjustment clause to recover the costs of its proposed energy efficiency portfolio, as well as for the approval of three new programs. APCo sought approval to implement the following three new EE programs for a five-year period starting January 1, 2021. The three proposed programs were:

- **Low Income Single Family (LISF).** The objective of the Extended Low-Income Single Family (LISF) Program is to deliver targeted, cost-effective measures to residential low-income customers through evaluation and implementation of energy saving improvement opportunities. The LISF Program will be implemented to supplement Appalachian Power’s (APCo) existing Residential Low-Income Weatherization Program that has been implemented since 2015. The LISF Program is designed to provide home energy services to APCo’s Virginia customers with limited income to assist them in reducing their electric energy usage and to manage their utility costs. The LISF Program will help facilitate the implementation of cost-effective electric energy-saving measures in residential low-income households. These services would be provided at no cost to qualifying participants.
- **Low Income Multifamily (LIMF).** The objective of the Low Income Multifamily (LIMF) Program is to deliver targeted, cost-effective measures to income-qualified multifamily households and properties. The program will also educate and motivate owners to participate in additional programs offered by APCo in Virginia. The LIMF Program will also include an education component for participating customers on ways to most effectively manage their energy usage. The LIMF Program will reduce energy consumption by educating residential customers about the energy and money saving benefits associated with energy efficiency in the home. All customers participating in this program will receive educational materials and an opportunity to discuss ways that they can continue to conserve and maintain the efficiency of their home after the services have been performed. All services will be provided at no cost to the customer.
- **ENERGY STAR Manufactured Housing (ESMH).** The objective of the ENERGY STAR Manufactured Housing Program (“ESMH”) is to grow the market for ENERGY STAR homes in the Virginia service territory of APCo by providing manufactured homes producers, sellers and HVAC industry partners with an incentive to promote and facilitate the completion of new ENERGY STAR certified manufactured homes. The ESMH Program will pay incentives in the form of rebates for electrically heated manufactured homes that qualify for the ENERGY STAR label as defined by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. ENERGY STAR compliance requires the use of a package of envelope and equipment measure that in combination result in performance that is more energy efficient than comparable homes built to the federal Manufactured Home Construction and Safety Standards, commonly referred to as the HUD code.

These three new proposed programs were vetted through the required Stakeholder process.

A public hearing on the Petition was convened by the Hearing Examiner on March 3, 2020. Participants in the hearing included:

- Appalachian Power
- The Office of Attorney General, Division of Consumer Counsel
- Staff of the Commission

On April 3, 2020, the Report of the Hearing Examiner was issued. In the Report, the Hearing Examiner recommended that, among other things, the LIMF and LISF programs be approved while the ESMH program be denied as filed. The Hearing Examiner noted that the Commission should approve a revised ESMH program that includes an incentive that would be split between the retailer and the participating ratepayer. In its comments on the report, APCo continued to support the ESMH program as proposed but stated that it would not oppose the alternative suggested by the Hearing Examiner. APCo suggested the following split of the incentive between retailer and ratepayer:

Table 8: APCo Incentive Split Proposal

Party	Incentive Amount
APCo Customer	\$700
HVAC Contractor	\$50-\$100
Retailer	\$600-\$650
Manufacturer	\$0



In its Order on May 21, 2020, the Commission:

- Approved the LISF and LIMF programs as filed.
- Approved the revised ESMH program with the alternative incentive structure proposed by APCo.
- Required APCo to perform additional sampling and statistical analysis to test the validity of the Technical Reference Manual (TRM) formulas and the accuracy of the claimed energy savings. This is required unless APCo can demonstrate in its Evaluation, Measurement, and Verification (EM&V) report what alternative was used to document actual savings for the particular program for which it did not use sampling and statistical analysis, and why that alternative provides evidence of actual savings for that program reasonably comparable to sampling and statistical analysis.
- Agreed with the Hearing Examiner that the LIMF and LISF programs satisfy the requirements of Code 56-596.2:1 and APCo should be permitted to apply the first three years of these programs towards meeting the \$25 million goal established therein.
- Found that the costs associated with the new programs proposed in the Petition should count towards the \$140 million target established for APCo in Code 56-596.2.

With this filing, APCo has proposed approximately \$71 million, or approximately 50.7%, of the required \$140 million target as required in Senate Bill 966.

