

ALJ/LRB/avs

Decision 01-06-037 June 14, 2001

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Approval of Year 2001 Energy Efficiency Programs, in Compliance with Ordering Paragraph 93 of Decision 00-07-017 (U 39 M).

Application 00-11-037
(Filed November 15, 2000)

Application of SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (U 338-E) for Approval of Program Year 2001 Energy Efficiency Program Plans, Budgets, and Performance Award Mechanism.

Application 00-11-043
(Filed November 15, 2000)

Compliance Application of Southern California Gas Company (U 904-G) for Approval of 2001 Energy Efficiency Programs.

Application 00-11-044
(Filed November 15, 2000)

Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U 902-M) for Approval of 2001 Energy Efficiency Programs.

Application 00-11-045
(Filed November 15, 2000)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title	Page
OPINION.....	2
I. Background.....	2
II. Discussion.....	3
A. Edison’s MA&E Plans, Studies, and Budgets.....	3
B. PG&E’s MA&E Plans, Studies, and Budgets	6
C. SDG&E’s MA&E Plans, Studies, and Budgets	8
D. SoCalGas’ MA&E Plans, Studies and Budgets	9
E. CEC MA&E Study Plans	10
III. Flexible Budgets	11
IV. Comments on Draft Decision.....	12
Findings of Fact	13
Conclusions of Law	16
ORDER.....	16
Attachment A	

O P I N I O N

We approve utility-specific Market Assessment and Evaluation (MA&E) studies and budgets, including the proposed MA&E studies and budgets to be administered by the California Energy Commission (CEC), for program year (PY) 2001, for Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), Southern California Edison Company (Edison), San Diego Gas and Electric Company (SDG&E), and Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas). This docket is closed.

I. Background

In Decision (D.) 01-01-060, we deferred approval of the studies and budgets for utility-specific studies and the proposed CEC studies because the studies had not been reviewed in a public process and were not sufficiently detailed to provide for review and evaluation. (*Id.*, *mimeo.*, at p. 16; Findings of Fact 14 and 15 at p. 38. *See, also*, Conclusion of Law 11 and Ordering Paragraph 4 at p. 41.) We ordered the utilities to present additional information on the proposed studies, including “a full description of the study plans, objectives, and budgets, and a discussion of the rationale and need for these particular studies.”¹ (*Id.* at p. 16.)

¹ In D.01-01-060 we also approved the proposed statewide MA&E studies and budgets managed by the utilities but noted our concern that the study plans did not correspond very well to approved programs or to our renewed emphasis on peak demand reduction. Thus, we expressed our expectation that the utilities revise the study plans to account for new programs as well as for changing program priorities and changing market conditions throughout the year.

After holding a publicly noticed workshop on February 21, 2001, the utilities submitted and served on the service list revised MA&E plans.² No comments have been received.

II. Discussion

A. Edison's MA&E Plans, Studies, and Budgets

In its revised plan, Edison provides more detail about its studies than that set forth in its application. Edison proposes some new studies to develop reliable estimates of energy savings and peak load reductions for specific programs. Edison's proposed new studies are reasonable and approved.

Edison also proposes to abandon some of its previously proposed studies, asking that it be relieved from several of the requirements of D.00-07-017. Edison proposes alternative means of compliance for some of the requirements.

First, Edison proposes to abandon quarterly reporting of changes in energy efficiency measure saturation levels. (D.00-07-017, Ordering Paragraph 54.) Instead, Edison proposes to provide an update on energy efficiency measure saturation levels one time, for PY 2002 planning purposes. This is reasonable, not only for Edison, but also for all the utilities. The utilities should provide a report on energy efficiency saturation levels in their Annual Reports.

Second, Edison proposes to abandon quarterly reporting and the special analyses necessary to establish program participation by "hard-to-reach"

² Edison filed its revised plans on March 6, 2001. PG&E, SDG&E, and SoCalGas submitted their revised plans without filing them on March 12 (PG&E) and March 26 (SDG&E and SoCalGas).

segments of residential and small nonresidential customers. (D.00-07-017, Ordering Paragraphs 35, 36, and 66.)³ Instead, Edison proposes to provide reports on segment participation in its Annual Report on PY 2001 programs, using available data sources, but not commissioning special new studies to gather additional data.

