From: michelle.thomas@sce.com

Sent: 4/21/2011 5:10:29 PM

To: Baker, Simon (simon.baker@cpuc.ca.gov)

Cc: Fogel, Cathleen A. (cathleen.fogel@cpuc.ca.gov); Clinton, Jeanne (jeanne.clinton@cpuc.ca.gov); Michael.Hoover@sce.com (Michael.Hoover@sce.com); Athena Besa (ABesa@semprautilities.com); Ramaiya, Shilpa R (/o=PG&E/ou=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SRRd); don.arambula@sce.com (don.arambula@sce.com); Melinda.martinez@sce.com (Melinda.martinez@sce.com); Work michelle thomas (Michelle.Thomas@sce.com)

Bcc:

Subject: RE: IOU interpretation of IOU authority and Commission direction on new pilot programs

Hi, Simon-

We did receive both the email and data request. The IOUs have been in contact and are working jointly on the response and will submit it on or before the May 5th due date.

We also got the two additional follow up questions from Cathy Fogel and will include responses to those questions in the data request.

Thank you!

NEW CONTACT INFORMATION
Michelle Thomas

Southern California Edison - Energy Efficiency
Regulatory, Controls, & Solicitations

626.302.0701

PAX 20701

From:
Don Arambula/SCE/EIX
To:
"Baker, Simon" <simon.baker@cpuc.ca.gov>, "Shilpa R Ramaiya" <SRRd@pge.com>, "Athena Besa" <abesa@semprautilities.com>
Cc:
"Fogel, Cathleen A." <cathleen.fogel@cpuc.ca.gov>, "Clinton, Jeanne" <jeanne.clinton@cpuc.ca.gov>, "Work michelle thomas" <Michelle.Thomas@sce.com>, Michael Hoover/SCE/EIX
Date:
04/21/2011 04:39 PM
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 iniated 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,
notication and approval of "trial studies," or similarly named tests or program concepts or designs, for "trial studies" not

explicity 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