

Application of Southern California Gas
Company (U-904-G) for Approval of
Natural Gas Energy Efficiency Programs
and Budgets for Years 2009 through 2011

Application 08-07- 022

Exhibit No.: _____

Witness: Athena M. Besa

AMENDED
PREPARED DIRECT TESTIMONY
OF
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY

CHAPTER II

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

MARCH 2, 2009

1 **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

2 **TABLE OF CONTENTS..... i**

3 **SECTION 1 ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAM PORTFOLIO..... 5**

4 **I. SoCalGas Portfolio Goals and Cost Effectiveness 5**

5 A. Portfolio Meets Annual Energy Efficiency and Cumulative Goals..... 5

6 B. Preferred Scenario Portfolio and Funding Levels Appropriately Balance

7 Short-Term and Long-Term Savings..... 8

8 C. Portfolios Reasonably Allocate Funding Among Market Sectors..... 9

9 D. Portfolio Cost-Effectiveness Takes into Account Uncertainty of Key Input

10 Parameters..... 9

11 E. Portfolio is Designed to Overcome Identified Barriers to Market

12 Transformation, and Advance Integration Objectives..... 13

13 **II. Program Design Achieves Savings Objectives..... 14**

14 A. Portfolios Provide Sufficient Strategies to Address Opportunities to Reduce

15 Critical Peak Loads and Improve System Load Factors..... 14

16 B. Portfolio Adequately Describes Strategies to Minimize Lost Opportunities 14

17 C. Successful and Cost-Effective Programs Will Continue 16

18 D. Program Design Reflects Cumulative Savings Approach Requirements..... 16

19 E. Proposal to Include Energy Savings from “Spillover” Activities 16

20 F. Proposal for Measurement of Market Transformation Programs and Potential

21 Phase Out of Program activity in Transformed Markets 18

22 G. Portfolios Include Strategic Promotion of Emerging Technologies that are

23 Anticipated to Increase Savings Potential 19

24 H. Portfolios Contribute to the Green Building Initiative 20

25 A. Summary of Proposed Programs 20

26 **III. Statewide Programs..... 28**

27 A. Residential Energy Efficiency Program 28

28 B. Statewide Commercial Energy Efficiency Program..... 31

29 C. Statewide Industrial Energy Efficiency Program 35

30 D. Statewide Agricultural Energy Efficiency..... 37

31 E. Statewide New Construction Program..... 40

32 F. Statewide HVAC Program—HVAC Quality Maintenance Program..... 43

33 G. Statewide Codes & Standards..... 44

1	H.	Statewide Emerging Technologies	46
2	I.	Statewide Workforce Education & Training	49
3	J.	Statewide Marketing, Education & Outreach (ME&O)	51
4	K.	Statewide Integrated DSM.....	53
5	VI.	Local Programs.....	54
6	A.	Local Institutional Partnerships	54
7	B.	SoCalGas Local Government Partnerships	58
8	C.	Comprehensive Home Performance Program (CHPP).....	69
9	D.	Local Non-Residential Incentive Partnership.....	69
10	E.	On-Bill Financing (OBF).....	70
11	F.	Palm Desert Energy Partnership Demonstration Program	71
12	G.	Strategic Development and Integration	71
13	H.	Sustainable Communities Case Studies Program.....	73
14	V.	SoCalGas Third Party programs	74
15	A.	California Sustainability Alliance.....	74
16	B.	Community Language Efficiency Outreach (CLEO).....	74
17	C.	Energy Challenger	75
18	D.	PACE Energy Savings Project (PACE Energy Efficient Ethnic Outreach	
19		program)	76
20	E.	Gas Cooling Retrofit.....	76
21	F.	HERS Rater Training Advancement	77
22	G.	LivingWise™	77
23	H.	Multi-Family Direct Therm Savings	78
24	I.	Multi-Family Solar Pool Heating	78
25	J.	Multi-Family Home Tune-Up.....	79
26	K.	OnDemand Efficiency	79
27	L.	Comprehensive Manufactured and Mobile Home.....	79
28	M.	Portfolio of the Future	80
29	N.	Program for Resource Efficiency in Private Schools (PREPS).....	80
30	O.	SaveGas Hot Water Control with Continuous Commissioning	81
31	P.	Small Industrial Facility Upgrades	81
32	Q.	Steam Trap and Compressed Air Survey.....	82

1	R.	Upstream High Efficiency Gas Water Heater Rebate	82
2	VI.	Third-Party Programs.....	82
3	A.	Third Party Program Competitive Process	83
4	B.	Third-Party Program Renewal Process.....	98
5	VII.	Local Government Partnerships	103
6	A.	Local Government Partnerships Process	105
7	VIII.	Summary of Energy Efficiency Market Transformation Strategies.....	112
8	IX.	On-Bill Financing and Other Financing Opportunities	113
9	A.	PY 2006-2008 OBF Program	114
10	B.	2006-2008 Program Summary and Results	115
11	C.	Lessons Learned From the Implementation Phase	116
12	D.	Investigation of Other Financing Strategies	117
13	E.	Modifications to 2006-2008 Program.....	118
14	F.	Proposed OBF Loan Pool	119
15	G.	Residential Financing Opportunities	121
16	H.	Additional Financing Options.....	124
17	X.	Coordination of Program Delivery and Marketing/Outreach and Integrated with	
18		Other Demand-Side Management Programs.....	127
19	A.	Comprehensive and Coordinated Marketing, Packaging and Delivery	
20		(Coordination).....	128
21	B.	Operational Improvements (Program Delivery Coordination to Enable	
22		System Integration).....	131
23	C.	Optimization (Technology & Systems Integration)	133
24	D.	Statewide Integrated DSM.....	134
25	E.	Proposed IDSM Pilot— Sustainable Community Case Studies.....	135
26	F.	Strategic Development and Integration	137
27	G.	Making IDSM a Success	139
28	XI.	Proposed Training Programs In Support of Strategic Plan Vision.....	140
29	SECTION 2 PROPOSED FUNDING REQUEST AND FUND-SHIFTING PROPOSAL		
30	ARE REASONABLE.....		
31	I.	Program Portfolio Funding Levels.....	141

1	B.	Proposed Costs Not Included in Performance Earnings Basis Calculations	143
2	II.	Proposed 2009-2011 Energy Efficiency Fundshifting Guidelines.....	143
3	A.	Modify Treatment of Mid-cycle Funding Augmentation.....	144
4	B.	Proposed Modification of Fund-Shifting Proposals to Align With the Other	
5		IOUs and Accommodate the Strategic Plan	146
6		SECTION 3 PROPOSED EVALUATION, MEASUREMENT AND VERIFICATION	
7		PLANS AND BUDGETS.....	149
8	I.	INTRODUCTION	149
9	II.	SoCalGas-Specific Program Activities.....	150
10	A.	Process Evaluations of Standard Portfolio	151
11	B.	Quantitative Baseline and Market Transformation Information	154
12	C.	Title 20 Saturation Study Requirements.....	155
13	D.	Statewide and National EM&V Organization Activities.....	156
14	E.	EM&V Strategic Planning Activities	156
15	F.	SoCalGas EM&V Staffing Requirements	156
16	III.	Energy Division-Managed Studies	157
17		SECTION 4 REVENUE REQUIREMENTS AND COST RECOVERY.....	158
18	I.	Overview	158
19	A.	Preferred Scenario	158
20	B.	Mandated Scenario	159
21	II.	Natural Gas Allocation Methodology and Rate Design Proposal.....	160
22		SECTION 5 WITNESS QUALIFICATIONS	163
23			

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

**SECTION 1
ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAM PORTFOLIO**

I. SoCalGas Portfolio Goals and Cost Effectiveness

A. Portfolio Meets Annual Energy Efficiency and Cumulative Goals

SoCalGas' Preferred portfolio meets the cumulative savings goals for the three-year cycle. As discussed in the Policy section of this Application, SoCalGas recommends a cumulative goal be adopted which reflects cumulative savings beginning in 2009 and ending in 2011.

SoCalGas also provides a Mandated scenario which follows the direction of D.07-10-032, and reiterated in the October 30, 2008 Assigned Commissioner's and Administrative Law Judge's Ruling requiring Supplemental Filings calculating the expected cumulative savings of the portfolio plans using 2004 as the base year.

1. Preferred Scenario Goals

SoCalGas' Preferred scenario, as stated above, recommends the adoption of a 3-year cumulative goal that is based on SoCalGas' natural gas goals adopted in D.04-09-060. D.08-07-047 OP 4 further adjusts 2009-2011 to be gross savings, i.e., net of free riders. The following table shows the Preferred scenario goals:

//
//
//

Table 1.1: Preferred Scenario—Projected Annual Savings Impacts for 2009-2011

Year	Gas Savings (Gross MTh)		
	Total	CPUC Goal	% of Goal
2009	30,663,931	27,200,000	113%
2010	28,300,000	32,424,753	115%
2011	33,458,732	29,900,000	112%
Total	96,547,416	85,400,000	113%

2. Mandated Scenario Goals

SoCalGas' Mandated scenario goals are based on the cumulative goals from 2004-2008 adopted in D.04-09-060, and the gross goals for 2009-2011 adopted in D.08-07-047.

Specifically SoCalGas' Mandated scenario follows the direction in the October 30, 2008

Assigned Commissioner's and Administrative Law Judge's Ruling requiring Supplemental

Filings (at page 14):

- Use of cumulative goals and accounting methodologies;
- Net basis for determining PEB, and;
- Use of Energy Division-approved ex-ante DEER values for 2009-2011 Planning Purposes.

Furthermore, SoCalGas adjusts these cumulative goals to account for the following:

- Adjustments to SoCalGas' 2004-2005 achievements based on the February 5, 2009 Energy Efficiency 2006-2007 Verification Report ("Verification Report"), prepared by the Energy Division;
- Adjustments to SoCalGas' 2006-2007 achievements based on the Verification Report;

- SoCalGas' 2008 achievements adjusted by the average adjustment factor to its 2006-2007 achievements as shown in the Verification Report;
- Adjustments to expected useful lives and other measures not covered by the Verification Report based on the December 2008 DEER¹.

SoCalGas notes that its use of the results from the Verification Report to develop its Mandated scenario cumulative goals should not be interpreted that it agrees with the results in the Verification Report and reserves the right to present arguments against its results at the next discussion of its 2006-2008 earnings claim.

SoCalGas contends that the cumulative goal as developed using the assumptions above is not achievable since the goal exceeds the available energy efficiency potential using full incremental measure costs in SoCalGas' service territory based on the 2008 *California Energy Efficiency Potential Study* even after SoCalGas adjusted the study to account for under-representation of certain residential sectors. The table below shows the forecasted performance of the Mandated scenario relative to the Mandated cumulative goal.

//

//

//

¹ Energy Division directed the utilities to use the December 2008 DEER update for the purpose of this application.

1 Table 1.2: Mandated Scenario—Analysis of Projected Annual Savings Target and Mandated
 2 Cumulative Goal

	Mandated Scenario	Therms
a	Cumulative Goal--Mandated Scenario	167,675,409
b	Proposed Portfolio Target Savings	122,241,065
c	Less Codes & Standards	3,772,364
d	Adj Target without C&S	118,468,701
e	Adjusted Potential Full Incremental*	120,234,424
f	Percentage of Potential to Goal (e/a)	72%
g	Percentage of Adj Target to Potential (d/e)	99%
h	Percentage of Target to Goal (b/a)	73%

3 *SoCalGas adjusted the potential to account for underrepresentation of its
 4 nonresidential potential. Itron Potential Study does not include C&S.

5 The following table shows SoCalGas' Mandated scenario portfolio annual savings.

6 Table 1.3: Mandated Scenario—Projected Annual Savings Impacts for 2009-2011
 7

Year	Gas Savings (Gross MTh)		
	Total	CPUC Goal	% of Goal
2009	38,789,208	41,764,678	93%
2010	40,495,849	62,784,519	64%
2011	42,956,007	63,126,212	68%
Total	112,241,064	167,675,409	67%

8
 9 **B. Preferred Scenario Portfolio and Funding Levels Appropriately Balance Short-**
 10 **Term and Long-Term Savings**

11 SoCalGas believes its portfolio is appropriately balanced on short-term versus long-term
 12 savings. As an indicator, the overall weighted average measure life for SoCalGas' Preferred and
 13 Mandated scenario portfolios is 17.9 years which is longer than the 10 year life assumed in the

1 CPUC goals decision (D.04-09-060) while still designed to meet the short-term 2009-2011 goals.

2 **C. Portfolios Reasonably Allocate Funding Among Market Sectors**

3 SoCalGas has analyzed the service territory-specific information provided in the draft
4 California Energy Efficiency Potential Study 2008² to guide the development of its sector and
5 end-use allocations, i.e., residential, commercial, and industrial. Although the study provides a
6 significant amount of useful information for program planning for the Residential, Commercial,
7 and Industrial sectors, the study provided limited data for the Agriculture sector.

8 The following table shows the comparison of SoCalGas proposed sector goals with the
9 draft Potential Study.

10 Table 1-4: Comparison of SoCalGas Portfolio and Energy Efficiency Potential by Sector
11

Market Sector	Budget (millions) ¹	% of Total Budget	Gas Savings (MMTh)	% of Total Savings	% Of Potential Study
Residential	\$ 51.91	19%	13.0282	13%	32%
Commercial	\$ 84.82	31%	16.0881	17%	13%
Industrial	\$ 55.75	20%	40.0106	41%	54%
Agricultural	\$ 15.50	6%	11.3300	12%	0%
Cross Cutting ²	\$ 62.29	23%	2.7716	3%	0%
LIEE	\$ -	0%	9.2030	10%	0%
Codes & Standards	\$ 3.00	1%	4.1160	4%	0%
Total ³	\$ 273.26		96.5474		100%

12 1 - The total budget by market sector is sum of rebate incentive, payments to upstream vendors,
direct install material and labor costs. Excludes marketing and administrative related costs.

Cross cutting core programs allocated to appropriate market sector where energy savings expected to be realized.

2 - Cross Cutting programs include Government Partnership programs and Third Party programs.

3 - Projected savings impacts include Intergrated Audit Program.

13 **D. Portfolio Cost-Effectiveness Takes into Account Uncertainty of Key Input** 14 **Parameters**

15 The savings for these programs are derived from savings estimates for each of the

² California Energy Efficiency Potential Study 2008 (Draft), Itron, Inc., February 2008

1 measures that the program is proposing to promote. The individual measure savings and other
2 load impact estimates (e.g., therm savings per unit, program net-to-gross ratios, incremental
3 measure costs and useful lives) are primarily derived from DEER.³ SoCalGas, however,
4 provides for some revisions to the 2008 DEER that it believes are more realistic. See Appendix
5 D for specific changes to DEER 2008 that SoCalGas is proposing to use. If the measure is not
6 documented in DEER, SoCalGas provides documentation in its workpapers to support its
7 estimates of the measure's load impacts. Documentation includes, but is not limited to, load
8 impact evaluations of past programs, market data, engineering model outputs, or manufacturer
9 test data, etc. This is consistent with Policy Rule IV.11.

10 In developing its proposed 2009-2011 portfolio, SoCalGas shows that its portfolio
11 exceeds the proposed goals by 13 percent over the three year period. SoCalGas is expecting that
12 the uncertainty in key input parameters will not fluctuate significantly such that SoCalGas will
13 not meet its goals.

14 SoCalGas has used the E3 calculator developed and updated by E3 under the direction of
15 the Commission's Energy Division staff. See Appendix A for the detail on cost effectiveness
16 parameters for the Preferred Scenario and Appendix A.1 for the Mandated scenario.

17 **1. Total Resource Cost Test and Program Administrator Cost Test**

18 The Commission's Energy Efficiency Policy Manual ("Policy Manual"), Version 4.0⁴
19 (Policy Rule IV. 1) directs the utilities to use the Total Resource Cost Test ("TRC") as the
20 primary indicator of energy efficiency program cost effectiveness, which is consistent with the

³ Based on DEER Updates provided by Commission's Energy Division Staff, December 2008 and utility-recommended changes for selected measures (see Appendix D).

⁴ The March 28, 2008 *Assigned Commissioner's Ruling on Revision 4.0 of the Energy Policy Manual* provide a draft of the Version 4.0 Manual. The final Manual is still pending release by the Commission.

1 Commission’s intent that ratepayer-funded energy efficiency should focus on programs that
2 serve as resource alternatives to supply-side options. The TRC test measures the net resource
3 benefits from the perspective of all ratepayers by combining the net benefits of the program to
4 participants and non-participants. The benefits are the avoided costs of the supply-side resources
5 avoided or deferred as adopted in D.05-04-024 and updated by the April 21, 2008 *Assigned*
6 *Commissioner’s Ruling and Administrative Law Judge’s Ruling Regarding May 15, 2008 Energy*
7 *Efficiency Portfolio Plans for 2009—2011* (“April 21 Ruling”). The April 21, 2008 Ruling
8 directs the utilities to use the updated 2007 generation cost values as adopted in Resolution E-
9 4118.

10 TRC costs, on the other hand, include the incremental cost to install the energy efficient
11 measures/equipment relative to the standard case and the costs incurred by the program
12 administrator. The Policy Manual (Policy Rule IV.2) directs the utility to use its own weighted
13 average cost of capital, as adopted by the Commission. SoCalGas’ discount rate for this
14 application is 8.68 percent.⁵

15 In addition to the TRC test, the utilities are also required to consider in evaluating
16 program and portfolio cost effectiveness the Program Administrator Cost (“PAC”) test (Policy
17 Rule IV.3.). The PAC benefits are the same as the TRC test but costs are defined to include the
18 costs incurred by the program administrator (including financial incentives or rebates paid to
19 participants), but not the costs incurred by the participating customer. The discount rate used for
20 the PAC test is the same as that of the TRC test.

21 Applying both the TRC and PAC cost effectiveness test is referred to as the “Dual-Test”.
22 Policy Rule IV.6. requires a prospective showing of cost effectiveness using the Dual-Test at the

⁵Effective January 1, 2003 per Advice Letter 3199-A dated November 22, 2002..

1 portfolio level to qualify for program funding.

2 The estimated TRC and PAC ratios of SoCalGas' 2009-2011 portfolio are as follows:

3 Table 1-5: Preferred Scenario—Portfolio Cost Effectiveness
4

Cost Effectiveness	
Total Resource Cost (TRC) Test	
Costs	\$419,564,093
Electric Benefits	\$60,921,638
Gas Benefits	\$596,641,792
Net Benefits (NPV)	\$237,999,337
BC Ratio	1.57
Program Administrator Cost (PAC) Test	
Costs	\$261,249,135
Electric Benefits	\$60,921,638
Gas Benefits	\$596,641,792
Net Benefits (NPV)	\$396,314,294
BC Ratio	2.52

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

//

16

//

//

Table 1-6: Mandated Scenario—Portfolio Cost Effectiveness

Cost Effectiveness	
Total Resource Cost (TRC) Test	
Costs	\$503,297,338
Electric Benefits	\$60,402,594
Gas Benefits	\$549,545,405
Net Benefits (NPV)	\$106,650,661
BC Ratio	1.21
Program Administrator Cost (PAC) Test	
Costs	\$497,768,382
Electric Benefits	\$60,402,594
Gas Benefits	\$549,545,405
Net Benefits (NPV)	\$112,179,617
BC Ratio	1.23

2. Environmental Benefits

D.05-04-024 adopted the various costs used to value a select group of environmental adders. These adders include NO_x, PM-10 and CO₂. The April 21, 2008 Ruling directs the utilities to include a second case scenario using an updated carbon value of \$30/tonne as an alternative to the \$15/tonne adopted by D.05-04-024. These environmental adders and the updated carbon value have been incorporated into the updated E3 calculator, however, there is no impact to the cost effectiveness of SoCalGas' portfolio.

E. Portfolio is Designed to Overcome Identified Barriers to Market Transformation, and Advance Integration Objectives

Identifying and addressing barriers to success is a key component to the Program Implementation Plans contained in Appendix B. In general, the success barriers facing most of the programs include awareness, performance/reliability uncertainty, first cost and financing.

1 Each PIP addresses mitigation measures for these hurdles with some of the more common being
2 targeted marketing, demonstration projects, split incentives and On-Bill Financing. An example
3 of a targeted marketing activity is our co-branding activity with retailers which leverages retailer
4 access to the customer with SoCalGas energy efficiency messages and is employed in our
5 Residential Energy Efficiency programs. Addressing performance/reliability uncertainty usually
6 involves completing demonstration tests to provide customers with evidence of successful
7 installations. This technique is often employed in our Non-residential Custom program.
8 Overcoming financial barriers typically involves providing incentives at multiple levels in the
9 product deliver stream including manufacturer/distributor incentives to ensure availability,
10 retailer incentives to ensure stocking and/or customer incentives to overcome pay-back hurdles.
11 This applies to almost every non-residential program and is the main driver behind its On-Bill
12 Financing program and its proposed Green Energy Systems program.

13 **II. Program Design Achieves Savings Objectives**

14 **A. Portfolios Provide Sufficient Strategies to Address Opportunities to Reduce** 15 **Critical Peak Loads and Improve System Load Factors**

16 This is not applicable to SoCalGas.

17 **B. Portfolio Adequately Describes Strategies to Minimize Lost Opportunities**

18 SoCalGas' proposed portfolio offers strategies to minimize lost opportunities. SoCalGas
19 believes that lost opportunities occur when customers are not afforded opportunities to install
20 comprehensive energy efficiency upgrades. SoCalGas has improved its program designs
21 consistent with CEESP underlying theme of comprehensiveness and "whole house" approaches
22 to further California's aggressive energy efficiency goals. The following are illustrative
23 examples of comprehensiveness in SoCalGas' program designs.

1 In the residential sector, SoCalGas' 2009-2011 portfolio of residential programs is
2 generally designed to avoid lost opportunities through a "comprehensiveness" strategy. For
3 example, programs will feature a "Whole House" performance training element for home
4 contractors and installers that focus on whole house energy performance, including effective air
5 sealing, insulation and ventilation. Customers will be encouraged to consider investing in
6 comprehensive projects as opposed to piecemeal purchases of equipment.

7 SoCalGas will be offering comprehensive services to its nonresidential customers such
8 that it facilitates the identification of as many opportunities to improve their energy efficiency as
9 possible. An example is the mobile energy van wherein onsite energy efficiency seminars at
10 selected customer industrial sites, combined with its flexible incentive programs which allows
11 the customer to implement all identified energy efficiency upgrades. On-bill financing and its
12 new Green Energy Systems program would offer financing options to further encourage
13 comprehensive installations.

14 Another way that SoCalGas seeks to minimize lost opportunities is through its new
15 construction energy efficiency programs seek to support the utility Strategic Plan, the Big Bold
16 Energy Efficiency Strategies and promote a sustainable future for southern California. By
17 addressing the environment, energy and resources efficiency, the programs seek to support the
18 residential 2020 goals of zero net energy in new construction. Coupled with the focus on
19 sustainable design and green building practices, the program will seek to influence the design
20 and construction of sustainable communities in its broadest definition.

21 Beginning in 2009, the SoCalGas program managers will be responsible for segments
22 rather than specific programs. The goal of this change to be even more knowledgeable about the
23 needs of customer segments (residential owners and renters; non-residential manufacturing,

1 agricultural, hospitality, foodservice, institutional, etc) and increase market penetration through
2 segment specific marketing and outreach. This additional step of segmentation enhances the
3 company's ability to design program and communications materials geared towards managing
4 the customer's energy needs in a comprehensive manner rather than the traditional method of
5 offering independent programs.

6 **C. Successful and Cost-Effective Programs Will Continue**

7 SoCalGas is not only proposing continuing successful programs but each of these
8 programs has been improved. SoCalGas has reduced the number of core programs to reduce
9 customer and market actor confusion due to different program offerings that were offering
10 competing rebates/incentives for like measures. SoCalGas has also reviewed its existing 2006-
11 2008 third party programs and offered contract renewals to several successful programs.

12 **D. Program Design Reflects Cumulative Savings Approach Requirements**

13 As discussed in previous sections, SoCalGas proposed portfolio is designed to meet the
14 proposed 2009-2011 three-year cumulative goal.

15 **E. Proposal to Include Energy Savings from "Spillover" Activities**

16 D.07-10-032 (at pages 123-128) reopens the discussion on whether or not it is appropriate
17 for the utilities to take credit for "spillover" effects due to programs. It would appear that the
18 fundamental question is not whether "spillover effects occur from the programs (both from
19 program participants and non-program participants), but whether or not there are EM&V
20 methodologies that can accurately measure the specific spillover impacts of a utility program.

21 D.05-04-051, Finding of Fact 27 states:

1 “The speculative nature of any attempts to quantify spillover effects significantly
2 reduces their applicability as an analytical tool at this time. Moreover, discounting the
3 accounting of free-ridership through “spillover,” as PG&E proposes, would make it
4 particularly difficult to attribute indirect program benefits to education and information
5 programs, without double-counting those benefits.”

6 Spillover and Net-to-Gross (“NTG”) analyses are intrinsically related to each other.
7 SoCalGas and SDG&E have taken the position that current methodologies for estimating NTG
8 are flawed and by extension⁶ so would the methodologies measuring spillover effects if no
9 significant progress is made on developing new or improving current methods.

10 The July 1, 2008 “Proposed Decision Adopting Interim Energy Efficiency Savings Goals
11 for 2012 Through 2020, and Defining Energy Efficiency Savings goals for 2009 Through 2011”
12 OP 4 adopts gross goals, not net of free riders goals. SoCalGas believes that moving to gross
13 goals mitigates issues related to measuring NTG and spillover effects.

14 With respects to program offerings influencing “spillover” effects, SoCalGas’ portfolio
15 of programs are designed to influence market actors to the greatest extent. For example,
16 upstream programs (e.g., manufacturers, distributors, retailers) which provide energy efficiency
17 equipment at reduced prices to all customers. It is indeed difficult to discern each customer’s
18 motivation for purchasing the energy efficiency equipment when the price is already reduced.
19 However, it is impractical to attempt to determine an individual’s motivation and differentiate
20 energy utility incentives based on that motivation. Moreover, Upstream programs are one of the
21 most efficient program designs to influence the energy efficiency market at all levels of the

⁶ Attachment A of “Comments of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U 902 M) and Southern California Gas Company (U 904 G) on Energy Efficiency Savings Goals through 2020 and Related Topics Pursuant to Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge’s Ruling Seeking Comment on Definition of Energy Savings Goals for 2009 Through 2011” submitted June 11, 2008.

1 supply chain.

2 Education & Training programs provide accessible energy efficiency information to
3 customers so that they can make decisions that are pro-energy efficiency. Frequent messaging,
4 communications, seminars and workshops reinforce these concepts so that at time of purchase
5 energy efficiency is one of the customer's top considerations. The ultimate goal for part of the
6 market transformation is that customers will purchase energy efficiency equipment on its
7 intrinsic value without a rebate or incentive which is then a 100 percent spillover effect
8 SoCalGas' Education & Training programs are designed to help reach that goal.

9 SoCalGas' New Construction programs offer design team incentives, along with Title 24
10 and sustainability workshops and training. These incentives reinforce the desired outcome of
11 influencing the design team (architects, engineering firms, etc.) to propose high efficiency design
12 options to builder- and owner-clients and help influence their final design decision. As more
13 architects and engineering firms incorporate energy efficiency into their design practice, the
14 industry will ideally transform itself thus facilitating the adoption of higher codes and standards,
15 and creating significant spillover effects.

16 These are but a few examples of strategies in SoCalGas' portfolio that bring about
17 spillover effects.

18 **F. Proposal for Measurement of Market Transformation Programs and Potential**
19 **Phase Out of Program activity in Transformed Markets**

20 Over the years, California has invested in market effects studies that track changes in a
21 product market.⁷ (e.g., California Residential Efficiency Market Share Tracking: Appliances
22 2005, Itron, 2006). Furthermore, California has formal protocols to conduct market effects

⁷ California Residential Efficiency Market Share Tracking: Appliances 2005, Itron, 2006

1 study.⁸ This body of evaluation work provides adequate methodologies to measure market
2 transformation.

3 As California embarks on aggressive market transforming activities such as the BBES
4 and the strategies laid in the CEESP, studies need to commence as soon as possible to begin
5 tracking the progress of programs so that there is a baseline established to determine progress
6 towards market transformation. See Section 3 below for more discussion on proposed market
7 transformation/effects studies.

8 **G. Portfolios Include Strategic Promotion of Emerging Technologies that are**
9 **Anticipated to Increase Savings Potential**

10 Emerging Technologies is an important component of SoCalGas' program portfolio as
11 the "incubator" of new measures for inclusion in the tradition incentive programs. We do not
12 have a specific budget allocated to "strategic promotion of emerging technologies" but we do
13 have a process in place to take full advantage of new technologies, regardless of the source of the
14 technology. The process has worked well in the past and we are confident will continue to work
15 as we move forward. Under that process, once an emerging technology project is complete and
16 results are available, the technology is handed over to the appropriate Segment Manager for
17 program development and implementation. Depending on the technology, it may simply be
18 incorporated into an existing program such as the Nonresidential Standard program, or it may
19 warrant a specialized program design and implementation. Either way, the impacted segment
20 utilizes its allocated program budgets or 3rd Party budget as appropriate. We have anticipated
21 this somewhat unpredictable shift in funding in our budget planning and have found in the past

⁸ The California Evaluation Framework, TecMarket Works, June 2004; and California Energy Efficiency Evaluation Protocols: Technical, Methodological, and Reporting Requirements for Evaluation Professionals, TecMarket Works, April 2006.

1 that there is generally a rough balance between new measures being introduced and mature ones
2 falling off because of obsolescence or changes in market conditions. As a result, we are
3 confident we have sufficient funds to adequately support the marketing and commercialization of
4 new technologies that may reasonably be expected to appear during the program cycle.

5 **H. Portfolios Contribute to the Green Building Initiative**

6 Please refer to Appendix F Table 2-4 (Preferred scenario) and Appendix F.1 Table 2-4
7 (Mandated scenario) for the portfolios contributions to the green Building Initiative. The
8 Statewide Commercial program and Institutional Partnership programs in Appendix B for the
9 different program activities that support the goals of the Green Building Initiative.

10 **A. Summary of Proposed Programs**

11 SoCalGas' 2009-2011 provides a list of comprehensive Energy Efficiency services to its
12 customers with a focus towards achieving BBEES and implementation of the CEESP strategies.
13 Tables 1-7 and 1-8 present the 2009 program budgets and goals, respectively, for the Preferred
14 scenario. Tables 1-9 and 1-10 present the 2009 program budgets and goals, respectively, for the
15 Mandated scenario. These tables are also available in Appendix F and F-1.

