



FILED

04-05-10

04:59 PM

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of Southern California Edison Company (U338E) for Approval of its 2009-2011 Energy Efficiency Program Plans And Associated Public Goods Charge (PGC) And Procurement Funding Requests.

Application 08-07-021
(Filed July 21, 2008)

And related matters.

Application 08-07-022
Application 08-07-023
Application 08-07-031
(Filed July 21, 2008)

**REPLY COMMENTS OF THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
ON PROPOSED DECISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE GAMSON
ON EVALUATION, MEASUREMENT AND VERIFICATION PROCESSES
FOR 2010 THROUGH 2012 ENERGY EFFICIENCY PORTFOLIOS**

Robert Finkelstein
Legal Director

The Utility Reform Network

115 Sansome Street, #900
San Francisco, CA 94104
415-929-8876, x. 307
bfinkelstein@turn.org

Cynthia K. Mitchell
Energy Economics Inc.
530 Colgate Court
Reno, Nevada 89503
Phone: (775) 324-5300
E-mail: ckmitchell1@sbcglobal.net

April 5, 2010

SUBJECT INDEX

I. The PD Correctly Uses Final 2006-08 Evaluation Reports to Calculate Energy Impacts of 2009 Programs.....	1
II. The Commission Should Reject PG&E’s Request That Nearly Half The EM&V Funds Go To The Utilities Rather Than To Energy Division.....	2
III. Rather than Serving To Clarify the Process of Minimize Unnecessary Review and Litigation, NRDC’s Proposed Changes Would More Likely Further Undermine Energy Division’s Role In The EM&V Process.....	3
IV. The PD Properly Limits Implementation of SB 488 To “Comparative Energy Usage Disclosure Programs,” Not All Programs That Fall Within The Rubric Of “Behavior-Based” As SCE Seeks.....	4
V. The Commission Should Reject The Utilities’ Attempt To Increase Savings From “Codes and Standards” Programs From 50% to 100%.....	5

**REPLY COMMENTS OF TURN ON PROPOSED DECISION
ON EM&V PROCESSES FOR
2010-2012 ENERGY EFFICIENCY PORTFOLIOS**

Pursuant to Rule 14.3(d) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, The Utility Reform Network (TURN) submits these reply comments on Proposed Decision of Administrative Law Judge David Gamson on Evaluation, Measurement and Verification (EM&V) processes for the 2010 to 2012 energy efficiency portfolios (Proposed Decision or PD).

I. The PD Correctly Uses Final 2006-08 Evaluation Reports to Calculate Energy Impacts of 2009 Programs.

The Proposed Decision would have the Commission adopt ED's proposal to use results from final 2006-08 evaluation reports for calculating the impact of 2009 programs where those programs were evaluated during the 2006-08 period.¹ PG&E now claims that this is inconsistent with a "directive" the utility finds in the Bridge Funding decision (D.08-10-027).² The utility's position is faulty, though, as it selectively quotes the earlier decision's directive to the utilities to re-calculate the savings and cost-effectiveness of 2009 programs without mentioning one of the problems the directive was intended to solve: "[T]he EM&V process for the 2006-2008 programs has revealed discrepancies in the calculation of the savings numbers due to deviations by the IOUs from the 2005 [DEER] metrics."³ The problem identified in the Bridge Funding decision was mitigated in the final 2006-08 evaluation reports precisely because the IOUs were directed to eliminate the discrepancies that were causing the problem. Therefore the PD's adoption of the Straw Proposal's approach in this regard is appropriate and should Commission should maintain that outcome.

Even if PG&E's interpretation of the Bridge Funding decision on this point accurately reflects the Commission's intent, the substantial number of custom and non-DEER measures (and

¹ Proposed Decision, pp. 43-44.

² PG&E Comments, pp. 10-11, citing D.08-10-027, p. 17.

³ D.08-10-027, p. 17 [emphasis added].

the amount of program savings attributed to those measures) creates a significant problem. Using DEER 2008 rather than the results of the 2006-08 ex post measurement and valuation studies will mean that the utilities' claimed savings for custom and non-DEER measures will simply be passed through to the PEB calculation without ever having been the subject of measurement and verification. Therefore, should the Commission choose to change this element of the PD, it would need to further require that the utilities use the 2004-05 measurement and verification study results for all custom and non-DEER measures to ensure those measures are subject to at least some amount of M&V.

II. The Commission Should Reject PG&E's Request That Nearly Half The EM&V Funds Go To The Utilities Rather Than To Energy Division.

