**4 CSR 240-20.094 Demand-Side Programs**

*PURPOSE: This amendment…*

(1) The definitions of terms used in this section can be found in **4 CSR 240-20.092** **Definitions for Demand-Side Programs and Demand-Side Program Investment Mechanisms**, which is incorporated by reference.

 (2) Guideline to Review Progress Toward an Expectation that the Electric Utility’s Demand-Side Programs Can Achieve a Goal of All Cost-Effective Demand-Side Savings. The goals established in this section are not mandatory and no penalty or adverse consequence will accrue to a utility that is unable to achieve the listed annual energy and demand savings goals.

(A) The commission shall use the greater of the annual realistic amount of achievable energy savings and demand savings as determined through a market potential study or the following incremental annual demand-side savings goals as a guideline to review ~~and approve demand-side plan and~~ progress toward an expectation that the electric utility’s demand-side programs can achieve a goal of all cost-effective demand-side savings:

1. For the utility’s approved first program year: three-tenths percent (0.3%) of total annual energy and one percent (1.0%) of annual peak demand;

2. For the utility’s approved second program year: five-tenths percent (0.5%) of total annual energy and one percent (1.0%) of annual peak demand;

3. For the utility’s approved third program year : seven-tenths percent (0.7%) of total annual energy and one percent (1.0%) of annual peak demand;

4. For the utility’s approved fourth program year : nine-tenths percent (0.9%) of total annual energy and one percent (1.0%) of annual peak demand;

5. For the utility’s approved fifth program year : one-and-one-tenth percent (1.1%) of total annual energy and one percent (1.0%) of annual peak demand;

6. For the utility’s approved sixth program year : one-and-three-tenths percent (1.3%) of total annual energy and one percent (1.0%) of annual peak demand;

7. For the utility’s approved seventh program year : one-and-five-tenths percent (1.5%) of total annual energy and one percent (1.0%) of annual peak demand;

8. For the utility’s approved eighth program year : one-and-seven-tenths percent (1.7%) of total annual energy and one percent (1.0%) of annual peak demand; and

9. For the utility’s approved ninth and subsequent program years and for subsequent years, unless additional energy savings and demand savings goals are established by the commission: one-and-nine-tenths percent (1.9%) of total annual energy and one percent (1.0%) of annual peak demand each year.

 (B) The commission shall also use the greater of the cumulative realistic amount of energy savings and demand savings that is determined to be cost-effectively achievable through a market potential study or the following cumulative demand-side savings goals as a guideline to review ~~and approve demand-side plans and~~ progress toward an expectation that the electric utility’s demand-side programs can achieve a goal of all cost-effective demand-side savings:

1. For the utility’s approved first program year: three-tenths percent (0.3%) of total annual energy and one percent (1.0%) of annual peak demand;

2. For the utility’s approved second program year: eight-tenths percent (0.8%) of total annual energy and two percent (2.0%) of annual peak demand;

3. For the utility’s approved third program year: one-and-five-tenths percent (1.5%) of total annual energy and three percent (3.0%) of annual peak demand;

4. For the utility’s approved fourth program year: two-and-four-tenths percent (2.4%) of total annual energy and four percent (4.0%) of annual peak demand;

5. For the utility’s approved fifth program year: three-and-five-tenths percent (3.5%) of total annual energy and five percent (5.0%) of annual peak demand;

6. For the utility’s approved sixth program year: four-and-eight-tenths percent (4.8%) of total annual energy and six percent (6.0%) of annual peak demand;

7. For the utility’s approved seventh program year: six-and-three-tenths percent (6.3%) of total annual energy and seven percent (7.0%) of annual peak demand;

8. For the utility’s approved eighth program year: eight percent (8.0%) of total annual energy and eight percent (8.0%) of annual peak demand; and

9. For the utility’s approved ninth and subsequent program years and for subsequent years, unless additional energy savings and demand savings goals are established by the commission: nine-and-nine-tenths percent (9.9%) of total annual energy and nine percent (9.0%) of annual peak demand for 2020, and then increasing by one-and-nine-tenths percent (1.9%) of total annual energy and by one percent (1.0%) of annual peak demand each year after 2020.

