



617 492 1400 tel 617 497 7944 fax 800 966 1254 toll free

1000 Winter St Waltham, MA 02451



Ameren Illinois Company Energy Efficiency Portfolio 2021 Net-to-Gross Ratios

Final Recommendations

September 30, 2020



Table of Contents

ıar	ole of (Jontents	1
1.	Resid	lential Program	1
	1.1	Retail Products Initiative	1
	1.2	Income Qualified Initiative	9
	1.3	Public Housing Initiative	10
	1.4	Home Efficiency (Non-Income Qualified)	10
	1.5	Behavioral Modification Initiative	11
	1.6	HVAC Initiative	12
	1.7	Midstream HVAC Initiative	14
	1.8	Appliance Recycling Initiative	15
	1.9	Direct Distribution of Efficient Products Initiative	17
	1.10	Multifamily Initiative	19
	1.11	. Residential Program-Level Non-Participant Spillover	24
2.	Busir	ness Program	26
	2.1	Standard Initiative	26
	2.2	Custom Initiative	35
	2.3	Retro-Commissioning Initiative	39
	2.4	Streetlighting Initiative	41
	2.5	Combined Heat and Power	42
	2.6	Business Program-Level Non-Participant Spillover	43
١	Poco	mmandations for Past AIC Program Offerings	45

1.1 Retail Products Initiative

1.1.1 LEDs

Program	Туре	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source	
Year	1,00	Electric	Gas	<i>Justineation</i>	moniou	Source	
PY8	Value Applied	0.73	N/A	Only Illinois specific value available	PY7 in-store intercept study conducted for ComEd	PY7 ComEd Lighting Evaluation	
(6/1/15- 5/31/16)	NTG Research Results	All LEDs - 0.69	N/A	N/A	Free-ridership and spillover estimated from in-store lighting customer interviews (n=853).	PY8 Evaluation	
PY9 (6/1/16- 5/31/17)	Value Applied	Omnidirectional LEDs: 0.58 Directional LEDs: 0.60	N/A	Most recent Illinois specific value available	PY8 in-store intercept study conducted for ComEd	PY8 ComEd Lighting Evaluation	
2018	Recommended	0.70	N/A	Most recent AIC-specific value available	See PY8	PY8 Evaluation	
2019	Recommended	0.69	N/A	Most recent AIC-specific value available	See PY8	PY8 Evaluation	
2020	Recommended	0.69	N/A	Most recent AIC-specific value available	See PY8	PY8 Evaluation	
2021	Recommended	0.69	N/A	Most recent AIC-specific value available	See PY8	PY8 Evaluation	

1.1.2 LEDs (Income Qualified)

Program	Туре	NT	NTGR Justification		Method	Source
Year	1,00	Electric	Gas	Sustineation		
2021	Recommended	1.00 N/A		Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A	SAG Consensus

1.1.3 LEDs (Food Bank Community Distribution)

Program	Туре	NT	GR	Justification	Method	Source	
Year	1,700	Electric	Gas	20011100111011			
2021	Recommended	1.00	N/A	Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A	SAG Consensus	

1.1.4 Advanced Thermostats

Program	Time	NTGR		lucatificanting.	Mathad	Source
Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source
2018	Value Applied	N/A	N/A	Deemed savings in the IL-TRM are based on billing analysis and are inclusive of net effects		Evaluation Team Recommendation
2019	Recommended	N/A	N/A	Deemed savings in the IL-TRM are based on billing analysis and are inclusive of net effects		Evaluation Team Recommendation
2020	Recommended	N/A	N/A	Deemed savings in the IL-TRM are based on billing analysis and are inclusive of net effects		Evaluation Team Recommendation
2021	Recommended	Cooling – 0.80 Heating – 0.90	Heating – 0.90	Evaluation team recommendation	N/A	See Joint Evaluator Presentation: Appropriate NTG Treatment for IL-TRM Measures Characterized with Consumption Analysis (Sept 25., 2020) ^a

^a https://ilsag.s3.amazonaws.com/Consumption-Analysis-NTG-Evaluator-Presentation-2020-09-25.pdf

1.1.5 Advanced Thermostats (Income Qualified)

Program	Туре	NTGR		lugaidia galiana	Mathad	Source
Year		Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source
2018			N/A	Deemed savings in the IL-TRM are based on billing analysis and are inclusive of net effects		Evaluation Team Recommendation
2019	ZUT9 RECOMMENDED N/A N/A		N/A	Deemed savings in the IL-TRM are based on billing analysis and are inclusive of net effects		Evaluation Team Recommendation

Program	Туре	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source
Year		Electric	Gas	Justinication	Method	Source
2020			N/A	Deemed savings in the IL-TRM are based on billing analysis and are inclusive of net effects		Evaluation Team Recommendation
2021	2021 Recommended 1.00 1.00 (1.00	Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A	SAG Consensus

1.1.6 Pool Pumps

Program	Tome	NTGR		lustification	Mathad	Source	
Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source	
2018	Value Applied	110 Annied $1 () 80$ $1 N/A$ $1 and 3 and$		Evaluation Team Recommendation			
2019	Recommended	0.80	N/A	I N/A		Evaluation Team Recommendation	
2020	Recommended			Participant self-report based on 65 surveys completed from a population of 197	2018 Evaluation		
2021	Recommended	0.76	N/A	Most recent AIC specific value available	Participant self-report based on 65 surveys completed from a population of 197	2018 Evaluation	

1.1.7 Pool Pumps (Income Qualified)

Program	Туре	NT	GR	Justification Method		Source
Year	Type	Electric	Gas	<i>Justineation</i>	motriod	Course
2021	Recommended	ed 1.00 1.00		Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A	SAG Consensus

1.1.8 Tier 1 Advanced Power Strips

Program	Time	NTGR		luntification	Makhaad	Course	
Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source	
2018	Value Applied	General Population - 0.86 Income Eligible – 1.00	N/A	Most recent AIC specific value available; SAG Consensus	Participant Self Report based on 190 surveys completed from a population of 12,117	PY4 Evaluation for the General Population; SAG Consensus for Income Eligible	

Program	Tymo	NTGR	NTGR		Mothod	Source	
Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source	
2019	Recommended	General Population - 0.86 Income Eligible – 1.00	N/A	Most recent AIC specific value available; SAG Consensus	Participant Self Report based on 190 surveys completed from a population of 12,117	PY4 Evaluation for the General Population; SAG Consensus for Income Eligible	
2020	Recommended	General Population - 0.86 Income Eligible – 1.00	N/A	Most recent AIC specific value available; SAG Consensus	Participant Self Report based on 190 surveys completed from a population of 12,117	PY4 Evaluation for the General Population; SAG Consensus for Income Eligible	
2021	Recommended	0.86	N/A	Most recent AIC specific value available; SAG Consensus	Participant Self Report based on 190 surveys completed from a population of 12,117	PY4 Evaluation for the General Population; SAG Consensus for Income Eligible	

1.1.9 Tier 1 Advanced Power Strips (Income Qualified)

Program	Туре	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source
Year	1,700	Electric	Gas			55055
2021	Recommended	ed 1.00 N/A		Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A	SAG Consensus

1.1.10 Refrigerators

Program Year	Туре	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source
		Electric	Gas	Justinisation	Motilod	3 00100
2021	Recommended	0.65	N/A	SAG consensus	2018 ComEd Evaluation Participant Self-Report	2018 (FR) & PY8 (S0) ComEd ES Rebate participant survey

1.1.11 Refrigerators (Income Qualified)

Program Year	Туре	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source
	туре	Electric	Gas	Zustineution.		
2021	Recommended	1.00	N/A	Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A	SAG Consensus

1.1.12 Freezers

Program Year	Туре	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source
		Electric	Gas	Justilledion	motriou	Source
2021	Recommended	0.63	N/A	SAG consensus	2018 ComEd Evaluation Participant Self-Report	2018 (FR) & PY8 (S0) ComEd ES Rebate participant survey

1.1.13 Freezers (Income Qualified)

Program Year	Туре	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source
	1,00	Electric	Gas	Justinication	motilou	3 00100
2021	Recommended	1.00	N/A	Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A	SAG Consensus

1.1.14 Clothes Washers

Program Year	Туре	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source
		Electric	Gas	Justilloution	Method	Source
2021	Recommended	0.63	0.63	SAG consensus	2018 ComEd Evaluation Participant Self-Report	2018 (FR) & PY8 (SO) ComEd ES Rebate participant survey

1.1.15 Clothes Washers (Income Qualified)

Program Year		NTGR		Justification	Method	Source
	.,,,,	Electric	Gas	Justinication	mounou.	304100
2021	Recommended	1.00	1.00	Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A	SAG Consensus

1.1.16 Clothes Dryers

Program Year	Туре	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source
		Electric	Gas	Justinication	Method	Source
2021	Recommended	0.67	N/A	SAG consensus	2018 ComEd Evaluation Participant Self-Report	2018 (FR) & PY8 (S0) ComEd ES Rebate participant survey

1.1.17 Clothes Dryers (Income Qualified)

Program Year	Туре	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source
		Electric	Gas	Justilication	metriou	Soul CC
2021	Recommended	1.00	N/A	Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A	SAG Consensus

1.1.18 Air Purifiers

Program Year	Туре	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source
		Electric	Gas	Justincation	Metriod	Source
2021	Recommended	0.79	N/A	Most recent IL-specific value available	Participant Self-Report	2018 (FR) & PY8 (SO) ComEd ES Rebate participant survey

1.1.19 Air Purifiers (Income Qualified)

Program Year		NTGR		Justification	Method	Source
	, ,,,,,,,	Electric	Gas	Justinoution	mounou.	304103
202:	1 Recommended	1.00	N/A	Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A	SAG Consensus

1.1.20 Dehumidifiers

Program Year Ty	Туре	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source
	Турс	Electric	Gas	Justineation		
2021	Recommended	0.67	N/A	Most recent AIC-specific value available	Participant Self-Report	PY4 REEP Evaluation

1.1.21 Dehumidifiers (Income Qualified)

Program Year	Туре	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source
	Турс	Electric	Gas	Zustinicution	moulou	334.33
2021	Recommended	1.00	N/A	Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A	SAG Consensus

1.1.22 Bathroom Vent Fans

Program Year	Туре	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source	
		Electric	Gas	Justinoution	metriou	Course	
2021	Recommended	0.66	N/A	Most recent IL-specific value	Participant Self-Report	2018 (FR) & PY8 (SO) ComEd ES Rebate participant survey	

1.1.23 Bathroom Vent Fans (Income Qualified)

Program	Туре	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source	
Year	.,,,,,	Electric	Gas		ou		
2021	Recommended	1.00	N/A	Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A	SAG Consensus	

1.1.24 Water Dispensers

Program	Туре	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source	
Year	1,700	Electric	Gas	Justinoution	Method	Source	
2021	Recommended	0.67	N/A	Most recent IL-specific value	Participant Self-Report	2018 (FR) & PY8 (SO) ComEd ES Rebate participant survey	

1.1.25 Water Dispensers (Income Qualified)

Program	Туре	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source	
Year		Electric	Gas		momou		
2021	Recommended	1.00	N/A	Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0		SAG Consensus	

1.2 Income Qualified Initiative

		NT	GR						
Program Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	- Justification	Method	Source			
PY1	N/A (no program)								
PY2	N/A (no program)								
PY3	N/A (no program)								
PY4 (6/1/11-5/31/12)	Value Applied	1.0	1.0	Other: Consensus reached between ICC and AIC that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A - Deemed	Deemed			
	NTG Research Results	No research	No research performed						
PY5	Value Applied	1.0	1.0	Other: Consensus reached between ICC and AIC that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A - Deemed	Deemed			
(6/1/12-5/31/13)	NTG Research Results	No research	No research performed						
PY6 (6/1/13-5/31/14)	Value Applied	1.0	1.0	Other: Consensus reached between ICC and AIC that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A - Deemed	Deemed			
(6/1/13-5/31/14)	NTG Research Results	No research	performed	I					
	Value Applied	1.0	1.0	Other: Consensus reached between ICC and AIC that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A - Deemed	Deemed			
(0/1/1+0/01/10)	NTG Research Results	No research performed							
PY8 (6/1/15-5/31/16)	Value Applied	1.0	1.0	Other: Consensus reached between ICC and AIC that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A - Deemed	Deemed			
(0/1/15-5/51/10)	NTG Research Results	No research	performed	I					
PY9 (6/1/16-5/31/17)	Value Applied	1.0	1.0	Other: Consensus reached between ICC and AIC that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A - Deemed	Deemed			
2018	Value Applied	1.0	1.0	Other: Consensus reached between ICC and AIC that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A - Deemed	Deemed			
2019	Recommended	1.0	1.0	Other: Consensus reached between ICC and AIC that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A - Deemed	Deemed			
2020	Recommended	1.0	1.0	Other: Consensus reached between ICC and AIC that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A - Deemed	Deemed			

