FILED
08-03-12
04:59 PM

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Approval of 2013-2014 Energy Efficiency Programs and Budget (U39M)	APPLICATION 12-07-001 (Filed July 2, 2012)
Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U902M) for Approval of Electric and Natural Gas Energy Efficiency Programs and Budgets for Years 2013 through 2014.	APPLICATION 12-07-002 (Filed July 2, 2012)
Application of Southern California Gas Company (U904G) for Approval of Natural Gas Energy Efficiency Programs and Budgets for Years 2013 through 2014.	APPLICATION 12-07-003 (Filed July 2, 2012)
Application of Southern California Edison Company (U338E) for Approval of Energy Efficiency and Demand Response Integrated Demand Side Management Programs and Budgets for 2013-2014.	APPLICATION 12-07-004 (Filed July 2, 2012)

Response of California Center for Sustainable Energy to the Consolidated Applications of Pacific Gas & Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company,

and Southern California Gas Company for Approval of 2013-2014 Energy Efficiency Programs and Budget

California Center for Sustainable Energy

August 2, 2012

Siobhan Foley
Director of Education and Outreach
California Center for Sustainable Energy
8690 Balboa Ave., Suite 100
San Diego, CA 92123
Tel: (858) 244-7292
Fax: (858) 244-1178
siobhan.foley@energycenter.org

Response of California Center for Sustainable Energy to the Consolidated Applications of Pacific Gas & Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and Southern California Gas Company for Approval of 2013-2014 Energy Efficiency Programs and Budget

I. INTRODUCTION

The California Center for Sustainable Energy (CCSE) respectfully submits the following response to the consolidated energy efficiency applications of Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company and Southern California Gas Company ("Applications"). On July 2, 2012, the Investor Owned Utilities (IOUs) each submitted applications for approval of their 2013-2014 energy efficiency programs and budgets. Administrative Law Judge Fitch consolidated the four applications on July 13, 2012 and set a prehearing conference date of August 16, 2012 for "discussion of any issues regarding utility compliance with the Commission's direction in D.12-05-015, procedural issues such as the need for evidentiary hearings or workshops, and the proceeding scope and schedule."[1]

We recognize the unique nature of the 2013-2014 Applications vis-à-vis the Commission's direction in D.12-05-015 that gave each IOU the option to file "in addition to a portfolio of energy efficiency programs that is compliant with all of the foregoing ordering paragraphs, one additional alternative energy efficiency program portfolio

[1] July 13, 2012. *Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Consolidating Applications and Setting Preliminary Schedule*. Pg. 3

proposal."[2] While this allowance for non-compliant alternative proposals obviates any need to protest on the grounds of non-compliance, we note that both PG&E and SDG&E specifically conclude their portfolio applications with a request that the Commission approve in full their "preferred" or "alternate" (non-compliant) portfolios and we ask the Commission to reject those requests.[3][4] While we appreciate IOU efforts to collaborate with stakeholders such as DRA, CEEIC and NRDC in addressing legitimate areas of concern such as the custom process in this alternative scenarios, we are concerned that key portions of the IOUs' preferred portfolios relating to local governments, the whole-house program, and statewide ME&O seek to eliminate many significant improvements the Commission has sought to enact throughout the portfolio planning process, begun in October of 2011. The wholesale approval of these non-compliant proposals would effectively represent an about-face in Commission direction from that which it has articulated in numerous rulings over the past year, and we trust the Commission to review the merits of all aspects of each proposal and provide approval accordingly. We respectfully direct our response towards the following topics:

- Whole House Upgrade Program/Energy Upgrade California
- Statewide ME&O
- Local Governments and Regional Energy Networks

---

[2] May 10, 2012. *Decision Providing Guidance on 2013-2014 Energy Efficiency Portfolios and 2012 Marketing, Education, and Outreach*. Ordering Paragraph 171. Pg. 436

[3] July, 2012. *Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company for Approval of Demand Response Programs and Budgets for the Years 2013 and 2014. Chapter 1 Prepared Direct Testimony of Ted Reguly, San Diego Gas & Electric Company.* Pg. TR-44

[4] July, 2012. *Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Approval of 2013-2014 Energy Efficiency Programs and Budget.* Pg. 26

II. WHOLE HOUSE UPGRADE PROGRAM/ENERGY UPGRADE CALIFORNIA

In their applications, the IOUs propose a number of changes to the whole-house program (known currently in the marketplace as Energy Upgrade California, and renamed in these applications, "WHUP"), some of which could be detrimental to the program and the industry it seeks to develop.