16
17
18 //

19 //

20 //

1
2

Table 1-7: Preferred Scenario—2009-2011 Program Budgets

	2009	2010	2011	2009-2011
#3P - IOU Administration	\$ 1,439,733	\$ 1,386,789	\$ 1,386,789	\$ 4,213,310
#L-InstP01 - CA Depart of Corrections Partnership	\$ 481,647	\$ 481,647	\$ 481,647	\$ 1,444,941
#L-InstP02 - CA Community College Partnership	\$ 422,727	\$ 422,727	\$ 422,727	\$ 1,268,182
#L-InstP03 - UC/CSU/IOU Partnership	\$ 778,329	\$ 771,959	\$ 778,329	\$ 2,328,616
#L-InstP04 - State of California /IOU Partnership	\$ 481,646	\$ 481,646	\$ 481,646	\$ 1,444,939
#Local01 - OBF	\$ 916,545	\$ 928,454	\$ 939,039	\$ 2,784,038
#Local02 - Local Whole Home Performance	\$ 411,642	\$ 415,464	\$ 419,424	\$ 1,246,530
#Local03 - Local Sustainable Communities (RMV)	\$ 257,090	\$ 257,090	\$ 309,590	\$ 823,770
#Local04 - Local Strategic Develop & Integ	\$ 284,396	\$ 284,396	\$ 284,396	\$ 853,187
#Local05 - Local Non-Residential BID	\$ 87,917	\$ 90,421	\$ 91,642	\$ 269,980
#SW-AgA - Calculated	\$ 3,325,989	\$ 3,238,984	\$ 3,387,483	\$ 9,952,456
#SW-AgB - Deemed	\$ 1,583,532	\$ 1,586,880	\$ 1,647,775	\$ 4,818,186
#SW-AgC - Nonresidential Audits	\$ 48,011	\$ 49,551	\$ 51,373	\$ 148,935
#SW-AgD - Pump Test & Repair	\$ 81,238	\$ 78,051	\$ 86,289	\$ 245,579
#SW-AgE - Continuous Energy Improvement	\$ 114,678	\$ 115,491	\$ 105,027	\$ 335,196
#SW-C&SA - Building Standards Advocacy	\$ 319,370	\$ 319,370	\$ 319,370	\$ 958,110
#SW-C&SB - Appliance Standards Advocacy	\$ 110,001	\$ 110,001	\$ 110,001	\$ 330,002
#SW-C&SC - Compliance Training	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 750,001
#SW-C&SD - Reach Codes	\$ 319,370	\$ 319,370	\$ 319,370	\$ 958,110
#SW-ComA - Calculated	\$ 1,794,388	\$ 2,161,699	\$ 2,228,077	\$ 6,184,164
#SW-ComB - Deemed	\$ 4,715,537	\$ 5,117,815	\$ 5,211,287	\$ 15,044,639
#SW-ComC - Nonresidential Audits	\$ 463,335	\$ 488,431	\$ 504,928	\$ 1,456,694
#SW-ComD - Continuous Energy Improvement	\$ 242,855	\$ 302,212	\$ 254,917	\$ 799,983
#SW-ComE - Direct Install	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
#SW-HVACA - Residential Energy Star Quality Insta	\$ 38,175	\$ 38,175	\$ 38,175	\$ 114,526
#SW-HVACB - Commercial Quality Installation	\$ 35,769	\$ 35,769	\$ 35,769	\$ 107,306
#SW-HVACC - Commercial Upstream Equipment	\$ 22,320	\$ 22,320	\$ 22,320	\$ 66,961
#SW-HVACD - Quality Maintenance Program	\$ 238,251	\$ 330,651	\$ 345,351	\$ 914,252
#SW-HVACE - Technology & Systems Diagnostics	\$ 300,500	\$ 300,500	\$ 300,500	\$ 901,499
#SW-HVACF - HVAC WE&T	\$ 45,727	\$ 45,727	\$ 45,727	\$ 137,181
#SW-HVACG - HVAC Core	\$ 26,287	\$ 26,287	\$ 26,287	\$ 78,862
#SW-IDSM - SW Integrated DSM	\$ 200,041	\$ 200,041	\$ 200,041	\$ 600,122
#SW-IndA - Calculated	\$ 15,365,941	\$ 15,372,517	\$ 15,752,312	\$ 46,490,770
#SW-IndB - Deemed	\$ 2,106,260	\$ 2,140,615	\$ 2,200,896	\$ 6,447,771
#SW-IndC - Nonresidential Audits	\$ 414,745	\$ 427,327	\$ 442,083	\$ 1,284,155
#SW-IndD - Continuous Energy Improvement	\$ 335,879	\$ 785,517	\$ 405,819	\$ 1,527,216
#LGovP01 - LA County IOU Partnership	\$ 212,455	\$ 214,930	\$ 217,106	\$ 644,491
#LGovP02 - Kern County Energy Watch Partnership	\$ 96,019	\$ 98,594	\$ 98,755	\$ 293,368
#LGovP03 - Riverside County Partnership	\$ 138,504	\$ 140,720	\$ 142,626	\$ 421,850
#LGovP04 - San Bernardino County IOU Partnership	\$ 135,595	\$ 138,520	\$ 140,347	\$ 414,462
#LGovP05 - Santa Barbara County IOU Partnership	\$ 97,039	\$ 106,253	\$ 121,444	\$ 324,736
#LGovP06 - SBCCOG Partnership	\$ 148,174	\$ 149,649	\$ 150,787	\$ 448,610
#LGovP07 - San Luis Obispo County Partnership	\$ 98,872	\$ 102,940	\$ 100,390	\$ 302,203
#LGovP08 - Tulare Cnty-Visalia Energy Watch Prtnr	\$ 91,516	\$ 92,775	\$ 93,745	\$ 278,036
#LGovP09 - Orange County Cities Partnership	\$ 127,996	\$ 131,522	\$ 129,732	\$ 389,250
#LGovP10 - ILG IOU Partnership	\$ 142,957	\$ 144,243	\$ 145,185	\$ 432,385
#LGovP11 - Community Energy Partnership	\$ 121,783	\$ 124,711	\$ 118,557	\$ 365,051
#LGovP12 - Desert Cities Partnership	\$ 24,840	\$ 25,294	\$ 25,570	\$ 75,704
#LGovP13 - VCREA Sub-Program Partnership	\$ 163,493	\$ 167,307	\$ 167,013	\$ 497,812
#LGovP14 - Palm Desert IOU Pilot Partnership	\$ 804,886	\$ 809,511	\$ 767,058	\$ 2,381,454

3

Table 1-7: Preferred Scenario—2009-2011 Program Budgets (continued)

	2009	2010	2011	2009-2011
#SW-ETA - Assessments	\$ 1,763,194	\$ 1,763,194	\$ 1,763,194	\$ 5,289,583
#SW-ETB - Scaled Field Placement	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
#SW-ETC - Demonstration / Showcasing	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
#SW-ETD - Market and Behavioral Studies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
#SW-ETE - Technology supply-side efforts	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
#SW-ETF - Technology Incubation	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
#SW-ETG - Technology Test Centers (TTC)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
#SW-ETH - ZNE lab (PG&E)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
#SW-NCNR - NRNC Savings By Design	\$ 2,398,362	\$ 2,468,472	\$ 2,694,792	\$ 7,561,627
#SW-NCResA - RNC	\$ 3,048,748	\$ 3,156,988	\$ 3,563,728	\$ 9,769,464
#SW-ResA - Multifamily EE Rebates	\$ 3,580,797	\$ 4,162,562	\$ 4,523,647	\$ 12,267,005
#SW-ResB - Home Efficiency Rebates	\$ 8,654,141	\$ 8,985,533	\$ 9,815,590	\$ 27,455,264
#SW-ResC - Home Efficiency Energy Survey	\$ 772,570	\$ 808,845	\$ 835,767	\$ 2,417,181
#SW-WE&TA - Strategic Planning & Implementation	\$ 357,000	\$ 257,250	\$ 141,750	\$ 756,000
#SW-WE&TB - WE&T Centers	\$ 2,919,076	\$ 3,083,263	\$ 2,935,669	\$ 8,938,008
#SW-WE&TC - WE&T Connections	\$ 651,143	\$ 663,149	\$ 675,588	\$ 1,989,880
#SW-ME&OA - Marketing, Education & Outreach (Core)	\$ 2,013,043	\$ 2,013,043	\$ 2,013,043	\$ 6,039,130
#SW-ME&OB - SW Marketing, E&O FYP	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
#SW-ME&OC - ME&O Strategic Plan	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Third Party Programs Total*	\$ 14,995,895	\$ 15,284,992	\$ 14,040,093	\$ 44,320,980
Total Programs Budget	\$ 79,604,926	\$ 82,465,113	\$ 83,294,536	\$ 245,364,575
*Individual Third Party Budgets are not finalized. Budgets will be finalized based on DEER update reviews, Commission Approval and final contract negotiations.				

1
2

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11 //
12 //
13 //

1
2

Table 1-8: Preferred Scenario—2009-2011 Program Goals

Programs	2009	2010	2011	2009-2011
#L-InstP01 - CA Depart of Corrections Partnership	0		0	0
#L-InstP02 - CA Community College Partnership	0		0	0
#L-InstP03 - UC/CSU/IOU Partnership	0		0	0
#L-InstP04 - State of California /IOU Partnership	0		0	0
#Local01 - OBF	0		0	0
#Local02 - Local Whole Home Performance	0		0	0
#Local03 - Local Sustainable Communities (RMV)	0		0	0
#Local04 - Local Strategic Develop & Integ	0		0	0
#Local05 - Local Non-Residential BID	0		0	0
#SW-AgA - Calculated	2,273,696	2,137,166	2,176,649	6,587,510
#SW-AgB - Deemed	1,561,485	1,561,485	1,619,516	4,742,486
#SW-AgC - Nonresidential Audits	0		0	0
#SW-AgD - Pump Test & Repair	0		0	0
#SW-AgE - Continuous Energy Improvement	0		0	0
#SW-C&SA - Building Standards Advocacy	845,236	1,552,408	1,718,396	4,116,040
#SW-C&SB - Appliance Standards Advocacy	0		0	0
#SW-C&SC - Compliance Training	0		0	0
#SW-C&SD - Reach Codes	0		0	0
#SW-ComA - Calculated	1,033,200	1,280,430	1,389,900	3,703,530
#SW-ComB - Deemed	3,623,468	3,623,468	3,778,448	11,025,383
#SW-ComC - Nonresidential Audits	0		0	0
#SW-ComD - Continuous Energy Improvement	0		0	0
#SW-ComE - Direct Install	0		0	0
#SW-HVACA - Residential Energy Star Quality Insta	0		0	0
#SW-HVACB - Commercial Quality Installation	0		0	0
#SW-HVACC - Commercial Upstream Equipment	0		0	0
#SW-HVACD - Quality Maintenance Program	0		0	0
#SW-HVACE - Technology & Systems Diagnostics	0		0	0
#SW-HVACF - HVAC WE&T	0		0	0
#SW-HVACG - HVAC Core	0		0	0
#SW-IDSM - SW Integrated DSM	0		0	0
#SW-IndA - Calculated	11,366,918	11,154,129	10,905,608	33,426,654
#SW-IndB - Deemed	2,156,556	2,156,556	2,270,792	6,583,904
#SW-IndC - Nonresidential Audits	0		0	0
#SW-IndD - Continuous Energy Improvement	0		0	0
#LGovP01 - LA County IOU Partnership	0		0	0
#LGovP02 - Kern County Energy Watch Partnership	0		0	0
#LGovP03 - Riverside County Partnership	0		0	0
#LGovP04 - San Bernardino County IOU Partnership	0		0	0
#LGovP05 - Santa Barbara County IOU Partnership	0		0	0
#LGovP06 - SBCCOG Partnership	0		0	0
#LGovP07 - San Luis Obispo County Partnership	0		0	0
#LGovP08 - Tulare Cnty-Visalia Energy Watch Prtnr	0		0	0
#LGovP09 - Orange County Cities Partnership	0		0	0
#LGovP10 - ILG IOU Partnership	0		0	0
#LGovP11 - Community Energy Partnership	0		0	0
#LGovP12 - Desert Cities Partnership	0		0	0
#LGovP13 - VCREA Sub-Program Partnership	0		0	0
#LGovP14 - Palm Desert IOU Pilot Partnership	0		0	0

* Partnership Savings are reported through the Commercial Programs.

3

Table 1-8: Preferred Scenario—2009-2011 Program Goals (continued)

Programs	2009	2010	2011	2009-2011
#SW-ETA - Assessments	0		0	0
#SW-ETB - Scaled Field Placement	0		0	0
#SW-ETC - Demonstration / Showcasing	0		0	0
#SW-ETD - Market and Behavioral Studies	0		0	0
#SW-ETE - Technology supply-side efforts	0		0	0
#SW-ETF - Technology Incubation	0		0	0
#SW-ETG - Technology Test Centers (TTC)	0		0	0
#SW-ETH - ZNE lab (PG&E)	0		0	0
#SW-NCResA - RNC	129,150	156,210	244,770	530,130
#SW-ResA - Multifamily EE Rebates	1,647,494	1,967,846	2,161,194	5,776,534
#SW-ResB - Home Efficiency Rebates	2,207,432	2,217,794	2,296,335	6,721,561
#SW-ResC - Home Efficiency Energy Survey	0		0	0
#SW-WE&TA - Strategic Planning & Implementation	0		0	0
#SW-WE&TB - WE&T Centers	0		0	0
#SW-WE&TC - WE&T Connections	0		0	0
#SW-ME&OA - Marketing, Education & Outreach (Core)	0		0	0
#SW-ME&OB - SW Marketing, E&O FYP	0		0	0
#SW-ME&OC - ME&O Strategic Plan	0		0	0
#SW-NCNR - NRNC Savings By Design	330,870	400,980	627,300	1,359,150
Third Party Program Total	923,859	923,859	923,859	2,771,576
#y LIEE - Low Income EE (LIEE)	2,564,567	3,292,424	3,345,967	9,202,958
TOTALS	30,667,949	32,428,773	33,462,754	96,547,416

//

//

//

Table 1-9: Mandated Scenario—2009-2011 Program Budgets

Programs	2009	2010	2011	2009-2011
#LGovP01 - LA County IOU Partnership	\$ 212,455	\$ 214,930	\$ 217,106	\$ 644,491
#LGovP02 - Kern County Energy Watch Partnership	\$ 96,019	\$ 98,594	\$ 98,755	\$ 293,368
#LGovP03 - Riverside County Partnership	\$ 138,504	\$ 140,720	\$ 142,626	\$ 421,850
#LGovP04 - San Bernardino County IOU Partnership	\$ 135,595	\$ 138,520	\$ 140,347	\$ 414,462
#LGovP05 - Santa Barbara County IOU Partnership	\$ 97,039	\$ 106,253	\$ 121,444	\$ 324,736
#LGovP06 - SBCCOG Partnership	\$ 148,174	\$ 149,649	\$ 150,787	\$ 448,610
#LGovP07 - San Luis Obispo County Partnership	\$ 98,872	\$ 102,940	\$ 100,390	\$ 302,203
#LGovP08 - Tulare Cnty-Visalia Energy Watch Prtnr	\$ 91,516	\$ 92,775	\$ 93,745	\$ 278,036
#LGovP09 - Orange County Cities Partnership	\$ 127,996	\$ 131,522	\$ 129,732	\$ 389,250
#LGovP10 - ILG IOU Partnership	\$ 142,957	\$ 144,243	\$ 145,185	\$ 432,385
#LGovP11 - Community Energy Partnership	\$ 121,783	\$ 124,711	\$ 118,557	\$ 365,051
#LGovP12 - Desert Cities Partnership	\$ 24,840	\$ 25,294	\$ 25,570	\$ 75,704
#LGovP13 - VCREA Sub-Program Partnership	\$ 163,493	\$ 167,307	\$ 167,013	\$ 497,812
#LGovP14 - Palm Desert IOU Pilot Partnership	\$ 804,886	\$ 809,511	\$ 767,058	\$ 2,381,454
#L-InstP01 - CA Depart of Corrections Partnership	\$ 481,647	\$ 481,647	\$ 481,647	\$ 1,444,941
#L-InstP02 - CA Community College Partnership	\$ 422,727	\$ 422,727	\$ 422,727	\$ 1,268,182
#L-InstP03 - UC/CSU/IOU Partnership	\$ 778,329	\$ 771,959	\$ 778,329	\$ 2,328,616
#L-InstP04 - State of California /IOU Partnership	\$ 481,646	\$ 481,646	\$ 481,646	\$ 1,444,939
#Local01 - OBF	\$ 916,545	\$ 928,454	\$ 939,039	\$ 2,784,038
#Local02 - Local Whole Home Performance	\$ 411,642	\$ 415,464	\$ 419,424	\$ 1,246,530
#Local03 - Local Sustainable Communities (RMV)	\$ 257,090	\$ 257,090	\$ 309,590	\$ 823,770
#Local04 - Local Strategic Develop & Integ	\$ 284,396	\$ 284,396	\$ 284,396	\$ 853,187
#Local05 - Local Non-Residential BID	\$ 87,917	\$ 90,421	\$ 91,642	\$ 269,980
#SW-AgA - Calculated	\$ 3,371,070	\$ 3,186,663	\$ 3,270,137	\$ 9,827,870
#SW-AgB - Deemed	\$ 9,949,642	\$ 9,952,991	\$ 10,381,444	\$ 30,284,076
#SW-AgC - Nonresidential Audits	\$ 48,011	\$ 49,551	\$ 51,373	\$ 148,935
#SW-AgD - Pump Test & Repair	\$ 81,238	\$ 78,051	\$ 86,289	\$ 245,579
#SW-AgE - Continuous Energy Improvement	\$ 114,678	\$ 115,491	\$ 105,027	\$ 335,196
#SW-C&SA - Building Standards Advocacy	\$ 319,370	\$ 319,370	\$ 319,370	\$ 958,110
#SW-C&SB - Appliance Standards Advocacy	\$ 110,001	\$ 110,001	\$ 110,001	\$ 330,002
#SW-C&SC - Compliance Training	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 750,001
#SW-C&SD - Reach Codes	\$ 319,370	\$ 319,370	\$ 319,370	\$ 958,110
#SW-ComA - Calculated	\$ 923,173	\$ 1,082,015	\$ 1,056,086	\$ 3,061,273
#SW-ComB - Deemed	\$ 5,705,320	\$ 6,107,598	\$ 6,245,654	\$ 18,058,572
#SW-ComC - Nonresidential Audits	\$ 463,335	\$ 488,431	\$ 504,928	\$ 1,456,694
#SW-ComD - Continuous Energy Improvement	\$ 242,855	\$ 302,212	\$ 254,917	\$ 799,983
#SW-ComE - Direct Install	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

//

//

//

Table 1-9: Mandated Scenario—2009-2011 Program Budgets (continued)

Programs	2009	2010	2011	2009-2011
#SW-ETA - Assessments	\$ 1,763,194	\$ 1,763,194	\$ 1,763,194	\$ 5,289,583
#SW-ETB - Scaled Field Placement	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
#SW-ETC - Demonstration / Showcasing	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
#SW-ETD - Market and Behavioral Studies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
#SW-ETE - Technology supply-side efforts	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
#SW-ETF - Technology Incubation	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
#SW-ETG - Technology Test Centers (TTC)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
#SW-ETH - ZNE lab (PG&E)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
#SW-HVACA - Residential Energy Star Quality Insta	\$ 38,175	\$ 38,175	\$ 38,175	\$ 114,526
#SW-HVACB - Commercial Quality Installation	\$ 35,769	\$ 35,769	\$ 35,769	\$ 107,306
#SW-HVACC - Commercial Upstream Equipment	\$ 22,320	\$ 22,320	\$ 22,320	\$ 66,961
#SW-HVACD - Quality Maintenance Program	\$ 238,251	\$ 330,651	\$ 345,351	\$ 914,252
#SW-HVACE - Technology & Systems Diagnostics	\$ 300,500	\$ 300,500	\$ 300,500	\$ 901,499
#SW-HVACF - HVAC WE&T	\$ 45,727	\$ 45,727	\$ 45,727	\$ 137,181
#SW-HVACG - HVAC Core	\$ 26,287	\$ 26,287	\$ 26,287	\$ 78,862
#SW-IDSM - SW Integrated DSM	\$ 200,041	\$ 200,041	\$ 200,041	\$ 600,122
#SW-IndA - Calculated	\$ 44,695,335	\$ 44,109,762	\$ 47,338,450	\$ 136,143,546
#SW-IndB - Deemed	\$ 6,543,490	\$ 6,577,845	\$ 6,741,855	\$ 19,863,190
#SW-IndC - Nonresidential Audits	\$ 414,745	\$ 427,327	\$ 442,083	\$ 1,284,155
#SW-IndD - Continuous Energy Improvement	\$ 335,879	\$ 785,517	\$ 405,819	\$ 1,527,216
#SW-ME&OA - Marketing, Education & Outreach (Core)	\$ 2,013,043	\$ 2,013,043	\$ 2,013,043	\$ 6,039,130
#SW-ME&OB - SW Marketing, E&O FYP	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
#SW-ME&OC - ME&O Strategic Plan	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
#SW-NCNR - NRNC Savings By Design	\$ 3,345,358	\$ 3,616,134	\$ 4,490,214	\$ 11,451,706
#SW-NCResA - RNC	\$ 3,838,113	\$ 4,111,744	\$ 5,059,762	\$ 13,009,619
#SW-ResA - Multifamily EE Rebates	\$ 6,130,713	\$ 7,504,169	\$ 8,183,580	\$ 21,818,462
#SW-ResB - Home Efficiency Rebates	\$ 40,245,498	\$ 40,680,333	\$ 43,773,528	\$ 124,699,359
#SW-ResC - Home Efficiency Energy Survey	\$ 772,570	\$ 808,845	\$ 835,767	\$ 2,417,181
#SW-WE&TA - Strategic Planning & Implementation	\$ 357,000	\$ 257,250	\$ 141,750	\$ 756,000
#SW-WE&TB - WE&T Centers	\$ 2,919,076	\$ 3,083,263	\$ 2,935,669	\$ 8,938,008
#SW-WE&TC - WE&T Connections	\$ 651,143	\$ 663,149	\$ 675,588	\$ 1,989,880
#x EM&V - Evaluation Measurement & Verification	\$ 14,451,399	\$ 14,451,399	\$ 14,451,399	\$ 43,354,197
#3P - IOU Administration	\$ 1,439,744	\$ 1,386,789	\$ 1,386,789	\$ 4,213,321
Third Party Program Total*	\$ 16,643,640	\$ 16,932,737	\$ 15,687,838	\$ 49,264,214
#y LIEE - Low Income EE (LIEE)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TOTALS	\$ 175,895,159	\$ 179,118,507	\$ 186,925,868	\$ 541,927,473

//

//

//

Table 1-10: Mandated Scenario—2009-2011 Program Goals

Program	2009	2010	2011	2009-2011
#LGovP01 - LA County IOU Partnership				-
#LGovP02 - Kern County Energy Watch Partnership				-
#LGovP03 - Riverside County Partnership				-
#LGovP04 - San Bernardino County IOU Partnership				-
#LGovP05 - Santa Barbara County IOU Partnership				-
#LGovP06 - SBCCOG Partnership				-
#LGovP07 - San Luis Obispo County Partnership				-
#LGovP08 - Tulare Cnty-Visalia Energy Watch Prtnr				-
#LGovP09 - Orange County Cities Partnership				-
#LGovP10 - ILG IOU Partnership				-
#LGovP11 - Community Energy Partnership				-
#LGovP12 - Desert Cities Partnership				-
#LGovP13 - VCREA Sub-Program Partnership				-
#LGovP14 - Palm Desert IOU Pilot Partnership				-
#L-InstP01 - CA Depart of Corrections Partnership				-
#L-InstP02 - CA Community College Partnership				-
#L-InstP03 - UC/CSU/IOU Partnership				-
#L-InstP04 - State of California /IOU Partnership				-
#Local01 - OBF				-
#Local02 - Local Whole Home Performance				-
#Local03 - Local Sustainable Communities (RMV)				-
#Local04 - Local Strategic Develop & Integ				-
#Local05 - Local Non-Residential BID				-
#SW-AgA - Calculated	3,057,210	2,883,184	2,933,510	8,873,904
#SW-AgB - Deemed	1,990,322	1,990,322	2,064,291	6,044,935
#SW-AgC - Nonresidential Audits				-
#SW-AgD - Pump Test & Repair				-
#SW-AgE - Continuous Energy Improvement				-
#SW-C&SA - Building Standards Advocacy	845,236	1,401,732	1,525,396	3,772,364
#SW-C&SB - Appliance Standards Advocacy				-
#SW-C&SC - Compliance Training				-
#SW-C&SD - Reach Codes				-
#SW-ComA - Calculated	1,316,952	1,632,080	1,771,614	4,720,646
#SW-ComB - Deemed	4,650,523	4,650,523	4,848,091	14,149,138
#SW-ComC - Nonresidential Audits				-
#SW-ComD - Continuous Energy Improvement				-
#SW-ComE - Direct Install				-

* Partnership Savings are reported through the Commercial Programs.

1
2

3
4
5
6
7
8
9 //
10 //
11 //

Table 1-10: Mandated Scenario—2009-2011 Program Goals (continued)

Program	2009	2010	2011	2009-2011
#SW-ETA - Assessments				-
#SW-ETB - Scaled Field Placement				-
#SW-ETC - Demonstration / Showcasing				-
#SW-ETD - Market and Behavioral Studies				-
#SW-ETE - Technology supply-side efforts				-
#SW-ETF - Technology Incubation				-
#SW-ETG - Technology Test Centers (TTC)				-
#SW-ETH - ZNE lab (PG&E)				-
#SW-HVACA - Residential Energy Star Quality Insta				-
#SW-HVACB - Commercial Quality Installation				-
#SW-HVACC - Commercial Upstream Equipment				-
#SW-HVACD - Quality Maintenance Program				-
#SW-HVACE - Technology & Systems Diagnostics				-
#SW-HVACF - HVAC WE&T				-
#SW-HVACG - HVAC Core				-
#SW-IDSMS - SW Integrated DSM				-
#SW-IndA - Calculated	14,924,181	14,652,952	15,557,415	45,134,549
#SW-IndB - Deemed	2,753,979	2,753,979	2,899,519	8,407,478
#SW-IndC - Nonresidential Audits				-
#SW-IndD - Continuous Energy Improvement				-
#SW-ME&OA - Marketing, Education & Outreach (Core)				-
#SW-ME&OB - SW Marketing, E&O FYP				-
#SW-ME&OC - ME&O Strategic Plan				-
#SW-NCNR - NRNC Savings By Design	421,738	511,103	799,578	1,732,419
#SW-NCResA - RNC	204,057	246,812	386,737	837,605
#SW-ResA - Multifamily EE Rebates	2,101,120	2,508,208	2,755,091	7,364,418
#SW-ResB - Home Efficiency Rebates	2,781,856	2,795,064	2,891,332	8,468,251
#SW-ResC - Home Efficiency Energy Survey				-
#SW-WE&TA - Strategic Planning & Implementation				-
#SW-WE&TB - WE&T Centers				-
#SW-WE&TC - WE&T Connections				-
Third Party Program Total	1,177,466	1,177,466	1,177,466	3,532,399
#y LIEE - Low Income EE (LIEE)	2,564,567	3,292,424	3,345,967	9,202,958
TOTALS	38,791,217	40,497,859	42,958,018	122,241,065

III. Statewide Programs

A. Residential Energy Efficiency Program

The Residential Energy Efficiency program (REEP) is designed to offer and promote specific and comprehensive energy solutions within the residential market sector. The Residential portfolio employs various strategies and tactics to overcome market barriers and to deliver programs and services aligned to support the Strategic Plan by encouraging adoption of economically viable energy efficiency technologies, practices, and services. The ultimate focus of the program is:

- To facilitate, sustain, and transform the long-term delivery and adoption of energy-efficient products and services for single and multi-family dwellings.
- To cultivate, promote and sustain lasting energy-efficient behaviors by residential customers through a collaborative statewide education and outreach mechanism.
- To meet consumers' energy efficiency adoption preferences through a range of offerings including single-measure incentives and more comprehensive approaches.

The 2009-2011 REEP is designed to begin the shift towards comprehensive energy efficiency changes in homes that are the goal of the Strategic Plan. It does this through a multi-pronged, comprehensive set of offerings that capture much of the current potential for single-measure savings while building the framework for the longer term need for more costly changes in building envelopes, HVAC systems, and occupant behavior patterns.

1. Home Energy Efficiency Rebates Program

The Home Energy Efficiency Rebate (HEER) program is a continuation of the existing program within the IOUs' residential energy efficiency portfolios, and a statewide program.

Although SCE, SoCalGas, PG&E and SDG&E share similar program theory, design and goals, there may be slight variation in each IOU's implementation and local logistics.

The HEER program is designed to be part of the CLTEESP solution. In accordance with the CLTEESP, this program advances comprehensive energy efficiency measures, including; whole house solutions, plug load efficiency, performance standards, local government, and DSM integration opportunities. By offering customers educational materials on energy efficiency options and rebate/incentive offerings, HEER encourages customers to make energy efficient choices when purchasing and installing household appliances and equipment measures. In addition to influencing efficient purchases, the program educates customers on how to use products correctly. For many measures, the program offers immediate rebates at the point-of-

1 sale (POS) in addition to an on-line/mail-in rebate application process.

2 The program targets owners and renters of single family residences as well as apartments,
3 townhomes, condominiums, and mobile homes, in parallel to the operation of the Multifamily
4 Energy Efficiency Rebate (MFEER) program, by encouraging participants to install energy
5 efficient products. This downstream implementation strategy will also include coordinated
6 statewide elements as well as elements specially targeted to the customers in each utility's
7 service area.

8 **2. Home Energy Surveys Program**

9 The Home Energy Efficiency Survey (HEES) Sub-program is a statewide residential
10 audit program that provides residential customers the opportunity to participate in a mail-in,
11 online, and in-home energy analysis of their home. The primary intent of the program is to
12 increase the residential adoption of energy efficiency, water conservation practices, and “green”
13 technology opportunities. The surveys are available in multiple languages to meet the needs of
14 hard-to-reach customers. The program is intended to inform participants of opportunities to save
15 money and provide information regarding resources to execute the recommendations.

16 HEES is a resource for prompting integration and participation in other residential energy
17 efficiency programs such as the Whole House Performance program, the Manufactured Housing
18 program, the Residential Common Facilities program, and the Single-Family & Multi-family
19 Energy Efficiency Retrofit programs.

20 **3. Multifamily Energy Efficiency Rebates Program**

21 The Multifamily Energy Efficiency Rebate (MFEER) program is a continuance of the
22 existing program within the IOU’s residential portfolio. In accordance with the California Long

1 Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan (CLTEESP), this program advances comprehensive
2 energy efficiency measures, including: whole house solutions, plug load efficiency, visual
3 monitoring and displays, performance standards, local government opportunities, and DSM
4 integration.

5 Multifamily property owners and managers are a historically less responsive market to
6 energy efficiency efforts. As one of California’s largest industries, this unique customer segment
7 warrants additional attention and effort to motivate property owners and managers to actively
8 participate in energy efficiency programs. MFEER program proposes a series of comprehensive
9 measures to address systems within multifamily housing establishments.

10 The MFEER program offers prescribed rebates for energy efficient products to motivate
11 the multifamily property owners/managers to install energy efficient products in both common
12 areas and dwelling areas of multifamily complexes and common areas of mobile home parks and
13 condominiums. An additional objective is to heighten property owners/managers and tenants
14 energy efficiency awareness and knowledge.

15 **B. Statewide Commercial Energy Efficiency Program**

16 The Statewide Commercial Energy Efficiency program offers California’s commercial
17 customers a statewide-consistent suite of products and services to overcome the market barriers
18 to optimized energy management. The program targets integrated energy management solutions,
19 including energy efficiency, demand response (DR), and distributed generation, through strategic
20 energy planning support; technical support services, such as facility audits, calculation and
21 design assistance; and financial support through rebates and incentives.

22 Targeted end-users include all commercial sub-segments such as distribution warehouses,

1 office buildings, hotels, motels, laundry, restaurants, government, schools, universities, colleges,
2 hospitals, retail facilities, entertainment centers, and “hard-to-reach” smaller customers that have
3 similar buying characteristics.

4 The Statewide Commercial Energy Efficiency program includes five core statewide sub-
5 program elements, including Continuous Energy Improvement, Non-Residential Audits, Direct
6 Install, Deemed Rebates and the Calculated Support Services and Incentives. Each utility also
7 offers local program elements, third party programs, and local government partnerships that
8 complement and enhance this core offering for their region, as described below, and in complete
9 detail in the Commercial Sub-program descriptions. Together these offerings are designed to not
10 only overcome the traditional market barriers to energy efficiency, but also use efficiency to
11 advance demand reduction and distributed generation opportunities uniquely suited to the
12 Commercial segment.

13 **1. Calculated Incentives**

14 The statewide non-residential Calculated Incentives sub-program provides customers
15 technical and calculation assistance, as well as incentives based on calculated savings, to
16 influence the design and installation of energy efficient equipment and systems in both retrofit
17 and added load applications.

18 The Calculated Incentives sub-program is utilized for projects where a rebate is not
19 available through the statewide Deemed program, where project conditions require customized
20 calculations to provide the most accurate savings estimates, or where a project has interactive
21 effects that are best captured through whole building or whole system modeling. Because
22 calculated savings estimates are based on actual customer operating conditions, pre-inspections
23 (for retrofit projects) and post-inspections are typically required as part of each utility’s project

1 documentation.

2 **2. Deemed Incentives**

3 The statewide commercial Deemed Incentives sub-program provides rebates for the
4 installation of new energy efficient equipment. Deemed retrofit measures have prescribed
5 energy savings and incentive amounts and are generally intended for projects that have well
6 defined energy and demand savings estimates (i.e. T12 to T8 replacements). The Deemed
7 Incentive mechanism is designed to help influence the installation of energy efficient equipment
8 and systems in both retrofit and added load applications by reducing the initial purchase costs of
9 such equipment and reducing the “hassle” of participating in utility rebate programs by offering a
10 simple application process.

11 The Deemed Incentives sub-program directly addresses key market factors that lead to
12 higher energy costs for California businesses. Providing a menu of prescribed common
13 measures simplifies the process of reviewing project proposals and provides a "per-widget"
14 rebate that reduces the cost of retrofitting outdated and inefficient equipment. This sub-program
15 makes it attractive for customers to spend money in the short-run in order to achieve lower
16 energy costs in the long-run

17 **3. Non-Residential Audits Program**

18 The Non-Residential Audits (NRA) sub-program is designed to deliver a coordinated
19 statewide integrated demand side management activity that promotes energy efficiency, demand
20 response, distributed generation and emerging technologies. Within the Non-Residential Audit
21 umbrella, there are three distinct elements:

22 Remote Audit: The Remote Audit element is designed as a “do-it-yourself” audit tool

1 that is offered to customers in various formats including, but not limited to, web-based, mail-in,
2 and telephone-based. The audit results will be available in English as well as other languages
3 based on particular demographics for each IOU service territory.

