

From: Baker, Simon  
Sent: 3/17/2011 10:26:37 AM  
To: Ramaiya, Shilpa R (/o=PG&E/ou=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SRRd)  
Cc: Haramati, Mikhail (mikhail.haramati@cpuc.ca.gov); Redacted  
Redacted

Bcc:  
Subject: RE: negative therm statement

Shilpa,

I would think that the issue raised below by Mikhail Haramati (ED, LMT lead) appears to be broader than just LMT. What is PG&E's policy rationale for inclusion of negative therms hampering PG&E's ability to run lighting programs? Is this really a barrier to PG&E moving forward aggressively with high-efficiency lighting programs?

Best,  
Simon Eilif Baker  
Supervisor, Energy Efficiency Planning  
Climate Strategies Branch  
California Public Utilities Commission - Energy Division  
[seb@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:seb@cpuc.ca.gov)  
415-703-5649

**From:** Haramati, Mikhail  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 16, 2011 12:39 PM  
**To:** Redacted  
**Cc:** Baker, Simon  
**Subject:** negative therm statement

Dave, thanks for speaking with me just now regarding LMT check-in meetings. I am, however, troubled by one of the statements you made and want to make sure I understand correctly.

In response to discussion about PGE's effort towards LMT so far, you stated that the accounting of negative TH savings is preventing PGE from going as far as is needed to transform the lighting market. You had asked me to see if there's anything ED can do in this area since the inclusion of negative therms is hampering PGE's ability to run lighting programs.

Can you confirm whether I've understood this correctly?

Thanks,

Mikhail

Mikhail Haramati  
Regulatory Analyst, Energy Efficiency EM&V  
California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Ave.  
San Francisco, CA 94107  
Tel: (415) 703-1458  
Fax: (415) 703-2200  
Email: [mkh@cuc.ca.gov](mailto:mkh@cuc.ca.gov)