203	21	Recommended	1.0	1.0	Other: Consensus reached between ICC and AIC that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A - Deemed	Deemed
-----	----	-------------	-----	-----	---	--------------	--------

1.3 Public Housing Initiative

Due gue ve Veeu	T	N	ITGR	lucatific cation	Method	Source
Program Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Methou	
2019	Recommended	1.00	1.00	Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A	SAG Consensus
2020	Recommended	1.00	1.00	Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A	SAG Consensus
2021	Recommended	1.00	1.00	Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A	SAG Consensus

1.4 Home Efficiency (Non-Income Qualified)

Duaguaya Vaay	Туре	NTO	GR	luctification	Mathad	Sauraa	
Program Year		Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source	
2021	Recommended	Air Sealing - 0.90 All Other Measures – 0.80		Evaluation team recommendation for Air Sealing Default value for all other measures	N/A	Air Sealing: See Joint Evaluator Presentation: Appropriate NTG Treatment for IL-TRM Measures Characterized with Consumption Analysis (Sept 25., 2020) ^a All other measures: Default value	

a https://ilsag.s3.amazonaws.com/Consumption-Analysis-NTG-Evaluator-Presentation-2020-09-25.pdf

1.5 Behavioral Modification Initiative

Bradram Vaar	Type	NTG	₹	luctification	Mothod	Source
Program Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source
PY1	No Program					
PY2	No Program					
PY3 (6/1/10-5/31/11)	Value Applied	N/A	N/A	Net savings determined through billing analysis	Billing analysis	N/A
PY4 (6/1/11-5/31/12)	Value Applied	N/A	N/A	Net savings determined through billing analysis	Billing analysis	N/A
PY5 (6/1/12-5/31/13)	Value Applied	N/A	N/A	Net savings determined through billing analysis	Billing analysis	N/A
PY6 (6/1/13-5/31/14)	Value Applied	N/A	N/A	Net savings determined through billing analysis	Billing analysis	N/A
PY7 (6/1/14-5/31/15)	Value Applied	N/A	N/A	Net savings determined through billing analysis	Billing analysis	N/A
PY8 (6/1/15-5/31/16)	Value Applied	N/A	N/A	Net savings determined through billing analysis	Billing analysis	N/A
PY9 (6/1/16-5/31/17)	Value Applied	N/A	N/A	Net savings determined through billing analysis	Billing analysis	N/A
2018	Value Applied	N/A	N/A	Net savings determined through billing analysis	Billing analysis	N/A
2019	Recommended	N/A	N/A	Net savings determined through billing analysis	Billing analysis	N/A
2020	Recommended	N/A	N/A	Net savings determined through billing analysis	Billing analysis	N/A
2021	Recommended	N/A	N/A	Net savings determined through billing analysis	Billing analysis	N/A

1.6 HVAC Initiative

Program		NTGR		lookii aattaa	Marthaul	Carrier
Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source
PY1 (6/1/08- 5/31/09)	N/A - No program					
PY2 (6/1/09-	Value Applied	0.63	0.49	Retrospective application	Secondary research	Secondary research
5/31/10)	NTG Research Results	No research conducted				
	Value Applied	0.59	Furnaces - 1.01 Boilers - 1.02		Customer self-report for FR and SO: 150	
PY3 (6/1/10- 5/31/11)	NTG Research Results (available 2/2012)	0.59	Furnaces - 1.01 Boilers - 1.02	Retrospective application	surveys completed from a population of 14,127. Drop out contractor self- report for non- participant spillover, 20 surveys completed from a population of 165.	PY3 Evaluation
PY4 (6/1/11-	Value Applied	0.59	Furnaces 1.01 Boilers 1.02	No market or program change. Previous IL EM&V NTG exists	See PY3	PY3 Evaluation
5/31/12)	NTG Research Results	N/A	N/A	No research conducted		
	Value Applied	0.59	Furnaces 1.01 Boilers 1.02	No market or program change. Previous IL EM&V NTG exists	See PY3	PY3 Evaluation
PY5 (6/1/12- 5/31/13)	NTG Research Results (available 3/2013)	<seer (rb)="" -="" 0.69<br="" 16="" cac="" hp="">SEER 16+ CAC/HP (RB) - 0.76 <seer (er)="" -="" 0.57<br="" 16="" cac="" hp="">SEER 16+ CAC/HP (ER) - 0.82 ECM - 0.70</seer></seer>	97% Furnace or Boiler - 0.64 95% Furnace - 0.52	N/A	Participant customer surveys for free ridership and participant spillover (n=210), and a non-participant contractor survey (n=65) for non-participant spillover.	PY5 Evaluation

Program	_	NTGR				Commen
Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source
PY6	Value Applied	0.59	Furnace 0.77 Boiler 0.79	Program change: Efficiency levels and incentive amounts have changed; gas measures dropped	See PY3	PY3 Evaluation Electric/ Revised PY3 Deemed Results for Gas
(6/1/13- 5/31/14)	NTG Research Results (available 1/2014)	SEER < 16 CAC/HP (RB) - 0.60 SEER 16+ CAC/HP (RB) - 0.64 SEER < 16 CAC/HP (ER) - 0.63 SEER 16+ CAC/HP (ER) - 0.76 Brushless Motors - 0.76	N/A	N/A	PY6 Participant customer surveys for free ridership (n=204). PY5 nonparticipant contract surveys for spillover.	PY5/PY6 Evaluation
PY7 (6/1/14- 5/31/15)	Value Applied	<pre> <seer (er)="" (rb)="" -="" 0.53="" 0.65="" 0.66<="" 0.72="" 0.78="" 16="" 16+="" <seer="" cac="" ecm="" hp="" pre="" seer=""></seer></pre>	N/A	Most recent values available for the program based on primary data.	See PY5	PY5 Evaluation ^a
	NTG Research Results	No research conducted				
PY8 (6/1/15- 5/31/16)	Value Applied	SEER < 16 CAC/HP (RB) - 0.60 SEER 16+ CAC/HP (RB) - 0.64 SEER < 16 CAC/HP (ER) - 0.63 SEER 16+ CAC/HP (ER) - 0.76 Brushless Motors - 0.76	N/A	Most recent values available for the program based on primary data.	See PY6 for FR estimates; See PY5 for SO.	PY5 and PY6 Evaluations
	NTG Research Results		No r	esearch conducted		
PY9 (6/1/16- 5/31/17)	Recommended	SEER < 16 CAC/HP (RB) 0.60 SEER 16+ CAC/HP (RB) 0.64 SEER < 16 CAC/HP (ER) 0.63 SEER 16+ CAC/HP (ER) 0.76 Brushless Motors 0.76	N/A	Most recent values available for the program based on primary data.	See PY6 for FR estimates; See PY5 for SO.	PY5 and PY6 Evaluations
2018	Recommended	SEER < 16 CAC/HP (RB) [Ducted] 0.60 SEER 16+ CAC/HP (RB) [Ducted] 0.64 SEER < 16 CAC/HP (ER) [Ducted] 0.63 SEER 16+ CAC/HP (ER) [Ducted] 0.76 Brushless Motors 0.76	N/A	Most recent values available for the program based on primary data.	See PY6 for FR estimates; See PY5 for SO.	PY5 and PY6 Evaluations

Program	Type	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source
Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justilication	Method	Source
2019	Recommended	SEER < 16 CAC/HP (RB) [Ducted] 0.60 SEER 16+ CAC/HP (RB) [Ducted] 0.64 SEER < 16 CAC/HP (ER) [Ducted] 0.63 SEER 16+ CAC/HP (ER) [Ducted] 0.76 Brushless Motors 0.76	N/A	Most recent values available for the program based on primary data.	See PY6 for FR estimates; See PY5 for SO.	PY5 and PY6 Evaluations
2020	Recommended	SEER < 16 CAC/HP (RB) [Ducted] 0.60 SEER 16+ CAC/HP (RB) [Ducted] 0.64 SEER < 16 CAC/HP (ER) [Ducted] 0.63 SEER 16+ CAC/HP (ER) [Ducted] 0.76 Brushless Motors 0.76	N/A	Most recent values available for the program based on primary data.	See PY6 for FR estimates; See PY5 for SO.	PY5 and PY6 Evaluations
2021	Recommended	SEER 16+ CAC/HP (ER) [Ducted] 0.74 SEER 16+ CAC/HP (RB) [Ducted] 0.82 Brushless Motors 0.76 Heat Pump Water Heaters 0.76 Advanced Thermostats (Cooling) - 0.80 Advanced Thermostats (Heating) – 0.90	Advanced Thermostats - 0.90	Most recent AIC-specific values available; Most recent-IL-specific value available for heat pump water heaters Evaluation team recommendation for advanced thermostats (heating)	2020 Participant Self-Report for CAC/HP; See PY6 for brushless motor FR and PY5 for SO Evaluation judgement for advanced thermostats	2020 Evaluation; PY5 and PY6 Evaluations; 2019 ComEd Evaluation Advanced Thermostats: See Joint Evaluator Presentation: Appropriate NTG Treatment for IL- TRM Measures Characterized with Consumption Analysis (Sept 25., 2020)b

^a Note: PY5 values adjusted per SAG discussion in February 2013 revising spillover from 26% to 22%.

1.7 Midstream HVAC Initiative

Program Year	Туре	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source	
		Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source	
2021	Pacammandad	Air Conditioners 0.80 Heat Pump Water Heaters 0.80	N/A	Default value given lack of existing data for this measure	N/A	Evaluation Team Recommendation	

b https://ilsag.s3.amazonaws.com/Consumption-Analysis-NTG-Evaluator-Presentation-2020-09-25.pdf

1.8 Appliance Recycling Initiative

5 . V		NTGR		1 100 11			
Program Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source	
PY1	Value Applied	Refrigerator 0.51 Freezer 0.53	N/A		Customer self-report. 93 surveys completed		
(6/1/08-5/31/09)	NTG Research Results (available 09/2009)	Refrigerator 0.51 Freezer 0.53	N/A	Retrospective application	from a population of 2,876.	PY1 Evaluation	
PY2	Value Applied	Refrigerator 0.79 Freezer 0.82 Room Air Conditioner 1.0			Customer self-report. 159 surveys completed		
(6/1/09-5/31/10)	NTG Research Results (available 9/2010)	Refrigerator 0.79 Freezer 0.82 Room Air Conditioner 1.0	N/A	Retrospective application	from a population of 11,211.	PY2 Evaluation	
PY3 (6/1/10-5/31/11)	Value Applied	Refrigerator 0.79 Freezer 0.82 Room Air Conditioner 1.0	N/A	 Program or Market change: No New Program: No Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes 	See PY2	PY2 Evaluation	
	NTG Research Results	N/A	N/A	No research conducted			
PY4	Value Applied	Refrigerator 0.64 Freezer 0.65 Room Air Conditioner 1.0	N/A	Retrospective application	Customer self-report. 141 surveys completed	PY4 Evaluation not including induced replacement	
(6/1/11-5/31/12)	NTG Research Results (available 02/2013)	Refrigerator 0.64 Freezer 0.65 Room Air Conditioner 1.0	N/A		from a population of 14,232.		
PY5 (6/1/12-5/31/13)	Value Applied	Refrigerator 0.79 Freezer 0.82 Room Air Conditioner 1.0	N/A	 Program change: No Market change: No New Program: No Previous IL EM&V NTG exists: Yes 	See PY2	PY2 Evaluation	
(0, 1, 12 0, 31, 13)	NTG Research Results (available 11/2013)	Refrigerator 0.56 Freezer 0.62 Room Air Conditioner 1.0	N/A	N/A	Customer self-report. 140 refrigerator surveys completed from population of 8,780; 70	PY5 Evaluation	

