

From: Skala, Pete
Sent: 4/5/2011 2:56:44 PM
To: Ramaiya, Shilpa R (/o=PG&E/ou=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SRRd); [Redacted]
[Redacted] [Redacted]
[Redacted]
Cc: Lai, Peter (peter.lai@cpuc.ca.gov); Drew, Tim G. (tim.drew@cpuc.ca.gov); Dietz, Sidney (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SBD4)
Bcc:
Subject: RE: EE Workpaper Meeting

Shilpa [Redacted]

Thanks again for coming over and explaining some of your concerns re: our conditional approval of your laptops and printers workpaper. We will mull over some of the questions we came out of the meeting with and get back to you shortly.

In the meantime, the Ph 2 calendar for the ES5, etc., TV workpaper would require us to provide you comments by COB today, but our resolution of the laptop/printer issue will also impact how we handle the TV workpaper, so I am wondering if you would object to our holding off on this for a few days? Let me know if you are ok with this -- otherwise I will plan to post something that will look very familiar to you at this point...

Thanks!

Pete Skala
Program Manager -- Demand-Side Management
Branch
CPUC Energy Division
(415)
703-5370 (office)
(415) 577-8576 (mobile)

From: Ramaiya, Shilpa R
[mailto:SRRd@pge.com]

Sent: Monday, April 04, 2011 11:08

AM

To: Skala, Pete; [Redacted]

Cc: Lai, Peter; Dietz, Sidney; [Redacted] [Redacted]

Subject: EE Workpaper Meeting

Pete, [Redacted]

I'd like to schedule a meeting with you this week to discuss the recent 'conditional approval' of our new EE workpaper for laptops and printers. After our hopeful view that the CPUC supported expansion of EE to new products in a timely manner, we were disappointed with the Energy Division response that prevents us from moving forward.

As discussed in Energy Division's response, 'conditional approval' requires us to conduct a one-year study on the program before counting any savings. We do not believe the cost of the study is justified given the (comparatively small) amount of savings associated with these products and are re-considering whether to offer this product at all. Further, while we appreciate the ability to collaborate further, 'conditional approval' is not consistent with the CPUC's intent to lock down savings values using the best available data (which we used in constructing the workpaper).

PG&E submitted the workpaper under the Energy Division's Phase 2 process on January 26 and received 'conditional approval' on March 30, after much discussion with Energy Division. We followed the Energy Division's Phase 2 workpaper process for new mid-cycle products (this is not covered in the pending ex ante lockdown PFM so no need to worry about potential conflicts).

[Redacted] This is relevant to the EM&V issues PPD has been tasked with and may be informative for you.

Can you please let me know your availability for a one-hour meeting? Tuesday and Friday AM are best.

Thanks.

Shilpa