

September 4, 2018

ADVICE 3859-E (U 338-E)

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA ENERGY DIVISION

SUBJECT: Southern California Edison Company's 2019 Energy Efficiency Program and Portfolio Annual Budget

In compliance with Decision (D.)18-05-041, Southern California Edison Company (SCE) hereby submits its 2019 Energy Efficiency (EE) and Integrated Demand Side Management (IDSM) Budget, forecast Total Resource Cost (TRC) and Program Administrator Cost (PAC) tests, and forecast energy savings for the program year 2019 for approval by the California Public Utilities Commission ("Commission" or "CPUC"). SCE also requests the Commission's approval to discontinue certain EE programs and sub-programs as detailed below.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this advice letter filing is to provide SCE's 2019 EE annual budget and associated forecasted energy savings and cost-effectiveness, summarized as follows:

- SCE proposed portfolio budget of \$229.8 million for 2019, which is \$23 million below SCE's EE Business Plan authorized amount.¹
- SCE's 2019 Portfolio results in a forecasted TRC of 1.18 without Codes & Standards.
- Forecasted energy savings of 524 GWH, which is 119 percent of goal; and 93 MW of forecasted demand reduction, which is 102 percent of goal <u>without</u> Codes & Standards.
- Forecasted energy savings of 1,205 GWH, which is 118 percent of goal; and 248 MW demand reduction, which is 115 percent of goal <u>including</u> Codes & Standards.

D.18-05-041, OP 12 approves SCE's business plan budget of \$253.36 million for 2019.

In this Advice filing SCE is also requesting approval to discontinue the programs and sub-programs listed in Attachment E. SCE's rationale for seeking to discontinue each program or sub-program is also provided in Attachment E.

The supporting attachments to this filing are as follows:

- 1. Attachment A: Commission Developed ABAL Tables
- 2. Attachment B: CEDARS Filing Confirmation
- 3. Attachment C: Historical Annual Budget Advice Letter Tables
- 4. Attachment D: Sector Level Metrics
- 5. Attachment E: Description of Program Changes
- 6. Attachment F: Near Term EM&V Activities Identified

BACKGROUND

In D.15-10-028, the Commission ordered each EE Program Administrator (PA) to file a Tier 2 advice letter in September of each year with the PA's annual EE budget for the following year.² Each Annual Budget Advice Letter (ABAL) must contain the following:

- Portfolio cost effectiveness statement; and
- Application summary tables with forecast budgets and savings by sector and program/intervention.

Beginning with the ABAL due on September 4, 2018, D.18-05-041 directed the PAs to provide the following information:

- A forecasted TRC that meets or exceeds 1.25, except during program years 2019-2022, when the forecasted TRC must meet or exceed 1.0;
- Forecasted energy savings goals that meet or exceed Commission established savings goals for each PA;
- A forecasted budget that does not exceed the PA's annual budget in the approved business plans, or (if applicable) the revised annual budget in the current ABAL;
- Sector-level metrics; and
- A description of program and portfolio information.3

² See D.15-10-028, Ordering Paragraph (OP) 4.

³ See D.18-05-041, p. 124-129, &133.

Additionally, D.18-05-041 directed Commission staff to develop templates and further guidance as needed for ABAL submissions.⁴ On July 19, 2018, Energy Division issued its guidance for the PAs ABAL submission that had been discussed at the July 10, 2018 Project Coordination Group (PCG) meeting among the Energy Division and the PAs. Per Energy Division guidance, the filing should also include:

- PA's Program Year Budget and Forecasted Savings;
- A Narrative of Program and Portfolio Information;
 - Proposed program changes
 - Proposed portfolio changes
 - Additional explanations if the PAs TRC is between 1.0 and 1.25 or if the forecasted energy savings is below Commission established goals
- PA's Budget True-up;
- PA's Savings True-up; and
- Investor Owned Utilities (IOU's) allocation for IDSM, pursuant to OP 10 of D.18-05-041

Energy Division has also directed the PAs to include the information contained in Attachment A as part of the ABAL filing at the July 10, 2018 PCG meeting. In addition, on August 30, 2018, Energy Division directed SCE to only upload the Historical Annual Budget Advice Letter Tables (Attachment C) onto the CEDARS website.⁵ As such, Attachment C has been uploaded onto the CEDARs website. Attachment B provides the confirmation of SCE's CEDARS filing.