**Utility Stakeholders, United for Missouri, and other stakeholders recommend striking the energy and demand savings goals. Environmental, advocacy, and trade ally stakeholders, as well as the division of energy, recommend keeping the goals. Since no consensus was reached, current goals were retained.**

**Response: DE continues to support the current goals, with Staff’s recommended changes to switch from specific calendar years to program years. However, DE still supports language which would have the utility demonstrate to the Commission why its proposed portfolio is the best portfolio possible, as well as the establishment of a substantive minimum target for low-income programs at 5%, as originally suggested. The level set for low-income programs should not be capped.**

 (3) Utility Market Potential Study.

(A) The market potential study shall:

1. Consider both primary data and secondary data and analysis for the utility’s service territory;

4. Be updated with primary data and analysis no less frequently than every four (4) years. To the extent that primary data for each utility service territory is unavailable or insufficient, the market potential study may also rely on or be supplemented by data from secondary sources and relevant data from other geographic regions;

5. Be prepared by an independent third party;

**Renew Missouri, Public Council, Division of Energy support the requirement to specifically estimate achievable potential for low-income. Utility Stakeholders object to the calling out once specific entity, and to the concept of dictating methodology in regulation.**

**Response: In addition to our objection to the removal of this provision, we object to the removal of provision (7) in the absence of an adder for NEBs (consistent with our previous comments). However, please see our comments to the side regarding this section for more specific details regarding what we would prefer to see regarding the language of the Market Potential Study section. DE prefers that the section provide more specificity to avoid confusion and uncertainty during MEEIA program and portfolio development.**

(B) The utility shall provide an opportunity for commission staff and stakeholder review and input in the planning stages of the potential study including review of assumptions, methodology in advance of the performance of the study. ~~A public version of the study assumptions, methodology and non-energy benefits should be made available for review so that stakeholders can effectively critique the study’s overall goals and objectives, analytical framework, input assumptions, and interim results. A mechanism for, and adequate time for, Commission resolution of disagreements about potential study assumptions, methodology, and non-energy benefits must be included.~~

**Utility Stakeholders, United for Missouri: Object to the concept of a statewide potential study. They prefer that each utility develop their own market potential studies. Each utility’s costs are different, their service territories have significant differences, etc. Renew Missouri, public council, and the division of energy support a statewide potential study, and argue that if the methodology is done correctly then differences between utilities can be included.**

**Response: DE supports a statewide market potential study. Such a study can flexibly include different avoided costs and differentiate between utility territories and would not need to include non-investor-owned utilities.**

(4) Applications for Approval of Electric Utility Demand-Side Programs or Program Plans. Pursuant to the provisions of this rule, 4 CSR 240-2.060, and section 393.1075, RSMo, an electric utility may file an application with the commission for approval of demand-side portfolio or portfolio plans.

(A) Prior to filing an application for approval of electric utility demand-side programs or program plans, the electric utility shall hold a stakeholder advisory meeting to receive input on the following components of its proposed DSM filing.

1. Avoided probable environmental compliance costs;

2. Including a net-to-gross formula, and if included whether free ridership, spillover, rebound and market effects will be included in the calculation;

3. Calculation of net shared benefits;

 (B) As part of its application for approval of electric utility demand-side programs or program plans, the electric utility shall file or provide a reference to the commission case that contains any of the following information. All models and spreadsheets shall be provided as executable versions in native format with all formulas intact.