DOMINION ENERGY VIRGINIA

During the 2019 filing year, Dominion Energy Virginia sought approval from the Commission to adjust its filing schedule to allow for inclusion of addition program items related to HB 2789 and to further refine the program recommendations based upon stakeholder feedback. The Commission granted approval. The approval now allows DEV to begin its programs in January of the following year.

On December 3, 2019, DEV filed petition for 15 programs to begin by January 2021. These were:

- *Residential Electric Vehicle Program (EE and DR)*. This program would encourage efficient charging of electric vehicles and shifting of electric vehicle charging load to off-peak periods. The incentive may be constructed such that it encourages a combination of purchase of higher efficiency/communicating charging equipment and/or load reduction using communicating charging equipment or by other means. Creativity in terms of the form of the incentive is welcomed in order to maximize cost-effectiveness. The program is not seeking proposals for a time-of-use electric rate or tariff as part of this program.
- *Residential Electric Vehicle (Peak Shaving)*. This Program would provide customers who already have a qualifying electric vehicle charger with an annual incentive in exchange for allowing the Company to reduce the operating cycle of their charger by remote control during periods of high demand.
- *Residential Energy Efficiency Kits (EE)*. This program would provide energy efficiency kits to customers as a welcome gift or in response to requests under specific conditions.
- *Residential Energy Efficiency – Home Retrofit (EE)*. This program would incentivize retrofit of participating customer homes using measures that may extend beyond what would be considered a typical measure in a home energy assessment program. The program could encourage retrofit measures using either (1) a menu-based approach, which would provide rebates or incentives associated with specific retrofit items, or (2) a “standards” approach which would encourage participants to perform retrofits to achieve specific energy efficiency standards, such as EnergyStar, Passive

House, specific HERS ratings, or retrofits that meet/exceed specific numerical energy consumption thresholds.

- *Residential Manufactured Housing (EE)*. This program would offer incentives for the installation of energy efficiency measures designed specifically for manufactured and modular housing.
- *Residential New Construction (EE)*. This program would encourage the use of energy efficient materials and practices in new home construction through a combination of incentives and education.
- *Residential Energy Efficiency – Multi-Family Targeted (EE)*. This program would identify and target multi-family residences with incentives and measures specifically designed to take advantage of energy-saving opportunities in this type of residence. For the purpose of this program, the assumption is that a multi-family residence is defined as a residence with a shared envelope, wall or floor/ceiling, with no specific limitation on the number of residences within a given structure.
- *Residential Customer Engagement (EE)*. This program would provide staffing and subject matter experts to interact with customers directly by phone, e-mail, and/or social media to provide energy efficiency advice on request. The program may also include staffing to provide experts at public events and meetings of local organizations.
- *Residential Smart Thermostat (EE and DR)*. The EE program would offer rebates to customers who either purchase a qualifying smart thermostat and/or enroll in an energy efficiency program. The DR program would manage heat pumps and air-conditioning units using smart thermostats to reduce peak demand.
- *Non-Residential Upstream and Midstream Efficient Products Incentives (EE)*. A companion program to a proposed residential efficient products program that would take advantage of additional savings opportunities that could be realized through upstream and midstream incentives applied to energy efficient products but targeted at non-residential customers. The proposed residential program includes incentives for the following items: A-Lines, Reflectors, Decoratives, Globes, Lighting Retrofit Kit and Fixture, Freezer, Refrigeration, Clothes Washer, Dehumidifier, Energy Star



Air Purifier, Clothes Dryer, and Dishwasher.

- *Non-Residential New Construction (EE)*. This program would encourage the use of energy efficient materials and practices in new construction through a combination of incentives and education.
- *Small Business Improvement Enhanced (EE)*. This program would provide small businesses an energy use assessment and tune-up or re-commissioning of electric heating and cooling systems, along with financial incentives for the installation of specific energy efficiency measures. This program is an enhancement to the existing DSM V Small Business Improvement Program.
- *HB 2789 (Heating and Cooling/Health and Safety) (EE)*. This program would provide incentives to low-income, elderly, and disabled individuals for the installation of measures that reduce heating and cooling costs and enhance health and safety of residents.