Cost-Effectiveness

Throughout the past eight months, the Commission has continuously reinforced its desire for increased emphasis on deep retrofits and a whole-building approach to energy efficiency. CCSE has repeatedly asked in comments for the Commission to view whole-house/building programs as market transformation programs and not to measure their performance solely on a TRC basis, and in D.12-05-015, the Commission largely agreed, stating:

> "we agree that the cost-effectiveness of the Energy Upgrade California program in the short-term should not be the only driver for decision-making about the program as long as its other objectives are clear, that the program should align with existing Commission direction and State policy, and that overall program costs should be kept reasonable as one component of the utilities' overall efficiency portfolio."[5]

We appreciate the IOUs' various recommendations to modify the cost-effectiveness framework for the WHUP, and we broadly support their proposals for the calculation and inclusion of spill-over effects in the NTG calculations. We encourage the Commission to consider these proposals and expand on them further based on discussions from the cost-effectiveness workshops held at the Commission in late June

[5] May 10, 2012. *Decision Providing Guidance on 2013-2014 Energy Efficiency Portfolios and 2012 Marketing, Education, and Outreach*. Ordering Paragraph 171. Pg. 436

as well as future workshops focusing more specifically on cost-effectiveness as it relates to EE programs. It was noted at these workshops that treatment of non-energy benefits likely requires further consideration within the TRC framework, and we look forward to future conversations around this topic.

Energy or even utility bill savings is not always the primary motivating factor in a homeowner's decision to undertake a residential retrofit, and the benefits extend beyond monetary savings to include improved comfort, health and safety for homeowners and job creation, improved building stock and pride in homeownership in their communities. In addition to the thought that has gone into making this building performance effort conform to current cost-effectiveness criteria required of utility programs, we encourage consideration of the synergistic value this overall effort represents to local, state and federal agencies working feverishly to meet policy goals related to energy and water usage, greenhouse gas emissions reductions, improved housing stock and job creation. We hope the Commission will encourage potentially equally creative ways to support and administer this effort in a collaborative fashion with other agencies that can realize and acknowledge these benefits.

Funding Levels for the WHUP

In their preferred/alternate portfolios, SCE proposes to "limit annual WHUP spending to enable the IOUs to nurture the program and ensure ratepayer funding is providing results in real time, and is successfully attracting participating customers."[6] While we welcome attempts to improve the consumer experience and program results and applaud all efforts to better attract participating homeowners, we are unsure how fewer resources and a short success horizon will constitute "nurturing", which is often a

[6] July 2012. *Testimony of Southern California Edison Company in Support of its Application for the Approval of its Energy Efficiency and Demand Response Integrated Demand Side Management Programs and Budget for 2013-2014*. Pg. 18

resource intensive endeavor with a view to long-term gains. We urge the Commission to continue its focus on the long-term policy goals supported by this program and its support for this extremely nascent industry in balance with a focus on the customer experience and rate payer value.

We further submit that to date, the necessary endeavor to build the home performance industry has been supported as much if not more by local governments and other non-utility actors as it has by the IOUs. For this reason, the Commission directed the utilities in D.12-05-015 to "include in their 2013-2014 Energy Upgrade California proposals a budget for and a narrative description of the activities that local, state, and/or regional government entities shall play in advancing Energy Upgrade California objectives in 2013-2014. The areas in which we would like to see significant government roles identified include locally-tailored outreach and marketing and contractor and technician training."[7] We are pleased to see that effort has been taken to continue successful programs and harvest best practices of these various efforts, but we are also concerned about customer and contractor confusion resulting from a multiplicity of programs and offerings that will continue to be provided in the marketplace. In our discussions with participants in the Department of Energy's Better Buildings Neighborhood program across the nation, CCSE has observed that many of the most successful program implementers, whose programs offer the best consumer experience, have singular oversight over all program aspects that touch each customer.