**Utility Stakeholders: Object to the concept of stakeholder input at this point in the process. They prefer that stakeholder input occur prior to the completion of the market potential study. These inputs would then remain the same for the MEEIA filing and implementation.**

**Response: DE supports stakeholder input both at the point contemplated in this part of the rule and the point stated by utility stakeholders, as well as other points during the MEEIA process.**

1. A current market potential study. If the market potential study of the electric utility that is filing for approval of demand-side programs or a demand-side portfolio, the sampling methodology shall reflect each utility’s service territory and shall provide statistically significant results for that utility;

1. Complete documentation of all assumptions, definitions, methodologies, sampling techniques, and other aspects of the current market potential study;
2. Clear description of the process used to identify the broadest possible list of measures and groups of measures for consideration;

2. Clear description of the process and assumptions used to determine technical potential, economic potential, maximum achievable potential, and realistic achievable potential for a twenty (20)-year planning horizon for major end-use groups (e.g., lighting, space heating, space cooling, refrigeration, motor drives, etc.) for each customer class; and

3. Identification and discussion of the twenty (20)-year baseline energy and demand forecasts. If the baseline energy and demand forecasts in the current market potential study differ from the baseline forecasts in the utility’s most recent 4 CSR 240-22 triennial compliance filing, the current market potential study shall provide a comparison of the two (2) sets of forecasts and a discussion of the reasons for any differences between the two (2) sets of forecasts. The twenty (20)-year baseline energy and demand forecasts shall account for the following:

A. Discussion of the treatment of all of the utility’s customers who have opted out;

B. Future changes in building codes and/or appliance efficiency standards;

C. Changes in customer combined heat and power applications;

D. Third party and other naturally occurring demand-side savings, and

E. The increasing efficiency of advanced technologies.

(C) Demonstration of cost-effectiveness for each demand-side program and for the total of all demand-side programs of the utility~~, excluding programs that are not subject to a cost-effectiveness test under Section 393.1075.4, RSMo~~. At a minimum, the electric utility shall include:

1. The total resource cost test and a detailed description of the utility’s avoided cost calculations and all assumptions used in the calculation;

2. The utility shall also include calculations for the utility cost test, the participant test, the non-participant test, and the societal cost test. ~~Tests other than the TRC may include quantifiable Non Energy Benefits;~~ and

3. The impacts on annual revenue requirements and net present value of annual revenue requirements as a result of the integration analysis in accordance with 4 CSR 240-22.060 over the twenty (20)-year planning horizon.

(D) Detailed description of each proposed demand-side program to include at least:

1. Customers targeted;

2. Measures and services included;

3. Customer incentives;

4. Proposed promotional techniques;

5. Specification of whether the program will be administered by the utility or a contractor;

6. Projected gross and net annual energy savings;

7. Proposed annual energy savings targets and cumulative energy savings targets;

8. Projected gross and net annual demand savings;

9. Proposed annual demand savings targets and cumulative demand savings targets;

10. Net-to-gross factors;

11. Size of the potential market and projected penetration rates;

12. Any market transformation elements included in the program and an EM&V plan for estimating, measuring, and verifying the energy and capacity savings that the market transformation efforts are expected to achieve;

13. EM&V plan including at least the proposed evaluation schedule and the proposed approach to achieving the evaluation goals pursuant to 4 CSR 240-20.093(7);

14. Budget information in the following categories:

A. Administrative costs listed separately for the utility and/or program administrator;

B. Program incentive costs;

~~C. Program implementation costs not including customer incentives;~~

D. Estimated equipment and installation costs, including any customer contributions;

E. EM&V costs; and

F. Miscellaneous itemized costs, some of which may be an allocation of total costs for overhead items such as the market potential study or the statewide technical reference manual;

15. Description of all strategies used to minimize free riders;

16. Description of all strategies used to maximize spillover; and

17. For demand-side program plans, the proposed implementation schedule of individual demand-side programs.

(E) Demonstration and explanation in quantitative and qualitative terms of how the utility’s demand-side programs are expected to make progress towards a goal of achieving all cost-effective demand-side savings over the life of the programs. Should the expected demand-side savings fall short of the incremental annual demand-side savings levels and/or the cumulative demand-side savings levels used to review the utility’s plan, the utility shall provide detailed explanation of why the incremental annual demand-side savings levels and/or the cumulative demand-side savings levels cannot be expected to be achieved, and the utility shall bear the burden of proof.