2019 EE PORTFOLIO SUMMARY

SCE's proposed portfolio and budget are designed to optimize each of the CPUC metrics, including but not limited to, cost-effectiveness, savings goals, budgets, and Commission-mandated budget caps and targets. To meet the Commission's requirements, SCE proposes significant modifications to its EE portfolio for 2019, as described herein. These modifications focus on delivering a cost-effective portfolio while beginning the transition to the new statewide and third-party model that the Commission has adopted for energy efficiency programs. SCE seeks to optimize its portfolio using three iterative strategies:

⁴ See D.18-05-041, OP 40.

⁵ This direction was provided by Monda Dzvova from the Commission's Energy Division to SCE on August 30, 3018 during a telephone conference.

- 1. **Shift** Increase the quantity of high cost-effective measures and decrease the quantity of low cost-effective measures.
- 2. **Invest** Add budget to high cost-effective measures and programs and to new third-party programs.
- 3. **Reduce** Reduce overhead and other non-resource-related costs, as well as the number of cost-ineffective programs.

Using the three strategies described above, SCE has optimized its portfolio to achieve higher than a 1.0 forecasted TRC value for 2019. The result of SCE's optimization efforts, SCE's portfolio budget, savings, and cost-effectiveness are detailed below.

SCE is proposing a portfolio cost-effectiveness and budget based upon currentlyapproved energy savings and cost-effectiveness inputs to its measure and program mix. While SCE's target cost-effectiveness is above 1.0, this mix and resulting costeffectiveness may change as the Commission releases measure dispositions, Database for Energy Efficient Resources (DEER) updates, and other key inputs which could reduce or improve portfolio savings and cost-effectiveness. Significant negative changes to measures in high-volume programs, such as Primary Lighting could have a significant impact on SCE's ability to achieve its cost-effectiveness and goals targets. Early notifications of such dispositions would assist SCE in responding to such changes. SCE is committed to working closely with the Commission and its staff so that its measure and program forecasts utilize the most recent information, while also providing customers, vendors, and SCE sufficient certainty in making energy efficiency investment decisions. As cost-effectiveness inputs change, SCE will continue to evaluate the available mix of measures and make portfolio adjustments as necessary to cost-effectively meet savings goals.

One significant challenge that SCE faces is that while EE goals are updated only at predetermined intervals, EE measure savings and cost effectiveness inputs on which those goals are based can change at any time. This creates a misalignment between the allowable savings claims and the goals developed based on a different set of inputs. SCE will utilize strategies such as fund shifting, measure and program elimination, and modifications to rebate levels to help adjust to these impactful changes that occur between goal updates, but SCE also suggests that the PAs work with the Energy Division and other stakeholders to develop a method to better align goals, claimable savings, and cost-effectiveness inputs.

2019 EE PORTFOLIO BUDGET

Table 1 below provides SCE's forecast for 2019 EE portfolio budget. Please see Attachment A for SCE's 2019 EE Portfolio Budget in the Commission issued ABAL template.

| Sector | Program Year (PY) Budget | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| Residential | \$96,819,285 | | |
| Commercial | \$48,787,134 | | |
| Industrial | \$20,352,822 | | |
| Agriculture | \$2,943,042 | | |
| Emerging Tech | \$10,579,964 | | |
| Public | \$24,215,749 | | |
| WE&T | \$5,571,814 | | |
| Finance | \$1,968,842 | | |
| OBF Loan Pool | \$- | | |
| Codes and Standards | \$8,939,320 | | |
| IOU EM&V ⁶ | \$9,667,142 | | |
| Total | \$229,845,115 | | |

