



FILED

03-09-10
02:25 PM

Data Request response text for water energy PD

Timeline

It is our understanding that the following timelines will apply for each of the twenty-one projects shown below.¹ This understanding is based on the CWA timeline response to Energy Division Data requests 1241 and 1242 submitted on Feb 22, 2010 replicated below.

Data Request OEEP-1 - OEEP Time Line		19-Feb-10						
Water Utility	Project Name	Equipment Install	Start Date* Phase 1A	Phase 1A End	EM&V to Begin by**	Phase 1B Start ***	EM&V Report to Commission	
Alco	County Well	12/17/2009	12/28/2009 ~	3/1/2011	6/1/2010	5/1/2011	9/1/2011	
Alco	Hemingway Booster	12/28/2009	12/28/2009 ~	3/1/2011	6/1/2010	5/1/2011	9/1/2011	
Cal Water	Bakersfield station 176 Booster	3/1/2010	3/1/2010	3/1/2011	6/1/2010	5/1/2011	9/1/2011	
Cal Water	Chico Station 64 Well	2/12/2010	2/12/2010	2/12/2011	6/1/2010	4/12/2011	9/1/2011	
Cal Water	Visalia station 74 Well	3/1/2010	3/1/2010	3/1/2011	6/1/2010	5/1/2011	9/1/2011	
GSWC	Pacifica Booster Station	3/15/2010	4/1/2010	4/1/2011	6/1/2010	6/15/2011	9/1/2011	
GSWC	Jeffries Well #4 pump	3/15/2010	4/1/2010	4/1/2011	6/1/2010	6/15/2011	9/1/2011	
GSWC	Booster pump Mojave Manor	3/15/2010	4/1/2010	4/1/2011	6/1/2010	6/15/2011	9/1/2011	
San Jose	Grant Street Station Well #2	9/15/09 field construction	12/22/2009	12/22/2010	6/1/2010	2/22/2011	9/1/2011	
San Jose	Bascom Avenue Station Booster #2	started, both sites.	11/22/2009	11/22/2010	6/1/2010	1/22/2011	9/1/2011	
East Pasadena	Booster Pump #3	3/22/2010	5/1/2010	5/1/2011	6/1/2010	7/1/2011	9/1/2011	
East Pasadena	Well Pump #8~	3/22/2010	5/1/2010	5/1/2011	6/1/2010	7/1/2011	9/1/2011	
Cal Am	Cypress Well ~~~	3/8/2010	5/1/2010	5/1/2011	6/1/2010	7/1/2011	9/1/2011	
Cal Am	Rancho Canada Well ~~~	3/8/2010	5/1/2010	5/1/2011	6/1/2010	7/1/2011	9/1/2011	
Cal Am	Segundo Booster Station ~~~	3/8/2010	5/1/2010	5/1/2011	6/1/2010	7/1/2011	9/1/2011	
Cal Am	Angeles Mesa Booster #1 ~~~	3/8/2010	5/1/2010	5/1/2011	6/1/2010	7/1/2011	9/1/2011	
Cal Am	Angeles Mesa Booster #2 ~~~	3/8/2010	5/1/2010	5/1/2011	6/1/2010	7/1/2011	9/1/2011	
Cal Am	Scot Booster #1 ~~~	3/8/2010	5/1/2010	5/1/2011	6/1/2010	7/1/2011	9/1/2011	
Cal Am	Scot Booster #2 ~~~	3/8/2010	5/1/2010	5/1/2011	6/1/2010	7/1/2011	9/1/2011	
Cal Am	Scot Booster #3 ~~~	3/8/2010	5/1/2010	5/1/2011	6/1/2010	7/1/2011	9/1/2011	
Cal Am	Scot Booster #3 ~~~	3/8/2010	5/1/2010	5/1/2011	6/1/2010	7/1/2011	9/1/2011	

¹ Based on the CWA response submitted Feb. 22, 2010 to Energy Division EEGA requests 1241-PGE and 1242-SCE.

General Notes:

*Start date, and phase 1A start date are the same. Furthermore, start dates depend upon availability of Water Division staff support for equipment installation, software design, and training.

**EM&V consultant selection, EM&V start date and EM&V reporting date to the Commission and reporting results by project, on an energy utility or combined basis, will be decided in collaboration with assigned CPUC staff in the Energy Division and/or Water Division, energy utilities and water utilities. This data response assumes the EM&V study will begin on June 1 or sooner, and the report to the Commission is assumed to be completed by September 2011. The November 2009 petition states that EM&V "...shall commence within 90 days of completion of Phase 1A installation for all the OEEP RD&D projects."

***In Phase 1B, water utilities determine if pump and motor replacement is cost effective and then obtain approval from Water Division to replace pumps and motors. Dates are based on an assumption that the Phase 1B decision is made two months after completion of Phase 1A. Phase 1B ends with decision not to replace pumps and motors or equipment installation. Project completion is after Phase 1B and EM&V reporting to the Commission, whichever date comes later.

Water Company Specific Notes:

~ The East Pasadena Water Well Pump #8 site will be changed to the Duarte Road Well site, with no change in costs. The site change is needed because engineers concluded that the Well Pump #8 site could not accommodate needed monitoring equipment. East Pasadena has notified the Director of Water and Audits of this change.

~~Alco had all equipment necessary to start Phase 1A in December as noted above. However, with the newly installed monitoring equipment, Alco detected current imbalances on one leg of the three leg services at both project sites. The current imbalance is preventing Alco from collecting accurate project data. PG&E was immediately notified of the problem and is working with Alco on a resolution. Measurement of Phase 1A results will be delayed until PG&E resolves the current imbalance at both sites. The Phase 1A end date assumes correction of current imbalance by March 1, 2010.

~~~California American Water obtained approval for a memorandum account from the PUC on December 28, 2009. The memorandum account was needed to begin OEEP expenditures since the Cal Am projects were not part of the Commission's OEEP authorized projects. The company is completing preliminary engineering, and project bid preparation. The company expects to order construction contracts by March 8. Due to the much larger size of the Cal American Water OEEP projects, delivery of some electronic equipment such as Variable Frequency Drives may take 8 to 10 weeks. In addition, the company needs to install discharge flow meters for each pump, this requires contracting with outside pipe fitters. The company's estimate of a Phase 1A start of May 1 assumes no delays in equipment performance and integration.

