PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
Energy Efficiency 2018-2025 Rolling Portfolio Business Plan
Application 17-01-015
Data Response

PG&E Data Request No.:	TURN_001-Q14		
PG&E File Name:	EnergyEfficiency2018-2025-RollingPortfolioBusinessPlan_DR_TURN_001-Q14		
Request Date:	February 17, 2017	Requester DR No.:	001
Date Sent:	March 6, 2017	Requesting Party:	The Utility Reform Network
PG&E Witness:	Chris Kato	Requester:	Hayley Goodson

SUBJECT: PG&E 2018-2025 EE ROLLING PORTFOLIO BUSINESS PLAN & BUDGET. TURN DATA REQUEST <u>TURN-PG&E-01</u>.

PORTFOLIO MEASURE COMPOSITION AND INTERVENTION STRATEGIES

QUESTION 14

The IOUs' joint response to Question 10 of TURN's Nov. 9, 2016 Data Request in R.13-11-005 (addressing the draft business plans of all four IOU PAs) included PG&E's top 10 measure groupings expected to drive portfolio savings in 2016 and 2017, with that ranking determined by percentage of portfolio GWh, MW, and/or therm savings provided by each measure grouping (gross and net).

a. Please clarify whether PG&E's Nov. 9, 2016 response providing top 10 measure groupings by the "DEER UseSubCategory" includes all measures in the portfolio, DEER or otherwise, that can be categorized into the key measure categories.

b. Please update that response to include the top 10 measure groupings, on a gross and net basis, underlying PG&E's forecast of savings and portfolio cost-effectiveness for 2018-2020, as reflected in Chapter 1 of its Business Plan. In preparing your response, please consider "behavior" or "behavior programs" as a measure category.

c. If one of your top ten measure groupings is "Indoor Ltg" (as it was for 2016-2017), please identify the key measures comprising this measure grouping, including CFLs, LFs, HIDs, and LEDs, with the percentage of each reflected in your savings forecast for 2018-2020.

d. For each of the top 10 measure groups underlying your 2018-2020 savings forecast, as identified in your response to part (b) above, please specify the percentage of savings assumed in your cost-effectiveness calculations to come from each of the following intervention/delivery strategies: upstream/manufacturer, midstream/distribution, midstream/retail, downstream direct install, other downstream, and custom. If your forecast of cost-effectiveness does not reflect any assumptions regarding intervention/delivery strategies, please explain the basis for your "implementation" and "incentives" cost projections in Table 1.5.

e. For each of the top 10 measure groups underlying your 2018-2020 savings forecast, as identified in your response to part (b) above, please specify whether your savings and cost-effectiveness projections reflect the assumption that the key

measure grouping will be targeted in whole or in part through early retirement interventions. If your forecast of cost-effectiveness does not reflect any assumptions regarding early retirement vs. replace-on-burnout interventions, please explain the basis for your "implementation" and "incentives" cost projections in Table 1.5.

ANSWER 14

a. Yes, PG&E's Nov. 9, 2016 response providing top 10 measure groupings by the "DEER UseSubCategory" includes all measures in the portfolio, DEER or otherwise, that can be categorized into the key measure categories.

b. See Tab 1 in Atch1_TURN_01_Top_10_Measure_Groups_Q14. We have identified measure groupings based on DEER UseSubCategory, and populated "Behavior" as a separate measure grouping, which consists of Home Energy Reports (HERs), and our audit measures.

c. See Tab 2 in Atch1_TURN_01_Top_10_Measure_Groups_Q14. Our forecast included only LED, CFL and LF lighting measures with percent contribution as indicated.

d. See Tab 3 in Atch1_TURN_01_Top_10_Measure_Groups_Q14 for percent contribution of each delivery type to each of the top 10 measure groupings. We used DEER delivery type categories which do not differentiate between Upstream and Midstream delivery types; Midstream delivery is captured within the Upstream category. Please note that PG&E's business plan cost-effectiveness analysis is directional in nature. Through the annual Tier 2 ALs, PG&E will provide updated cost-effectiveness updates for each year of business plan implementation.

PG&E did not make any adjustments to the delivery type assumptions when forecasting cost-effectiveness. "Implementation" and "incentives" cost projections were based on high level assumptions regarding historical performance, and cost efficiencies realized through future outsourcing activities.

e. PG&E did not make any adjustments regarding early retirement vs. replace-on-burnout interventions when forecasting cost-effectiveness. "Implementation" and "incentives" cost projections were based on high level assumptions regarding historical performance, and cost efficiencies realized through future outsourcing activities.