

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Application of Southern California Edison Company (U338E) for Approval of its 2009- 2011 Energy Efficiency Program Plans and Associated Public Goods Charge (PGC) and Procurement Funding Requests.	Application 08-07-021 (Filed July 21, 2008)
And Related Matters.	Application 08-07-022 Application 08-07-023 Application 08-07-031

REPLY COMMENTS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ON ENERGY EFFICIENCY WORKSHOP ISSUES

JODY S. LONDON Jody London Consulting P.O. Box 3629 Oakland, California 94609 Telephone: (510) 459-0667 E-mail: jody_london_consulting@earthlink.net

For THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT SUSTAINABLE ENERGY COALITION

July 10, 2009

As directed in the June 9, 2009 Administrative Law Judge Ruling, the City of Irvine, the South Bay Cities Council of Governments, the County of Ventura, and the County of Los Angeles ("Governments"), all members of the Local Government Sustainable Energy Coalition ("LGSEC"), submit these reply comments on energy efficiency workshop issues. The Governments limit these reply comments to issues raised in the opening comments of Southern California Edison ("SCE") and the Natural Resources Defense Council ("NRDC"), in particular on the issue of the interaction of ratepayer-funded programs with other funding sources.

Response to Southern California Edison

Southern California Edison ("SCE") states in its comments:

Funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) should be leveraged and combined with the activities of local governments and other programs just as any other source of funding would be. Additionally, due to the short implementation period of the ARRA, SCE does not see any justification for prescribing new and different rules for crediting savings from existing program funds in the presence of federal stimulus funds.¹

The Governments agree that there is no need for new rules for crediting savings. However, because local governments have the ultimate responsibility for expenditure of ARRA funds – just like utilities have this responsibility for public goods charge funds – local governments must be an equal partner with utilities when it comes to decisions for joint program implementation. The LGSEC and individual local governments have advocated for this for many years in this and predecessor dockets;² the introduction of ARRA funds, as well as other funding opportunities unique to local governments, brings this issue once again to the forefront.

¹ Southern California Edison Company's Comments On The Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Seeking Comments On Workshop Issues, June 29, 2009, p. 3.

² See most recently: Comments of the Local Government Sustainable Energy Coalition on Energy Efficiency Workshop Issues, June 29, 2009, pp. 9-10.

When using ARRA funds, local governments are being held to 10% administration costs. To the extent there are opportunities to leverage ARRA funds with ratepayer funds, the Governments would hope that the utilities can voluntarily commit to the same administrative limits. This would free up the maximum ratepayer funds for incentives.

There will be a certain degree of flexibility with ARRA funds. The Governments are pleased to see that SCE agrees on this point,³ saying it would like to "maintain maximum flexibility to leverage available energy efficiency funding resources within existing program criteria." This point also was made by the City and County of San Francisco and Efficiency First.⁴

As described in numerous earlier filings, local government partnerships ideally will allow each partner to take advantage of each other's strengths. Local governments have a strong connection to the community and other local governments, planning and construction oversight, and ARRA funding. Utilities have data (consumption as well as program participation data), ratepayer money, and greater expertise in marketing and measurement and verification. Local governments would like to see a true partnership with the utilities that would blend these strengths into comprehensive programs, each of which has a single interface for the customer.

However, SCE's proposed Energy Leader model does not sufficiently support this vision for true partnership and seamless integration of program efforts. Many local governments are finding the Energy Leader model to be overly restrictive. SCE in its June 29 comments referenced its assistance efforts to local governments to leverage ARRA funds, but the focus of

³ LGSEC, *loc cit.*, p. 3.

⁴ Response Of The City & County Of San Francisco To The Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Seeking Additional Record And Comments On Workshop Issues, June 29, 2009, pp. 2-3; Sustainable Spaces' Comments In Response To Administrative Law Judge's June 9, 2009 Ruling Seeking Additional Record And Comments On Workshop Issues, June 29, 2009, p. 1.

this assistance has been solely on municipal facilities rather than energy efficiency needs and opportunities in the broader community. In the case of the City of Irvine, the proposed assistance consisted of a one-page letter with several outdated reports attached (see Attachment A). It did not include the type of data and program development information that would be helpful in crafting programs to mobilize the broader community. SCE has subsequently reiterated to the City verbally what programs may be available to assist in Irvine's community efforts, but has not made any movement toward a comprehensive and integrated approach.