Efficient and equitable use of the public goods charge requires that all customers have the opportunity to fully participate in energy efficiency programs. We have previously determined that there are large groups of customers who contribute to the public goods charge but who do not receive energy efficiency services. We have categorized these customers as “underserved” or “hard-to-reach.” We have also found the utilities’ outreach efforts lacking. Full participation by all customers is particularly important during the current energy shortage. It would not be in the public interest to eliminate all efforts to identify and target customers who are not being reached by current utility-administered programs. Thus, we reinstate Edison’s budget for the hard-to-reach analyses.⁴

Edison’s request to provide the required information in its Annual Report instead of on a quarterly basis is reasonable not only for Edison but for all the utilities. The utilities should submit the required information in their Annual Reports.

³ Ordering Paragraphs 35, 36, and 66 were modified by the Administrative Law Judge’s October 25, 2000 Ruling Giving Direction for Program year 2001. (ALJ Ruling, at pp. 4-5 and 11-12.)

⁴ Edison’s budget for the non-residential classification project has been reduced to provide funding for this project. Because the classification project only requires the organization of Edison’s own data, Edison should not require substantial funds to complete it.

Third, Edison asks that it be relieved from providing data on five of the eighty-two performance indicators related to long-term market transformation goals that it proposed in response to Ordering Paragraph 76 in D.00-07-017.⁵ Edison proposes to eliminate the following five surveys and instead include these or related, broader indicators in statewide studies:

- A survey of pre- and post-program energy efficiency awareness of a sample of customers reached by the residential mass market program
- A survey of customer awareness of the cost of operating inefficient appliances
- An exit survey at retailers of customer awareness of high-performance windows, and
- Surveys for both the nonresidential renovation/remodeling and the nonresidential new construction sectors of the frequency of energy efficiency requirements in Requests for Proposals for projects, and of the frequency of requests for energy efficiency design experience in Requests for Qualifications sent to design professionals.

⁵ Attachment H of the Compliance Filing of Pacific Gas and Electric Company in Response to a Number of Ordering Paragraphs in Decision 00-07-017, filed on August 7, 2000, contains the joint utility response to Ordering Paragraph 76. It identifies for each utility a schedule for identifying data collection needs and expected report dates for PY 2000 Performance Indicators.

Edison's request is reasonable. Edison's reports on the statewide studies should specifically identify how these indicators were addressed in those studies. Edison's utility-specific MA&E studies and budgets are approved as set forth on Attachment A.

B. PG&E's MA&E Plans, Studies, and Budgets

In its revised plan, PG&E provides more detail regarding its proposed utility-specific studies than that set forth in its application. PG&E proposes new studies to evaluate demand and energy savings for new residential and nonresidential programs, such as the residential 1-2-3 cashback program, and the nonresidential air conditioning and task lighting programs. PG&E's new studies appear reasonable and are approved.

PG&E also asks for "relief" from some of the requirements of D.00-07-017. First, PG&E seeks to be relieved of its obligation to track non-residential program participation, particularly for the Standard Program Contract (SPC) program. (D.00-07-017, Ordering paragraph 49.)⁶ Program participation information is essential for the operation of an efficient, effective, and equitable energy efficiency program and it is important that all the utilities continue to track participation. However, we will only require PG&E and the other utilities to track participation going forward and looking backward *three* years. The utilities should focus on sorting and presenting data already tracked to answer basic questions about repeat customer and Energy Service Company (ESCO) participation, by subsector. The utilities are not required to recontact

⁶ Ordering Paragraph 49 was modified by the Administrative Law Judge's October 25, 2000 Ruling Giving Direction for Program year 2001. (ALJ Ruling, at pp. 10-11.)

participants from years prior to the issuance of D.00-07-017 to obtain necessary data.

