

**CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
DEMAND ANALYSIS WORKING GROUP (DAWG)**

**Meeting Notes
for
September 15, 2010**

**2nd Floor Conference Room
California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA**

**Dial-In: 866-740-1260
Participant code: 5859653#¹**

AGENDA

Catch up on the status of topic areas of interest to the Working Group and discuss plans for the Working Group going forward.

I. Welcome and Introductions

There were some new faces in the crowd as we launched our new “cycle” for the Working Group. Thus, we spent some time with brief introductions, for both new and existing members.

Mike Wu	CAISO, Loads and Resources group, working on the Summer Assessment
Cynthia Rogers	CEC, Demand Analysis Office -- tracks POU energy efficiency
Bill Junker	CEC, Demand Analysis Office -- manages the DAO
Don Schultz	CEC, Demand Analysis Office -- works on IEPR, in particular energy efficiency compilation and adjustments necessary for demand forecasts
Lara Ettenson	NRDC -- CA energy policy
Sierra Martinez	NRDC -- energy attorney
Cynthia Mitchell	Consultant for The Utility Reform Network (TURN) -- interested in energy efficiency, in particular attribution of savings, also, drivers of demand
Kim Mahoney	CPUC, Department of Ratepayer Advocates -- electricity pricing
Athena Besa	SDG&E -- energy efficiency policy and evaluation
Ken Schiermeyer	SDG&E -- demand forecasting
Lonnie Mansi	SDG&E -- energy efficiency evaluation
Zeynep Yucel	PG&E -- forecasting and load research
Phil Toth	SCE -- energy efficiency potential forecasting, coordination with IEPR
Johanna Benson	SCE -- demand forecasting
Damon Hanway	SCE -- energy efficiency policy and reporting
Nick Fugate	CEC, Demand Analysis Office -- works on IEPR, in particular energy efficiency compilation and adjustments necessary for demand forecasts
Chris Kavalec	CEC, Demand Analysis Office -- lead forecaster and “architect” for forecasting
Mike Jaske	Electricity Supply and Analysis -- founder of Working Group formerly known as DFEEQP

¹ 9578

Bill Knox	California Air Resources Board – tracks utility activity with respect in particular to GHGs and GHG reduction
Manual Alvarez	SCE – Lead on regulatory policy
Che McFarlin	CEC, Demand Analysis Office – tracking energy efficiency for POUs
Carmen Best	CPUC – Energy Efficiency Evaluation
Nat Skinner	CPUC – Lead analyst for Long Term Procurement Plans
Mike Messenger	Itron – Sr. Principal Energy Consultant, involved with topics including energy efficiency potential assessment
Sylvia Bender	CEC – Deputy Director, Electricity Supply and Analysis Division
(Via phone)	
Mike Cockayne	LADWP – lead forecaster, working also on load profiles and on energy efficiency potential study
Jaqueline Jones	SCE – forecasting, interface with IEPR
Ed Vine	Lawrence Berkeley National Lab/California Institute for Energy and Environment – research coordinator
Simon Baker	CPUC – Supervisor Energy Efficiency planning

**II. Discussion of meeting purpose(s)
Establish core purpose(s) and activities for WG during the next cycle -- All**

At least 3 key purposes of WG:

- Information (shared, in particular, to folks working in different arenas)
- Ensure proper info is collected/provided for demand forecasting purposes (e.g., aim for apples-to-apples comparison between impacts reported for different demand-side resources, from different players (IOUs, POUs, DG, CSI, etc.)
- Special projects/key issues (e.g., incremental-uncommitted EE)
- Others?

Committee structure:

Introduce proposed committee structure (see attached memo).

These goals were discussed (see details in attached memo). Members suggested that the word “ensure” (see above) might be too strong since it’s not clear that this group has power to “ensure” at this time. However by organizing and expressing an interest in topics, the group can ensure that certain perspectives are represented, and can express its opinions.

Members added to the list of objectives for the WG:

- Provide continuity for follow-up on previous discussions. E.g., NRDC is interested in follow up to comments on the forecast to understand changes (2009) from previous years.
- Ability to take a long-term perspective for collecting data that (among other things) can be used to create time series; to track impacts over an historical period.
- Create a forum where individuals working in different organizations and/or in different domains can speak a “common language” regarding technical matters.

Members of the group noted that consensus is useful but may not always be achieved given the diverse composition of the WG.