According to PG&E's comments, the Joint Plan submitted by the utilities and Energy Division included a \$49.5 million budget allocation resulting from a "bottoms-up estimate" and, therefore, the Commission should allocate that amount to the utilities.⁴ PG&E's approach simply claims for the utilities every dollar designated as process evaluation, market analysis, or early M&V in Table C of the Joint Plan.⁵ But the utility fails to address, much less explain, the other language in the Proposed Decision reminding the parties that Energy Division will continue to bear responsibility for process and formative evaluations, including the ultimate studies to determine if program or portfolio goals are met.⁶ PG&E asks the Commission to interpret Table C of the Joint Plan as if it intended to assign full responsibility for such work to the utilities (since all of the funding for such efforts would flow to the utilities under PG&E's reading).⁷ PG&E also simply

⁴ PG&E Comments, p. 4.

⁵ Joint Plan, Table C, p. 19 (attachment 1 to ALJ's Ruling of November 20, 2009).

⁶ Proposed Decision, p. 19.

⁷ Table C includes two broad categories – "Evaluation and M&V Projects" (with \$49.5 million for process evaluation, market analysis, and early M&V), and "Overarching and Policy Support Projects." There is nothing included in the latter category that would cover process evaluation, market analysis and early M&V, so even if the full amount of the latter category goes to Energy Division, it would not cover the staff's work in these areas.

glosses over the very different funding level (\$18.75 million) that Energy Division recommended as sufficient to permit the utilities to fulfill their EM&V responsibilities going forward.

The Commission should reject PG&E's argument because 1) the utility failed to demonstrate any legal or factual error, but rather simply is disagreeing with the outcome under the Proposed Decision; and 2) it inappropriately reduces funding that should go to the Energy Division to support its work as a neutral evaluator interested only in producing accurate and timely evaluations, without corporate or individual earnings tied to the results of those evaluations.

III. Rather than Serving To Clarify the Process of Minimize Unnecessary Review and Litigation, NRDC's Proposed Changes Would More Likely Further Undermine Energy Division's Role In The EM&V Process.

In a section that purports to present NRDC's support for requiring increased transparency and coordination of EM&V plans and contracts, NRDC instead makes recommendations that would more likely work counter to those goals. In nearly every case, NRDC's position is virtually identical to the position of at least one of the other utilities. For example, NRDC would have the Commission permit the utilities to request approval to perform "additional evaluation of an ED managed study or model that IOUs view as inadequate."⁸ If the utilities do not like ED's response to the request, they could pursue the matter further through the dispute resolution process. NRDC further recommends that all EM&V project plans and methodologies be made publicly available for informal stakeholder review as soon as they are available, and that ED should have no say over utility-performed studies where ostensibly funded with shareholder funds rather than through rates.⁹ Also, NRDC argues that the proposed dispute resolution mechanism should be have "input from

⁸ NRDC Comments, p. 2. *Compare with* SDG&E and SCG Comments, p. 6

⁹ NRDC Comments, pp. 2-3; *compare with* PG&E Comments, p. 9.

outside experts”, with the ALJ and Commissioners given the opportunity to consult “impartial experts”.¹⁰

None of NRDC’s comments on these points raise factual or legal error warranting any change to the Proposed Decision and, therefore, should be disregarded as non-compliant with the Commission’s rules. Even if the Commission were to consider the merits, it should reject such recommendations, whether from the utilities themselves or from NRDC, because they would undermine the role of Energy Division and more likely hinder rather than promote the staff’s ability to perform its work as efficiently as practicable.

IV. The PD Properly Limits Implementation of SB 488 To “Comparative Energy Usage Disclosure Programs,” Not All Programs That Fall Within The Rubric Of “Behavior-Based” As SCE Seeks.

The PD’s discussion of how to treat savings from “behavior-based” programs is limited to “comparative energy usage disclosure programs” because those are the subset of programs addressed in SB 488. However, it also would have the Commission state that it is “reasonable to attempt to measure savings from behavior based programs” and rely upon the prioritization plan in the adopted EM&V plan to decide which of the other programs in this category to evaluate and how that evaluation will occur.¹¹ SCE’s comments parrot the utility’s earlier position asking the Commission to treat anything deemed a “behavior based” program the same as it would treat the programs specified in SB 488.¹²

SCE fails to identify any factual or legal error with regard to the PD’s treatment of this issue, and so its comments should be disregarded. Even if the Commission were to consider the utility’s comments, it should note that SCE made no effort to counter the explanation set forth in the PD as to why a narrower approach is more appropriate at this time.

¹⁰ NRDC Comments, pp. 3-4; *compare with* SCE Comments, p. 3, and SDG&E and SCG Comments, p. 4.

