

California Energy Commission

DOCKETED

12-HERS-01

TN # 75614

APR 10 2015

April 10, 2015

We would like to thank the Energy Commission for resuming this process in a structured, transparent manner.

The Energuy is a team of professionals that works throughout the State of California. We have interacted with hundreds of HVAC Contractors and thousands of home owners since our inception. We use technology and our experience to create solutions that bring value to our customers.

Before we get into more specifics, we would like to explain our methodology for our comments and opinions. Keep in mind that our comments are tailored for the alterations market as this is our company focus. We have asked ourselves two specific questions to each area of discussion. The questions are:

- 1) Does the proposed change bring about a simplification of the current system?
- 2) Does the proposed change benefit the homeowner by ensuring that they are achieving the energy savings that are intended by this process?

In the chart below, we will list the topic, our comments and/or our suggestions. Finally, in the Columns listed as #1 and #2, we will give and answer to the questions above. We will limit our answers to: Yes, No, Neutral.





Topic	Comment/Recommendation	#1	#2
What improvements can be made to the current QA requirements?	Compliant raters need to be rewarded with a lower QA requirements. Currently, there is a minimum of 1% of infield verification per measure. We would like to see two changes. First, change the requirement to 1% per tested system. Second, once a Rater has successfully passed 3 QA verifications, the requirement would change to .5% of tested systems	Yes	Yes
	Providers need to be encouraged to use technology to develop more innovative ways to complete their QA requirements. I encourage the Energy Commission to adopt language that will entice providers to improve the efficiency of the QA process.	Yes	Yes
How can we improve the current decertification process and how will that affect other providers and the HERS rating company, if applicable?	Providers, as a group, should develop a standardized set of policies that are adopted by all providers. We believe that while the Energy Commission develops the regulations, the industry should make every effort to use its collective knowledge to self regulate. Peer based ideas are more acceptable and easier to implement. This could be reviewed and amended once every code cycle.	Yes	Neutral
Conflict of interest	While there are many areas that have been raised as a potential conflict of interest, we believe the most glaring is the financial relationship between the Rater and the Contractor. We believe that in order to remain at arm's length, truly, the homeowner must be the payor for the FV/DT services. Homeowners would be more engaged in the process and collectively be more educated about the benefits of the verifications.	Neutral	Yes





We have also listed questions requiring a yes/no answer in the chart below:

Question	Answer
Should homeowners be notified of a QA failure?	
Should the disciplinary decision be overseen by an independent group?	
Should the Energy Commission seek to develop Rater disciplinary processes for Providers to adhere to?	
Should the owner/operator of a Rater Company be required to be a certified HERS Rater in good standing?	
Should corrective action taken against one Rater be applied to all Raters of a Rater Company	
Should individuals (not Raters) entering compliance document data into a HERS Registry need to be certified to do so?	
Should Contractors or their affiliates be prohibited from performing ratings on projects where they have installed energy efficient measures?	
Should HERS Providers be required to get certifications for all of the categories of Field Verification and Diagnostic Testing?	
Should HERs Providers be approved for only one segment of the market?	
Should Energy Commission develop uniform language for Provider training material, processes, etc.?	





While our team praises the CEC's desire to reduce conflict of interest, it must be said that until the Rater is paid directly by the homeowner, any discussion of conflict of interest is of little value. In addition, we ask the CEC to consider carefully any possible restrictions on the business of HERS Raters. If the industry is to flourish, Raters must be allowed to innovate in the marketplace in order to bring more value to their customers and grow their business.

We have seen through the implementation of the 2013 Building Standards that the increased complexity of the registries and the associated administrative processes has done little to entice HVAC contractors to comply with state regulations. We are going in the wrong direction. We need to allow stakeholders to innovate and find ways to make the process easier so that the true customer, the home owner, receives the energy savings that they have paid for.

Thank you,



Eric Beriault