(F) Identification of demand-side programs which are supported by the electric utility and at least one (1) other electric or gas utility (joint demand-side programs).

(3) Designation of program pilots. For programs designed to operate on a limited basis for evaluation purposes before full implementation (program pilot), the utility shall provide as much of the information required under subsections (2)(C) through (E) of this rule as is practical and shall include explicit questions that the program pilot will address, the means and methods by which the utility proposes to address the questions the program pilot is designed to address, a provisional cost-effectiveness evaluation ~~if the program is subject to a cost-effectiveness test under Section 393.1075.4 RSMo~~, the proposed geographic area, and duration for the program pilot.

(F)Any existing demand-side program with tariff sheets in effect prior to the effective date of this rule shall be included in the initial application for approval of demand-side programs if the utility intends for unrecovered and/or new costs related to the existing demand-side program be included in the DSIM cost recovery revenue requirement and/or if the utility intends to establish a utility lost revenue component of a DSIM or a utility incentive component of a DSIM for the existing demand-side program. The commission shall approve, approve with modification acceptable to the electric utility, or reject such applications for approval of demand-side program plans within one hundred twenty (120) days of the filing of an application under this section only after providing the opportunity for a hearing. In the case of a utility filing an application for approval of an individual demand-side program, the commission shall approve, approve with modification acceptable to the electric utility, or reject applications within sixty (60) days of the filing of an application under this section only after providing the opportunity for a hearing.

(G) The total resource cost test shall be the preferred screening test for demand-side programs. ~~A utility shall not be required to include a measure or program that has a negative net shared benefit; however, the net shared benefit screen will not be applied to low-income programs.~~ For demand-side programs and program plans that have a total resource cost test ratio greater than one (1), the commission shall approve demand-side programs or program plans, and annual demand and energy savings targets for each demand-side program it approves, provided it finds that the utility has met the filing and submission requirements of this rule and the demand-side programs and program plans—

1. Are consistent with a goal of achieving all cost-effective demand-side savings;

2. Have reliable evaluation, measurement, and verification plans; and

3. Are included in the electric utility’s preferred plan or have been analyzed through the integration process required by 4 CSR 240-22.060 to determine the impact of the demand-side programs and program plans on the net present value of revenue requirements of the electric utility.

(H) The commission shall approve demand-side programs having a total resource cost test ratio less than one (1) for demand-side programs targeted to low-income customers or general education campaigns, if the commission determines that the utility has met the filing and submission requirements ofthis rule, the program or program plan is in the public interest, the portfolio of programs is beneficial to all customers within the customer class, and meets the requirements stated in paragraphs (3)(G)2. and 3.

**Division of Energy: Object to the requirement that low income programs be included as part of the portfolio, when considering whether the portfolio is beneficial to all customers in the class. Do not link programs that aren’t subject to a cost effectiveness test to a decision on whether a portfolio is beneficial. Ameren states that recovery for programs is dependent on programs being beneficial to all customers within the customer class. The utility will not off the program if it will not receive recovery for it.**

**Response: DE’s objections are that (1) *all* programs exempted from cost-effectiveness testing (including low-income and general education programs) should also not be subject to cost-effectiveness testing at the *portfolio* level, since this leads to *program-level testing by default*; and (2) no additional “tests” should be required of such programs since the only consideration required by statute is whether or not the *Commission determines* that such programs are in the *public interest* by statute. As per §393.1075.4: “Programs targeted to low-income customers or general education campaigns *do not need to meet a cost-effectiveness test*, so long as *the commission determines that the program or campaign is in the public interest*.” Please also note our comments regarding the non-statutory constraint posed by conditioning the MEEIA portfolio on the IRP process.**

**In response to Ameren’s concern, DE notes that the utility receives cost recovery for all incurred program costs associated with low-income and general education programs under a DSIM mechanism regardless of program cost-effectiveness. The utility may also propose alternative recovery mechanisms to account for the throughput disincentive and performance incentive in light of the statutory caveats regarding cost-effectiveness. Any requirement by the utility that it will only offer such programs if they are “beneficial to all customers within the customer class” imposes an extraneous and inappropriate test on such programs, particularly if cost recovery is guaranteed under a DSIM.**

1. If a program is targeted to low-income customers, the electric utility must also state how the electric utility will assess the expected and actual effect of the program on the utility’s bad debt expenses, customer arrearages, and disconnections.