Also, members indicated that it will be important to define “outputs” for the WG and for the different committees.

Management of subgroups -- Each subgroup will identify membership and a leader.

- Subgroups will refine their charter and set a course and schedule for activities and accomplishments
- Subgroups will report in during each WG meeting

The group discussed whether to include demand response. Members considered this option, and decided to table it for the moment. The rationale is that demand response programs are “counted” as supply resources by Energy Commission and by the CAISO and IOUs in their accounting conventions, whereas the current charter of this group is focused on (longer-term) load modifying programs and activities.

LADWP noted the importance of this group for discussing issues such as the extent to which forecasters are required and/or encouraged to include policy directives in their forecasts as opposed to preparing forecasts that represent their best professional judgment regarding likely demand. The WG agrees that this is an important type of issue to surface.

The WG discussed whether there is a need for “demand forecasting protocols.” Energy Commission has promoted “common forecasting methodologies” (CFM) since the 1970s. Though in practice, this does not cover methodologies, per se, but rather, codifies a process for receiving forecasts from IOUs and POUs, receiving documentation, data, etc. The WG does not think that it would be valuable at this time to prepare or sponsor “protocols” for demand forecasting. However, the WG could cover topics such as the 10 most important things people would like to know about the demand forecast when it is produced, and could discuss issues such as the best way to incorporate uncertainty in demand forecasts.

III. New Name Contest

We are now the Demand Analysis Working Group!!!!!!!!!!!!!! (DAWG).

IV. Subgroup Roundup

A. Demand Forecast Committee

Relevant activities to date:

- **Demand Model Methodology Evaluation (DMME) – Kavalec, Goldstone**

An evaluation version of the DMME report has been prepared for internal Energy Commission management review. Part of it talks about improving QFER (quarterly fuel and energy report) data and re-organizing the Demand Analysis Office. An implementation group has been formed, with sub-groups for forecasting residential, industrial, commercial and peak. Chris K is the overall architect for the forecast.

A key appendix of the DMME report contains a proposal to make modeling results more transparent. The goal is to be able to increase transparency and create a framework for settling differences among stakeholders. There is discussion underway about some features of the proposed approach, including engagement by an expert panel.

Among the items being discussed is a “multi-resolution-uncertainty paradigm” which includes both high and low-resolution modeling. In other words, a multiplicity of approaches to modeling will be considered including triangulation from different approaches.

Most of the ideas in the DMME report might not be implemented until the 2013 IEPR.

- Completion of incremental-uncommitted peak impacts report – Kavalec

The incremental-uncommitted EE peak impacts report (supplement to 2009 IEPR) has been completed and can be viewed at the link below:

Incremental Impact of Energy Efficiency Policy Initiatives Relative to the 2009 Integrated Energy Policy Report Adopted Demand Forecast Main Report and technical appendix:

<http://www.energy.ca.gov/2010publications/CEC-200-2010-001/index.html>

And newest addition:

Weather-Induced Ranges for Incremental Uncommitted Energy Efficiency Peak Savings, Staff Paper. Supplement to the Energy Commission Committee Report: Incremental Impacts of Energy Efficiency Policy Initiatives Relative to the 2009 Integrated Energy Policy Report Adopted Demand Forecast. Publication number CEC-200-2010-005.

- **2011 IEPR initial thoughts on schedule – Kavalec**

Currently the schedule contemplates a preliminary forecast in May 2011 and a revised forecast in August. It is possible that these dates may become moved earlier due to other work the Commission has to accomplish.

The “trust and transparency” activities proposed in the DMME report (see above) may begin coming into play for the 2011 IEPR in a preliminary fashion, e.g., there will be staff workshops to discuss forecasting assumptions, and to identify issues and areas of agreement ahead of time.

Some of the planned upgrades for EE include:

- A new Residential Appliance Saturation Study (RASS) has been completed and information from this study will be incorporated in the forecast.
- The 2004 Commercial End Use Survey (CEUS) is still being revised, but will be incorporated into the 2011 forecast.
- The 2011 forecast will include another incremental-uncommitted EE product, and will also include upgrades for at least LADWP and SMUD.
- Also, Chris has been planning to estimate a model dealing with macro-efficiency. This could dovetail with some of CPUC’s interest in macro-consumption metrics.
- The 2009 forecast assumed continued growth at recent rates through 2020 for PV but in the new forecast a predictive model will be used that includes information regarding policy incentives (e.g., when CSI ratchets down in 2016), incentives, savings based on rates. A nonresidential PV model might also be developed, or at least begun.