Second, PG&E seeks relief from the requirement that it perform a saturation study for commercial lighting and other end-uses suspected of being more than 50% saturated. (D.00-07-017, Ordering paragraph 54.) Instead, PG&E proposes to include this topic in its newly-proposed Technical and Market Potential for Energy Efficiency in the Nonresidential Sector study. This request is reasonable so long as PG&E ensures that commercial lighting saturation is covered in the Technical and Market Potential study and demonstrates such inclusion in its study report. PG&E should also report on saturation in its Annual Report.

Third, PG&E seeks relief from performing studies to assess “performance indicators” related to milestones for all programs. (D.00-07-017, Ordering paragraph 76.) Performance indicators provide useful information for the design and implementation of future programs and should not be eliminated. However, recognizing that funds are necessary for new studies relating to new programs, we allow PG&E to perform a scaled-back version of the “performance indicator” studies, with a reduced budget. PG&E should include a summary of the proposed scaled-back studies in its next Quarterly Report.

PG&E did not propose any studies or budget for the hard-to-reach segment analysis required in D.00-07-017 (Ordering Paragraphs 35, 36, and 66). As we stated earlier, efficient and equitable use of the public goods charge requires that all customers have the opportunity to fully participate in energy efficiency programs and it would not be in the public interest to eliminate all efforts to identify and target customers who are not being reached by current utility-administered programs. Thus, we require PG&E, like the other utilities, to conduct appropriate studies. PG&E may limit the scope of its studies to certain

customer segments and/or programs, as it deems necessary, but should ensure that the studies performed are funded sufficiently to produce usable results.

PG&E should file the required information in its Annual Report.⁷

PG&E's utility-specific MA&E studies and budgets are approved as set forth on Attachment A:

C. SDG&E's MA&E Plans, Studies, and Budgets

In its revised plan, SDG&E provides more detail about its proposed studies than that set forth in its application. SDG&E proposes new MA&E studies for its new programs and funds for measurement of PY 2000 Summer Initiative programs. SDG&E's new studies are reasonable and approved.

SDG&E also proposes to reduce funding for studies related to market effects milestones and for performance indicators. Because SDG&E will still be performing some studies of performance indicators, consistent with the other utilities, SDG&E's proposed reductions are reasonable and are adopted.⁸

SDG&E's utility-specific MA&E studies and budgets are approved as set forth on Attachment A.

⁷ PG&E's budget for the non-residential market tracking database has been reduced to provide funding for this project. Because the project only requires the organization of PG&E's own data, PG&E should not require substantial funds to complete it.

⁸ While SDG&E has not included any studies or budget for tracking and assessing hard-to-reach program access (D.00-07-017, Ordering Paragraphs 35, 36, and 66), SDG&E assures us that it is including the required data as part of their normal tracking of program participation as well as in surveys that are done on a statewide basis. SDG&E should ensure that the requirements of D.00-07-017 are met. It should report on the results in its Annual Report. Similarly, SDG&E does not include a project for tracking non-residential program participation as required by D.00-07-017, Ordering Paragraph 49. SDG&E advises that it has already submitted data for the past three years and has added tracking questions to its data gathering instruments to obtain the required information going forward. This is reasonable.

D. SoCalGas' MA&E Plans, Studies and Budgets

In its revised plan, SoCalGas provides more detail regarding its proposed studies than that set forth in its application. SoCalGas proposes new studies to evaluate new programs. The new studies are reasonable and are approved.

SoCalGas also seeks to be relieved from complying with some requirements of D.00-07-017. Specifically, it does not propose to conduct any studies to facilitate the hard-to-reach segment analyses required by D.00-07-017, Ordering Paragraphs 35, 36, and 66. As we stated earlier, efficient and equitable use of the public goods charge requires that all customers have the opportunity to fully participate in energy efficiency programs and it would not be in the public interest to eliminate all efforts to identify and target customers who are not being reached by current utility-administered programs. Thus, we require SoCalGas, like the other utilities, to conduct appropriate studies. Recognizing that funds are necessary for SoCalGas' new studies supporting program offerings, we allow SoCalGas to cut back on the originally proposed studies and budgets. SoCalGas may limit the scope of its studies to certain customer segments and/or programs as it deems necessary, but should ensure that the studies performed are funded sufficiently to produce usable results. SoCalGas should file the required information in its Annual Report.⁹

⁹ SoCalGas' budget for the non-residential Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Recoding & Corporate Parent Reporting Requirement has been reduced to provide funding for these projects. Because the recoding project only requires the organization of SoCalGas' own data, it should not require substantial funds to complete it. The proposed budget for Local Government Initiatives and Third Party Initiatives Assessment is also reduced.