(I) The commission shall approve demand-side programs which have a total resource cost test ratio less than one (1), if the commission finds the utility has met the filing and submission requirements of this rule and the costs of such programs above the level determined to be cost-effective are funded by the customers participating in the programs or through tax or other governmental credits or incentives specifically designed for that purpose and meet the requirements as stated in paragraphs (3)(G)2. and 3.

(J) Utilities shall file and receive approval of associated tariff sheets prior to implementation of approved demand-side programs.

(K) The commission shall simultaneously approve, approve with modification acceptable to the utility, or reject the utility’s DSIM proposed pursuant to 4 CSR 240-20.093.

(5) Applications for Approval of Modifications to Electric Utility Demand-Side Programs. (A)Pursuant to the provisions of this rule, 4 CSR 240-2.060, and section 393.1075, RSMo, an electric utility

1. Shall file an application with the commission for modification of demand-side programs when there is a variance of forty percent (40%) or more in the approved demand-side plan three (3)-year budget and/or any program design modification which is no longer covered by the approved tariff sheets for the program.

2. Shall file an application with the commission for modification of demand-side programs, including but not limited to the following:

 A. Reallocation of funds among programs;

 B. Changes in allocation based on contract implementers input, such as if a program is performing below expectations.

C. changes in incentive amounts paid to customers.

 **Division of Energy: Object to the concept of filing if changing the incentive payment. Argues this decreases flexibility to respond to market forces.**

**Response: As stated.**

**Utility Stakeholders: Object to the requirement to file an application associated with reallocation of funds, changing contractors, or changing incentives. State that currently they are not required to file an application to make such changes. This decreases flexibility to respond to market forces.**

**Response: Please see our objections in the first box.**

3. The application shall include a complete explanation for and documentation of the proposed modifications to each of the filing requirements in section (3). All models and spreadsheets shall be provided as executable versions in native format with all formulas intact.

4. The electric utility shall serve a copy of its application to ~~the Office of Public Counsel and~~ all ~~other~~ parties to the case under which the Demand-Side Programs were approved.

5. The parties shall have thirty (30) days from the date of filing of an application to object to the application to modify.

6. If no objection is raised within 30 days, the commission shall approve, approve with modification acceptable to the electric utility, or reject such applications for approval of modification of demand-side programs within forty-five (45) days of the filing of an application under this section, subject to the same guidelines as established in section (3),

7. If objections to the application are raised, the Commission shall provide the opportunity for a hearing.

(B) For any program design modifications approved by the commission, the utility shall file for and receive approval of associated tariff sheets prior to implementation of approved modifications.

(6) Applications for approval to discontinue electric utility demand-side programs. Pursuant to the provisions of this rule, 4 CSR 240-2.060, and section 393.1075, RSMo, an electric utility may file an application with the commission to discontinue demand-side programs.

(A) The application shall include the following information. All models and spreadsheets shall be provided as executable versions in native format with all formulas intact.

1. Complete explanation for the utility’s decision to request to discontinue a demand-side program.
2. EM&V reports for the demand-side program in question.
3. Date by which a final EM&V report for the demand-side program in question will be filed.

.