**DRAFT  
DATA REQUEST RESPONSE  
Petition to Modify D. 08-11-057**

|                              |                                           |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| <b>Response provided by:</b> | David Morse                               |
| <b>Title:</b>                | OEEP Project Coordinator, Ca Water Assoc. |
| <b>Data Request Number:</b>  | OEEP-1 Question #2 response               |
| <b>Date Received:</b>        | February 1, 2010                          |
| <b>Date Due:</b>             | February 22, 2010                         |
| <b>Date Provided:</b>        | February 22, 2010                         |

**Response Provided to:** Mikhail Haramati - mkh@cpuc.ca.gov  
Raj Naidu – rkn@cpuc.ca.gov

---

**Data Request:**

2. **Timeline**-The original implementation date for the OEEP was March 1, 2009 which the PTM is proposing to change to Jan 31, 2010 for the previously approved projects. Because of the addition of four new projects, the PTM suggests moving the results reporting from April 1, 2010 to an as yet unspecified date. In the January 11, 2010 reply comments filed by CWA on behalf of the Joint Petitioning utilities, further high level timeline information is given suggesting nearly all projects will proceed on a similar schedule. *Please confirm this by providing timelines for each of the proposed projects that include best estimates of the following dates:*

- Project start
- Phase 1A start and end
- Phase 1B start and end
- Equipment installations (please specify if hardware or software)
- EM&V periods
- Project completion
- EM&V report date
- Results reporting to the Commission

**RESPONSE to OEEP-1, Question 2:**

***EM&V Evaluation Dates:***

*The PTM did not request changing the reporting date of April 1, 2010 because of the four new California American Water projects. Rather, the requested reporting date change was made for several reasons including: updated phase descriptions, updated project start dates, and providing sufficient time for CPUC staff to work with energy and water utilities to develop EM&V procedures. In reference to the original “Evaluation Program” reporting language of April 1, 2010 in D. 08-11-057, the PTM requests the following revision to Ordering Paragraph 2 regarding the commencement of the program evaluations:*

*“We approve the funding ... the EM&V process...shall commence within 90 days of completion of Phase 1A installation for all the OEEP RD&D projects.”*

*The PTM furthermore noted that “...all project implementation and EM&V analysis needs to be complete by the third quarter of 2011.”(page 17, PTM). The attached Excel spreadsheet provides a time line for the OEEP projects, including proposed start and end dates of EM&V. The EM&V projects are proposed to be completed by September 1, 2011. However, as noted in the spreadsheet, the actual completion date will be decided in collaboration with assigned CPUC staff in the Energy Division and/or Water Division, energy utilities, and water utilities.*

***Start Dates for OEEP:***

*The PTM proposed language on implementation dates, page A-2 requests the following:*

*“The Division of Water and Audits, the Energy Utilities, and the California Water Association and its utility members shall work together to implement the RD&D OEEP projects approved in the Decision, as updated in the Joint Petition or with the consent of the DWA, as applicable, by January 31, 2010, with the exception of those OEEP RD&D projects for California American. The implementation deadline for the California American OEEP RD&D projects shall be within two months of the Commission’s approval of the four new OEEP projects referenced in the Joint Petition.”*

*All water utilities are actively working on getting their OEEP projects operational. However, the January 31 date for beginning Phase 1A has been delayed for some projects as noted in the timeline. As described above in the PTM language, the water utilities are informing DWA staff as to progress of OEEP installation. The attached timeline summarizes the estimated start and end dates for each phase of the OEEP projects as of February 19, 2010. The projected start dates are estimates which depend on a variety of factors including availability of Water Division staff as well as absence of unanticipated technical problems.*

***Equipment Installations:***

*The attached timeline includes dates for equipment installation. This includes the installation of hardware and software.*

**Budget**

Based on the February 16, 2010 CWA budget response to Energy Division EEGA data requests 1241 and 1242, it is our understanding that the following budgets will apply within the constraints identified in the CWA response replicated below.

| OEEP Cost Summary                                    |                                  |                     |                     |                     |                     |                                |                     |  |
|------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| PG&E projects                                        |                                  | Cost                | Cost                | Energy Utility      | Water Company       | Integrated total for           |                     |  |
| Utility                                              | Project                          | D- 08-11-057        | Revised             | Pays*               | Pays**              | Petition to Modify changes     | **                  |  |
| Del Oro                                              | Pines District                   | \$ 100,000          | zero                |                     | \$ -                | Removed                        |                     |  |
| Cal Water                                            | Bakersfield station 176 Booster  | \$ 95,000           | \$ 108,000          | \$ 16,000           | \$ 92,000           | increase cost                  | \$ 156,983          |  |
| Cal Water                                            | Chico Station 64 Well            | \$ 110,000          | \$ 107,000          | \$ 23,000           | \$ 84,000           | increase cost                  | \$ 155,983          |  |
| GSWC                                                 | Pacifica Booster Station         | \$ 100,000          | \$ 129,000          | \$ 90,000           | \$ 39,000           | location change, increase cost | \$ 177,983          |  |
| San Jose Water                                       | Grant Street Station Well #2     | \$ 95,000           | \$ 349,000          | \$ 169,000          | \$ 180,000          | increase cost                  | \$ 408,400          |  |
| San Jose Water                                       | Bascom Avenue Station Booster #2 | \$ 100,000          | \$ 220,000          | \$ 122,000          | \$ 98,000           | change from "17th St station"  | \$ 279,400          |  |
| Cal American                                         | Cypress Well                     | zero                | \$ 141,000          | \$ 42,000           | \$ 99,000           | New Project                    | \$ 176,963          |  |
|                                                      | Rancho Canada Well               | zero                | \$ 44,000           | \$ 36,000           | \$ 8,000            | New Project                    | \$ 79,963           |  |
|                                                      | Segunda Booster Station          | zero                | \$ 263,000          | \$ 140,000          | \$ 123,000          | New Project                    | \$ 298,963          |  |
| Alco                                                 | County Well                      | \$ 194,000          | \$ 292,000          | \$ 157,000          | \$ 135,000          | increase cost                  | \$ 320,150          |  |
| Alco                                                 | Hemingway Booster                | \$ 53,000           | \$ 144,000          | \$ 112,000          | \$ 32,000           | increase cost                  | \$ 172,150          |  |
