

From: Alyssa.Cherry@sce.com
Sent: 10/26/2010 4:29:34 PM
To: Tapawan-Conway, Zenaida G. (zenaida.tapawan-conway@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc: Hardy, Katherine (katherine.hardy@cpuc.ca.gov); larry.cope@sce.com (larry.cope@sce.com); don.arambula@sce.com (don.arambula@sce.com); Besa, Athena (ABesa@semprautilities.com); Ramaiya, Shilpa R (/o=PG&E/ou=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SRRd); Lai, Peter (peter.lai@cpuc.ca.gov); Steven.Long@sce.com (Steven.Long@sce.com)

Bcc:

Subject: Re: redlined version of the Appendix C in the PFM

Hi Zeny-

I circled back with our team to better understand how Jeff's version figured into the process. From what I understand:

The May 21 document from Natalie includes discussion on DEER, non-DEER, and custom process, and represented a version that ED/IOUs largely agreed to, although the IOUs did have some proposed modifications. Jeff then sent the May 27 version, which included only the customized process. There was ongoing discussion between IOUs and ED on this version, with the last IOU proposed edits sent to ED on June 25, with significant proposed modifications.

In preparing the PFM, the IOUs worked off of Natalie's version, not Jeff's, as we had significantly more concerns with the version from Jeff.

As such, if Jeff's version represents ED's final position on the customized process (as appears to be the case), it should be used to compare to the IOUs filed version. However, it appears an actual "redline" is still not very useful and that a summary or table of key outstanding issues would likely be more useful, but we will defer to you on this.

Please let us know if you need anything further.

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

From: "Tapawan-Conway, Zenaida G."
<zenaida.tapawan-conway@cpuc.ca.gov>
To: <Alyssa.Cherry@sce.com>
Cc: "Besa, Athena" <ABesa@semprautilities.com>, "Hardy, Katherine" <katherine.hardy@cpuc.ca.gov>, "Lai, Peter" <peter.lai@cpuc.ca.gov>, "Ramaiya, Shilpa R" <SRRd@PGE.COM>, <Larry.Cope@sce.com>, <Don.Arambula@sce.com>, <Steven.Long@sce.com>

Date: 10/26/2010 01:31 PM
Subject: RE: redlined version of the Appendix C in the PFM

Alyssa -- thanks for your email below. However, I've learned that there was actually a later version of the document that was sent to the utilities (see attached email from Jeff H., with the May 27 version of the document). We would consider this May 27 version as the latest set of Energy Division recommendations that the utilities had, which I suppose you worked off on in preparing the attachment to the PFM.

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

From: Alyssa.Cherry@sce.com [mailto:Alyssa.Cherry@sce.com]
Sent: Monday, October 25, 2010 2:11 PM
To: Tapawan-Conway, Zenaida G.
Cc: Besa, Athena; Hardy, Katherine; Lai, Peter; Ramaiya, Shilpa R; Larry.Cope@sce.com; Don.Arambula@sce.com; Steven.Long@sce.com
Subject: Re: redlined version of the Appendix C in the PFM

Zeny and all-

I was able to track down the document we are considering the "original", which was sent from Natalie Walsh to the IOUs on 5/21/10. Her email specified this was the final version, pending any additional IOU suggested edits (note that subsequent IOU suggested edits were submitted, but we have not considered these agreed to, as we are not aware of a final response to these proposals). However, in comparing this document to the IOU-filed version, there are significant differences, as the IOU filed version is essentially a summary of issues we considered most critical, and pared down/rearranged substantially. As such, while much of the content is the same, redlining the document results in a completely redlined document, which doesn't effectively portray agreements and differences.

I've attached the original from ED (with the original email from Natalie for context) and the version filed in the PFM by the IOUs. We'd propose that rather than submit a redlined version, a summary of key differences could be developed, or a table that shows each issue, each parties position, and outstanding concerns for easy identification.

Please let us know how you'd like to proceed and we can provide whatever is needed.

Thanks,

(See attached file: 5.21.10 Custom Process from ED to IOUs-Clean.DOC)(See attached file: Email from ED- Custom Process.pdf)(See attached file: Appendix C- Customized Project Approach.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

From: "Tapawan-Conway, Zenaida G."
<zenaida.tapawan-conway@cpuc.ca.gov>
To: "Besa, Athena" <ABesa@semprautilities.com>,
<Alyssa.Cherry@sce.com>
Cc: "Lai, Peter" <peter.lai@cpuc.ca.gov>, "Hardy, Katherine"
<katherine.hardy@cpuc.ca.gov>
Date: 10/25/2010 10:44 AM
Subject: redlined version of the Appendix C in the PFM

Athena/Alyssa -- per our conversation last Friday at the PHC, please
send us ASAP today the IOUs' redlined version of the Custom Project
Application review process document that's attached as Appendix C to the
PFM. Based on the discussion at the PHC, my understanding is that we're
supposed to show the initial Energy Division proposed document, with the
IOUs' edits, so that parties can see our recommendations. We'd like to
start with that redlined version first and see if that could be the
attachment to the forthcoming ALJ ruling on this matter. Thanks!