4 Integrated Energy Audits: The Integrated Energy Audit (IEA) element is designed to
5 help customers understand and identify their energy usage and provide concrete suggestions for
6 maximizing energy efficiency, demand response, and distributed-generation options. The goal is
7 to educate customers and offer implementation guidance to bridge the education/action gap. A
8 full spectrum of energy management services will be offered to customers in support of the
9 Integrated Demand-Side Management (IDSM) portfolio. In addition, IEA will provide Savings
10 Calculation Assistance (SCA) targeted to specific end-uses and systems for retrofit applications
11 in existing buildings. SCA will be provided by the IOU engineers or through contracted third-
12 party energy engineering firms and will help customers prepare and submit accurate, technically
13 complete retrofit project applications to the Commercial Deemed and Calculated Incentive sub-
14 programs. This technical assistance will expedite the process and reduce expensive and time
15 consuming rework later in the process.

16 Retro-commissioning: The Retro-commissioning (RCx) element is designed to optimize
17 existing building or system performance by identifying operational deficiencies and making
18 necessary adjustments to correct the deficiency. A “Master List of Findings” results from the
19 initial assessment that identifies low-cost projects with simple payback periods of less than 4
20 years. These projects may involve resetting, repair or replacing of existing system controls and
21 components. Larger scale retrofit projects that result from the assessment are referred to other
22 sub-programs for completion (i.e. Calculated and Deemed Incentives).

1 **4. Continuous Energy Improvement**

2 Continuous Energy Improvement (CEI) is a consultative service that is aimed at helping
3 large commercial customers engage in long-term, strategic energy planning. Corporate energy
4 management is not currently part of normal business operations for the majority of utility
5 customers and with current economic pressures forcing customers to reduce costs and focus
6 more on their core business, it is likely to be further marginalized. CEI proposes to reintroduce
7 the importance of energy management by transforming the market (and reducing energy
8 intensity) through a comprehensive approach that addresses both technical and management
9 opportunities and creates sustainable practices through a high-level energy commitment from
10 executive and board-level management.

11 CEI applies the principles of well-known business continuous improvement programs,
12 such as Six Sigma and International Standards Organization (ISO) standards, to facility and plant
13 energy management: (1) Commitment; (2) Assessment; (3) Planning; (4) Implementation; and
14 (5) Evaluation and Modification. At each stage of customer engagement, there are a variety of
15 complementary utility and non-utility products and services that can be customized to fit
16 different customer profiles and optimize the cost effectiveness of the delivered energy
17 management solution.

18 **C. Statewide Industrial Energy Efficiency Program**

19 The Statewide Industrial program offers California’s industrial segment a statewide-
20 consistent suite of products and services designed to meet customer needs, overcome market
21 barriers to optimized energy management, enhance adoption of integrated demand-side
22 management (IDSM) practices, and advance the industry toward achieving the goals of the
23 Strategic Plan. The program overcomes barriers through strategies that provide an integrated

1 solution to the customer; create heightened awareness through education and outreach; and foster
2 continuous energy improvement (CEI). The program also promotes use of commonly accepted
3 standards—such as those established by the ISO or DOE SEP program to document a facility’s
4 attainment of high resource management levels—and branding and certification to garner market
5 recognition for this achievement. In addition, it supports training to create a highly skilled energy
6 efficiency workforce that is accessible to industry.

7 Industries are uniquely suited to integrated energy strategies, and an integrated approach
8 should be an effective way to help customers meet overall economic and green goals. In
9 alignment with California’s preferred loading order, however, the utilities will continue to
10 aggressively market and support energy efficiency first as the most cost-effective energy
11 resource through education and training, as well as when pursuing strategic energy planning
12 with customers.

13 **1. Nonresidential Audits**

14 Nonresidential Audits, including basic audits, Integrated Audits, and Retro
15 Commissioning (RCx) audits (see the PIP section on Audits for details), provide an inventory of
16 technical project opportunities and financial analysis information that can populate a customer’s
17 short- or long-term energy plan, as well as overcome informational and technical customer
18 barriers.

19 **2. Calculated Program**

20 The Calculated program offering provides standardized incentives—as well as
21 comprehensive technical and design assistance—for customized and integrated energy
22 efficiency/DR initiatives in new construction, retrofit, and RCx projects (see CEI sub-program
23 description for details). This sub-program overcomes information, technical, and financial

1 barriers, and because it presents a calculation method that can consider system and resource
2 interactions, will become the preferred approach for supporting the integrated, whole system, and
3 multi-resource management strategies of the Strategic Plan.

4 **3. Deemed Rebates**

5 The Deemed rebate offering provides utility representatives, equipment vendors, and
6 customers an easy-to-use mechanism to cost-effectively subsidize and encourage adoption of
7 mass market efficiency measures through fixed incentive amounts per unit/measure for installed
8 energy-saving projects.

9 **4. Continuous Energy Improvement**

10 Continuous Energy Improvement (CEI), a non-resource sub-program, describes a
11 collection of strategic planning tools and resources that lay the groundwork for long-term
12 integrated energy planning and provide a platform for launching other utility and non-utility
13 programs and services. Through analysis, benchmarking, long-term goal setting, project
14 implementation support, performance monitoring, and ultimately energy management
15 certification, CEI aims to transform the market away from a “project-to-project” approach
16 toward a continuous improvement pathway. In support of the Strategic Plan, CEI also sets the
17 stage for integration of non-energy resources, such as GHG reduction, water conservation, and
18 regulatory compliance.

19 **D. Statewide Agricultural Energy Efficiency**

20 The Statewide Agriculture program offers California’s diverse agricultural customers a
21 statewide-consistent suite of products and services to overcome the market barriers to optimized
22 energy management. The program targets integrated energy management solutions, including

1 energy efficiency (EE), demand reduction (DR), and distributed generation (DG), through
2 strategic energy planning support, technical support services, such as facility audits, pump tests,
3 calculation and design assistance, and financial support through rebates and incentives. The
4 program adopts and supports the strategies and actions of the Agriculture and Industrial chapters
5 of the California Long-Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan (Strategic Plan).

6 Targeted end-users include agricultural growers (crops, fruits, vegetable, and nuts),
7 greenhouses, post-harvest processors (ginners, nut hullers, and associated refrigerated
8 warehouses), and dairies. Food processors targeted through each utility's program efforts may
9 also include fruit and vegetable processors (canners, dryers, and freezers), prepared food
10 manufacturers, wineries, and water distribution customers. As described in the market
11 characterization summary below, market sub-segments in this program vary widely and require
12 targeted strategies.

13 **1. Non-Residential Audits**

14 Nonresidential Audits, including basic audits, Integrated Audits, and Retro-
15 Commissioning (RCx) audits, provide an inventory of technical project opportunities and
16 financial analysis information that can be used to support a customer's short- or long-term
17 energy plan, and overcome both informational and technical customer barriers.

18 **2. Calculated Program**

19 The Calculated program offering provides standardized incentives for customized and
20 integrated energy efficiency/DR projects in new construction, retrofit, and RCx projects, and
21 offers comprehensive technical and design assistance for each. It overcomes information,
22 technical, and financial barriers. As a more customized calculation method that can consider
23 system and resource interactions, it will also be the preferred approach for supporting the

1 integrated, whole system, and multi-resource management strategies of the Strategic Plan.

2 **3. Deemed Rebates**

3 The Deemed rebate offering provides utility representatives, equipment vendors, and
4 customers an easy-to-use mechanism to cost-effectively subsidize and encourage adoption of
5 mass market efficiency measures through fixed incentive amounts per unit/measure for energy
6 saved/projects installed. While Deemed rebates lend themselves well to penetrating the small and
7 medium customer market, they are also a cost effective and efficient way to process large
8 customer projects targeted through large customer strategies.

9 **4. Continuous Energy Improvement**

10 Continuous Energy Improvement (CEI), a non-resource sub-program, describes a
11 collection of strategic planning tools and resources that lay the groundwork for long-term
12 integrated energy planning and serve as a launching platform for other utility and non-utility
13 programs and services. Through analysis, benchmarking, long-term goal setting, project
14 implementation support, performance monitoring, and potentially access to energy management
15 certification offered through evolving Department of Energy (DOE) and International
16 Organization for Standardization (ISO) efforts, CEI aims to transform the market from a
17 “project-to-project” approach toward a continuous improvement pathway. In support of the
18 Strategic Plan, the CEI approach also sets the stage for non-energy resource integration, such as
19 greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction, water conservation strategies, and regulatory compliance.

20 **5. Pump Test**

21 Because pumps account for an estimated 80 percent of the electric load in California’s
22 agricultural segment, the Pump Test sub-program aims to overcome key informational, technical,

1 and financial barriers to pump optimization by offering pump tests, repair incentives, and
2 targeted education, training and technical support for customers and pump companies. Each
3 IOU's database of pump test results will be used in the near-term to target pumps in need of
4 repair as a means to capture savings. However in the mid-term, this pump performance data
5 aggregated at the statewide level will contribute to the development of metrics and targets for
6 pump improvements, in support of the pumping focus in the Agricultural Strategic Plan.

7 **E. Statewide New Construction Program**

8 The New Construction program is a statewide program that will continue to support
9 transformation process of California's residential and nonresidential new construction markets
10 consistent with the vision of the California Long Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan
11 (CEESP) and a more sustainable energy efficient future. Through several Sub program
12 elements, the New Construction program aims to ensure:

- 13 • Home builders of all production volumes in California will be encouraged to construct
14 homes that exceed California's Title 24 energy efficiency standards by at least 15%;
- 15 • Residential new construction will work towards reaching "zero net energy" (ZNE)
16 performance for all single and multi family homes by 2020;
- 17 • By 2011, 50% of new homes built in California will be 35% more efficient than 2005
18 Title 24 standards and 10% will be 55% more efficient ;
- 19 • Plug loads will be managed for decline through technological innovation spurred by
20 market transformation and customer demand for energy efficient products;
- 21 • Nonresidential new construction will be progressively more efficient and include clean,
22 on-site distributed generation, moving towards Zero Net Energy (ZNE) by 2030.

23 **1. Savings By Design (SBD)**

24 This Sub program aims for significant energy efficiency improvements in the

1 nonresidential new construction industry, and is designed to overcome customer and market
2 barriers to designing and building high performance facilities. Since 1999, SBD has provided
3 statewide consistency, program stability and savings.

4 California's Title 24 requirements set some of the most stringent energy regulations in
5 the nation. Exceeding these standard energy performance levels requires a high level of design
6 expertise, technical knowledge, and motivation. The requirements also can be complex and
7 sometimes confusing. Because many in the design field are unaware of the potential savings
8 from energy efficient design or perceive budgetary constraints, they are reluctant to implement
9 energy-efficiency strategies. As a result, energy efficiency is often a lost consideration,
10 abandoned in favor of pursuing the "lower initial cost" option. SBD strives to avoid lost
11 opportunities by assisting customers in moving beyond initial cost considerations and towards
12 the realization of long-term energy cost savings.

13 Through an integrated design approach (a Whole Building Approach that encourages
14 performance significantly better than Title 24 code by offering a variety of financial incentives)
15 as well as a Systems Approach for simpler facilities where integrated opportunities are limited,
16 SBD encourages energy efficiency and green building practices in new commercial buildings.
17 These financial incentives are supplemented by a variety of other support activities such as:
18 feasibility studies and pilot projects, training and education, conferences and workshops,
19 scholarships, and program marketing activities. In the 2009-2011 portfolio period, SBD will
20 advance a broader palette of technical and financial resources to aid the proactive design of new
21 facilities in accordance with the most cost-effective energy and resource efficiency standards.
22 SBD will incorporate several new approaches towards integrated design and green building
23 certification in support of the CEESP.

1 **2. California Advanced Homes Program (CAHP)**

2 The California Advanced Home program (CAHP) encourages single and multi-family
3 builders of all production volumes to construct homes that exceed California’s Title 24 energy
4 efficiency standards by a minimum of 15 percent. This goal will be achieved through a
5 combination of incentives, technical education, design assistance, and verification. With respect
6 to the CEESP (Section 2, Strategy 1-1), the CAHP targets an interim goal of 50 percent of
7 residential new construction to Tier II (2005) level by 2011, and a final goal of 100 percent of
8 residential new construction to “net zero” by 2020.

9 Through a pay-for-performance sliding scale incentive structure that is based on a whole
10 building approach, CAHP will encourage builders to exceed Title 24 energy efficiency standards
11 by 15% to 45%. Performance Bonus adders, Design Team Incentives and some prescriptive
12 measure incentives will also be included to encourage green building initiatives, energy star
13 appliances, compact homes, and solar thermal installations. In addition, several non incentive
14 customer services will be offered, including: technical support to Energy Analysts and Design
15 teams, Design Team Assistance, Economic modeling / measure selection support to builders,
16 marketing support and DSM coordination for builders to maximize demand side reductions.
17 CAHP will be closely coordinated with the Zero Net Energy Homes, described below.

18 **3. Zero Net Energy Homes (ZNEH)**

19 The purpose of this Sub program is to examine a wide array of energy saving
20 technologies, accelerate the market acceptance of new and emerging technologies, explore new
21 solutions, and encourage distinctive approaches in demonstration projects. Participating builders
22 will be encouraged to incorporate environmentalism, economics, and social equity in their
23 design, while integrating landscape into the built environment for human interaction. Each being

1 distinctive, these case studies will be positioned to highlight the underutilized potential of
2 sustainability in residential new construction. IOUs will seek to integrate R&D ideas from
3 Emerging Technologies, PIER, LBNL and other avenues to further assist the projects in
4 advancing sustainability and achieving higher levels of energy efficiency.

5 **4. Manufactured Housing**

6 This Sub program is designed to promote the construction of new manufactured homes
7 that comply with ENERGY STAR® energy efficiency standards. It targets manufacturers,
8 retailers, and homebuyers of new manufactured homes. The current baseline for manufactured
9 homes is the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) standard specification. The program
10 encourages manufacturers to go beyond HUD and install “right-size” heating, cooling, and
11 ventilation equipment (HVAC), install high-efficiency HVAC equipment, and evaluate homes on
12 a whole-building basis covering windows, insulation levels, and quality installation inspections.
13 The key objectives of this Sub program are to capture cost effective energy savings and demand
14 reduction opportunities and move the industry towards zero-net energy. Additionally, this Sub
15 program aims to move the market segment from ‘HUD compliant’ to ENERGY STAR and
16 provide savings for customers purchasing energy efficient manufactured homes. The program
17 will also include an education and outreach component.

18 **F. Statewide HVAC Program—HVAC Quality Maintenance Program**

19 This sub-program may represent one of the more creative aspects of the HVAC “Big
20 Bold Energy Efficiency Strategy.” It is based on the assumption that there are energy and
21 demand savings achievable through the regular application of quality maintenance procedures
22 applied to existing residential and commercial HVAC equipment. This sub-program intends to
23 (1) quantify those potential savings and (2) develop and implement both a residential and

1 commercial maintenance program focused on comprehensive, continuously improving O&M
2 activities that capture those savings and provide a high ROI to the end-user thus driving the
3 intense level of market transformation of the HVAC industry envisioned by the CLTEESP.

4 **G. Statewide Codes & Standards**

5 The Codes and Standards (C&S) program saves energy on behalf of ratepayers by
6 directly influencing standards and code-setting bodies to strengthen energy efficiency
7 regulations, by improving compliance with existing codes and standards, and working with local
8 governments to develop ordinances that exceed statewide minimum requirements.

9 The C&S program conducts advocacy activities to improve building and appliance
10 efficiency regulations. The principal audience is the California Energy Commission (CEC),
11 which conducts periodic rulemakings, usually on a three-year cycle (for building regulations), to
12 update building and appliance energy efficiency regulations. C&S also seeks to influence the
13 United States Department of Energy (DOE) in setting national energy policy that impacts
14 California.

15 **1. Building Codes: Advocacy, Extension of Advocacy (EOA) and CASE Studies**

16 C&S advocacy comprises a portfolio level strategy that complements incentive and
17 information offerings in several ways. Since IOU incentive and rebate programs typically
18 capture only a small percentage of the market, a transition to regulatory intervention is essential
19 to maximize portfolio energy savings. This transition to code causes a once high-margin product
20 to become an industry standard; thereby reducing the overall cost to society for energy
21 efficiency. This commoditization effect, in turn, spurs innovation for new high-margin products
22 since most manufacturers and other industry practitioners seek to compete in part on high-margin
23 differentiated products.

1 **2. Compliance Enhancement (CE): Measure-Based and Holistic**

2 The Compliance Enhancement subprogram, whose primary purpose is to increase the
3 number of customers complying with code, is based on the Code Compliance Enhancement
4 programs Protocol featured on pages 100-103 of California Energy Efficiency Evaluation
5 Protocols: Technical, Methodological, and Reporting Requirements for Evaluation Professionals.
6 Per the evaluator’s protocols, Compliance Enhancement programs require a separate program
7 theory and logic model, and before and after measurements of compliance rates. Hence, a
8 separate logic model for the CE subprogram is included at the end of this document. This
9 subprogram has two elements including measure-specific and holistic.

10 CE subprogram activities – in that, these are not carried out as extension of advocacy –
11 include two elements based on the CPUC’s Evaluator’s Protocol for Code Compliance
12 Enhancement programs: 1) the measure-based element is aimed at codes or standards not
13 adopted as a result of the program, similar to extension of advocacy efforts, and 2) the holistic
14 compliance enhancement subprogram seeks to improve building department energy code
15 enforcement processes from beginning to end. Compliance improvement responds to the
16 CPUC’s interest in robust implementation of existing standards and support for the California
17 Long Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan’s HVAC Big Bold strategies.

18 **3. Reach Codes (RC): Local Government Ordinances and Green Building**
19 **Standards**

20 The Reach Codes subprogram will develop and/or support the development of reach
21 codes, or locally adopted ordinances, that exceed statewide minimum requirements. Reach
22 codes are typically codes adopted by local governments and provide a means to test new codes as
23 well as testing the efficacy of increasing the stringency of existing codes at a local level prior to

1 disseminating the code on a statewide basis. Each jurisdiction's experience with local codes can
2 be used to inform the state's process by documenting both the successes and barriers faced for
3 both adoption and implementation.

4 The program will encourage all local governments to first optimize compliance with
5 existing codes. In addition to the biggest savings opportunity, sub-optimal compliance with the
6 existing code will erode potential savings from a new code. The reach code subprogram is
7 designed to facilitate mutual support from the utilities and local governments to realize the full
8 savings potential from codes, both statewide, and at a local level. The IOUs will request that
9 prior to adopting any new codes, building department staff attend role-based training as well as
10 relevant measure-specific training (HVAC replacements, controls under skylights, etc.), and to
11 identify, implement and document two actions designed to increase compliance. Examples
12 might include: conducting outreach to market actors in the community, adding or expanding
13 online services, providing a financial incentive to those who submit required compliance
14 documents, or offering rewards such as expedited plan check services for contractors with high
15 compliance rates. Incentive programs may also require acceptance testing to improve energy
16 savings from installed equipment and provide incentives to contractors to participate in advanced
17 hands on training. Observations of contractor performance at the hands on training can in turn
18 be used to improve the acceptance test methods or materials for the next round of standards.

19 **H. Statewide Emerging Technologies**

20 The mission of the Emerging Technologies program (ETP) is to support increased energy
21 efficiency market demand and technology supply (the term supply encompassing breadth, depth,
22 and efficacy of product offerings) by contributing the development and deployment of new and
23 underutilized energy efficiency (EE) measures (that is, technologies, practices, and tools), and by

1 facilitating their adoption as measures supporting California’s aggressive energy and demand
2 savings goals.

3 Increased market demand and increased technology supply are reinforcing effects – each
4 working to spur the other. As market demand increases, market-pull leads to technology supply
5 increases. As technology supply increases, changes in perceptions and attitudes, work to
6 stimulate increased market demand.

7 **1. Technology Resource Incubator Outreach (TRIO) Program**

8 TRIO is a statewide program that aims to draw a greater number of providers of desired,
9 energy saving measures into the utility EE programs (and the IDEEA program, for Southern
10 California Edison) by:

- 11 • Providing training workshops
- 12 • “Mentoring” on energy efficiency
- 13 • Coordinating with existing clean tech programs (such as the California Clean Tech Open
14 and various clean tech business clusters)

15 **2. Zero Net Energy Laboratory**

16 PG&E has proposed a Zero Net Energy Laboratory subprogram within the utility’s ETP
17 PIP. SoCalGas’ ETP will leverage and co-fund activities at the laboratory to gain information on
18 technologies that could be utilized to achieve the zero energy goals.

19 Aware of the need for new technologies to meet California’s ZNE goals for homes and
20 commercial buildings, vendors are presenting a range of products designed to provide specific
21 energy savings benefits. However, before incorporating such products into customer offerings,
22 independent verification of performance and energy savings claims under a controlled laboratory
23 setting are needed to avoid expending time, money, and resources on offerings that do not

1 provide the expected energy savings and other customer benefits--and put customer satisfaction
2 at risk.

3 **3. Zero Net Energy Demonstration «GreetingLine»**

4 SoCalGas' ETP will exchange information and collaborate with PG&E on the utility's
5 Zero Net Energy Demonstration Home, as issues related to the consumption of natural gas are
6 identified and potential project ideas are scoped.

7 Achieving California's ambitious ZNE goal for new homes will require a host of
8 innovations and a shift beyond the single technology approach into whole home solutions. To
9 accomplish this, new technologies, a clear understanding of the evolving performance of
10 integrated technologies, and real-world experience with technologies will be critical for future
11 program successes.

12 Also needed are resources for education and training homeowners, builders,
13 manufacturers, contractors and others about ZNE homes. These resources need to be sufficiently
14 concrete to raise confidence in the collective ability to achieve the ZNE goal—and sufficiently
15 stimulating enough to spark innovation in the market and market actors. Today, no such resource
16 exists.

17 **4. Technology Centers**

18 This subprogram will leverage and co-fund technology testing at SCE Technology Test
19 Centers including ZNE test facility for technologies that impact natural gas use. Southern
20 California Edison's TTCs provide unique capabilities for evaluating performance of new
21 technologies. The TTC is currently comprised of three test facilities focused on distinct end uses:
22 Refrigeration, Air Conditioning, and Lighting. These facilities are widely known for their past

1 accomplishments in testing and promoting energy efficient technologies and strategies.

2 In the 2009-2011 program cycle, a fourth test facility will be added to the portfolio to
3 help meet California's new ZNE goal for residential construction, with potential to also address
4 commercial needs. This facility, the Advanced Residential Test Center (ARTC), will be used to
5 investigate the viability of energy efficiency, demand response, smart meters, and on-site
6 renewable generation in meeting the needs of builders and occupants. It will be designed as a
7 flexible facility to accommodate a range of different envelope, space conditioning, lighting, plug
8 load, and renewable technologies. The ARTC will provide the opportunity to examine these
9 technologies on a system level, while individual benefits can be assessed in the existing TTCs.

10 **I. Statewide Workforce Education & Training**

11 The Statewide IOU Workforce Education and Training (WE&T) program represents a
12 portfolio of education, training and workforce development planning and implementation funded
13 by or coordinated with the IOUs: Pacific Gas & Electric, Southern California Edison, SDG&E,
14 and Southern California Gas. Education and training is a vital component to each of the IOU
15 energy efficiency portfolio filings for 2009-2011 and integral in supporting achievement of IOU
16 energy savings targets and the workforce objectives set forth in the California Long-Term
17 Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan (Strategic Plan). Workforce Education & Training has become
18 an important crosscutting activity for the IOUs in an effort to not only educate and train current
19 workers, but to prepare future workers to be able to successfully perform the jobs needed to help
20 achieve increased energy savings targets for the IOUs and California's clean energy goals.

21 **1. WE&T Centergies**

22 The WE&T Centergies Sub-program is generally organized around market sectors and
23 cross-cutting segments to facilitate workforce education and training appropriate to achieve the

1 energy savings, demand reductions and related energy initiatives required of the IOUs. Energy
2 Centers represent the largest component of this Sub-program group, have many years of
3 experience in creating and disseminating high-quality programs, and provide WE&T curriculum
4 and related deliverables - training courses, seminars, workshops, clean energy technology
5 demonstration, equipment efficiency testing, interactive training exhibits and lectures to promote
6 industry trends and developments for advancing energy efficiency as a professional discipline.
7 Statewide Energy Education and Testing Centers (Centers) are located in the IOU's service
8 territories. For many years, they have served as the IOU's primary delivery channels for mid-
9 stream/up-stream workforce education and training, information dissemination, and
10 education/outreach coordination. IOU administered Third-party, Partnership, Local Government
11 and Emerging Technology programs, Codes and Standards, Heating, Ventilation and Air
12 Conditioning (HVAC), Low Income Energy Efficiency (LIEE), as well as other community-
13 based training efforts are supported by the Energy Centers to sponsor workforce training courses.

14 The Statewide Building Operator Certification (BOC) Training Partnership, the second
15 component of this subprogram, will continue to play a major role in improving and maintaining
16 California's energy efficient green collar building workforce stock of building engineers,
17 stationary engineers, maintenance supervisors, maintenance workers, facility coordinators,
18 HVAC technicians, electricians, , and others in the facility operation and maintenance field. The
19 IOUs have been collaborating with BOC to offer California building operators competency-
20 based training and certification, resulting in improved job skills and more comfortable, efficient
21 facilities. Operators earn certification by attending training and completing project assignments
22 in their facilities. Training topics include facility electrical, HVAC and lighting systems, indoor
23 air quality, environmental health and safety, and energy conservation. The IOUs will work with

1 BOC to shape and realign the BOC certification program to be consistent with the California
2 Long Term Energy Efficiency Strategy Plan.

3 **2. WE&T Connections**

4 The WE&T Connections statewide Sub-program is organized around downstream and
5 upstream IOU relationships with the educational sector, entry and intro-level community-based
6 training efforts that support workforce development in energy efficiency, energy management
7 and new emerging green careers. This Sub-program focuses emphasis on education curriculum
8 and related activities that inspire interest in energy careers, new and emerging technology, as
9 well as future skills development to advance the energy initiatives and goals of the state. This
10 Sub-program involves expanded relationship building to foster curriculum development and
11 related training that are a result of existing and expanding industry needs. IOUs will work with
12 education institutions, labor and communities to nurture interest in green careers by K-12,
13 community college, occupational, vocational, and major university students, as well as assist in
14 growth of low-income and transitional workforce targeted clean energy training programs.

15 **J. Statewide Marketing, Education & Outreach (ME&O)**

16 The purpose of Marketing, Education and Outreach is to increase utility customer
17 awareness and participation in cost-effective energy-saving activities offered by the utilities, as
18 well as to promote behavior changes that result in energy management efforts that save energy
19 and reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, in coordination with demand response and
20 renewable self-generation options. To be successful, ME&O must move consumers through a
21 transitional process from awareness to attitude change to action.

22 Californians are currently engaged in a broad public discussion about energy use and its
23 relationship to global warming and the environment. AB 32 set the stage for a statewide

1 transition to a clean energy future by requiring the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions to
2 1990 levels by 2020. Across numerous studies, energy efficiency strategies consistently are
3 identified as uniquely able to significantly reduce GHG emissions and do so with a net economic
4 savings. As a result, there is increased awareness among consumers and businesses to do their
5 part. A strategic window of opportunity exists to use ratepayer-funded ME&O to leverage
6 public and private messages on global warming to achieve greater impact on consumer
7 awareness of, and demand for, energy efficient actions.

8 **1. Statewide Marketing & Outreach**

9 The Statewide Marketing & Outreach campaign is a three-firm effort currently
10 implemented under the Flex Your Power brand that has been carefully planned and executed
11 since 2003, with the guidance of and in conjunction with the state’s IOUs and the Commission.
12 The campaign plans for which they are responsible are:

Firm	Campaign Plan
Efficiency Partnership (EP)	General Market
Staples Marketing (Staples)	Hispanic Market
Runyon Saltzman & Einhorn, Inc. (RS&E)	Rural-Area Market

13
14 The objective is to educate ratepayers about how they can take action on energy
15 efficiency by giving them the necessary tools and information on how to do so. Overall the
16 campaign focuses on providing information resources on purchasing energy efficiency products
17 and services, as well as behavior changes that include conservation and efficiency actions.

18 Working in collaboration, utilities have taken great care to integrate campaigns and to
19 avoid duplication and overlap among markets. For example, the overriding messages
20 encouraging reduction of energy consumption are essentially the same, all utilities feature and

1 operate under the Flex Your Power brand, and utilities share resources and call to action tools
2 such as brochures, a Web site (www.fypower.org and www.flexyourpower.org) and toll-free
3 telephone line (1-866-431-FLEX). Conversely, IOUs plan and place media so that each
4 campaign augments the overall effort, and doesn't compete or duplicate mediums. In other
5 words, programs are designed to work in conjunction and are executed accordingly.

6 **2. Strategic Plan Implementation**

7 The goal of the ME&O Strategic Planning effort is to create a culture in California that
8 practices energy efficiency and other demand side management options as a way of life resulting
9 in both short term and long term behavior change. Because many consumers believe that they
10 are already doing everything they can to save energy⁹, a concerted effort must be made to
11 convince them that they can, in fact, do more.

12 In alignment with the California Long Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan (CLEESP),
13 branding, segmentation and social marketing activities will be key components of both the
14 assessment/creation of California's new DSM brand and implementation of a statewide
15 marketing and outreach plan. The results will inform the Commission's decision regarding the
16 future direction of statewide marketing and outreach which could involve continuing with or
17 broadening the scope of the current statewide marketing and outreach program, or launching an
18 entirely new DSM brand for California in years 2010-2011.

19 **K. Statewide Integrated DSM**

20 The California Long Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan (Strategic Plan) encourages
21 programs that integrate the full range of demand-side management (DSM) options: energy

⁹ Statewide Flex Your Power 2007 Tracking Study – Hiner & Partners, Inc.

1 efficiency (EE), demand response (DR), and distributed generation (DG) as fundamental to
2 achieving California’s strategic energy goals.

3 The IOUs have identified integrated DSM (IDSM) as an important priority. SoCalGas
4 has included separate exhibits on IDSM as well as specific integration activities within each
5 program implementation plan at the Statewide and local program levels as instructed by the
6 CPUC.

7 In addition to SoCalGas and other IOUs’ individual IDSM activities and pilots, the IOUs
8 are proposing a statewide IDSM effort that will establish a Statewide Integration Task Force
9 (Task Force). Efforts of the Task Force will encompass activities that promote in a statewide-
10 coordinated fashion two specific IDSM strategies identified in the Strategic Plan (e.g.
11 stakeholder coordination (Strategy 1.3) and new technologies (Strategy 1.4)). The IOUs believe
12 that Strategy 1.1—“Carry out integrated marketing of DSM opportunities across all customer
13 classes” should be coordinated with the statewide Marketing, Education and Outreach efforts
14 (see ME&O PIP) and implemented at the local level by the IOUs focused on particular segment
15 and customer-specific strategies. The Task Force will coordinate closely with the Marketing,
16 Education and Outreach statewide team to ensure a consistent approach and the gain knowledge
17 from statewide and local marketing and outreach efforts.

18 **VI. Local Programs**

19 **A. Local Institutional Partnerships**

20 Institutional Partnerships are designed to create dynamic and symbiotic working
21 relationships between Investor-Owned Utilities (IOU), state or local governments and agencies
22 or educational institutions. The objective is to reduce energy usage through facility and

1 equipment improvements, share best practices, and provide education and training to key
2 personnel. SoCalGas' 2009-2011 statewide partnership portfolio will focus strongly on
3 supporting the key CEESP goal of Demand Side Management (DSM) integration and
4 coordination, which includes establishing integration procedures, piloting DSM integration
5 programs, and improving regulatory coordination. The 2009-2011 Institutional Partnerships will
6 also concentrate on innovative delivery channels and funding mechanisms to meet current
7 economic conditions and achieve program integration and savings.

8 **1. California Community Colleges Partnership (CCC)**

9 The CCC/IOU Energy Efficiency Partnership has been a successful collaboration
10 between the California Community Colleges (CCC) and the four Investor-Owned Utilities
11 (IOUs). The CCC is a two-year public institution of higher education that is composed of 110
12 colleges statewide and organized into 72 self-governing Districts. It serves more than 2.6 million
13 students coming from a wide range of cultural and economic backgrounds, and represents the
14 largest system of higher education in the world. SoCalGas alongside the other IOUs (PG&E,
15 SoCalGas and SCE), will continue this collaboration, which started with the 2006-2008
16 CCC/IOU Energy Efficiency Partnership, to share best practices and implement energy
17 efficiency programs and projects for immediate and long-term energy savings and peak demand
18 reduction.