| <b>Subtotal PG&amp;E projects</b>                    |                                  | <b>\$ 847,000</b>   | <b>\$ 1,797,000</b> | <b>\$ 907,000</b>   | <b>\$ 890,000</b>   |                                | <b>\$ 2,226,938</b> |  |
| <b>SCE Projects</b>                                  |                                  |                     |                     |                     |                     |                                |                     |  |
| Cal Water                                            | Visalia station 74 Well          | \$ 110,000          | \$ 108,000          | \$ 15,000           | \$ 93,000           | change to Station 74           | \$ 155,683          |  |
| GSWC                                                 | Jeffries Well #4 Pump            | \$ 100,000          | \$ 138,000          | \$ 95,000           | \$ 43,000           | increase cost                  | \$ 185,683          |  |
| GSWC                                                 | Booster pump Mojave Manor        | \$ 60,000           | \$ 162,000          | \$ 102,000          | \$ 60,000           | increase cost                  | \$ 209,683          |  |
| East Pasadena                                        | Booster Pump #3                  | \$ 75,000           | \$ 55,000           | \$ 16,000           | \$ 39,000           | decrease in cost               | \$ 81,850           |  |
| East Pasadena                                        | Well Pump #8                     | \$ 139,500          | \$ 243,000          | \$ 86,000           | \$ 157,000          | increase in cost               | \$ 269,850          |  |
| Cal American                                         | Angeles Mesa Booster #1          | zero                | \$ 187,000          | \$ 81,000           | \$ 106,000          | New Project                    | \$ 221,663          |  |
|                                                      | Angeles Mesa Booster #2          | zero                | \$ 187,000          | \$ 81,000           | \$ 106,000          | New Project                    | \$ 221,663          |  |
|                                                      | Scot Booster #1                  | zero                | \$ 186,000          | \$ 80,000           | \$ 106,000          | New Project                    | \$ 220,663          |  |
|                                                      | Scot Booster #2                  | zero                | \$ 186,000          | \$ 80,000           | \$ 106,000          | New Project                    | \$ 220,663          |  |
|                                                      | Scot Booster #3                  | zero                | \$ 186,000          | \$ 80,000           | \$ 106,000          | New Project                    | \$ 220,663          |  |
| <b>Subtotal SCE project</b>                          |                                  | <b>\$ 484,500</b>   | <b>\$ 1,638,000</b> | <b>\$ 716,000</b>   | <b>\$ 922,000</b>   |                                | <b>\$ 2,008,063</b> |  |
| <b>All projects not including Admin and EM&amp;V</b> |                                  | <b>\$ 1,331,500</b> | <b>\$ 3,435,000</b> | <b>\$ 1,623,000</b> | <b>\$ 1,812,000</b> |                                |                     |  |
| <b>EM&amp;V Costs</b>                                |                                  |                     | <b>\$ 275,000</b>   | <b>\$ 275,000</b>   |                     |                                | <b>\$ 4,235,000</b> |  |
| <b>PG&amp;E and Edison Admin Costs - 8% of Total</b> |                                  |                     | <b>\$ 275,000</b>   | <b>\$ 275,000</b>   |                     |                                |                     |  |
| <b>Water Utility Admin Costs</b>                     |                                  |                     | <b>\$ 250,000</b>   |                     | <b>\$ 250,000</b>   |                                |                     |  |
| <b>All projects with Energy Admin Costs Included</b> |                                  | <b>\$ 1,331,500</b> | <b>\$ 4,235,000</b> | <b>\$ 2,173,000</b> | <b>\$ 2,062,000</b> |                                |                     |  |

| <b>Totals by water utility</b> |                 | <b>D-08-11-057</b>  | <b>Revised</b>      | <b>Revised Energy Utility</b> | <b>Revised Increase</b> | <b>Revised Energy Utility Increase</b> |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Alco                           |                 | \$ 247,000          | \$ 436,000          | \$ 269,000                    | \$ 189,000              | \$ 22,000                              |
| Cal Water                      |                 | \$ 315,000          | \$ 323,000          | \$ 54,000                     | \$ 8,000                | \$ (261,000)                           |
| GSWC                           |                 | \$ 260,000          | \$ 429,000          | \$ 287,000                    | \$ 169,000              | \$ 27,000                              |
| San Jose                       |                 | \$ 195,000          | \$ 569,000          | \$ 291,000                    | \$ 374,000              | \$ 96,000                              |
| East Pasadena                  |                 | \$ 214,500          | \$ 298,000          | \$ 102,000                    | \$ 83,500               | \$ (112,500)                           |
| Del Oro                        |                 | \$ 100,000          | zero                | zero                          | \$ (100,000)            | \$ (100,000)                           |
|                                | Sub total       | \$ 1,331,500        | \$ 2,055,000        | \$ 1,003,000                  | \$ 723,500              | \$ (608,000)                           |
| Cal Am                         | PG&E            |                     | \$ 448,000          | \$ 218,000                    | \$ 448,000              | \$ 448,000                             |
| Cal Am                         | SCE             |                     | \$ 932,000          | \$ 402,000                    | \$ 932,000              | \$ 932,000                             |
|                                | <b>Total</b>    | <b>\$ 1,331,500</b> | <b>\$ 3,435,000</b> | <b>\$ 1,623,000</b>           | <b>\$ 2,103,500</b>     | <b>\$ 772,000</b>                      |
|                                | Admin PG&E 8%   |                     | \$ 144,000          |                               |                         |                                        |
|                                | Admin SCE 8%    |                     | \$ 131,000          |                               |                         |                                        |
|                                | EM&V PG&E       |                     | \$ 137,500          |                               |                         |                                        |
|                                | EM&V SCE        |                     | \$ 137,500          |                               |                         |                                        |
|                                | Water Admin     |                     | \$ 250,000          |                               |                         |                                        |
|                                | Total all costs |                     | \$ 4,235,000        |                               |                         |                                        |

\* Includes OEEP, IT, System Integration, and VFD for Alco projects \*\* Includes Equipment, Incremental O&M.

\*\* Includes allocation of EM&V and Admin costs, actual EM&V and Admin costs may not track to this estimate. See tabs for further breakdown of costs.