SoCalGas also requests that it be relieved of the requirement to comply with quarterly reporting of energy efficiency measure saturation data given the cost of obtaining sufficiently accurate and detailed data. Energy efficiency programs should not be providing incentives where the market is already saturated. Thus, this information is important and should be collected. SoCalGas should conduct appropriate studies and, like the other utilities, report on measure saturation data in its Annual Report.

SoCalGas' utility-specific MA&E studies and budgets are approved as set forth on Attachment A.

E. CEC MA&E Study Plans

The utilities' revised MA&E plans provide further clarification and background, with supporting summary tables, of the funding requests for CEC-implemented studies. The specific projects and budget proposed are the same as in the original applications. They explain the request as follows. In Resolution E-3592, the Commission authorized \$2.1 million for 2 years to the CEC for Title 20 data collection activities, for a total of \$4.2 million, as follows:

	1999	2000
Commercial End Use Survey (CEUS)	\$1.7 million	\$1.7 million
Updates to Database of Energy Efficiency Resources (DEER)	\$400,000	\$400,000
Total	\$2.1 million	\$2.1 million

The utilities' PY 2000 and 2001 applications (filed on September 27, 1999), proposed to use the \$2.1 million budgeted for the CEC-administered programs in PY 2000 for a Residential Appliance Saturation Survey (RASS) instead of the CEUS and DEER projects. They further requested an additional \$2.1 million for PY 2001 to fund the second half of the CEUS and

additional DEER projects administered by the CEC. The following table illustrates the proposal:

	1999	2000	2001
CEUS	\$1.7 million		\$1.7 million
DEER Updates	\$400,000		\$400,000
Residential Appliance Saturation Survey (RASS)		\$2.1 million	
Total	\$2.1 million	\$2.1 million	\$2.1 million

The utilities' PY 2001 applications (filed on November 15, 2000), proposes to reallocate the PY 2000 funds for CEC-administered programs, with \$1.9 million going to RASS and \$200,000 to CEUS. The applications reiterate the previous request for an additional \$2.1 million (\$1.7 million for CEUS and \$400,000 for DEER) for 2001. The current proposal as set forth on Attachment A.

The proposed studies are reasonable and necessary to provide basic data, particularly on customer characteristics, energy use, and energy-using technologies. Further, the CEUS and DEER studies have begun and require second year funding and funds have been encumbered for the RASS. We adopt the proposed funding for CEC-administered studies as set forth on Attachment A. Each utility should allocate the following budget set forth on Attachment A to fund the CEC-sponsored studies.

III. Flexible Budgets

The utilities have provided plans and budgets for the individual MA&E studies. We have noted specific activities that must be added into these plans and have altered the proposed budgets as necessary. We recognize that budgets may change as the scope of the studies change, and that some studies may be dropped or added and budgets may change because of changed program activity, changed market conditions, or contractual bids during the program year. Thus, except for the studies that we have mandated herein, and for the

budgets approved for the organization of the utilities own data¹⁰ the utilities are authorized to shift funds, as necessary, among studies within the utility-specific budget category, with one exception. Edison's non-residential classification project, PG&E's non-residential market tracking database, and SoCalGas' SIC Recoding & Corporate Parent Reporting Requirement should not be increased by more than 20% of their respective total approved budgets. Budget and study changes, with appropriate justifications, should be reported in the Quarterly Reports.