19 This partnership provides a unique opportunity to deliver cost effective energy savings
20 while leveraging the CCC's local and statewide new construction bond funding. The 2009-2011
21 CCC/IOU Partnership will expand its efforts for the implementation of energy-efficient Retrofits,
22 New Construction Design Assistance facilitated by the Savings By Design program, Demand
23 Response, Retro-Commissioning (RCx), and Monitoring-Based Commissioning (MBCx)

1 projects. The program will also focus its efforts on training and education, which will expand
2 existing education programs by training faculty and staff in best practices on energy efficient
3 technology implementation and energy management.

4 **2. California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation Partnership** 5 **(CCDR)**

6 SoCalGas and the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) are
7 collaborating to continue the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation/Investor-Owned
8 Utility (IOU) Partnership for the 2009-2011 cycle. The CDCR/IOU partnership is a customized
9 statewide energy efficiency partnership program that accomplishes immediate, long-term peak
10 energy demand savings and establishes a permanent framework for sustainable, long-term
11 comprehensive energy management programs at CDCR institutions served by California's four
12 large IOUs.

13 This program capitalizes on the vast opportunities for efficiency improvements and
14 utilizes the resources and expertise of CDCR and IOU staff to ensure a successful and cost-
15 effective program that meets all objectives of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC
16 or Commission). The program also leverages the existing contractual relationship between
17 CDCR and Energy Service Companies (ESCOs) to develop and implement energy projects at
18 CDCR facilities statewide. CDCR is comprised of Adult Institutions, Parole Offices,
19 Community Conservation Camps, and Juvenile Facilities which encompass an estimated
20 47,714,415 square feet of occupied space.

21 **3. UC/CSU Partnership (UC/CSU)**

22 The University of California, California State University (UC/CSU), SoCalGas and the
23 three other Investor-Owned Utilities are collaborating to continue the Energy Efficiency

1 Partnership program to share energy efficiency best practices and to implement energy efficiency
2 projects for immediate and long-term energy savings and peak demand reduction.

3 The UC/CSU/IOU Partnership is a natural fit with the goals, objectives and strategies
4 articulated in the CLTEESP. The partnership was designed to achieve immediate energy and
5 demand savings and establish a permanent framework for sustainable, comprehensive energy
6 management programs. The partnership program is an existing statewide nonresidential program
7 that will continue in the 2009-2011 program cycle. It will continue to offer incentives for retrofit
8 projects, monitoring-based commissioning, and training for campus energy managers.

9 **4. State of California Partnership (State of CA)**

10 SoCalGas and the State of California are collaborating to continue the State of
11 California/Investor-Owned Utilities Energy Efficiency Partnership program for the 2009-2011
12 program cycle. This program's goals include sharing energy efficiency best practices and
13 implementing projects to capture immediate and long-term energy savings and to produce
14 mechanisms for peak demand reduction.

15 The program will assist the State's agencies to reduce the amount of energy they
16 purchase from the grid by 20 percent by the year 2015, as required by the Governor's Executive
17 Order S-20-04 (i.e. Green Building Initiative (GBI)). Like all Executive Orders, the GBI is an
18 unfunded mandate that requires State agencies to support the Governor's environmental agenda.

19 Accompanying the GBI is the Green Building Action Plan (GBAP), which contains
20 detailed instructions on how to achieve the mandated energy savings and reduction in demand.
21 In addition to requiring all new construction and large renovations to meet Leadership in Energy
22 and Environmental Design (LEED) silver certification requirements, the GBAP directs the state

1 to benchmark, retro-commission, and retrofit its existing building stock.

2 **B. SoCalGas Local Government Partnerships**

3 SoCalGas' Government Partnership program is complex and multi-dimensional to
4 capture the varied ways that SoCalGas works with governments in its 2009-2011 portfolio. First,
5 local governments are a distinct customer segment that operates with their own unique
6 challenges and needs related to energy efficiency. Second, local governments also serve as a
7 delivery channel for specific products and services when they serve as Local Government
8 Partnerships. Finally, local governments have a unique role as leaders of their communities.
9 Increasingly, local governments are interpreting their moral responsibility for community well-
10 being to include reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, increasing renewable energy usage,
11 protecting air quality, creating green jobs, and making the community more livable and
12 sustainable.

13 The Government Partnership program is designed to reach local governments in all of
14 their roles. Depending upon the activity, SoCalGas may play a different role with the local
15 government, ranging from service provider to supporter to equal partner. Governments
16 increasingly engage in strategic planning for GHG reduction not only in their facilities
17 (represented in the municipal GHG inventory) but also in the community (analyzed in the
18 community GHG emissions inventory). Opportunities increase for partnerships with utilities to
19 meet mutual goals of energy reduction. These governments can not only coordinate and integrate
20 demand-side management opportunities in each sector or market they influence, but also
21 effectively leverage and promulgate low-income offerings.

22 **1. Government Facilities**

23 The Government Facilities element will be implemented by most of the unique individual

1 Local Government Partners (LGPs). If an individual LGP has a distinctive or targeted approach
2 to Government Facilities, that LGP's individual PIP will contain additional information. The
3 individual LGPs will primarily target local government facilities/sites that are owned or leased
4 by public agencies including city halls, administrative offices, recreation centers, fire stations,
5 libraries.

6 Individual LGPs play an important role in assisting local governments (cities, counties
7 and special districts) with retrofitting the facilities that they own and operate to achieve short and
8 long term savings. While all local governments have access to SoCalGas programs and
9 incentives to save energy, SoCalGas' Government Partnership program will work closely with
10 the LGPs to foster government facilities' energy savings and to place these projects in the
11 context of sustainability and climate change initiatives.

12 **2. Strategic Plan Support**

13 The Strategic Plan Support element will be implemented primarily through the unique
14 program elements of the Emerging Cities coordinating with the SANDAG partnership and some
15 components of the individual partners which are specifically designed to actualize the vision set
16 forth in the long term strategic plan: California's local governments will be leaders in using
17 energy efficiency to reduce energy use and global warming emissions both in their own facilities
18 and throughout their communities.

19 Individual LGPs will also play an important role in furthering the strategic plan. If an
20 individual LGP has a different or targeted approach to Government Facilities, that LGP's
21 individual PIP will contain additional information.

1 **3. Core Program Coordination**

2 The Core Program Coordination element will be implemented to some degree by all of
3 the unique individual Local Government Partners (LGPs). If an individual LGP has a distinctive
4 approach to Core Program Coordination, that LGP’s individual PIP will contain additional
5 information. Within Government Partnerships, the unique elements of Emerging Cities will also
6 support the Core Program Coordination element.

7 Because of their close ties to the community, individual LGPs may identify opportunities
8 to serve customer energy needs through integrated demand side management products including
9 energy efficiency, demand response, low income programs, and codes and standards assistance
10 as well as other utility programs including distributed generation. Such coordination provides
11 customers with comprehensive solutions and minimizes overlap of effort and service. Where the
12 LGP identifies a need that they do not currently service, they can refer participants to programs.
13 The Partnership will provide the participant with contact information for the relevant programs
14 and assistance as required. If program overlap is determined to exist, the Partnership will notify
15 SoCalGas of the program(s) involved and discuss and coordinate efforts so as not to duplicate
16 services and compete for customers.

17 **4. Individual Local Government Partnerships**

18 *a. County of Los Angeles Partnership*

19 The 2009 - 11 SCE/SoCalGas/County of Los Angeles Partnership is a continuation of the
20 existing, successful 2004 - 05, and 2006 -08 programs with SCE and SoCalGas. The 2009 - 11
21 Partnership will build on the lessons learned and will continue to focus on identifying energy
22 efficiency activities in county facilities in support of the recently adopted county of Los Angeles
23 Energy and Environmental Plan.

1 The Partnership program will support the energy efficiency components of the Energy
2 and Environmental Plan initiatives by identifying projects and strategies to reach the 38 different
3 county departments that the Internal Services Department (ISD) serves. In addition, there are
4 departments and public agencies affiliated with the county (Public Housing, Sanitation Districts,
5 School Districts County Metro Transit Authority, and Waterworks and Wastewater utilities) that
6 have previously not participated in past Partnership programs. By tailoring outreach and
7 implementing innovative ways to participate (emerging technologies, integration with state-wide
8 pilots, e.g. water districts, and flexible funding) the Partnership will increase energy efficiency
9 participation in these LA County departments.

10 *b. Kern County Energy Watch Partnership*

11 The Kern County Energy Watch Partnership is a continuation of the partnership between
12 the City of Bakersfield, Kern County, Southern California Edison (SCE), Southern California
13 Gas, and Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) which will be expanded to include the cities of Delano,
14 McFarland, Tehachapi, and California City, and the implementing partner: The Kern County
15 Council of Governments (KCOG).

16 The Partnership builds upon the success of the Kern County Energy Watch Partnership.
17 The 2009-2011 partnership improves SCE's current local government partnering strategy by
18 establishing a disciplined, concentrated approach to create consistency in program offerings and
19 improve clarity and ease of participation in community partnerships. The Partnership will
20 develop new partners from the additional four incorporated cities and extend the program's reach
21 into the unincorporated communities within Kern County. The Partnership's comprehensive
22 portfolio of activities is designed to seek innovative approaches to energy efficiency by
23 implementing best practices for municipalities and by establishing a wave of energy efficiency

1 activities through focused educational and outreach events. This will also increase effective
2 delivery of technical and financial energy services to residents and businesses.

3 c. Riverside County Partnership

4 Southern California Gas Company will join with Southern California Edison and the
5 County of Riverside in implementing the Riverside County/SCE/SoCalGas Energy Efficiency
6 Partnership program for the 2009 - 11 program years. SoCalGas will bring additional resources
7 to the Partnership to expand the County's efforts to enhance electric and gas energy efficiency
8 projects through state-of-the-art new construction and retrofits of existing buildings. This
9 partnership interlocks with the goals, objectives, and strategies articulated in the CEESP.

10 This is a collaborative effort between utility program managers, county facility managers
11 and other internal organizations. The partnership's goal is to build an infrastructure that delivers
12 cost-effective energy efficiency projects and provides a comprehensive outreach and education
13 element with the goal of raising partner and customer awareness about the benefits of energy
14 efficiency. The partnership's commitment to success during the 2006-2008 program cycle was
15 demonstrated by the implementation of major projects that exceeded title 24 standards.

16 Projects will adopt a comprehensive approach by including retrofits and there DSM
17 alternatives to include: demand-response, distributed generation (renewable self-generation),
18 solar hot water and water efficiency as applicable.

19 d. County of San Bernardino Partnership

20 Southern California Edison, Southern California Gas and the County of San Bernardino
21 (County) will form a 2009 - 11 energy efficiency Partnership that will build upon and expand the
22 County's efforts to enhance energy efficiency through state-of-the-art new construction and

1 retrofits of existing buildings.

2 This Partnership will assist the County in achieving its green policy initiatives to
3 formulate an integrated approach to energy efficiency. This will be a collaborative effort with
4 the aim to build an infrastructure that would efficiently deliver cost effective energy efficiency
5 projects thus reducing the “carbon footprint” created by County facilities. It would also provide
6 a comprehensive outreach and education element with the goal of raising awareness about the
7 benefits of energy efficiency. County facilities will be targeted for the retrofit, retro-
8 commissioning (RCx) and new construction elements.

9 *e. Santa Barbara County Partnership*

10 The Santa Barbara County Energy Efficiency Partnership (SCEEP) is a joint project of
11 Southern California Edison, Southern California Gas Company, the County of Santa Barbara and
12 the Cities of Santa Barbara, Goleta and Carpinteria. SCEEP leverages partner resources to
13 reduce energy use, increase energy efficiency awareness and reduce greenhouse gas emissions,
14 in Santa Barbara County and partnering Cities.

15 *f. South Bay Partnership*

16 The South Bay Energy Efficiency Partnership consists of the City of Carson, the City of
17 El Segundo, the City of Gardena, the City of Hawthorne, the City of Hermosa Beach, the City of
18 Inglewood, the City of Lawndale, the City of Lomita, the City of Manhattan Beach, the City of
19 Palo Verdes Estates, the City of Rancho Palos Verdes, the City of Redondo Beach, the City of
20 Rolling Hills, the City of Rolling Hills Estates, the City of Torrance, South Bay Cities Council of
21 Governments, Southern California Edison, and the Southern California Gas Company. The
22 Partnership is implemented by the South Bay Cities Council of Governments through the South

1 Bay Environmental Services Center.

2 Through the participation of Southern California Gas, the West Basin Water District, and
3 the LA County Sanitation District in the Partnership, a comprehensive and integrated approach to
4 energy efficiency, natural gas efficiency, water efficiency as well as wastewater, storm water and
5 potable water capital projects will be identified and developed ensuring that the municipalities
6 are as energy efficient as possible.

7 g. San Luis Obispo County Energy Watch Partnership

8 San Luis Obispo County Energy Watch (SLOCEW) is a joint partnership between the
9 County of San Luis Obispo and Pacific Gas and Electric Company, and SoCalGas. The
10 Partnership will manage the administration, marketing, integration and implementation
11 components of this Partnership program. Through the SLOCEW Partnership, emphasis will be
12 placed on the outreach to the Cities and Special Districts within San Luis Obispo County to assist
13 them in improving the energy efficiency of their facilities and integrating energy efficiency
14 throughout the local communities.

15 h. San Joaquin Valley Partnership

16 The SJVELP program is a Local Government Partnership proposed to be comprised of
17 the County of Tulare and the cities of Exeter, Farmerville, Lindsey, Portersville, Tulare, Visalia,
18 Woodlake, Southern California Edison, Southern California Gas, the implementing partner: The
19 San Joaquin Valley Clean Energy Organization (SJVCEO), and potentially Pacific Gas &
20 Electric.

21 The Partnership's comprehensive portfolio of activities is designed to seek innovative
22 approaches to energy efficiency in California's central valley environment; to increase adoption

1 of energy efficiency measures and best practices within their municipality and community by
2 continuing a “culture” of energy efficiency through focused educational and outreach events; and
3 to increase the effective delivery of technical and financial energy services to residents and
4 businesses. ME&O activities will consist of staff training, SCE’s Mobile Education Unit at home
5 shows, fairs and farmers market nights, technical training at the local collages, marketing and co-
6 branding with SCE core programs, and evaluate implementing an AB 811 financing mechanism
7 for citizens of Tulare County.

8 i. Orange County Cities Partnership

9 The Orange County Energy Partnership (OCEP) will optimize opportunities for several
10 Orange County jurisdictions, including Huntington Beach, Fountain Valley, Costa Mesa, and
11 Westminster. Through this Partnership, the program will deliver short and long-term energy
12 savings in municipal buildings, and commercial buildings and the residential sectors. OCEP
13 will help promote energy efficiency to a level not yet achieved in these cities. Opportunities to
14 provide information and education targeted to the specific demographics in these communities
15 will be seamlessly integrated with resource programs that develop hard savings.

16 j. ICLEI – Local Governments for Sustainability, U.S.A., Inc. (ICLEI), the
17 Institute for Local Government (ILG) and the Local Government Commission
18 (LGC)

19 SoCalGas is offering assistance to help local governments reduce their carbon footprint
20 through increased energy efficiency. This offering will primarily be delivered through the non-
21 profit organizations, ICLEI – Local Governments for Sustainability, U.S.A., Inc. (ICLEI), the
22 Institute for Local Government (ILG) and the Local Government Commission (LGC). This

1 collaborative effort is structured to leverage the unique resources, assets, relationships,
2 communications channels, programs, training, models and tools brought by each non-profit
3 organization to support the CEESP. This is a statewide local government strategic element
4 support effort among the four investor-owned utilities.

5 ICLEI will help local government (LG) participants in SoCalGas' service territory
6 understand the linkages between energy efficiency and greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction/AB32
7 compliance. ICLEI will deliver in-person and online trainings to facilitate LG understanding of
8 requirements under AB32, learn about principles and methodologies for conducting GHG
9 inventories and setting GHG reduction targets, as well as developing and implementing climate
10 action plans (CAPs). ICLEI will also provide access to templates and tools that detail the
11 components of GHG inventories and CAPs and provide training on mitigation strategies for
12 reducing GHG emissions in both local government operations and community-scale activities
13 and facilities.

14 *k. Community Energy Partnership (CEP)*

15 The CEP's 2009-2011 program builds upon the CEP's successful, award-winning model
16 originated in 1992 by enhancing the leadership role of cities in energy management. Over the
17 past 16 years, the CEP has evolved from the Irvine Energy Efficiency Initiative to a ten cities
18 program that defines a true partnership between local governments and utilities focused on
19 achieving energy savings and behavioral change in residential, non-residential and the municipal
20 sectors.

21 This approach pursued will allow the CEP to be flexible in the customization of solutions
22 to overcome challenges and exploit opportunities faced by local governments. In doing so, local

1 governments will be able to develop individualized action plans for achieving both local and
2 statewide goals and targets. Through this framework, the CEP program supports local
3 governments who are willing to commit and sustain the appropriate level of participation and
4 resources to effectively initiate programs that address the main issue areas for local government
5 action that are identified in the CLTEESP.

6 *l. Desert Cities Partnership*

7 The Desert Cities Partnership program is a new local government partnership in SCE's,
8 and SoCalGas' partnership portfolio. The Desert Cities Energy Partnership includes the
9 Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG), Southern California Edison, and
10 Southern California Gas Company with cooperation from Imperial Irrigation District, a local
11 public utility. CVAG is a local government agency, including 10 cities, Riverside County, and
12 three tribal governments (collectively referred to as Jurisdictions) as its members. CVAG will
13 partner with Southern California Edison (SCE), and SoCalGas for this partnership. CVAG will
14 coordinate education and outreach efforts, a valley-wide marketing program, as well as related
15 administrative and reporting activities. Through its existing communication network, CVAG will
16 provide outreach to the member jurisdictions and the larger Coachella Valley community about
17 energy efficiency. SCE, and SoCalGas will provide energy information, technical assistance, and
18 assist the jurisdictions with implementation of municipal facilities retrofits and energy efficiency
19 upgrades. The IOUs will provide resources and support, as available, for training, events, and
20 marketing programs.

21 *m. Ventura County Regional Energy Alliance*

22 The Ventura County Regional Energy Alliance (VCREA) consists of nine Cities and one

1 County. The Cities of Camarillo, Fillmore, Moorpark, Ojai, Port Hueneme, Santa Paula,
2 Thousand Oaks, and Ventura along with Ventura County are members of the Alliance. The
3 Alliance implements its program of comprehensive energy savings organized through a single
4 energy office for public agencies and non-profit service providers.

5 VCREA Board of Directors is composed of elected officials from various public agencies
6 and provides the policy and leadership for the program. The Board has been instrumental in
7 building an ethic of energy efficiency in the region that has led to friendly competition among
8 public agencies and greater desire among community activists to have their own local “green
9 councils” to take action. VCREA is not a mandated public agency, but rather an outcome of
10 collaboration among regional leaders concerned specifically with energy issues.

11 *n. Palm Desert Energy Partnership Demonstration Program*

12 The Palm Desert Energy Partnership Demonstration program (the “Project”) presents a
13 model for the community energy partnerships that brings the City of Palm Desert (the “City”)
14 and its energy utilities, Southern California Gas and Southern California Edison, together in a
15 partnership in which each of the partners brings its experience, expertise and resources to bear on
16 the task of saving energy. The facilitating partner for this demonstration project is The Energy
17 Coalition, which also advises the partners on partnership principles. This partnership between the
18 City, its energy utilities and the facilitating partner provides the foundation for a long-term
19 energy partnership commitment and a five-year, comprehensive demand-side management
20 campaign.

21 California benefits from this powerful partnership model because the city’s residents and
22 businesses are empowered to become reliable providers of cost-effective, environmentally-

1 advantaged, demand-side management energy resources that help meet the states growing energy
2 needs. In return, the city’s citizens and businesses reap the economic benefits of their
3 participation in a comprehensive program that helps them save energy and money.

4 **C. Comprehensive Home Performance Program (CHPP)**

5 SoCalGas’ Whole House Performance Pilot program will be implemented as a joint
6 utility program with SCE’s Comprehensive Home Performance program. The program will be a
7 new to SoCalGas’ 2009-2011 residential energy efficiency portfolio, based on the SCE’s
8 successful 2006-2008 IDEEA Comprehensive Home Performance Delivery program. In
9 accordance with the CEESP, this program advances comprehensive energy efficiency measures,
10 including: whole house solutions, visual monitoring and displays, performance standards, local
11 government opportunities, and DSM integration.

12 The Whole House Performance program (WHP) delivers comprehensive improvement
13 packages tailored to the needs of each existing home and its owner. The WHP solicits, screens,
14 and trains qualified residential repair and renovation and HVAC contractors to deliver program
15 services such as performing whole-house diagnostics by proposing a comprehensive
16 improvement package, and then completing the recommended improvements. The program also
17 includes marketing activities to help educate customers on program services and provide
18 additional customer leads to trained contractors. Furthermore, the program will provide
19 consistent standards and professional identity in association with the national Home Performance
20 with ENERGY STAR® program.

21 **D. Local Non-Residential Incentive Partnership**

22 The mission of the LRNP is to provide integrated energy, resource and emissions
23 conservation solutions to California industry and to encourage and enable a higher degree of

1 energy-efficiency market penetration by increasing the amount of comprehensive high efficiency
2 measures being installed.

3 The SoCalGas Local Non-Residential Incentive Partnership (LNRP) provides incentives
4 for energy-efficient retrofits or replacements of existing equipment at SoCalGas customer sites.
5 Participants may be either customers or energy-efficiency service providers (EESP's) acting as
6 project sponsors for activities at customer sites. To qualify, a project must save a minimum of
7 1,000,000 therms per year. Associated energy, resource such as water, sewerage and emissions,
8 and GHG savings will be considered when evaluating a project for funding. A project may
9 consist of a single project at a single site, or may be aggregated from multiple projects belonging
10 to a single customer, and may include a variety of measures.

11 **E. On-Bill Financing (OBF)**

12 The On-Bill Financing Option is designed primarily to facilitate the purchase and
13 installation of comprehensive¹⁰, qualified energy efficiency measures by customers who might
14 not otherwise be able to act given capital constraints and/or administrative and time burdens. It
15 is designed to build on the success of the 2006-2008 program cycle offering. SoCalGas proposes
16 to establish a \$9 million sustainable loan pool from non-PGC ratepayer funds to fund loans
17 during 2009, 2010 and 2011.

18 Participating customers who install comprehensive projects are eligible to receive a full
19 rebate or incentive from the participating programs and to finance the balance of comprehensive,
20 qualified energy efficiency and demand response measures. Loan is not transferable. Partial or
21 non-payment of loan could result in shut-off of utility service and turned over for collection.

¹⁰ Comprehensive is defined as two or more distinct measure types not including CFLs or delamping.

1 **F. Palm Desert Energy Partnership Demonstration Program**

2 The Palm Desert Energy Partnership Demonstration program presents a model for the
3 community energy partnerships that brings the City of Palm Desert (the “City”) and its energy
4 utilities, Southern California Gas and Southern California Edison, together in a partnership in
5 which each of the partners brings its experience, expertise and resources to bear on the task of
6 saving energy. The facilitating partner for this demonstration project is The Energy Coalition,
7 which also advises the partners on partnership principles. This partnership between the City, its
8 energy utilities and the facilitating partner provides the foundation for a long-term energy
9 partnership commitment and a five-year, comprehensive demand-side management campaign.

10 The 2009-2011 Palm Desert Energy Partnership Demonstration program is designed to
11 encourage residential and business customers to purchase energy efficient equipment and focus
12 on activities based on a segmented market in conjunction with SoCalGas’ EE portfolio of
13 programs. The program will expand the opportunity to obtain energy savings through a variety of
14 sources and maximize existing savings potential for both residential and commercial customers.
15 The program embraces initiatives established by the CPUC, known as the “Big Bold Energy
16 Efficiency Strategies:”

17 **G. Strategic Development and Integration**

18 In order to create market transformation in California, SoCalGas is committed to the
19 vision and goals outlined in the CEESP. This plan includes customer segmentation and targeted
20 program development and the integration of EE/DSM and emerging high efficiency technologies
21 coupled with innovative and comprehensive program design and theory. A focused team of
22 qualified resources has been identified to support these activities and drive the direction of the
23 programs through innovation and the inclusion of best practices. This team will be dedicated to

1 this activity and will act as a coordinating entity by collaborating with regulatory, program,
2 technology and other staff.

3 The team will be specifically responsible for overseeing activities associated with
4 achieving strategic plan goals and ensuring that the strategic plan itself is updated so that it
5 provides relevant guidance and direction on a continuous basis. The team will be responsible for:

- 6 • Cooperatively developing milestones toward achieving strategic objectives and
7 evaluating the progress of programs toward these milestones as well as meeting sector
8 goals.
- 9 • Facilitating the evolution of program design to ensure support of the long term strategic
10 vision and direction.
- 11 • Researching, identifying and supporting incorporation of best practices in both current
12 and future programs.
- 13 • Providing guidance and acting as an ongoing information source for pilot programs,
14 integration activities and program innovations associated with emerging technologies,
15 best practices, and market awareness.
- 16 • Representing SoCalGas in Strategic Planning activities. This includes the representation
17 of SoCalGas at all California Strategic Planning meetings. SoCalGas subject matter
18 experts will provide input as the plan evolves in order to keep it current and valuable.
19 The team will share lessons learned and successful strategies with the other IOUs.
- 20 • Incorporating stakeholder input in the long-term planning process, collaborating with
21 other utilities and the CPUC to conduct public workshops such as an annual California
22 Energy Efficiency Summit.
- 23 • Acting as a liaison between external parties and internal staff to ensure that there is a
24 complete and ongoing feedback loop with lessons learned and recommendations being
25 fully shared and leveraged.
- 26 • Ensuring that, as specific objectives emerge and the plan evolves, lessons learned are
27 available for incorporation into existing programs as well as for future planning.

- 1 • Collaborating with the Emerging Technologies group to ensure that cutting edge
2 technologies are quickly adopted and incorporated into the programs thru 2011 and
3 beyond.
- 4 • Working in partnership with, and providing information and guidance to, program sector
5 management to ensure that interim milestones and approaches are directed toward the
6 long-term vision.

7 **H. Sustainable Communities Case Studies Program**

8 SoCalGas' Sustainable Communities (SC) program provides the framework for the
9 design and building of communities that support the environment through energy- and resource-
10 efficiency. SC helps to enhance quality of life by protecting and preserving natural resources
11 and improving economic development. Incentives and other assistance are available to
12 developers, building owners, and design teams that construct highly energy-efficient buildings
13 with sustainable design, and long-term energy-efficiency.

14 This highly innovative program will be SoCalGas' flagship program providing the path
15 for all other programs in meeting California's long-term energy efficiency goals, including zero
16 net energy homes by 2020. This program will enable market transformation resulting in
17 measurable energy efficiency, integrated demand response, distributed generation, renewables
18 and natural resource savings while optimizing long term ecological, social and economic health
19 of California. It accomplishes this by comprehensively integrating the "vertical" development
20 (buildings and their components) with the "horizontal" development (land and utility and
21 transportation infrastructure) over the full planning horizon. This holistic approach to program
22 design and implementation is coupled with a new management model and evolutionary
23 improvements in energy, water and air quality savings over the project life.

1 **V. SoCalGas Third Party programs**

2 **A. California Sustainability Alliance**

3 The California Sustainability Alliance is an innovative cross-cutting market
4 transformation program designed to increase and accelerate adoption of cost-effective energy
5 efficiency. Key strategies are to:

- 6 • increase demand for energy efficiency by increasing understanding of the costs and
7 benefits of energy efficiency and sustainability;
- 8 • increase voluntary adoption by creating value for market leaders and early adopters
9 through a comprehensive program of awards, rewards and recognition;
- 10 • increase effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of energy efficiency programs by packaging
11 them with complementary “sustainability” measures (e.g. climate action, water
12 efficiency, renewable energy, smart land use, waste management, transportation
13 management) to leverage complementary program delivery channels, and use existing
14 marketing, education and outreach channels to increase the frequency and strength of
15 energy efficiency and sustainability messages;
- 16 • increase and accelerate adoption of energy efficiency by engaging the assistance of expert
17 advisors to overcome major barriers in high potential undersubscribed sectors;
- 18 • provide comprehensive approaches such as whole building, portfolio and system
19 approaches that achieve energy savings faster and more cost effectively while minimizing
20 lost opportunities, and
- 21 • simplify and streamline energy efficiency adoption through one-stop shopping for
22 technical and financial assistance.

23 **B. Community Language Efficiency Outreach (CLEO)**

24 The Community Language Efficiency Outreach program (CLEO) is a highly targeted
25 residential energy efficiency marketing, outreach, education and training program specifically

1 targeted to the Vietnamese, Indian, Chinese and Korean (VICK) speaking customers of Southern
2 California Edison (SCE) and SoCalGas. The program strategy is unique in that it is a 100% in-
3 language strategy, which serves a key role in overcoming the English as a second language
4 market barrier and targets hard-to-reach, low and medium income customers. In 2009-2011 the
5 program will continue to target the Vietnamese, Indian, Chinese and Korean and will also
6 expand the program to target the Hispanic (Spanish speaking) and the hard-to-reach, low and
7 medium income customers in the African American Communities.

8 The program will market SoCalGas efficiency programs and offer energy efficiency
9 education and training using local ethnic media (TV, radio, and newspapers), and community
10 events. The program's marketing efforts garner interest and lead to participation in CLEO
11 residential seminars and energy audits. CLEO will target SoCalGas customers in the areas of Los
12 Angeles, San Bernardino, and Orange Counties with high concentrations of Asian, Hispanic and
13 African American customers.

14 **C. Energy Challenger**

15 The 2009-2011 Energy Challenger program will build on the existing 2006-2008
16 program with a goal to engage 2,000 new small and mid-sized businesses in a web-based energy
17 audit/business assessment (delivered through the SoCalGas website), and provide each business
18 with an immediate action plan containing direct links to SoCalGas rebates and implementation
19 services. The program is designed to support the service territory and is hosted by Contractor.

20 The program will provide a platform to enable businesses to identify their priority energy
21 management needs and to be directed to the most appropriate services/rebates for their needs.
22 Energy Challenger will offer a web-based energy assessment tool tailored to stimulate interest in
23 programs, rebates and services. The tool has demonstrated a high success rate (over 80% of

1 businesses that start the assessment, finish and receive an action plan).

2 **D. PACE Energy Savings Project (PACE Energy Efficient Ethnic Outreach**
3 **program)**

4 The PACE Energy Savings Project (PACE ESP) is a multi-ethnic outreach program that
5 actively promotes the energy efficiency programs of The Gas Company to residential and small
6 business customers who belong to the Chinese, Korean, Hispanic, and Vietnamese communities.
7 In 2009-2011, the program proposes to expand its outreach to the Filipino community and other
8 geographical areas including Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura Counties. In
9 addition, the program will take its outreach efforts to “the next level” by encouraging target
10 small businesses to take more concrete steps to saving energy as well as conducting follow-
11 through and follow-up activities to determine the extent to which customers practiced or
12 employed energy savings in their homes or work places.

13 **E. Gas Cooling Retrofit**

14 This program will encourage customers in the SoCalGas service territory to purchase and
15 retrofit inefficient gas cooling units by offering information on the newer technology and
16 incentives for gas cooling units up to 100 tons in size. This program would support the effort to
17 not increase the electrical peak demand and total energy usage. The primary target market will be
18 small commercial customers who currently have old gas cooling units and the secondary market
19 would be residential. The program will pay an incentive of .80 per therm saved to either the
20 customer or the upstream channel. Marketing focus will continue to be expanding its
21 distribution channels by increasing CEC certified products and working with current and new
22 manufacturers.

1 **F. HERS Rater Training Advancement**

2 The program will promote, develop, and deliver training to currently certified Home
3 Energy Rating System (HERS) raters and energy analysts involved in new housing in Southern
4 California Gas service territory. The curriculum will address technical and administrative
5 elements of Home Energy Ratings, and will cover both current issues and changes based on Title
6 24 requirements taking effect in 2009.

7 The program rationale begins with the need for HERS Rater Training Advancement that
8 incorporates new codes and standards, green building and zero net energy technologies and
9 practices, and provides raters comprehensive and consistent tools and information. By providing
10 training advancement opportunities through web-based and classroom instruction, the utility
11 seeks to improve and align HERS Rater skill sets to (a) include the long-term focus on whole-
12 building energy efficiency opportunities, (b) integrate and digest local, regional and state
13 building codes, statutes and programs such that builders and developers can count on HERS
14 raters for current information and appropriate recommendations, and (c) engage and equip the
15 HERS rater profession as emissaries in the deployment of new energy efficiency technologies
16 and adoption of voluntary building standards in the near term.

