

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 7/28/2010 9:23:07 AM
To: Ramaiya, Shilpa R (/o=PG&E/ou=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SRRd); Baker, Simon (simon.baker@cpuc.ca.gov); ABesa@SempraUtilities.com (ABesa@SempraUtilities.com); Fogel, Cathleen A. (cathleen.fogel@cpuc.ca.gov); larry.cope@sce.com (larry.cope@sce.com); don.arambula@sce.com (don.arambula@sce.com); Premo, Anne W. (anne.premo@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc: Clinton, Jeanne (jeanne.clinton@cpuc.ca.gov); [Redacted]
[Redacted]
Bcc:
Subject: Petition For Modification Issues

All,

I have reviewed the DRAFT PFM issues on benchmarking and do find a few inconsistencies from our previous conversations. The main inconsistency, which I don't see reflected in the DRAFT, is that benchmarking should have two tracks. The DRAFT reflects one of these tracks, emphasizing benchmarking is only a "Customer Driven Process". We agreed on our June 10 call that if the IOUs are going to use Energy Star Portfolio Manager (ESPM), then benchmarking would be considered "customer driven", for which the customer would have to open an account, and the IOUs would provide the data upload. The IOUs would also provide pamphlets and training as needed to aid this process, but would not open the account for the customer.

The second track, which the CPUC has voiced numerous times, is the need for an "IOU Driven Process". This track would take advantage of other benchmarking tools, as it is understood that not all customers will open the ESPM account, and we don't want to miss the opportunity of benchmarking these customers.

We think both processes are doable as the IOUs already have the meter data from service accounts to provide an EUI for the buildings. Only using ESPM for the purposes of benchmarking was not the intent of the Decision D.09.09.047.

Simon is on vacation, and asked that I respond directly. I will also be out the rest of the week, and could discuss the PFM next week, Monday - Wednesday.

Best,

Redacted

----- Original Message -----

From: Alyssa.Cherry@sce.com <Alyssa.Cherry@sce.com>

To: Clinton, Jeanne; Baker, Simon

Cc: SRRd@pge.com <SRRd@pge.com>; abesa@semprautilities.com
<abesa@semprautilities.com>; Larry.Cope@sce.com <Larry.Cope@sce.com>;
Don.Arambula@sce.com <Don.Arambula@sce.com>

Sent: Mon Jul 19 09:27:15 2010

Subject: Petition For Modification Issues

Simon & Jeanne,

Pursuant to Energy Division's most recent direction, SCE is developing a Petition For Modification to address several implementation issues around the 2010-2012 portfolios. Attached are the key issues we plan to address; we expect to file this PFM by the end of this month. Please let us know if you have any questions or would like to discuss this further.

Thanks,

(See attached file: Petition For Modification Issues-Draft 7.19.10.doc)

Alyssa Cherry

Regulatory Group

Customer Energy Efficiency & Solar Division

Southern California Edison

Internal PAX 43129 External 626-633-3129

"The reward of a thing well done is to have done it." - Emerson