Burgara Vara		NTGR		least Constant	Madhad	
Program Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source
					freezer surveys from population of 2,899	
PY6 (6/1/13-5/31/14)	Value Applied	Refrigerator 0.63 Freezer 0.63 Room Air Conditioner 1.0	N/A	 Program change: No Market change: No New Program: No Previous IL EM&V NTG exists: Yes 	See PY4; PY5 evaluation for induced replacement	PY4 & PY5 Evaluations
(0) 1) 13 0) 31, 14)	NTG Research Results (available - 12/2014)	Refrigerator 0.52 Freezer 0.62	N/A	N/A	Customer self-report. 140 surveys completed from population of 9,260	PY6 Evaluation
PY7 (6/1/14-5/31/15)	Value Applied	Refrigerator 0.56 Freezer 0.62 Room Air Conditioner 0.50	N/A	 Program change: No Market change: No New Program: No Previous IL EM&V NTG exists: Yes 	See PY5 for freezers and refrigerators; AC units from PY5 ComEd evaluation	PY5 Evaluation (AIC and ComEd)
	NTG Research Results	No research conducted				
PY8 (6/1/15-5/31/16)	Value Applied	Refrigerator 0.52 Freezer 0.62 Room Air Conditioner 0.50	N/A	 Program change: No Market change: No New Program: No Previous IL EM&V NTG exists: Yes 	See PY6. AC units from PY5 ComEd evaluation	PY6 Evaluation & PY5 ComEd Evaluation
	NTG Research Results	No research conducted			1	1
PY9 (6/1/16-5/31/17)	Recommended	Refrigerator 0.52 Freezer 0.62	N/A	 Program change: No Market change: No New Program: No Previous IL EM&V NTG exists: Yes 	See PY6 NTG research	PY6 Evaluation
2018	Value Applied	Refrigerator 0.52 Freezer 0.62	N/A	Program change: NoMarket change: NoPrevious IL EM&V NTG exists: Yes	See PY6 NTG research	PY6 Evaluation
2019	Recommended	Refrigerator 0.52 Freezer 0.62	N/A	Program change: NoMarket change: No	See PY6 NTG research	PY6 Evaluation

Bradram Vaar	Type	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source
Program Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justinication	Wethou	Source
				Previous IL EM&V NTG exists: Yes		
2020	Recommended	Refrigerator 0.71 Freezer 0.64	N/A	Program change: NoMarket change: NoPrevious IL EM&V NTG exists: Yes	See 2018 NTG research	AIC 2018 Participant Survey Memo
2021	Recommended	Refrigerator - 0.47 Freezer - 0.54 Room Air Conditioner Recycling – 0.50	N/A	Most recent AIC-specific values available for refrigerators and freezers, most recent IL-specific values for room air conditioners	Participant Self-Report	AIC 2019 Participant Survey Memo (refrigerators and freezers), PY5 ComEd evaluation (Room AC)

1.9 Direct Distribution of Efficient Products Initiative

Drogram Voor	Type	NTO	GR		Justification	Method	Source
Program Year	Туре	Electric	Gas		Justinication	Wethod	Source
PY1 - PY5	No program						
PY6 (6/1/13- 5/31/14)	Value Applied	CFLs - 0.71 Showerheads - 0.77 Faucet aerators - 0.46 Water Heater Temp Adjustment - 0.46	N/A	•	Similar to IPA program for rural kits	N/A - Deemed	Docket 12-0544 (IPA filing)
0,01,11,	NTG Research Results	No research conducted					
PY7 (6/1/14- 5/31/15)	Value Applied	CFLs - 0.85 Showerheads - 0.95 Faucet aerators - 1.00 Hot water card thermometer - 1.00	Faucet aerator – 1.00 Showerhead – 0.95 Hot water card thermometer – 1.00	•	New Program: No Previous EM&V NTG exists: No	Secondary research: 2013 unpublished Midwest utility's evaluation of a very similar program (participant survey, n=91).	Secondary research
	NTG Research Results	No research conducted					

Duagua Vasu	T	NTO	GR	luchification	Mathad	Carres
Program Year	туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source
PY8 (6/1/15- 5/31/16)	Value Applied	CFLs - 0.83 Showerheads - 1.05 Faucet aerators - 1.04 Water heater Setback – 1.00	Showerheads - 1.05 Faucet aerators - 1.04 Water heater Setback - 1.00	New Program: No Previous EM&V NTG exists: No	This value is based on the average of results from three similar programs (NIPSCO, Nicor Ryder 29, and Nicor Gas GPY1), and is consistent with ComEd values.	Secondary research
	NTG Research Results	No research conducted				
PY9 (6/1/16-	Recommended	CFLs - 0.83 Showerheads - 1.05 Faucet aerators - 1.04 Water heater Setback - 1.00	Showerheads 1.05 Faucet aerators 1.04 Water Heater Setback 1.00	New Program: NoPrevious EM&V NTG exists: No	Water Heater Setback: Secondary research All others: Avg. of values from similar programs. See PY8.	Secondary research
5/31/17)	NTG Research Results	CFLs: 0.61 Showerheads - 0.84 Kitchen faucet aerators - 0.84 Bath aerators - 0.87 Water heater Setback - 0.88	N/A	N/A	Participant self-report with 75 respondents out of a population of 9,499.	PY9 Evaluation
2018	Value Applied	CFLs - 0.83 Showerheads - 1.05 Faucet aerators - 1.04 Water heater Setback - 1.00	Showerheads 1.05 Faucet aerators 1.04 Water Heater Setback 1.00	New Program: NoPrevious EM&V NTG exists: No	Water Heater Setback: Secondary research All others: Avg. of values from similar programs. See PY8.	Secondary research
2019	Recommended	LEDs - 0.84 Showerheads - 1.00 Kitchen faucet aerators - 1.00 Bath aerators - 1.00 Water heater Setback - 1.00	Showerheads - 1.00 Kitchen faucet aerators - 1.00 Bath aerators - 1.00 Water heater Setback - 1.00	LEDs: Most appropriate IL value; Other Measures: SAG consensus value on education kits	LEDs: PY9 ComEd HEA Evaluation All Others: N/A	Evaluation Team Recommendation/ SAG Consensus
2020	Recommended	LEDs - 0.84 Showerheads - 1.00 Kitchen faucet aerators - 1.00 Bath aerators - 1.00 Water heater Setback - 1.00	Showerheads - 1.00 Kitchen faucet aerators - 1.00 Bath aerators - 1.00 Water heater Setback - 1.00	LEDs: Most appropriate IL value; Other Measures: SAG consensus value on education kits	LEDs: PY9 ComEd HEA Evaluation All Others: N/A	Evaluation Team Recommendation/ SAG Consensus

	Program Year	Туре	NTO	GR	Justification	Method	Source
			Electric	Gas	Justinication	Method	
	2021	Recommended	LEDs - 0.84 LEDs (IQ) - 1.00 Showerheads - 1.00 Kitchen faucet aerators - 1.00 Bath aerators - 1.00 Water heater Setback - 1.00	Showerheads - 1.00 Kitchen faucet aerators - 1.00 Bath aerators - 1.00 Water heater Setback - 1.00	LEDs: Most appropriate IL value; Other Measures: SAG consensus values on education kits and low income	LEDs: PY9 ComEd HEA Evaluation All Others: N/A	Evaluation Team Recommendation/ SAG Consensus

1.10 Multifamily Initiative

Duaguaya Vanu	Time		NTGR	luctification.	Mathad	Source
Program Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source
PY1	Value Applied	0.76	N/A	Retrospective application	N/A - Deemed Value	Deemed
(6/1/08-5/31/09)	NTG Research Results	N/A	N/A	No research conducted		
PY2 (6/1/09-5/31/10)	Value Applied	In-Unit 1.0 Common Areas: 0.8	N/A	Retrospective	Deemed for in-unit measures. For common	Deemed & PY2
	NTG Research Results (available -12/2010)	In-Unit 1.0 Common Areas: 0.8	N/A	application	areas, surveyed 10 participants from a population of 12 projects.	Evaluation
PY3	Value Applied	In-Unit 1.0 Common Areas: 0.8	N/A	Application of most recent research available	See PY2	PY2 Evaluation
(6/1/10-5/31/11)	NTG Research Results	No research perfor	med			
PY4 (6/1/11-5/31/12)	Value Applied	In-Unit 1.0 Common Areas 0.8 Major Measures 0.93	In-Unit 1.0 Major Measures 0.93	Program or Market change: NoNew Program: No	See PY2 and HEP PY3 entry for Major Measures	PY2 Evaluation and PY3 HEP Evaluation
	NTG Research Results	No research condu	cted			

Dua gua va Va au	Type		NTGR	lucatificación	Mathad	Cauras
Program Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source
PY5 (6/1/12-5/31/13)	Value Applied	In-Unit 1.0 Common Areas 0.8 Major Measures 0.94	In-Unit 1.0 Major Measures 0.94	Program change: In PY4, the program began offering the Major Measures Component	See PY2 for CAL and In- Unit; MM retro. application	PY2 and PY5 Evaluations
	NTG Research Results (available 2/6/2014)	Major Measures 0.94	Major Measures 0.94	N/A	Property manager survey (n=14) and participant self-report.	PY5 Evaluation
PY6 (6/1/13-5/31/14)	Value Applied	Common Areas 0.80 In Unit 1.00 Major Measures 0.94	Common Areas 0.80 In Unit 1.00 Major Measures 0.94	No market or program change Previous IL EM&V NTG exists: Yes	See PY2 and PY5	PY2 and PY5 Evaluations
	NTG Research Results (available - 11/25/14)	Common Area - 0.83 In-Unit: CFLs - 0.95 Faucet Aerators - 1.06 Showerhead - 1.00 Programmable T-Stat - 1.04	In-Unit: Faucet Aerators – 1.00 Showerhead – 0.60 Programmable T-Stat – 1.00	N/A	Customer self-report based on interviews with property managers (n=33) for common area lighting, major measures and some in-unit measures, and tenants (n=82) for in-unit CFLs.	PY6 Evaluation
PY7 (6/1/14-5/31/15)	Value Applied	Common Area – 0.80 Major Measures: Insulation – 0.96 Air Sealing – 0.88 In-Unit: CFLs – 0.81	Major Measures: Insulation – 0.81 Air Sealing – 0.75 In-Unit: Faucet Aerator – 0.94 Showerhead – 0.93 Water Temp. – 1.00 Programmable T-Stat – 1.00	No market or program change Previous IL EM&V NTG exists: Yes	Common Area from PY2; Major Measures from PY5; In Unit from ComEd's EPY3 Evaluation, as well as PY2.	PY2, PY5 NTG Research

Duaguaya Vasu	Tyne		NTGR	lucaidia adia u	Makhaad	Source
Program Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source
		Faucet Aerator – 0.94 Showerhead – 0.93 Water Temp. – 1.00 Programmable T- Stat – 1.00				
	NTG Research Results	No research perfor	rmed			
	Value Applied	In-Unit: CFLs - 0.95 Faucet Aerator - 1.06 Showerhead - 1.00 Programmable T- Stat - 1.04 CAL: 0.83 Insulation: 0.88 Air sealing: 0.96	In-Unit: Faucet Aerators – 1.00 Showerhead – 0.94 Programmable T-Stat – 0.98 Insulation: 0.71 Air sealing: 0.81	No market or program change; IL values exists.	See PY5 and PY6	PY5 and PY6 Evaluations
PY8 (6/1/15-5/31/16)	NTG Research Results (available – 1/5/2017)	Major measures Insulation – 0.86 Air Sealing – 0.86 In unit: Programmable thermostats – 0.79 Faucet aerators – 0.79 Showerheads – 0.79	Major measures Insulation – 70.7 Air Sealing – 80.0 In unit: Programmable thermostats – 1.00 Faucet aerators – 1.00 Showerheads – 1.00	• N/A	Customer self-report based on interviews with property managers (n=57) for major measures and in-unit measures out of a population of 402.	PY8 Evaluation

Due des un Verse	₹		NTGR	Lucation and a se	No. ale	C
Program Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source
PY9 (6/1/16-5/31/17)	Recommended	In-Unit: CFLs - 0.95 Faucet Aerator - 1.06 Showerhead - 1.00 Programmable T- Stat - 1.04 CAL: 0.83 Insulation: 0.88 Air sealing: 0.96	In-Unit: Faucet Aerators – 1.00 Showerhead – 0.94 Programmable T-Stat – 0.98 Insulation: 0.71 Air sealing: 0.81	No market or program change; IL values exists.	See PY5 and PY6	PY5 and PY6 Evaluations
2018	Values Applied	Major measures Insulation - 0.86 Air Sealing - 0.86 In unit: LEDs: 0.77 Programmable thermostats - 0.79 Advanced thermostats - N/A Faucet aerators - 0.79 Showerheads - 0.79 Pipe wrap - 0.79 Advanced power strips - 0.79 CAL - 0.83	Major measures Insulation – 0.71 Air Sealing – 0.80 In unit: Programmable thermostats – 1.0 Advanced thermostats – N/A Faucet aerators – 1.0 Showerheads – 1.0 Pipe wrap – 0.79	• N/A	See PY6 and PY8 Multifamily and PY8 Midstream Lighting under C&I Standard for LEDs	PY6 and PY8 Evaluations
2019	Recommended	LEDs: 0.77	Programmable thermostats – 1.00 Faucet aerators – 1.00	Most recent AIC specific values available and	See PY8 Multifamily and PY8 Midstream Lighting under C&I Standard for	PY8 Evaluations