IV. Comments on Draft Decision

PG&E, Edison, SDG&E, and SoCalGas filed comments on the Draft Decision on June 4, 2001.¹¹ No reply comments were filed. The utilities generally support the draft decision except for the language giving them flexibility to shift funds for MA&E studies up to 20% from the authorized amounts. The utilities argue that they have always had total flexibility to shift individual study funds from one project to another as needed, to meet changed study scope or content, changed program activity, changed market conditions, and the bids submitted by the contractors and, thus, that the provision allowing up to 20% fund-shifting was actually a restriction and not a grant of additional flexibility. The utilities

¹⁰ Edison's non-residential classification project, PG&E's non-residential market tracking database, and SoCalGas' Recoding & Corporate Parent Reporting Requirement.

¹¹ We determined that time was of the essence in implementing these studies because of the current electric supply shortages and the need to collect information to guide future program planning and conservation efforts, and, thus, concluded, pursuant to Rule 77.7 (f)(9), that public necessity required a reduced period for review and comment. The comment periods provide notice and opportunity to be heard on the modification of this decision.

thus seek the ability to shift funds, as needed, within the maximum budget authorized for utility-specific MA&E. We agree; it was not our intent to limit budget flexibility, with one exception. We reduced the amount budgeted by Edison for its non-residential classification project, by PG&E for its non-residential market tracking database, and for SoCalGas for its SIC Recoding & Corporate Parent Reporting Requirement because these projects only require the organization of the utilities' own data. While we do not foresee that these budgets will be increased at all, we will limit any funding increase to 20% of those budgets. All budget changes shall be addressed in the Quarterly Reports. We have also made changes to SoCalGas' budgets and other changes to correct typographical errors.

Findings of Fact

1. Edison's, PG&E's, SDG&E's, and SoCalGas' new MA&E studies and budgets are reasonable.
2. Energy efficiency programs should not be providing incentives where the market is already saturated. Thus, energy efficiency saturation information is important and should be collected. SoCalGas should collect and report on saturation levels, consistent with the other utilities.
3. PG&E's request to include the study of measure use saturation in its newly-proposed "Technical and Market Potential for Energy Efficiency in the Nonresidential Sector" study is reasonable so long as PG&E ensures that commercial lighting saturation is covered in that study and demonstrates such inclusion in its study report.
4. It is reasonable to abandon quarterly reporting of changes in energy efficiency measure saturation. Edison, PG&E, SDG&E, and SoCalGas should report on energy efficiency saturation levels in their Annual Reports.

5. It is not in the public interest to eliminate all efforts to identify and target customers who are not being reached by current utility-administered programs. Edison, PG&E, SDG&E, and SoCalGas should perform analyses on “underserved” and “hard-to-reach” segments of residential and non-residential customers as contemplated by Ordering Paragraphs 35, 36, and 66 of D.00-07-017, although they may limit the scope of their studies commensurate with budgets and the need to produce useable results. The utilities should file the required information in their Annual Reports.

6. It is reasonable for SDG&E to include activities to track and assess hard-to-reach program access as part of their normal tracking of program participation and through surveys that are done on a statewide basis.

7. Performance indicators provide useful information for the design and implementation of future programs. Edison, PG&E, SDG&E, and SoCalGas should conduct studies to assess performance indicators related to some programs in accordance with the requirements of D.00-07-017, Ordering paragraph 76. Given the limited budgets and need to fund new studies, it is reasonable to allow the utilities to perform a scaled-back version of the studies, with reduced budgets.

8. Edison should be permitted to eliminate five studies related to five of its twelve performance indicators so long as these indicators are identified and addressed in the statewide studies and study reports.

9. PG&E should include a summary of its proposed scaled-back performance indicator studies in its next Quarterly Report.

10. Program participation information is essential for the operation of an efficient, effective, and equitable energy efficiency program and it is important that all the utilities continue to track participation as required by D.00-07-017, Ordering Paragraph 49. The utilities should track participation going forward

and looking backward *three* years, focusing on sorting and presenting data already tracked to answer basic questions about repeat customer and ESCO participation, by subsector. The utilities are not required to recontact participants from years prior to the issuance of D.00-07-017 to obtain necessary data.

11. It is reasonable for SDG&E to track non-residential program participation as required by D.00-07-017, Ordering Paragraph 49, in its on-going information-gathering activities without special studies.