A public hearing on the Petition was convened by the Hearing Examiner on April 29-30, 2020 and held online due to the COVID-19 pandemic. No opposition to approval of the proposed programs was presented, but questions around specific aspects of several programs were raised. Commission staff had concerns about the rebate structure of Residential New Construction Program. In order to resolve their concerns, although holding its originally filed position, DEV agreed to modify how the program dollars would flow between the customer and home builder if the Commission deemed such a program design change necessary for approval. A Final Order has not yet been issued and is pending. Approval, if granted, is expected in July 2020, and not later than August 3. With this filing, DEV has proposed approximately \$344.2 million, or approximately 39.6 percent of the required \$870 million target as required by the Grid Transformation and Security Act (GTSA), within the first two years.

<u>Projected Rate Year Spend ('18 -'19)</u> ¹	<u>Projected Rate Year Spend ('19 -'20)</u> ²	<u>Phase VII 5 Yr. Cost Caps</u> ³	<u>Projected Rate Year Spend ('20 -'21)</u> ⁴	<u>Phase VIII Projected 5 Yr. Cost Caps</u> ⁵
\$26.0	\$20.4	\$109.1	\$15.3	\$173.5

Footnotes:

- 1 - For Phases III - VI, represents projected rate year costs (Jul '18 - Jun '19) in revenue requirement approved in case PUR-2017-00129. Includes program costs, common costs, and margin.
- 2 - For Phases III - VI, represents projected rate year costs (Jul '19 - Jun '20) in revenue requirement proposed in case PUR-2018-00168. Includes program costs, common costs, and margin.
- 3 - For Phase VII, represents proposed 5 yr. cost caps excluding lost revenue for 8 EE programs in case PUR-2018-00168. Includes estimates for program costs, common costs, and margin. Exclude Cust Engagement, Residential Smart Thermostat programs.
- 4 - For Phases IV - VI, represents projected rate year costs (Sep 20 - Aug '21) in revenue requirement proposed in case PUR-2019-00XXX. Includes program costs, common costs, and margin.
- 5 - For Phase VIII, represents proposed 5 yr. cost caps excluding lost revenue. (3 yr. for HB2789) Includes estimates for program costs, common costs, and margin. Includes updated Phase VII Cust Engagement, Residential Smart Thermostat programs.



UPDATE ON 2019 REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

In the 2019 Report of the Independent Monitor, four recommendations were provided to improve the stakeholder process. The recommendations were formulated based upon reviewing similar stakeholder processes in other states and jurisdictions such as Arkansas, the District of Columbia, Illinois and Oregon, and incorporating stakeholder feedback about the process. This report provides an update on the recommendations.

- **A stakeholder group developed vision and strategic or guiding plan.** The independent monitor provided opportunities for discussion of this topic in the follow-on 2019 filing meetings and initial 2020 filing year meetings to begin this process. The idea for longer-range planning was also included in the DEV stakeholder group through having one sub-group focus on innovation. Additionally, the independent monitor suggested that stakeholders who were interested in developing a plan could volunteer for a subcommittee to work independently, with some guidance and assistance from the independent monitor, on behalf of the stakeholders. The recent changes in legislation appear to address some of the issues associated with stakeholders' interests in a longer-range plan. As the first programs roll out in January 2021, an approach for a longer-term strategy may emerge.
- **Working groups to address multiple issues simultaneously.** Given the complexity and scope of energy efficiency issues,

other states' have adopted workgroup, or sub-group, formats so that multiple issues can be worked on simultaneously to make the group more effective and efficient. The first attempt was to use sub-committee groups in the DEV stakeholder process. What was observed is that some stakeholders are extremely busy and engaged with the General Assembly's legislative session at the time this work is needed. Adding additional responsibilities may not be feasible. However, examining the range of stakeholder processes across multiple agencies with an eye toward consolidation or streamlining should be undertaken to reduce stakeholder process fatigue.

- **Stakeholder group written policies and procedures.** This recommendation was not pursued explicitly in the 2020 filing year, but instead was incorporated into the process of developing recommendations by use of templates and multiple reviews of recommendations.
- **Stakeholder Recommendation Tracking Process.** The independent monitor set up a tracking process for recommendations, but the nature of how the groups contributed their feedback did not necessitate a detailed system. The use of Mentimeter also captured and documented input which was provided in meeting notes. However, more traceability between finalized stakeholder recommendations and utility filings needs to be developed.