5	_		NTGR			
Program Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source
		Programmable thermostats – 0.79 Advanced thermostats – N/A Faucet aerators – 1.00 Showerheads – 1.00 Pipe wrap – 0.79 Advanced power strips – 0.79 Common area lighting – 0.77	Showerheads - 1.00 Pipe wrap - 1.00	appropriate for application	LEDs and Common Area Lighting	
2020	Recommended	LEDs: 0.96 Programmable thermostats – 0.79 Advanced thermostats – N/A Faucet aerators – 1.00 Showerheads – 1.00 Pipe wrap – 0.79 Advanced power strips – 0.79 Common area lighting – 0.77	Prog. thermostats – 1.00 Faucet aerators – 1.00 Showerheads – 1.00 Pipe wrap – 1.00 Advanced thermostats – N/A	Most recent AIC specific values available and appropriate for application	See AIC Multifamily 2018 NTG Memo and PY8 Multifamily Evaluation Report	AIC Multifamily 2018 NTG Memo and PY8
2021	Recommended	LEDs (In-Unit) - 0.96 Programmable thermostats - 0.79 Advanced Thermostats Cooling - 0.80	Prog. thermostats – 1.00 Faucet aerators – 1.00 Showerheads – 1.00 Pipe wrap – 1.00 Advanced Thermostat Cooling – 0.80	Most recent AIC specific values available and appropriate for application. Evaluation team recommendation	See AIC Multifamily 2018 NTG Memo and PY8 Multifamily Evaluation Report	AIC Multifamily 2018 NTG Memo and PY8 Multifamily Evaluation Report For air sealing, See Joint Evaluator Presentation: Appropriate NTG Treatment for IL-TRM

opiniondynamics.com

Duagua Vaau	T		NTGR	lustification	Madead	Carrea	
Program Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source	
		Advanced Thermostats Heating – 0.90 Faucet aerators – 1.00 Showerheads – 1.00 Pipe wrap – 0.79 Advanced power strips – 0.98 Common area lighting – 0.77 Shower Restrictor Valve – 0.80 Air Sealing – 0.86 Air Sealing (when insulation is also installed) – 0.93	Advanced Thermostat Heating – 0.90 Shower Restrictor Valve – 0.80 Air Sealing – 0.80 Air Sealing (when insulation is also installed) – 0.90			Measures Characterized with Consumption Analysis (Sept 25., 2020) ^a	

a https://ilsag.s3.amazonaws.com/Consumption-Analysis-NTG-Evaluator-Presentation-2020-09-25.pdf

1.11 Residential Program-Level Non-Participant Spillover

Duaguaya Vanu	T	Net Savin _s	gs Multiplier*	lucatification	Madhad	Source
Program Year	Туре	Electric Gas		Justification	Method	Source
2019	Recommendation	103.1%	104.4%	Most recent AIC value available	Participant Self- Report with 350 AIC customer from a sample frame of 4.997.	PY9 Evaluation
2020	Recommendation	103.1%	104.4%	Most recent AIC value available	Participant Self- Report with 350 AIC customer from a sample frame of 4.997.	PY9 Evaluation
2021	Recommendation	103.1%	104.4%	Most recent AIC value available	Participant Self- Report with 350 AIC	PY9 Evaluation

Program Year	Туре	Net Saving	gs Multiplier*	lustification	Method	Source
		Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	
					customer from a sample frame of 4.997.	

^{*} This value is a multiplier on net savings and is not additive to NTGRs.

2. Business Program

2.1 Standard Initiative

The Standard Initiative has a number of distinct components as outlined in this section. The evaluation team has recommended values for each in Sections 2.1.1, 0, 0, 2.1.4, and 0.

2.1.1 Core Standard Initiative

Program	Type	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source	
Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justinication	Methou	Source	
	Value Applied	0.62	N/A				
PY1 (6/1/08- 5/31/09)	NTG Research Results (available 11/30/09)	0.62	N/A	Retrospective application	Customer self-report. 17 surveys completed from a population of 34. Basic method.	PY1 Evaluation	
	Value Applied	0.78 (program- level)	N/A				
PY2 (6/1/09- 5/31/10)	NTG Research Results (available 1/28/11)	Lighting - 0.78 Grocery - 0.76 HVAC - 0.47 Motors - 0.63 Refrigeration - 0.90 (0.76 program-level)	N/A	Retrospective application	Customer self-report. 80 surveys completed from a population of 414. Enhanced method. Trade allies and key account executives called for 7 participants and their responses factored in to FR.	PY2 Evaluation	
	Value Applied	0.75 (program- level) DI Aerators – 0.76	N/A			PY3 Evaluation	
PY3 (6/1/10- 5/31/11)	NTG Research Results (available 12/19/11)	Lighting - 0.76 Agriculture - 0.76 HVAC - 0.78 Motors - 0.76 Refrigeration - 0.82 (0.75 program- level)	N/A	Retrospective application	Customer self-report. 178 Standard surveys completed from a population of 913. Enhanced method. Trade allies and key account executives called for 3 participants.		

Business Program

	Value Applied	0.76 (program- level) 0.80 Direct Install	0.76 (program- level) 0.80 Direct Install	No program or market change	See PY2; Updated NTGRs for Staffing Grant participants	PY2 Evaluation
PY4 (6/1/11- 5/31/12)	NTG Research Results	Lighting – 0.62 Agriculture – 0.76 HVAC – 0.43 Motors – 0.80 Refrigeration – 0.83 Kitchen – 0.54	HVAC - 0.60 Kitchen - 0.53 Water Heater - 0.73	N/A	Customer self-report. 195 Standard surveys completed from a population of 933 for Core. Enhanced method utilizing 2 interviews with key account executives and trade allies.	PY4 Evaluation
	Value Applied	0.75 (program- level)	0.75 (program-level)	No program or market change	See PY3; Updated NTGRs for Staffing Grant participants	PY3 Evaluation
PY5 (6/1/12- 5/31/13)	NTG Research Results (available 2/6/2014)	Lighting – 0.77	Steam Trap - 0.90	N/A	Customer self-report method. Lighting surveys (n=68) completed from a population of 560 contacts and steam traps (n=6) completed from a population of 21 contacts. Enhanced method utilizing interviews with trade allies.	PY5 Evaluation
PY6 (6/1/13- 5/31/14)	Value Applied	Lighting - 0.62 Agriculture - 0.76 HVAC - 0.43 Motors - 0.80 Refrigeration - 0.83 Kitchen - 0.54	HVAC - 0.60 Kitchen - 0.53 Water Heater - 0.73	No program or market change	See PY4	PY4 Evaluation
	NTG Research Results	No research con-	ducted			
PY7	Value Applied	Lighting – 0.77 HVAC – 0.43 Motors – 0.80 Specialty – 0.82	Steam Trap - 0.90 HVAC - 0.60 Specialty - 0.70	No program or market change	See PY5 for lighting and steam traps, and PY4 for other measures	PY4 and PY5 Evaluations
(6/1/14- 5/31/15)	NTG Research Results	Lighting - 0.78 HVAC - 0.56 Leak Survey - 0.70 Specialty - 0.85 VFD - 0.83	Steam Trap - 0.61 HVAC - 0.49 Specialty - 0.68	N/A	Customer self-report method. Lighting interviews (n=70) completed from a population of 638 contacts. Remaining interviews (n=65) completed as attempted census by end-use from population of 204 contacts.	PY7 Evaluation

Business Program

PY8 (6/1/15- 5/31/16)	Value Applied	Lighting – 0.78 HVAC – 0.44 Motors – 0.81 Specialty – 0.83	Steam Trap - 0.90 HVAC - 0.80 Specialty - 0.90	Previous EM&V NTG exists	PY5 and PY4 values with NPSO included.	PY4 and PY5 Evaluations					
	NTG Research Results	No research con-	ducted								
PY9 (6/1/16- 5/31/17)	Value Applied Value Applied HVAC - 0.56 0.		Steam Trap - 0.61 HVAC - 0.49 Specialty - 0.68	Most recent AIC specific value	See PY7; See Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in PY7).	PY7 Evaluation					
	NTG Research Results	No research con-	o research conducted								
2018	Value Applied	Lighting - 0.78 HVAC - 0.56 Leak Survey - 0.70 Specialty - 0.85 VFD - 0.83	Steam Trap - 0.61 HVAC - 0.49 Specialty - 0.68	Most recent AIC specific value	See PY7; See Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in PY7).	PY7 Evaluation					
2019	Recommended	Lighting - 0.78 HVAC - 0.56 Leak Survey - 0.70 Specialty - 0.85 VFD - 0.83	Steam Trap - 0.61 HVAC - 0.49 Specialty - 0.68	Most recent AIC specific value	See PY7; See Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in PY7).	PY7 Evaluation					
2020	Recommended	Lighting - 0.84 HVAC - 0.68 Leak Survey & Repair - 0.85 Specialty - 0.85 VFD - 0.83	Steam Trap - 0.61 HVAC - 0.43 Specialty - 0.68	Most recent AIC specific value	See AIC 2018 Standard Initiative NTG Research Memo and PY7 Standard Program Evaluation; See Section 2.6 for non- participant SO (updated in 2019).	AIC 2018 Standard Initiative NTG Research Memo and PY7 Evaluation					
2021	Recommended	Lighting – 0.84 HVAC (Thermostats only) – 0.84 HVAC (all other measures) – 0.68	Steam Trap - 0.61 HVAC (thermostats only) - 0.71 HVAC (all other measures) - 0.43	Most recent AIC specific values	See AIC 2018 Standard Initiative NTG Research Memo and PY7 Standard Program Evaluation; See Section 2.6 for non- participant SO (updated in 2019). Evaluation team recommendation for thermostats	AIC 2018 Standard Initiative NTG Research Memo and PY7 Evaluation For thermostats, see Joint Evaluator Presentation: Appropriate NTG Treatment for IL- TRM Measures Characterized with					

	-	Specialty – 0.68		Consumption Analysis (Sept 25., 2020) ^a

^a https://ilsag.s3.amazonaws.com/Consumption-Analysis-NTG-Evaluator-Presentation-2020-09-25.pdf

2.1.2 Online Store

Duaguaya Vaay	Tyrno	NT	GR	luntification	Method	Course
Program Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source
PY1 (6/1/08-5/31/09)	Value Applied	N/A – Not offered				
PY2	Value Applied	0.80	N/A	Initial launch and	Doomed planning	
(6/1/09-5/31/10)	NTG Research Results (available 11/30/09)	0.80	N/A	limited participation	Deemed planning value	AIC
	Value Applied	0.64	N/A		Customer self-report.	
PY3 (6/1/10-5/31/11)	NTG Research Results (available 11/30/09)	0.64	N/A	Retrospective application	88 surveys completed from a population of 17,596. Basic method.	PY3 Evaluation
	Value Applied	0.80	N/A	No program or market change	See PY2	PY2 Evaluation
PY4 (6/1/11-5/31/12)	NTG Research Results (available 11/30/09)	0.83	N/A	Expansion of target population for participation	Customer self-report. 213 surveys from the Online Store population of 24,623	PY4 Evaluation
PY5	Value Applied	0.64	N/A	No program or market change	See PY3	PY3 Evaluation
(6/1/12-5/31/13)	NTG Research Results	No research conducted				
PY6	Value Applied	0.83	N/A	Updated IL value available	See PY4	PY4 Evaluation
(6/1/13-5/31/14)	NTG Research Results	No research conducted				
PY7 (6/1/14-5/31/15)	Value Applied	0.83	N/A	No program or market change	See PY4	PY4 Evaluation

Duaguan Vaar	Time	NT	GR	lunkiti naki na	Makhad	Carrea
Program Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source
	NTG Research Results	No research conducted				
DVO	Value Applied	0.83	N/A	Previous EM&V NTG exists	See PY4	PY4 Evaluation
PY8 (6/1/15-5/31/16)	NTG Research Results	0.83	N/A	N/A	Customer self-report. 131 surveys from a population of 1,333.	PY8 Evaluation
PY9	Value Applied	0.83	N/A	Previous EM&V NTG exists	See PY4	PY4 Evaluation
(6/1/16-5/31/17)	NTG Research Results	No research conducted				
2018	Value Applied	0.83	N/A	Most recent AIC specific value	See PY8 and Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in PY7).	PY8 Evaluation
2019	Recommended	0.83	N/A	Most recent AIC specific value	See PY8 and Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in PY7).	PY8 Evaluation
2020	Recommended	0.83	N/A	Most recent AIC specific value	See PY8 and Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in 2019).	PY8 Evaluation
2021	Recommended	Thermostats - 0.88 All Other Measures - 1.16	Thermostats - 0.88	Evaluation team recommendation for thermostats Most recent AIC specific value for all other measures	Participant self-report. 60 surveys from a population of 908 for all other measures	2019 Evaluation For thermostats, see Joint Evaluator Presentation: Appropriate NTG Treatment for IL-TRM Measures Characterized with Consumption Analysis (Sept 25., 2020) ^a

a https://ilsag.s3.amazonaws.com/Consumption-Analysis-NTG-Evaluator-Presentation-2020-09-25.pdf