12. The studies proposed by the utilities to be administered by the CEC are reasonable and necessary to provide basic data particularly on customer characteristics, energy use, and energy-using technologies.

13. Because study scope and content and budgets may change during the program year, it is reasonable to authorize the utilities to shift funds among studies within the utility-specific budget category, up to the maximum authorized total utility-specific budget, with one exception: Edison's non-residential classification project, PG&E's non-residential market tracking database, and SocalGas' SIC Recoding & Corporate Parent Reporting Requirement shall not be increased by more than 20% of their respective total approved budgets. Further, the utilities should not be allowed to eliminate the studies added herein. Budget and study changes, with appropriate justifications, should be reported in the Quarterly Reports.

14. Given the current electric supply shortages and the need to collect information to guide future program planning and conservation efforts, time is of the essence in implementing these studies.

Conclusions of Law

1. Public necessity requires that we reduce the period for public comment pursuant to Rule 77.7(f)(9) so that the proposed studies and budgets may be implemented as soon as possible.

2. The proposed studies and budgets to be administered by the CEC, as set forth on Attachment A, should be approved.

3. Edison's proposed utility-specific studies and budgets, as set forth on Attachment A, should be approved.

4. PG&E's proposed utility-specific studies and budgets, as set forth on Attachment A, should be approved.

5. SDG&E's proposed utility-specific studies and budgets, as set forth on Attachment A, should be approved.

6. SoCalGas' proposed utility-specific studies and budgets, as set forth on Attachment A, should be approved.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The public comment period is reduced so that we may consider this decision at our June 14, 2001 conference. Comments shall be filed by June 5, 2001, and reply comments shall be filed by June 11, 2001.

2. The utility-specific and California Energy Commission-administered Market Assessment and Evaluation (MA&E) plans, studies, and budgets, as proposed by the Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), Southern California Edison Company (Edison), San Diego Gas and Electric Company (SDG&E), and Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas), as modified herein, are approved.

3. PG&E, Edison, SDG&E, and SoCalGas shall attach copies of their MA&E plans, studies, and budgets, having first made the modifications adopted herein, to the Applications maintained in the Commission's central files.

4. Applications (A.) 00-11-037, A.00-11-043, A.00-11-044, and A.00-11-045 are closed.

This order is effective today.

Dated June 14, 2001, at San Francisco, California.

LORETTA M. LYNCH
President
HENRY M. DUQUE
RICHARD A. BILAS
GEOFFREY F. BROWN
Commissioners

Commissioner Carl Wood, not necessarily
absent, did not participate.

ATTACHMENT A

Attachment A
Page 1 of 5

Edison's Approved MA&E Studies and Budgets:

Projects	Approved PY 2001 Budget
RESIDENTIAL	\$460,000
Residential Appliance Rebate Impact Evaluation	\$140,000*
Residential Lighting Rebate Impact Evaluation	\$40,000*
Study of Refrigerator Recycling Programs	\$45,000*
Summer Initiative Savings and Demand Reduction Analysis	\$80,000*
Analysis of Air Conditioner Recycling Programs	\$10,000*
School-based Residential Pilot Program	\$60,000
Residential Audit Programs Evaluation	\$85,000
NONRESIDENTIAL	\$630,000
Nonresidential Incentive Program Impact Evaluation	\$330,000*
Summer Initiative Pool Pump Program Evaluation	\$60,000*
Summer Initiative Savings and Demand Reduction Analysis	\$80,000*
Nonresidential Customer Classification Project	\$120,000
Pilot School Energy Efficiency Program Evaluation	\$40,000
NEW CONSTRUCTION	\$115,000
Thermostat Behavior Study	\$75,000*
Energy Design Resource Usage Study	\$40,000*
CROSS-SECTOR PROJECTS	\$460,000
Weather Data	\$120,000
Load and Consumption Data for Statewide Studies	\$100,000
Ad Hoc Analyses for Program Planning and Management	\$80,000
Third Party Initiative Project Analyses	\$80,000
2002 Program Planning Support	\$80,000
Hard-to-Reach Segment Analyses	\$140,000
TOTAL	\$1,805,000