With its emphasis on contractors selling a multi-measure, multi-visit service with variable pricing in a competitive marketplace to consumers who, by and large, are not yet aware of its value and benefits, building performance requires more marketing,

[7] May 10, 2012. *Decision Providing Guidance on 2013-2014 Energy Efficiency Portfolios and 2012 Marketing, Education, and Outreach*. Pg. 177-178

education and outreach to consumers than most residential offerings. It also requires more training and marketing support for contractors, as whole-house programs depend upon a marketplace of independent contractors, who are often small business owners and new to these concepts themselves, to be their sales force and customer service agents. This effort is not your typical utility incentive program, and is vital to meeting the goals outlined in California's Long-Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan (LTEESP), which specifically calls for a 20% reduction in energy usage in existing homes by 2015 and a 40% reduction by 2020.[8] Moreover, the plan envisions 75% of existing homes in California consuming 30% less energy in 2020 than they did in 2008. [9] The building performance industry is one that is being built from the ground up through workforce training and education, marketing support, and a great deal of mentoring and soft-skill development in local communities throughout the state. In market transformation terms, the building performance industry is very much in the early innovator stage and requires a great deal of support in order to continue early successes and build upon lessons learned. For this reason, it is important that many stakeholders remain active in developing and supporting the industry, but centralized, consumer-centric oversight is needed to streamline these activities and ensure clarity in the marketplace. CCSE would like to see a greater role for the statewide steering committee in this regard under the auspices of the statewide marketing, education and outreach campaign and addresses these in greater detail below.

Marketing Residential Retrofits

In all applications, the IOUs have aligned on calling what was known as the Energy Upgrade California program the Whole House Upgrade Program or "WHUP". CCSE

[8] Long-Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan. 2011 Update. Section 2, pg. 11
[9] Long-Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan. 2011 Update. Section 2, pg. 20

assumes this renaming serves to distinguish the whole house program from the statewide marketing, education and outreach umbrella brand Energy Upgrade California for clarity in this proceeding, but should not be seen as a new consumer name or brand identity for the program. The Energy Upgrade California brand should be used maintained in all marketing, education and outreach for the whole-house program until the brand-program relationship is determined in the transition process.

The Energy Upgrade California brand was co-developed by the California Energy Commission and the California Public Utilities Commission to support awareness of and stimulate demand for home and building performance upgrades, and to provide a place from which to direct consumers to contractors who could perform those upgrades and provide an avenue for those consumers to obtain incentives, financing and other support for such efforts. Developed independently and concurrently with the various programs it was intended to support, Energy Upgrade California was an attempt to fulfill LTEESP strategy three for market transformation in the residential sector, which is to "create high levels of customer demand for progressively more efficient homes through a coordinated statewide public education campaign and targeted incentive programs."[10]

With that history, D.12-05-015 directs "the utilities to focus on transforming the Energy Upgrade California brand from the name of one program to more of an umbrella brand which residential consumers and small businesses can come to associate with learning about energy use information and taking energy efficiency and/or other demand-side management actions."[11] It goes on to say that "messages surrounding the use of the Energy Upgrade California brand must also continue to

[10] Long-Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan. 2011 Update. Section 2, pg. 12

[11] May 10, 2012. *Decision Providing Guidance on 2013-2014 Energy Efficiency Portfolios and 2012 Marketing, Education, and Outreach*. Ordering Paragraph 171. Pg. 300

build its usefulness in prompting home and building owners to take immediate steps to achieve deep energy retrofits"[12] Importantly, what the Commission laid forth reflects the intent that, from a consumer perspective, Energy Upgrade California will continue to be a brand consumers can associate with residential energy retrofits that will now also provide a pathway for them to many other demand-side management programs, incentives and energy information. Brand and marketing consistency is an important aspect of supporting this nascent industry and related policy goals, and the Energy Upgrade California umbrella brand must continue to be associated with the whole house upgrade program per the strategies outlined in the LTEESP related to the residential sector and existing building stock. The success of a brand is most often related to the quality or perceived quality of its related products. Thus, it is important that oversight of the whole-house program is consistent and market (rather than program) focused with an emphasis on nurturing the consumer experience and all the factors that contribute to that.