NEXT STEPS

The second year of the stakeholder process was focused on increasing the input and guidance of the stakeholders into the program recommendations to create portfolios of programs that meet multiple needs. While effort was placed on aligning the program recommendations with the GTSA and other requirements, and to think strategically about the process, these ideas were not as explicit in the process as some stakeholders would have desired. Stakeholders also indicated from their feedback in the survey that improving the diversity of the stakeholder group is needed. A perception expressed by some stakeholders is that representation of interest groups is strong, but regular participation from direct customers, or other audiences, including representation of minority communities and customers, is lacking. A few stakeholders also noted that while generating program ideas and feedback is useful, there is not time to have deeper conversations about how the feedback is reviewed and then how programs are implemented. Several stakeholders have acknowledged that the revised legislation may contribute to improving the process even more.

Based upon the feedback received, the independent monitor offers the following suggestions for the 2021 filing year (October 1, 2020 – September 30, 2021) and beyond.

1. **Utilize the next meetings to plan how the revised legislation will be implemented.** The changes provided in the amended and reenacted legislation address a number of issues that have been raised by some stakeholders. As new requirements, it will be essential to have discussions and agreement on how these can be implemented.
 - a. For example, it will be necessary for the groups to discuss how SCC staff can be involved in discussions, but still remain neutral.
 - b. To the extent possible, plan for earlier meetings in the process (Fall 2020) and reduce meetings held during the General Assembly sessions to increase the participation and diversity of stakeholders represented. It should be noted that program development is complex, and meetings could be necessary in the early months of the year prior to any RFP's being released.
2. **Increase the diversity of the stakeholder group. This must be an intentional process and effort.** The independent monitor, and other stakeholders, could do the following:
 - a. Create an outreach effort to recruit a more diverse pool of stakeholders to the meetings
 - b. Offer an alternative way to solicit and obtain stakeholder feedback, should meetings not be feasible for under-represented groups or populations.
 - c. Have the utilities and other stakeholders align other customer-focused communication efforts to identify and encourage participation of more diverse groups.
3. **Strengthen the longer-term ideas and thinking for the process and its goals.** Coordination with other Commonwealth energy mandates and initiatives, including the 2020 Virginia Clean Energy Act (VCEA), and planning for potential rapid changes in technology, the economy, socio-cultural shifts, and other issues affecting multiple audiences, will be essential for achieving the intended impact of energy efficiency and conservation over a 10-year period. Therefore, incorporating more long-term ideas into the process can support innovative program recommendations and potential pilot programs. In general, the stakeholder groups are supportive of long-term planning, but there is not yet consensus in how to implement it. Several stakeholders have proposed developing a 10-year guiding plan, while others have suggested that a 10-year plan may not be feasible if it is not flexible enough to allow for adaptation to new data and emergent ideas. The independent monitor recommends that the stakeholder groups may want to consider:
 - a. Recruit a set of stakeholders to work as a long-term, strategy committee to provide strategic ideas to the larger stakeholder group. This idea has been raised by multiple stakeholders.
 - b. Identifying experts from different industries, including technology, to provide briefs at the meetings, or webinars to increase stakeholder awareness of emerging trends and ideas. This could also help in program recommendations.
 - c. Incorporating time in meetings to allow for longer-term ideas and strategic discussions. These could be done more in focus group fashion and facilitated by the independent monitor.
 - d. Consider scenario planning as part of the stakeholder process.
 - e. Be more explicit in the process about addressing “Parking Lot” issues to ensure the issues are discussed thoroughly.



Appendix I: Virginia Energy Efficiency Stakeholder Process Feedback Survey Results

Survey invitations sent: 226
 Total survey responses received: 81
 Total response rate: 38.4%
 Number of complete responses: 67

Data Confidence Levels and Intervals

Confidence Level	Confidence Interval
90%	+ 7.36%
95%	+ 8.74%

Q1. Which of the following Energy Efficiency Stakeholder group(s) are you a member of? Member means that you are on the mailing list and/or the Trello collaborative site for the group.		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Appalachian Power (APCo) Stakeholder Group only	19.75%	16
Dominion Energy Virginia (DEV) Stakeholder Group only	56.79%	46
Both APCo and DEV Stakeholder Groups	19.75%	16
I do not belong to either group and have not participated in any energy efficiency meetings.	3.70%	3
	Answered	81
	Skipped	0