Utility Alco

| Project details                      | Site Name         | Cost for OEEP Measuring Instruments | Equipment Cost    | IT Costs Data collection, Storage, Analysis, & Transmission | Incremental O&M  | System Integration | Total Project     | VFD Portion of equipment | EM&V             | Energy Admin     | Water Admin |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|
| County 2009-9010                     | County Well       | \$ 76,000                           | \$ 154,000        | \$ 52,000                                                   | \$ 5,000         | \$ 5,000           | \$ 292,000        | \$ 24,000                | \$ 13,750        | \$ 14,400        | 0           |
| Alco costs                           |                   |                                     | \$ 130,000        |                                                             | \$ 5,000         |                    |                   |                          |                  |                  |             |
| PG&E Costs                           |                   | \$ 76,000                           |                   | \$ 52,000                                                   |                  | \$ 5,000           |                   | \$ 24,000                | \$ 13,750        | \$ 14,400        |             |
| Hemingway 2009-9009                  | Hemingway Booster | \$ 63,000                           | \$ 38,000         | \$ 33,000                                                   | \$ 5,000         | \$ 5,000           | \$ 144,000        | \$ 11,000                | \$ 13,750        | \$ 14,400        |             |
| Alco Costs                           |                   |                                     | \$ 27,000         |                                                             | \$ 5,000         |                    |                   |                          |                  |                  |             |
| PG&E costs                           |                   | \$ 63,000                           |                   | \$ 33,000                                                   |                  | \$ 5,000           |                   | \$ 11,000                | \$ 13,750        | \$ 14,400        |             |
| <b>Total Alco and Total PG&amp;E</b> |                   | <b>\$ 215,000</b>                   | <b>\$ 322,000</b> | <b>\$ 137,000</b>                                           | <b>\$ 15,000</b> | <b>\$ 20,000</b>   | <b>\$ 436,000</b> | <b>\$ 70,000</b>         | <b>\$ 55,000</b> | <b>\$ 57,600</b> |             |

| Utility                | Cal Water               | Cost for            | Equipment            | IT Costs                             | Incremental         | System      |                      |                  |                  |                  |                   |
|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Project details        |                         | OEEP Measuring      | Cost                 | Data collection,                     | O&M                 | Integration | Total Project        | EM&V             | Energy           | Water            | Total with        |
| project #              | Site Name               | Instruments         |                      | Storage, Analysis,<br>& Transmission |                     |             |                      |                  | Admin            | Admin            | Overhead          |
|                        | Bakersfield station 176 | \$ 6,000.00         | \$ 87,000.00         | \$ 10,000.00                         | \$ 5,000.00         |             | \$ 108,000.00        | \$ 13,750        | \$ 14,400        | \$ 20,833        | \$ 156,983        |
|                        | Cal Water Costs         |                     | \$ 87,000.00         |                                      | \$ 5,000.00         |             |                      |                  |                  | \$ 20,833        | \$ 112,833        |
|                        | PG&E Costs              | \$ 6,000.00         |                      | \$ 10,000.00                         |                     |             |                      | \$ 13,750        | \$ 14,400        |                  | \$ 44,150         |
|                        | Chico Station 64 Well   | \$ 13,000.00        | \$ 79,000.00         | \$ 10,000.00                         | \$ 5,000.00         |             | \$ 107,000.00        | \$ 13,750        | \$ 14,400        | \$ 20,833        | \$ 155,983        |
|                        | Cal Water Costs         |                     | \$ 79,000.00         |                                      | \$ 5,000.00         |             |                      |                  |                  | \$ 20,833        | \$ 104,833        |
|                        | PG&E Costs              | \$ 13,000.00        |                      | \$ 10,000.00                         |                     |             |                      | \$ 13,750        | \$ 14,400        |                  | \$ 51,150         |
| <b>Total PG&amp;E</b>  | <b>OEEP Projects</b>    | <b>\$ 19,000.00</b> | <b>\$ 166,000.00</b> | <b>\$ 20,000.00</b>                  | <b>\$ 10,000.00</b> |             | <b>\$ 215,000</b>    | <b>\$ 27,500</b> | <b>\$ 28,800</b> | <b>\$ 41,667</b> | <b>\$ 312,967</b> |
|                        | Visalia station 74 Well | \$ 5,000.00         | \$ 88,000.00         | \$ 10,000.00                         | \$ 5,000.00         | \$ -        | \$ 108,000.00        | \$ 13,750        | \$ 13,100        | \$ 20,833        | \$ 155,683        |
|                        | Cal Water Costs         |                     | \$ 88,000.00         |                                      | \$ 5,000.00         |             |                      |                  |                  |                  |                   |
|                        | SCE Costs               | \$ 5,000.00         |                      | \$ 10,000.00                         |                     |             |                      |                  |                  |                  |                   |
| <b>Total SCE OEEP</b>  | <b>Projects</b>         | <b>\$ 5,000.00</b>  | <b>\$ 88,000.00</b>  | <b>\$ 10,000.00</b>                  | <b>\$ 10,000.00</b> |             | <b>\$ 108,000.00</b> | <b>\$ 13,750</b> | <b>\$ 13,100</b> | <b>\$ 20,833</b> | <b>\$ 155,683</b> |
| <b>Total Cal Water</b> |                         | <b>\$ 24,000.00</b> | <b>\$ 254,000.00</b> | <b>\$ 30,000.00</b>                  | <b>\$ 20,000.00</b> |             | <b>\$ 323,000.00</b> | <b>\$ 41,250</b> | <b>\$ 41,900</b> | <b>\$ 62,500</b> | <b>\$ 468,650</b> |

| Utility Project details project # | GSWC Site Name            | Cost for OEEP Measuring Instruments | Equipment Cost   | IT Costs Data collection, Storage, Analysis, & Transmission | Incremental O&M  | System Integration | Total Project     | EM&V             | Energy Admin     | Water Admin      | Total with Overhead |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|
|                                   | Pacifica Booster Station  | \$ 70,000                           | \$ 34,000        | \$ 15,000                                                   | \$ 5,000         | \$ 5,000           | \$ 129,000        | \$ 13,750        | \$ 14,400        | \$ 20,833        | \$ 177,983          |
|                                   | GSWC Costs                |                                     | \$ 34,000        |                                                             | \$ 5,000         |                    |                   |                  |                  | \$ 20,833        | \$ 59,833           |
|                                   | PG&E Costs                | \$ 70,000                           |                  | \$ 15,000                                                   |                  | \$ 5,000           |                   | \$ 13,750        | \$ 14,400        |                  | \$ 118,150          |
| <b>Total PG&amp;E</b>             |                           | <b>\$ 70,000</b>                    | <b>\$ 34,000</b> | <b>\$ 15,000</b>                                            | <b>\$ 5,000</b>  | <b>\$ 5,000</b>    | <b>\$ 129,000</b> |                  |                  |                  |                     |
|                                   | Jeffries Well #4 pump     | \$ 75,000                           | \$ 38,000        | \$ 15,000                                                   | \$ 5,000         | \$ 5,000           | \$ 138,000        | \$ 13,750        | \$ 13,100        | \$ 20,833        | \$ 185,683          |
