

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
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