17 **G. LivingWise™**

18 LivingWise (LW) is a school-delivered residential energy savings program that is
19 currently sponsored through collaboration between Southern California Edison (SCE) and
20 Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas), along with additional water agency funding for
21 more than 50% of program locations. The program is run by Resource Action Programs (RAP)
22 and provides a proven blend of classroom activities and take-home retrofit and audit projects
23 which students complete as homework assignments with their parents and families. Audit data

1 and installation reports are collected via surveys, which are returned to teachers and forwarded to
2 the LW program Center for tabulation and storage. LW is used at the 6th Grade level in
3 California to best align with State Learning Standards, and is offered to eligible teachers as an
4 elective program. Teacher enrollment is very high, and overall participant program satisfaction
5 (including parents) is excellent.

6 **H. Multi-Family Direct Therm Savings**

7 The Multi Family Direct Therm Savings program, marketed and branded as “*Energy*
8 *Smart*”, is a field sales and direct installation program for multi family dwellings and apartment
9 buildings. The Multi Family Direct Therm Savings program will help deliver energy savings to
10 multifamily customers located in Los Angeles, Ventura, and Santa Barbara counties during the
11 2009-2011 program period.

12 Since there are two contractors implementing similar programs for multifamily customers
13 in SoCalGas territory, each contractor has been assigned specific counties in which to market
14 their program.

15 **I. Multi-Family Solar Pool Heating**

16 The Multi Family Solar Pool Heating program aims to encourage large apartment
17 building owners, condominium and homeowners associations as well as property managers to
18 install solar pool heating system for their swimming pools or if it is not practical to do so, to
19 replace their old pool water heaters with more efficient technologies. The program will be
20 directed to the larger apartment complexes with swimming pools that are heated throughout the
21 year.

1 **J. Multi-Family Home Tune-Up**

2 Through the Multi-Family Home Tune-up program, Contractor will help deliver energy
3 savings to multifamily customers located in Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, and parts of San
4 Luis Obispo, Fresno, Kern, Kings, Tulare and Imperial counties during the 2009-2011 program
5 period.

6 Since there are two contractors implementing similar programs for multifamily customers
7 in SoCalGas territory, each contractor has been assigned specific counties in which to market
8 their program.

9 **K. OnDemand Efficiency**

10 The baseline target segment is multifamily residence apartment complexes with central
11 boilers and a timeclock or no control. The program will achieve savings by making direct offers
12 to known decision makers in the identified market niche. There is a large pool of older multi-
13 family apartment buildings in SoCalGas' service territory (estimated to be nearly ¼ of
14 California's roughly 4.1 million multi-family units). Many of these buildings (25-50%) have
15 central boilers serving individual buildings on the properties. While other programs address
16 boiler efficiency, the OnDemand Efficiency program is targeted at the delivery mechanism (re-
17 circulation system).

18 **L. Comprehensive Manufactured and Mobile Home**

19 The residential Comprehensive Manufactured and Mobile Home program (CMHP) has
20 been designed to complement the SoCalGas Residential Energy Efficiency Portfolio by reaching
21 manufactured and mobile home customers, where there is a rich potential for cost-effective
22 energy and demand savings. The program is run by Synergy Companies. This is a targeted
23 market that is not generally reached by statewide mass-market programs. Manufactured homes

1 are defined as factory built, pre-fabricated housing, mobile homes, and homes within mobile
2 home type communities, but does not include homes traditionally built entirely at the
3 construction site.

4 **M. Portfolio of the Future**

5 The Portfolio of the Future (PoF) is designed to leverage and enhance Southern
6 California Gas Company's (SCG) Emerging Technology (ET) efforts by identifying and
7 accelerating the market adoption of emerging technologies that can significantly improve end-
8 use energy efficiency in Southern California. It will do so by:

- 9 • Helping to validate the technology, demonstrate the benefits, build the necessary market
10 infrastructure, and promote and encourage early adoption by concurrently providing
11 assistance, defining the value proposition, and addressing market barriers,
- 12 • Building awareness regarding the benefits from the emerging technologies and setting the
13 stage for including some of the emerging technologies in the next cycle of (2012–2014)
14 energy efficiency programs; and
- 15 • Leveraging SCG resources and those of other utilities (including municipal utilities,
16 water utilities, Southern California Edison (SCE), San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E)
17 and Pacific Gas and Electric Co. (PG&E)), NCI, potential R&D partners (including the
18 U.S. Department of Energy, CEC PIER, NYSERDA), private equity, and venture capital
19 funds), the utilities' customers, other state and federal agencies, and local governments.

20 **N. Program for Resource Efficiency in Private Schools (PREPS)**

21 The program Resource Efficiency in Private Schools (PREPS) program will target private
22 K–12 schools, colleges and universities, preschools, and trade and technical schools throughout
23 Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) service territory. The primary goal of PREPS is
24 to capture therm savings within the private school sector. Another goal to educate end-users on
25 cost-effective energy efficiency measures and practices to improve overall building operations

1 and comfort. This will be achieved through a practical and comprehensive approach by
2 identifying, evaluating, and supporting the installation of specific and applicable energy
3 efficiency measures within these market segments.

4 **O. SaveGas Hot Water Control with Continuous Commissioning**

5 This program addresses gas savings in SoCalGas' service territory by implementing
6 domestic hot water (DHW) control systems in hotels, motels, resorts and senior care facilities
7 plus other associated hot water end uses (e.g. on-site kitchen and laundry facilities). A typical
8 equipment arrangement consists of a hot-water storage tank, a hot-water boiler which includes a
9 circulation pump, a loop or network of piping to supply the heated domestic hot water to the
10 facilities guest rooms / dwelling units, and a recirculation pump on the return line from the
11 piping loop.

12 **P. Small Industrial Facility Upgrades**

13 The Small Industrial Facility Upgrades program will assist Southern California Gas
14 Company (SoCalGas) small industrial customers in becoming more energy efficient and
15 productive through the adoption of existing, including low-penetration, technologies. The
16 program will target small industrial customers with annual gas usage less than 50,000 therms.
17 The program will offer proven measures currently used in SoCalGas' Local Business Energy
18 Efficiency program (BEEP) and Express Efficiency Rebate program (EERP). These measures
19 include calculated custom process improvements for heat recovery, process equipment
20 replacement, and equipment modernization, furnace and oven improvements, and excess air
21 reduction. The program will also include deemed measures such as boilers, water heaters, and
22 steam trap replacements, along with insulation improvements.

1 **Q. Steam Trap and Compressed Air Survey**

2 The program for Steam Trap and Compressed Air Survey (SCAS) will provide
3 compressed air and steam audits and evaluations to small, medium, and large industrial
4 customers throughout the Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) territory. All customers
5 of SoCalGas with air and steam systems will be eligible to participate in the program. Targets
6 will be industrial customers, but other qualifying facilities including governmental, institutional,
7 and military facilities may also participate if they meet the program requirements. This program
8 is designed for a range of industrial customers from small to very large industrial processes with
9 gas consumption greater than 50,000 therms per annum.

10 **R. Upstream High Efficiency Gas Water Heater Rebate**

11 The program for Upstream High Efficiency Gas Water Heater will provide
12 comprehensive services to establish and maintain an upstream rebate system, (i.e.
13 distributors/wholesalers) to reduce or altogether remove the price differential between the
14 standard and high-efficiency gas water heaters in the Southern California Gas Company
15 (SoCalGas') service territory. The primary objective of the program is to support and
16 complement SoCalGas' existing Single Family Residential Energy-Efficiency Rebate Resource
17 program by stimulating plumber and contractor participation in energy efficiency rebates. This
18 program is to be implemented for replacement market only and only storage gas water heaters,
19 50 gallons or smaller with an Energy Factor of 0.62 or higher, will qualify.

20 **VI. Third-Party Programs**

21 SoCalGas' Third Party programs ("3P") are a diverse set of resource and non-resource
22 programs offered by outside vendors to its customers. The budget allocated to these programs

1 will meet or exceed the Commission’s requirement that utilities dedicate at least 20 percent of
2 their energy efficiency budgets to 3P programs; however, specific proposed budgets and goals as
3 of this filing are not final because these amounts remain subject to completion of contract
4 negotiations with vendors. A complete list of third party programs that were identified for
5 potential implementation (pending final Commission approval of program budgets and
6 negotiations) are available in the 3P program implementation plan in Appendix B.

7 SoCalGas’ 2009-2011 program cycle includes three types of 3P programs: competitively
8 bid programs, renewed programs, and potentially renewed programs. Renewed programs are
9 those 2006-2008 third-party programs that have demonstrated the ability to meet program goals
10 and/or deliver cost effective energy savings. Potentially renewed programs are those relatively
11 new third-party programs that SoCalGas will evaluate later in 2008 for possible renewal.
12 Competitively bid programs are those that SoCalGas selected through requests for proposals
13 (“RFPs”) to complement these programs and planned core utility programs.

14 **A. Third Party Program Competitive Process**

15 **1. Introduction**

16 SoCalGas’ selection of third-party programs for the 2009-2011 program cycle includes
17 three groups of programs. These are competitively bid programs, renewed programs, and
18 potentially renewed programs. SoCalGas elected to renew 2006-2008 third-party programs that
19 have demonstrated the ability to meet program goals and deliver cost effective energy savings.
20 In addition, there are some relatively new third-party programs that SoCalGas will evaluation
21 later in 2008 for possible renew. To complement these programs and the planned SoCalGas core
22 IOU programs, SoCalGas issued general and targeted third-party program RFPs and selected
23 those programs determined most likely to achieve the stated goals.

1 Significant effort was made to reach out to entities in both the energy efficiency industry
2 and in the regional community at large. SoCalGas believes the solicitations and proposal
3 submittals it received as part of this third-party process are representative of the expertise, skill,
4 and innovation available in the marketplace. Therefore, the third-party contribution to
5 SoCalGas' portfolio represents the more innovative and cost-effective offerings in the
6 marketplace. SoCalGas' energy efficiency programs achieve the objectives set forth by the
7 Commission, such as pursuit of cost-effective energy efficiency opportunities over both the
8 short- and long-term and focus on programs that serve as alternatives to more costly supply-side
9 resource options ("resource programs").

10 SoCalGas' competitive bid selection process is fully compliant with the Commission's
11 decision, D.05-09-043.

12 (1) SoCalGas conducted its competitive bid selection process using the selection criteria
13 adopted for SoCalGas in D.05-09-043 Attachment 6.

14 (2) SoCalGas worked closely with its PRG in developing both its selection criteria and
15 selection process and in reviewing the findings and recommendations of the procurement
16 process. SoCalGas addressed all PRG concerns and reached a consensus on its final selections.

17 (3) SoCalGas' final 2009-2011 portfolio consisting of its own programs, partnerships,
18 and these proposed selected third-party programs is cost effective and will meet or exceed the
19 Commission's established energy savings and demand reduction goals.

20 It should be noted that the specific savings assumptions and other cost-effectiveness
21 assumptions that these selected third parties used in their proposals have not been updated to
22 conform with the 2008 DEER updates and therefore after their inputs have been adjusted to
23 conform with Commission's final decision on the utilities cost effectiveness inputs, their

1 proposal may change. The specific program savings goals and budgets will be negotiated after
2 this filing is approved. No contracts will be executed until the Commission renders its approval
3 of SoCalGas' 2009-2011 Energy Efficiency Program Application.

4 **2. Peer Review Group Participation**

5 Representatives of SoCalGas' Peer Review Group ("PRG") were designated to monitor
6 the bid evaluation process, as described in D.05-01-055. The PRG was in general agreement
7 with SoCalGas' competitive bid solicitation process. They reviewed and offered numerous
8 recommendations regarding the RFP wording, bid scoring protocols, and portfolio review.
9 SoCalGas incorporated PRG recommendations into its bid process and will continue to seek
10 PRG input subsequent to this filing and regularly during program implementation and
11 administration.

12 **3. Flight Structure of Solicitations**

13 In an effort to improve the third-party solicitation process, SoCalGas established a phased
14 approach to issuing and reviewing the RFPs. It was SoCalGas' intent that such a phased process
15 would reduce the challenges faced by vendors responding to more than one RFP and thus
16 increase the quality of both the proposed programs and the received proposals. Each phase was
17 called a flight. The flights and the corresponding RFPs issued during each flight are listed
18 below. All three flights issued RFPs for resource programs only. In addition, Flight 1 was
19 comprised of two stages. Stage 1 was a request for vendors to submit an abstract of their
20 proposed program. Stage 2 was a request for those vendors who passed the Stage 1 evaluation
21 to submit full proposals. During Stage 2, the bidders were expected to provide SoCalGas with
22 fully-developed program proposals, along with the necessary documentation to substantiate
23 proposed energy savings (E3 Calculators, DEER-related materials, and/or workpapers).

1 SoCalGas believed that first reviewing abstracts would reduce the overall preparation burden on
 2 the marketplace.

3 Table 1-11: Description of RFP Stages

Flight 1 - Stage 1	State-wide General Request For Abstracts	
	SoCalGas Local Innovative (DEEP) Requests For Abstracts	
Flight 2	State-wide Targeted Request For Proposals	Energy Efficiency program for Entertainment Centers K-12 Private Schools and Private Colleges Audit and Retrofit program Manufactured Housing program – New Construction
	SoCalGas Targeted Requests For Proposals	Point-of-Sale Instant Rebate program Multifamily Home Tune-Up Comprehensive Multifamily Retrofits ARM Comprehensive Upgrade (Automotive Repair & Maintenance) Commercial Launderers EE Upgrade FLU – Facility Laundry Upgrade program Spa-N-Salon EE Upgrade program Food Service EE Upgrade program Controls & Sensors Surveys and Installations
Flight 3	: SoCalGas Targeted Requests For Proposals	Small Industrial Facility Upgrades Industrial Mover Upstream Energy Efficiency Equipment Manufacturers Incentive Gas Cooling Retrofit Solar Pool Covers
Flight: SoCalGas Non-Resource Requests For Proposals		New Construction Kiosk New Construction HERS Raters Training Online Industrial Energy Efficiency Training Modules Steam Trap and Compressed Air Survey
Flight 1 - Stage 2	State-wide General Request For Proposals	
	SoCalGas Local Innovative (DEEP) Requests For Proposals	

4

5 1. Statewide General Program Solicitations

1 SoCalGas participated in the Statewide General RFP process. The intent of this
2 solicitation was to offer the marketplace the ability to standardize programs across the state and
3 potentially leverage economies of scale to the benefit of both the vendors and the ratepayers.
4 This solicitation did not define the design or implementation method of the program, but rather
5 gave bidders the opportunity to propose any cost effective program that would complement
6 SoCalGas' existing portfolio.

7 2. Innovative Program Solicitations

8 SoCalGas also demonstrated its willingness to explore new and innovative program
9 designs through solicitation of innovative program proposals. To encourage innovative program
10 design, the scoring criteria for this RFP removed the Reliability of Savings criterion and instead
11 assessed the degree of innovation.

12 3. Targeted Solicitations

13 In its Application A.05-06-106, SoCalGas identified targeted Resource areas it believes
14 would yield innovative and cost-effective programs through the competitive bid process. These
15 areas were considered underserved through the existing utility portfolio. SoCalGas sought
16 targeted Resource proposals for the areas listed above under Flights 2, 3, and 4.

17 5. Bid Submission and Preparation Process

18 The objective of SoCalGas' activities prior to receipt of proposals in response to the
19 various RFPs was to maximize the value of the third-party competitive bidding process for both
20 the marketplace and ratepayers in the following manner:

- 21 • Help foster the expansion of a market of third-party EE program providers
- 22 • Maximize the exposure of the competitive bidding process to encourage a broad industry
23 response

- Provide education and feedback to vendors to increase the quality of their program design and proposal content

The following subparagraphs summarize the third-party bid submission and preparation process implemented by SoCalGas. Many of the activities described were repeated for each flight.

1. Summary of the Development of the Solicitation Process

In late 2006, the IOUs and the local PRGs met to discuss the process by which a statewide solicitation could be conducted. As reflected in the Energy Division report, the IOUs and the PRGs agreed to various approaches to a statewide solicitation including the agreement that the IOUs were to commit to a statewide solicitation process beginning 2009-2011.

In July 2007, the IOUs began discussions regarding the solicitation planning process by sharing “lessons learned” from prior solicitations. IOUs also shared these past “lessons learned” with their individual IOU PRGs during their local solicitations conducted during the 2006-2008 period. The “lessons learned” were used to improve the 2009-2011 solicitation process. Lessons learned addressed the bidders, outreach and pre-notification, the RFPs, the bid stages, technical documentation, scoring processes and criteria, and other key elements of the solicitation process. The lessons learned and related solutions were incorporated into the design of the 2009-2011 solicitation.

During this time it was also determined that in order to meet a 2008 filing date and program rollouts in the fourth quarter of 2008, the solicitation process would have to begin immediately. The typical two-stage solicitation process takes approximately eleven (11) months from beginning to end. Therefore, the IOUs realized that the typical schedule would have to be significantly compressed in order to meet the 2008 filing date.

1 During July through September 2007, the IOUs continued to meet (face-to-face and via
2 conference calls) with a focus on understanding the individual IOU procurement process and
3 ways to find commonalities among the different IOU's procurement approaches (e.g., online
4 systems, RFP requirements, bidder's conferences, technical documentation workshops, scoring,
5 and evaluation processes, etc.).

6 Through this process, the IOUs closely coordinated, and operated joint working groups
7 for each of the following issues: statewide program identification, statewide general and local
8 innovative RFPs, scoring and weights, PEPMA and portal development, and
9 procurement/solicitation process coordination.

10 Additionally, the IOUs past experience has been that contracts held at a local level allow
11 each utility greater control over the program activities and provides the needed oversight to
12 ensure ratepayer funds are managed properly.

13 IOUs coordinated the outreach and bid pre-notification, created a joint statewide portal
14 for bidder registration, solicitation updates and bid submission, offered statewide bidder's
15 conferences and technical workshops, and offered the first statewide energy efficiency
16 solicitation. While the IOUs continuously seek to improve and increase coordination, the IOUs
17 believe that their efforts reflect significant improvement and a high degree of coordination
18 amongst the IOUs.

19 D.07-10-032 allowed the IOUs to use the scoring criteria from the 2006-2008 cycle as the
20 basis for 2009-2011 scoring. In addition, it required "the utilities to conduct third-party
21 solicitations in time for inclusion in their energy efficiency portfolio applications", which was
22 originally due May 15, 2008. This direction made the early launch of the solicitations a priority.

23 2. Questions and Answers

1 During the Stage 1 solicitation process, bidders were asked to submit any questions about
2 the RFP (Abstract) and/or the process. SoCalGas posted responses to bidders' questions. The
3 nature of the questions ranged from bid process timelines to clarification on specific bid program
4 requirements.

5 3. E3 Calculator Workshop

6 To increase the quality of the proposals and subsequent programs, bidders were required
7 to participate in an E3 Calculator workshop sponsored by SoCalGas. The purpose of the
8 workshop was to familiarize bidders with how the E3 Calculator tool works and the inputs
9 required. The workshop was held via a web conference on several occasions to increase the
10 ability to reach perspective bidders. Several hundred vendor representatives participated in the
11 E3 Workshops and the Bidders Conferences held by SoCalGas as part of this competitive bid
12 process.

13 4. Evaluation Criteria

14 These scoring criteria were as follows:

15 Table 1-12: Flight 1 – Stage 1, Statewide General Resource Programs for Residential, Non-
16 Residential, Cross-Cutting

Criteria	Weights
Proposal Responsiveness	Pass/Fail
Program Implementation and Feasibility	50%
- Feasibility	35%
- Portfolio Fit	35%
- Comprehensiveness	15%
- Reliability of Savings	15%
Cost Efficiency	30%
Skills and Experience	20%

17

1
2

Table 1-13: Flight 1 – Stage 1, Local Innovative Resource Programs for Residential, Non-Residential, Cross-Cutting

Criteria	Weights
Proposal Responsiveness	Pass/Fail
Program Implementation and Feasibility	50%
- Feasibility	35%
- Portfolio Fit	35%
- Comprehensiveness	15%
- Innovation	15%
Cost Efficiency	30%
Skills and Experience	20%

3

4
5

Table 1-14: Flight 2, Statewide and Local Targeted Resource Programs for Residential, Non-Residential, Cross-Cutting

Criteria	Weights
Proposal Responsiveness	Pass/Fail
Program Implementation and Feasibility	35%
- Feasibility	35%
- Comprehensiveness	25%
- Reliability of Savings	30%
Cost Efficiency	30%
- \$/net kWh and \$/net therm	25%
- Levelized Cost	25%
- TRC	25%
- PAC	25%
Skills and Experience	25%
Supplier Diversity and Misc.	10%

6

7
8

Table 1-15: Flight 3, Local Targeted Resource Programs for Residential, Non-Residential, Cross-Cutting

Criteria	Weights
Proposal Responsiveness	Pass/Fail
Program Implementation and Feasibility	35%
- Feasibility	35%
- Comprehensiveness	25%
- Reliability of Savings	30%
Cost Efficiency	30%
- \$/net kWh and \$/net therm	25%
- Levelized Cost	25%
- TRC	25%

Criteria	Weights
- PAC	25%
Skills and Experience	25%
Supplier Diversity and Misc.	10%

1
2
3
Table 1-16: Flight 4, Non-Resource
Non-Resource Programs for Residential, Non-Residential, Cross-Cutting

Criteria	Weights
Proposal Responsiveness	Pass/Fail
Program Implementation and Feasibility	35%
- Feasibility	50%
- Marketing Approach	25%
- Innovation	25%
Budget Evaluation	30%
- Implementation Cost Efficiency	60%
- Administration Efficiency	40%
Skills and Experience	25%
Supplier Diversity and Misc.	10%

4
5
6
Table 1-17: Flight 1 Stage 2, Statewide General Resource Programs for Residential, Non-
Residential, Cross-Cutting

Criteria	Weights
Proposal Responsiveness	Pass/Fail
Program Implementation and Feasibility	50%
- Feasibility	35%
- Portfolio Fit	35%
- Comprehensiveness	15%
- Reliability of Savings	15%
Cost Efficiency	30%
- \$/net kWh and \$/net therm	25%
- Levelized Cost	25%
- TRC	25%
- PAC	25%
Skills and Experience	10%
Supplier Diversity and Misc.	10%

Table 1-18: Flight 1 Stage 2, Local Innovative Resource Programs for Residential, Non-Residential, Cross-Cutting

Criteria	Weights
Proposal Responsiveness	Pass/Fail
Program Implementation and Feasibility	50%
- Feasibility	35%
- Portfolio Fit	35%
- Comprehensiveness	15%
- Innovation	15%
Cost Efficiency	30%
- \$/net kWh and \$/net therm	25%
- Levelized Cost	25%
- TRC	25%
- PAC	25%
Skills and Experience	10%
Supplier Diversity and Misc.	10%

6. Bid Evaluation Process

The competitive bid process involved multiple steps with several review cycles by SoCalGas Program Management, Engineering, Supplier Diversity, and Supply Management that allowed for a complete, equitable, and standardized process that included quality control checks. In addition, SoCalGas hired an independent consulting group to coordinate the third-party proposal review tasks and ensure that each proposal was treated in a fair and consistent manner. The goal of the overall process was to ensure that the solicitation process moved forward in an efficient manner for both the participating vendors and SoCalGas staff and that the awarded third-party programs provided the best portfolio fit to meet SoCalGas' long term energy efficiency plan and the Commission's goals.

The final step in the selection process was to present a summary of the evaluation process and the results of the SoCalGas management review to the PRG. During this meeting, SoCalGas presented its findings and award decisions and explained the rationale for those decisions. The

1 PRG then made suggestions that modified SoCalGas' original awards or concurred with
2 SoCalGas' recommendations. The outcomes of these meetings and thus the final award
3 outcomes are summarized below.

4 **7. Results of Competitive Third-Party Solicitation Process**

5 In total, SoCalGas received 109 abstracts and proposals. Ten proposed programs were
6 selected for award. The details of this selection are described below by flight.

7 5. Flight 1 - Stage 1

8 a. Initial Results

9 SoCalGas received proposal abstracts from vendors for both the Statewide General and
10 Local Innovative solicitations. The results of the Flight 1 – Stage 1 review process were as
11 follows:

- 29 Abstracts Received
 - 17 Statewide General
 - 12 Local Innovative
- 4 Abstracts failed the Responsiveness Evaluation
- 3 Abstracts were Not Reviewed
 - 1 was a duplicate submittal
 - 2 were non-resource and thus need to be submitted in Flight 4
- 22 Abstracts were Reviewed
- 15 Abstracts were Recommended – Ask to submit full proposal under Stage 2
 - 10 Statewide General
 - 5 Local Innovative
- 7 Abstracts were Not Recommended – Not invited to submit a full proposal for Stage 2

12
13 To arrive at these results, SoCalGas scored each abstract using the approved criteria
14 documented in the above. SoCalGas decided that those bidders whose proposed programs
15 scored a zero on the cost effectiveness criterion would not be invited to submit a full proposal,
16 but that all other bidders would be invited to participate in Stage 2. This decision was made with

1 the goal of encouraging increased marketplace participation in third-party programs and with the
2 hope that in submitting full proposals, vendors would refine and improve their proposed
3 programs.

4 b. PRG Input

5 The PRG met with SoCalGas on February 8, 2008, to review the Flight 1 - Stage 1
6 results. SoCalGas presented the final scores and rankings from the Stage 1 bid review process.
7 The PRG was concerned that SoCalGas' standard to pass to Stage 2 was not stringent enough.
8 The PRG recommended that a minimum total score be established as an additional passing
9 standard to increase the quality of the proposals submitted during Stage 2. Based on a review of
10 the individual program scores, the PRG recommended and SoCalGas agreed that proposed
11 programs need a 50% total score to be invited to Stage 2. This change modified the final Flight 1
12 – Stage 2 results as shown below:

- 22 Abstracts were Reviewed
- 6 Abstracts were Recommended – Ask to submit full proposal under Stage 2
 - 4 Statewide General
 - 2 Local Innovative
- 16 Abstracts were Not Recommended – Not invited to submit a full proposal for Stage 2

13
14 6. Flight 1 - Stage 2

15 a. Initial Results

16 SoCalGas received proposals from the vendors who had passed Stage 1 for both
17 Statewide General and Local Innovative solicitations. The results of the Flight 1 – Stage 2
18 review process were as follows:

- 6 proposals were received
 - 4 for the State-wide General RFP
 - 2 for the Local Innovative RFP
- None failed the Responsiveness Evaluation
- 1 proposals were selected for award
 - 1 from the Local Innovative RFP

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

The final selection criteria used for the two RFPs in this flight were to fill an existing utility portfolio gap or to provide any truly innovative energy efficiency measure or implementation methodology. The most common reason for not selecting proposed programs was that they overlapped with existing SoCalGas EE programs or existing third-party programs

b. PRG Input

The PRG met with SoCalGas on April 22, 2008, to review the Flight 1 - Stage 2 results. SoCalGas presented the final scores and rankings from the review process. The PRG asked questions about each proposal and discussed each proposal's score and possible fit within the SoCalGas portfolio. The PRG concurred with SoCalGas' decisions and made no changes to those shown above.

7. Flight 2

a. Initial Results

SoCalGas received proposals from vendors for both Statewide and Local Targeted solicitations. Flight 2 was comprised on targeted RFPs. Thus, in general, each program was designed to fill a gap in SoCalGas' current EE portfolio. For this reason, SoCalGas awarded contracts the bidder best able to provide a cost-effective program that filled such a gap. In five cases, no award was made because no proposed program met these criteria. The results of the Flight 2 review process were as follows:

- Three RFPs did receive a proposal response
- 22 proposals were received

- Two failed the Responsiveness Evaluation
- 20 proposals were reviewed
- 4 proposals were selected for award

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

b. PRG Input

The PRG met with SoCalGas on April 10, 2008, to review the Flight 2 results. SoCalGas presented the final scores and rankings from the review process. The PRG asked questions about each proposal and discussed each proposal’s score and possible fit within the SoCalGas portfolio. The PRG concurred with SoCalGas’ decisions and made no changes to those shown above.

8. Flight 3

a. Initial Results

SoCalGas received proposals from vendors for additional Local Targeted solicitations. Flight 3 was comprised on targeted RFPs. Thus, in general, each program was designed to fill a gap in SoCalGas’ current EE portfolio. For this reason, SoCalGas awarded contracts to the bidder best able to provide a cost-effective program that filled such a gap. In one case, no bids were received. In two other cases, no award was made because no proposed program met these criteria. The results of the Flight 3 review process were as follows:

• No proposals were received for one RFPs
• 5 proposals were received for the other four RFPs
• None failed the Responsiveness Evaluation
• 5 proposals were reviewed
• 2 proposals were selected for award

b. PRG Input

The PRG met with SoCalGas on April 10, 2008, to review the Flight 3 results. SoCalGas presented the final scores and rankings from review process. The PRG asked questions about each proposal and discussed each proposal’s score and possible fit within the SoCalGas

1 portfolio. The PRG concurred with SoCalGas' decisions and made no changes to those shown
2 above.

3 9. Flight 4

4 a. Initial Results

5 SoCalGas received proposals from vendors for Non-Resource solicitations. Flight 4 was
6 comprised on targeted Non-Resource RFPs. Thus, in general, each program was designed to fill
7 a gap in SoCalGas' current EE portfolio. For this reason, SoCalGas awarded contracts to the
8 bidder best able to provide a cost-effective program that filled such a gap. One proposed
9 program was selected for each of the four RFPs. The results of the Flight 4 review process were
10 as follows:

• 9 proposals were received for the four RFPs issued
• None failed the Responsiveness Evaluation
• 9 proposals were reviewed
• 4 proposals were selected for award

11 b. PRG Input

12 The PRG met with SoCalGas on April 22, 2008, to review the Flight 3 results. SoCalGas
13 presented the final scores and rankings from review process. The PRG asked questions about
14 each proposal and discussed each proposal's score and possible fit within the SoCalGas
15 portfolio. The PRG concurred with SoCalGas' decisions and made no changes to those shown
16 above.
17

18 **B. Third-Party Program Renewal Process**

19 **1. Introduction**

20 In addition to the competitive bidding process, SoCalGas successfully implemented a
21 review and assessment of its existing 2006 – 2008 EE third-party programs and renewed those
22 programs that were judged likely to provide cost effective energy savings that were in line with

1 SoCalGas and CPUC objectives during the 2009 – 2011 period.

2 **2. Renewal Results**

3 As a part of SoCalGas’ commitment to allocate 20% of the 2009-2011 Energy Efficiency
4 program Funds and CPUC Savings Goals to be contracted with third parties, SoCalGas selected
5 eight (8) 2006-2008 third-party programs for renewal in the 2009-2011 program cycle. These
6 eight programs total \$22.6 million in funding during this 3-year period. These programs and
7 funds are in addition to those selected under the competitive bidding process. No contracts will
8 be executed until the Commission’s final decision.

9 **3. Renewal Selection Process**

10 The objective of SoCalGas’ renewal selection process was to identify existing third-party
11 programs that are likely to provide cost-effective energy savings during the 2009-2011 program
12 cycle in a manner that met the following general guidelines:

- 13 • Leverage utility knowledge and experience of the market, vendor, and program to allow
14 for a more informed assessment of future performance potential.
- 15 • Assess all existing programs in a fair and equitable manner.
- 16 • Minimize “rebid” and assessment effort for both the vendor and the utility but in a
17 manner that does not sacrifice a fair and accurate process.

18 The outcomes of the renewal selection process was a decision on each current 2006 –
19 2008 third-party program to renew, re-bid, or discontinue the program for the 2009 – 2011
20 program cycle. The renewal selection process was comprised of three basic steps, a review and
21 assessment of the existing programs, submission of 2009 – 2011 plans, and evaluation of those
22 plans.

23 1. Review and Assessment of 2006 – 2008 Programs

1 In late 2007, SoCalGas developed a standard set of evaluation questions. These
2 questions, which are listed below in the following subsection, were distributed to the appropriate
3 SoCalGas Program Managers. The program managers documented their responses to each
4 question and used these responses to provide an overall recommendation to renew or not. Below
5 are the renewal assessment questions:

- 6 • Program Goals and Achievements, Including Commitments: Is program at or ahead of
7 contracted/revised forecast? If not, does implementer have a solid plan to meet goals?
- 8 • Program Cost: Is proposed program PAC Levelized Cost equal to or less expensive than
9 original forecast? If not, did program change substantially from forecast to increase
10 comprehensiveness or incorporate new delivery strategies?
- 11 • Cost-Effectiveness: Is TRC greater than or equal to original forecast? If not, did
12 program change substantially from forecast to increase comprehensiveness or incorporate
13 new delivery strategies?
- 14 • Actual Installed Measure Mix: Does the actual measure mix vary substantially from the
15 forecasted measure mix? Particularly, is the actual mix less comprehensive, or does the
16 end-use split vary dramatically from forecast?
- 17 • Customer Satisfaction /Program Quality: Does program have outstanding complaints
18 from customers or other implementers, or outstanding inspection fails, excluding very
19 recent issues that implementer hasn't had reasonable opportunity to resolve yet?
- 20 • Coordination/Vendor Relationship: Is existing coordination agreement working well? Is
21 implementer pro-actively coordinating with other programs and stakeholders, including
22 utility account representatives and programs, other third party programs, and local
23 government partnerships? Is the vendor cooperative, responsive, and meeting needs?
24 Are their responses timely?
- 25 • Regulatory and Reporting Compliance/Audits: Are implementer's reports accurate and
26 on-time? Is implementer in compliance with all regulatory requirements? Is the
27 implementer responsive to audit data requests? Are audit requests accurate and on-time?

