

From: Baker, Simon
Sent: 11/26/2010 3:31:11 PM
To: Ramaiya, Shilpa R (/o=PG&E/ou=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SRRd);
ABesa@SempraUtilities.com (ABesa@SempraUtilities.com);
don.arambula@sce.com (don.arambula@sce.com)
Cc: Fogel, Cathleen A. (cathleen.fogel@cpuc.ca.gov); Clinton, Jeanne
(jeanne.clinton@cpuc.ca.gov); [Redacted]
[Redacted]
amri.christianto@sce.com (amri.christianto@sce.com); Julie.Rowey@sce.com
(Julie.Rowey@sce.com); Sylvia.Cortes@sce.com (Sylvia.Cortes@sce.com)
Bcc:
Subject: IOU positions on EUC issues for 12/2 CPUC-CEC meeting

Hi All,

On 12/2, Cathy Fogel and I will be meeting with CEC management folks to discuss EUC implementation issues, including: (a) requirements / use of HERS II / EnergyPro on performance jobs in the short-term (months) and long-term (years); (b) "EUC job database" and data transfer for ARRA reporting; (c) co-marketing and process for webportal content updates, review, and management; (d) FYP rebate finder database administration and interface with EUC website; (e) post-2012 funding and long-term program sustainability implications (for webportal, etc.) once ARRA expires.

We expect a meeting with broader participation from IOUs, local governments, and CEC contractors (Renewable Funding, etc.), and possibly home performance contractors to discuss some or most of these issues will occur in combination with the planned 12/6 meeting on EUC marketing and/or at some point soon. In the meantime, it would be very helpful to us, when meeting with the CEC next week, to have clearly articulated positions of the IOUs on these and any other matters of concern.

Below please find string of emails between Cathy and Jeff Gleeson (copying other IOU whole-house program leads) which begins to develop IOU positions on (a) and (b) above. I have also seen notes from Cathy indicating the IOUs have some asks in regards to (c) above. I have seen emails between Julie Rowey (SCE, ME+O) and CEC folks indicating there are / were some differences in regards to (d) above. I am personally interested in hearing the IOUs views on (e) above. CPUC is particularly interested in understanding whether specific components of the "EUC program" have implications for cost and/or

administrative complexity. While CPUC strongly supports the whole-house program, we want to ensure it is being implemented most cost-effectively.

Can you please send us a summary of IOU positions on (a) thru (e) above (and any other related concerns) by noon 12/1? Joint IOU responses are preferable, but individual IOU responses are also acceptable. If you don't have time to respond to all of the above, it is most important to get us something by noon 12/1, even if incomplete.

Hopefully, this won't be too hard to pull together as there has already been dialogue on these subjects. Thanks!

I also copy a few of the IOU whole-house program managers (please forward to Cynthia Swaim, Nathan Bruner and any others), and IOU ME+O folks.

Best,

Simon Baker

Supervisor, EE Planning

CPUC Energy Division

From: Redacted

Sent: Friday, November 12, 2010 3:15 PM

To: Fogel, Cathleen A.

Subject: RE: Clarifying "asks" on HERs II issues

I believe you are right, that our implementers will hire QA folks who are BPI and HERS II certified, but the number of people needed for those jobs will not nearly employ the 100s of trained folks. Assuming a verifier can check 2 homes per day, I can't imagine each implementer hiring more than 5 to 7 verifiers in the short-term.

My IOU colleagues were out today so we weren't able to check-in and clarify any asks for you. My guess is that these issues will persist for a few weeks, so let me know if you would like me to circle back with everyone to get you a more coherent response.

From: Fogel, Cathleen A. [<mailto:cathleen.fogel@cpuc.ca.gov>]

Sent: Friday, November 12, 2010 3:12 PM

To: Redacted

Subject: RE: Clarifying "asks" on HERs II issues

It was delayed and I am on it right now at until 4:30, so any additional

input you have at this point is relevant.

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Friday, November 12, 2010 3:11 PM
To: Fogel, Cathleen A.
Subject: FW: Clarifying "asks" on HERs II issues

Cathy,

We were out all day yesterda - I'm sorry I missed your noon deadline. Is there any follow-up from your call with the CEC that is of note to us?

Thanks, [Redacted]

From: Fogel, Cathleen A. [<mailto:cathleen.fogel@cpuc.ca.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, November 10, 2010 2:18 PM
To: [Redacted] Cc: Amri.Christianto@sce.com; Swaim, Cynthia M.; Bruner, Nathan J
Subject: Clarifying "asks" on HERs II issues

Thanks Jeff,

To all, I'm sorry, but I think I need to ask you all collectively to really zero in on your "asks" for me here. I need to make sure I am getting the "must have" requests from you as opposed to the "nice to have" requests regarding the issues that Jeff and I corresponded on below.