Q2. In which years have you participated in the stakeholder process?		
Answer Choices	Responses	
2018-2019 (October 2018-September 2019) only	7.79%	6
2019-2020 (October 2019-Present) only	23.38%	18
Both 2018-2019 and 2019-2020	62.34%	48
I am new to the stakeholder and have not participated yet.	5.19%	4
I have not participated in any way in the Energy Efficiency stakeholder process.	1.30%	1
	Answered	77
	Skipped	4

Q3. How would you rate your participation in the Virginia Energy Efficiency Stakeholder process so far. (On a scale of 0 to 100)				
Answer Choices	Mean	Total Number	Responses	
(no label)	64.74074074	3496	100.00%	54
Median	72		Answered	54
Range	0 to 100		Skipped	27

Q4. For the Stakeholder Process Year 2018-2019, approximately how many in-person meetings did you participate (Please provide your best estimate).		
Answer Choices	Responses	
0	28.79%	19
1	18.18%	12
2	18.18%	12
3	13.64%	9
4	10.61%	7
More than 4	10.61%	7
	Answered	66
	Skipped	15



Q5. For the Stakeholder Process Year 2019-2020, approximately how many in-person meetings did you participate (Please provide your best estimate).		
Answer Choices	Responses	
0	21.74%	15
1	21.74%	15
2	26.09%	18
3	18.84%	13
4	4.35%	3
More than 4	7.25%	5
	Answered	69
	Skipped	12

Q6. Please rate the extent of your agreement with the following statements.										
	Much worse	Worse	About the Same	Better	Much Better	N/A - I have not participated in 2 years of the process	Total	Weighted Average		
The collaborative environment between the stakeholders and the utility in 2019-2020 compared to 2018-2019.	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	24.24% 16	24.24% 16	18.18% 12	33.33% 22	66	2.45		
The recommendations made by the stakeholder group in 2019-2020 compared to 2018-2019.	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	24.24% 16	28.79% 19	16.67% 11	30.30% 20	66	2.24		
The progress made by the stakeholder process in 2019-2020 compared to 2018-2019.	0.00% 0	4.55% 3	19.70% 13	28.79% 19	15.15% 10	31.82% 21	66	2.11		
							Answered	66		
							Skipped	15		



Q7. Have you participated in any other energy stakeholder processes in Virginia?		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	33.33%	23
No	66.67%	46
If yes, (please specify)		19
	Answered	69
	Skipped	12

Q8. Have you participated in any energy efficiency related stakeholder processes in other U.S. states and or territories?		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	27.54%	19
No	72.46%	50
	Answered	69
	Skipped	12

Q9. In which U.S. states/territories have you participated in an energy efficiency related stakeholder process? (Please select all that apply)		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Alabama	0.00%	0
Alaska	0.00%	0
Arizona	0.00%	0
Arkansas	11.11%	2
California	22.22%	4
Colorado	0.00%	0
Connecticut	11.11%	2
Delaware	11.11%	2
District of Columbia	11.11%	2
Florida	0.00%	0
Georgia	11.11%	2
Hawaii	5.56%	1
Idaho	0.00%	0
Illinois	5.56%	1
Indiana	5.56%	1
Iowa	0.00%	0
Kansas	0.00%	0
Kentucky	0.00%	0
Louisiana	5.56%	1
Maine	5.56%	1



Maryland	11.11%	2
Massachusetts	11.11%	2
Michigan	0.00%	0
Minnesota	0.00%	0
Mississippi	0.00%	0
Missouri	11.11%	2
Montana	0.00%	0
Nebraska	0.00%	0
Nevada	0.00%	0
New Hampshire	5.56%	1
New Jersey	11.11%	2
New Mexico	0.00%	0
New York	22.22%	4
North Carolina	27.78%	5
North Dakota	0.00%	0
Ohio	5.56%	1
Oklahoma	0.00%	0
Oregon	5.56%	1
Pennsylvania	16.67%	3
Rhode Island	5.56%	1
South Carolina	0.00%	0
South Dakota	0.00%	0
Tennessee	0.00%	0
Texas	0.00%	0
Utah	0.00%	0
Vermont	0.00%	0
Virginia	5.56%	1
Washington	5.56%	1
West Virginia	11.11%	2
Wisconsin	0.00%	0
Wyoming	0.00%	0
Other (please specify)	5.56%	1
	Answered	18
	Skipped	63



Q10. How does the Virginia Energy Efficiency Process compare to other State processes you've been involved in?

