

From: Fitch, Julie A.
Sent: 2/25/2010 11:18:05 AM
To: Dietz, Sidney (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SBD4);
Michael.Hoover@sce.com (Michael.Hoover@sce.com);
pvillegas@semprautilities.com (pvillegas@semprautilities.com)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Re: Meeting at 130

I am happy to hear from the utility experts some ideas for how to move forward. But just as you aren't interested in hearing how great the reports are, I am equally uninterested in generalized bashing of the reports. Saying we can't use them at all for verification is not productive. We are not going to be able to totally deep six all of these even if we wanted to. I would like to have a productive exchange of ideas but the attitude you are bring in does not seem to lead to a useful exchange. We are open to listening to productive ideas but not to being beat up for doing what the commission orders require.

Julie

From: Michael.Hoover@sce.com
To: Sidney Dietz ; Pedro Villegas
Cc: Fitch, Julie A.
Sent: Thu Feb 25 11:10:03 2010
Subject: Fw: Meeting at 130

You all should respond to Julie with attendees. I am not sure where we are headed today.

From: Michael Hoover
Sent: 02/25/2010 11:06 AM PST
To: "Fitch, Julie A." <julie.fitch@cpuc.ca.gov>
Subject: Re: Meeting at 130

I thought we were going to brainstorm what we should do. We can file a PTM if we have to. The bottom line is that the reports are so flawed that they can't be used for verification no matter how hard we try. If all we want to do today is listen how great they are then I will send my folks home now.

I know that at least skills from PGE and Athena will be there.

From: "Fitch, Julie A." [julie.fitch@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: 02/25/2010 11:01 AM PST
To: Michael Hoover
Subject: Re: Meeting at 130

Ok, just recognize that we are constrained by what the commission ordered us to do, so we don't have complete freedom.

Who specifically is coming from the other utilities, can you let me know?

Thanks.

Julie

From: Michael.Hoover@sce.com
To: Fitch, Julie A.
Sent: Thu Feb 25 10:39:01 2010
Subject: Re: Meeting at 130

Thanks julie,

No lobbying and we tried to put together an agenda but decided your idea to Brainstrom what to do going forward is the best we can do in an hour and a half. All the IOUs have the EMV gurus in attendance including Marian Brown from SCE.

Our bottom line is that the reports have value but not in term of providing detailed information on program savings. The high impact measure approach is great for some things but not for estimating KWH savings.

My objective is figure out what to do with the reports.

From: "Fitch, Julie A." [julie.fitch@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: 02/25/2010 10:22 AM PST
To: Michael Hoover
Subject: Meeting at 130

Hi Mike,

I haven't seen a requested agenda for this afternoon. In the absence of input, I assume we will want to talk about:

- high impact measure approach
- net to gross
- effect of the economy
- spillover

I want to emphasize that we want this to be an exchange by the evaluation experts from the utilities and our staff, not regulatory lobbying on outcomes. Can we get a list of who you expect to be coming from the utility side?

Thanks.

Julie