

From: don.arambula@sce.com
Sent: 4/21/2011 4:39:06 PM
To: Ramaiya, Shilpa R (/o=PG&E/ou=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SRRd); Baker, Simon (simon.baker@cpuc.ca.gov); Athena Besa (ABesa@semprautilities.com)
Cc: Fogel, Cathleen A. (cathleen.fogel@cpuc.ca.gov); Clinton, Jeanne (jeanne.clinton@cpuc.ca.gov); Michael.Hoover@sce.com (Michael.Hoover@sce.com); Work michelle thomas (Michelle.Thomas@sce.com)
Bcc:
Subject: RE: IOU interpretation of IOU authority and Commission direction on new pilot programs

Simon,
I've been on vacation this week so my auto email notice must not be set for external communications. My apologies. Michelle Thomas will work with the internal organizations on this issue and will get back to you shortly.

Don Arambula

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

From: "Baker, Simon" [simon.baker@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: 04/21/2011 03:50 PM MST
To: "Baker, Simon" <simon.baker@cpuc.ca.gov>; Don Arambula; <SRRd@pge.com>; <ABesa@semprautilities.com>
Cc: "Fogel, Cathleen A." <cathleen.fogel@cpuc.ca.gov>; "Clinton, Jeanne" <jeanne.clinton@cpuc.ca.gov>
Subject: RE: IOU interpretation of IOU authority and Commission direction on new pilot programs

Folks - I still haven't heard back from any of you on this request. Just checking to ensure you received it. Please let me know. Thanks!

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

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

From: Baker, Simon
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2011 6:39 PM
To: 'Don.Arambula@sce.com'; 'SRRd@pge.com'; 'ABesa@semprautilities.com'
Cc: Fogel, Cathleen A.; Clinton, Jeanne
Subject: IOU interpretation of IOU authority and Commission direction on new pilot programs

Don, Shilpa, Athena,

I am writing to seek feedback from your companies regarding your assessment of your responsibilities and

authority for new pilot projects initiated during the 2010-2012 energy efficiency program cycle but not explicitly approved or directed in D. 09-09-047.

As you know, D. 09-09-047 explicitly authorized IOU implementation of at least nine pilot programs (OP 19, p. 372), and instructed IOUs to submit pilot program summaries via Advice Letter within 120 days of adoption of the decision. Ordering Para 20 outlines the ten informational elements that these Pilot Summaries were to contain.

In addition, dicta at 4.3.1 (page 49) directs utilities to provide information on these ten elements for pilot projects approved in D. 09-09-047 and "for all future proposed pilot projects."

Our questions are, then:

1) What authority do IOUs see yourselves as having to initiate pilot projects not explicitly approved in D. 09-09-047 during the 2010-2012 program cycle?

2) What notification requirements regarding initiation of such pilot projects do your companies see yourselves as having for the 2010-2012 program cycle?

3) What approvals do your companies see yourselves as needing prior to pursuit of pilot projects not explicitly approved in D. 09-09-047, from either Energy Division or the Commission, for the 2010-2012 period, if any?

4) How do your companies define pilot project?

5) How do your companies define "trial studies" or similar "tests" of program design elements or concepts, differently from pilot projects, if at all?

6) What requirements do you see yourselves as having regarding the initiation, notification and approval of "trial studies," or similarly named tests or program concepts or designs, for "trial studies" not explicitly approved in D. 09-09-047, during the 2010-2012 program cycle?

We would like to hear your companies' responses on these issues within ten business days.

I will also have these questions posted on EEGA as a formal data request.

Much thanks,
Simon