2.1.3 Green Nozzles

Program Year	Туре	NTGR Electric Gas		Justification	Method	Source
		Electric	Gas			
PY1 (6/1/08-5/31/09)	Value Applied	N/A - Not offered				

Business Program

Program Year	Туре	NI	GR	Justification	Method	Source		
- rogram rear	Турс	Electric	Gas	Justineation	Method	Source		
PY2 (6/1/09-5/31/10)	Value Applied	N/A - Not offered						
PY3 (6/1/09-5/31/10)	Value Applied	N/A - Not offered						
	Value Applied	0.92	0.89		Customer self-report.			
PY4 (6/1/11-5/31/12)	NTG Research Results	0.92	0.89	Retrospective application	101 surveys from a population of 514 for Green Nozzles	PY4 Evaluation		
PY5	Value Applied	0.92	0.89	Updated IL value available	See PY4	PY4 Evaluation		
(6/1/12-5/31/13)	NTG Research Results	No research conducted		•				
PY6	Value Applied	0.92	0.89	No program or market change	See PY4	PY4 Evaluation		
(6/1/13-5/31/14)	NTG Research Results	No research conducted						
PY7	Value Applied	0.92	0.89	No program or market change	See PY4	PY4 Evaluation		
(6/1/14-5/31/15)	NTG Research Results	No research conducted						
PY8	Value Applied	0.92	0.89	Previous EM&V NTG exists	See PY4	PY4 Evaluation		
(6/1/15-5/31/16)	NTG Research Results	No research conducted	No research conducted					
PY9 (6/1/16-5/31/17)	Value Applied	0.92	0.89	Previous EM&V NTG exists	See PY4	PY4 Evaluation		
(0/1/10-5/31/17)	NTG Research Results	No research conducted		_				
2018	Value Applied	0.92	0.89	Previous EM&V NTG exists	See PY4 and Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in PY7)	PY4 Evaluation		
2019	Recommended	0.92	0.89	Previous EM&V NTG exists	See PY4 and Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in PY7)	PY4 Evaluation		
2020	Recommended	0.92	0.89	Previous EM&V NTG exists	See PY4 and Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in 2019)	PY4 Evaluation		
2021	Recommended	0.92	0.89	Previous EM&V NTG exists	See PY4 and Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in 2019)	PY4 Evaluation		

2.1.4 Instant Incentives

Program	_	NTGR		1		
Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source
PY8 (6/1/15- 5/31/16)	Value Applied	0.68 CFLs 0.77 LEDs	N/A	Most recent Illinois specific value available.	Customer self-report approach based on the end-user telephone surveys of 282 participants and in-depth interviews with 9 BILD end-user participants. 2. Supplier self-reports based on in-depth interviews with program lighting distributors.	ComEd PY6 BILD Evaluation
	NTG Research Results	0.77 (Linear LEDs, Specialty LEDs, Standard LEDs, CFLs, and Occupancy Sensors)	N/A	N/A	Customer self-report approach based on participant telephone surveys with 27 participants out a population of 273.	PY8 Evaluation
PY9 (6/1/16-5/31/17) Recommend	Recommended	0.64 CFLs 0.78 LEDs	N/A	Most recent Illinois specific value available at the time recommendations were due.	Customer self-report approach based on the end-user telephone surveys of 224 participants, web surveys with 159 participants, and in-depth interviews with 5 BILD end-user participants. Supplier self-reports based on web surveys with 61 program lighting distributors.	ComEd PY7 BILD Evaluation
	NTG Research Results	0.92 Linear LEDs 0.92 Specialty LEDs 0.92 Standard LEDs	N/A	N/A	Customer self-report approach based on participant internet surveys with 160 participants out of a population of 1,603.	PY9 Evaluation
2018	Recommended	0.77 (Linear LEDs, Specialty LEDs, Standard LEDs, CFLs, and Occupancy Sensors)	N/A	Most recent AIC specific value	See PY8 Evaluation	PY8 Evaluation
2019	Recommended	0.92 Linear LEDs 0.92 Specialty LEDs 0.92 Standard LEDs	N/A	Most recent AIC specific value	See PY9 Evaluation and Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in 2019).	PY9 Evaluation
2020	Recommended	0.92 Linear LEDs 0.92 Specialty LEDs 0.92 Standard LEDs 0.80 Non-lighting products	N/A	Most recent AIC specific value for lighting; default value for non-lighting	See PY9 Evaluation and Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in 2019).	PY9 Evaluation; default
2021	Recommended	0.831 Linear LEDs 0.670 Specialty LEDs 0.670 Standard LEDs 0.88 Thermostats 0.80 Notched V-Belts 0.89 Air Conditioners 0.89 HP Water Heaters	0.88 Thermostats	SAG consensus for lighting measures Evaluation team recommendations for other measures	Participant self-report, secondary research	PY9 AIC and 2019 ComEd Part Self- Report research for FR and PSO, 2018 Evaluation - NP Self-Report for NPSO

Business Program

Program Year	Туре	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source
		Electric	Gas	Justilication	Metriod	Source
						Xcel Energy Colorado Cooling Efficiency Product 2017 Evaluation for midstream AC and HPWH
						For thermostats, see Joint Evaluator Presentation: Appropriate NTG Treatment for ILTRM Measures Characterized with Consumption Analysis (Sept 25.,
						2020)a

a https://ilsag.s3.amazonaws.com/Consumption-Analysis-NTG-Evaluator-Presentation-2020-09-25.pdf

2.1.5 Small Business Direct Install

Due gue ve Ve eu	Туре	NTGR		lucation attent				
Program Year		Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source		
	Value Applied	0.90	N/A	IPA Program	AIC Planning Value	Deemed		
PY6 (6/1/13-5/31/14)	NTG Research Results (available 3/1/14)	0.89	N/A	N/A	Participant self-report conducted in PY6. Surveyed 70 contacts from a population of 445 participants.	PY6 Evaluation		
PY7	Value Applied	0.90	N/A	IPA Program	AIC Planning Value	Deemed		
(6/1/14-5/31/15)	NTG Research Results	No research conducted						
	Value Applied	0.89	N/A	Previous EM&V NTGR Exists	See PY6	PY6 Evaluation		
PY8 (6/1/15-5/31/16)	NTG Research Results (available 12/1/16)	0.96	N/A	N/A	Customer self-report. 77 completed interviews out of a population of 649 participants.	PY8 Evaluation		
PY9	Value Applied	0.89	N/A	Previous EM&V NTGR Exists	See PY6	PY6 Evaluation		
(6/1/16-5/31/17)	NTG Research Results	No research	conducted					
2018	Value Applied	0.96	0.96	Most recent AIC specific value available	See PY8	PY8 Evaluation		
2019	Recommended	0.96	0.96	Most recent AIC specific value available	See PY8	PY8 Evaluation		
2020	Recommended	0.91	0.91	Most recent AIC specific value available	See 2018 Standard Initiative NTG Research Memo	2018 Evaluation		
2021	Recommended	0.91	0.91	Most recent AIC specific value available	See 2018 Standard Initiative NTG Research Memo	2018 Evaluation		

2.1.6 Small Business Refrigeration

Program Year	Туре	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source	
r rogram rear	Турс	Electric	Gas	Justilloution	Method	300100	
PY8 (6/1/15-5/31/16)	Value Applied	0.86	N/A	Some previous EM&V NTGR results exists	Combined refrigeration NTG results from the PY4 and PY6 C&I Standard evaluation	PY4 and PY6 Standard Evaluations	
(0) 1) 10 0) 01) 10)	NTG Research Results	No research	conducted				
PY9 (6/1/16-5/31/17)	Recommended	0.86	N/A	Some previous EM&V NTGR results exists	See PY8	PY4 and PY6 Standard Evaluations	
PY10 (1/1/18-12/31/18)	Recommended	0.86	0.86	Some previous EM&V NTGR results exists	See PY8	PY4 and PY6 Standard Evaluations	
2021	Recommended	0.86	N/A	Most recent AIC specific value available	See PY8	PY4 and PY6 Standard Evaluations	

2.1.7 Small Business Building Envelope

Program Year	Туре	NTGR				
		Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source
2021	Recommended	0.91	0.91	Most recent AIC specific value available	See 2018 Standard Initiative NTG Research Memo	2018 Evaluation

2.2 **Custom Initiative**

Program Year	Туре	NT	GR	Justification	Mathad	Source
		Electric	Gas	Justilication	Method	
PY1	Value Applied	0.77	N/A	Potrochootivo	Customer self-report. 14 surveys completed from a population of 34. Basic method.	PY1 Evaluation
· · -	NTG Research Results (available 11/30/09)	0.77	N/A	Retrospective application		

Duagua Vasu	T	NT	GR	luckific esticu	Madhad	Carrea
Program Year	туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Wietnod	Source
DV0	Value Applied	0.69	N/A		Customer self-report. 56 surveys completed from a population of 146. Enhanced method.	D) (O
PY2 (6/1/09-5/31/10)	Value Applied 0.69 N/A Retrospective application Retrospective application Retrospective application Retrospective application Trade allies and key account executives called for 7 participants and their responses were factored in to the customer free ridership calculation. Retrospective application Retrospective appl	PY2 Evaluation				
	Value Applied	0.75	N/A			
PY3 (6/1/10-5/31/11)		0.75	N/A		account executives called for 5 participants and their responses were factored in to the	PY3 Evaluation
PY4 (6/1/11-5/31/12)	Value Applied	0.69	0.69	Market change: No New Program: No Previous EM&V NTG	participant interviews, new projects NTGR score used if higher than PY2 Recommended	PY2 Evaluation
	NTG Research Results	No research perforn	ned			
PY5 (6/1/12-5/31/13)	Value Applied	0.75	0.81	Market change: No New Program: No Previous EM&V NTG	participant interviews (8 of 16, 81% of kWh savings), new NTGR score used if higher than PY3 Recommended NTGR. Affected 7	PY3 Evaluation
	NTG Research Results (available 2/6/2014)	0.74	0.74	N/A		PY5 Evaluation

-	_	NT	GR			
Program Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source
PY6 (6/1/13-5/31/14)	Value Applied	0.75	0.81	 Program change: No Market change: No New Program: No Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes 	See PY3 for Electric; Deemed Value for Gas. Also supplemented by Staffing Grant participant interviews, new projects NTGR score used if higher than PY3 Recommended NTGR.	PY3 Evaluation
	NTG Research Results (available - 3/11/2015)	N/A	0.83	Customer self-report. 8 surveys completed from a population of 24. Enhanced method, however no respondents required interviews with trade allies or key account executives. Program change: No Market change: No Now See PY5 for FR and participant SO	PY6 Evaluation	
PY7 (6/1/14-5/31/15)	Value Applied	0.75	0.74	change: No Market change: No	See PY5 for FR and participant SO	PY5 Evaluation
	NTG Research Results	No research perform	ned			
PY8 (6/1/15-5/31/16)	Value Applied	0.75	0.83	 Program or Market change: No New Program: No Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes 	See PY5 for Electric & PY6 for Gas (FR and SO); See Section 2.6 for non-participant SO.	PY5 and PY6 Evaluations
	NTG Research Results	Core Custom: 0.82 New Construction Lighting: 0.82	Core Custom: 0.94 New Construction Lighting: 0.94	N/A	Customer self-report. 36 completed surveys from a population of 105 participants. Enhanced method, however no respondents required interviews with trade allies or key account executives.	PY8 Evaluation

Program Year	Tyrac	NT	GR	Justification	Method	Source
Program rear	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justilication	Method	Source
PY9 (6/1/16-5/31/17)	Value Applied	0.74	0.83	 Program or Market change: No New Program: No Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes 	See PY5 for Electric & PY6 for Gas (FR and SO); See Section 2.6 for non-participant SO.	PY5 and PY6 Evaluations
2018	Value Applied	Core Custom: 0.82 New Construction Lighting: 0.82	Core Custom: 0.94 New Construction Lighting: 0.94	Most recent AIC specific value available	See PY8 Evaluation; See Section 2.6 for non-participant SO.	PY8 Evaluation
2019	Recommended	Core Custom: 0.82 New Construction Lighting: 0.82	Core Custom: 0.94 New Construction Lighting: 0.94	Most recent AIC specific value available	See PY8 Evaluation; See Section 2.6 for non-participant SO.	PY8 Evaluation
2020	Recommended	Core Custom: 0.82 New Construction Lighting: 0.82	Core Custom: 0.94 New Construction Lighting: 0.94	Most recent AIC specific value available	See PY8 Evaluation; See Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in 2019).	PY8 Evaluation
2021	Recommended	Core Custom: 0.82 New Construction Lighting: 0.82	Core Custom: 0.94 New Construction Lighting: 0.94	Most recent AIC specific value available	See PY8 Evaluation; See Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in 2019).	PY8 Evaluation