Other thoughts on topics for discussion re: role of subgroup:

- Changes/Upgrades in 2011 IEPR Forecast
- Methodological Issues (e.g. incorporating uncertainty, CFM)
- Econ-demo assumptions and application in forecast
- Electrification (e.g. EVs, trains)
- Input to DMME Effort

The subgroup can be a place where issues such as which economic/demographic inputs to use and forecasting assumptions (e.g., electricity rates) can be discussed by members. Ideally these issues can be worked out ahead of the public workshops to present the draft and revised forecasts. In areas where the members still do not agree upon which data/information/assumptions should be used in the forecasts, at least these topic areas can be scoped out in advance which will allow discussions at public workshops to be targeted on particular issues.

Energy Commission is planning to hold a workshop on economic/demographic inputs, and is planning to have experts from organizations including the Department of Finance, Global Insight, University of the Pacific, etc. to discuss the status of the CA economy and implications for demand forecasts.

Also note that transparency guidelines being contemplated by Energy Commission would apply to all modeling results discussed in the IEPR proceeding, not just the Energy Commission's forecasts.

Energy Commission will be holding a workshop on Forms and Instructions for utilities submitting information for the 2011 IEPR. The initial workshop will be on October 14 (though the information is not due to Energy Commission for several months).

Chris Kavalec will serve as leader of this subgroup.

B. Energy Savings Subgroup

Relevant activities to date:

- **ARRA (Federal Stimulus) EE – Schultz**

EM&V for the CEC's ARRA programs will start soon – there will be some data collection in September/October, but they are still deciding how much EM&V to do and at what level of detail. Note that a lot of the impacts are from deemed savings, but CEC has elected not to use DEER values.

Note there is an internal need to take the \$300 million in CA ARRA (federal stimulus) funding that is being implemented by Energy Commission into account in terms of EE in the forecast. This is complicated by the fact that some of the ARRA EE will be installed in the same premises where IOU EE is installed.

Indeed, overlapping EE is arising from the following sources:

- IOU
- POU
- ARRA/Stimulus
- Federal tax breaks.

An ad hoc group with CPUC and CEC staff has formed to discuss the associated evaluation issues.

- **CPUC Long Term Procurement Plan proceeding – Skinner**

The Order Instituting Rulemaking went out on May 6. This has a series of planning standards (all but RPS, EE, which came later). In mid-June Chris and Mike J. presented at an LTPP workshop discussing how EE numbers were stacked up against EE goals, including incremental uncommitted EE.

A scoping memo will be out very soon covering system planning and a schedule for Track II bundled plans.

The 2012 LTPP will hopefully kick off in early 2012 – plans are being made for this. A scoping memo is due for the 2010 LTPP – IOUs will likely file plans in early 2011, there will be hearings during the spring/summer of 2011, with a PD in November 2011 and a final decision in Dec 2011. (Then nearly immediately thereafter, kickoff of the 2012 LTPP).

- **2006-08, 2009 and 2010-12 CPUC Energy Efficiency Programs and Evaluation, Measurement & Verification – Best**

The 2006-08 final EM&V report is finished. This report presents the evaluated estimate of the savings achieved by the IOU portfolios for the 2006-2008 program cycle and includes findings and recommendations from the 2006-2008 evaluation studies finalized in February 2010. The results of the evaluation studies form the foundation for systematic updates to the utility-reported savings assumptions used to estimate portfolio and program savings and cost effectiveness, and also provide critical information for programmatic improvements and future savings estimates. California's \$2.1 billion IOU ratepayer investment in energy efficiency for the 2006 – 2008 program cycle resulted in over 6,000 GWh, 80 million therms, and over 1,100 MW in annual energy savings for program participants over the three-year program cycle. Approximately two-thirds of those savings would not have occurred without program intervention. Over the life of the measures installed by program participants, the savings are estimated to be over 66,000 GWh and over 1,000 million therms. The savings presented in the report represent savings that were confirmed through field evaluation work to verify that the energy efficient technologies were installed and are producing savings, and that they represent the savings directly attributable to the program intervention. As a point of comparison, the energy savings by the end of 2008 represent approximately 3.2% of electricity and 1.0% of the natural gas sold in that year.

