

- Goals¹ - Energy savings targets established by the Commission for IOU programs in the 2006-2008 program cycle, as well as cumulative goals for 2004-2008. These goals have an annual, program cycle and multi-cycle cumulative dimension. The current goals are based on historical energy efficiency savings assumptions.
- Utility Reported Savings - Energy savings were based on the utility records of installed technologies and the savings from those technologies based on pre-evaluation assumptions.
- Evaluated Savings - Energy savings based on field research of the installations that were reported during the 2006-2008 program cycle.

In the following two tables the evaluated saving are presented in comparison to the savings goals for the program cycle (2006-2008) and for the cumulative goals period (2004-2008).

Combined, the utilities achieved roughly 70 percent of the statewide electric goals, and 63 and 63 percent of the MW and MMtherm goals respectively in the 2006-2008 program implementation period.

The energy efficiency savings goals that are in effect for the 2006-2008 cycle were developed from analyses conducted from 2002 to 2004. New information on energy efficiency market penetration, end user adoption rates, and per unit savings levels developed through evaluations and other research conducted since the original goals were developed may lead to incongruence between the savings estimates from the most recent evaluation results and the assumptions and data underlying the original energy efficiency forecasts used to support the CPUC's efficiency goals. The CPUC deliberately set challenging energy efficiency goals for the IOUs' 2006-2008 programs, and it appears that market forces are contributing to a larger share of energy savings than were forecasted in the studies used to inform the CPUC's goals. Additionally, it appears that market forces are contributing to a larger share of energy savings than were forecasted in the studies used to inform the CPUC's goals. Because Energy Division's evaluations are charged with estimating savings that are directly attributable to the utilities' programs, increases in market driven adoption of efficiency measures can result in a lower level of estimated savings for utility programs even though total societal savings from both utility program and market forces are significant.

¹ The goals that are currently in place were adopted in D. 04-09-060; September 23, 2004, were based on the data available at the time; and were considered "stretch goals." http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/word_pdf/FINAL_DECISION/40212.pdf

Table 23. Comparative of Program Cycle 2006-2008 Evaluated Results to Goals

	PGE	SCE	SDGE ²	SoCalGas	Total
Savings Goals					
PY 2006-2008					
Cumulative Savings (GWH)	2,826	3,135	638		6,599
Peak Savings (MW)	613	672	122		1,407
Cumulative Natural Gas Savings (MMTh)	45		10	57	112
EE Portfolio Savings (Reported)					
PY 2006-2008					
Cumulative Savings (GWH)	5,251	3,898	850		9,999
Peak Savings (MW)	845	690	147		1,682
Cumulative Natural Gas Savings (MMTh)	66		7	67	140
EE Portfolio Savings (Evaluated)					
PY 2006-2008					
Cumulative Savings (GWH)	1,766	1,959	364	0	4,089
Peak Savings (MW)	320	383	72	0	776
Cumulative Natural Gas Savings (MMTh)	22	0	3	32	57
50% C&S** Savings (Evaluated)					
PY 2006-2008					
Cumulative Savings (GWH)	157	162	37	0	356
Peak Savings (MW)	30	31	7	0	68
Cumulative Natural Gas Savings (MMTh)	2	0	0.2	3	6
EM&V Adjusted LIEE* Savings					
PY 2006-2008					
Cumulative Savings (GWH)	79	74	16		169
Peak Savings (MW)	16	16	4		36
Cumulative Natural Gas Savings (MMTh)	4		1	3	8
Performance against 2006-2008 goal					
Percent of GWH Goal	71%	70%	65%		70%
Percent of MW Goal	60%	64%	69%		63%
Percent of MMTh Goal	63%		37%	67%	63%

*LIEE = Low Income Energy Efficiency Programs

**Codes and Standards Savings from pre-2005 advocacy work

The Commission adopted cumulative goals starting in 2004 to encourage utilities to plan for long term savings and to make sure that savings that were not achieved in one cycle would be made up in the next cycle to continue to meet the cumulative goals. The Commission officially removed the savings for the 2004-2005 program cycle³ from the cumulative savings targets for the 2010-2012 cycle, but it did not explicitly remove it from the 2006-2008 cumulative savings goals. Therefore, the comparison of 2004-2008 accomplishments and the cumulative goals are presented in Table.

² SDGE goals reflect updates in D. 09-09-047; September 24, 2009 <http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PUBLISHED/GRAPHICS/107829.PDF>

³ Decision 09-05-037 http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/WORD_PDF/FINAL_DECISION/101543.PDF

Table 24. Comparative of Cumulative 2004-2008 Evaluated Results to Goals

	PGE	SCE	SDGE	SoCalGas	Total
Savings Goals					
PY 2004-2008					
Cumulative Savings (GWH)	4,313	4,788	1,175		10,488
Peak Savings (MW)	936	1,006	223		2,206
Cumulative Natural Gas Savings (MMTh)	64		13	77	154
EE Portfolio Savings (Reported)					
PY 2004-2008					
Cumulative Savings (GWH)	6,993	6,195	1,483		14,670
Peak Savings (MW)	1,202	1,219	268		2,689
Cumulative Natural Gas Savings (MMTh)	111		10	93	214
EE Portfolio Savings (Evaluated)					
PY 2004-2008					
Cumulative Savings (GWH)	2,764	3,457	707		6,927
Peak Savings (MW)	532	654	132		1,318
Cumulative Natural Gas Savings (MMTh)	41		7	43	92
50% C&S Savings (Evaluated)					
PY 2006-2008					
Cumulative Savings (GWH)	157	162	37		356
Peak Savings (MW)	30	31	7		68
Cumulative Natural Gas Savings (MMTh)	2		0	3	6
EM&V Adjusted LIEE Savings					
PY 2004-2008					
Cumulative Savings (GWH)	124	107	28		258
Peak Savings (MW)	25	22	7		54
Cumulative Natural Gas Savings (MMTh)	6		1	5	12
Performance against 2004-2008 Cumulative Goals					
Percent of GWH Goal	71%	78%	66%		72%
Percent of MW Goal	63%	70%	65%		65%
Percent of MMTh Goal	76%		66%	67%	71%

Combined, the utilities achieved roughly 72 percent of the statewide electric goals, and 65 and 71 percent of the MW and MM therm goals respectively in the 2004-2008 program implementation period. The increase in the therm savings relative to the goal reflects the dual effects of a reduced therm goal for PGE and SDGE and the fact that negative therm interactive effects were not included in the 2004-2005 evaluation studies.

The charts within Figure 35. Comparison of Evaluated Savings against the Commission Adopted Goals show the relative accomplishment of energy savings against both the 2004-2008 and 2006-2008 goals.