2.3 Retro-Commissioning Initiative

Program	.	NT	GR	luctification	Markey	C
Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source
PY1	Value Applied	1.0	N/A	Pilot with only 1 project.	Deemed	PY1 Evaluation
(6/1/08- 5/31/09)	NTG Research Results	N/A	N/A	No research conducted		
PY2	Value Applied	0.8	N/A	Retrospective application	AIC planning Value	PY2 Evaluation
(6/1/09- 5/31/10)	NTG Research Results	N/A	N/A	No research conducted		
DV2	Value Applied	0.58	N/A		Ought was a self-way and 17 august a same alabad	
PY3 (6/1/10- 5/31/11)	NTG Research Results (available 04/01/12)	0.58	N/A	Retrospective application	Customer self-report. 17 surveys completed from a population of 18 participant contacts. Basic method.	PY3 Evaluation
	Value Applied	0.95	0.95			
PY4 (6/1/11- 5/31/12)	NTG Research Results (available 01/24/13)	0.95	0.95	Retrospective application	Customer self-report. 14 surveys completed from a population of 32 participants. Service Provider self-report. 9 surveys completed from a population of 12 participants. Enhanced method. Participant and Service Provider spillover researched.	PY4 Evaluation

Program	Туре		GR	Justification	Method	Source	
Year	-31-3	Electric	Gas				
PY5 (6/1/12- 5/31/13)	Value Applied	0.95	0.95	 Program change: No Market change: Market evolving with service providers reaching outside of the program for work and increasing resources to deliver. Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes 	See PY4	PY4 Evaluation	
	NTG Research Results	N/A	N/A	No Research Conducted			
PY6 (6/1/13- 5/31/14)	Value Applied	0.96	0.95	 Program change: No Market change: No New Program: No Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes 	See PY4; See Section 2.6 for electric non-participant SO.	PY4 Evaluation	
	NTG Research Results (available - 3/12/2015)	0.92	0.91	N/A	Customer self-report. 6 surveys completed from a population of 26. See Section 2.6 for electric non-participant SO.	PY6 Evaluation	
PY7 (6/1/14- 5/31/15)	Value Applied	0.96	0.95	 Program change: No Market change: No New Program: No Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes 	See PY4; See Section 2.6 for electric non-participant SO.	PY4 Evaluation	
	NTG Research Results	No research perform	ed				
PY8 (6/1/15-	Value Applied	0.92	0.91	Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes	See PY6 for FR and participant SO; See Section 2.6 for non-participant SO.	PY6 Evaluation	
5/31/16)	NTG Research Results	No research performed					
PY9 (6/1/16- 5/31/17)	Recommended	0.91	0.91	Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes	See PY6 for FR and participant S0; See Section 2.6 for electric non-participant S0 (updated in PY7).	PY6 Evaluation	

opiniondynamics.com

Program	Type	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source
Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justilication	Metriod	Source
	NTG Research Results	0.89	0.89	N/A	Customer self-report. 11 surveys completed from a population of 21. See Section 2.6 for electric non-participant SO.	PY9 Evaluation
2018	Value Applied	0.91	0.91	Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes	See PY6 for FR and participant S0; See Section 2.6 for electric non-participant S0 (updated in PY7).	PY6 Evaluation
2019	Recommended	0.89	0.89	Most recent AIC specific value available	See PY9 for FR and participant S0; See Section 2.6 for electric non-participant S0 (updated in PY7).	PY9 Evaluation
2020	Recommended	0.89	0.89	Most recent AIC specific value available	See PY9 for FR and participant S0; See Section 2.6 for electric non-participant S0 (updated in 2019).	PY9 Evaluation
2021	Recommended	Compressed Air RCx and Industrial Refrigeration RCx 0.82; Large Facilities RCx and RCx Lite 0.94 Virtual Commissioning 1.00	Compressed Air RCx and Industrial Refrigeration RCx 0.75; Large Facilities RCx and RCx Lite 0.94 Virtual Commissioning 1.00	Average of recent AIC- specific research given small sample sizes; ComEd research for Large Facilities and RCx Lite given limited AIC participation to date SAG Consensus for Virtual Commissioning	Average of PY9 and 2019 AIC Part Self Report for CARCx/IRRCx; PY9 ComEd Research for Large Facilities and RCx Lite; See Section 2.6 for electric non-participant SO (updated in 2019);	PY9 Evaluation 2019 Evaluation PY9 ComEd Research

2.4 Streetlighting Initiative

Program	Туре	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source
Year	Type	Electric Gas		Justilication	Method	Source
2018	Value Applied	1.00	N/A	Participants have no ability to implement without AIC assistance	N/A	Evaluation Team Recommendation
2019	Recommended	1.00	N/A	Participants have no ability to implement without AIC assistance	N/A	Evaluation Team Recommendation
2020	Recommended	1.0 – Utility-Owned Streetlighting 0.80 – Municipality-Owned Streetlighting	N/A	Participants have no ability to implement without AIC assistance; No AIC-specific research available	N/A	Evaluation Team Recommendation; Default value

Program Year Type	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source	
	Electric		Gas	Justinication	metriod	Source
2021	Recommended	1.00 – Utility-Owned Streetlighting 0.69 – Municipality-Owned Streetlighting	N/A	Participants have no ability to implement without AIC assistance; Most recent AIC specific value available	N/A; Participant self-report	Evaluation Team Recommendation; 2019 Evaluation

2.5 Combined Heat and Power

Drogram Voor	Tyrno	NT	GR	Justification	Method	Source
Program Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justinication	Method	Source
PY8 (6/1/15- 5/31/16)	Recommended	N/A - Project Specific	N/A - Project Specific	New Program: YesPrevious EM&V NTG exists: No	The evaluation team will determine NTGRs on a per-project basis upfront. The value assigned to each project will be valid for the life of that project.	Annual Evaluation Efforts
PY9 (6/1/16- 5/31/17)	Recommended	N/A - Project Specific	N/A - Project Specific	New Program: NoPrevious EM&V NTG exists: No	The evaluation team will determine NTGRs on a per-project basis upfront. The value assigned to each project will be valid for the life of that project.	Annual Evaluation Efforts
2018	Recommended	N/A - Project Specific	N/A - Project Specific	New Program: NoPrevious EM&V NTG exists: No	The evaluation team will determine NTGRs on a per-project basis upfront. The value assigned to each project will be valid for the life of that project.	Annual Evaluation Efforts
2019	Recommended	N/A - Project Specific	N/A - Project Specific	New Program: NoPrevious EM&V NTG exists: No	The evaluation team will determine NTGRs on a per-project basis upfront. The value assigned to each project will be valid for the life of that project.	Annual Evaluation Efforts
2020	Recommended	N/A - Project Specific	N/A - Project Specific	New Program: NoPrevious EM&V NTG exists: No	The evaluation team will determine NTGRs on a per-project basis upfront. The value assigned to each project will be valid for the life of that project.	Annual Evaluation Efforts
2021	Recommended	N/A - Project Specific	N/A - Project Specific	New Program: NoPrevious EM&V NTG exists: No	The evaluation team will determine NTGRs on a per-project basis upfront. The value assigned to each project will be valid for the life of that project.	Annual Evaluation Efforts

2.6 Business Program-Level Non-Participant Spillover

Program Year	Туре	Non- Participant Spillover	Justification	Method	Source
PY7 (6/1/14- 5/31/15)	Value Applied	Electric - 0.01	Based on IL specific primary data collection	During the PY5 Standard Evaluation, we examined spillover using responses to the non-participant telephone survey and found that 1.2% of the decision-makers took action and attributed it to the ActOnEnergy Business Program. Overall, we completed surveys with 251 respondents from a sample frame of 5,500. We conducted a similar study during PY3 and completed surveys with 245 respondents. For both studies, we developed estimates of the savings associated with these measures based on an engineering analysis of participant survey responses, as well as follow-up interviews performed by engineering staff. Based on the information gathered, we were able to perform engineering-based calculations or use the Statewide TRM to calculate savings. The most common type of equipment installed outside the program was efficient lighting, followed by water heating and cooling equipment.	PY5 and PY3 Evaluations
DVS	NTG Research Results	0.00	N/A	During the PY7 Standard Evaluation, we examined spillover using responses to the non-participant telephone survey, and found that none of the interviewed customers took un-incented energy efficient actions and attributed them to the Ameren Illinois Business Program.	PY7 Evaluation
PY8 (6/1/15-	Value Applied	Electric - 0.01	Based on IL specific primary data collection	See PY7 value applied	PY5 and PY3 Evaluations
5/31/16)	NTG Research Results	as follow-up interviews performed by engineering gathered, we were able to perform engineering-based TRM to calculate savings. The most common type of program was efficient lighting, followed by water heat non-participant telephone survey, and found that non-participant telephone survey, and found that now un-incented energy efficient actions and attributed business Program. Based on IL specific primary data collection No research performed Based on IL specific primary data collection See PY7 value applied Based on IL specific primary data collection No research performed No research performed			
PY9 (6/1/16-	Value Applied	Electric - 0.00	specific primary	See PY7 NTG research results	PY7 Evaluation
5/31/17)	NTG Research Results		During the PY5 Standard Evaluation, we examined spillover non-participant telephone survey and found that 1.2% of the action and attributed it to the ActOnEnergy Business Program surveys with 251 respondents from a sample frame of 5,500. study during PY3 and completed surveys with 245 respondent from a sample frame of 5,500. study during PY3 and completed surveys with 245 respondent from a sample frame of 5,500. study during PY3 and completed surveys with 245 respondent from a sample frame of 5,500. study during PY3 and completed surveys with 245 respondent from a sample frame of 5,500. study during PY3 and completed surveys with 245 respondent from a sample frame of 5,500. study during PY3 and completed surveys with 245 respondent frame of 5,500. study during PY3 and completed surveys with 245 respondent frame of 5,500. study during PY3 and completed surveys with 245 respondent frame of 5,500. study during PY3 and completed surveys with 245 respondent frame of 5,500. study during PY3 and completed surveys with 245 respondent frame of 5,500. study during PY3 and completed surveys with 245 respondent frame of 5,500. study during PY3 and completed surveys with 245 respondent frame of 5,500. study during PY3 and completed surveys with 245 respondent frame of 5,500. study during PY3 and completed surveys with 245 respondent frame of 5,500. study during PY3 and completed surveys with 245 respondent frame of 5,500. study during PY3 and completed surveys with 245 respondent frame of 5,500. study during PY3 and completed surveys with 245 respondent frame of 5,500. study during PY3 and completed surveys with 245 respondent frame of 5,500. study during PY3 and completed surveys with 245 respondent frame of 5,500. study during PY3 and completed surveys with 245 respondent frame of 5,500. study during PY3 and completed surveys with 245 respondent frame of 5,500. study during PY3 and completed surveys with 245 respondent frame of 5,500. study during PY3 and completed surveys with 245 respondent frame of 5,500. study during	No research performed	
2018	Value Applied	Electric - 0.00	specific primary	See PY7 NTG research results	PY7 Evaluation
2019	Recommended	Electric - 0.00	specific primary	See PY7 NTG research results	PY7 Evaluation

Program Year	Туре	Non- Participant Spillover	Justification	Method	Source
2020	Recommended	Electric - 0.0002 Gas - 0.0000	Based on IL specific primary data collection	See 2018 Non-Participant Research	2018 Evaluation
2021	Recommended	Electric - 0.0002 Gas - 0.0000	Based on IL specific primary data collection	See 2018 Non-Participant Research	2018 Evaluation

Residential Lighting (CFLs)

		NTGR					
Program Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source	
PY1	Value Applied	1.0	N/A	Retrospective	Customer self-report of CFL purchase rates of	514.5	
(6/1/08- 5/31/09)	NTG Research Results (available 10/09)	1.0	N/A	application	AIC customers and customers in non-program areas.	PY1 Evaluation	
PY2 (6/1/09- 5/31/10)	Value Applied	0.83	N/A	Retrospective application	Average NTG results from two methods: 1) supplier self-report surveys from 16 suppliers representing 97% of CFL sales and 2) a multistate model based on 92 site visits of random Ameren Illinois customers using CFLs compared to site visits in areas without	PY2 Evaluation	
	NTG Research Results (available 10/09)	0.83	N/A		programs or programs with different levels of maturity.		
PY3 (6/1/10-	Value Applied	0.83	N/A	Application of most recent research available	See PY2	PY2 Evaluation	
5/31/11)	NTG Research Results	No research conduc	ted				
PY4 (6/1/11- 5/31/12)	Value Applied	0.83	N/A	 Program or Market change: No Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes 	See PY2	PY2 Evaluation	
, , ,	NTG Research Results	No research conduc	ted				
PY5 (6/1/12-	Value Applied	0.83	N/A	 Program or Market change: No Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes 	See PY2	PY2 Evaluation	
5/31/13)	NTG Research Results (available 2/6/2014)	0.47	N/A	• N/A	Free-ridership estimated from in-store lighting customer interviews conducted in January 2013, and spillover estimated from 2012 inhome lighting study.	PY5 Evaluation	

