

From: Sandoval, Catherine J.K.
Sent: 11/19/2013 9:20:04 AM
To: Cherry, Brian K (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BKC7)
Cc: Katague, Ditas (ditas.katague@cpuc.ca.gov); Baker, Amy C. (amy.baker@cpuc.ca.gov); Sandoval, Catherine J.K. (CatherineJ.K.Sandoval@cpuc.ca.gov)
Bcc:
Subject: Re: CPUC EE policy re: lighting

Ed Randolph and the head of the CPUC's EE portfolio including lighting (Sandra Goeken Miles met with him) are both very enthusiastic about effective lighting that contributes to energy efficiency goals. No nebulous staff position overturns the Commission Order providing support for energy efficient lighting as a part of an EE portfolio. Sandra Goeken Miles can tell you about the Enthusiastic meetings she had in September with the CPUC energy division staff, and with all of the Commissioners, as well as the enthusiastic meeting she had with Professor Simonivotch of the UC Davis Lighting Center. If you are hearing that staff is not supporting the Commission Order re: lighting as a component of energy efficiency, please let me know. We want to clarify priorities consistent with the Commission's Order and I am informed that Ed Randolph and the leader of the EE portfolio understand the priorities that include effective lighting a low-hanging fruit, especially for existing buildings and existing outdoor lighting, and new buildings. Thanks, Commissioner Sandoval

Sent from my iPad

On Nov 19, 2013, at 11:25 AM, "Cherry, Brian K" <BKC7@pge.com> wrote:

> Catherine - for clarification, I didn't mean to imply that rebates aren't allowed. They certainly are. What I meant to convey is lighting is no longer a large segment of our every efficiency savings portfolio. At one time, a significant portion of the portfolio and savings were attributed to lighting. In a post CFL era, lighting has become the step child of savings despite the fact that the cheapest and largest EE savings area is lighting. My goal is to increase the EE lighting segment exponentially. Unfortunately, I don't see that support coming from Commission staff

>

> Brian K. Cherry
> PG&E Company
> VP, Regulatory Relations
> 77 Beale Street
> San Francisco, CA. 94105
> (415) 973-4977

>

>

> On Nov 19, 2013, at 11:20 AM, "Sandoval, Catherine J.K."
<CatherineJ.K.Sandoval@cpuc.ca.gov<<mailto:CatherineJ.K.Sandoval@cpuc.ca.gov>>> wrote:

>

> Brian, When we met last week you mentioned that the CPUC won't allow PG&E to provide rebates for LEDs. This is contrary to our understanding of both PG&E's current programs and Commission authorization. The decision below supports rebates for LEDs, particularly any that conform to the Title 20 rulemaking. Please let me or Amy Baker, my Energy Advisor, know if you have any questions, Thanks, Commissioner Sandoval

>

> From Amy Baker:

> Hello Commissioner,

> Re: allowing IOUs to provide rebates for LED lights. You asked for the decision and decision language authorizing the utilities to provide rebates for LEDs. I've provide that information at the end of this e-mail.

>

> If you look at PG&E's lighting rebate catalog, LEDs are described on page
10:http://www.pge.com/includes/docs/pdfs/mybusiness/energysavingsrebates/incentivesbyindustry/lighting_catalog

> PG&E's LED page describes the rebates available specifically for LEDs: <http://www.pge.com/led/>

>

> D.12-05-015<tel:12-05-015> (Covers 2013-2014 portfolios) Section
10.4.2:http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/word_pdf/FINAL_DECISION/166830.pdf

>

> "Consistent with the Strategic Plan's emphasis on advanced lighting products, the Staff proposal recommends providing upstream rebates for light emitting diode, specialty Compact Fluorescent Lamps, efficient incandescent lamp, and dimmable linear fluorescent ballast products in the Statewide Lighting Program. The 2011 Potential Study indicates substantial achievable savings are available from these advanced lighting measures.

> Parties generally favor supporting light emitting diode products in the 2013-2014 portfolio. While the baseline information TURN identified is not widely available, the 2011 Potential Study indicates there is substantial energy savings potential in light emitting diode measures. Much of this is due to the fact that light emitting diode and Compact Fluorescent Lamps technologies tend to be complementary; many applications that are adequate for Compact Fluorescent Lamps, such as omnidirectional installations in portable desktop luminaires, are not as suitable for current widely available light emitting diodes, and vice versa.

>

> In light of the 2011 Potential Study findings and supportive party comments, we direct the IOUs to propose upstream rebates for light emitting diode (LED) measures, including LED down lamps and screw base LED general service lamps, in the Primary Lighting subprogram directed herein. In California there is substantial energy saving potential for the replacement of inefficient incandescent down lamps that are deployed in buildings all across the state with more efficient LED down lamps. We expect the California Energy Commission to adopt a lighting quality standard for LEDs in the current Title 20 Rulemaking.

> We direct the IOUs to only propose incentives for LED products that adhere to that standard. For example, regarding quality standards, we direct the IOUs to only propose rebates for general service screw base LED products that are consistent with the quality standards developed by the California Energy Commission. We concur that Commission Staff, the IOUs, and the California Energy Commission should consult with U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) ENERGY STAR program, Design Lights Consortium, and the California Lighting Technology Center in the California Energy Commission's establishment of a California general service LED standard. We agree with DRA and direct the IOUs to only propose rebates for LED products that have a U.S. Department of Energy Lighting Facts® label, a program of the U.S. Department of Energy and U.S. Federal Trade Commission."

>

> Please let me know if you have any questions or would like additional information.

>

> Amy

>

> Amy Baker

- > Energy Advisor to Commissioner Catherine J.K. Sandoval
- > California Public Utilities Commission
- > 415.703.1691<tel:415.703.1691>
- > amy.baker@cpuc.ca.gov<<mailto:amy.baker@cpuc.ca.gov>>
- >
- >
- >
- >
- > <California Quality Lamp Standards .docx>
- > Sent from my iPad
- >
- >
- > PG&E is committed to protecting our customers' privacy.
- > To learn more, please visit <http://www.pge.com/about/company/privacy/customer/>