URL: http://www.calmac.org/publications/2006-2008_Energy_Efficiency_Evaluation_Report.pdf

There will be a draft PD forthcoming for the RRIM incentive mechanism – it is likely there will be two PDs.

2009 EM&V is getting started. Will be using values from 2006-08 mostly – no primary data collection. A final tally is expected in September.

The 2010-2012 EM&V is getting underway. Two prime contractors have been selected – Itron and KEMA; and advisory team of consultants has also selected. There is no specific division of labor between Itron and KEMA. ED and the contractors are currently revisiting the list of activities to be accomplished per the April 2010 EM&V decision and determine the best way to

proceed. That decision is located at:

http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PUBLISHED/FINAL_DECISION/116710.htm . Currently 75 studies have been proposed and are being discussed/prioritized.

2010-2012 data will be reported in a common format and it will be possible to readily apply DEER values.

Three proposed 2010-2012 EM&V studies that are of particular interest to the DAWG are:

- Mandated study on energy efficiency savings decay
- Mandated study on macro-consumption metrics
- Assistance to saturation studies including Commercial End Use Saturation (CEUS)

- **POU EE /AB 2021 – McFarlin**

Energy Commission compares annual targets to actual energy savings and demand reduction in the IEPR and makes recommendations for improvements as needed.

The AB2021 Annual report is in the works and will be out in approximately one month.

POUs have to progress toward EE targets set in 2007 – and are currently working on the third progress report toward that goal.

The POUs need to provide for EM&V studies in their programs – there were 10 studies in 2009 for the 2007-2008 programs. The studies indicated high realization rates – but arguably the studies could have been more thorough. KEMA has reviewed the studies and has discussed a number of shortcomings. A progress report on this will likely come out in December. There will be training of POU staff.

Chris K and Don S. note that in the 2009 IEPR, Energy Commission DAO treated IOU and POU energy efficiency differently. For the IOUs the incremental-uncommitted projections were developed. This was not done for the POUs. For the 2011 IEPR, DAO is planning to repeat the incremental-uncommitted energy efficiency projection for IOUs and also for (at least) LADWP and SMUD.

- **Energy Commission Comments on CPUC Assigned Commissioner’s Ruling on 2012+ EE EM&V – Jaske**

Commissioner Grueneich’s office sought comments and reply comments on two rulings for re-vamping the CPUC’s EM&V process for 2013 and beyond. Energy Commission prepared a letter between Commissioners, and distributed the letter to the service list (Energy Commission is not a party to the proceeding thus it was a letter and not comments per se). The overarching issue discussed in these comments was that EM&V needed to support assessment of TMG efficiency impacts – in a total market gross measurement paradigm, all factors affecting demand (IOU and POU EE, and arguably other factors including DG) need to be addressed. Thus one of the ideas was that it might be appropriate for CPUC EE EM&V funds to be devoted to improving other areas of assessment and forecasting, e.g., codes and standards effects, POU EE, etc.

Other thoughts on topics for discussion re: role of Committee:

- What strategies are IOU and POUs using to incorporate recent EM&V results in their forecasts?

- How shall Energy Commission approach using 2006-08 (and 09) CPUC EM&V results in the next forecast?
- How shall Energy Commission approach using POU EM&V results in the next demand forecast?
- Additional attention to Low Income EE in the next cycle?
- Meeting or meeting topic to discuss naturally occurring conservation; price impacts on energy use?
- How to move forward on topics related to cumulative savings/savings decay.
- Interest in compilation of historic EE impacts?
- Research to better assess impacts of codes and standards relative to voluntary energy efficiency?

C. Goals and Potential Subgroup

(At this time, the WG determined that activities conducted as part of the goals and potential subgroup would be rolled together with the energy efficiency savings subgroup – but that this subgroup will exist as a placeholder for such time as there is an appropriate level of activity specific to goals and potential. Our meeting will still include reporting in on these topics.)

Relevant activities to date:

- **CPUC EE Potential and Goals Study Update – Baker**

CPUC is considering several options with regard to the new energy efficiency potential and goals studies. Energy Division is having discussions with Commissioner Grueneich to determine the best course of action

One option involves completing the energy efficiency potential and goals cycle in 2012. In this case a finished EE goals study need to be in place by approximately Q2 2011. This timeline would be necessary in order to allow time for policy guidance based on that study to be developed and vetted and for the IOUs to proceed with developing and preparing their portfolio plans in time to launch the 2013-2015 program cycle based on those policy directives. Given that this timeline would entail having an EE goals study completed in a few months, at best an attenuated goals update could be completed.

