


ATTACHMENT



Contact: Cheryl Cox, DRA Policy Advisor - (415) 703-2495 - cxc@cpuc.ca.gov

PROCEEDINGS: A. 11-05-017, A.11-05-018, A.11-05-019, A.11-05-020

DATE: June 21, 2011

Energy Assistance Savings Program (ESAP) and CARE Applications for programs 2012 - 2014

Provided below are excerpts from the Utilities' Applications requesting contingency CARE and ESAP funding for program year 2012. Following this are relevant excerpts of parties' responses to the Utilities' Applications.

Utilities' requests for contingency CARE and ESAP funding for program year 2012:

Southern California Gas Company:

CARE

"To avoid program disruption, SoCalGas seeks Commission authorization to continue funding for the PY2012 CARE program as a contingency if the Commission is delayed in issuing a decision for the PY2012-2014 program cycle prior to January 1, 2012." (SCG Testimony, CAR 26)

ESAP

"- Approval to continue its existing Energy Savings Assistance Program into PY2012, using PY2012 program funds, should the Commission be delayed in issuing a decision in this proceeding before year-end 2011 and count program achievements towards PY2012 accomplishments." (SCG Testimony, DM-77)

San Diego Gas & Electric Company:

CARE

"To avoid program disruption, SDG&E seeks Commission authorization to continue funding for the PY2012 CARE program as a contingency if the Commission is delayed in issuing a decision for the 2012-2014 program cycle prior to January 1, 2012." (SDG&E Testimony, SW-32)

ESAP

"-Approval to continue its existing Energy Savings Assistance Program into 2012, using PY2012 program funds, should the Commission be delayed in issuing a decision in this proceeding before year-end 2011, and count program achievements towards PY2012 accomplishments." (SDG&E Testimony, SW-74)


Pacific Gas & Electric Company:

CARE

"Absent a Commission Decision by November 10, 2011, PG&E requests interim funding to ensure continuity of the existing CARE program.Also, if the Commission should be delayed in issuing a decision on the 2012-2014 program budget application, PG&E requests interim authorization from the Commission to continue CARE program administration activities into 2012 at the current levels" (PG&E CARE and ESAP Application, pp. 14-15)

ESAP

If the Commission should be delayed in issuing a decision on PG&E's 2012-2014 low income program budget application, PG&E requests interim authorization from the Commission to continue ESA activities into 2012. (PG&E CARE and ESAP Application, p. 11)



Southern California Edison Company

CARE

“Authorization to fund CARE activities in 2012 using proposed 2012 program funds in the event of Commission delay in issuing a decision of SCE’s 2012-2014 Application.” (SCE Application, p. 65)

ESAP

“Authorization to fund Energy Savings Assistance Program activities in 2012 using proposed 2012 program funds in the event of Commission delay in issuing a decision on SCE’s 2012-2014 Application.”(SCE Application, p. 47)

Parties requesting extension of 2009 – 2011 program cycle funding, or requesting extended ESAP schedule that may require a schedule that extends beyond 2011:

- ffi TELACU
- ffi Maravilla
- ffi Association of California Community and Energy Services
- ffi Energy Efficiency Council
- ffi Synergy Corporation
- ffi Disability Rights Advocates
- ffi Natural Resources Defense Council

“Based on the issues described above, the Joint CBOs agree with DRA that the issues associated with ESAP deserve an extensive review and support DRA’s proposal (attached) for a year of bridge funding and DRA’s overall schedule with testimony and hearings in the fall and early winter.” (p. 14)


The Joint Protest of The East Los Angeles Community Union (TELACU), the Maravilla Foundation, and the Association of California Community and Energy Services (ACCES) regarding the Applications of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (U 39 M), San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U 902E), Southern California Gas Company (U 904G) and Southern California Edison Company (U 388-E) for Approval of their 2012–2014 Energy Savings Assistance and California Alternative Rates for Energy Programs and Budgets., June 17, 2007

“We respectfully request the Commission either approve a schedule that ensures there will be no break in service or approve bridge funding should the program not be up and running by January 1, 2012. California has a significant workforce relying on these programs and any hiatus would be detrimental to that structure.” (pp.20-21)

Opening Comments of the Energy Efficiency Council on Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), Southern California Gas Company (SCG), Southern California Edison (SCE), and San Diego Gas and Electric’s (SDG&E) 2012-2014 Energy Savings Assistance and California Alternate Rates for Energy Programs and Budget, June 17, 2011

“The utilities’ proposals certainly should not be rubber-stamped without hearings.” (p. 15)

The Opening Comments of Synergy Companies regarding the Applications of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (U 39 M), San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U 902E), Southern California Gas Company



(U 904G) and Southern California Edison Company (U 388-E) for Approval of their 2012–2014 Energy Savings Assistance and California Alternative Rates for Energy Programs and Budgets June 20, 2011,

“DisabRA also supports bridge funding for the continuation of these programs into 2012, since we do not believe that this proceeding can reasonably be concluded prior to the end of 2011.” (p.2)

Response Of Disability Rights Advocates To Pacific Gas And Electric Company, Southern California Gas Company, Southern California Edison Company, And San Diego Gas And Electric Company’s Applications For Approval Of Their 2012-2014 Energy Savings Assistance Programs And Budgets, June 20, 2011

“We urge the Commission to set a schedule for this proceeding that allows the Commission, Utilities, and stakeholders an opportunity to take a harder look at how measures are evaluated, introduced and removed from the ESA Program and the cost-effectiveness framework applied to the Pogram (sic).” (p. 8)

“Without discounting the important comfort and safety objectives of the ESA Program, we urge the Commission to set a schedule in this proceeding that will allow parties to explore new approaches to achieve more energy savings from the ESA Program.(p. 13)

Response Of The Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) To Pacific Gas And Electric Company, Southern California Gas Company, Southern California Edison Company, And San Diego Gas And Electric Company’s Applications For Approval Of Their 2012-2014 Energy Savings Assistance And California Alternate Rates For Energy Programs And Budget, June 20, 2011