----- Message from [Redacted] on Thu, 27 May
2010 12:06:56 -0700 -----

To: "Lai, Peter" <peter.lai@cpuc.ca.gov>, <abesa@semprautilities.com>, [Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted] <CHarmstead@semprautilities.com>, "Darren" <Darren.Hanway@sce.com>,
<Don.Arambula@sce.com>,
<EKirchhoff@semprautilities.com>, <J3Ru@pge.com>, <jawb@pge.com>, "Kevin Madison"
<kevinjm5000@comcast.net>,
<KMckinley@semprautilities.com>, [Redacted]
<KValenzuela@semprautilities.com>,
<LSidibe@semprautilities.com>, <Marian.Brown@sce.com>, <markmcully@sbcglobal.net>,
<Martin.Vu@sce.com>,
"Matthew.Evans@sce" <Matthew.Evans@sce.com> [Redacted], "Paul Reeves"
<PaulReevesPRC@gmail.com>, "Peter
Ford" <PFord@semprautilities.com>, [Redacted]
<Shahana.Samiullah@sce.com>,
[Redacted] <SLDa@pge.com>, [Redacted] <Steve.Galanter@sce.com>,
<Steven.Long@sce.com>,
"Tapawan-Conway, Zenaida G." <zenaida.tapawan-conway@cpuc.ca.gov>, "Walsh,
Natalie"
<natalie.walsh@cpuc.ca.gov>, [Redacted]

Subject: Re: ED-Utilities non-DEER process meeting notice-Wednesday May 26th

This message's attachments have been archived by the Barracuda

Message Archiver.

CustomMeasureProcedures_Strawman_2010-05-27.doc <

https://archivedmz.cpuc.ca.gov/cgi-mod/getstubbedattachment.cgi/CustomMeasureProcedures_Strawman_2010-05-27.doc?charset=iso-8859-1&len=439296&md5=1dba011576aebf37263416a1e6525589&mid=d6506a69e51f38b49c51245ba3af43ef0ac1d82?
> (429.0K)

Peter Lai requested I send this email with its attachment.

Attached is a replacement version of the custom measure procedures draft document. The only changes are a replaced Appendix I. The changes to the appendix are:

- * flow chart mistakes corrected
- * some clarification added to the wording in some of the boxes
- * notes and related discussion/examples were added below the flowchart to define terms and ideas presented in the flowchart

Redacted

From: Lai, Peter <<mailto:peter.lai@cpuc.ca.gov>>

Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 2010 10:16 AM

To: abesa@semprautilities.com Redacted

Redacted; CHarmstead@semprautilities.com; Darren <<mailto:Darren.Hanway@sce.com>>; Don.Arambula@sce.com;

EKirchhoff@semprautilities.com; Redacted

Redacted

Redacted; KMcKinley@semprautilities.com;

Redacted; KValenzuela@semprautilities.com;

LSidibe@semprautilities.com; Marian.Brown@sce.com;

Redacted; Martin.Vu@sce.com; Matthew.Evans@sce.com;

Redacted; Peter Ford <<mailto:PFord@semprautilities.com>>

Shahana.Samiullah@sce.com Redacted; SLDa@pge.com; SRRd@pge.com;

Steve.Galanter@sce.com; Steven.Long@sce.com; Tapawan-Conway, Zenaida G. <

<mailto:zenaida.tapawan-conway@cpuc.ca.gov>>; Walsh, Natalie <

<mailto:natalie.walsh@cpuc.ca.gov>>; Redacted

Redacted

Subject: RE: ED-Utilities non-DEER process meeting notice-Wednesday May 26th

Hi All,

Please find attached the draft custom application review process protocol document. I apologize for getting it to you on the day of the meeting. For the meeting this afternoon, I wish to provide a high-level preview of the draft doc. Utilities may provide comments to us after you've had a chance to review fully the draft protocol.

Talk to you at 3:30.

Thanks,

Redacted

ED-Utilities

Non-DEER Review Meeting

Wednesday, May 26, 2010, 3:30-5:00 PM

Call-in No. Redacted

Participant code: Redacted

Proposed Agenda

- * Utilities to raise what is not clear about the Phase 2 review process under the November 18, 2009 ALJ ruling.
- * ED high-level preview of draft custom application review process protocol.