|                                   | GSWC Costs                |                                     | \$ 38,000        |                                                             | \$ 5,000         |                    |                   |                  |                  | \$ 20,833        | \$ 63,833           |
|                                   | SCE Costs                 | \$ 75,000                           |                  | \$ 15,000                                                   |                  | \$ 5,000           |                   | \$ 13,750        | \$ 13,100        |                  | \$ 121,850          |
|                                   | Booster pump Mojave Manor | \$ 82,000                           | \$ 55,000        | \$ 15,000                                                   | \$ 5,000         | \$ 5,000           | \$ 162,000        | \$ 13,750        | \$ 13,100        | \$ 20,833        | \$ 209,683          |
|                                   | GSWC Costs                |                                     | \$ 55,000        |                                                             | \$ 5,000         |                    |                   |                  |                  | \$ 20,833        | \$ 80,833           |
|                                   | SCE Costs                 | \$ 82,000                           |                  | \$ 15,000                                                   |                  | \$ 5,000           |                   | \$ 13,750        | \$ 13,100        |                  | \$ 128,850          |
| <b>Total SCE</b>                  |                           | <b>\$ 157,000</b>                   | <b>\$ 93,000</b> | <b>\$ 30,000</b>                                            | <b>\$ 10,000</b> | <b>\$ 10,000</b>   | <b>\$ 300,000</b> | <b>\$ 27,500</b> | <b>\$ 26,200</b> | <b>\$ 41,667</b> | <b>\$ 395,367</b>   |

| Utility                                         | San Jose                         |                   |                                                             |                   |                    |                  |                   |                  |                  |                     |                   |            |  |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------|--|
| Project details                                 | Cost for OEEP Measuring          | Equipment Cost    | IT Costs Data collection, Storage, Analysis, & Transmission | Incremental O&M   | System Integration | Total Project    | EM&V              | Energy Admin     | Water Admin      | Total with Overhead |                   |            |  |
| project #                                       | Site Name                        | Instruments       |                                                             |                   |                    |                  |                   |                  |                  |                     |                   |            |  |
| SJ-W001                                         | Grant Street Station Well #2     | \$ 84,000         | \$ 175,000                                                  | \$ 59,000         | \$ 5,000           | \$ 26,000        | \$ 349,000        | \$ 13,750        | \$ 14,400        | \$ 31,250           | \$ 408,400        |            |  |
| SJ-B001                                         | Bascom Avenue Station Booster #2 | \$ 47,000         | \$ 93,000                                                   | \$ 59,000         | \$ 5,000           | \$ 16,000        | \$ 220,000        | \$ 13,750        | \$ 14,400        | \$ 31,250           | \$ 279,400        |            |  |
| <b>Cost allocation between energy and water</b> |                                  | <b>\$ 131,000</b> | <b>\$ 268,000</b>                                           | <b>\$ 118,000</b> | <b>\$ 10,000</b>   | <b>\$ 42,000</b> | <b>\$ 569,000</b> | <b>\$ 27,500</b> | <b>\$ 28,800</b> | <b>\$ 62,500</b>    | <b>\$ 687,800</b> |            |  |
| San Jose PG&E total                             |                                  | \$ 131,000        | \$ 268,000                                                  | \$ 118,000        | \$ 10,000          | \$ 42,000        |                   | \$ 27,500        | \$ 28,800        | \$ 62,500           | \$ 347,300        | \$ 687,800 |  |

| Utility Project details            | Cal American            | Cost for OEEP Measuring Instruments | Equipment Cost    | IT Costs Data collection, Storage, Analysis, & Transmission | Incremental O&M  | System Integration | Total Project       | EM&V              | Energy Admin      | Water Admin      | Total with Overhead |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| project #                          | Site Name               |                                     |                   |                                                             |                  |                    |                     |                   |                   |                  |                     |
|                                    | Cypress Well            | \$ 23,000                           | \$ 94,000         | \$ 14,000                                                   | \$ 5,000         | \$ 5,000           | \$ 141,000          | \$ 13,750         | \$ 14,400         | \$ 7,813         | \$ 176,963          |
|                                    | CAW Costs               |                                     | \$ 94,000         |                                                             | \$ 5,000         |                    |                     |                   |                   | \$ 7,813         | \$ 106,813          |
|                                    | PG&E Costs              | \$ 23,000                           |                   | \$ 14,000                                                   |                  | \$ 5,000           |                     | \$ 13,750         | \$ 14,400         |                  | \$ 70,150           |
|                                    | Rancho Canada Well      | \$ 23,000                           | \$ 3,000          | \$ 8,000                                                    | \$ 5,000         | \$ 5,000           | \$ 44,000           | \$ 13,750         | \$ 14,400         | \$ 7,813         | \$ 79,963           |
|                                    | CAW Costs               |                                     | \$ 3,000          |                                                             | \$ 5,000         |                    |                     |                   |                   | \$ 7,813         | \$ 15,813           |
|                                    | PG&E Costs              | \$ 23,000                           |                   | \$ 8,000                                                    |                  | \$ 5,000           |                     | \$ 13,750         | \$ 14,400         |                  | \$ 64,150           |
|                                    | Segunda Booster Station | \$ 113,000                          | \$ 118,000        | \$ 22,000                                                   | \$ 5,000         | \$ 5,000           | \$ 263,000          | \$ 13,750         | \$ 14,400         | \$ 7,813         | \$ 298,963          |
|                                    | CAW Costs               |                                     | \$ 118,000        |                                                             | \$ 5,000         |                    |                     |                   |                   | \$ 7,813         | \$ 130,813          |
|                                    | PG&E Costs              | \$ 113,000                          |                   | \$ 22,000                                                   |                  | \$ 5,000           |                     | \$ 13,750         | \$ 14,400         |                  | \$ 168,150          |
| <b>Total PG&amp;E</b>              |                         | <b>\$ 159,000</b>                   | <b>\$ 215,000</b> | <b>\$ 44,000</b>                                            | <b>\$ 15,000</b> | <b>\$ 15,000</b>   | <b>\$ 448,000</b>   | <b>\$ 41,250</b>  | <b>\$ 43,200</b>  | <b>\$ 23,438</b> | <b>\$ 555,888</b>   |
|                                    | Angeles Mesa Booster #1 | \$ 70,000                           | \$ 101,000        | \$ 6,000                                                    | \$ 5,000         | \$ 5,000           | \$ 187,000          | \$ 13,750         | \$ 13,100         | \$ 7,813         | \$ 221,663          |