	Much worse	Worse	About the Same	Better	Much Better	N/A - I have not participated in 2 years of the process	Total	Weighted Average
Commitment of your time	0.00% 0	12.50% 2	50.00% 8	12.50% 2	18.75% 3	6.25% 1	16	3.4
Ability to provide your input and recommendations throughout the entire process	0.00% 0	6.25% 1	43.75% 7	18.75% 3	25.00% 4	6.25% 1	16	3.67
The extent to which your input/ recommendations are considered during the process	0.00% 0	6.25% 1	43.75% 7	12.50% 2	25.00% 4	12.50% 2	16	3.64
The resulting program recommendations from the process	6.25% 1	0.00% 0	31.25% 5	25.00% 4	25.00% 4	12.50% 2	16	3.71
The diversity of stakeholders represented	6.25% 1	6.25% 1	37.50% 6	31.25% 5	12.50% 2	6.25% 1	16	3.4
							Answered	16
							Skipped	65

Q11. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the Virginia Energy Efficiency Stakeholder Process?

Answer Choices	Responses
Very satisfied	25.00% 16
Somewhat satisfied	42.19% 27
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	21.88% 14
Somewhat dissatisfied	9.38% 6
Very dissatisfied	1.56% 1
	Answered 64
	Skipped 17



Q12. Overall, how productive do you think the process has been?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Very productive	27.69%	18
Somewhat productive	50.77%	33
Neither productive nor unproductive	12.31%	8
Somewhat unproductive	6.15%	4
Very unproductive	3.08%	2
	Answered	65
	Skipped	16

Q13. The Virginia Energy Efficiency Stakeholder Process allows stakeholders to provide energy efficiency recommendations directly to the utility.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total	Weighted Average
1	0.00% 0	4.76% 3	12.70% 8	58.73% 37	23.81% 15	63	4.02
						Answered	63
						Skipped	18

Q14. The Energy Efficiency Stakeholders input and recommendations are valued throughout the process.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total	Weighted Average
1	1.64% 1	4.92% 3	26.23% 16	52.46% 32	14.75% 9	61	3.74
						Answered	61
						Skipped	20

Q15. So far, the Virginia Energy Efficiency Stakeholder Process has improved the energy efficiency measures recommendations for energy efficiency areas that I work in.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total	Weighted Average
1	3.23% 2	3.23% 2	35.48% 22	43.55% 27	14.52% 9	62	3.63
						Answered	62
						Skipped	19

Q16. From my perspective, the Virginia Energy Efficiency Stakeholder Process is increasing trust and collaboration between stakeholders and the utility(ies).

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total	Weighted Average
1	3.28% 2	4.92% 3	27.87% 17	49.18% 30	14.75% 9	61	3.67
						Answered	61
						Skipped	20



Q17. I am able to see the results of stakeholder recommendations in the following:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A	Total	Weighted Average
Energy Efficiency RFPs or Programs developed by the utilities.	1.61% 1	6.45% 4	25.81% 16	35.48% 22	24.19%	15 6.45%	4 62	3.79
Energy Efficiency Filings by the utilities to the State Corporation Commission (from first year).	1.61% 1	6.45% 4	27.42% 17	37.10% 23	20.97%	13 6.45%	4 62	3.74
							Answered	62
							Skipped	19

Q18. Based on the information I have up to this point, I believe the stakeholder process will lead to better energy efficiency conservation within Virginia.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total	Weighted Average
1	1.59% 1	3.17% 2	14.29% 9	57.14% 36	23.81% 15	63	3.98
						Answered	63
						Skipped	18



Q19. Please rate the extent of your satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the following:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	N/A	Total	Weighted Average
The commitment of my time to the stakeholder process.	0.00% 0	5.00% 3	18.33% 11	51.67% 31	20.00%	12 5.00%	3 60	3.91
The opportunities to provide my input and recommendations throughout the entire process.	0.00% 0	6.67% 4	13.33% 8	38.33% 23	35.00%	21 6.67%	4 60	4.09
The extent to which my input/recommendations are considered during the process.	1.67% 1	3.33% 2	28.33% 17	30.00% 18	28.33%	17 8.33%	5 60	3.87
My ability to provide my input through the Trello site, phone, or email, or to the Independent monitor if I'm unable to personally attend a meeting.	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	15.25% 9	52.54% 31	22.03%	13 10.17%	6 59	4.08
							Answered	60
							Skipped	21