The IOUs have expressed concern about the intersection of the statewide ME&O effort and local program marketing and made clear to CCSE their preference that statewide ME&O be distinct from local program marketing. Generally speaking, we can understand this position, while also recognizing that this point of intersection for statewide ME&O and local marketing crucially needs to be addressed and understood to ensure the success of both efforts and minimize consumer confusion. We look forward to discussing this important transition point in response to the IOUs' ME&O applications.

---

[12] May 10, 2012. *Decision Providing Guidance on 2013-2014 Energy Efficiency Portfolios and 2012 Marketing, Education, and Outreach*. Ordering Paragraph 171. Pg. 300

For the whole-house program and related home performance efforts that build from Energy Upgrade California under ARRA as described in the REN applications, however, we do not believe this distinction is appropriate, and we ask the Commission to give CCSE a clear mandate for oversight of these programs, either directly or via CCSE's leadership on the Statewide Steering Committee. We have considered many factors in making this request, and it is not one we make lightly.

Certainly the evolution of the brand is one consideration. The Energy Upgrade California brand has been used primarily for building performance programs to date, and while the brand will transition to an umbrella and extend to include many more aspects of energy management, it should not leave this core offering behind, especially since research indicates brand equity has been built from these efforts. A second consideration is that the whole-house program was developed in accordance with policy goals and strategies outlined in the LTEESP to create demand for efficient homes through a coordinated statewide campaign and targeted incentives. The statewide nature of this outreach and the importance of consumer engagement around these issues on a statewide basis should not be lost. A third factor that has not been acknowledged within the IOUs' applications is the highly unique nature of this program. It is not an upstream or downstream product rebate, nor is it anything like a direct install program; rather it is something intrinsically different than any previous IOU program offering to date. Delivery of the program necessarily requires a multitude of actors in the marketplace providing services, and if both the IOU and REN applications are approved, some regions may have similar programs that could cause consumer confusion if not coordinated. Thus coordinated oversight is very important.

Statewide Steering Committee

In their applications, the IOUs propose to convene a "repurposed steering committee" in order to address "relevant and significant issues for adoption in the 2015

IOU program cycle."[13] The IOUs do not define the term, "repurposed", and thus it is necessary to point out that a Statewide Steering Committee already exists for the Energy Upgrade California program. We hope that the utilities do not plan to convene an entirely new committee, though we appreciate their and the Commission's attention to the right mix of informed and engaged stakeholders going forward, and we urge the Commission to ensure opportunities for engagement for all qualified stakeholders in and accountability for program implementation to the process of that engagement. The Steering Committee should foster a robust and forthright conversation with contractors, real estate stakeholders, local governments and other relevant actors, whose participation is vital to the success of these programs. The aim of these discussions must be to gather input related to program design, marketing approaches, and QA/QC needs, always keeping customer experience at the forefront of concern. The Committee must have real oversight over the substantive design and implementation aspects of the programs, such that problems get fixed and the experience improves. Ideally, the Steering Committee would have public channels by which to report on the status of market transformation underway with the whole-house effort, possibly a quarterly report to the Commission directly. As a current member of the Steering Committee, CCSE looks forward to working with the other members to address the various topics articulated in PG&E's residential PIP.[14] We note that these issues have been addressed at length by the current Steering Committee, and we look forward to their timely and efficient resolutions. We posit that the changes needed to spur more projects from lead generation to project completion will only occur if the appropriate cross-section of actors is present at the table and their voices are given equal weight to those of the

[13] July 2, 2012. *Pacific Gas and Electric Company 2013-2014 Energy Efficiency Portfolio Statewide Program Implementation Plan Residential Program*. Pg. 97-98

[14] *Id*

utilities. Conversely, if a "repurposed" Steering Committee is not structured in such a way that non-utility actors are able to effect meaningful program design changes, the Committee will be little more than a vehicle by which the utilities can put a "check" in the "stakeholder engagement" box.

