

From: Tagnipes, George S.
Sent: 6/30/2010 12:13:31 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: Ramaiya, Shilpa R (/o=PG&E/ou=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SRRd); McCarty, Steven (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SJM8); [Redacted]
[Redacted] [Redacted]
Bcc:
Subject: RE: 2006 - 2008 EM&V Costs With ET EM&V Costs Subtotalled

Thanks [Redacted] No questions on my end. We can close this thread.

George S. Tagnipes | 415.703.2451 (direct) | 415.703.2200 (facsimile) |
jst@cpuc.ca.gov
CPUC Energy Division - Energy Efficiency Section PLEASE VISIT
<http://eega2006.cpuc.ca.gov>

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Wed 6/30/2010 11:29 AM
To: Tagnipes, George S.
Cc: Ramaiya, Shilpa R; [Redacted] McCarty, Steven
Subject: RE: 2006 - 2008 EM&V Costs With ET EM&V Costs Subtotalled

George:

Upon further investigation of our data, we found that the costs we thought was exclusively ET costs were not. The Summit Blue order number we were using had ET and GP work charging to this order number. After backing out the GP costs, we confirmed that the figure you came up with is the correct figure to use for ET related costs.

Therefore, the costs that you show on your attached spreadsheet for PG&E in columns D and E for ET costs are correct.

Please call me if you have any questions.

[Redacted]

Redacted

Shareholder Incentive Analysis Group
Portfolio Optimization & Metrics

Redacted

From: Tagnipes, George S. [mailto:george.tagnipes@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Friday, June 25, 2010 2:54 PM
To: Redacted
Subject: RE: 2006 - 2008 EM&V Costs With ET EM&V Costs Subtotalled

Red
act

The ET EMV costs in spreadsheet "2006 - 2008 EMV costs_PGE.xls" can't be right. The total EMV budget for ET was \$1,996,000.

The % allocation for PGE on CMS is 46%.

At most, PGE would be responsible for 46% of \$1,996,000 or \$918,160.

But a lot of the costs were incurred in 2009, so the total should be even less.

Looking at our internal costs charged to PGE for ET I get \$336,975 for the last confirmed invoice through 2008 (see cell S25 in tab "ET Costs" of attached spreadsheet).

Another comparison is the monthly confirmed payments, same tab, column P. These total to \$1.7 million (cell R11) which is close to the \$1.996 million budget, which makes me think these numbers in column P make sense (there are still a few outstanding invoices to confirm).

In column Q, I break out what PGE's portion of the amounts in column P must be, using a 46% allocation factor.

The max amount in this column, which again represents PGE's allocation of the confirmed payments, is \$57,271, but the max payments in your spreadsheets is \$248,858. The average in column Q is \$26,072 while the average in column G of your pivot table is \$108,372.

So the numbers aren't jiving but your numbers are just way to high.

Any thoughts?

I'm going to send another email to the utils with this spreadsheet to make sure I got the numbers correct for the other issues.

George S. Tagnipes | 415.703.2451 (direct) | 415.703.2200 (facsimile) | jeorge.tagnipes@cpuc.ca.gov

CPUC Energy Division - Energy Efficiency Section PLEASE VISIT <http://eega2006.cpuc.ca.gov>

From: Redacted
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 4:40 PM
To: Tagnipes, George S.
Subject: 2006 - 2008 EM&V Costs With ET EM&V Costs Subtotal

Jorge:

Here is the spreadsheet we used to track the ET EM&V costs as compared to the overall EM&V costs.

<<2006 - 2008 EMV costs.xls>>
The 36 month costs are at the very bottom of the spreadsheet.

Please call me if you have any questions.

Redacted

Redacted

Shareholder Incentive Analysis Group
Portfolio Optimization & Metrics
245 Market St. Room 622

Redacted