|                                    | CAW Costs               |                                     | \$ 101,000        |                                                             | \$ 5,000         |                    |                     |                   |                   | \$ 7,813         | \$ 113,813          |
|                                    | SCE Costs               | \$ 70,000                           |                   | \$ 6,000                                                    |                  | \$ 5,000           |                     | \$ 13,750         | \$ 13,100         |                  | \$ 107,850          |
|                                    | Angeles Mesa Booster #2 | \$ 70,000                           | \$ 101,000        | \$ 6,000                                                    | \$ 5,000         | \$ 5,000           | \$ 187,000          | \$ 13,750         | \$ 13,100         | \$ 7,813         | \$ 221,663          |
|                                    | CAW Costs               |                                     | \$ 101,000        |                                                             | \$ 5,000         |                    |                     |                   |                   | \$ 7,813         | \$ 113,813          |
|                                    | SCE Costs               | \$ 70,000                           |                   | \$ 6,000                                                    |                  | \$ 5,000           |                     | \$ 13,750         | \$ 13,100         |                  | \$ 107,850          |
|                                    | Scot Booster #1         | \$ 69,000                           | \$ 101,000        | \$ 6,000                                                    | \$ 5,000         | \$ 5,000           | \$ 186,000          | \$ 13,750         | \$ 13,100         | \$ 7,813         | \$ 220,663          |
|                                    | CAW Costs               |                                     | \$ 101,000        |                                                             | \$ 5,000         |                    |                     |                   |                   | \$ 7,813         | \$ 113,813          |
|                                    | SCE Costs               | \$ 69,000                           |                   | \$ 6,000                                                    |                  | \$ 5,000           |                     | \$ 13,750         | \$ 13,100         |                  | \$ 106,850          |
|                                    | Scot Booster #2         | \$ 69,000                           | \$ 101,000        | \$ 6,000                                                    | \$ 5,000         | \$ 5,000           | \$ 186,000          | \$ 13,750         | \$ 13,100         | \$ 7,813         | \$ 220,663          |
|                                    | CAW Costs               |                                     | \$ 101,000        |                                                             | \$ 5,000         |                    |                     |                   |                   | \$ 7,813         | \$ 113,813          |
|                                    | SCE Costs               | \$ 69,000                           |                   | \$ 6,000                                                    |                  | \$ 5,000           |                     | \$ 13,750         | \$ 13,100         |                  | \$ 106,850          |
|                                    | Scot Booster #3         | \$ 69,000                           | \$ 101,000        | \$ 6,000                                                    | \$ 5,000         | \$ 5,000           | \$ 186,000          | \$ 13,750         | \$ 13,100         | \$ 7,813         | \$ 220,663          |
|                                    | CAW Costs               |                                     | \$ 101,000        |                                                             | \$ 5,000         |                    |                     |                   |                   | \$ 7,813         | \$ 113,813          |
|                                    | SCE Costs               | \$ 69,000                           |                   | \$ 6,000                                                    |                  | \$ 5,000           |                     | \$ 13,750         | \$ 13,100         |                  | \$ 106,850          |
| <b>Total SCE</b>                   |                         | <b>\$ 347,000</b>                   | <b>\$ 505,000</b> | <b>\$ 30,000</b>                                            | <b>\$ 25,000</b> | <b>\$ 25,000</b>   | <b>\$ 932,000</b>   | <b>\$ 68,750</b>  | <b>\$ 65,500</b>  | <b>\$ 39,063</b> | <b>\$ 1,105,313</b> |
| <b>Total Edison &amp; PG&amp;E</b> |                         | <b>\$ 506,000</b>                   | <b>\$ 720,000</b> | <b>\$ 74,000</b>                                            | <b>\$ 40,000</b> |                    | <b>\$ 1,380,000</b> | <b>\$ 110,000</b> | <b>\$ 108,700</b> | <b>\$ 62,500</b> | <b>\$ 1,661,200</b> |

| Utility                                  | East Pasadena   | Cost for OEEP         | Equipment Cost | Reimbursement from other SCE Program | Net equipment costs | IT Costs Data collection, Storage, & | Incremental O&M | System Integration | Total Project | EM&V      | Energy Admin | Water Admin | Total with Overhead |
|------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------|--------------|-------------|---------------------|
| Project details project #                | Site Name       | Measuring Instruments | Cost           |                                      |                     |                                      |                 |                    |               |           |              |             |                     |
|                                          | Booster Pump #3 | \$ 9,000              | \$ 41,000      | \$ 5,000                             | \$ 36,000           | \$ 2,000                             | \$ 3,000        | \$ 5,000           | \$ 55,000     | \$ 13,750 | \$ 13,100    | \$ -        | \$ 81,850           |
|                                          | Well Pump #8    | \$ 69,000             | \$ 151,000     |                                      | \$ 151,000          | \$ 12,000                            | \$ 6,000        | \$ 5,000           | \$ 243,000    | \$ 13,750 | \$ 13,100    | \$ -        | \$ 269,850          |
| <b>Total SCE and Total East Pasadena</b> |                 | \$ 78,000             | \$ 192,000     |                                      | 187,000             | \$ 14,000                            | \$ 9,000        | \$ 10,000          | \$ 298,000    | \$ 27,500 | \$ 26,200    | \$ -        | \$ 351,700          |

Cost allocation between energy and water

|               |           |            |            |  |           |          |           |  |           |           |  |  |            |
|---------------|-----------|------------|------------|--|-----------|----------|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|--|--|------------|
| East Pasadena |           |            | \$ 187,000 |  |           |          | \$ 9,000  |  |           |           |  |  | \$ 196,000 |
| SCE           | \$ 78,000 |            |            |  | \$ 14,000 |          | \$ 10,000 |  | \$ 27,500 | \$ 26,200 |  |  | \$ 155,700 |
|               | \$ 78,000 | \$ 187,000 |            |  | \$ 14,000 | \$ 9,000 | \$ 10,000 |  | \$ 27,500 | \$ 26,200 |  |  | \$ 351,700 |

**Table 2**

|                            | well                |              |                 | pump         |              |              |
|----------------------------|---------------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|                            | Total               | PG&E         | Water           | total        | PG&E         | water        |
| Alco                       | \$ 292,000          | \$ 157,000   | \$ 135,000      | \$ 144,000   | \$ 112,000   | \$ 32,000    |
| CAW                        | \$ 185,000          | \$ 78,000    | \$ 107,000      | \$ 263,000   | \$ 140,000   | \$ 123,000   |
| CWS                        | \$ 107,000          | \$ 23,000    | \$ 84,000       | \$ 108,000   | \$ 16,000    | \$ 92,000    |
| GSWC                       |                     |              |                 | \$ 129,000   | \$ 90,000    | \$ 39,000    |
| SJ                         | \$ 349,000          | \$ 169,000   | \$ 180,000      | \$ 220,000   | \$ 122,000   | \$ 98,000    |
| sub total                  | \$ 933,000          | \$ 427,000   | \$ 506,000      | \$ 864,000   | \$ 480,000   | \$ 384,000   |