¹¹ Proposed Decision, pp. 36-41 (in particular, p. 40).

¹² SCE Comments, p. 6.

V. The Commission Should Reject The Utilities’ Attempt To Increase Savings From “Codes and Standards” Programs From 50% to 100%.

PG&E and SCE ask the Commission to count 100% of Codes and Standards (C&S) program savings toward savings goals and calculations of net benefits (and, the utility leaves out, increased shareholder “earnings” under the existing mechanism).¹³ According to PG&E and SCE, the conditions that led to the 50% limitation adopted in D.05-09-043 are no longer relevant. But as the Proposed Decision makes clear, this assessment seems overly optimistic at best. As the Commission noted in D.09-09-047, the utilities have not even provided estimated savings numbers or bother explaining how they derived the savings estimates for two of the sub-programs that fall into C&S (“Compliance Enhancement Sub-Program” (CEP) and Reach Codes sub-program).¹⁴ Until the utilities provide such fundamental information and there is a meaningful opportunity to review and analyze their estimates, it is premature at best to even consider abandoning the current treatment of counting 50% of the savings from these programs, and then only to the extent the savings are from within the utility’s service territory.

Furthermore, the Commission recognized in D.05-09-043 that it would be inappropriate to include resource benefits from pre-2006 C&S standards in the calculation of benefits achieved by programs in place during the 2006-2008 period.¹⁵ Here the same concerns not only apply but are amplified, as the Commission will need to exclude benefits from pre-2010 C&S programs. The utilities’ comments set forth empty assurances that these problems have somehow disappeared. The Commission must not make such a substantial change in response to such a weakly supported argument as PG&E and SCE have put forward here.

¹³ PG&E Comments, pp. 12-14. SCE Comments, pp. 10-11.

¹⁴ D.09-09-047, p. 207.

¹⁵ D.05-09-043, p. 130; *see also* Attachment 10, p. 5.

Date: April 5, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By: /S/ _____
Robert Finkelstein
Legal Director

THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
115 Sansome Street, Suite 900
San Francisco, CA 94104
Phone: (415) 929-8876, x. 307
Fax: (415) 929-1132
Email: bfinkelstein@turn.org

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Serrita Teer, certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the following is true and correct:

On April 5, 2010 I served the attached:

**REPLY COMMENTS OF THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
ON PROPOSED DECISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE GAMSON
ON EVALUATION, MEASUREMENT AND VERIFICATION PROCESSES
FOR 2010 THROUGH 2012 ENERGY EFFICIENCY PORTFOLIOS**

on all eligible parties on the attached lists **A.08-07-021** by sending said document by electronic mail to each of the parties via electronic mail, as reflected on the attached Service List.

Executed this April 5, 2010, at San Francisco, California.

/S/
Serrita Teer

Service List for A.08-07-021

9watts@gmail.com
abesa@semprautilities.com
achang@efficiencycouncil.org
adam@agp-llc.com
aeo@cpuc.ca.gov
agarcia@energy.state.ca.us
alex.kang@itron.com
aliddell@icfi.com
ameliag@ensave.com
andrew.mcallister@energycenter.org
andrew.wood3@honeywell.com
andrew_meiman@newcomb.cc
ann.kelly@sfgov.org
Ann.Peterson@itron.com
ann_mccormick@newcomb.cc
annette.beitel@gmail.com
ashish.goel@intergycorp.com
ashley.watkins@energycenter.org
asloan@rs-e.com
atencate@rsgrp.com
atr@cpuc.ca.gov
awatson@quest-world.com
awp@cpuc.ca.gov
bbarkett@summitblue.com
bernardo@braunlegal.com
bfinkelstein@turn.org
bhines@svlg.net
bill@jbsenergy.com
bkc7@pge.com
bmatulich@egia.com
bmcdonnell@mwdh2o.com
bmfinkelor@ucdavis.edu
bob.ramirez@itron.com
bobbi.sterrett@swgas.com
bobho@mid.org
brad.bergman@intergycorp.com
brbarkovich@earthlink.net
brian.hedman@cadmusgroup.com
bruce.foster@sce.com
Bruce@BuildItGreen.org
cadickerson@cadconsulting.biz
Case.Admin@sce.com
cassandra.sweet@dowjones.com
cbe@cpuc.ca.gov
CCole@currentgroup.com
cem@newsdata.com
CentralFiles@semprautilities.com
CentralFiles@semprautilities.com
cf1@cpuc.ca.gov
cfpena@sempra.com
cheryl.collart@ventura.org