Q20. Please rate the extent of your satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the following:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	N/A	Total	Weighted Average
The resulting program recommendations from the process.	3.33% 2	5.00% 3	25.00% 15	43.33% 26	20.00%	12 3.33%	2 60	3.74
The diversity of stakeholders represented.	3.33% 2	8.33% 5	31.67% 19	33.33% 20	21.67%	13 1.67%	1 60	3.63
My ability to access information about the process and recommendations on the Trello collaborative website.	1.69% 1	3.39% 2	23.73% 14	42.37% 25	25.42%	15 3.39%	2 59	3.89
							Answered	60
							Skipped	21

Q21. Please provide any additional comments you have about the Virginia Energy Efficiency Stakeholder Process.

Answered	18
Skipped	63
Responses	
Although I don't personally attend all of the sessions offered that pertain to the Stakeholder Process, our organization does in fact have a participant regularly in attendance who relays information and engagements in regards to the meeting events.	
The stakeholder process is a good opportunity for dialogue.	
I personally feel that Ted Kniker and IMPACT Paradigm Associates has done an incredible job facilitating the AEP Stakeholder meetings. Very organized. The time schedule is well respected. I always look forward to attending and end up leaving with a feeling of accomplishment.	
I was not able to participate in-person due to family medical issues. However, I was kept informed, provided input and feedback and feel the process was very productive.	
It is difficult to rate this as a single process; the two processes for the respective utility is as different as the utilities themselves. Overall, I would agree this process has improved and will continue to improve the programs developed and submitted by APCo. On the other hand, we are far from achieving the same level of trust and collaboration with Dominion Virginia. I believe this process will improve with the clarification that has been inserted into the legislative code about the direction of this process starting July 1, 2020, but there is still much work to be done. I also want to note that it is unclear to me what the time period is for each year of the process as the question indicates 2018-2019 program year, but we didn't start meeting until 2019. The question did not provide clarification and thus I noted I attended all the meetings for 2019, but missed the two meeting thus far in 2020 (for future reference, it would be helpful to not schedule stakeholder meetings during the legislative session).	



<p>Group is too heavily weighted to special interest groups for low income and enviro not enough consideration for regular customers or COSTS to customers.</p>
<p>Seen an definite improvement during the period of my involvement (starting Feb 2019).</p>
<p>I only attendee one meeting out of luck. I could do public transit all the way except for a Lyft ride from the bus terminal in Richmond. I also stayed overnite. Had a conference in DC the day prior. Took a commuter bus to DC, train to Richmond. Lyft to hotel. Walked to meeting. Lyft to Greyhound in Richmond to catch a bus to Charlottesville. Then train to Culpepper and home. Too much to participate regularly. If I could carpool from NoVa or Fredericksburg— would have participated more.</p>
<p>I would like to see more stakeholders from various groups attend. We have an excellent group supporting low-income, but I'd like to hear from other sectors, too.</p>
<p>The process has improved greatly! However, I think that there should be a commitment to continuous improvement. The group is, at times, too large and diverse, to have meaningful discussions on specific topics. We also should come together to do long-term, strategic planning. What would it take to meet the goals of the GTSA (and now the EERS). This also has to include discussion of policy restraints like cost-effectiveness testing, the 500 kW opt-out, among others. I think a great example is the Duke Energy Collaborative.</p>
<p>There are a lot of issues that go into the parking lot that are never discussed. Additionally, while the utilities do seem to take into consideration the types of programs the stakeholders recommend, the design and implementation of those programs are somewhat of a black box still. It would be great to have a deeper dive into the program design and implementation instead of just using the meetings to brainstorm program topics. Additionally, while I think there is a lot of diverstiy at the Dominion meetings, I think there needs to be more diversity at the APCO ones. For example, I would like to see more implementers attend those meetings.</p>
<p>As made evident by COVID19, programs for energy efficiency must incorporate health and safety as a criteria - this would involve more building science based understanding by non-building science stakeholders. And missing stakeholders are representatives from the medical community - especially those specializing in built environment contributions to respiratory and pulmonary health.</p>
<p>The stakeholder process is better than nothing but not as valuable or consequential as the Governor's Executive Committee on EE which actually had access to power and influence on decisions. A process involving everyone requiring significant time commitment without assurance of influence is frustrating.</p>
<p>We need more representation of consumers, especially C&I and communities of color. I am interested to see how new legislation allows the group to discuss more ways to improve utility EE programs. Utilities need a long-term plan for EE. This survey does not differentiate between APCo and Dominion. The process with APCo has been more collaborative and done more to build trusting relationships. I feel that Dominion is in total control and not open to innovative thinking.</p>
<p>I only went to one meeting. It wasn't worth travelling to Richmond for. Not because it was a bad meeting, just not really part of my job function. Trello website is blocked by my company's firewall so I cannot access it. I can't be the only stakeholder who has experienced this challenge. Stakeholders were being heard, but not really steering the process.</p>