In order to forge a genuine utility partnership and maximize the leverage potential of ARRA funds, Irvine had been hoping to remove the significant barriers to customer participation caused by multiple program resources and multiple marketing messages. Irvine would like to bundle the utility incentives with an AB 811 program. SCE has not been supportive of this approach, ostensibly because it is not consistent with the proposed "Energy Leader" model. Irvine has already accomplished a substantial amount of energy efficiency within its municipal facilities and now intends to concentrate on mostly community-scale energy projects with the ARRA funding. Specifically, Irvine would like to see SCE:

- Expand the parameters of the Energy Leader model to include strong utility partnership with the City to achieve the community-wide benefit that is referenced above;
- Adopt the EPA Portfolio Manager portal program that is currently functioning for PG&E customers in order to support the City's use of ARRA funding to implement Portfolio Manager training that will support compliance with AB 1103;
- Continue to pursue ways in which consumption and program participation data can be shared with the City in a useful format while still complying with CPUC rules.

Response to NRDC

NRDC appears to suggest that local governments should be required to participate in utility programs before they can use ARRA funds.⁵ This is contrary to the intent of the ARRA, which provides funds directly to local governments so they can design programs that meet local needs. NRDC's recommendations also disregard facts that are well-documented in this case: ARRA applies criteria different than those employed by the CPUC, and requires funds to be encumbered on a very tight schedule that is moving more quickly than the CPUC's schedule for approving these applications. Even the utilities do not make this recommendation. While the Governments appreciate NRDC's call for collaboration between utilities and local governments, its suggestions for how to facilitate that collaboration in the context of ARRA are not practical.

LGSEC and other parties also have already provided ample comments on the issue of credit for savings from programs that combine ARRA and ratepayer funds. NRDC suggests these savings should accrue to the utility. This may be a question of semantics. In opening comments, LGSEC recommends that savings accrue to the local government partnership. This is only fair because the local government has brought the ARRA funds to the project. Most partnerships for 2009-2011 are proposed to be resource programs, meaning they have hard savings goals. Ultimately, savings achieved by a partnership are credited to the utility, so the utility should enjoy the same opportunity for shareholder incentives.

⁵ Comments of NRDC In Response To Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Seeking Additional Record And Comments On Workshop Issues, June 9, 2009, pp. 3-5.

Dated: July 10, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Jody Inder By:

Jody S. London

Jody London Consulting P.O. Box 3629 Oakland, California 94609 Telephone: (510) 459-0667 E-mail: jody_london_consulting@earthlink.net

For THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT SUSTAINABLE ENERGY COALITION

ATTACHMENT A

SCE LETTER OFFERING ASSISTANCE WITH FEDERAL STIMULUS FUNDS



An EDISON INTERNATIONAL * Company

June 2, 2009

Reducing your electrical consumption by 10% can save up to \$478,241* and 2,851,907 lbs. of GHG* or more this year.

Dorah 0

Mr. Sean Joyce City Manager City of Irvine P.O Box 19575 Irvine, CA 92623-9575

Dear Mr. Joyce,

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Act) provides unprecedented opportunities for cities and counties to put energy saving projects into action. As part of the Act, the Department of Energy's (DOE) Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant (EECBG) program will help create jobs, save costs and reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

Southern California Edison (SCE) wants to ensure that the City of Irvine takes full advantage of our available programs and resources when implementing energy-related EECBG projects. In addition, we want to help the City of Irvine achieve maximum energy savings with cost efficiency and ease.

SCE is prepared to assist by:

- Helping you track programs (once defined) and providing the technical resources to assist in identifying your energy saving opportunities;
- · Assisting you in making decisions about the most cost-effective projects to pursue; and
- Ensuring that your federal stimulus dollars are maximized by leveraging the energy efficiency incentives and rebates that we offer.