	_	NTGR				
Program Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source
PY6 (6/1/13-	Value Applied	0.47	N/A	Program or Market change: No Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes	See PY5	PY5 Evaluation
5/31/14)	NTG Research Results (available – 12/23/14)	Std. CFL - 0.63 Spec. CFL - 0.72	N/A	N/A	Free-ridership estimated from in-store lighting customer interviews conducted in January 2014 (n=439), and spillover estimated from 2014 in-home lighting study (n=225).	PY6 Evaluation
PY7 (6/1/14- 5/31/15)	Value Applied	0.47	N/A	Most recent value available for the program based on primary data	See PY5	PY5 Evaluation
	NTG Research Results	No research conduc	ted			
PY8 (6/1/15-	Value Applied	Std. CFL - 0.63 Spec. CFL - 0.72	N/A	Most recent value available for the program based on primary data	See PY6	PY6 Evaluation
5/31/16)	NTG Research Results (available 11/1/2016)	All CFLs - 0.63	N/A	N/A	Free-ridership and spillover estimated from instore lighting customer interviews (n=853).	PY8 Evaluation
PY9 (6/1/16- 5/31/17)	Recommended	Std. CFL - 0.63 Spec. CFL - 0.72	N/A	Most recent value available for the program based on primary data	See PY6	PY6 Evaluation
PY10 (1/1/18- 12/31/18)	Recommended	All CFLs - 0.63	N/A	Most recent AIC specific value available	See PY8	PY8 Evaluation

Small Business Refrigeration

Program Year	Туре	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source
r rogram roar		Electric	Gas	Justinication	moulou	Gouros
PY8 (6/1/15-5/31/16)	Value Applied	0.86	N/A	Some previous EM&V NTGR results exists	Combined refrigeration NTG results from the PY4 and PY6 C&I Standard evaluation	PY4 and PY6 Standard Evaluations
	NTG Research Results	No research o	conducted			
PY9 (6/1/16-5/31/17)	Recommended	0.86	N/A	Some previous EM&V NTGR results exists	See PY8	PY4 and PY6 Standard Evaluations
PY10 (1/1/18-12/31/18)	Recommended	0.86	0.86	Some previous EM&V NTGR results exists	See PY8	PY4 and PY6 Standard Evaluations

Small Business Exterior Lighting

		NTGR					
	Program Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source
	PY10 (1/1/18-12/31/18)	Recommended	0.96	N/A	Based on AIC-specific values for a similar program	See SBDI PY8 NTG research	PY8 SBDI Evaluation

Small Business Linear LED Lighting

	Туре	NTGR				
Program Year		Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source
PY10 (1/1/18-12/31/18)	Recommended	0.96	N/A	Based on AIC-specific values for a similar program	See SBDI PY8 NTG research	PY8 SBDI Evaluation

Small Business Lit Signage

	Туре	NTGR				
Program Year		Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source
PY10 (1/1/18-12/31/18)	Recommended	0.96	N/A	Based on AIC-specific values for a similar program	See SBDI PY8 NTG research	PY8 SBDI Evaluation

Small Business Whole Building

	Туре	NT	GR		Method		
Program Year		Electric	Gas	Justification		Source	
PY10 (1/1/18-12/31/18)	Recommended	Refrigeration Measures - 0.86 All Other Measures - 0.96	Refrigeration Measures - 0.86 All Other Measures - 0.96	Based on AIC-specific values	Combined refrigeration NTG results from the PY4 and PY6 C&I Standard evaluation, as well as PY8 SBDI evaluation	PY8 SBDI Evaluation & PY4 and PY6 Standard Evaluations	

Private Sector Enhanced HVAC Optimization

	Туре	NTGR				
Program Year		Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source
PY10 (1/1/18-12/31/18)	Recommended	0.96	0.96	Based on AIC-specific values for a similar program	See SBDI PY8 NTG research	PY8 SBDI Evaluation

Public Sector Enhanced HVAC Optimization

		NTGR					
Program Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source	
PY10 (1/1/18-12/31/18)	Recommended	0.96	0.96	Based on AIC-specific values for a similar program	See SBDI PY8 NTG research	PY8 SBDI Evaluation	

Demand-Controlled Ventilation

Program Year	Type	NT	GR	Justification	Method	Source
Flogram Tear	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justilication	Method	Source
PY8 (6/1/15-5/31/16)	Recommended	0.89	0.89	There is no viable secondary data for this measure. However, based on the team's knowledge of the measure, we believe the NTGR used in AlC's analysis is reasonable	N/A – Planning Value	Deemed
PY9 (6/1/16-5/31/17)	Recommended	0.89	0.89	There is no viable secondary data for this measure. However, based on the team's knowledge of the measure, we believe the NTGR used in AlC's analysis is reasonable	N/A – Planning Value	Deemed
PY10 (1/1/18-12/31/18)	Recommended	0.89	0.89	There is no viable secondary data for this measure. However, based on the team's knowledge of the measure, we believe the NTGR used in AlC's analysis is reasonable	N/A – Planning Value	Deemed

ENERGY STAR New Homes

Program Year	Type	NT	GR	Justification	Method	Source			
Flogram Tear	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justilication	Methou				
PY1	Value Applied	N/A	N/A	No program					
(6/1/08-5/31/09)	NTG Research Results	IN/A	IN/A	No program					
PY2	PY2 Value Applied		N/A	No program					
(6/1/09-5/31/10)	NTG Research Results	N/A	N/A	No program					
PY3 (6/1/10-5/31/11)	Value Applied	0.80	0.80	Program is a small percentage of the portfolio and does not justify EM&V dollars to estimate NTG.	N/A - Deemed	Deemed			
	NTG Research Results	N/A	N/A	No research conducted					
PY4 (6/1/11-5/31/12)	Value Applied	0.80	0.80	Program is a small percentage of the portfolio and does not justify EM&V dollars to estimate NTG.	N/A - Deemed	Deemed			

Bus dans Value		NT	GR	Local Constant	Markani	C
Program Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source
	NTG Research Results	N/A N/A		No research conducted		
PY5 (6/1/12-5/31/13)	Value Applied	0.80	0.80	Program is a small percentage of the portfolio and does not justify EM&V dollars to estimate NTG.	N/A - Deemed	Deemed
	NTG Research Results	N/A	N/A	No research conducted		
PY6 (6/1/13-5/31/14)	Value Applied	0.80	0.80	Program is a small percentage of the portfolio and does not justify EM&V dollars to estimate NTG.	N/A - Deemed	Deemed
	NTG Research Results (available 12/12/2014)	Overall - 0.42 SF Only - 1.01	1.01	N/A	Customer self-report. Interviews with 5 builders out of around 42 builders who built single-family homes representing 27% of single-family homes.	PY6 Evaluation
PY7 (6/1/14-5/31/15)	Value Applied	0.80	0.80	Program is a small percentage of the portfolio and updated AIC specific value not yet available.	N/A - Deemed	Deemed
	NTG Research Results	No research cond	ucted			
DVO	Value Applied	Overall - 0.42 SF Only - 1.00	1.01	Most recent AIC specific value available	See PY6 NTG research results	PY6 Evaluation
PY8 (6/1/15-5/31/16)	NTG Research Results	SF Homes -0.57	SF Homes -0.54	N/A	Customer self-report. Interviews with 13 builders out of 72 builders who participated in the program.	PY8 Evaluation
PY9 (6/1/16-5/31/17)	Recommended	SF Only - 1.00	1.01	Most recent AIC specific value available	See PY8 NTG research results	PY6 Evaluation
PY10 (1/1/18- 12/31/18)	Recommended	SF Homes -0.57	SF Homes -0.54	Most recent AIC specific value available	See PY8 NTG research results	PY6 Evaluation

opiniondynamics.com

Home Efficiency Standard

Drogram Voor	Type	N1	rgr .	Justification	Method	Source	
Program Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justilication	Method	Source	
PY1 (6/1/08-5/31/09)	Value Applied	0.76	N/A	Retrospective application	N/A - Deemed Value	Deemed	
(0/1/08-3/31/09)	NTG Research Results	N/A	N/A	No research condu	ucted		
PY2 (6/1/09-5/31/10)	Value Applied	Insulation – 0.63 Air Sealing – 1.00 CFLs – 0.75 Aerators – 0.99 Showerheads – 0.97 Pipe Wrap – 0.93	N/A	Retrospective	Customer self-report for CFLs, faucet aerators, low flow showerheads, pipe wrap; 72 surveys		
	NTG Research Results (available 1/28/11) Insulation - 0.63 Air Sealing - 1.00 CFLs - 0.75 Aerators - 0.99 Showerheads - 0.97 Pipe Wrap - 0.93		N/A	application	completed from a population of 2,987. Secondary research for insulation and air sealing.	PY2 Evaluation	
PY3 (6/1/10-5/31/11)	Value Applied	Insulation – 0.92 Air Sealing – 0.99 CFLs – 0.75 Aerators – 0.99 Showerheads – 0.97 Pipe Wrap – 0.93	Insulation – 0.97 Air Sealing – 1.04 Aerators – 1.04 Showerheads – 1.01 Pipe Wrap – 0.98	Application of most recent research available	Deemed from PY2 for CFLs, faucet aerators, low flow showerheads, pipe wrap; Updated secondary research for insulation and air sealing.	PY2 Evaluation & Secondary Research	
	NTG Research Results	Insulation – 0.92 Insulation – 0.97 Air Sealing – 0.99 Air Sealing – 1.04		Updated secondary research from PY2 to include spillover.			
PY4 (6/1/11-5/31/12)	Value Applied	Insulation – 0.88 Air Sealing – 0.88 CFLs – 0.97 Aerators – 0.86 Showerheads – 1.05 ESHP – 0.92	Insulation - 0.80 Air Sealing - 0.83 Aerators - 0.75 Showerheads - 0.82 T-Stat - 0.87* ESHP - 0.80	Retrospective application	Customer self-report. 201 surveys completed from a population of 4,627. *The thermostat value is based on a	PY4 Evaluation	

Duaguaya Vasu	Turns	N	rgr .	Justification	Mathad	Cauraa			
Program Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source			
	NTG Research Results	Insulation – 0.88 Air Sealing – 0.88 CFLs – 0.97 Aerators – 0.86 Showerheads – 1.05	Insulation - 0.80 Air Sealing - 0.83 Aerators - 0.75 Showerheads - 0.82 T-Stat - 0.87		deemed planning assumption given that there were insufficient participants to develop a new value.				
PY5 (6/1/12-5/31/13)	Value Applied	Insulation - 0.88 Air Sealing - 0.88 CFLs - 0.97 Aerators - 0.86 Showerheads - 1.05 ESHP - 0.92	Insulation – 0.80 Air Sealing – 0.83 Aerators – 0.75 Showerheads – 0.82 T-Stat – 0.87 ESHP – 0.80	No program change or market change Previous IL EM&V NTG exists: Yes	See PY4	PY4 Evaluation			
	NTG Research Results	No research performed							
PY6	Value Applied	Insulation – 0.88 Air Sealing – 0.88 CFLs – 0.97 Aerators – 0.86 Showerheads – 1.05	Insulation – 0.80 Air Sealing – 0.83 Aerators – 0.75 Showerheads – 0.82 T-Stat – 0.87	No program or market change	See PY4	PY4 Evaluation			
(6/1/13-5/31/14)	NTG Research Results	Insulation – 0.78 Air Sealing – 0.71 CFLs – 0.82 Aerators – 0.92 Showerheads – 0.86	Insulation – 0.78 Air Sealing – 0.72 Aerators – 0.94 Showerheads – 0.91 T-Stat – 0.87	N/A	Customer self-report. 238 surveys completed from a population of 2,997.	PY6 Evaluation			
PY7 (6/1/14-5/31/15)	Value Applied	Insulation – 0.88 Air Sealing – 0.88 CFLs – 0.97 Aerators – 0.86 Showerheads – 1.05	Insulation – 0.80 Air Sealing – 0.83 Aerators – 0.75 Showerheads – 0.82 T-Stat – 0.87	Most recent AIC value available	See PY4	PY4 Evaluation			
	NTG Research Results	No research conducted							
PY8 (6/1/15-5/31/16)	Value Applied	Insulation – 0.78 Air Sealing – 0.71 CFLs – 0.82 Aerators – 0.92 Showerheads – 0.86 T-Stat – 0.87	Insulation – 0.78 Air Sealing – 0.72 Aerators – 0.94 Showerheads – 0.91 T-Stat – 0.87	Most recent AIC value available	See PY6	PY6 Evaluation			