- Are program/project savings claims clear, well documented and defensible?

2. Portfolio Fit

SoCalGas EE Managers reviewed the existing third-party programs to assess their fit with the 2009-2011 portfolio objectives. Those programs that would be consistent with those goals were determined appropriate for renewal or re-bid. Two major factors determining portfolio fit were the appropriateness of the program given the customer profile of the SoCalGas service territory and the overlap of the program with other planning utility or third-party programs.

3. Evaluation Criteria

SoCalGas EE Managers used the Program Manager’s assessments as input to the final renewal selection process. The evaluation criteria for the renewal selection process were a combination of quantitative and qualitative criteria. These criteria were not scored but rather evaluated. An important aspect of the renewal criteria is the inclusion of the SoCalGas program knowledge of the relevant market segment conditions and the status, progress, and challenges faced by the current program. The final decisions to renew, re-bid, or discontinue were based upon evaluations of these criteria. The renewal evaluation criteria were as follows:

Table 1-19: Renewal Evaluation Criteria Resource Programs for Residential, Non-Residential, Cross-Cutting

Criteria	Threshold Level(s)
Savings Performance: Program has or is on-track to meeting savings goals	>70% of 3yr Goal
Budget Performance: Funds spent are reasonable given savings levels	% Savings Goal / % Budget > .8
Program Assessment: PM assessment of ongoing potential of the program	Good potential

Note, all renewal quantitative evaluation criteria values were evaluated as of December 31, 2007 and again on March 31, 2008.

1 Table 1-20: Renewal Evaluation Criteria
 2 Non-Resource Programs for Residential, Non-Residential, Cross-Cutting

Criteria	Threshold Level(s)
Goal Attainment: Program has completed all or most of the task expected	Most task completed
Budget Performance: Funds spent are reasonable given tasks completed	< 90% of 3-year Budget Spent
Program Assessment: PM assessment of ongoing potential of the program	Good potential

3
 4 4. Submission and Review of Proposed 2009 – 2011 Programs

5 After completing the evaluation process, SoCalGas invited those vendors operating the
 6 programs that passed the renewal evaluation to submit implementation plans and E3 calculators
 7 for the 2009-2011 program cycle. SoCalGas Program Management and Engineering staff
 8 reviewed those plans. If the plans were found to be both reasonable and cost effective, then
 9 SoCalGas selected them for renew negotiations.

10 **4. Potential Additional Third-Party Renewals**

11 In addition to the seven 2006 – 2008 third-party programs renewed as part of the process
 12 described above, SoCalGas has recently initiated an additional 6 programs. These programs
 13 were started between the fall of 2007 and spring of 2008. Because these programs have just
 14 begun, there is insufficient information to determine if they should be renewed for the 2009 -
 15 2011 program cycle. SoCalGas plans to evaluate these programs mid-year during the 2009
 16 Bridge Funding period and use the same evaluation criteria as used for the other 2006-2008
 17 third-party programs. These programs have the potential of adding an additional 6 million
 18 terms of savings to the SoCalGas portfolio.

19 Overall, SoCalGas believes that continuation of successful current third-party programs
 20 will contribute to achieving cost effective energy savings for the customers of the SoCalGas

1 service area.

2 **VII. Local Government Partnerships**

3 SoCalGas is working in Partnership with municipalities to deliver energy efficiency
4 programs to residential and commercial customers through the Local Government Partnership
5 (“LGP”) marketing channels. The LGP program is a multi-faceted approach in that SoCalGas
6 works with various city, county, and “quasi-government” departments to promote energy
7 efficiency, energy conservation, and demand response. These collaborative programs are
8 designed to enhance energy efficiency program offerings as well as serve as a marketing channel
9 for projects to complement the portfolio.

10 SoCalGas does not attribute direct energy savings to its Partnership programs. Rather,
11 Partnership programs encourage participation in the utility’s resource programs and, therefore,
12 such energy savings will be captured through the relevant resource programs.

13 SoCalGas Partners include:

- 14 • Bakersfield/Kern County Energy Watch (KCEW)
- 15 • City of Costa Mesa, Fountain Valley, Huntington Beach and Westminster (Orange Cities
16 Energy Partnership)
- 17 • City of Palm Desert (Palm Desert Energy Partnership Demonstration program)
- 18 • ICLEI-Local Governments for Sustainability, Local Government Commission (LGC) and
19 Institute for Local Government (ILG)
- 20 • Los Angeles County
- 21 • Riverside County
- 22 • San Bernardino County
- 23 • San Luis Obispo Energy Watch (SLOEW)

- 1 • Santa Barbara County (South Coast Energy Efficiency Partnership)
- 2 • South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG)
- 3 • The Energy Coalition (Community Energy Partnership)
- 4 • Tulare County and City of Visalia
- 5 • Ventura County Regional Energy Alliance (VCREA)
- 6 • In addition, SCE and Pacific Gas and Electric PG&E are co-utility partners in these local
- 7 partnerships. The programs are designed to address both gas and electric efficiency. As
- 8 such, some of the references contained in the program implementation plans are for
- 9 SCE's electric related scope and such scope is not included in SoCalGas' partnership
- 10 activities.

11 program components include:

- 12 • Support for municipal facility retro fit for energy efficiency improvements,
- 13 • Strengthened building energy codes and enforcement,
- 14 • Land use planning and design
- 15 • Emerging technologies
- 16 • Energy Plan development
- 17 • Education and Outreach
- 18 • Comprehensive commercial retrofit
- 19 • Comprehensive mobile home direct install
- 20 • Residential and non-residential energy surveys
- 21 • CFL bulb recycling programs
- 22 • Green Building program
- 23 • Peer to Peer
- 24 • Staff training program

- Permit expedite and fee reduction programs

A. Local Government Partnerships Process

In 2006-2008, SoCalGas had a mixture of partnerships that consisted of statewide government entities, local governments and “quasi-governments”¹¹. This section describes SoCalGas’ proposal with respect to local government partnerships only. SoCalGas’ statewide and local institutional partnerships are discussed in other parts of this testimony. The statewide and local institutional partnerships were not subject to the selection criteria developed for local governments.

1. Proposed Partnership Structure and Statewide Consistency

SoCalGas’ proposed local government partnership structure for 2009-2011 continues to build upon the successes of the 2006-2008 local government partnerships. D.07-10-032 (at page 88) recognizes that “These entities may provide expertise the utilities do not have or better access to target groups and local communities. Local governments may be able to combine utility programs with their own complimentary, more comprehensive energy strategies.” In addition, the Chapter 12—Roles of Local Governments explores a range of strategies that local governments can implement “to promote energy efficiency technologies and practices within their communities, in their own facilities and with their peers.” Concurrently, as the CEESP was being developed, SoCalGas and the other utilities worked with the PRG to develop selection criteria for 2009-2011 local government partnerships that would reflect the strategies proposed for local governments in the CEESP. SoCalGas’ 2009-2011 portfolio plans to continue existing successful partnerships, expand its partnership portfolio with additional new local government

¹¹ In agreement with the PRG, the IOUs define “quasi-government” to be a “non-profit that works directly with government entities, government associations, joint powers authorities, statewide associations, etc.”

1 partnerships, and expects to develop additional partnerships during the three-year cycle subject
2 to potential budget constrains. This proposed portfolio of local government partnerships was
3 developed with extensive consultation with the PRG as directed by the Commission (D.07-10-
4 032 at page 106) and is consistent with the intent of D.07-10-032 and the Policy Manual
5 RuleVI.5.

6 The overarching structure of the local government partnerships is consistent statewide
7 with regards to program offering, eligibility, expectations, and results of the program. In 2006-
8 2008, SoCalGas considered its approach to local governments more as a “pilot” effort, working
9 with only select cities, counties and quasi-governments. For 2009-2011, SoCalGas is taking a
10 broader approach to working with local governments by offering a “portfolio” of program
11 elements. These elements range from basic support activities for local governments who are not
12 yet capable of supporting a fully-developed partnership effort, to those that are. In fact, a key
13 component of the LGP proposal is an effort at both the local and statewide levels to help develop
14 local governments along this continuum. This was loosely described as a “tiered” approach
15 during the planning process. While the details or extent of programs may vary among the
16 utilities, each IOU offers programs to local governments at different points along the energy
17 efficiency learning curve. Each IOU has programs available for all cities, counties and quasi-
18 governments in their territory to assist local governments in participating in energy efficiency.
19 Each IOU has a Partnership program that provides resources to Partners (selected via a consistent
20 process with identical selection criteria) to provide assistance in marketing utility programs, to
21 deliver products and services and to achieve saving savings and other goals.

22 D.07-10-032 OP 13 requires that the IOUs explain efforts undertaken to expand the LGP
23 effort for the 2009-2011 program cycle. In addition to providing expanded offerings to local

1 governments, which as noted above are intended to ensure all local governments have access to
2 more tailored EE services, SoCalGas advertised the “call for abstract” (“CFA”) process
3 (described below in Section b below) to as many local government entities as possible. This
4 included sending the CFA to every city and county in its service territory, as well as known
5 quasi-government groups.

6 The proposed partnerships for 2009-2011 are presented in detail in the attached PIP (see
7 Appendix B). The PIP is a summary of the various Abstracts (response to the CFA) submitted
8 by the prospective partner. At this point in the selection process, all of the selections are
9 preliminary and depend upon successful negotiation of a partnership agreement. The Abstracts
10 will need to be expanded to provide specific details of the partnerships to meet the expectations
11 of the PRG guidance. Consequently, the final PIP for each specific partnership is expected to
12 vary somewhat from what is shown, and SoCalGas plans to submit the final individual local
13 government PIPs to the CPUC based on the final contracts.

14 **2. Criteria and Process**

15 D.07-10-032 directed the PRG to oversee the development of the selection criteria and
16 the subsequent selection of LGPs for the IOUs.¹² This section describes the process of creating
17 the selection criteria, the process created for selecting LGPs, and the role of the PRG in each
18 process. The Guidance Document (note sure what the correct reference is for Appendix A)
19 further requires the IOUs Applications to describe the criteria and process used in developing
20 LGPs, the recommendations received from the PRGs and how the utilities responded to these
21 recommendations in the selection process.

¹² D.07-10-032, page 106 and OP 30.

1 a. Criteria Development

2 The process for selecting Partners was developed jointly by the IOUs with PRG input to
3 be consistent statewide. This involved an agreed-upon process to develop selection criteria,
4 where several meetings were held with local governments for their input, and included much
5 back-and-forth with the PRG. Although this process for selection was relatively structured, the
6 process was not a competitive solicitation process (like the third party solicitations).

7 Based on suggestions from the workshops held in late January, the IOUs drafted selection
8 criteria, which were reviewed by the PRG during a meeting in February. The IOUs revised the
9 criteria based on this input, and shared a final draft with the PRG on February 22, 2008.

10 The IOUs implemented the following recommendations of the PRG:

- 11 10. Define a Quasi Government Partnership as “non-profit that works directly with
12 government entities, government associations, joint powers authorities, statewide
13 associations, etc.).”
- 14 11. To be eligible for a partnership, all applicants must meet the definition of a partnership,
15 which is Governments, Government Associations, and Quasi-Government groups (a non-
16 profit organization that works directly with government entities, government
17 associations, joint powers authorities, statewide associations, etc.).
- 18 12. Add a criterion to evaluate the degree to which the submitted abstracts demonstrate
19 “Innovation and Reflects Strategic Planning.”
- 20 13. Clarify the Criteria definitions and sub-criteria descriptions (e.g. define “Skill and
21 Experience” Criteria to include experience with “related projects”).

1 14. Weight the criteria in a manner similar to the Third Party selection process, including
2 increasing the weighting for “Innovation and Reflects Strategic Plan” and decreasing the
3 weighting for “Feasibility.”

4 15. Send the draft Criteria to existing Partners for feedback.

5 The IOUs believe the final criteria, weighting and scoring process was mutually agreed
6 by the IOUs and the PRG. The IOUs and PRG supplemented the criteria with a jointly
7 developed definition of Partnership eligibility: New partnerships will be with government or
8 quasi-government (non-profit that works directly with government entities, government
9 associations, joint powers authorities, statewide associations, etc.) only. The final list of criteria
10 included:

- 11 • Cost Efficiency
- 12 • Skill and Experience
- 13 • Demonstrated Commitment
- 14 • Municipal Facility Buildings
- 15 • Feasibility
- 16 • Integrated Approach
- 17 • Comprehensiveness
- 18 • Innovation and Reflects Strategic Plan

19 *b. Selection Process*

20 The process for selecting potential LGPs was based on the desire to make it as easy as
21 possible for all interested parties to submit proposals, recognizing the need to be fair and
22 consistent to all parties. After the criteria were finalized, the IOUs and the PRG agreed to issue a

1 Call for Abstracts (“CFA”), whereby a schedule and scoring criteria were communicated to
2 potential parties. The CFA included the following input from the PRG:

3 16. Require existing Partners to comply with CFA Criteria.

4 17. Require private sector firms and others who do not fit the definition of partner to change
5 the proposed structure.

6 18. Edit the CFA language and format (e.g. length of Partners Abstracts and further clarity to
7 Criteria definitions).

8 19. Score existing partners on the selection criteria.

9 20. Require both existing partners and potential new partners to submit abstracts that reflect
10 the selection criteria and the guidelines in the call for abstracts.

11 21. Send a pre-announcement to local governments and agencies alerting them to the
12 selection process and the upcoming CFA.

13 22. Send all abstracts submitted by prospective local government partners to the PRG for
14 review.

15 Once parties submitted their proposals, SoCalGas reviewed and scored each proposal
16 using a 4 person team. SoCalGas submitted a summary sheet of the abstracts, together with
17 copies of all submitted Abstracts) to the PRG on March 19,2008. SoCalGas participated in a
18 meeting with the PRG on March 27, 2008 to review the Abstracts, discuss evaluation scores, and
19 receive input on which direction to steer the partnerships as they developed specific program
20 implementation plans for the three-year cycle.

1 c. Review by PRG

2 This section describes the role of the PRG in the review process for selecting the initial
3 LGPs for the IOUs (in addition to what's noted above). The IOUs worked closely with the PRG
4 throughout the Partnership development and selection process. Regarding the selection of
5 Partners for the 2009-2011 period, the PRG made, and SoCalGas implemented, the following
6 recommendations:

- 7 • Identify in the May 15 filing partnerships selected for 2009-2011 and include a fund for
8 additional partnerships, including new partnerships to be developed over the course of the
9 program cycle and for current applicants whose proposals need additional work and focus
10 to develop a successful partnership.
- 11 • Ask partners to provide a future work plan regarding municipal buildings to supplement
12 the information that most provided in the abstract regarding past work on municipal
13 buildings.

14 d. Energy Efficiency Policy Manual

15 This section describes how the process of LGP selection and development meets the
16 requirements regarding LGPs as contained in the EE Policy Manual. Policy Rule VI.5 refers to
17 the role of the partner in program design, development planning and implementation. SoCalGas
18 believes that the abstract solicitation process described above follows the intent of Policy Rule
19 VI.5, and plans to ensure further compliance with this Item as contracts are negotiated and the
20 programs are implemented. Policy rule VI.6 refers to standard contract language. The 2009-2011
21 contract “templates” will be substantially similar to 2006-2008 templates that were developed to
22 meet policy requirements that address the rights and responsibilities of the partners, program
23 flexibility, information sharing, intellectual property ownership, reimbursement turn-around, and
24 dispute resolution. Modifications may be made to reflect the individuality of the different

1 partnerships, and to clarify existing language.

2 **VIII. Summary of Energy Efficiency Market Transformation Strategies**

3 SoCalGas believes its entire portfolio is designed to contribute to market transformation
4 at various stages in the process. At the earliest stage, our Emerging Technology program helps
5 to incubate new technologies that have are either just emerging from R&D development to
6 commercialization or products that have not been successfully commercialized due to poor
7 marketing support and/or lack of credible energy savings tests. The Emerging Technology
8 organization has an ongoing effort to identify these products, analyze the missing value
9 proposition and project manage appropriate pilot tests to confirm or refute their value.
10 Successful products are immediately presented to the impacted segment manager for
11 incorporation into our program portfolio. Shower Start is a good, recent example of this
12 transition where this product was tested in late 2007 and early 2008 and is now being included in
13 our residential programs.

14 The program management staff then shepherds the product through the
15 commercialization process with the ultimate goal of handing off to Codes and Standards. The
16 commercialization process involves analyzing the target market for the product and evaluating
17 the optimal price and promotion options to increase market penetration. The options, depending
18 on the type of product, include adding it as a measure in the Single Family Energy Efficiency
19 program or the Non-residential Standard Energy Efficiency program and promoting it through
20 retailers and other mass market outreach efforts such as through our Local Government
21 Partnerships, or including it in the non-residential Custom Energy Efficiency program and
22 marketing it through Account Executives and vendors/contractors that serve that segment, or
23 including it in our Residential/ Nonresidential New Construction programs and marketing it

1 directly to architects and builders. Alternatively, the product may warrant a specialized program
2 to target a niche market which may warrant a contract with a third party to directly market the
3 product as a stand-alone measure to a specific sub-segment of our customer base. A good
4 example of a product moving through this process is tankless water heaters which have been
5 included in our incentive programs for the past program cycle and are gradually increasing
6 market acceptance to where they are beginning to be considered for inclusion in new
7 construction standards by some progressive cities.

8 Ultimately, a successful product will achieve increasing market acceptance, lower costs
9 through mass production, verified reliability through market testing and then be ready for
10 consideration as a code or standard. Our Codes and Standards organization is charges with
11 taking these mature products and, if appropriate for inclusion in a building or appliance code,
12 completing case studies appropriate for use in a code or standard proceeding (i.e. Title 24 or Title
13 20). These case studies are used in the regulatory proceedings to provide evidence that the
14 product is ready for code because of its demonstrated cost effectiveness, reliability and
15 acceptance in the marketplace.

16 It is clear to SoCalGas that identifying a specific component of our program portfolio as a
17 “market transformation” strategy, fails to recognize the breadth of the continuum of effort
18 necessary to achieve true market transformation. Our goal for all of our programs is to
19 continually feed the pipeline of energy efficiency products to our customers, move products
20 through market acceptance and into codes where 100% of the savings opportunities can be
21 achieved. We believe our proposed portfolio is well designed to achieve that goal.

22 **IX. On-Bill Financing and Other Financing Opportunities**

23 The CEESP cites leveraging various financing opportunities in order to stimulate and

1 expand investments in energy efficiency.¹³ SoCalGas has been promoting financing options to
2 its residential multi-family and selected commercial customer groups (including local
3 governments) through its 2006-2008 On-Bill Financing (“OBF”) program. This program has
4 been successfully implemented in 2006-2008, and with the experience gained as well as the
5 information provided by study results of other successful OBF programs, SoCalGas has made
6 modifications to improve program design and encourage more participation in its OBF program;
7 these changes occurred in 2006, 2008, and 2009 through Advice Letter Filings and PAG
8 Notification Process. For the next program cycle, SoCalGas is only proposing changes to the
9 funding mechanism for the loan pool. Additionally, SoCalGas is exploring other financing
10 opportunities including potentially partnering with financial institutions to increase financial
11 assistance to customers, especially hard-to-reach customers.

12 **A. PY 2006-2008 OBF Program**

13 SoCalGas proposed a robust OBF pilot effort for the 2006-2008 program cycle, which
14 was approved by the Commission in D.05-09-043. The OBF pilot was originally envisioned to
15 be implemented in two phases: Phase I was intended to be a two-year effort covering the initial
16 development of the program, including making changes to the billing systems, creating
17 marketing materials and efforts, and rolling out the program. Phase II was envisioned as a
18 proposal for the “next generation” of OBF that would be based on the learning experience of
19 Phase I.¹⁴ Due to unforeseen issues that occurred during the development and “beta” testing
20 periods, SoCalGas requested and received approval for an extension of Phase I until the end of

¹³ California Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan, June 2, 2008, page 3-8.

¹⁴ Spasaro Testimony, A.05-06-011, page 6.

1 2008.¹⁵ Additionally, that extension deferred the Phase II “proposal” to be included as part of
2 the 2009-2011 program filing. During Phase I, as SoCalGas gained experience and received
3 market feedback, it filed for and received authorization to increase OBF Tariff, Rule No. 40, to
4 increase the loan cap, update credit requirements, and expand project eligibility¹⁶. In D.07-10-
5 032, the Commission directed the California IOUs to propose On-Bill Financing programs for
6 institutional customers¹⁷ for the 2009-2011 cycle¹⁸. Accordingly, in May 2008, SoCalGas
7 moved forward with an expanded offering for institutional customers by launching a “pilot
8 institutional program” with a longer payback period and higher loan ceiling. Additionally, in
9 December 2008, SoCalGas requested and was granted approval to further broaden customer
10 participation¹⁹. At end of 2008, SoCalGas proposed its “next generation” OBF program in a
11 PAG Notification Letter and implemented it in January 2009.

12 At this point in its evolution, SoCalGas believes it is offering an extremely robust
13 program, and we are not considering any additional changes to the program. The “next
14 generation loan pool”, however, is being proposed in this Application (contained herein).

15 **B. 2006-2008 Program Summary and Results**

16 The OBF program Phase I included using a manual system and fine-tuning of the
17 program’s operational requirements. The automated billing process was developed concurrently.
18 SoCalGas met this program’s milestones. Most notably, the automated billing system was
19 operational in September 2007. This success was due to the commitment of several internal

¹⁵ Advice Letter 3753, effective 7/13/2007.

¹⁶ Advice Letter 3673, effective 11/30/2006

¹⁷ Tax-payer funded government institutions such as cities, counties, etc

¹⁸ D. 07-10-032, Page 92

¹⁹ Advice Letter 3936, effective 1/16/2009.

1 SoCalGas departments, Billing, IT, Accounting, Customer Services, Technical Services, and
2 Customer Programs to provide a fully functional OBF process and system.

3 Account Executives have been the primary channel for customer participation and
4 coordinating measure installation. The Account Executives and customers provided feedback on
5 program requirements which SoCalGas used to continually streamline the procedures to increase
6 both customer satisfaction and participation. Key accomplishments of OBF include:

- 7 • Completion of billing system to allow for monthly billing of loan charges
- 8 • Internal policies and procedures completed
- 9 • Successful On Bill Financing collaboration with Express Efficiency and Business Energy
10 Efficiency programs
- 11 • 100% Inspection pass rate
- 12 • No loan defaults to date
- 13 • Successfully installed, financed and billed six gas-only projects
- 14 • Program Participation Statistics:
 - 15 • 9 projects in financing process
 - 16 • \$307,500 – Installed and completed
 - 17 • 25% commercial customers
 - 18 • 37.5% agricultural customers
 - 19 • 37.5% industrial customers

20 **C. Lessons Learned From the Implementation Phase**

21 The 2006-2008 program cycle provided SoCalGas with the following key lessons:

- 22 • Customers who are aware of and qualify for On Bill Financing have been very eager to
23 take advantage of the interest free financing to help with their capital constraints.

- 1 • On-Bill Financing requires on-going collaboration with internal departments including:
2 IT, Billing, Accounting, Technical Services, Incentive and Rebate programs as well as
3 Customer Services.
- 4 • SoCalGas' gas-only OBF program faces special challenges, for instances, most projects
5 have very long lead time, often takes months, sometimes more than a year, for a project
6 from planning to installation.
- 7 • Most gas-only applications have very long payback periods based on energy savings.
8 This limits access to gas-only OBF to only the most cost effective gas projects such as
9 heat exchange project, industrial process improvement projects, retro-commissioning
10 projects, or greenhouse curtain projects.
- 11 • There is a lack of a lighting equivalent measure for gas projects in terms of qualifying
12 payback periods for OBF, therefore SoCalGas' gas-only OBF has not been able to attract
13 many contractors/vendors to participate in OBF. However, those vendors whose cost
14 effective gas equipment can meet the payback period requirement have shown
15 enthusiasm in utilizing OBF to help encourage their customers to undertake energy
16 efficiency upgrades.
- 17 • Coordination with Local Government Partnerships is key to driving energy efficient
18 upgrades within institutional customer sites.²⁰

19 **D. Investigation of Other Financing Strategies**

20 SoCalGas investigated other program strategies statewide and energy efficiency
21 financing programs in the New England area. While program offerings and concepts are
22 relatively consistent, eligible customers, loan funding sources and processes vary somewhat
23 across programs. Key successful strategies include:

- 24 • Interest-free or low interest loans

²⁰ SoCalGas recently expanded project eligibility for institutional customers during 2006-2008 program cycle to help ease financial and time constraints that frequently delay equipment installation.

- 1 • Managing default for ratepayers by:
- 2 • Performing credit checks (or payments history with utility)
- 3 • Allowing only low-risk customers to qualify (municipalities, etc.)
- 4 • Aiming for bill-neutrality
- 5 • Non-transferable loans
- 6 • Reducing administrative burden by maintaining a loan minimum

7 **E. Modifications to 2006-2008 Program**

8 OBF provides interest-free, unsecured, on-the-utility-bill financing for purchase and
9 installation of qualified energy efficiency measures offered through various energy efficiency
10 programs offered by the Utility. The 2006-2008 OBF program as approved in Decision 05-09-
11 043 contained the following guidelines:

- 12 • 10% reduction (capped at \$500) of rebate/incentive;
- 13 • Loan amount: \$5,000 to \$25,000 per meter;
- 14 • Maximum loan term is five years for government segment and three years for business
15 and multifamily segments
- 16 • Up to \$5 million of loan funds from utility working cash available during 2006—2008;

17 In 2006, SoCalGas made the following program requirement changes via Advice Letter
18 3673 and PAG approval:

- 19 • Loan amount: \$5,000 to \$50,000 per meter;
- 20 • Maximum loan term is five years for all market segments

21 In 2008, SoCalGas proposed and received approval through the PAG Notification
22 Process to implement a pilot institutional program with the following specific changes to the
23 2006-2008 program guidelines:

- 1 • Maximum Project Payback and loan terms: 10 years or useful measure life (whichever is
- 2 shorter)
- 3 • Maximum Loans Amount - 100,000 per meter

4 In January 2009, with approval from PAG, SoCalGas implemented its 2009 OBF
5 program with the following specific changes to the 2006-2008 OBF program requirements:²¹

6 (1) Eliminate the requirement of reduced rebate/incentive.

7 (2) Raise the loan cap from \$50,000 to \$100,000 per meter for non-institutional
8 customers/multifamily customers and from \$100,000 to \$250,000 per meter for taxpayer-funded
9 institutional customers.

10 **F. Proposed OBF Loan Pool**

11 SoCalGas proposes to create a new two-way balancing account for the loan pool, funded
12 at \$3.5 million from a refundable non-Public Purpose Program funds. For the 2006-2008
13 program cycle and the 2009 bridge funding period, the loan pool funding was borrowed from
14 SoCalGas' working cash as a way to jump-start the program. Now that SoCalGas has a better
15 sense of the loan funds needed to support the program, SoCalGas proposes to establish a
16 ratepayer-funded loan pool to meet the anticipated demands during 2009-2011 program cycle.
17 Once established, this loan pool is expected to be sustainable, as the loan repayments will be
18 recycled to fund additional loans (i.e., a "revolving" fund). Also, at the beginning of the next
19 program cycle, as part of the efforts to transition OBF loan pool from utility working cash to
20 ratepayer funding, SoCalGas intends to transfer the remaining loan balances of existing loans to

²¹ To support these program changes, SoCalGas filed Advice Letter 3936 to revise Rule No. 40 On-Bill Financing Program to remove all references to rebates/incentives to allow energy efficiency programs which do not offer rebate/incentives such as Emerging Technology Program to work with OBF as well as remove the restriction that OBF only serves core customers. This Advice Letter was approved with an effective date of January 16, 2009.

1 the newly created ratepayer-funded loan pool. SoCalGas requests \$3.5 million for this loan pool:
2 approximately \$500,000 to account for transition from utility working cash to ratepayer funding
3 at beginning of 2009-2011 program cycle and \$1 million each year over the three years from
4 2009 to 2011. No cap is proposed for this loan pool as SoCalGas believes that OBF is
5 contributing to a cost effective portfolio by providing positive support to energy efficiency
6 rebate/incentive programs and should be allowed to grow as needed. This will create a
7 sustainable loan pool with non-Public Purpose Program ratepayer funds. Since the loans are
8 intended to be paid back (minus defaults), the loan pool should not be a “cost” to the EE
9 programs. Loan defaults, on the other hand, are costs to the program and will be charged to PPP
10 funds with corresponding credits to the loan pool through accounting entries as they occur.

11 To track the loan pool funding, SoCalGas proposes to establish the On-Bill
12 Financing Balancing Account (“OBFBA”). The OBFBA is an interest bearing, two-way
13 balancing account, which will track the difference between ratepayer funding and actual loans
14 provided to customers participating in SoCalGas’ OBF program. The two-way balancing
15 account will afford SoCalGas the flexibility it needs to ensure the loan program will adhere to
16 the requirements of its commercial lender's license exemption. If approved, SoCalGas would file
17 a Compliance Advice Letter within 90 days of the effective date of the decision on this program
18 to establish the OBFBA. Cost of loan defaults will be charged to Demand Side Management
19 Balancing Account. The authorized funding will be collected through gas transportation rates
20 and allocated to customers based on Equal Percent of Base Revenue (“EPBR”). The balance in
21 the OBFBA will be amortized as necessary to recover any under collections associated with
22 actual loan funding above the authorized annual funding requirements embedded in rates in
23 connection with SoCalGas’ annual regulatory account balance update filing for gas

1 transportation rates effective January 1 of the following year . After repayment of all loans and
2 termination of the On-Bill Financing program, the disposition of the over collection balance in
3 the OBFBA will be refunded to ratepayers in connection with SoCalGas' annual regulatory
4 account balance update filing or address the balance in the SoCalGas ' next energy efficiency
5 proceeding.

6 **G. Residential Financing Opportunities**

7 D.07-10-032 Conclusion of Law 25 states, "...The Utilities should ... to assess the
8 opportunities for on-bill financing program for residential customers." First, it is important to
9 note that SoCalGas does offer OBF to certain multi-family ("MF") residential customers (i.e.,
10 MF owners who do not reside on premise). While this is certainly a limited portion of the
11 residential market, SoCalGas was hoping this would allow it to preliminarily gauge residential
12 demand for OBF.²² So far, no inroads have been made into this market segment. Nonetheless,
13 SoCalGas will continue to offer OBF to this customer segment, and include the multifamily
14 market segment in its continuing investigation of residential financing programs.

15 Second, consumer/residential financing has more involved lending laws than commercial,
16 which appear to be an administrative burden to comply with, including: lending law timelines,
17 Fair Credit Reporting Act, loan statement format requirements versus utility bill design, Truth in
18 Lending Act, Fair Debt Collection Act, Safeguards Rule, and loan repayment terms. The
19 extensive reporting, disclosure, and compliance requirements associated with consumer debt
20 potentially increases program administration costs.

21 Third, offering OBF more broadly to the residential market raises certain issues.
22 Residential energy efficiency project payback periods tend to be very long and not likely to meet

²² Spasaro testimony, A. 05-06-011, page 10.

1 the project payback limit required for OBF loans. Increasing the payback period requirement to
2 allow more projects to qualify could result in risky loans, as the risk of defaults increases with
3 longer loan terms. Another potential issue for residential markets is the non-transferability of
4 OBF loans. This is another program requirement intended to reduce defaults, and minimize
5 administration costs, as the utility has no credit or payment information on the new owner of the
6 financed equipment. In addition, the alternative of requiring the loan to be paid in full upon
7 moving could very well counteract the benefit of the “no upfront capital cost” and make the
8 program less appealing to residential customers. Furthermore, it could even increase default
9 rates, especially in a down real estate market where many people are forced to move due to
10 inability to meet mortgage obligations. SoCalGas believes that controlling defaults is especially
11 important in the residential markets based on results of other utility residential financing
12 programs, some with default rates up to 20%.