* new studies

Attachment A**Page 2 of 5****PG&E's Approved MA&E Studies and Budgets:**

Projects	Approved PY 2001 Budget
Update of Customer Participation and Energy/Demand Savings Estimates Resulting from "1" No Cost Element of 1-2-3-Cash Back Program	\$75,000*
Verification of Installation of "2" Do-It-Yourself Element of 1-2-3 Cash Back Program	\$150,000*
Update Energy and Demand Savings Input Values for Estimates Resulting from "3" Measure Investments of 1-2-3	\$300,000*
Subtotal Residential	\$525,000
Technical and Market Potential for Energy Savings Opportunities in the Nonresidential Sector (must include lighting saturation study)	\$500,000*
Market tracking database (D.00-07-017 OP 49)	\$150,000
Subtotal Nonresidential	\$650,000
Multifamily Water Heating, HVAC, and Window Survey	\$100,000*
Thermostats for Single Zone Nonresidential AC Equipment	\$75,000*
Office Task Lighting Field Study	\$75,000*
M&V Supplemental Analyses of Energy and Demand Savings for Both Residential and Nonresidential New Construction Programs	\$250,000
Subtotal New Construction	\$500,000
Hard-to-Reach Segment Analysis	\$100,000
Retrofit and Renovation: TOSER Program	\$40,000*
Compilation of Data for CEC	\$25,000
Performance Indicator Studies (OP76)	\$300,000
Subtotal Other Market Assessment and Planning	\$465,000
GRAND TOTAL	\$2,140,000

* new studies

Attachment A**Page 3 of 5****SDG&E's Approved MA&E Studies and Budgets:**

Projects	Approved PY 2001 Budget
Residential	
Evaluation of Residential Lighting Program	\$25,000
Evaluation of Residential Appliances Program	\$25,000
Non-residential	
Evaluation of Large Nonresidential Comprehensive Retrofit Program	\$150,000
New Construction	
Market Assessment Study for Residential New Construction-Single Family	\$75,000
Market Assessment Study Residential New Construction – Multi Family	\$75,000
Crossover	
Performance Indicators Studies	\$165,000
Summer Initiative	\$40,000*
Schools Pilot Evaluation	\$50,000*
Ridgehaven Building Case Study	\$10,000*
Residential & Nonresidential Audit Evaluations	\$20,000*
Review of Cost Effectiveness Assumptions	\$169,000*
Total Budget	\$804,000

* new studies

Attachment A
Page 4 of 5

SoCalGas' Approved MA&E Studies and Budgets:

Projects	Approved PY 2001 Budget
Residential Activities	
Residential Contractor Program Multi Family Impact Ass.	\$80,000
Residential Needs Assessment & "Hard-to-Reach" Tracking	
Residential Programs kW & kWh Impact Ass.	\$90,000*
Residential Audit Program Ass.	\$50,000
Non-Residential Activities	
Nonresidential Needs Ass. & "Hard-to-Reach" Tracking	
Nonresidential Programs kW & kWh Impact Ass.	\$90,000*
SIC Recoding & Corporate Parent Reporting Requirement	\$68,000
New Construction Activities	
Local Government Initiatives & Third Party Initiatives Ass.	\$140,000
Total	\$518,000

* new studies

Attachment A
Page 5 of 5

Approved CEC-Administered Studies and Budgets:

Study Title	Approved PY 2001 Budget
DEER Update – SPC/Load Shape Data Collection and Analysis	\$400,000
Commercial End Use Survey (CEUS)	\$1,700,000
Residential Appliance Saturation Survey (RASS)	
Total	\$2,100,000

Each utility should allocate the following budget to fund the CEC-administered studies:

Utility	Approved PY 2001 Budget¹²
SCE	\$680,000
PG&E	\$945,000
SDG&E	\$287,000
SoCalGas	\$204,000
Total	\$2,116,000

(END OF ATTACHMENT A)

¹² We include the actual amounts requested by SDG&E and SoCalGas, which make the total for the CEC-administered projects slightly more than \$2.1 million.