There is more to this than I had originally realized. For instance, due to the CEC emphasis on HERs II, if you recall, there are now about 100 certified HERs II raters waiting/hoping to get work applying HERs II as part of the EUC model... So, this is a complex multifaceted issue that goes beyond the data transfer protocols to the HERs II Provider database which is currently eating up at least some of your precious time. It seems that IOUs could still urge your QA providers to hire HERs II certified raters, when they are available and have the other necessary qualifications, right? So that could be one other pathway to jobs for those now-trained raters.

Could I ask you all to collectively refine your "ask" for me by Friday at noon building on the below (feel free to change the format as needed; what I wrote is in Times New Roman, Jeff's refinements in Arial).

I speak with the CEC at 2 pm Friday so being clearer on this by then would be helpful. Please distinguish, as I said to the extent you can, between

"must have" and "nice to have" requests.

Thanks much,

Cathy

From: Redacted

Sent: Tuesday, November 09, 2010 6:27 PM

To: Fogel, Cathleen A.

Subject: RE: EnergyPRO Files

Just some minor additions included below:

From: Fogel, Cathleen A. [<mailto:cathleen.fogel@cpuc.ca.gov>]

Sent: Tuesday, November 09, 2010 5:46 PM

To: Redacted

Subject: RE: EnergyPRO Files

If you don't mind, let me send one more email.

We seem to have 3 issues:

1) ARRA reporting needs: ideal is IOUs report directly to DOE for both CEC and Better Buildings programs. Fall back is negotiate delay in sending job data to HERs II until sometime next year. Third choice is NDAs with SEP recipients on a one by one basis. Option 3, multiple NDAs, would be extremely difficult. But not impossible? That is what was currently being worked on by IOUs, right?

2) Program rapid ramp up to create jobs and savings: ideal is to allow BestTest software across the state, not just CEC HERs II compatible approved. If we can ensure (through bestest) that we are generating consistent results, it does seem best to contractors and customers decide which tools are most helpful to them. Again, consistency is key.

3) HERs II build up: ideal is to delay sending job data to HERs II provider until some unspecified time next year (spring?) when the program begins to stabilize. Ideal is to dispense with attempts to coordinate IOU and HERs II QA/QC because IOU QA teams can perform water QA if needed.

The water QA is certainly one of the snags, but another is the overall HERs II infrastructure. The IOUs would have to take on verification that is outside of the BPI protocol to verify HERs II items (please clarify what

this is exactly; is it the distinction between "installed" and "installed correctly"? Can the IOU QA teams perform the water QA?) , and the CEC would want that data pushed to the registries (especially if a rating is provided)

4) Website: ideal is to.... ?

It must be easier for the contractor lists to be streamlined between IOU programs and all of the varying regional programs that place requirements on top of the IOU contractor requirements. Also, the co-branding piece for contractors through EUC seems to be helpful.

I would also add that it is not, in any way, my intention to deter the CEC's efforts to expand the HERS II rating system. I think it is extremely important to long-term goals in CA and I do not want to negatively impact our working relationship with them, as I think HERS ratings will eventually be integral to Whole House programs.

Would you alter the above in any way?

Cathy

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

From: Redacted
Sent: Tue 11/9/2010 5:42 PM
To: Fogel, Cathleen A.
Subject: RE: EnergyPRO Files

Fortunately, the folks at NREL have covered that for us with BESTEST. They make sure that each software tool hits a consistent mark, although they don't specify how your model has to get there. We haven't compared all of the tools on one site, simply because it was unclear as to whether or not we would be able to continue utilizing the other tools under the full contract.

From: Fogel, Cathleen A. [<mailto:cathleen.fogel@cpuc.ca.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 09, 2010 5:33 PM
To: Redacted Subject:
RE: EnergyPRO Files

Thanks,

Another question, since you all are using Recurve and TREAT software in the

pilot, I assume that both of those can provide a "before" and "after" site (kwh, therms, kw) savings estimate? Has there been any work done to check all 3 model's calibration on the same job? Do they give similar/same results? I understand that much/most of the uncertainty lies in the inputs to the models...

Cathy

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

From: Redacted

Sent: Tue 11/9/2010 5:15 PM To: Fogel, Cathleen A.

Subject: FW: EnergyPRO Files

FYI:

From: Scott Fable [<mailto:sfable@bki.com>] Sent: Tuesday, November 09, 2010 5:08 PM To: Gleeson, Jeff

Subject: RE: EnergyPRO Files

Redacted

Yes, as a matter of course, we collect the building files from each simulation, both at the pre- and post-retrofit stage for Advanced/performance jobs.

Regards,

Scott

Scott Fable Project Manager Bevilacqua-Knight, Inc (BKi) 1000 Broadway
#410 Oakland, CA 94607 510-444-8707 x214510-463-2690
faxfable@bki.com www.bki.com