(B) If a program subject to the TRC ~~cost effectiveness test under Section 393.1075.4 RSMo~~ and 4 CSR 240-3.164(2)(B)(1) [needs to be updated with new section number] is determined not to be cost-effective, the electric utility shall identify the causes why and present possible program modifications that could make the program cost-effective. If analysis of these modified program designs suggests that none would be cost-effective, the program may be discontinued. In this case, the utility shall describe how it intends to end the program and how it intends to achieve the energy and demand savings initially estimated for the discontinued program. Nothing here-in requires utilities to end any program which is subject to a cost-effectiveness test deemed not cost-effective immediately. Utilities proposal for any discontinuation of a program should consider, but not be limited to: the potential impact on the market for energy efficiency services in its territory; the potential impact to vendors and the utilities relationship with vendors; the potential disruption to the market and to customer outreach efforts from immediate starting and stopping of programs; and whether the long term prospects indicate that continued pursuit of a program will result in a long term cost-effective benefit to ratepayers.

**Utility Stakeholders: Object to this new language on the grounds that there are other methods proposed for increasing or decreasing targets based on added or discontinued targets. OPC objects to taking out a program and the associated savings with that target, and therefore wants something like the language highlighted above.**

**Response: DE continues to support the language at issue. This requirement will ensure a showing by the utility that it has a plan to meet its overall portfolio savings goals in the absence of a discontinued program.**

**DE also notes that the determination of cost-effectiveness under this section does not reference the analysis contemplated at 4 CSR 240-3.164(2)(B)1 (subsequently moved in these revisions), which provides for flexibility based on a range of reasonable uncertainty when performing a TRC evaluation. Please see our suggested addition above.**

(C) The commission shall approve or reject such applications for discontinuation of utility demand-side programs within thirty (30) days of the filing of an application under this section only after providing an opportunity for a hearing.

(7) Provisions for Customers to Opt-Out of Participation in Utility Demand-Side Programs.

(A) Any customer meeting one (1) or more of the following criteria shall be eligible to opt-out of participation in utility-offered demand-side programs:

1. The customer has one (1) or more accounts within the service territory of the electric utility that has a demand of the individual accounts of five thousand (5,000) kW or more in the previous twelve (12) months;

2. The customer operates an interstate pipeline pumping station, regardless of size; or

3. The customer has accounts within the service territory of the electric utility that have, in aggregate across its accounts, a coincident demand of two thousand five hundred (2,500) kW or more in the previous twelve (12) months, and the customer has a comprehensive demand-side or energy efficiency program and can demonstrate an achievement of savings at least equal to those expected from utility-provided programs. The customer shall submit to commission Staff sufficient documentation to demonstrate compliance with this criteria, including the amount of energy savings. Examples of documentation could include, but are not limited to:

A. Lists of all energy efficiency measures with work papers to show energy savings and demand savings. This can include engineering studies, cost benefit analysis, etc.;

B. Documentation of anticipated lifetime of installed energy efficiency measures;

C. Invoices and payment requisition papers; or

D. Other information which documents compliance with this rule.

E. For utilities with automated meter reading and/or advanced metering infrastructure capability, the measure of demand is the customer coincident highest billing demand of the individual accounts during the twelve (12) months preceding the opt-out notification.

F. Any confidential business information submitted as documentation shall be clearly designated as such in accordance with 4 CSR 240-2.135.

4. Opt-out in accordance with subsection (7)(A)(3) shall be valid for the term of the MEEIA cycle approved by the commission. Customers who opt-out consistent with subsection (7)(A)(3) may apply to opt-out again in successive MEEIA cycles, consistent with the requirements of subsection (7)(A)(3).

**Customer stakeholder objects to the additional burdens on opt out customers, it creates barriers to opt out, and staff would be required to handle confidential business information. The demonstration process should remain unchanged.**

**Response:**

(B) Written notification of opt-out from customers meeting the criteria under paragraph (7)(A)1. or 2. shall be sent to the utility serving the customer. Written notification of opt-out from customers meeting the criteria under paragraph (7)(A)3. shall be sent to the utility serving the customer and the manager of the energy resource analysis section of the commission or submitted through the commission’s electronic filing and information system (EFIS) as a non-case-related filing. In instances where only the utility is provided notification of opt-out from customers meeting the criteria under paragraph (7)(A)3., the utility shall forward a copy of the written notification to the manager of the energy resource analysis section of the commission and submit the notice of opt-out through EFIS as a non-case-related filing.