Another option would be to extend the current program cycle by an additional year (e.g., with a bridge year, similar to the PY 2009 add on to the 2006-2008 cycle) and start the new program cycle in 2014. This would allow completion of a larger scale EE goals study, though the timeline would still be tight. There may be other alternatives and/or nuances to be considered, but these two general options are currently being discussed.

Other thoughts on topics for discussion re: role of Committee:

- Total Market Gross – what does it mean, relationship to forecasts, goals, potential, strategic plan, etc.

The group discussed the importance of characterizing CPUC energy efficiency goals in terms of Total Market Gross, which is a new perspective. Given that TMG represents a new way of

tabulating the effects of (and measuring potential for) energy efficiency, the new energy efficiency goals study needs to consider this new perspective. A related concern is that it takes perhaps at least 18 months or so to do a traditional bottom-up energy efficiency potential study. A combination of these reasons points to the possibility that a scenario-based energy efficiency potential and/or goals study may be an appropriate approach to consider.

The WG also discussed CARB's (Knox) recommendation that goals/potential studies need to forge clearer links between energy efficiency and GHG reduction.

CPUC/ED agrees with the notion that these approaches may make sense, and notes that they intend to be strategic about how the EE goals process will proceed. It may not be necessary to do a measure-level bottom-up EE potential study. Indeed, there may be opportunities to leverage work on a macro-consumption metric in conjunction with and/or as part of characterizing CPUC energy efficiency savings goals.

Don S. recommends that one way of prioritizing resources would be to focus on key end uses in which there is remaining energy efficiency potential:

- Residential AC
- Commercial lighting
- Residential lighting

Cynthia M. noted that Nonresidential commissioning and retro-commissioning also represent a lot of EE potential and should be added to that list. Also, financing strategies for energy efficiency is an area with a lot of potential savings.

LADWP mentioned that the AB 2012 goal of a 10% load reduction by 2016, as amended by an EE potential study for a given service territory every 3 year is more realistic than achieving that 10% by a certain date, as a broad statewide goal independent of the available potential in a service territory. LADWP currently has a consultant working on an EE potential study, to be completed this fall. They are taking the Huffman bill into account, forecasting a 20% saturation of LEDs by 2020.

Also, the group discussed different interpretations regarding whether AB 2021's 10% reduction requirements include both voluntary programs and codes/standards.

D. Distributed Generation Subgroup

(At this time, the WG determined that activities undertake as part of the DG subgroup will be placed somewhat on hold as we focus on launching the first two subgroups – Demand Forecasting and Energy Savings. We will continue to monitor DG and will reach out to DG policymakers in preparation for launching this subgroup.)

V. Next Steps

- Kavalac and Best agreed to serve as leads for the two subgroups
- CEC will provide some support through Chris Ann Dickerson to the subgroup efforts
- Each of them will develop proposed charters and circulate among those interested in the subgroup
- Subgroups will consider meeting during October
- The next overall DAWG meeting will be Tuesday November 9 at CPUC.

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

DEMAND ANALYSIS WORKING GROUP

Working Group Participant List

Attended
09/15/10

	Last	First	Organization	Role	Email	Phone	Sub-Groups			
							DF	ES	Goals	DG
	Adkins	Thomas	SMUD	Marketing Services	tadkins@smud.org	916-732-6586				
	Alexander	Mike	PG&E	EE	maa6@pge.com	415-973-2392				
●	Alvarez	Manuel	SCE	forecasting	manuel.alvarez@sce.com	916-441-2369	X	X		X
	Aslin	Rick	PG&E	forecasting	rda3@pge.com	415-973-1101				
●	Baker	Simon	CPUC/ED	LTPP	seb@cpuc.ca.gov	415-703-5649		X	X	
●	Bender	Sylvia	CEC	DAO	sbender@energy.state.ca.us	916-653-6841				
●	Benson	Johanna	SCE	Forecasting	johanna.benson@sce.com	626-302-3244				
●	Besa	Athena	SDG&E	EE planning	abesa@semprautilities.com	858-654-1257				
●	Best	Carmen	CPUC	ED EM&V	cbe@cpuc.ca.gov	415-703-1797		X	X	
	Brown	Marian	SCE	EE EM&V	marian.brown@sce.com	606-812-7662				
	Cammorata	Jordana	CPUC	ED EE	jnc@cpuc.ca.gov	415-703-1606				
	Canning	Art	SCE	forecasting	Arthur.canning@sce.com	626-302-9633				
	Clinton	Jeanne	CPUC/ED	ED	cln@cpuc.ca.gov	415-703-1159				
●	Cockayne	Mike	LADWP	forecasting Resource	michael.cockayne@ladwp.com	213-367-0243	X			
	Codina	Rick	SMUD	planning	rcodina@smud.org	916-732-6817				
	Cox	Cheryl	CPUC/DRA CAD	EE Progs	cxc@cpuc.ca.gov	415-703-3027				
●	Dickerson	Chris Ann	Consulting	CEC consultant	cadickerson@cadconsulting.biz	510-562-1034	X	X	X	X
	Drew	Tim	CPUC/ED	EE EM&V	zap@cpuc.ca.gov	415-703-5618				
	Emmert	Robert	CAISO		remmert@caiso.com	916-351-2253				
●	Ettenson	Lara	NRDC	EE advocate	lettenson@nrdc.org	415-875-6100	X	X	X	