III. STATEWIDE MARKETING, EDUCATION, AND OUTREACH

In D.12-05-015, the Commission determined that the statewide marketing, education and outreach (ME&O) program should henceforth be known as "Energy Upgrade California", utilizing a recognizable brand as an "umbrella" for all demand-side management programs targeting residential and small commercial customers throughout the state. The Commission further directed that "CCSE should serve as the statewide ME&O program implementer, under contract with PG&E no later than July 1, 2012, and in coordination with Commission Staff, California Energy Commission Staff, the utilities, and local governments operating demand-side programs."[15] Since the adoption of this Decision by the Commission, CCSE has met with stakeholders and begun activities to transition Energy Upgrade California into the statewide ME&O umbrella brand. We have earnestly sought the input of myriad stakeholders, including Commission staff, the IOUs, local governments, non-profits, and other relevant actors in order to ensure the success of the statewide ME&O effort going forward. We strongly believe that a successful statewide ME&O program directly aligns with CCSE's overall mission, and as such, we are entirely dedicated to fulfilling the Commission's goals for the program as articulated in the LTEESP and other guidance.

The IOUs have not yet embraced this new ME&O effort with the same commitment to success and have continually asserted that the Commission must competitively bid

[15] May 10, 2012. *Decision Providing Guidance on 2013-2014 Energy Efficiency Portfolios and 2012 Marketing, Education, and Outreach*. Pg. 394

the role of statewide ME&O implementer. This position is further highlighted in their preferred/alternate portfolio proposals, in which the IOUs propose to competitively bid for this role. The language and rhetoric contained in many of these arguments implies a misunderstanding of the role the Commission intends for CCSE related to statewide ME&O. Unlike the role of a third-party implementer, this role is one of design, oversight, and coordination, similar to the role a utility might perform with regard to a program and the marketing, education and outreach related to a program. Such functions are not normally competitively bid. This is consistent with the Commission's expressed desire for substantive changes in the design and delivery of the statewide ME&O program. Thus, while CCSE will administer the program, much of the marketing activity and associated tasks will be competitively bid to contractors, consistent with Commission rules and regulations, in the same manner that an IOU would contract for various services related to its programs.

While the Commission has on numerous occasions asserted its authority to select CCSE for this role, we add that the Energy Efficiency Policy Manual clearly provides for such an arrangement in its discussion of competitive bidding, stating, "not all program activities lend themselves to a competitive solicitation. It would be counterproductive to require open bids in instances where… a combination of partnerships and bilateral contracting arrangements with private or public entities can deliver effective statewide initiatives, *such as a statewide public awareness campaign* or an upstream lighting program."[16]

While we feel that this question has been settled on multiple occasions, we also take this opportunity to respond to SDG&E's specific testimony about CCSE's function and

[16] March, 2008. *Energy Efficiency Policy Manual, Version 4.0*. Pg. 14-15 (emphasis added)

qualifications in this role [17] as it best exemplifies the IOUs' lack of understanding of CCSE's role. As noted above, CCSE's role is not one of a marketing agency such as Fraser Communications as cited by SDG&E, and CCSE will in fact enlist the services of a marketing agency on behalf of the Energy Upgrade California campaign via competitive solicitation. The purpose of this new role is for CCSE to work alongside the IOUs while bringing to bear a different, not-for-profit perspective and a community-focused, collaborative approach to statewide ME&O strategy and implementation in much the same way that CCSE works alongside other program administrators to serve SDG&E rate payers in other programs. Furthermore, in this role, CCSE seeks to coordinate with the IOUs from a statewide perspective to bring alignment and coordination to the initiative that recognizes and leverages the unique characteristics of the varied regions and communities across this large state and aims to connect the campaign across utility service territory boundaries to the benefit all rate-payers.

We appreciate the Commission's vision to engage Californians and look forward to the exciting and challenging work before us. We note that the overall success of the statewide ME&O program hinges on the cooperative collaboration and commitment of all stakeholders, which was widely expressed at the Statewide ME&O workshop, held on June 26 at the CPUC.