|                            |                     | <b>SCE</b>   |                 |              | <b>SCE</b>   |              |
| CAW                        |                     |              |                 | \$ 932,000   | \$ 402,000   | \$ 530,000   |
| CWS                        | \$ 108,000          | \$ 15,000    | \$ 93,000       |              |              |              |
| GSWC                       | \$ 138,000          | \$ 95,000    | \$ 43,000       | \$ 162,000   | \$ 102,000   | \$ 60,000    |
| East Pa                    | \$ 243,000          | \$ 86,000    | \$ 157,000      | \$ 55,000    | \$ 16,000    | \$ 39,000    |
| sub total                  | \$ 489,000          | \$ 196,000   | \$ 293,000      | \$ 1,149,000 | \$ 520,000   | \$ 629,000   |
| all total                  | \$ 1,422,000        | \$ 623,000   | \$ 799,000      | \$ 2,013,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,013,000 |
| <b>Total Water</b>         | <b>\$ 1,812,000</b> | <b>admin</b> | <b>EM&amp;V</b> | <b>Total</b> |              |              |
| <b>Total PG&amp;E pays</b> | <b>\$ 907,000</b>   | \$ 144,000   | \$ 137,400      | \$ 1,051,000 |              |              |
| <b>Total SCE pays</b>      | <b>\$ 716,000</b>   | \$ 131,000   | \$ 137,400      | \$ 847,000   |              |              |
| <b>Grand Total</b>         | <b>\$ 3,435,000</b> | \$ 275,000   | \$ 274,800      | \$ 3,984,800 |              |              |
| <b>water utility admin</b> |                     |              |                 | \$ 250,000   |              |              |
| <b>Total</b>               |                     |              |                 | \$ 4,234,800 |              |              |

**DATA REQUEST RESPONSE  
Petition to Modify D. 08-11-057**

**Response provided by:**  
**Title:**

David Morse  
OEEP Project Coordinator, Ca Water Assoc.

**Data Request Number:** OEEP-1 (Budget and Timeline Request)  
**Date Received:** February 1, 2010  
**Date Due:** February 16, 2010  
**Date Provided:** February 16, 2010  
**Response Provided to:** Mikhail Haramati - mkh@cpuc.ca.gov  
Raj Naidu – rkn@cpuc.ca.gov

---

**Data Request:**

**Budget and Timeline Data Request on the Petition to Modify D. 08-11-057**

The Petition to Modify Decision 08-11-057, filed by the California Water Association, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company (collectively, the Joint Petitioners) on November 23, 2009, included descriptions of the additional projects proposed, how new funds would be used, rules regarding fund shifting and allowable project costs, and a revised timeline.

In order to undertake an informed and thoughtful review of the proposal under consideration, the Commission is requesting the provision of the following additional information regarding these items. The Joint Petitioners shall provide responses to the following items by **February 15, 2010**. *On February 9, 2010, Mikhail Haramati verbally informed CWA, PG&E, and SCE that the due date was February 16, 2010 since February 15 is a holiday.*

2. **Detailed Budgets-** While providing updated budget information for the OEEP projects and OEEP projects overall, the PTM does not contain comprehensive, detailed budgets for each project. Specifically, the EM&V, operations and maintenance, administration and support, and systems integration costs are not broken down by project. Through this response, the Commission is seeking an understanding of the total cost associated with the project by all partners. We understand that a good deal of this information may be estimates, and ask that the parties do their best to come up with accurate values based on currently available information.

*a) Using the attached spreadsheet, please present the total budget estimated for each project showing a detailed allocation of the following costs:*

- *Administration and Support*

- *EM&V*
- *Operations and Maintenance*
- *Equipment*
- *System Integration*

*These should be broken out by project to show the respective contributions of the various parties committing funds as illustrated in the example below. This budget should be inclusive of all project costs by all partners, and contain a summary table.*

| PGE                 |           | Alco Water Service |              |                     |                   |                  |                  |
|---------------------|-----------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Project             | water IOU | energy IOU         | Cost name    | Cost type           | Cost distribution |                  | Total            |
|                     |           |                    |              |                     | water utility     | energy utility   |                  |
| Alco                | Alco      | PGE                | Well pump    | equipment cost      | \$135,000         | \$157,000        | \$292,000        |
|                     |           |                    | Booster Pump | equipment cost      | \$32,000          | \$112,000        | \$144,000        |
|                     |           |                    |              | oper. & maintenance |                   |                  | \$0              |
|                     |           |                    |              | system integration  |                   |                  | \$0              |
|                     |           |                    |              | EM&V                |                   |                  | \$0              |
| total (w/out admin) |           |                    |              |                     | \$167,000         | \$269,000        | \$436,000        |
|                     |           |                    |              | admin&support       |                   | \$21,520         | \$21,520         |
| <b>total</b>        |           |                    |              |                     | <b>\$167,000</b>  | <b>\$290,520</b> | <b>\$457,520</b> |

**Totals Table**

| Cost type           | PGE | SCE | Water companies | Total Pilot costs |
|---------------------|-----|-----|-----------------|-------------------|
| equipment cost      |     |     |                 |                   |
| oper. & maintenance |     |     |                 |                   |
| admin&support       |     |     |                 |                   |
| system integration  |     |     |                 |                   |
| EM&V                |     |     |                 |                   |

|       |  |  |  |  |
|-------|--|--|--|--|
| total |  |  |  |  |
|-------|--|--|--|--|

**RESPONSE to OEEP-1, Question 1a:**

*With the exception of EM&V and Administration and Support costs for the energy utilities, CWA developed the budgets for this program and developed the attached Excel spreadsheet titled Question 1a data response, which provides the information requested above. PG&E and SCE have reviewed the contents of the attached spreadsheet and confirm that the project costs assigned to them in the summary tab and Table 2 tab conform to what was reported in the PTM. The total EM&V from all of the projects correctly sums to \$275,000, which is split evenly between PG&E and SCE. PG&E administration and support costs correctly total \$144,000, and SCE’s correctly total \$131,000.*

*CWA, PG&E, and SCE staff discussed the data response format issue with Energy Division staff on February 9, 2010. Energy Division staff indicated that the data response associated with Question 1a could use a different format as long as the information requested in question 1a is provided.*

*b) Please confirm whether all costs to be incurred by the water and energy utilities over the entire duration of the project are included in the budget presented in the 11/23/09 PTM Tables 2 and 3. If there are other types of costs which have not been included previously, or if there are changes to costs or additional items which have come to light since the PTM, please include them in the response to item 1a above.*

**RESPONSE to OEEP-1, Question 1b:**

*Tables 2 and 3 from the 11/23/09 PTM provide a summary of all known costs to date. As noted on page 13 of the November 23, 2009 petition: “...the OEEP RD&D costs included in this Joint Petition are estimates. The actual costs of the program may be higher or lower, and there should be no presumption that costs in excess of the estimates are not reasonable. The Joint Petitioners request that PG&E and SCE have a cap on their obligation to fund OEEP projects in the amount of \$907,000 and \$716,000, respectively,<sup>2</sup> which is the agreed-upon share of the Energy Utilities’ responsibilities based upon the updated cost*

---

<sup>2</sup> Excluding EM&V and administrative costs.