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION DEMAND ANALYSIS WORKING GROUP

Working Group Participant List

Attended
09/15/10

	Last	First	Organization	Role	Email	Phone	Committees			
							DF	ES	Goals	DG
	Fogel	Cathleen	CPUC	EE Planning	cf1@cpuc.ca.gov	415-703-1809				
	Franzese	Peter	CPUC	EE	pcf@cpuc.ca.gov	415-703-1926				
	Friedmann	Rafael	PG&E	EM&V	rafi@pge.com	415-972-5799				
●	Fugate	Nick	CEC	forecasting	nfugate@energy.state.ca.us	916-654-4219	X	X		X
●	Goldstone	Sy	CEC	forecasting	sgoldsto@energy.state.ca.us	916-483-7993	X	X	X	
	Gorin	Tom	CEC	forecasting	tgorin@energy.state.ca.us	916-654-4759				
●	Hanway	Darren	SDG&E Hirsch & Associates	EE	darren.hanway@sce.com	626-633-3023		X	X	
	Hirsch	Jeff	Associates	CPUC Advisor	jeff.hirsch@doe2.com	805-553-9000				
●	Jaske	Mike	CEC	forecasting	mjaske@energy.state.ca.us	916-654-4777	X			
	Johnson	Jaimi	LADWP	forecasting	jaimi.johnson@ladwp.com	213-367-2739				
●	Jones	Jaqueline	SCE	EE	Jacqueline.Jones@sce.com	626-302-8798				
●	Junker	Bill	CEC	forecasting	bjunker@energy.state.ca.us	916-654-4172	X	X	X	X
●	Kavalec	Chris	CEC	forecasting	ckavalec@energy.state.ca.us	916-654-5184	X			
	Korosec	Suzanne	CEC	IEPR	skorosec@energy.state.ca.us	916-654.4516				
	Kromer	Steve	CPUC MECT	Evaluation Elec&Gas Liason	skromer@gmail.com	510-655-1492				
●	Knox	Bill	ARB	CC	wknox@arb.ca.gov	916-324-0839		X	X	
	Lai	Peter	CPUC/ED	EE EM&V	ppl@cpuc.ca.gov	213-576-7087				
	Lewis	Kae	CEC	DAO	klewis@energy.state.ca.us	916-654-4176				

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION DEMAND ANALYSIS WORKING GROUP