13 While SoCalGas is subject to the commercial versions of those laws, they appear to be
14 less onerous than the consumer lending laws. The Department of Corporations in its Release 60-
15 FS (“Release”), issued on 7/14/2006, determined that the investor-owned utilities are not
16 “engaged in the business” of a finance lender or broker under Financial Code §22100 of the
17 California Finance Lenders Law (“CFLL”) when making commercial loans under the conditions
18 described in the Release.²³ Therefore, the IOUs are not required to obtain a finance lender or
19 broker license under the CFLL when engaged in these financing activities “for energy efficiency
20 purposes.” Without this commercial lender license exemption from the Department of
21 Corporation, SoCalGas may have been subject to a potentially large annual license fee (and a

²³ The Release sets specific limitations to lenders, borrowers, and loans with respect to financing programs offered by the public utilities. As stated on page 2 of the Release, the exemption is specific to commercial, non-residential customers including governmental agencies and owners of residential multi-family units who do not live on the premises and that loans are not to be used for personal, family or household purposes.

1 bond). The Release specifically noted that it did not apply to consumer lending.

2 The above considerations are related to SoCalGas' opportunities to being a financial
3 lender for the residential segment. However, SoCalGas promotes other types of financing for
4 residential customers. SoCalGas is one of the major sponsors of "The Energy Loan", a Fannie
5 Mae special product developed to provide homeowners with an unsecured finance option for
6 specified energy efficient home improvements. This program is administered by Viewtech, an
7 experienced lender with utility-sponsored programs in the nation and has been instrumental in
8 the development of contractor quality control standards and processes; developing unique and
9 proprietary quality control techniques specific for service-conscious utilities. Additional
10 information on this program can be found at <http://www.energyloans.org/main.htm>.

11 SoCalGas will continue to include multifamily housing in its OBF offering and will
12 continue to investigate financing programs for residential markets. Two main options are being
13 considered and evaluated:

- 14 • AB811: This legislation would allow cities to use the property tax bill and "assessment
15 districts" to create a way for property owners to finance qualifying energy efficiency and
16 photovoltaic equipment (via the California Solar Initiative program). SoCalGas strongly
17 supports and supports AB811 as a way to more broadly finance energy efficiency
18 equipment..
- 19 • Partnering with a bank/ financial institution: SoCalGas is researching the possibility of
20 partnering with banks or other funding institutions to offer energy efficiency financing to
21 residential customers. Partners may help minimize utility risk and lower transaction costs
22 while offering financing options to customers and projects outside SoCalGas' current
23 commercial lender license exemption from the Department of Corporations.

1 **H. Additional Financing Options**

2 **1. CEC’s Energy Efficiency Financing Program**

3 In additional to SoCalGas’ activities above, SoCalGas will also work with customers to
4 take advantage of the CEC’s Energy Efficiency Financing program which provides financing for
5 schools, hospitals and local governments through low-interest loans for feasibility studies and the
6 installation of energy-saving measures.

7 **2. Issuing “Energy Efficiency” Bonds**

8 As noted above, AB811 allows cities to use the property tax bill to create a way for
9 property owners to finance qualifying energy efficiency and photovoltaic equipment (via the
10 California Solar Initiative program). AB811 was initiated by the City of Palm Desert as a way to
11 help achieve the ambitious energy savings goals of the Palm Desert Demonstration Partnership
12 program (with Southern California Gas Company and Southern California Edison). SoCalGas
13 strongly supports AB811 as a way to more broadly finance energy efficiency equipment, and
14 plans to promote it with other cities. To implement AB811, cities would offer bonds though
15 “assessment districts” (the source of the loan funds), and then offer their constituents low-interest
16 loans that could be paid back on their property tax bills. The key target market would be
17 residential property owners. While these bonds/loans would be available to solar PV equipment,
18 it would be SoCalGas’ intent to focus on energy efficiency measures in support of SoCalGas’
19 goals.

20 **3. Partnering with Financial Institutions**

21 SoCalGas is very supportive of partnering with financial institutions to provide energy
22 efficiency loans to customers in an efficient and effective manner to supplement the on-bill
23 financing option. In particular, SoCalGas recognizes that financial institutions have the loan

1 program expertise (credit scoring, etc.) to be a significant player in helping to facilitate upfront
2 equipment costs. SoCalGas sees this partnership arrangement as the future to providing
3 customer solutions to high upfront cost energy efficiency investments. With the current troubles
4 in the banking community regarding the subprime and housing crisis, SoCalGas intends to move
5 prudently and in more of a pilot-niche market approach to these partnerships, and promotes on-
6 bill-financing as its primary vehicle for financial solutions until a more stable and robust
7 financial market returns.

8 In this regard, SoCalGas is working with SDG&E to pursue conversations with local,
9 minority owned banks that market to small businesses in low income areas. The discussions
10 have explored potentially partnering to offer Energy Efficiency (Green) Loans and also
11 Renewable Loans to small commercial businesses. The goal is to provide greater dollars
12 available for investment in Green Loans and support the CEESP statement (at page 3-8), to
13 identify existing needed tools, instruments and information necessary to attract greater
14 participation of capital markets in funding efficiency transactions. Also, specifically noted was
15 the goal of providing financing alternatives for hard to reach customers in addition to utility's
16 on-bill financing option.

17 **4. Green Energy Systems**

18 SoCalGas has in some instances encountered new and existing customers who are
19 presented with the opportunity to maximize the energy savings on a major energy systems
20 project they are planning (*e.g.* chiller system, boiler, co-generation), but for reasons such as
21 scarce capital or perceived risk elect not to make the investment in the highest efficiency option.
22 This results in a lost opportunity for energy savings for the 20 to 30-year life of the equipment.
23 In order to avoid this lost opportunity, SoCalGas proposes the development of a "Green Energy

1 Systems” (“GES”) program, pursuant to which they would have the ability to own or finance
2 these large energy systems. Utility-owned or financed projects would be required to maximize
3 the use of cost effective equipment. The customer would then pay, in concept, a surcharge that is
4 lower than the incremental energy savings they are experiencing and would thus have a positive
5 cash flow.

6 Under GES, SoCalGas will seek to identify projects with the following characteristics:

- 7 • The project is of sufficient size to warrant the effort (>\$2,000,000 investment)
- 8 • The building is intended to be owner occupied or owner managed
- 9 • The HVAC system is a central plant configuration

10 If an appropriate project is identified and the owner is willing to enter into a contractual
11 agreement with SoCalGas to own and operate the building’s HVAC central plant, SoCalGas will
12 file an advice letter or other CPUC required filing for approval of incremental capital and
13 maintenance costs for the project and will demonstrate that the project meets the following
14 criteria:

- 15 • The project is cost effective as a stand alone energy efficiency project and delivers
16 incremental energy savings beyond what the building owner would otherwise have
17 installed
- 18 • The capital requirement is between \$2,000,000 and \$20,000,000
- 19 • The savings associated with the project will count toward determination of SoCalGas’
20 Minimum Performance Standard but would not count toward determination of its
21 Performance Earnings Basis

22 If approved, SoCalGas will sub-contract out the design, construction and operation of the
23 facility but will serve as its project manager to ensure that it is constructed and operated at the
24 design efficiency levels.

1 **X. Coordination of Program Delivery and Marketing/Outreach and Integrated with**
2 **Other Demand-Side Management Programs**

3 On March 7, 2008 the Energy Division conducted a workshop to explore IDSM ideas and
4 to address potential issues/challenges of integrating various demand-side management programs
5 so that they collectively produce greater results. Subsequently the *Joint Assigned*
6 *Commissioners' Ruling Providing Guidance on Integrated Demand-Side Management in 2009-*
7 *2001 Portfolio Applications* ("Joint ACR") was issued in April 11, 2008. The Ruling provides
8 guidance to the utilities regarding integrated demand-side management ("IDSM"), Marketing,
9 Education & Outreach ("ME&O"), Zero Net Energy ("ZNE") and other IDSM pilot projects and
10 operational improvements. Additionally, on April 21, 2008 Assigned Commissioner's Ruling
11 Requesting Comments on Proposed Energy Efficiency Measure for the California Solar Initiative
12 program, was issued to further the discussion how best to integrate/coordinate energy efficiency
13 efforts with CSI.

14 This section of the testimony presents SoCalGas' current and proposed integration
15 activities across various program portfolios in different Commission proceedings, Energy
16 Efficiency ("EE"), Low Income Energy Efficiency ("LIEE"), Demand Response ("DR"),
17 Advanced Metering Infrastructure ("AMI") Distributed Generation ("DG"), and California Solar
18 Initiatives ("CSI"). SoCalGas submitted its 2009-2011 LIEE application (A.08-05-025) on May
19 15, 2008. SoCalGas notes that it is not the program administrator of the electric EE, DR, DG
20 and CSI program portfolios and they are currently assigned to SCE for most of our service
21 territory and with PG&E and SDG&E in smaller portions of our service territory. Although,
22 these various proceedings are currently independent of each other, the CEESP provides vision
23 and strategy to leverage these various program efforts to ensure the realization of the aggressive

1 BBEES laid out by the Commission in D.07-10-032.

2 This section can be considered a “stand alone” chapter as required by the April 11 Joint
3 ACR. This comprehensive presentation of SoCalGas’ IDSM efforts across the different
4 proceedings is being presented for the first time in this EE application as the EE application is
5 the last application to be submitted to the Commission.²⁴ This was to ensure that all EE activities
6 and programs addressing IDSM were fully vetted and developed prior to it being submitted in
7 other proceedings.²⁵ In the following sections, SoCalGas addresses various aspects of its IDSM
8 efforts in the order of priorities laid out by the April 11 Joint ACR.

9 **A. Comprehensive and Coordinated Marketing, Packaging and Delivery**
10 **(Coordination)**

11 This section discusses the various integrated outreach and education of customers that
12 optimizes utility engagement with customers.

13 **1. Customer Programs Organization**

14 Currently, SoCalGas’ Customer Programs organization is responsible for its Energy
15 Efficiency Programs. The department was reorganized in 2006 such that these programs reside
16 respectively by sector with a Residential segment supervisor, a Commercial segment supervisor,
17 an Industrial segment supervisor and a New Construction segment manager. Moving forward
18 into 2009, SoCalGas is enhancing its comprehensiveness by restructuring how it designs and
19 manages its program. In the past its programs were managed across the residential and non-
20 residential markets uniformly. Beginning in 2009, the program managers will be responsible for

²⁴ The May 5th ACR and June 2nd ACR reset the due dates for the 2009-2011 EE application from May 15 to June 2 and finally to July 21.

²⁵ On July 1, 2008, SoCalGas submitted “Response of Southern California Gas Company to Assigned Commissioner’s Ruling Ordering Large Investor-Owned Utilities to Comply with Prior Commission/Commissioner Directives” in which SoCalGas discusses various LIEE integration efforts with EE .

1 segments rather than specific programs. The goal is to be even more knowledgeable about the
2 needs of customer segments (residential owners and renters; non-residential manufacturing,
3 agricultural, hospitality, foodservice, institutional, etc) and increase market penetration through
4 segment specific marketing and outreach. This additional step of segmentation enhances the
5 company’s ability to design program and communications materials geared towards managing
6 the customer’s energy needs in a comprehensive manner rather than the traditional piecemeal of
7 offering independent programs. This approach will encourage segment program managers to
8 first understand a customer’s energy needs and offer assistance consistent with the loading order
9 of the Energy Action Plan. Employees will receive proper training and have opportunities to
10 improve their jobs skills to effectively manage the market segments assigned to them.

11 **2. Marketing, Education and Outreach (“ME&O”)**

12 *a. SoCalGas-specific ME&O Communication Strategies*

13 SoCalGas’ messaging strategy will coordinate, where appropriate, with SCE to present
14 IDSM as the complete energy management solution that can help customers save energy, as well
15 as manage their energy costs. This effort is intended to improve customers understanding of
16 “energy management” as a whole in regards to how EE/LIEE, DR and CSI can work together.

17 Some of SoCalGas’ specific communications strategies:

- 18 • For general awareness communications, “un-brand” programs and instead focus
19 messaging on program benefits (e.g., SoCalGas is simplifying its nonresidential programs
20 to move away from traditional program names such as Express Efficiency but work
21 closely with customers to identify incentive opportunities.) This ultimately leads to better
22 customer segmentation, personalized communication and messaging that is relevant
- 23 • For program-specific promotions, “match” programs together in terms of appropriateness
24 for the customer and focus on benefits (e.g., Low-income energy efficiency customer

1 programs, segmentation of commercial customers and targeting residential customers
2 using other segmentation tools such as Prism codes).

- 3 • Where appropriate, SoCalGas will coordinate with SCE to provide project solutions that
4 are bundled to aggressively include EE, LIEE, DR and CSI opportunities. This will focus
5 communications on customer benefits and industry segment needs; not programs.
6 SoCalGas will provide energy management “packaged” solutions for each industry
7 segment. Example: “Get the complete Energy Management Solution tailored for your
8 business.
- 9 • SoCalGas will begin using the “Go Green. Save Green” theme that has proven successful
10 at SDG&E. This will include all communications to reinforce how taking advantage of
11 these programs can help them achieve their “green” goals (GHG emissions reductions,
12 conservation, approval of their customers, and other benefits) while also saving money in
13 the long run.
- 14 • Expand EE and LIEE in-home education to residential customers that will include
15 information on GHG reductions.
- 16 • New Construction programs will work cooperatively with SCE and continue to work with
17 various industry participants to encourage comprehensive solutions in new homes and
18 buildings that incorporate not only EE measures, but also DR technologies
19 (programmable smart thermostats, Auto DR) and CSI opportunities. This approach is
20 essential to meeting the Commission’s BBEEES towards net zero energy new construction
21 homes and building.
- 22 • Local Government Partnerships LGPs provide opportunities to communicate the IDSM
23 message not only to their own organization but to their peers and their constituency
24 through communication avenues unique to them.
- 25 • EE Third Party programs also present opportunities to provide IDSM messaging and
26 customer education materials to general residential customers, LIEE customers and
27 nonresidential customers. Third Party program providers are encouraged to co-brand and
28 co-market with SoCalGas and other Third Party providers where multiple program
29 opportunities exist.

1 b. Statewide ME&O

- 2 • EE statewide ME&O is primarily implemented through Flex Your Power with additional
3 ME&O efforts for hard-to-reach customers. On the other hand, DR statewide ME&O is
4 implemented through Flex Your Power Now!. These two programs are complimentary
5 since it provides a common platform that allows customers to associate “Flex Your
6 Power” with managing energy through energy efficiency incentive programs,
7 conservation messages and during critical peak times.
- 8 • As part of CEESP, the Commission intends to develop a statewide brand and web portal
9 that could encompass not only EE but all other aspects of IDSM to have a centralized
10 location for IDSM information. SoCalGas will actively participate in this activity.

11 **3.Customer Relations Management Tool (“CRM”)**

12 CRM is a comprehensive information technology tool that is designed to integrate and
13 optimize the administration of all energy efficiency programs at SoCalGas. Some of the
14 functionality of the system includes rebate and incentive processing, online enrollment,
15 consolidated results tracking and reporting, automated energy savings calculations, customer
16 equipment database, marketing plan development and market segment development. This
17 integrated tool will facilitate the ongoing development and management of integrated DSM
18 programs at SoCalGas.

19 **B. Operational Improvements (Program Delivery Coordination to Enable System**
20 **Integration)**

21 **1. Exemplary Specific Programs That Offer IDSM Audits**

22 The following list of programs that SoCalGas has proposed in its LIEE, DR and EE
23 applications are not meant to be an exhaustive list of programs that offer IDSM.

- 24 • Home Energy Comparison Tool (“HECT”) is an online tool that compares a residential
25 customer’s energy usage to other customers who have similar demographics in their

1 neighborhood and used in conjunction with SoCalGas' Home Energy Efficiency Survey
2 provides EE recommendations for customers to reduce their energy use. Customers
3 without on-line access can avail themselves of this service by calling SoCalGas' call
4 center.

- 5 • Home Energy Efficiency Survey ("HEES") is a comprehensive multi-lingual energy audit
6 tool designed to reach a wide range of residential customers via online, phone or direct
7 mail. The audit results provide customers with suggested EE recommendations to reduce
8 their energy use and energy costs. The survey tool also supports the CSI requirement that
9 homeowners complete an EE audit prior to participating in the CSI program.
- 10 • PEAK Student Energy Actions ("PEAK") program, offered by SoCalGas in partnership
11 with SCE and The Energy Coalition, is a standards-based program focused on DR and
12 EE that educate children about energy usage and management and provides them with
13 tools to "practice" learnings at home. SoCalGas proposed continuing this program in its
14 DR application.
- 15 • SoCalGas has committed to working with SCE to deliver combined EE and DR audits.
16 These audit services could be used to meet CSI audit requirements. SoCalGas will be
17 adding green house gas emission inventory calculators to the audit process in 2009.
- 18 • SoCalGas' Mobile Energy Van (EE) which provides on-site training for large customers
19 and assists customers in identifying their integrated energy management opportunities.

20 **2. IDSM Coordination of Incentive Programs**

- 21 • SoCalGas is working with the SCAQMD to jointly fund a program to promote early
22 replacement of water heaters. The objective of the joint project is to capture energy
23 savings and reduce NOx emissions within the LA basin.
- 24 • SoCalGas requests CPUC approval to include gas fuel renewable projects in its EE
25 programs. We have experienced several opportunities to increase the efficiency of
26 digester gas production facilities that would ultimately reduce the amount of natural gas
27 used at the facility. We have not funded these projects because they may use the digester
28 gas to fuel an existing cogeneration facility. However, by allowing these projects to

1 participate in SoCalGas' EE programs we will achieve energy savings integrated with
2 GHG emission reductions through the use of renewable energy.

- 3 • For the 2009-2011 SoCalGas Energy Efficiency Third Party Contractor programs, both
4 EE and LIEE personnel will collaborate to determine which residential contractor
5 programs could have LIEE integrated into the program. As third party contracts are
6 negotiated in the following months, SoCalGas will discuss with the EE-selected third
7 parties (which will be submitted to the Commission in SoCalGas 2009-2011 EE
8 application on July 21, 2008), the third parties capacity and incremental budget
9 requirements to incorporate LIEE outreach, education and services into their proposed EE
10 program. Additionally, SoCalGas will provide training and education to third party
11 contractors who are not currently participating as LIEE contractors. This will ensure that
12 LIEE customers are either offered or made aware of the portfolio of energy savings
13 programs and services that are available to them and the benefits that can be achieved
14 from program participation, i.e., energy savings, greenhouse gas reduction and other
15 benefits.

16 **C. Optimization (Technology & Systems Integration)**

17 **1. EE/DR Emerging Technologies ("ET")**

18 SoCalGas' and SDG&E's EE and DR Emerging Technologies programs are implemented
19 by the same organization under our Technology Development department. This strategic
20 organizational decision allows SoCalGas to effectively foster technology investment and
21 development that supports both EE and DR in a more integrated fashion. SoCalGas expects that
22 through these efforts the commercialization of strategic EE and DR measures will be expedited
23 so that they become more accessible to customers. This integrated group can significantly
24 contribute to the development of communication standards of various communicating devices
25 that would allow customers to manage their energy remotely such as Home Area Networks and
26 smart appliances.

1 The EE and DR portfolios budgets have identified separate ET budgets.

2 **2. Codes & Standards**

3 SoCalGas and SDG&E have an integrated Codes & Standards organization that
4 participates in both DR and EE proceedings. The organization operates with separate EE and
5 DR budgets but is able is to promote, through CASE studies and active participation in CEC
6 proceedings, the next generation of California Title 24 codes and standards that incorporate
7 integrated systems that provide both EE and DR benefits.

8 **3. SMART METERS**

9 SoCalGas is currently exploring the value of smart meters in its service territory. If smart
10 meters are approved for our service territory, we will develop EE programs to utilize smart meter
11 technology and incorporate them into our portfolio at that time.

12 In the interim, through the Emerging Technologies program, projects are planned to
13 develop technologies that enable customers to tap into their “smart” home while they are away.
14 For example, a smart home equipped with a home area network (“HAN”) will allow customers
15 to remotely connect to, monitor and control many different automated digital devices. For
16 example, a homeowner at work or on vacation can potentially use a cell phone or their computer
17 to switch appliances on or off, arm a home security system, control temperature gauges, control
18 lighting or program a home entertainment system. Alternatively, the monitoring devices could
19 notify the customer when an appliance is no longer operating at peak efficiency and suggest
20 maintenance actions.

21 **D. Statewide Integrated DSM**

22 The California Long Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan (Strategic Plan) encourages

1 programs that integrate the full range of demand-side management (DSM) options: energy
2 efficiency (EE), demand response (DR), and distributed generation (DG) as fundamental to
3 achieving California’s strategic energy goals.

4 The IOUs have identified integrated DSM (IDSM) as an important priority. SoCalGas
5 has included separate exhibits on IDSM as well as specific integration activities within each
6 program implementation plan at the Statewide and local program levels as instructed by the
7 CPUC.

8 In addition to SoCalGas and other IOUs’ individual IDSM activities and pilots, the IOUs
9 are proposing a statewide IDSM effort that will establish a Statewide Integration Task Force
10 (Task Force). Efforts of the Task Force will encompass activities that promote in a statewide-
11 coordinated fashion two specific IDSM strategies identified in the Strategic Plan (e.g.
12 stakeholder coordination (Strategy 1.3) and new technologies (Strategy 1.4)). The IOUs believe
13 that Strategy 1.1—“Carry out integrated marketing of DSM opportunities across all customer
14 classes” should be coordinated with the statewide Marketing, Education and Outreach efforts
15 (see ME&O PIP) and implemented at the local level by the IOUs focused on particular segment
16 and customer-specific strategies. The Task Force will coordinate closely with the Marketing,
17 Education and Outreach statewide team to ensure a consistent approach and the gain knowledge
18 from statewide and local marketing and outreach efforts.

19 **E. Proposed IDSM Pilot— Sustainable Community Case Studies**

20 SoCalGas, together with SDG&E, will be working with a Master Community Developer
21 on a development with a long build out schedule to serve as a test bed for integrating proven and
22 emerging technologies for EE/DR and CSI with the goal of promoting sustainable design and
23 ZNE.

1 The objectives of the pilot are: develop cross-cutting Integrated Program Design; provide
2 comprehensive energy management solutions designed into the development; stimulate Market
3 Transformation in community design and marketing techniques; and leverage upstream energy
4 savings in SoCalGas' infrastructure design, thereby yielding multiple benefits for ratepayers and
5 other stakeholders.

6 **1. Develop cross-cutting Integrated Programs Design:**

- 7 • Performance-based program embraces residential (SFD, SFA and MFA) and non-
8 residential (retail, office, schools) in one program
- 9 • Includes multiple stakeholders incentives (e.g., master developer, builder, end-user, trade
10 and supply chain partners, and public-sector)
- 11 • Integrates horizontal (infrastructure), vertical (green buildings) and people/ratepayers
12 (education, training) needs
- 13 • EE/DR/CSI and transportation integration
- 14 • Anticipated implementation across program-cycles

15 **2. Provide comprehensive energy management**

- 16 • Promote connectivity of “Smart Home” with “Smart Grid”
- 17 • Leverages upstream (infrastructure) and downstream (building) synergies
- 18 • Incorporates integrated horizontal (land use) and vertical (buildings) design optimization
- 19 • Promote energy and demand management solutions
- 20 • Integrates emerging and proven technologies
- 21 • Provides feedback loops for end-users (e.g., in-home displays)

22 **3. Provide integrated sustainable communities incentives**

- 23 • Includes multiple stakeholders (master developer, builder, end-user, design, trade and
24 supply chain partners, and public-sector)

- 1 • Integrated computer modeling
- 2 • Performance-based metrics (energy, water, waste, air quality, and Gags)
- 3 • Pre-development, construction, post-construction
- 4 • Education and training of stakeholders
- 5 • Design Assistance
- 6 • Streamlined processing
- 7 • Market research and analysis
- 8 • Monitoring and verification

9 SoCalGas is entering this project at approximately year 5 of the process of a projected
10 15-20 year project.

11 SoCalGas' requested budget for the 2009-2011 program cycle is limited to funding the
12 initial preparation work including analysis and evaluations of the proposals. It is possible that
13 within the program cycle, new homes and small commercial business buildings may be
14 completed but it is not anticipated that there will be a large number of these buildings. If the
15 project accelerates quicker than the timeline shown above and SoCalGas requires additional
16 funding, SoCalGas will request additional funding from the Commission through the Advice
17 Letter process.

18 **F. Strategic Development and Integration**

19 In order to create market transformation in California, SoCalGas is committed to the
20 vision and goals outlined in the CEESP. This plan includes customer segmentation and targeted
21 program development and the integration of EE/DSM and emerging high efficiency technologies
22 coupled with innovative and comprehensive program design and theory. A focused team of
23 qualified resources has been identified to support these activities and drive the direction of the

1 programs through innovation and the inclusion of best practices. This team will be dedicated to
2 this activity and will act as a coordinating entity by collaborating with regulatory, program,
3 technology and other staff.

4 The team will be specifically responsible for overseeing activities associated with
5 achieving strategic plan goals and ensuring that the strategic plan itself is updated so that it
6 provides relevant guidance and direction on a continuous basis. The team will be responsible for:

- 7 • Cooperatively developing milestones toward achieving strategic objectives and
8 evaluating the progress of programs toward these milestones as well as meeting sector
9 goals.
- 10 • Facilitating the evolution of program design to ensure support of the long term strategic
11 vision and direction.
- 12 • Researching, identifying and supporting incorporation of best practices in both current
13 and future programs.
- 14 • Providing guidance and acting as an ongoing information source for pilot programs,
15 integration activities and program innovations associated with emerging technologies,
16 best practices, and market awareness.
- 17 • Representing SoCalGas in Strategic Planning activities. This includes the representation
18 of SoCalGas at all California Strategic Planning meetings. SoCalGas subject matter
19 experts will provide input as the plan evolves in order to keep it current and valuable.
20 The team will share lessons learned and successful strategies with the other IOUs.
- 21 • Incorporating stakeholder input in the long-term planning process, collaborating with
22 other utilities and the CPUC to conduct public workshops such as an annual California
23 Energy Efficiency Summit.
- 24 • Acting as a liaison between external parties and internal staff to ensure that there is a
25 complete and ongoing feedback loop with lessons learned and recommendations being
26 fully shared and leveraged.

- 1 • Ensuring that, as specific objectives emerge and the plan evolves, lessons learned are
2 available for incorporation into existing programs as well as for future planning.
- 3 • Collaborating with the Emerging Technologies group to ensure that cutting edge
4 technologies are quickly adopted and incorporated into the programs thru 2011 and
5 beyond.
- 6 • Working in partnership with, and providing information and guidance to, program sector
7 management to ensure that interim milestones and approaches are directed toward the
8 long-term vision.

9 **G. Making IDSM a Success**

10 Currently these different components of IDSM are in several regulatory proceedings with
11 different policy objectives and rules. Different methodologies for measurement and verification,
12 and cost effectiveness are in place for each of these programs. However, as we analyze and
13 incent these customer projects that present themselves through these IDSM efforts, it will be
14 become imperative that new approaches to valuation and measurement will need to be
15 developed. For example, customers would prefer that these integrated project cost effectiveness
16 are analyzed at the project level and not as individual components. For example, in a joint
17 EE/DR project, the customer would most likely be persuaded to install the integrated system if
18 the project sponsor could do a payback analysis that identifies the consolidated savings from the
19 project. This would require new methodologies to determine energy savings and demand
20 reductions and cost effectiveness. Additionally, the EE or DR measure on a stand alone basis
21 could present themselves as non-cost effective but when bundled together may improve its cost
22 effectiveness.

23 In order for IDSM to succeed, new and improved cost effectiveness analysis tools need to
24 be developed that will value integrated projects. Determining energy savings and demand
25 reductions for integrated projects may be more efficient than trying to determine benefits

1 incrementally. Finally, the Commission may need to begin integrating proceedings, not only on
2 a funding cycle basis but also procedurally. SoCalGas welcomes the integration of the LIEE and
3 EE proceedings in one Rulemaking.

4 **XI. Proposed Training Programs In Support of Strategic Plan Vision**

5 The goal of a statewide WE&T Strategic Planning program is to ensure California's
6 workforce is sufficiently trained and engaged to contribute in achieving the state's energy
7 efficiency potential. WE&T Strategic Planning is a joint investor-owned utility (IOU) program
8 that serves as a planning support and administrative function to accomplish the greater California
9 WE&T long-range activities and goals.

10 In order to meet the state's growing workforce demand, a concerted planning effort with
11 a wide variety of initiatives and multiple funding sources beyond ratepayer funds is required.
12 Such an effort will demand the collaboration and involvement of secondary and post-secondary
13 education leaders, technical and professional organizations, state agencies, economic and labor
14 development organizations, utilities, and construction and manufacturing businesses that deliver
15 energy efficiency solutions. The IOUs will support the larger statewide effort, and will help
16 facilitate ongoing development of WE&T activities through their WE&T Strategic Planning
17 program.

18 As activities to further develop the WE&T, SoCalGas will continue to offer education
19 and training through its ERC and other success education and training programs in its portfolio.

1 **SECTION 2**
2 **PROPOSED FUNDING REQUEST AND FUND-SHIFTING PROPOSAL ARE**
3 **REASONABLE**

4 **I. Program Portfolio Funding Levels**

5 SoCalGas' proposed 2009-2011 energy efficiency program portfolio budget are intended
6 to fund energy efficiency programs that will achieve the Commission's energy savings and
7 demand reduction targets as well as supports progress towards the realization of the long-term
8 goals and specific strategies and actions identified in the CEESP. In addition, to providing
9 program budgets, the Commission requires that a minimum of 20 percent of the entire portfolio
10 of programs be allocated for the competitive bid solicitation.²⁶ SoCalGas interprets this to be 20
11 percent of the total budget allocated for implementing all programs, excluding (1) the EM&V
12 budget and (2) SoCalGas' proposed funding for activities associated with SoCalGas' support of
13 CEESP. SoCalGas has budgeted a minimum of 20 percent of the total program budget for its
14 competitive bid solicitation. Depending on Commission's approval and final negotiations with
15 the selected program bids received during the solicitation process, SoCalGas' allocation for non-
16 utility programs may increase from the minimum allocation.

17 The following budget categories and definitions were used to breakdown the program
18 budget:

19 **1. Administrative Costs**

20 Administrative Costs are costs that are incurred by the program administrator and third
21 party implementers required to manage the programs. These include the following
22 subcategories:

²⁶ D. 05-01-051 at page 94 and Policy Rule VI.3.

- Other Administrative Costs include managerial and clerical labor, including payroll taxes and vacation/sick leave, human resources support and development, travel and conference fees. These include administrative costs incurred by third party program implementer or any subcontractor to the program.
- Overhead and General and Administration Costs includes program support for regulatory reporting, IT services & support, reporting databases, EM&V/ED data request responses, TPI bidding process, PUC financial audits, regulatory filings support and other adhoc support required across all programs. Regulatory support **does not** refer to the IOU's corporate Regulatory and Legal Functions. These functions are not covered by EE funds.

2. Marketing and Outreach Costs

Marketing and Outreach costs are costs incurred by the program to provide promote the program and energy efficiency, in general. These include items such as advertising, brochures, program collateral, seminars and the labor incurred in the marketing of the program.

3. Direct Implementation Costs

Direct Implementation Costs include rebates, incentives paid to customers, installation and services, including labor, any hardware and materials required for installation, and the labor and material costs incurred for rebate processing and inspections.

4. Evaluation, Measurement and Verification (“EM&V”) Costs

EM&V costs are the labor and material costs incurred to conduct process and measurement studies required to evaluate the program. SoCalGas only provides the EM&V budget at the portfolio level and not at the program level pending further direction from the Commission.

SoCalGas’ Preferred Scenario Table 2-1 below provides the Preferred scenario program

budgets by program category and by program year. Detailed program budgets can be found in Appendix F Table 4.1.

Table 2-1: Preferred Scenario—2009-2011 Proposed Program Budgets

	2009 Budget	2010 Budget	2011 Budget	Total 2009-2011 Program Cycle Budget
Southern California Gas Company Programs	Gas	Gas	Gas	Gas
Total Programs Budget	\$ 81,617,970	\$ 84,478,156	\$ 85,307,579	\$ 251,403,705
#x EM&V - Evaluation Measurement & Verification	\$ 7,287,064	\$ 7,287,064	\$ 7,287,064	\$ 21,861,192
Total SCG Portfolio Budget	\$ 88,905,034	\$ 91,765,220	\$ 92,594,643	\$ 273,264,897

SoCalGas' Mandated Scenario Table 2-2 below provides the Preferred scenario program budgets by program category and by program year. Detailed program budgets can be found in Appendix F.1 Table 4.1.