(C) Written notification of opt-out from customer shall include at a minimum:

1. Customer’s legal name;

2. Identification of location(s) and utility account number(s) of accounts for which the customer is requesting to opt-out from demand-side program’s benefits and costs; and

3. Demonstration that the customer qualifies for opt-out.

(D) For customers filing notification of opt-out under paragraph (7)(A)1. or 2., notification of the utility’s acknowledgement or plan to dispute a customer’s notification to opt-out of participation in demand-side programs shall be delivered in writing to the customer and to the staff within thirty (30) days of when the utility received the written notification of opt-out from the customer.

(E) For customers filing notification of opt-out under paragraph (7)(A)3., the staff will make the determination of whether the customer meets the criteria of paragraph (7)(A)3. Notification of the staff’s acknowledgement or disagreement with customer’s qualification to opt-out of participation in demand-side programs shall be delivered to the customer and to the utility within thirty (30) days of when the staff received complete documentation of compliance with (7)(A)3.

(F) Timing and effect of opt-out provisions.

1. A customer notice of opt-out shall be received by the utility no earlier than September 1st and not later than October 30th to be effective for the following program year.

~~2. A new customer whose account is created outside of the opt-out notice period may apply for provisional opt-out approval. This approval will be valid until the following September 1~~~~st~~~~, at which time a new customer notice will be required per (7)(F)1.~~

2. For that calendar year in which the customer receives acknowledgement of opt-out and each successive program year until the customer revokes the notice pursuant to subsection (6)(H), ~~the customer’s opt-out expires at the end of a MEEIA cycle or~~ the customer is notified that it no longer satisfies the requirements of Section (7)(A)3, none of the costs of approved demand-side programs of an electric utility offered pursuant to 4 CSR 240-20.093, 4 CSR 240-20.094, or by other authority and no other charges implemented in accordance with section 393.1075, RSMo, shall be assigned to any account of the customer, including its affiliates and subsidiaries listed on the customer’s written notification of opt-out.

**Customer stakeholder objects to having to recertify for opt out. A utility stakeholder objects to recertification for each MEEIA cycle as impractical.**

**Response:**

(G) Dispute notices. If the utility or staff provides notice that a customer does not meet the opt-out criteria to qualify for opt-out or renewal of opt-out, the customer may file a complaint with the commission. The commission shall provide notice and an opportunity for a hearing to resolve any dispute.

(H) Revocation. A customer may revoke an opt-out by providing written notice to the utility and commission two to four (2–4) months in advance of the program year for which it will become eligible for the utility’s demand-side program’s costs and benefits. Any customer revoking an opt-out to participate in a program will be required to remain in the program for the number of years over which the cost of that program is being recovered, or until the cost of their participation in that program has been recovered.

(I) A customer who participates in demand-side programs initiated after August 1, 2009, shall be required to participate in program funding for a period of three (3) years following the last date when the customer received a demand-side incentive or a service. Participation shall be determined based on premise location regardless of the ownership of the premise.

(J) A customer electing not to participate in an electric utility’s demand-side programs under this section shall still be allowed to participate in interruptible or curtailable rate schedules or tariffs offered by the electric utility.

(8) Tax credits and monetary incentives.

(A) Any customer of an electric utility who has received a state tax credit under sections 135.350 through 135.362, RSMo, or under sections 253.545 through 253.559, RSMo, shall not be eligible for participation in any demand-side program offered by a utility if such program offers the customer a monetary incentive to participate. The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to any low income customer who would otherwise be eligible to participate in a demand-side program that is offered by a utility to low income customers.