Working Group Participant List

Attended
09/15/10

	Last	First	Organization	Role	Email	Phone	Sub-Groups			
							DF	ES	Goals	DG
	Linville	Carl	Aspen Environmental Group	CEC Consultant	CLinville@aspenerg.com	916-379-0350.				
●	Mahoney	Kim	CPUC	DRA	kmb@cpuc.ca.gov	415-703-2376				
	Mansi	Lonnie	SDG&E	EE	lmansi@semprautilities.com	858-654-1231		X		
	Martinez	Sierra	NRDC	Energy Advocate	smartinez@nrdc.org	415-875-6108				
	Masters	Matt	PG&E	Forecasting	mxmf@pge.com					
●	McFarlin	Che	CEC	EE	cmcfarli@energy.state.ca.us	916-651-0965				
●	Messenger	Mike	ITRON	CPUC consultant	mike.messenger@itron.com	510-844-2899				
	Miller	Ross	CEC	SAO	ross.miller@energy.state.ca.us	916-654-4892				
●	Mitchell	Cynthia	TURN	consultant	cynthiakmitchell@gmail.com	775-324-5300		X		X
	Modisette	Dave	CMUA		dmodisette@cmua.org					
	Richard	Oberg	SMUD	EE	ROberg@smud.org	916-452-3211				
	Peck	David	CPUC	DRA	david.peck@cpuc.ca.gov	415-703-1213				
	Patry	Dan	PG&E	State Agency Rep	dbp0@pge.com	415-973-4003				
	Ralff			Climate Policy & Planning						
	Douglas	Kristen	CPUC		krd@cpuc.ca.gov	415-703-2826				
	Ramaiya	Shilpa	PG&E	EE	srrd@pge.com	415-973-3186				
●	Rogers	Cynthia	CEC	DAO	crogers@energy.state.ca.us	916-651-9009		X		
	Rogers	Nika	CPUC	DRA	nlr@cpuc.ca.gov	415-703-1529				

Rufo

Mike

ITRON

CPUC consultant mike.rufo@itron.com

510-844-2881

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION DEMAND ANALYSIS WORKING GROUP

Working Group Participant List

Attended
09/15/10

	Last	First	Organization	Role	Email	Phone	Sub-Groups			
							DF	ES	Goals	DG
	Salazar	Irene	CEC	DAO	isalazar@energy.state.ca.us	916 657-4046				
	Sanstad	Alan	LBNL	EE/RE	ahsfor@eapx02.lbl.gov	510-486-6433				
●	Schiermeyer	Ken	SDG&E	Forecasting	kschiermeyer@semprautilities.com	858-654-1764				
●	Schultz	Don	CEC	Forecasting	dschultz@energy.state.ca.us	916-653-1614		X		X
	Seager	Jonathan	PG&E	EE Portfolio	j7se@pge.com	415-973-6410				
	Sharp	Glen	CEC	DAO	Gsharp@energy.state.ca.us	916-654-4764				
	Shelton	Jean	ITRON	CPUC consultant	jean.shelton@itron.com	858-724-2620				
	Shmidt	Yuliya	CPUC/DRA	EE Progs	ys2@cpuc.ca.gov	415-703-2719				
	Shumavon	Aram	CPUC/ED	LTPP	aram.shumavon@cpuc.ca.gov	415-703-5228				
●	Skinner	Nathanie I	CPUC/ED	LTPP	nws@cpuc.ca.gov	415-703-1393	X			
	Swanson	Jeffrey	PG&E	Forecasting	jksr@pge.com					
	Taginepes	Jorge	CPUC/ED	EE	jst@cpuc.ca.gov	415-703-2451				
	Tapawan- Conway	Zenaida	CPUC/ED	EE	ztc@cpuc.ca.gov	415-703-2624				
	Thomashefsky	Scott	NCPA		scott.thomashefsky@ncpa.org					
	Ting	Michael	Itron	CPUC Consultant	michael.ting@itron.com	510 844-2883				
	Tisdale	Matthew	CPUC/DRA	LTPP	mwt@cpuc.ca.gov	415-703-5137				
	Toth	Phil	SCE	DSM Planning	tothpr@sce.com	626-302-8027				
	Toyama	Nate	SMUD	planning	Ntoyama@smud.org	916-732-6685				

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION DEMAND ANALYSIS WORKING GROUP

Working Group Participant List

Attended
09/15/10

	Last	First	Organization	Role	Email	Phone	Sub-Groups			
							DF	ES	Goals	DG
	Tyler	Craig	PG&E Consultant	EE EE Research	craigtyler@comcast.net	510-841-8038				
●	Vine	Ed	CIEE	Director	edward.vine@uc-ciee.org	510-486-6047				
	Vonder	Tim	SDG&E	forecasting	Tvonder@semprautilities.com	856-654-1735				
	Walden	Dave	SCPPA		dwalden@scppa.org					
●	Wu	Mike	CAISO	Loads & Resources	mwu@caiso.com	916-608-5843	X			
●	Yucel	Zeynep	PG&E	Forecasting	zty1@pge.com	415-973-6775	X			
	Zettel	Nick	Redding	planning	nzettel@ci.redding.ca.us	530-339-7309				

30 August 2010

To: Working Group formerly known as Demand Forecast Energy Quantification Project (DFEEQP)
From: Chris Ann Dickerson, Working Group Project Manager
Subject: Proposed New Working Group Structure

The following proposal is based on a Working Group Executive Committee meeting on July 22. At this meeting we developed a proposed charter and structure for the group through the next Integrated Energy Policy Report (IEPR) cycle.