The City of Irvine has been allocated \$2,288,000 of EECBG funds. Applications are due to the DOE by June 25, 2009, so quick action is essential in order to take full advantage of this unique opportunity. Based upon an analysis of your 2008 energy usage, a 10% reduction in usage may save the City of Irvine \$478,241* and result in a reduction of 2,851,907* pounds of GHG annually. It may also qualify the City of Irvine for energy efficiency incentives of \$142,595* or more.

The following attachments are included for your reference and to help you take action:

- An Energy Savings Profile displaying current electricity consumption data, proposed energy reduction targets, with estimated cost savings and GHG reductions;
- · Existing energy efficiency opportunities for your facilities identified by SCE;
- Estimated costs for key measures**; and
- Suggested components for an Energy Efficiency and Conservation Strategy.

Your assigned account representative, Rick Raskin, will contact your department staff within the next week to answer any questions. Should you wish to talk sooner, feel free to contact Rick Raskin at 714-973-5765.

Sincerely,

Steven K. Melson

Doug Bour Fisk

Steven K. Nelson Region Manager

cc: Manuel Gomez, Director of Public Works Rick Raskin, SCE

*This analysis is meant as an aid to assist you in establishing an electricity reduction target. Due to guarantee any level of savings. The information is based on actual 2008 historical energy consumensure your understanding of the variables that can affect actual savings.

** These cost estimates are based on the average costs for the top ten measures processed throu 2008 Program cycle. Actual costs may vary.

©2009 Southern California Edison. All rights reserved.

SER

e to 106 to

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Jody London, certify that I have, on this date, served a copy of "Reply Comments Of Local Governments in Southern California On Energy Efficiency Workshop Issues" on all known parties to A.08-07-021, A.08-07-022, A.08-07-07-023, and A.08-07-031 by transmitting an e-mail message with the document attached to each party named in the official service list, and by serving a hard copy on the Administrative Law Judge.

I declare under penalty of perjury, pursuant to the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated July 10, 2009 in Elko, Nevada.

Jody Inch

Jody London

Proceeding: A0807021 - EDISON - FOR APPROV Filer: Southern California Edison Company List Name: LIST Last changed: July 8, 2009

Proceeding: A0807022 - SOCAL GAS CO - FOR A Filer: Southern California Gas Company List Name: LIST Last changed: July 8, 2009

Proceeding: A0807023 - SDG&E - FOR APPROVAL Filer: San Diego Gas & Electric Company List Name: LIST Last changed: July 8, 2009

Proceeding: A0807031 - PG&E - FOR APPROVAL Filer: Pacific Gas and Electric Company List Name: LIST Last changed: July 8, 2009

ddayton@cleanenergysol.com sesco@optonline.net mmoore@newportpartnersllc.com keith.mccrea@sablaw.com donaldgilligan@comcast.net mharrigan@ase.org adam@agp-llc.com jimross@r-c-s-inc.com rockybacchus@gmail.com gtropsa@ice-energy.com ckmitchell1@sbcglobal.net spatrick@sempra.com dmahmud@mwdh2o.com nkarno@yahoo.com thamilton@icfi.com pwuebben@aqmd.gov larry.cope@sce.com monica.ghattas@sce.com cfpena@sempra.com liddell@energyattorney.com andrew.mcallister@energycenter.org steven@moss.net dmano@enalasys.com etaylor@enalasys.com mlewis@ctg-net.com mike.rogers@greenhomesamerica.cossmyers@att.net

judi.schweitzer@post.harvard.edu rscott@cheers.org dale@betterbuildings.com wilkinson@es.ucsb.edu tam.hunt@gmail.com pcanessa@charter.net mtierney-lloyd@enernoc.com rsa@a-klaw.com JeffreyH@hellermanus.com RemiT@hellermanus.com bfinkelstein@turn.org

hayley@turn.org marcel@turn.org dil@cpuc.ca.gov jeanne.sole@sfgov.org stephen.morrison@sfgov.org achang@nrdc.org cjn3@pge.com saw0@pge.com jsqueri@gmssr.com edwardoneill@dwt.com jimflanagan4@mac.com

jak@gepllc.com wbooth@booth-law.com jerryl@abag.ca.gov rknight@bki.com jody_london_consulting@earthlink.net hoerner@redefiningprogress.org swentworth@oaklandnet.com

samuelk@greenlining.org TWhite@homeenergy.org john@proctoreng.com pmschwartz@sbcglobal.net tim@marinemt.org wem@igc.org hankryan2003@yahoo.com