Table 2-2: Mandated Scenario—2009-2011 Proposed Program Budgets

	2009 Budget	2010 Budget	2011 Budget	Total 2009-2011 Program Cycle Budget
Total Programs Budget	\$ 161,439,742	\$ 164,663,088	\$ 172,470,447	\$ 498,573,276
#x EM&V - Evaluation Measurement & Verification	\$ 14,451,399	\$ 14,451,399	\$ 14,451,399	\$ 43,354,197
Total SCG Portfolio Budget	\$ 175,891,141	\$ 179,114,487	\$ 186,921,846	\$ 541,927,473

B. Proposed Costs Not Included in Performance Earnings Basis Calculations

Costs related to the following implementation activities of CEESP for the Preferred and Mandated scenarios are listed above under the subheading “Long Term Support of CEESP” in Tables 2-1 and 2-2 above. These activities are primarily undertaken to support CEESP or have major contributions towards the achievements of CEESP objectives. These costs are not to be included in the calculation of the 20 percent minimum requirement for Third Party programs.

II. Proposed 2009-2011 Energy Efficiency Fundshifting Guidelines

For the 2006-2008 program cycle, the Commission recognized and approved the need for

1 IOU program administrators to have flexibility “to make decisions, without undue restrictions or
2 delays, so they can effectively manage their portfolios to meet or exceed the Commission’s
3 savings goals cost-effectively.”²⁷ The proposed fund shifting guidelines “Guidelines” are an
4 extension of the fund shifting guidelines approved for 2006—2008 energy efficiency programs.
5 In the 2006—2008 program cycle, the Commission recognized and approved the need for IOU
6 program administrators to have flexibility to use their knowledge of evolving market conditions
7 and technologies to maximize energy savings. Additionally these Guidelines are needed to
8 provide the IOU program administrators with flexibility to manage the 2009-2011 portfolio,
9 adapt to changing market conditions, and optimize resource potential to meet the hard line
10 energy savings and demand reduction targets, annually and cumulatively. SoCalGas fund-
11 shifting and program flexibility proposals are consistent with PG&E, SCE and SDG&E.

12 SoCalGas proposes selective modifications to the current Guidelines to: (1) change to
13 the current treatment of mid-cycle portfolio funding augmentation; (2) recognize the elimination
14 of the policy advisory group in 2009-2011; and (3) clarify language contained within the 2006-
15 2008 Guidelines for 2009-2011.

16 **A. Modify Treatment of Mid-cycle Funding Augmentation**

17 In D.07-10-032, the Commission set a Policy Rule IV.12 that does not allow IOUs to
18 claim energy savings and demand reductions results towards the achievement of the Commission
19 energy efficiency goals because mid-cycle funding augmentation provides a “bonus” to utilities
20 without any undue risk bestowed upon them.²⁸ D.07-10-032 also indicates that “in effect, mid-
21 cycle funding augmentations provide the utilities with additional funding to accomplish a goal

²⁷ D.05-09-043, dated September 22, 2005, Section 8.9 Fund Shifting Guidelines, p. 144.

²⁸ D.07-10-032, dated October 18, 2007, OP# 7, p. 143.

1 that was set with a lower budget.”²⁹ As a result of this rule, IOUs are now discouraged from
2 pursuing all cost-effective energy efficiency even though there may be energy efficiency funds
3 available from prior years. SoCalGas proposes the elimination of the 2006-2008 mid-cycle
4 funding augmentation rule for 2009-2011 as it: (1) creates a disincentive to propose new
5 programs with augmented funding; (2) punishes, unnecessarily, IOUs when market conditions
6 change which may require additional funds to incent customers in order to achieve the
7 Commission energy efficiency goals, (3) creates a contradiction to the California’s Energy
8 Action Policy³⁰ and Commission policy³¹ to pursue all cost-effective energy efficiency; and (4)
9 mid-cycle implementation of fully developed energy savings strategies contained in the CEESP.

10 The inability to record results from mid-cycle funding sends the wrong signal to IOUs
11 that stifles program innovation and creation of promising programs. This is contrary to the
12 Commission’s desire to promote innovation and test new program designs. Another key fault of
13 the 2006-2008 mid-cycle funding augmentation rule is it assumes that during the program
14 implementation cycle the marketplace remains static and acts just as assumed during the
15 planning process. This is unrealistic. The marketplace is dynamic with many actors and
16 unforeseen influences which can foreclose expected opportunities as well as create new
17 opportunities. The mid-cycle rule also contradicts California’s Energy Action Plan³² which calls

²⁹ D.07-10-032, dated October 18, 2007, p.98.

³⁰ Energy Action Plan identifies specific goals and actions to ensure that adequate, reliable, and reasonably-priced electrical power and natural gas supplies are achieved and provided through cost-effective and environmentally sound strategies. A copy of the Energy Action Plan, including the 2008 Update, is posted on the Commission’s website at <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/static/energy/electric/energy+action+plan/index.htm>. See also, D.05-09-043, mimeo., p. 15 and Energy Efficiency Policy Manual Version 3.1, dated January 8, 2008, Rule II.2, p. A-2 .

³¹ D.07-10-032, dated October 18, 2007, p. 2.

³² Energy Action Plan identifies specific goals and actions to ensure that adequate, reliable, and reasonably-priced electrical power and natural gas supplies are achieved and provided through cost-effective and environmentally sound strategies. A copy of the Energy Action Plan, including the 2008 Update, is posted on the Commission’s website at <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/static/energy/electric/energy+action+plan/index.htm>. See also, D.05-09-043, mimeo., p. 15 and Energy Efficiency Policy Manual Version 3.1,dated January 8, 2008, Rule II.2, p. A-2 .

1 for the pursuit of all cost-effective energy efficiency by discouraging IOUs to supplement their
2 program portfolios with promising new/enhanced programs. Thus, for 2009-2011, SoCalGas
3 proposes to modify the mid-cycle funding policy rule to allow all utilities to count all installed
4 energy efficiency results towards the Commission's aggressive energy savings and demand
5 reduction goals.

6 **B. Proposed Modification of Fund-Shifting Proposals to Align With the Other**
7 **IOUs and Accommodate the Strategic Plan**

8 In Decision (D.) 05-09-043, the CPUC adopted fund-shifting rules to provide the utilities
9 with flexibility in managing their EE portfolios over each program cycle, within certain
10 parameters. In Decision 07-10-032, the CPUC affirmed those fund-shifting rules for 2009-2011
11 programs as well as addressed rolling budget cycles and encumbering funds from subsequent
12 budget cycles.

13 For 2009-2011, SoCalGas requests that the CPUC modify the fund-shifting rules from
14 D.05-09-043 to facilitate incorporation of the Strategic Plan and the 12 statewide programs.
15 Accordingly, SoCalGas requests that Resource/Non-Resource program categories be defined as:
16 1) Residential- Residential; 2) Non-Residential – Commercial, Agricultural, and Industrial; and
17 3) Crosscutting (New Construction, IDSM, Workforce, Education, and Training; Local
18 Integration programs; On-Bill Financing; Lighting Market Transformation, HVAC and Local
19 Government Partnerships).

20 In addition, SoCalGas requests that all programs exempted from the PEB be subject to
21 the existing fund-shifting rules for the ET category. Since the Strategic Planning-oriented items
22 are focused on emerging policies and technologies, it is appropriate for these activities to be
23 subject to the same fund-shifting rules as ET. See Appendix E for these proposed changes to

1 Table 8 from D.05-09-043.

2 **1. Funding Proposal Reflects Rolling Budget Cycle as Set Forth in D.07-10-032**

3 In Decision 07-10-032 (p. 95), the CPUC permitted the IOUs for the 2009-2011 cycle
4 and beyond to “spend next-cycle funds in the current budget cycle (once the next-cycle portfolio
5 has been approved) to avoid interruptions of those programs continuing into the next cycle and
6 for start-up costs of new programs.” The CPUC then lays out rules for spending next-cycle
7 funds. Unfortunately, this process does not avoid the interruptions from program cycles since
8 the IOU portfolio is typically not approved until September or October of the year prior to the
9 start of the program cycle and in multiple instances portfolio approval has been delayed beyond
10 October (as is the current case). Well before September or October, third-parties and
11 government partnerships, as well as core program, managers are requesting assurance that
12 incentives and programs will be available for the next year (next cycle). Moreover, IOUs are
13 allocating resources to ensure timely start for the next program cycle. SoCalGas requests that
14 this procedure be revised to allow utilities to spend up to 15 percent of the next-cycle funds prior
15 to the next-cycle portfolio being approved. This revised process will allow the IOUs to facilitate
16 the rolling-budget concept envisioned by the CPUC. Accordingly, SoCalGas requests authority
17 from the CPUC to spend up to 15 percent of next-cycle funds in the year prior to a new cycle.

18 **2. Proposal for Encumbering Funds from Subsequent Budget Cycle Is**
19 **Reasonable**

20 SoCalGas is concerned that the “Funding Projects with Lead Times Beyond Three Years”
21 process laid out by the CPUC in D.07-10-032 (pp. 97-98) cannot be implemented as written.
22 While the process for encumbering funding laid out by the CPUC is reasonable and provides
23 adequate guidance for SoCalGas to commit funds from the next program cycle to fund programs

1 that will not yield savings in the current cycle, it requests that long-term projects that require
2 funding beyond the 3-year program cycle be specifically identified in the utility portfolio plans.
3 In addition, the utility portfolio plans shall include an estimate of the total costs broken down by
4 year and associated energy savings. SoCalGas cannot predict the expected energy saving
5 projects that will be committed during the 2009-2011 program cycle at this time. These long-
6 term projects are identified as SoCalGas works with its customers in promoting EE
7 opportunities. SoCalGas proposes to identify these long-term projects as well as the dollar value
8 of the encumbered funds, up to 20 percent of the value of the current program cycle budget as
9 stated in D.07-10-032, in its quarterly reports to the CPUC. This will allow the CPUC to review
10 the encumbered funds on a regular basis and will facilitate SoCalGas' pursuit of projects that
11 will produce energy savings beyond the current program cycle.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 //

20 //

21 //

1 **SECTION 3**
2 **PROPOSED EVALUATION, MEASUREMENT AND VERIFICATION PLANS AND**
3 **BUDGETS**

4 **I. INTRODUCTION**

5 Consistent with D.07-10-032 9 (at page 110), SoCalGas' budget proposal includes a set
6 aside of 8 percent of its total portfolio funding for both utility and Commission-managed EM&V
7 studies, policy support, and strategic planning projects. SoCalGas recommends that consistent
8 with the 2006—2008 EM&V allocation, 6 percent be allocated for the Commission staff budget
9 and 2 percent for the IOU budget. However, because of the substantially larger budget amounts
10 in the 2009 – 2011 program cycle, SoCalGas is unconvinced that a total set-aside of 8 percent of
11 each IOU's total portfolio budget is necessary. The EM&V budget is \$21.7 million under the
12 Preferred Scenario and \$43.3 million under its Mandated scenario. Therefore, SoCalGas
13 recommends that following the approval of the 2009—2011 program portfolios, that the utilities
14 work closely with Commission staff and CEC staff to develop appropriate EM&V plans and
15 budget requirements. Similar to the 2006-2008 process, SoCalGas recommends that the utilities
16 submit advice letters for approval to provide public review and formal Commission approval.

17 This section of the testimony will describe general plans for SoCalGas' own energy
18 efficiency process evaluation and market analysis projects.

19 To provide continuous feedback to the 2009-2011 Energy Efficiency programs and
20 improve the programs through the three-year cycle, SoCalGas will conduct various process
21 evaluations and program/measure-specific market analysis. Additionally, SoCalGas may
22 coordinate with the other IOUs to conduct the studies required by California Title 20 over the
23 next three years: Residential Appliance Saturation Study ("RASS"), Commercial End Use Study
24 ("CEUS") and the Industrial End Use Study ("IEUS").

1 SoCalGas proposes to group programs based on target markets or customers to facilitate
2 evaluations but still allowing for “program-specific” analyses as required. Some of the
3 objectives for evaluation or analysis are:

- 4 • To review the broad market segments and the programs being offered to help
5 determine if the programs being offered are optimally designed;
- 6 • To determine if there are unnecessary overlaps between the programs, if significant
7 parts of the market are being missed by the program designs, and/or if the targeted
8 markets should be defined differently

9 Since program funding is for three years, ongoing feedback by the process evaluations
10 will be beneficial for continuous improvement of the program design and implementation. In
11 order to meet this objective, SoCalGas anticipates issuing evaluation RFPs in the first quarter of
12 2010 that combine both Process Evaluations and Market Analysis for each of the groups
13 identified, although additional RFPs may be developed to address unanticipated program needs
14 through the program cycle. At this time, SoCalGas’ proposed grouping of programs into Process
15 Evaluations and Market Analysis is as follows:

16 Group 1: Residential Programs

17 Group 2: New Construction Programs (subset for residential and nonresidential)

18 Group 3: Partnership Programs

19 Group 4: Non-Residential Programs

20 Group 5: Statewide Programs: will include programs where projects are embarked on
21 jointly with the other IOUs and other stakeholders:

22 **II. SoCalGas-Specific Program Activities**

23 In addition to the above groupings, over the course of the funding cycle SoCalGas

1 anticipates identifying specific needs for certain programs to be studied in order to optimize
2 program achievements. While many of the programs and specific areas of research are unknown
3 at this time, SoCalGas believes there will be a need to study program components that aren't
4 materializing as anticipated. Therefore, as these issues occur, SoCalGas will select a contractor
5 and submit its request to the Energy Division to obtain approval to conduct the study as required
6 per the California Evaluation Energy Efficiency Protocols³³ ("Protocols").

7 **A. Process Evaluations of Standard Portfolio**

8 The process evaluation consists of in-depth examinations of the design, delivery, and
9 operations of energy programs in order to improve the ability of the program to achieve energy
10 savings and accomplish other program goals. The California Evaluation Framework³⁴
11 (Framework) defines a process evaluation as:

12 "A systematic assessment of an energy efficiency program for the purposes of (1)
13 documenting program operations at the time of examination, and (2) identifying and
14 recommending improvements that can be made to the program to increase the program's
15 efficiency or effectiveness for acquiring energy resources while maintaining high levels
16 of participant satisfaction.³⁵

17 Certainly, the primary reason for conducting process evaluations is to identify and
18 recommend changes in a program's operational procedures or systems that can be expected to
19 improve the program's efficiency or cost-effectiveness. These recommendations need to be

³³ "Process Evaluation Protocol in the California Energy Efficiency Evaluation Protocols: Technical, Methodological and Reporting requirements for Evaluation Professionals," prepared for the California Public Utilities Commission by The TecMarket Works Team, April 2006.

³⁴ "The California Evaluation Framework," prepared for the California Public Utilities Commission and the Project Advisory Group, June 2004 by the Tec Market Works team.

³⁵ Ibid, p. 207

1 developed so that they support the program or the program’s operational practices consistent
2 with the program theory or with recommended change to the program theory.³⁶”

3 The goals of Process Evaluations, as articulated in Chapter 8 of the Framework, include:

- 4 • Improve program performance with respect to internal administration, promotional
5 practices, program delivery, incentive levels, and data management,
- 6 • Provide information to regulators and other interested parties that energy programs are
7 being implemented effectively and modified or refined as necessary,
- 8 • Provide a means of improving customer satisfaction and identifying market threats and
9 opportunities,
- 10 • Provides a means of contributing to industry-wide knowledge in order that other
11 providers may improve their programs,
- 12 • Improve program implementation efficiency,
- 13 • Assess market segments and targeting of specific segments,
- 14 • Improve the quality of measures installed,
- 15 • Identify program design issues,
- 16 • Providing an accounting of program progress, and
- 17 • Examine special issues (measure life, program comprehensiveness, etc.)

18 Additionally, the Process Evaluation Protocol in the Protocols identifies key issues to be
19 considered:

20 Program Design

- 21 • Program design, design characteristics and design process;
- 22 • Program mission, vision and goal setting and its process,

³⁶ Ibid, p. 209.

- Assessment or development of program and market operations theories and supportive logic models, theory assumptions and key theory relationships – especially their casual relationships; and
- Use of new or best practices.

Program Administration

- Program oversight and improvement process;
- Program staffing allocation and requirements;
- Management and staff skill and training needs;
- Program information and information support systems; and
- Reporting and the relationship between effective tracking and management, including both operational and financial management.

Program Implementation and Delivery

- Description and assessment of the program implementation and delivery process;
- Quality control methods and operational issues;
- Program management and management’s operational practices;
- Program delivery systems, components and implementation practices;
- Program targeting, marketing, and outreach efforts;
- Program goal attainment and goal-associated implementation processes and results;
- Program timing, timeliness and time-sensitive accomplishments; and
- Quality control procedures and processes.

Market Response

- 1 • Customer interactions and satisfaction (both overall satisfaction with key
- 2 program components and including satisfaction with key customer-product-
- 3 provider relationships and support services);
- 4 • Customer participant energy efficiency or load reduction needs and the ability
- 5 of the program to provide for those needs;
- 6 • Market allies interactions and satisfaction;
- 7 • Low participation rates or associated energy savings;
- 8 • Market allies needs and the ability of the program to provide for those needs;
- 9 • Reasons for overly high free-riders or too low a level of market effects, free-
- 10 drivers or spillover; and
- 11 • Intended or unanticipated market effects.³⁷

12 **B. Quantitative Baseline and Market Transformation Information**

13 Market Transformation has not been a major focus of the California energy efficiency
14 programs since the energy crisis. Consequently, relatively little attention has been given in
15 recent years to identifying and gathering data on indicators of change towards market
16 transformation. For some programs or sub-programs that promote a single end use or measure,
17 there may be some data available for this purpose, probably from industry sources, that we have
18 not yet identified. For many of the programs, however, this kind of long-term, consistent, and
19 expensive data collection has not been done in California.

20 The utility program planners have worked closely with their respective EM&V staffs and
21 with each other to identify available information and propose potential metrics that can be used
22 for the program implementation plans. Each utility and each program has some data available,
23 but attempts to distill the limited available information into a common set of agreed-upon metrics

³⁷ Protocols, pp. 135-136

1 have proved far more difficult to accomplish at this time and instead suggest a means of
2 developing meaningful indicators.

3 The utilities will develop meaningful baseline and market transformation concepts and
4 metrics for programs that do not currently have them, and then propose to design and administer
5 studies to gather and track consistent, reliable and valid baseline and market effects data.

6 SoCalGas would propose to use the program logic models and “The California Evaluation
7 Framework (2004)” as guides, and to begin this work after approval of the Application using
8 funding provided for Evaluation, Measurement & Verification.

9 SoCalGas expects that the baseline studies (1) adequately describe the operation of
10 markets that are targeted by a program, (2) confirm our tentative identification of measurable
11 parameters that would indicate changes towards greater efficiency in the market(s) and that are
12 likely to be affected by the program, and (3) gather the current values of those parameters, to
13 serve as baselines against which future market movement can be tracked.

14 **C. Title 20 Saturation Study Requirements**

15 Title 20 of the California Code of Regulations §1343 requires electric and gas utilities to
16 conduct saturation surveys for its Residential, Commercial and Industrial customers for the
17 purpose of estimating end-user energy requirements. These studies are typically referred to as
18 the RASS, CEUS and IEUS Data and analyses from these studies are not only useful for
19 statewide evaluation of energy requirements but also provide program management staff
20 necessary information to improve their program design and determine market opportunities.

21 SoCalGas will work with CEC staff and other utilities to determine the optimum study plans and
22 efficacy of conducting statewide saturation surveys.

1 **D. Statewide and National EM&V Organization Activities**

2 SoCalGas, together with PG&E, SCE and SDG&E, have coordinated/sponsored
3 statewide EM&V activities, meetings and forums that allow a wide variety of stakeholders to
4 participate and be informed of ongoing utility EM&V activities and state-of-the-art EM&V
5 practices and coordinate statewide utility EM&V activities. An example of this is the California
6 Measurement Advisory Council (“CALMAC”), which the utilities alternate chairing. The
7 utilities also provide support for maintaining the CALMAC website (<http://calmac.org/>) which
8 houses all measurement and evaluation studies sponsored by California since 1994.

9 The California utilities also provide support/sponsorships of national evaluation
10 activities, examples of which are: Efficiency Valuation Organization that sponsors, among other
11 things, the International Performance Measurement and Verification Protocols (“IPMVP”),
12 Consortium for Energy Efficiency (“CEE”) Energy Star Awareness Surveys, American Council
13 for an Energy-Efficient Economy (“ACEEE”) Summer Study, etc.

14 **E. EM&V Strategic Planning Activities**

15 SoCalGas has proposed several strategic planning activities in support of the CEESP.
16 These are discussed in Section 1 above. SoCalGas proposes to conduct appropriate EM&V
17 studies to establish baselines, market transformation-type studies and evaluate the effectiveness
18 of its pilot proposals. SoCalGas will work with the other utilities and Commission staff to
19 review and finalize study designs and determine whether statewide studies can be conducted for
20 these strategic planning activities.

21 **F. SoCalGas EM&V Staffing Requirements**

22 SoCalGas will require staffing in order to conduct and manage its own internal EM&V
23 studies; manage out-sourced EM&V Process Evaluation and Market Assessment studies; provide

1 required data by the Load Impact contractors selected by Energy Division Staff; respond to data
2 requests from outside parties, provide input to Energy Division evaluations and studies;
3 participate in CPUC sponsored workshops and forums; manage Statewide Studies; and provide
4 feedback to program implementers.

5 **III. Energy Division-Managed Studies**

6 D.05-01-055 establishes that Energy Division staff will be responsible for “program and
7 portfolio-related impact studies”; and research and analysis in support of Commission Policy
8 Oversight. These activities are also to be funded through the utilities Energy Efficiency portfolio
9 budgets. As stated above, SoCalGas is assuming a 6 percent allocation of the EM&V budget
10 similar to the 2006-2008 evaluation. A more refined EM&V budget is expected to be established
11 once the utilities, Energy Division and CEC staff have had an opportunity to review the needs of
12 Commission-approved 2009-2011 program portfolios.

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

//
//
//

1 **SECTION 4**
2 **REVENUE REQUIREMENTS AND COST RECOVERY**

3 **I. Overview**

4 SoCalGas in this amended filing presents a CPUC mandated program scenario that
5 incorporates revisions in response to various CPUC directives. The amended filing also presents
6 for CPUC review a program portfolio that incorporates SoCalGas' proposed scenario. The
7 presentation of SoCalGas' proposed scenario is permitted by CPUC ruling dated October 30,
8 2008, in Application 08-07-021 et al. The 3-year funding levels proposed by SoCalGas' for the
9 Mandated and Preferred scenarios are \$541,927,472 and \$273,264,897, respectively.

10 The increased costs for 2010 will also include a true-up of the authorized 2009 bridge
11 funding revenue requirement adopted in D.08-10-027³⁸ recorded in its Energy Efficiency 2009-
12 2011 Memorandum Account ("EMMA")³⁹ offset by any available overcollections recorded in its
13 balancing accounts for program years prior to 2009. SoCalGas' approved 2009 bridge funding is
14 \$7,203,063.

15 **A. Preferred Scenario**

16 In order to meet the adopted savings and demand reduction goals and to support the
17 Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan, SoCalGas is proposing the following total annual program
18 budget of \$91,088,299 for 2009, 2010 and 2011. These budgets were determined based on the
19 program designs and the targeted measures.

³⁸ D.08-10-027, Decision Adopting Bridge Funding for 2009.

³⁹ The Energy Efficiency 2009-2011 Memorandum Account (EEMA) was established pursuant to Decision (D.) 08-10-027 and approved through Advice Letter 3912. The purpose of the EEMA is to record the difference between the revenue requirement adopted for the 2009 Bridge Funding period and the revenue requirement requested and eventually approved in SoCalGas' 2009-2011 Energy Efficiency Application (A.) 08-07-022. Upon Commission approval of the EEMA balance incorporated in 2010 rates, the EEMA will no longer be necessary as the collection of these funds will be recorded in SoCalGas' Demand Side Management Balancing Account (DSMBA). The EEMA will be eliminated effective at that time.

In order to meet the adopted goals, SoCalGas is proposing to use the gas public purpose program (“PPP”) surcharge funds authorized through Assembly Bill 1002. Currently SoCalGas collects \$86 million in 2009 rates. Any “shortfall” will be addressed by increasing the level of PPP funds collected. The Gas Surcharge is updated annually through an advice letter request filed in October to establish the PPP surcharge rates effective January 1 of the subsequent year.

The following table shows the annual budget requirements for the Preferred scenario, the projected available funds in the Demand Side Management Balancing Account and the current levels of authorized gas PPP funding:

Table 4-1: Preferred Scenario--Available Funds or Shortfalls for 2009 through 2011 Programs

Total Program Budget	\$ 91,088,299	\$ 91,088,299	\$ 91,088,299	
	2009	2010	2011	TOTAL
Total Program Budget	\$ 91,088,299	\$ 91,088,299	\$ 91,088,299	\$ 273,264,897
Gas PPP Budget	\$ 91,088,299	\$ 91,088,299	\$ 91,088,299	\$ 273,264,897
Total Program Budget	\$ 91,088,299	\$ 91,088,299	\$ 91,088,299	\$ 273,264,897
PGC Balancing Account				
Authorized Public Policy Program (PPP) - Collections ¹	\$ 86,436,756	\$ 86,436,756	\$ 86,436,756	\$ 259,310,268
Unspent/Uncommitted PPP Funds from Balancing Account (pre-2009) ²	\$ -	\$ 22,600,000	\$ 22,600,000	\$ 45,200,000
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Other Available Funds Carried Over From PPP Balancing Account	\$ -	\$ (4,651,543)	\$ 13,296,914	N/A
Total Available PGC Balancing Account Funds	\$ 86,436,756	\$ 104,385,213	\$ 122,333,670	\$ 304,510,268
PGC (Shortfall) Excess	\$ (4,651,543)	\$ 13,296,914	\$ 31,245,371	\$ 31,245,371

Assumptions:

Authorized Revenues in Gas PPP Surcharge rates for Energy Efficiency

(1) Assumed 2009 Authorized Bridge Funding in PPP rates for Energy Efficiency.

(2) Includes balancing account interest through December 31, 2008.

B. Mandated Scenario

In order to meet the adopted savings and demand reduction goals and to support the Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan, SoCalGas is proposing the following total annual program budget of \$180,642,491 for 2009, 2010 and 2011 for its Mandated scenario. These budgets were

determined based on the program designs and the targeted measures.

In order to meet the adopted goals, SoCalGas is proposing to use the gas public purpose program (“PPP”) surcharge funds authorized through Assembly Bill 1002. Currently SoCalGas collects \$86 million in 2009 rates. Any “shortfall” will be addressed by increasing the level of PPP funds collected. The Gas Surcharge is updated annually through an advice letter request filed on October to establish the PPP surcharge rates effective January 1 of the subsequent year.

The following table shows the annual budget requirements for the Mandated scenario, the projected available funds in the Demand Side Management Balancing Account and the current levels of authorized gas PPP funding:

Table 4-2: Mandated Scenario--Available Funds or Shortfalls for 2009 through 2011 Programs

Total Program Budget	\$ 180,642,491	\$ 180,642,490	\$ 180,642,491	
	2009	2010	2011	TOTAL
Total Program Budget	\$ 180,642,491	\$ 180,642,490	\$ 180,642,491	\$ 541,927,472
Gas PPP Budget	\$ 180,642,491	\$ 180,642,490	\$ 180,642,491	\$ 541,927,472
Total Program Budget	\$ 180,642,491	\$ 180,642,490	\$ 180,642,491	\$ 541,927,472
PGC Balancing Account				
Authorized Public Policy Program (PPP) - Collections ¹	\$ 86,436,756	\$ 86,436,756	\$ 86,436,756	\$ 259,310,268
Unspent/Uncommitted PPP Funds from Balancing Account (pre-2009) ²	\$ -	\$ 45,200,000	\$ -	\$ 45,200,000
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Other Available Funds Carried Over From PPP Balancing Account	\$ -	\$ (94,205,735)	\$ (143,211,469)	N/A
Total Available PGC Balancing Account Funds	\$ 86,436,756	\$ 37,431,021	\$ (56,774,713)	\$ 304,510,268
PGC (Shortfall) Excess	\$ (94,205,735)	\$ (143,211,469)	\$ (237,417,204)	\$ (237,417,204)

Assumptions:

Authorized Revenues in Gas PPP Surcharge rates for Energy Efficiency

(1) Assumed 2009 Authorized Bridge Funding in PPP rates for Energy Efficiency.

(2) Includes balancing account interest through December 31, 2008.

II. Natural Gas Allocation Methodology and Rate Design Proposal

In December 2007, SDG&E, SoCalGas, and PG&E (the “Utilities”) filed a joint application (A.07-12-006) to change the allocation method for state-mandated natural gas social program costs including Energy Efficiency program costs. In this application the Utilities

1 propose to change the allocation method to Equal Percent of Base Revenue (“EPBR”). If this
 2 application is approved, SoCalGas will allocate natural gas energy efficiency program costs
 3 identified in Tables 7-1 and 7-2 using EPBR. Until this application is decided, however,
 4 SoCalGas will allocate natural gas energy efficiency program costs using the allocations
 5 currently in place.

6 Tables 4-3 and 4-4 below show the 2010 through 2011 PPP surcharge rate impacts
 7 compared to present rates for both the Preferred and Mandated scenarios.

8 Table 4-3: PPP Surcharge Class Average Rate Change-2010
 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
 Energy Efficiency
 PPP Surcharge Class Average Rate Changes
 2010

Customer Class	CARE Customers			Non-CARE Customers		
	2009	2010	% Change	2009	2010	% Change
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
Core						
1. Residential						
Mandated	3.706	5.949	60.5%	6.384	8.626	35.1%
Preferred	3.706	3.498	-5.6%	6.384	6.176	-3.3%
2. Commercial/Industrial						
Mandated	4.455	11.550	159.3%	7.132	14.227	99.5%
Preferred	4.455	3.796	-14.8%	7.132	6.474	-9.2%
3. Gas Air Conditioning						
Mandated	5.429	14.243	162.4%	8.107	16.921	108.7%
Preferred	5.429	4.611	-15.1%	8.107	7.288	-10.1%
4. Gas Engine						
Mandated	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.096	14.236	100.6%
Preferred	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.096	6.434	-9.3%
5. Natural Gas Vehicle						
Mandated	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.678	2.678	0.0%
Preferred	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.678	2.678	0.0%
Noncore						
6. Commercial/Industrial						
Mandated	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.162	3.888	23.0%
Preferred	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.162	3.094	-2.1%

1

Table 4-4: PPP Surcharge Class Average Rate Changes--2011

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY

Energy Efficiency

PPP Surcharge Class Average Rate Changes
2011

Customer Class	CARE Customers			Non-CARE Customers		
	2009	2011	% Change	2009	2011	% Change
(a)	¢/th (b)	¢/th (c)	% (d)	¢/th (e)	¢/th (f)	% (g)
Core						
1. Residential						
Mandated	3.706	5.181	39.8%	6.384	7.859	23.1%
Preferred	3.706	3.425	-7.6%	6.384	6.103	-4.4%
2. Commercial/Industrial						
Mandated	4.455	9.122	104.8%	7.132	11.799	65.4%
Preferred	4.455	3.566	-20.0%	7.132	6.243	-12.5%
3. Gas Air Conditioning						
Mandated	5.429	11.227	106.8%	8.107	13.905	71.5%
Preferred	5.429	4.324	-20.3%	8.107	7.002	-13.6%
4. Gas Engine						
Mandated	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.096	11.793	66.2%
Preferred	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.096	6.202	-12.6%
5. Natural Gas Vehicle						
Mandated	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.678	2.678	0.0%
Preferred	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.678	2.678	0.0%
Noncore						
6. Commercial/Industrial						
Mandated	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.162	3.640	15.1%
Preferred	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.162	3.071	-2.9%

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

//

9

//

10

//

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

**SECTION 5
WITNESS QUALIFICATIONS**

My name is Athena M. Besa. My business address is 8335 Century Park Court, Suite 1200, San Diego, California 92123-1257. I am employed by San Diego Gas & Electric Company as the Customer Programs Policy and Support Manager in the Customer Programs Department for SDG&E and SoCalGas. In my current position, I am responsible for the measurement of energy efficiency, demand response and customer assistance programs; regulatory reporting requirements, energy efficiency forecasting and the financial management of the Customer Programs department.

I attended the University of the Philippines in Quezon City, Philippines. I graduated with a Bachelor of Science degree in Statistics in 1983, and a Master of Science degree in Statistics in 1986. I have completed coursework at University of California, Davis towards a Doctorate degree in Statistics.

I was hired by SDG&E in 1990 in the Load Research Section of the Marketing Department. Since that time I have held positions of increasing responsibility in the Department. I have been in my present position for five years. I have previously testified before this Commission in several AEAPs and the PY2000/2001 Energy Efficiency Program Application Proceeding.

The purpose of my testimony is to sponsor Sections 1, 2, 3 and 4 of this Application Exhibit and the Appendices A, A.1, B, C, D, E, F and F.1.