IV. LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND REGIONAL ENERGY NETWORKS

In their preferred/alternative applications, each of the IOUs submits that the local government Regional Energy Networks (RENs), which were approved by the Commission in D.12-05-015, are unnecessary and should not be funded. SCE's preferred

[17] July, 2012. *Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company for Approval of Demand Response Programs and Budgets for the Years 2013 and 2014. Chapter 1 Prepared Direct Testimony of Ted Reguly, San Diego Gas & Electric Company.* Pg. TR-40

program plan seeks to include "a total budget decrease of $108 million based on reductions to (1) On-Bill Financing, in favor of increased third party financing, (2) RENs, in favor of enhanced local government partnerships, and (3) WHUP."[18] This proposal should not be approved. PG&E similarly states, "Given the expansion of its local and regional partnerships, PG&E believes its proposal for local and regional government partnerships in this Application completely covers the objectives and scope identified in the discussion of Regional Energy Network pilots in the Decision." We note that an increase in the scope of local government partnerships (LGPs) does not obviate the need for REN pilots, and would not be "consistent with a key objective underlying the proposed pilots- to determine if local governments are in a position to plan and administer energy efficiency programs *absent utility support or intervention*."[19]

SDG&E proposes to "provide local governments with additional technical resources as an alternative to Regional Energy Networks."[20] This proposal does not fulfill the goals of the Regional Energy Networks as described in the guidance decision and should not be adopted by the Commission. SDG&E's testimony goes on to state, "IOU territory and LGP structure differences beg different solutions; what is successful at one utility may not be successful at another utility." CCSE fully agrees with this, and it is for this reason that a REN has not been submitted at this time by San Diego local governments; however, this has no bearing on whether or not the Commission should

---

[18] July 2012. *Testimony of Southern California Edison Company in Support of its Application for the Approval of its Energy Efficiency and Demand Response Integrated Demand Side Management Programs and Budget for 2013-2014*. Pg. 18

[19] May 10, 2012. *Decision Providing Guidance on 2013-2014 Energy Efficiency Portfolios and 2012 Marketing, Education, and Outreach*. Pg. 149

[20] July 2, 2012. *Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U-902-M) for Approval of Demand Response Programs and Budgets for the Years 2013 and 2014. Chapter 1Preapared Direct Testimony of Ted Reguly.* Pg. 25

allow REN pilots in general throughout the state, nor does this preclude the potential for future REN applications to be filed in SDG&E territory.

Despite its testimony in opposition to the REN concept, SDG&E's partnerships PIP includes a "San Diego Regional Energy Network"[21] which formalizes an existing collaboration between SDG&E, SDG&E Local Government Partnerships, and non-profits in the San Diego region, including CCSE. While we appreciate the close collaboration and amicable relationships that exist in the San Diego region among these stakeholders, we note that the proposed "SDREN", while a laudable venture, does not exhibit some of the key characteristics of a "Regional Energy Network" contained in D.12-05-015. Chiefly, the SDREN does not "provide centralized, regional program management and administration by local governments."[22] Rather, the proposed "SDREN" represents a collaborative pooling of LGP resources to achieve regional energy goals within the SDG&E LGP administrative framework and should not be confused with the Regional Energy Network proposals in other regions, which are consistent with the REN concept articulated in D.12-05-015.

V. SUMMARY

We appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on the IOUs 2013-2014 energy efficiency applications, and were pleased to see the incorporation of the Commission's thoughtful guidance into cost-effective portfolios that begin to set a new direction for energy efficiency programs going forward. We ask the Commission not to give its wholesale approval to the IOUs' non-compliant preferred/alternative portfolio

[21] July 2, 2012 *Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U-902-M) for Approval of Demand Response Programs and Budgets for the Years 2013 and 2014.* Pg. 982

[22] May 10, 2012. *Decision Providing Guidance on 2013-2014 Energy Efficiency Portfolios and 2012 Marketing, Education, and Outreach.* Pg. 146

proposals, but rather we hope the Commission will carefully assess the individual recommendations which are not compliant with the guidance given in D.12-05-015 and approve only those which are consistent with the overall direction that has been set through the myriad rulings put forth by the Commission during this planning process.

VI. CONCLUSION

CCSE respectfully submits to the Commission this response to the Consolidated Applications of Pacific Gas & Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and Southern California Gas Company for Approval of 2013-2014 Energy Efficiency Programs and Budget.

August 3, 2012

Siobhan Foley
Director of Education and Outreach
California Center for Sustainable Energy
8690 Balboa Ave., Suite 100
San Diego, CA 92123
Tel: (858) 244-7292
Fax: (858) 244-1178
siobhan.foley@energycenter.org