Table 1: 2019 EE Portfolio Budget

SCE does not yet have authority to utilize unspent and uncommitted funds in the Energy Efficiency Finance Programs Balancing Account (EEFPBA) from the previous 2010-2016 EE program cycles, including On-Bill Financing (OBF) loan repayments, to fund the OBF loan program. To continue to fund the OBF loan program in 2018 and 2019, SCE will file a separate Advice Letter requesting authority to shift funding from prior cycles' unspent and uncommitted OBF loan pool funds to SCE's OBF program for 2018 and 2019. While SCE filed for approval of OBF program funding for 2018 in Advice Letter 3654-E, the Commission did not approve the AL in its Decision approving SCE's Business Plan.^Z SCE will also file a subsequent Advice Letter to convert its loan pool into a revolving fund for future years consistent with previous Commission direction for this program.⁸

Table 2 below provides SCE's 2019 EE Portfolio budget and Cost Recovery by Funding Source.

| | 2019 |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| | |
| SCE's 2019 EE Portfolio Budget | \$ 229,845,115 |

| Table 2 - Bu | dget and Cost | Recoverv by | v Funding | Source |
|--------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|--------|
| | aget and evel | | , . anang | 000100 |

EM&V Budget reflects only the portion of EM&V funds that remain with SCE. \$287,822, \$34,196, and \$6,689 in EM&V funds have been respectively allocated to Southern California Regional Energy Network (SoCalREN), Tri-County Regional Energy Network (3CREN), and Lancaster Choice Energy (LCE).

^Z D.18-05-041, OP 12

⁸ D.09-09-047, OP 40

| SCE's Unspent/Uncommitted Program Carryover Funds | |
|---|-------------------|
| from 2018 | \$ (1,672,495) |
| Lancaster Choice Energy's (LCE) Funding Request for | |
| 2019 EE Portfolio | \$ 401,318 |
| LCE's EM&V | \$ 6,689 |
| Tri-County Regional Energy Network's (3CREN) | |
| Funding Request for 2019 EE Portfolio | \$ 2,051,754 |
| 3CREN's EM&V | \$ 34,196 |
| Southern California Regional Energy Network's | |
| (SoCalREN) Funding Request for 2019 EE Portfolio | \$ 17,269,325 |
| SoCalREN's EM&V | \$ 287,822 |
| Total PA's Funding Request for 2019 EE Portfolio | \$ 248,223,723 |

In addition to the \$248.22 million requested for EE programs in 2019, SCE is requesting \$9.36 million for 2019 funding to continue IDSM activities directed in D.18-05-041.⁹ In D.18-05-041, the Commission approved SCE's Business Plan Application which included funding for IDSM activities. Further, the 3CREN and SoCalREN will be submitting their own Advice Letters for each PA's 2019 budget. Per Resolution E-4917, LCE's budget comes from SCE's budget; however, LCE will submit its own budget via CEDARS.

SCE is requesting an increase in the percentage allocation for evaluation, measurement, and verification (EM&V) as authorized by Decision 16-08-019.¹⁰ The EM&V budget is allocated between the Commission and SCE. SCE is requesting this increase in the EM&V budget allocation because timely, reliable and predictable studies are necessary to meet local customer and market needs and to enhance the energy efficiency value proposition. Cost-effective programs require high customer engagement that deliver the right impacts for the electric grid. This requires SCE's evaluations to go beyond their current state and examine what program elements are meaningful to electric consumers and to the grid that serves them. With increased EM&V budget allocation, SCE will identify market and customer behavior levers to engage customers to serve the local grid, clean the environment, and integrate energy efficiency with broader clean energy choices. The Commission has already acknowledged areas of embedded evaluation practices and new technology-based solutions to make energy efficiency reliably measured.¹¹ Please see Attachment E for the near- term categories of EM&V activities SCE has identified for the additional budget request.