Q22. Which of the following best describes the organization you represent? (Please select only one option).

Answer Choices	Responses	
Government - State agency/entity	6.56%	4
Government - Local municipality	9.84%	6
Government – Federal	0.00%	0
Utility Company	13.11%	8
Energy Service Organization/Provider	8.20%	5
Energy Conservation Interest Group/Association	6.56%	4
Environmental organization	8.20%	5
Housing group/association	1.64%	1
Residential consumer organization/association	0.00%	0
Business consumer organization/association	0.00%	0
Weatherization provider	16.39%	10
Low-income advocate organization/association	3.28%	2
Law firm	1.64%	1
Health Related Organization	0.00%	0
School or University	0.00%	0
Hospital	0.00%	0
Program implementer	11.48%	7
Charitable organization	1.64%	1
Interested individual	3.28%	2
Other (please specify)	8.20%	5
Other (please specify)	Answered	61
Other (please specify)	Skipped	20
Utility strategy/management consulting firm		
Energy Management Equipment Manufacturer		
Software and program services provider		
Building Science Consultancy: Forensics, Diagnostics, Design		
Program evaluator		

the 1990s, the number of people with a mental health problem has increased in the UK, and the number of people with a mental health problem who are in contact with mental health services has also increased (Mental Health Act 1983, 1990, 1994, 1997, 2003, 2007, 2012).

There is a growing awareness of the need to improve the lives of people with a mental health problem, and to reduce the stigma and discrimination that they experience (Mental Health Act 1983, 1990, 1994, 1997, 2003, 2007, 2012). This has led to a number of initiatives to improve the lives of people with a mental health problem, and to reduce the stigma and discrimination that they experience (Mental Health Act 1983, 1990, 1994, 1997, 2003, 2007, 2012).

One of the most important initiatives is the development of self-help materials for people with a mental health problem. These materials can help people to understand their condition, and to manage their symptoms. They can also help people to access the services that they need, and to improve their quality of life (Mental Health Act 1983, 1990, 1994, 1997, 2003, 2007, 2012).

Self-help materials can be developed in a number of ways. They can be developed as books, leaflets, or brochures. They can also be developed as audio or video materials. They can be developed in a number of languages, and for a number of different cultures (Mental Health Act 1983, 1990, 1994, 1997, 2003, 2007, 2012).

Self-help materials can be developed for a number of different conditions. They can be developed for people with a mental health problem, or for people with a physical health problem. They can be developed for people who are newly diagnosed, or for people who have been diagnosed for a long time (Mental Health Act 1983, 1990, 1994, 1997, 2003, 2007, 2012).

Self-help materials can be developed for a number of different purposes. They can be developed to help people to understand their condition, and to manage their symptoms. They can also be developed to help people to access the services that they need, and to improve their quality of life (Mental Health Act 1983, 1990, 1994, 1997, 2003, 2007, 2012).

Self-help materials can be developed in a number of ways. They can be developed as books, leaflets, or brochures. They can also be developed as audio or video materials. They can be developed in a number of languages, and for a number of different cultures (Mental Health Act 1983, 1990, 1994, 1997, 2003, 2007, 2012).

Self-help materials can be developed for a number of different conditions. They can be developed for people with a mental health problem, or for people with a physical health problem. They can be developed for people who are newly diagnosed, or for people who have been diagnosed for a long time (Mental Health Act 1983, 1990, 1994, 1997, 2003, 2007, 2012).

Self-help materials can be developed for a number of different purposes. They can be developed to help people to understand their condition, and to manage their symptoms. They can also be developed to help people to access the services that they need, and to improve their quality of life (Mental Health Act 1983, 1990, 1994, 1997, 2003, 2007, 2012).