From:	Paul Johnson
To:	Gretchen Calcagni
Subject:	paul johnson comments on plan
Date:	Wednesday, October 14, 2015 11:16:17 AM

Hi Gretchen,

Below is an exerpt from my note I sent to Emmett. It is a better version than i sent you yesterday and i think it more fully presents my comments on the plan. I hope you will include this in your aggregation.

Let me know if you can include this.

Thanks
Paul

//////// exerpt from letter to Emmett Lyne.

I understand that it was a big lift for the PAs to agree to the higher savings goals and appreciate your hard work in creating the plan and responding in one way or other to the 95 Council recommendations. I know you believe you have a winning formula to achieve the highest goals in the country and that doing too many things may possibly dilute your efforts to serve customers effectively. Nevertheless, we are looking at very challenging conditions with changing baselines at this point. My support for the new plan is dependent on these priorities being addressed in some way.

1. That you will supply more details than the current draft of the plan provides in terms of a new mid-size customer strategy.
2. That you commit to doing a demonstration project on behavior in C&I which could be either SEM (strategic energy management) for large customers or a behavior project for small or medium-size customers.
3. That you will be finishing the evaluation of the CHP potential study and will also share your goals and pipeline info about CHP.
4. That you will report regularly on program penetration numbers, in particular, mid-size customer segments, renters and in the residential program the number of measures installed within a zip code.
5. That you will complete the extensive review of the HES program.
6. That you include the small business representative on the Demand Reduction working group

Emmett, you and I differ on how many of the Council recommendations were fulfilled. I have reviewed the list of 95 recommendations several times and you have simply not committed to enough of them to meet the Council's reasonable expectations. You have clearly omitted the most important and challenging ones. The renter initiative does not differ significantly from what we have been doing for four years other than for the door hangers. The online incentive application portal is useless if customers do not know what they should order, which a well-trained salesman could help them with. Unfortunately, mid-size customers will not get this

level of service with this plan. The 60-80% of SMI initiative is admirable but these customers could usually get a heat loan unless they were among the 1300 that were rejected last year. It is unfortunate that PAs thought it inappropriate to consider "exploring" a loan loss reserve for all of them. The Demand Reduction working group has only one Council Member besides DOER and the AG onboard. Small ESCOs have unique insights on what customers would respond to in terms of demand reduction products and incentives. I have done extensive research on this topic and believe I would be a valuable contributor to this group.

There is clear explanation for the difference between the 79% of recommendations that you think the PAs adequately addressed and the 44% that I think they addressed. This discrepancy exists because you count as the fulfillment of many council recommendations, efforts now conducted within a current program. But it is clear that the Council was asking what you were going to do differently in the future. We know what the program includes currently, because we attended 11 workshops describing them. Our recommendations were to address what we saw as shortcomings in the current program or to tap a good opportunity that was lurking on the horizon for you to pursue. Where you did outline an effort to do something new or different, it was with little or no commitment or timeline to actually doing it.