<u>9</u> D.18-05-041, OP 10

<u>10</u> D.16-08-019, OP 16

¹¹ D.16-08-019, p.80-81

2019 EE PORTFOLIO SAVINGS

Table 3 and Table 4 below provides SCE's forecast of energy savings and demand reduction for its 2019 EE portfolio. The energy savings from SCE's low-income EE program, the Energy Savings Assistance (ESA) program, are included in the figures below. Energy savings from SCE's Codes and Standards program are excluded in the figures below. Please see Attachment A for SCE's 2019 EE Portfolio Savings in the Commission issued ABAL template.

| Table 3: 2019 | EF Portfolic | Savings | | Programs | Only) |
|---------------|--------------|---------|------|----------|-------|
| Table 5. 2015 | | Javings | 1001 | rograms | |

| | 2019 Forecast | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------|-----------|----------------|--|--|
| | Total | CPUC Goal | % of 2019 Goal | | |
| Energy Savings (Net GWH) | 524 | 442 | 119% | | |
| Demand Reduction (Net MW) | 93 | 91 | 102% | | |

Table 4: 2019 EE Portfolio Savings (Including Codes & Standards)

| | 2019 Forecast | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------|-----------|----------------|--|
| | Total | CPUC Goal | % of 2019 Goal | |
| Energy Savings (Net GWH) | 1,205 | 1,014 | 118% | |
| Demand Reduction (Net MW) | 248 | 216 | 115% | |

2019 EE PORTFOLIO COST-EFFECTIVENESS

Table 5 below sets forth the results of the Total Resource Cost (TRC) test and Program Administrator Cost (PAC) test for SCE's 2019 EE portfolio. These estimates exclude impacts from SCE's Codes and Standards programs, and SCE's low-income EE program, the Energy Savings Assistance (ESA) program. Please see Attachment A for SCE's 2019 EE Portfolio TRC and PAC in the Commission issued ABAL template.

| Table 5: 2019 EE Portfolio TRC and PAC (w | w/o Codes & Standards) |
|---|------------------------|
|---|------------------------|

| | 2019 Forecast | | |
|-----|---------------|--|--|
| TRC | 1.18 | | |
| PAC | 1.46 | | |

METRICS

Pursuant to D.18-05-041, SCE provides sector-level metrics and their associated targets for program year 2019 in Attachment D using the format developed by the Energy Division. SCE also provides the required 2017 data associated with the metrics and targets.

PROPOSED PROGRAM AND PORTFOLIO CHANGES

Cost-effectiveness is a key consideration in SCE's development of its 2019 proposed EE portfolio and budget. As such, SCE's proposed portfolio is designed to maximize cost-effectiveness while also seeking to satisfy all other Commission metrics and working towards meeting a minimum forecasted cost-benefit ratio of 1.25 beginning no later than 2023.¹² For these reasons, SCE's proposed portfolio budget of \$229.8 million is significantly lower than its most recently approved budget advice letter¹³ of \$333.3 million in 2017 and lower than the 2018 approved budget of \$250.3 million.¹⁴ To help meet the Commission's goals for energy efficiency, SCE is proposing to reduce its non-resource program portfolio, eliminate low-performing programs, and maximize savings from cost-effective programs and measures.

SCE also is working towards the implementation of third-party proposed, designed, and implemented programs as directed in D.18-01-004, including third-party delivered statewide programs. Solicitations are scheduled to begin in late 2018 for program implementation as early as 2019. To prepare for the implementation of new third-party designed and delivered programs, SCE's 2019 budget accounts for ramp-up funding for new programs in 2019. In addition, SCE has budgeted funds for the continued implementation of third-party energy efficiency programs and projects from previous years. SCE also increased its investment in its Emerging Technologies Program.

