

From: michael.hoover@sce.com

Sent: 2/25/2010 6:36:45 PM

To: Redacted Fitch, Julie A. (julie.fitch@cpuc.ca.gov); Ramaiya, Shilpa R (/o=PG&E/ou=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SRRd); Best, Carmen (carmen.best@cpuc.ca.gov); Drew, Tim G. (tim.drew@cpuc.ca.gov); Dietz, Sidney (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SBD4); Pedro Villegas (PVillegas@semprautilities.com); KMcKinley (KMcKinley@semprautilities.com); mgaines (mgaines@semprautilities.com); abesa (abesa@semprautilities.com); don.arambula@sce.com (don.arambula@sce.com); Tapawan-Conway, Zenaida G. (ZTC@cpuc.ca.gov); marian.brown@sce.com (marian.brown@sce.com); Walsh, Natalie (natalie.walsh@cpuc.ca.gov)

Cc:

Bcc:

Subject: RE: Follow up from utility/ED evaluation discussion

I think it needs to be clear that we do not agree that the studies are at all correct. In a sense, the proof is in the pudding and the studies make result in conclusions that we find questionable. The scenarios we will be proposing are alternatives to the studies that result in savings estimates that the Commission should consider as reasonable alternatives to the reports.

That is my understanding of what was agreed to.

**From:** "Fitch, Julie A." [julie.fitch@cpuc.ca.gov]

**Sent:** 02/25/2010 05:34 PM PST

**To:** Redacted <srdd@pge.com>; <sbd4@pge.com>; "Drew, Tim G." <tim.drew@cpuc.ca.gov>; "Fitch, Julie A." <julie.fitch@cpuc.ca.gov>; "Best, Carmen" <carmen.best@cpuc.ca.gov>; <abesa@semprautilities.com>; <kmckinley@semprautilities.com>; <mgaines@semprautilities.com>; "Pedro Villegas" <PVillegas@semprautilities.com>; Marian Brown; Michael Hoover; Don Arambula; "Tapawan-Conway, Zenaida G." <ztc@cpuc.ca.gov>; "Walsh, Natalie" <natalie.walsh@cpuc.ca.gov>

**Subject:** Follow up from utility/ED evaluation discussion

Hi everyone,

Thanks again for everyone who came today to discuss options for a path forward on EE evaluation results. Here is a summary of what I think we agreed for next steps:

1. The utilities will get together and make a prioritized list of no more than 10 key assumptions or drivers that could legitimately be questioned (where reasonable minds could come to different conclusions). I expect these will be things like net-to-gross, run hours for CFLs, installation rates for CFLs, error bounds for a particular study parameter, etc. For factors where the utilities prefer the use of a different value or assumption than the one ultimately included in the final evaluation

report for a particular area, the utilities will suggest a rational basis for departure from the consultant's conclusion, for discussion.

2. The utilities may or may not also group the assumptions or factors together in some way to suggest a few key scenarios (perhaps 2-3).
3. One of the scenarios that will always be presented in any reporting will be the conclusions from the ED/consultant evaluation studies. What we are seeking to do is potentially augment that analysis with a limited number of alternative options for the commission ultimately to consider.
4. The utilities will send via email by next Tuesday COB (hopefully?) their list of key factors where assumptions are suggested to differ. If the utilities have suggested grouping or scenarios by that point, those could be sent, too, or we could wait to discuss that part in person.
5. Energy Division will consult amongst ourselves about the schedule implications of running additional scenarios and then consult with the assigned Commissioner/ALJ about the best approach to the schedule and ultimate resolution of the issues. We will let you know no later than our meeting next week whether we think it's necessary for the utilities to file a petition to modify to revise the schedule or whether there is some other way we can handle it internally at the CPUC.
6. I suggest an in-person meeting next Thursday afternoon 1-5 p.m. in San Francisco to discuss the utility list, the underlying reasons for the suggestion to run different scenarios, and the ultimate scenarios to be analyzed. The goal of the meeting will be to agree on a reasonable set of additional scenarios to be run, but not necessarily on the correctness (or not) of the particular underlying values or assumptions.
7. We will all/each consult amongst ourselves about who to bring to the meeting. The PUC staff may bring a very few selected consultants, once we see the list from the utilities of issues/assumptions that you want us to look at. Edison or Sempra will look into booking the Opera Plaza community room for this purpose. If that doesn't work, perhaps we can utilize one of the CPUC training rooms or the Pacific Energy Center.

Let me know if next Thursday doesn't work for too many people, or if I am misrepresenting any of the above. Thanks again for a productive conversation today.

Regards,

Julie

---

Julie A. Fitch

Director, Energy Division

California Public Utilities Commission

505 Van Ness Avenue, 4th floor

San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone (415) 703-2059

Fax (415) 703-1464

email: [jf2@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:jf2@cpuc.ca.gov)

[www.cpuc.ca.gov](http://www.cpuc.ca.gov)