Rob@ConSol.ws jweil@aglet.org bill@jbsenergy.com elee@davisenergy.com mike@calcerts.com rnichols@navigantconsulting.com tcrooks@mcr-group.com eemblem@3eintinc.net chris@cuwcc.org

mboccadoro@dolphingroup.org

glw@eslawfirm.com Imh@eslawfirm.com jparks@smud.org ljimene@smud.org bmatulich@egia.com cscruton@energy.state.ca.us kmills@cfbf.com rob@clfp.com bburt@macnexus.org steve@greenplumbersusa.com js@clearedgepower.com

tom@ucons.com gandhi.nikhil@verizon.net ameliag@ensave.com Clark.Pierce@us.landisgyr.com wjp4@bpconsulting.org CCole@currentgroup.com srassi@knowledgeinenergy.com staples@staplesmarketing.com mking@staplesmarketing.com nphall@tecmarket.net skihm@ecw.org gstaples@mendotagroup.net annette.beitel@gmail.com padib@apx.com jmeyers@naima.org pjacobs@buildingmetrics.biz bbarkett@summitblue.com mmcguire@summitblue.com bobbi.sterrett@swgas.com emello@sppc.com David.Pettijohn@ladwp.com tblair@mwdh2o.com bmcdonnell@mwdh2o.com AWilliamson@semprautilities.com HYao@SempraUtilities.com kwong@semprautilities.com kshore@semprautilities.com gclayborn@gmail.com nhernandez@isd.co.la.ca.us david@nemtzow.com susan.munves@smgov.net jcluboff@lmi.net brad.bergman@intergycorp.com southlandreports@earthlink.net cyin@yinsight.net cdamore@icfi.com

dpape@icfi.com sculbertson@icfi.com don.arambula@sce.com tory.weber@sce.com devon@hartmanbaldwin.com Case.Admin@sce.com Jennifer.Shigekawa@sce.com Laura.Genao@sce.com Stacie.Schaffer@sce.com dwood8@cox.net rsperberg@onsitenergy.com jlaun@apogee.net ashley.watkins@energycenter.org CentralFiles@semprautilities.com irene.stillings@energycenter.org jennifer.porter@energycenter.org jyamagata@semprautilities.com sephra.ninow@energycenter.org CentralFiles@semprautilities.com bob.ramirez@itron.com rachel.harcharik@itron.com david.gordon@efm-solutions.com kjk@kjkammerer.com LukeH@enalasys.com cneedham@edisonmission.com cperkins@energycoalition.org TFlanigan@EcoMotion.us sthompson@ci.irvine.ca.us sbarata@opiniondynamics.com mlong@anaheim.net cheryl.collart@ventura.org Jeff.Hirsch@DOE2.com dmatson@co.santa-barbara.ca.us hhuerta@rhainc.com pk@utilitycostmanagement.com atencate@rsgrp.com Icasentini@rsgrp.com jcelona@sbcglobal.net ann.kelly@sfgov.org abesa@semprautilities.com wblattner@semprautilities.com bruce.foster@sce.com pvillegas@semprautilities.com matt@sustainablespaces.com norman.furuta@navy.mil eric@ethree.com ichou@nrdc.org kgrenfell@nrdc.org lettenson@nrdc.org nlong@nrdc.org

andrew meiman@newcomb.cc andy.goett@paconsulting.com ann_mccormick@newcomb.cc efm2@pge.com yxg4@pge.com John_Newcomb@newcomb.cc filings@a-klaw.com LDRi@pge.com manuson.leif@epa.gov lhj2@pge.com matt_sullivan@newcomb.cc nes@a-klaw.com sls@a-klaw.com SRRd@pge.com tmfry@nexant.com rekl@pge.com jared@efficiencyfirst.org

