From: Dietz, Sidney
Sent: 9/20/2010 11:40:34 AM
To: Tisdale, Matthew (matthew.tisdale@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Fw: PG&E's Energy Efficiency Savings in 2009

Matthew --

Sorry for the delay, we had to start over.

Here is Shilpa's response on the differences, in addition to what I think is the problem of comparing gross to net. Please let me know if you'd like more.

Have a good day!

yours,

sid

From: Ramaiya, Shilpa R
To: Dietz, Sidney
Sent: Mon Sep 20 10:42:32 2010
Subject: RE: PG&E's Energy Efficiency Savings in 2009

Matthew,

There are two drivers for the difference in savings between 2008 and 2009: DEER changes and less lighting (primarily CFLs).

We did a comparison of the 2008 savings with 2005 DEER and 2008 DEER (which underlies the 2009 savings report). For our stellar savings year 2008, the switch to the more recent DEER causes an approximately one-fourth reduction in kW savings, one-third reduction in kWh savings, and three-fourths reduction in therm savings (includes the introduction of negative interactive effects). Since it is difficult to run 2009 savings in both sets of DEER due to the changes to measure mapping and codes, running the 2008 year with both sets of DEER allows us to a see the single effect of updating DEER on our savings.

Then, we looked at our 2009 savings. When our 2008 and 2009 savings are run net (even though the goals are gross for 2009) and with the 2008 DEER assumptions, our electric savings are approximately 45% lower and our gas savings are approximately 80% higher in 2009 when compared to 2008. When we looked at this comparison more closely, we see that one of the main drivers is the amount of lighting measures (primarily CFLs) we delivered. Our lighting measures were two-thirds lower in 2009 than 2008. We also had a reduction in volume due to the poor economy which reduces customer commitments for large projects. We saw an increase in gas savings due to the interactive

effects from lower delivery of electric programs.

So yes, the DEER change itself has a significant effect and then the lower volume of primarily lighting has a compounding effect on the reduction of savings in 2009 when compared to 2008.

From: Ramaiya, Shilpa R
Sent: Monday, August 09, 2010 9:35 AM
To: Dietz, Sidney
Subject: RE: PG&E's Energy Efficiency Savings in 2009

We'll have a complete answer on Thursday. We have to run an E3.

From: Dietz, Sidney
Sent: Monday, August 09, 2010 9:25 AM
To: Ramaiya, Shilpa R
Subject: RE: PG&E's Energy Efficiency Savings in 2009

How are we doing on a complete answer for Matthew?

From: Ramaiya, Shilpa R
Sent: Thursday, August 05, 2010 1:29 PM
To: Dietz, Sidney
Subject: RE: PG&E's Energy Efficiency Savings in 2009

So the key is the DEER update. For our 2006-08 accomplishments, we used the 2005 DEER or ex ante. For our 2009 reporting, we were instructed to use 2008 DEER. Since 2008 DEER is worse, each widget is worth less in that it saves less. I'm going to see if Ed can run our numbers using the same DEER so we can have a direct comparison but that will take a few days. I think you should get back to Matthew with the quick DEER answer and let him know that we are trying to see if we can do an apples-to-apples comparison in the next couple days.

From: Dietz, Sidney
Sent: Thursday, August 05, 2010 9:24 AM
To: Ramaiya, Shilpa R
Subject: Re: PG&E's Energy Efficiency Savings in 2009

Thanks.

Do I seem terse? Blame the thumb keyboard.

From: Ramaiya, Shilpa R
To: Dietz, Sidney
Sent: Thu Aug 05 08:26:23 2010
Subject: RE: PG&E's Energy Efficiency Savings in 2009

Looking into it, I'll let you know. I'm not surprised our savings are lower given the lower budget, but I'll get the facts.

From: Dietz, Sidney
Sent: Wednesday, August 04, 2010 5:52 PM
To: Ramaiya, Shilpa R
Subject: Fw: PG&E's Energy Efficiency Savings in 2009

I can't open the attachment right now, but I know I'll need your help.

Do I seem terse? Blame the thumb keyboard.

From: Tisdale, Matthew <matthew.tisdale@cpuc.ca.gov>
To: Dietz, Sidney
Sent: Wed Aug 04 17:32:58 2010
Subject: PG&E's Energy Efficiency Savings in 2009

Hi Sid,

I asked staff to put together the attached comparison of PG&E's reported savings for 2009 compared to 2008. I read the comparison to say PG&E's reported energy savings in 2009 were 56% of its 2008 savings. This analysis got Commissioner Grueneich's attention in a big way. Could that be right? Will you have your staff take a look and follow up. If the analysis is right, what the drivers?

Thank you,

Matthew