

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 4/8/2011 8:29:07 AM
To: Drew, Tim G. (tim.drew@cpuc.ca.gov); Skala, Pete (pete.skala@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc: Ramaiya, Shilpa R (/o=PG&E/ou=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SRRd); Lai, Peter (peter.lai@cpuc.ca.gov); Dietz, Sidney (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SBD4); Deal, Matthew (matthew.deal@cpuc.ca.gov); [Redacted]
[Redacted]
Bcc:
Subject: RE: EE Workpaper Meeting

Peter and Tim,

On behalf of the PG&E team, thank you for taking the time to meet with PG&E on Tuesday to discuss the energy efficiency new product workpaper review process. We thought the dialogue was very productive. As we discussed, the slides we reviewed with you are attached for reference.

Here is a short recap of the discussion from our perspective. Please let us know if we have not adequately captured the discussion or if you have other thoughts or observations.

Discussion

PG&E and Energy Division discussed the new workpaper review process and the nature of Energy Division's feedback on PG&E workpaper submittals. As a result, PG&E better understands the value of early collaboration with Energy Division staff prior to workpaper submittal. Energy Division understands PG&E's desire to obtain more definitive and timely feedback on workpapers that we submit.

Next Steps

Energy Division will review the new workpaper review process and supplement the procedure documents and timelines to better define and clarify the amount of time allotted for each step in the process with the objective of limiting the total time period from submittal to final disposition to a reasonable period of time that allows for timely program implementation by the IOUs. (Note: See Slide 7 of the attached slide deck for an outline of the timeline.)

Once again, thank you for taking the time to discuss this the new product workpaper review process and options for refinement.

Regards,

[Redacted]
Principal, CEE Statewide Leads
PG&E
[Redacted]

From: Skala, Pete [mailto:pete.skala@cpuc.ca.gov]

Sent: Tuesday, April 05, 2011 2:57 PM

To: Ramaiya, Shilpa R; [Redacted] [Redacted]

Cc: Lai, Peter; Drew, Tim G.; Dietz, Sidney

Subject: RE: EE Workpaper Meeting

Shilpa, Brian, and Grant,

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; Deal, Matthew

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

Subject: EE Workpaper Meeting

Pete, Matthew,

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).

Matthew – 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