Finally, SCE reduced its administrative costs by over 45 percent from its 2018 budgets. In order to maintain a cost-effective portfolio, SCE is committed to managing its administrative and other non-resource-related costs while making sure there is appropriate oversight of its portfolio during and after the transition to the statewide and third-party program implementation model.

Program and Sub-Program Cancellation

SCE is requesting to discontinue the following programs that are not cost-effective as for reasons discussed in Attachment E.

Resource Programs

- Energy Upgrade California (Home Upgrade)
- IDEEA365 Program
- Cool Schools
- Commercial Utility Building Efficiency
- Energy Leader Partnership Program

¹² See D.18-05-041, COL 36

¹³ See SCE's Advice Letter 3465-E-B

¹⁴ In D.18-05-041, the Commission did not adopt SCE's 2018 Budget Advice Letter Budget request of \$299.6 million and approved its 2018 Business Plan budget of \$250.3 million.

 American Reinvestment Recovery Act (ARRA)-Originated Financing. Also known "Empower Energy Efficiency Program."

Non-Resource Programs

- Cool Planet
- Lighting Market Transformation
- Lighting Innovation Program
- WE&T Planning
- WE&T Mobile Energy Unit
- WE&T Community Language Efficiency Outreach
- Sustainable Communities Pilot Program
- Energy Efficiency Integrated Demand Side Management Program

Program Realignments

- Strategic Energy Management
- Commercial Continuous Energy Improvement
- Agricultural Continuous Energy Improvement
- Industrial Continuous Energy Improvement

SCE is proposing to eliminate one Workforce Education and Training (WE&T) program and two sub-programs to improve the overall cost-effectiveness of SCE's overall energy efficiency portfolio. Pursuant to current Commission requirements on portfolio costeffectiveness, the WE&T programs provide no claimable resource value due to the inability to directly link the results of such programs to energy efficiency resource impacts. As such, WE&T programs negatively impact SCE's overall TRC as it can only be included as a "cost" in the TRC and PAC cost-effectiveness calculations. Therefore, SCE requests the Commission consider removing the costs of WE&T programs from the cost-effectiveness evaluations as part of the Market Transformation policy issues that will be resolved in Phase III of R.13-11-005. While SCE believes WE&T programs do not provide benefit in calculating portfolio cost effectiveness, SCE believes they are useful to customers and can transform the market over the longer term. As such, WE&T programs should be treated similar to Emerging Technology Program costs. The Commission approved removal of Emerging Technology Program costs from the costeffectiveness evaluations in D.05-04-051.¹⁵ In that Decision, in reference to Emerging Technology Program budgets, the Commission stated, "The usefulness of the TRC test as a primary indicator of cost-effectiveness is limited for certain programs which do not necessarily focus on the timing or type of resource needs of the utility."16 Similarly, SCE believes that while WE&T programs can provide value, it should not be considered in the TRC test. if the Commission were to remove WE&T costs from the TRC calculation in Phase III of R.13-11-005, SCE would plan to continue to offer the WE&T programs.

¹⁵ See D.05-04-051, Attachment 3, Rules II.8 and IV.9.

¹⁶ See D.05-04-051, Attachment 3, Rule IV.9.

New Programs and Sub-Programs

As discussed above, SCE is working towards the utilization of third-party proposed, designed, and delivered implemented programs as directed in D.18-01-004. Because the third-party programs have not yet been proposed, SCE has created placeholders for programs that SCE plans to award at the conclusion of the third-party solicitation process. SCE has allocated \$6.8 million in 2019 for ramp up costs for these future programs.

SCE anticipates performing solicitations for nearly all programs to meet the Commission's requirement that, at minimum, 60 percent of the EE program portfolio budget must eventually be used for programs proposed, designed, and implemented by third parties.¹⁷ To accomplish this, SCE will conduct a multi-phased solicitation that will be implemented in stages beginning in the fourth quarter of 2018. In the interim, SCE is proposing the following new programs, in addition to the new third-party programs discussed above. Please see Attachment E for a description of the proposed programs.