sbuchwalter@icfi.com sdhilton@stoel.com thuebner@icfi.com vprabhakaran@goodinmacbride.com policy.solutions@comcast.net cem@newsdata.com lisa_weinzimer@platts.com M1ke@pge.com slda@pge.com wmcguire@fypower.org bkc7@pge.com jkz1@pge.com wcm2@pge.com regrelcpuccases@pge.com hxag@pge.com rafi@pge.com epetrill@epri.com andrew.wood3@honeywell.com sharon@emeter.com Mary@EquipoiseConsulting.com elowe@barakatconsulting.com tlmurray@earthlink.net singh70@gmail.com mistib@comcast.net ashish.goel@intergycorp.com grant.cooke@intergycorp.com jay.bhalla@intergycorp.com rfox@intergycorp.com sbeserra@sbcglobal.net ghamilton@gepllc.com michael.cheng@paconsulting.com cadickerson@cadconsulting.biz

alex.kang@itron.com Ann.Peterson@itron.com fred.coito@kema.com jenna.canseco@us.kema.com jennifer.fagan@itron.com jtiffany@ase.org john.cavalli@itron.com kathleen.gaffney@kema.com brbarkovich@earthlink.net Karin.Corfee@kema.com karl.brown@ucop.edu mrw@mrwassoc.com Bruce@BuildItGreen.org awatson@guest-world.com robertg@greenlining.org stevek@kromer.com craigtyler@comcast.net elvine@lbl.gov mwbeck@lbl.gov darmanino@co.marin.ca.us rita@ritanortonconsulting.com cpechman@powereconomics.com gthomas@ecoact.org mary.tucker@sanjoseca.gov esprague@consol.ws NancyKRod@conSol.ws bobho@mid.org joyw@mid.org gsenergy@sonoma-county.org tconlon@geopraxis.com garrick@jbsenergy.com bmfinkelor@ucdavis.edu rmccann@umich.edu mbhunt@ucdavis.edu dmahone@h-m-g.com mgillette@enernoc.com kenneth.swain@navigantconsulting.cgms@cpuc.ca.gov kdusel@navigantconsulting.com lpark@navigantconsulting.com

david.reynolds@ncpa.com scott.tomashefsky@ncpa.com asloan@rs-e.com mclaughlin@braunlegal.com dgeis@dolphingroup.org ehebert@energy.state.ca.us jcastleberry@rs-e.com wynne@braunlegal.com klewis@energy.state.ca.us mharcos@rs-e.com

rsapudar@energy.state.ca.us bernardo@braunlegal.com pstoner@lgc.org wwester@smud.org vwood@smud.org jane@autocell.net richard@autocell.net rmowris@earthlink.net hgilpeach@scanamerica.net Dbjornskov@peci.org paul.notti@honeywell.com brian.hedman@quantecllc.com Sami.Khawaja@quantecllc.com janep@researchintoaction.com samsirkin@cs.com mbaker@sbwconsulting.com jbazemore@emi1.com john@enactenergy.com ppl@cpuc.ca.gov atr@cpuc.ca.gov aeo@cpuc.ca.gov cbe@cpuc.ca.gov cf1@cpuc.ca.gov cxc@cpuc.ca.gov crv@cpuc.ca.gov dmg@cpuc.ca.gov trh@cpuc.ca.gov flc@cpuc.ca.gov hcf@cpuc.ca.gov jbf@cpuc.ca.gov jl2@cpuc.ca.gov cln@cpuc.ca.gov jst@cpuc.ca.gov msj@cpuc.ca.gov inc@cpuc.ca.gov jdr@cpuc.ca.gov jci@cpuc.ca.gov keh@cpuc.ca.gov lp1@cpuc.ca.gov mmw@cpuc.ca.gov mkh@cpuc.ca.gov nfw@cpuc.ca.gov pw1@cpuc.ca.gov snr@cpuc.ca.gov smw@cpuc.ca.gov srm@cpuc.ca.gov tcx@cpuc.ca.gov tcr@cpuc.ca.gov zap@cpuc.ca.gov

ys2@cpuc.ca.gov ztc@cpuc.ca.gov awp@cpuc.ca.gov crogers@energy.state.ca.us agarcia@energy.state.ca.us msherida@energy.state.ca.us sbender@energy.state.ca.us