chris@cuwcc.org
cjn3@pge.com
ckmitchell1@sbcglobal.net
clamasbabbini@comverge.com
Clark.Pierce@us.landisgyr.com
cln@cpuc.ca.gov
cneedham@edisonmission.com
cperkins@energycoalition.org
craigtyler@comcast.net
crogers@energy.state.ca.us
crv@cpuc.ca.gov
cscruton@energy.state.ca.us
cxc@cpuc.ca.gov
cyin@yinsight.net
dale@betterbuildings.com
darmanino@co.marin.ca.us
david.gordon@efm-solutions.com
David.Pettijohn@ladwp.com
david.reynolds@ncpa.com
david@nemtzw.com
Dbjornskov@peci.org
ddayton@cleanenergysol.com
devon@hartmanbaldwin.com
dgeis@dolphingroup.org
dil@cpuc.ca.gov
dmahmud@mwdh2o.com
dmahone@h-m-g.com
dmano@enalsys.com
dmatson@co.santa-barbara.ca.us
dmg@cpuc.ca.gov
don.arambula@sce.com
donaldgilligan@comcast.net
dwood8@cox.net
edwardoneill@dwt.com
eemblem@3eintinc.net
efm2@pge.com
EGrizard@deweysquare.com
ehebert@energy.state.ca.us
elee@davisenergy.com
Elizabeth.DeSouza@csggrp.com
elowe@barakatconsulting.com
elvine@lbl.gov
emahlon@ecoact.org
emello@sppc.com
emily.hallett@positiveenergy.com
epetrill@epri.com
eric@ethree.com
etaylor@enalsys.com
filings@a-klaw.com
fred.coito@kema.com
gandhi.nikhil@verizon.net
garrick@jbsenergy.com

gclayborn@gmail.com
ghamilton@gepllc.com
glw@eslawfirm.com
grant.cooke@intergycorp.com
gsenergy@sonoma-county.org
gstaples@mendotagroup.net
gthomas@ecoact.org
gtropsa@ice-energy.com
hankryan2003@yahoo.com
hayley@turn.org
hcf@cpuc.ca.gov
hgilpeach@scanamerica.net
hhuerta@rhainc.com
hoerner@redefiningprogress.org
hxag@pge.com
HYao@SempraUtilities.com
irene.stillings@energycenter.org
jack.rosenthal@p2seng.com
jak@gepllc.com
jane@autocell.net
janep@researchintoaction.com
jared@efficiencyfirst.org
jay.bhalla@intergycorp.com
jbazemore@emi1.com
jbf@cpuc.ca.gov
jcastleberry@rs-e.com
jcelona@sbcglobal.net
jchou@nrdc.org
jci@cpuc.ca.gov
jcluboff@lmi.net
jdr@cpuc.ca.gov
jeanne.sole@sfgov.org
Jeff.Hirsch@DOE2.com
JeffreyH@hellermanus.com
jenna.canseco@us.kema.com
jennifer.fagan@itron.com
jennifer.porter@energycenter.org
Jennifer.Shigekawa@sce.com
jerryl@abag.ca.gov
jholmes@emi1.com
jimflanagan4@mac.com
jimross@r-c-s-inc.com
jkz1@pge.com
jl2@cpuc.ca.gov
jlaun@apogee.net
jmeyers@naima.org
jnc@cpuc.ca.gov
jody_london_consulting@earthlink.net
john.cavalli@itron.com
john@enactenergy.com
john@proctoreng.com
John_Newcomb@newcomb.cc

joyw@mid.org
jparks@smud.org
js@clearedgepower.com
jsqueri@goodinmacbride.com
jst@cpuc.ca.gov
jtiffany@ase.org
judi.schweitzer@post.harvard.edu
jweil@aglet.org
jws@cpuc.ca.gov
jyamagata@semprautilities.com
Karin.Coffee@kema.com
kathleen.gaffney@kema.com
kdusel@navigantconsulting.com
kecia.davison@csggrp.com
keh@cpuc.ca.gov
keith.mccrea@sutherland.com
kenneth.swain@navigantconsulting.com
kgrenfell@nrdc.org
kjk@kjkammerer.com
klewis@energy.state.ca.us
kmills@cbbf.com
ks3@cpuc.ca.gov
kshore@semprautilities.com
kwong@semprautilities.com
larry.cope@sce.com
Laura.Genao@sce.com
lcasentini@rsggrp.com
LDRI@pge.com
lettenson@nrdc.org
lhj2@pge.com
liddell@energyattorney.com
lisa_weinzimer@platts.com
ljimene@smud.org
lmh@eslawfirm.com
lp1@cpuc.ca.gov
lpark@navigantconsulting.com
LukeH@enasys.com
M1ke@pge.com
magnuson.leif@epa.gov
marcel@turn.org
mary.tucker@sanjoseca.gov
Mary@EquipoiseConsulting.com
matt@sustainablespaces.com
matt_sullivan@newcomb.cc
mbaker@sbwconsulting.com
mbhunt@ucdavis.edu
mboccardo@dolphingroup.org
mclaughlin@braunlegal.com
mgillette@enernoc.com
mgo@goodinmacbride.com
mharcos@rs-e.com
mharrigan@ase.org

