To: Pacific Gas & Electric

From: Arthur O'Donnell, Energy Division, California Public Utilities Commission

Date: June 21, 2012

RE: Data Request in A11-11-017 Smart Grid Pilot Deployment Project

Question 1.

PG&E's June 13 Rebuttal Testimony (pg. 1-9) introduced consideration of Pilot Plan criteria for evaluating pilot projects, as adopted by the Commission in D.12-04-045 (Demand Response OIR), and a similar set of criteria adopted in D.09-09-047 (2010-2012 Energy Efficiency Portfolios). For each of the six proposed pilot projects in A11-11-017, please describe how each matches these 9 Pilot Plan criteria:

Each Pilot Plan should illustrate the following elements:

- 1. New and innovative program design, concepts or technology that have not yet been tested or employed;
- 2. A specific statement of the concern, gap, or problem that the pilot seeks to address and the likelihood that the issue can be addressed cost-effectively through utility programs;
- 3. How the pilot matches the characteristics for Smart Grid technologies enumerated in SB 17 * (with three added characteristics adopted in D10-06-047).
- 4. Specific objectives and goals for the pilot;
- 5. A clear budget and timeframe to complete the pilot and obtain results. Pilots that are continuations of pilots from previous portfolios should clearly state how it differs from the previous phase;
- 6. Information on relevant standards or metrics or a plan to develop a standard against which the pilot outcomes can be measured;
- 7. Where appropriate, propose methodologies to test the cost effectiveness of the pilot;
- 8. A proposed EM&V plan; and.
- 9. A concrete strategy to identify and disseminate best practices and lessons learned from the pilot to all California utilities and to transfer those practices to resource programs, as well as a schedule and plan to expand the pilot to utility and hopefully statewide usage.

Question 2.

PG&E in its June 13 Rebuttal Testimony explained the difference in amounts for its total requested project cost of \$108.8 million, and its Revenue Request for \$39.8 million during the 2013-2016 period as largely a function of favorable tax treatment for internally developed software and other IT assets. Please explain whether there will be any residual Revenue Requirement assessed from 2017 on, and how much, specifically related to these proposed pilots (not to full deployment if pursued).

As directed by ALJ Hymes, please provide your responses to all Parties.

Thank you for your prompt response,

Arthur O'Donnell, Energy Division A01@cpuc.ca.gov 415-703-1184