***estimates and allocations accompanying this Joint Petition. (See Table 2.) The Water Utilities will fund actual costs incurred above the revised project cost estimates.”***

*c) When project wide or IOU wide costs are presented for each program, please indicate the method by which this cost breakdown is determined. For instance, please indicate if the \$250,000 allocated for EM&V of the OEEP pilot will be distributed evenly among the projects for the purpose of these detailed budgets, or if they will be apportioned via a different method.*

***RESPONSE to OEEP-1, Question 1c:***

*The attached Excel spreadsheet referenced in response to Question 1a provides a summary of costs by project. The spreadsheet also includes a breakdown of costs by project and, furthermore, an estimate of project costs for Energy and Water utility administrative costs, as well as the EM&V cost.*

***EM&V Costs: Section III.*** *Evaluation, Measurement and Verification (EM&V) Budget in the PTM identifies the total EM&V costs as \$275,000, rather than \$250,000 as stated in the question. This cost is split evenly between PG&E and SCE at \$137,500 for each energy utility, and the cost was not estimated on a per project basis. The evaluation budget was set at approximately 8% of total project costs, excluding administration and project support costs, using guidelines from the California Evaluation Framework (CEF). These guidelines suggest that evaluation budgets be set between 4% and 8% (p. 76, CEF). However, new programs and pilot programs should be allotted a larger budget than an ongoing program, because (1) there is no history of effectiveness for new programs, and (2) they require a more thorough evaluation to understand their effectiveness (p. 390, CEF).*

*Each project’s estimated share of EM&V costs can be ascertained by dividing the respective energy utility EM&V costs by the number of projects. Thus, each project’s share of EM&V costs is \$13,750. ( $\$275,000/20(\text{projects})$ ).*

*Each project’s estimated share of administration and EM&V is provided solely for illustrative purposes. The actual individual project costs will depend on the project needs, as determined by the EM&V contractor to be secured with CPUC approval.*

***Water Utility Administrative Costs:*** *The \$250,000 for water utility administration was not estimated on a per project basis. Furthermore, the water utility administrative costs will be shared equally among the four Class A utilities and not the two Class B utilities participating in the OEEP.*

*The water administrative costs on a project basis were calculated by dividing total water administrative costs by 4 and then dividing by the number of projects for each Class A water utility. For example: the water administrative costs for San Jose Water are:  $\$250,000/4$ (four class A water utilities)/2(two OEEP Projects) = $\$31,250$ .*

*The actual water administrative cost of \$250,000 is an estimate. The actual water administrative costs will be tracked via a memorandum account, and allocated among the four Class A water utilities.*

***Energy Utility Administrative and Project Support Costs:*** *The PG&E administrative cost of \$144,000 and the SCE administrative cost of \$131,000 were not estimated on a per project basis.*

*Energy utility Administrative and Project Support costs were originally estimated at 8% of total project costs assigned to each energy utility, which is consistent with the Commission's direction with respect to project administration costs in D.09-09-047. Each project's share of Administrative and Project Support costs can be estimated by dividing each utility's total Administrative and Project Support cost by the total number of projects assigned to that utility. For example, the administrative costs for PG&E OEEP projects were estimated by dividing the PG&E administrative value of  $\$144,000/10 = \$14,400$ .*

*As with the EM&V costs associated with the OEEP, the actual energy administrative costs per project will depend on individual project needs.*

3. **Timeline-**The original implementation date for the OEEP was March 1, 2009, which the PTM is proposing to change to Jan 31, 2010 for the previously approved projects. Because of the addition of four new projects, the PTM suggests moving the results reporting from April 1, 2010 to an as yet unspecified date. In the January 11, 2010 reply comments filed by CWA on behalf of the Joint Petitioning utilities, further high level timeline information is given suggesting nearly all projects will proceed on a similar schedule. *Please confirm this by providing timelines for each of the proposed projects that include best estimates of the following dates:*
- Project start
  - Phase 1A start and end
  - Phase 1B start and end
  - Equipment installations (please specify if hardware or software)

- EM&V periods
- Project completion
- EM&V report date
- Results reporting to the Commission

**RESPONSE to OEEP-1, Question 2:**

*CWA requested an extension to February 22, 2010 to answer Question 2 on February 9, 2010. As the water utilities represented by CWA are the only parties able to provide this answer, PG&E and SCE have confirmed that CWA will provide a response to this question will be provided on February 22, 2010.*

4. **Project Costs-** On page 9 of the PTM, the Joint Petitioners characterize all Phase 1 hardware (except VSDs), software, information tech and system integration consulting costs as being paid for by the energy utilities. The water agencies are responsible for "water system equipment costs, including VFDs, new pumps and motors, and the incremental operating and maintenance costs." Text in page 9 says that details about these costs are in Appendix B and supported by Appendix C, however, the declarations do not include this detail of information. *Please clarify which entity would be responsible for the cost of a piece of water system equipment hardware in Phase 1A.*

**RESPONSE to OEEP-1, Question 3:**

*Energy utilities are responsible for the following Phase 1A costs: Phase 1A hardware excluding VSDs (with the exception of Alco Water), software, additional information technology, and system integration consulting costs. Water utilities will be responsible for VSDs and also responsible for Phase 1B costs, which would include new pumps and motors.*

*The Excel summary table prepared by CWA and provided in response to question 1a is a workpaper used to develop the overall project costs by component. In the supporting tabs, CWA shows project cost details by water utility and project. The summary table shows each project with the breakdown of costs between water and energy utilities.*

**(END OF ATTACHMENT 1)**