michael.cheng@paconsulting.com
michael@ecoact.org
michael@opower.com
michele@boggis.com
mike.rogers@greenhomesamerica.com
mike@calcerts.com
mistib@comcast.net
mkh@cpuc.ca.gov
mking@staplesmarketing.com
mlewis@ctg-net.com
mlong@anaheim.net
mmcguire@summitblue.com
mmoore@newportpartnersllc.com
mmw@cpuc.ca.gov
monica.ghattas@sce.com
mpa@a-klaw.com
mrw@mrwassoc.com
msherida@energy.state.ca.us
mtierney-lloyd@enernoc.com
mwbeck@lbl.gov
NancyKRod@conSol.ws
nes@a-klaw.com
nfw@cpuc.ca.gov
nhernandez@isd.co.la.ca.us
nkarno@yahoo.com
nlong@nrdc.org
norman.furuta@navy.mil
nphall@tecmarket.net
padib@apx.com
paul.notti@honeywell.com
pbarthol@energy.state.ca.us
pcanessa@charter.net
pcf@cpuc.ca.gov
pjacobs@buildingmetrics.biz
pk@utilitycostmanagement.com
pmschwartz@sbcglobal.net
policy.solutions@comcast.net
ppl@cpuc.ca.gov
pstoner@lgc.org
puja.deverakonda@positiveenergyusa.com
pvillegas@semprautilities.com
pw1@cpuc.ca.gov
pwuebben@aqmd.gov
rachel.harcharik@itron.com
rafi@pge.com
regrelcpuccases@pge.com
rekl@pge.com
RemiT@hellermanus.com
rfox@intergycorp.com
richard@autocell.net
rita@ritanortonconsulting.com
rknight@bki.com

rlauman@ecosconsulting.com
rmccann@umich.edu
rmowris@earthlink.net
rnichols@navigantconsulting.com
rob@clfp.com
Rob@ConSol.ws
robertg@greenlining.org
rockybacchus@gmail.com
rsapudar@energy.state.ca.us
rscott@cheers.org
rsperberg@onsitenergy.com
s1w2@pge.com
Sami.Khawaja@cadmusgroup.com
samsirkin@cs.com
samuelk@greenlining.org
saw0@pge.com
sbarata@opiniondynamics.com
sbender@energy.state.ca.us
sbeserra@sbcglobal.net
scott.bowman@csgroup.com
scott.tomashefsky@ncpa.com
sculbertson@icfi.com
sdhilton@stoel.com
sean.harrington@opower.com
sephra.ninow@energycenter.org
sesco@optonline.net
sharon@emeter.com
singh70@gmail.com
skihm@ecw.org
slda@pge.com
sls@a-klaw.com
snr@cpuc.ca.gov
southlandreports@earthlink.net
spatrick@sempra.com
srm@cpuc.ca.gov
SRRd@pge.com
sschiller@efficiencycouncil.org
ssmyers@att.net
staples@staplesmarketing.com
steve@greenplumbersusa.com
stevek@kromer.com
steven@moss.net
sthompson@ci.irvine.ca.us
susan.munves@smgov.net
swentworth@oaklandnet.com
tam.hunt@gmail.com
tconlon@geopraxis.com
tcr@cpuc.ca.gov
tcrooks@mcr-group.com
tcx@cpuc.ca.gov
TFlanigan@EcoMotion.us
thamilton@icfi.com

tim@marinemt.org
tlmurray@earthlink.net
tmfry@nexant.com
tom@ucons.com
tory.weber@sce.com
trh@cpuc.ca.gov
twayne@roadrunner.com
TWhite@homeenergy.org
vwood@smud.org
wblattner@semprautilities.com
wbooth@booth-law.com
wem@igc.org
wilkinson@es.ucsb.edu
william.sanders@sfgov.org
wjp4@bpconsulting.org
wmcguire@fypower.org
wwester@smud.org
wynne@braunlegal.com
yxg4@pge.com
zap@cpuc.ca.gov
ztc@cpuc.ca.gov