I. Mission

Contribute to California demand forecasts.

II. Objectives

1. Provide a forum for sharing information pertinent to demand forecasting in California, including inputs to and development of forecasts; models assumptions and techniques used to produce the forecasts; approaches for ensuring transparency; and, uses for demand forecast results.
2. Work to ensure that complete, accurate, and comparable information on the impacts of a) drivers of energy demand and b) programs, initiatives and policies designed to modify energy demand is collected and provided for demand forecasting purposes. Load modifying activities such as energy efficiency and distributed generation are of particular interest.
3. Facilitate inter-agency, inter-organizational and inter-disciplinary coordination to accomplish these goals.
4. Conduct special projects as necessary.

III. Committees

An important goal of the Working Group is to provide a forum for interaction between functional groups within and between organizations on topics related to demand forecasting, recognizing that in many cases these groups normally operate in separate arenas. While facilitating these interactions remains an important activity for the Working Group, it is also the case that details regarding certain topics are of more interest to some members than others. Thus, the Working Group will be implementing a committee-based structure with four committees to start. Meeting agendas will be developed with the committee structure in mind to facilitate participation; full Working Group meetings may also be convened as needed.

The four proposed committees are:

Demand Forecasting – Emphasis on modeling and forecasting issues including demand forecasting models, methods, techniques, assumptions, inputs, outputs and transparency.

Energy Savings – Emphasis on load impacts from energy efficiency, including historic, current and future accomplishments. Engage in particular with evaluation, measurement & verification (EM&V) activities wherein load impacts are reported and assembled. Programs implemented by investor-owned utilities and publicly owned utilities are of particular interest, as well as other statewide, federal and local initiatives likely to produce meaningful impacts. Work toward ensuring that a unit of load reduction in one venue is equivalent to a unit of load reduction from another venue and also comparable between energy efficiency and distributed generation.

Distributed Generation – Emphasis on load impacts from distributed generation, including historic, current and future accomplishments. Engage in particular with evaluation, measurement & verification (EM&V) activities wherein load impacts are reported and assembled. Combined heat and power, customer-side photo-voltaic and other small-scale self-generation programs implemented by investor-owned utilities and publicly owned utilities are of particular interest, as well as other customer driven, statewide, federal and local initiatives likely to produce meaningful impacts. Work toward ensuring that a unit of load reduction in one venue is equivalent to a unit of load reduction from another venue and also comparable between distributed generation and energy efficiency.

Potential and Goals – Emphasis on forecasting efforts aimed at estimating the impact or potential impact of load-modifying activities such as efforts to promote energy efficiency and distributed generation.

(See chart next page.)

IV. Meeting Schedule

Working Group meetings will be planned for the third Wednesday every other month; more frequently if needed, either for the full Working Group or, more likely, for particular Committees. Meeting agendas may focus on activity pertinent to particular Committees, the full Working Group or both.

Working Group Committees

Purpose: Contribute to CA demand forecasts

Demand Forecasting

- Methods
- Models
- Assumptions

Energy Efficiency

- Historic
- Current EM&V
- Forecasts

Distributed Generation

- CHP
- PV/DG
- Including CSI

Potential & Goals

- EE
- DG

All committees address IOU and POU programs, and other statewide and/or federal initiatives

V. New Working Group Name

As fond as we all are of the DFEEQP, a number of people have expressed over time that the acronym is difficult to conceptualize (and pronounce) and that furthermore, the group focuses on more than just energy efficiency. Therefore, a new name will be selected.

A number of candidates were suggested at the meeting, including:

- Demand Forecast Working Group (DFWG)
- Demand Forecast Working Group (DFoG)
- Demand Analysis Working Group (DAWG)
- Public Policy Forecasting Group (PPFG) and permutations thereof
- Demand Quantification Working Group (D-Quant; DQ)
- Demand Analysis Quantification Working Group (DA Quant; DAQ, D'Quant)

A final decision will be made during the full working group meeting on September 15.

VI. Next Steps

The next meeting will be held September 15 at the Energy Commission. The agenda will include a “round-up” of key activities and topics, discussion regarding the proposed new charter and committee structure, and selection of the new group name.