Program Year	Туре	N	rgr -	Justification	Method	Source	
	Турс	Electric	Gas	Justinication	Method	Jource	
	NTG Research Results	No research conducted					
PY9 (6/1/16-5/31/17)	Recommended	Insulation - 0.78 Air Sealing - 0.71 CFLs - 0.82 Aerators - 0.92 Showerheads - 0.86 T-Stat - 0.87 Insulation - 0.78 Air Sealing - 0.72 Aerators - 0.94 Showerheads - 0.91 T-Stat - 0.87		Most recent AIC value available	See PY6	PY6 Evaluation	
PY10 (1/1/18-12/31/18)	Recommended	Insulation – 0.78 Air Sealing – 0.71 CFLs – 0.82 Aerators – 0.92 Showerheads – 0.86 T-Stat – 0.87	Insulation – 0.78 Air Sealing – 0.72 Aerators – 0.94 Showerheads – 0.91 T-Stat – 0.87	Most recent AIC value available	See PY6	PY6 Evaluation	

Moderate Income Kits

Program Year	Туре	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source	
r rogram rear	1300	Electric	Gas	Justinication	metriou	Cource	
PY8 (6/1/15-5/31/16)	Value Applied	1.0	1.0	Consensus reached between ICC and AIC that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A - Deemed	Deemed	
PY9 (6/1/16-5/31/17)	Recommended	1.0	1.0	Consensus reached between ICC and AIC that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A - Deemed	Deemed	
PY10 (1/1/18-12/31/18)	Recommended	1.0	1.0	Consensus reached between ICC and AIC that program design merits NTGR of 1.0	N/A - Deemed	Deemed	

Rural Efficiency Kits

Program	T	NTG	SR ST								
Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source					
PY1 - PY5	N/A - No program										
PY6 (6/1/13-	Value Applied	CFLs - 0.71 Showerheads - 0.77 Faucet aerators - 0.46 Water heater temp adjustment - 0.46	N/A	IPA Program	N/A - Deemed	Docket 12- 0544 (IPA filing)					
5/31/14)	NTG Research Results	No research conducted									
PY7 (6/1/14-	Value Applied	CFLs - 0.85 Showerheads - 0.95 Faucet aerators - 1.00 Water heater temp adjustment - 1.00	N/A	Not a new Program, but no previous EM&V NTG exists	Secondary research: 2013 unpublished Midwest utility's evaluation of a very similar program (participant survey, n=91).	Secondary research					
5/31/15)	NTG Research Results (available 1/7/2016)	14-watt CFLs - 0.63 23-watt CFLs - 0.54 1.75gpm Showerhead - 0.92 1.0gpm Bath F. Aerator - 1.08 2.0gpm Kitchen F. Aerator - 0.99 Hot Water Temp Card Therm 1.13	1.75gpm Showerhead – 0.83 1.0gpm Bath F. Aerator – 0.99 2.0gpm Kitchen F. Aerator – 0.90 Hot Water Temp Card Therm. – 1.04	N/A	Customer self-report method. 70 interviews completed from a population of 9,781 contacts.	PY7 Evaluation					
PY8 (6/1/15- 5/31/16)	Value Applied	CFLs - 0.85 Showerheads - 0.95 Faucet aerators - 1.00 Water heater temp adj 1.00	N/A	Not a new Program, but no previous EM&V NTG exists	See PY7 value applied	Secondary research					
3/31/10)	NTG Research Results	No research conducted									
PY9 (6/1/16- 5/31/17)	Recommended	14-watt CFLs - 0.63 23-watt CFLs - 0.54 1.75gpm Showerhead - 0.92 1.0gpm Bath. Faucet Aerator - 1.08 2.0gpm Kitchen Faucet Aerator - 0.99 Hot Water Temp Card Therm 1.13	1.75gpm Showerhead – 0.83 1.0gpm Bath. Faucet Aerator – 0.99 2.0gpm Kitchen F. Aerator – 0.90 Hot Water Temp Card Therm. – 1.04	Most recent AIC values available	See PY7 NTG research results	PY7 Evaluation					
PY10 (1/1/18- 12/31/18)	Recommended	14-watt CFLs - 0.63 23-watt CFLs - 0.54 1.75gpm Showerhead - 0.92	1.75gpm Showerhead – 0.83 1.0gpm Bath. Faucet Aerator – 0.99 2.0gpm Kitchen F. Aerator – 0.90	Most recent AIC values available	See PY7 NTG research results	PY7 Evaluation					

Program Type		NTG	R	Justification	Mathad	Sauraa
Year	Year Type	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source
		1.0gpm Bath. Faucet Aerator – 1.08 2.0gpm Kitchen Faucet Aerator – 0.99 Hot Water Temp Card Therm. – 1.13				

Elementary Education Kits

Program Year	Type	NTG	iR	Justification	Method	Sauraa
	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justilication	Metriod	Source
PY10 (1/1/18-12/31/1	Recommended	LEDs - 0.83 Showerheads - 1.05 Faucet Aerators - 1.04 Water Heater Setback - 1.00 Other Non-Lighting Measures - 1.00	Showerheads – 1.05 Faucet Aerators – 1.04 Water Heater Setback – 1.00 Other Non-Lighting Measures – 1.00	No Illinois- specific value available	Avg. of Values from Similar Programs (SAG consensus values for PY9 School Kits Program)	Secondary research

Online Assessment Kits

Program Year Type	NTGR		Justification	Mathad	Sauraa	
	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source
PY10 (1/1/18- 12/31/18)	Recommended	LEDs – 0.70 Other Non-Lighting Measures – 0.90	Other Non- Lighting Measures – 0.90	No Illinois-specific values available for this delivery mode. This value is Illinois-specific, and unpublished evaluations of similar programs for another Midwestern utility indicate that this is a reasonable assumption.	Secondary research: Evaluation of an Online Kits Program offered by another Midwestern utility	Secondary research

LED Awareness Kits

Program Year	T	NTGR		bookista aktau	Madead	Course	
Program tear	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source	
PY10 (1/1/18-12/31/18)	Recommended	LEDs - 0.85	I IN/A	Delivery mode of this program is new, but is similar to a combination of existing programs	Avg. of values from similar programs	Combination of Rural Kits, School Kits, CFL Distribution, and Moderate Income Kits values	

Savings through Efficient Products (STEP)

		NTGR					
Program Year Type		Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source	
PY10 (1/1/18-12/31/18)	Recommended	0.90	0.90	Most recent Illinois specific value available	Secondary research	Most recent DCEO evaluation of this program	

Community LED Distribution

	Туре	NTGR					
Program Year		Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source	
PY10 (1/1/18-12/31/18)	Recommended	1.00	N/A	Best available secondary data	N/A – Planning Value	2013 Ameren Missouri Evaluation	

Single-Family Moderate Income

Program Year	Туре	NT	GR	lucaisi a sai an	N/Louble of	Source
		Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	
PY10 (1/1/18- 12/31/18)	Recommended	LEDs - 0.91 Faucet Aerators - 0.96 Showerheads - 0.93 Air Sealing - 0.86 Insulation - 0.89 Programmable Thermostat - 0.94 Smart Thermostat - N/A Other Non-Lighting Measures - 0.90	LEDs- N/A Faucet Aerators - 0.97 Showerheads - 0.96 Air Sealing - 0.86 Insulation - 0.89 Programmable Thermostat - 0.94 Smart Thermostat - N/A Other Non-Lighting Measures - 0.90	At this time, it is unclear whether this program would include only low to moderate income customers or allow some higher-income customers to participate. Given the possibility of a more heterogeneous participant population, we recommend these values. However, if the final program design ultimately limits program participants to those meeting low or moderate income requirements, the evaluation team will apply a NTGR of 100% for these measures.	Avg. of values from similar programs	Average of PY9 HES and HEIQ

Large C&I

Program Year	Туре	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source
		rani Tear Type		Gas	Justilication	Method
PY7 (6/1/14-5/31/15)	Recommended	0.72	0.72	 New Program: Yes Previous EM&V NTG exists: No 	Developed NTGR based on existing values from large customers who participated in the C&I Custom Program in PY3 and PY5. Original values are based on participant self-report. Overall, the data are from 28 surveys completed from a population of 96. See the Custom section for additional details on the overall methodology.	PY3 and PY5 Custom evaluation data

All Electric Homes

Program Year	Туре	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source
i logialli leai		Electric	Gas	Justilication	Wethou	Source
PY1 - PY5	N/A - No program					
PY6 (6/1/13-5/31/14)	Value Applied	CFLs 0.88 Showerhead 0.82 Faucet Aerator 0.73 Water Heater Setback 1.00 Air sealing 1.00 (at audit) and 0.80 Insulation 0.77 HVAC Measures 0.90	N/A	IPA Program	N/A - Deemed	Deemed
	NTG Research Results (available – 2/28/2014)	Single-Family Low-Impact 0.76 Single-Family High-Impact 1.02 Single-Family Overall 1.00 Multifamily High-Impact 1.00	N/A	N/A	Participant self- report. 22 surveys completed from population of 69.	PY6 Evaluation
PY7 (6/1/14-5/31/15)	Recommended	CFLs 0.88 Showerhead 0.82 Faucet Aerator 0.73 Water Heater Setback 1.00 Air sealing 1.00 (at audit) and 0.80 Insulation 0.77 HVAC Measures 0.90	N/A	IPA Program	N/A - Deemed	Deemed
PY8 (6/1/15-5/31/16)	Recommended	Single-Family Low-Impact 0.76 Single-Family High-Impact 1.02 Single-Family Overall 1.00 Multifamily High-Impact 1.00	N/A	Updated to reflect primary research	See PY6	PY6 Evaluation

Residential Efficient Products

Due sue ve Veeu	Toma	NTGR		lugatificantia o	Madhad	Cauras	
Program Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justification	Method	Source	
PY1	Value Applied	NI/A	N1 /A	No program			
(6/1/08-5/31/09)	NTG Research Results	N/A	N/A				
PY2	Value Applied	N/A	N/A	No program			
(6/1/09-5/31/10)	NTG Research Results	19.1	7				
PY3 (6/1/10-5/31/11)	Value Applied	0.80	0.80	In PY3, this program was part of Lighting and Appliances, and NTG was deemed at 0.80 for appliances.		Deemed	
	NTG Research Results	N/A	N/A	No research conducted			
PY4	Value Applied	Room AC/Dehumidifier/Air Purifier 0.78 Thermostat—Elec Heat/Thermostat—AC/Power Strips/H.P. Water Heater 0.86	0.90	Retrospective	Customer self- report. 190 surveys	DV4 Evaluation	
(6/1/11-5/31/12)	NTG Research Results (available 12/12)	Room AC/Dehumidifier/Air Purifier 0.78 Thermostat—Elec Heat/Thermostat—AC/Power Strips/H.P. Water Heater 0.86	0.90	application completed from a population of 12,117.		PY4 Evaluation	
PY5 (6/1/12-5/31/13)	Value Applied	Room AC/Dehumidifier/Air Purifier 0.78 Thermostat—Elec Heat/Thermostat—AC/Power Strips/H.P. Water Heater 0.86	0.90	 Program change: No Market change: No New Program: No Previous IL EM&V NTG exists: Yes 	See PY4	PY4 Evaluation	
	NTG Research Results	N/A	N/A	No research conducted			

Drogram Voor	Tymo	NTGR		Justification	Method	Source	
Program Year	Туре	Electric	Gas	Justilication	Method	Source	
PY6 (6/1/13-5/31/14)	Value Applied	Room AC/Dehumidifier/Air Purifier 0.78 Thermostat—Elec Heat/Thermostat—AC/Power Strips/H.P. Water Heater 0.86		 Program change: No Market change: No New Program: No Previous IL EM&V NTG exists: Yes 	See PY4	PY4 Evaluation	
	NTG Research Results	N/A	N/A	No research conducted			

opiniondynamics.com

For more information, please contact:

Hannah Howard Managing Director

510 444 5050 tel 510 444 5222 fax hhoward@opiniondynamics.com

1000 Winter Street Waltham, MA 02451



Boston Headquarters	San Francisco Bay	San Diego
617 492 1400 tel	510 444 5050 tel	858 270 5010 tel
617 497 7944 fax	510 444 5222 fax	858 270 5011 fax
800 966 1254 toll free		
	1 Kaiser Plaza	7590 Fay Avenue
1000 Winter St	Suite 445	Suite 406
Waltham MA 02451	Oakland CA 94612	La Jolla CA 92037