



FILED
9-02-16
04:59 PM

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Southern California Edison
Company (U 338E) for Approval of its Energy
Savings Assistance and California Alternate
Rates for Energy Programs and Budgets for
Program Years 2015-2017.

Application 14-11-007

And Related Matters:

Application 14-11-009
Application 14-11-010
Application 14-11-011

**NOTICE OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATION OF
THE ENERGY EFFICIENCY COUNCIL (EEC)**

September 2, 2016

Allan Rago
Energy Efficiency Council
4751 Arrow Highway
Montclair, CA 91763
909-281-3531 (ph/fax)
arago@qcsca.com

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Southern California Edison Company (U 338E) for Approval of its Energy Savings Assistance and California Alternate Rates for Energy Programs and Budgets for Program Years 2015-2017.

Application 14-11-007

And Related Matters:

Application 14-11-009

Application 14-11-010

Application 14-11-011

**NOTICE OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATION OF
THE ENERGY EFFICIENCY COUNCIL (EEC)**

In accordance with rules 8.2, 8.3 and 8.5 of the Commission Rules of Practice and Procedure, the Energy Efficiency Council (EEC), hereby gives notice of the following communication in the above referenced proceeding.

On the morning of Wednesday, August 31, 2016, from approximately 10:30 am to 11:00 am, Allan Rago, Ortensia Lopez, Anna Solorio and Ron Garcia of the EEC met with Michael Colvin, advisor to Commissioner Sandoval at the Commission's offices in San Francisco: 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102.

On the afternoon of Wednesday, August 31, 2016, from approximately 3:10 pm to 3:40 pm, Allan Rago, Ortensia Lopez and Ron Garcia of the EEC met with Jennifer Kalafut, advisor to Commissioner Peterman at the Commission's offices in San Francisco: 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102.

The communication was initiated by Ortensia Lopez of the EEC and focused on the proposed and alternate decisions of the investor-owned utilities for the CARE and ESA Programs. During the discussion EEC members expressed concern for any prioritization of high usage customers over low-usage customers, missing renter measures from the APD, requirements by the APD for enrollment into a

demand response program and the difference between buildings that participate in the whole building approach vs those buildings that simply need or want in-apartment measures. In addition, EEC members expressed concern of the loss of jobs that would accompany the PD if it were approved.

September 2, 2016

Respectfully Submitted,

By: /s/ *Allan Rago*

Allan Rago
Energy Efficiency Council
4751 Arrow Highway
Montclair, CA 91763
909-281-3531 (ph/fax)
arago@qesca.com