(B) As a condition of participation in any demand-side program offered by an electric utility under this section, when such program offers a monetary incentive to the customer, the customer shall attest to non-receipt of any tax credit listed in subsection (7)(A) and acknowledge that the penalty for a customer who provides false documentation is a class A misdemeanor. The electric utility shall maintain documentation of customer attestation and acknowledgement for the term of the demand-side program and three (3) years beyond.

(C) The electric utility shall maintain a database of participants of all demand-side programs offered by the utility when such programs offer a monetary incentive to the customer including the following information:

1. The name of the participant, or the names of the principals if for a company;

2. The service property address; and

3. The date of and amount of the monetary incentive received.

(D) Upon request by the commission or staff, the utility shall disclose participant information in subsections (7)(B) and (C) to the commission and/or staff.

(9) Collaborative guidelines.

(A) Utility-Specific Collaboratives. Each electric utility and its stakeholders shall form a utility-specific advisory collaborative for input on the design, implementation, and review of demand-side programs as well as input on the preparation of market potential studies. This collaborative process may take place simultaneously with the collaborative process related to demand-side programs for 4 CSR 240-22. Collaborative meetings are encouraged to occur at least once each calendar quarter. In order to provide appropriate and informed input on the design, implementation, and review of demand-side programs the stakeholders will be provided drafts of all plans and documents prior to meeting with adequate time to review and provide comments. In addition, all stakeholders will be provided opportunity to inform and suggest agenda items for each meeting and to present presentations and proposal. All participants shall be given a reasonable period to propose agenda items and prepare for any presentations.

(B) State-Wide Collaborative

1.Electric utilities and their stakeholders shall formally establish a state-wide advisory collaborative. The Collaborative shall :

A. Create and implement a statewide technical resource manual that includes values for deemed savings and addresses measures in all sectors, ~~including Commercial & Industrial, Residential, Residential Multifamily, and Residential Low-Income~~, no later than July 1, 2019, and updated annually by ~~July 1~~~~st~~ thereafter;

B. Create and implement statewide protocols for evaluation, measurement, and verification of energy efficiency savings, no later than July 1, 2018, and updated annually thereafter;~~,~~

~~C. Create a statewide market potential study, to be utilized in the design and approval of electric utilities’ demand-side programs, no later than July 1, 2019, and updated every 3 years thereafter;~~

**Utility Stakeholders: Object to the concept of a statewide potential study. They prefer that each utility develop their own market potential studies.**

**Response: DE supports a statewide market potential study, as already indicated. We would also note that we previously proposed different dates in our comments on other drafts; these dates were 2017, 2016, and 2017 for sections (B)2.A, B, and C, respectively.**

1. ~~Create and implement an online statewide reporting tool to be used by utilities in submitting their annual reports;~~

**Utility Stakeholders: Object on the belief that this contradicts other annual reporting requirements.**

**Response: DE opposes the removal of this language, and does not see how “an online statewide reporting tool to be used … in submitting … annual reports” contradicts any requirements to submit such annual reports.**

E. Establish individual working groups to address the creation of the specific deliverables of the collaborative; and

F. Create a semi-annual forum for discussing and resolving statewide policy issues, wherein utilities may share lessons learned from demand-side program planning and implementation and wherein stakeholders may provide input on how to implement the recommendations of the individual working groups.

G. Explore other opportunities, such as development of a percentage adder for non-energy benefits.

2. Within sixty (60) days of the effective date of this rule, commission staff shall file, with the commission, a charter for the statewide advisory collaborative.

3. Collaborative meetings shall occur at least semi-annually. Additional meetings or conference calls will be scheduled as needed ~~and approved by members of the collaborative~~. Staff shall schedule the meetings, provide notice of the meetings and any interested persons may attend such meetings.

(10) Variances. Upon request and for good cause shown, the commission may grant a variance from any provision of this rule.

*AUTHORITY: sections 393.1075.11 and 393.1075.15, RSMo Supp. 2010.\* Original rule filed Oct. 4, 2010, effective May 30, 2011.*

*\*Original authority: 393.1075, RSMo 2009.*