- Midstream Point of Purchase
- Water Infrastructure and System Efficiency Program
- AB 793 Residential Pay for Performance
- Facilities Assessment Service Program
- National and International Standards (Codes & Standards sub-program)

Reduced and Expanded Programs

To achieve the Commission's requirement to meet a cost benefit ratio of 1.0 for 2019 and meet its energy savings goals, SCE optimized its portfolio by expanding programs with high cost effectiveness and reducing or eliminating programs with low cost effectiveness in order to achieve a higher TRC value. Please see Attachment E for program change descriptions of programs that will be expanded and reduced by more than 40 percent in 2019.

Expanded Programs

- Residential Direct Install
- Enhanced Retro-commissioning
- Select Local Government Programs
- Statewide Codes and Standards
- WE&T Connections
- Statewide Emerging Technologies Program (ETP)

Reduced Programs

Nonresidential HVAC Program

¹⁷ See. D.16-08-019, OP 12, p.111

- Industrial Deemed Energy Efficiency Program
- Agriculture Deemed Energy Efficiency Program
- Lodging Energy Efficiency Program
- Comprehensive Chemical Products
- Comprehensive Petroleum Refining
- Oil Production
- Select Local Government Programs

To support its 2018 and 2019 energy efficiency portfolios, SCE recently received approval to modify its Nonresidential HVAC program to eliminate non-cost-effective measures and to implement lower incentives on certain measures, thereby improving the cost-effectiveness of the program and the portfolio.¹⁸ Note, however, that SCE kept some of the non-cost-effective measures in this program to help meet the overall savings goals of the portfolio.

SCE will also file an Advice Letter to add a revolving loan element to its On-Bill Financing program which will reduce the overall budget necessary in the portfolio.

SCE will also begin to ramp down existing third-party programs and transition to new third-party program designs as part of SCE's third-party solicitation effort. The programs listed below will stop accepting new enrollments for 2019 but will continue to be funded to complete committed projects in the pipeline as of the end of 2018.

- Healthcare EE
- Data Center EE
- Lodging EE
- Food & Kindred
- Primary and Fabricated Metals
- Non-Metallic Minerals & Products
- Residential HVAC
- Comprehensive Chemical Products
- Comprehensive Petroleum
- Oil Production
- Enhanced Retro-Commissioning
- Medium Size Industrial Customer

Continued Non Cost-Effective Programs

SCE is proposing to continue multiple programs in 2019 that are not cost-effective in order to comply with various regulatory mandates, achieve 2019 goals, and support customer programs through the transition period. SCE will continue to evaluate its

¹⁸ Advice Letter 3831-E, Request for Approval to Change Incentives for Measures Offered in SCE's Statewide Commercial Quality Maintenance Energy Efficiency Program. Approved August 24, 2018.

portfolio of programs in response to competitive solicitations, cost-effectiveness, ability to achieve goals and metrics, as well as other factors, and SCE may propose eliminating these programs in the future.

Per D.18-05-041, PAs cannot opt out of statewide programs and are required to fund all statewide programs.¹⁹ As such, SCE will continue three statewide programs, listed below, even though the programs are not cost-effective. SCE does not know if the cost effectiveness will improve over time, however, SCE is committed to working with statewide programs leads to maximize the cost-effectiveness of these programs. In addition, the three programs will be part of the upcoming third-party solicitation which may improve the cost-effectiveness of third-party programs.

- Plug Load and Appliance Program
- Nonresidential HVAC Program
- Savings by Design

SCE will continue to offer Savings by Design (SBD) even though it may no longer be cost effective.²⁰ The IOUs received a disposition for SBD that requires modification of the calculation method in the *EnergyPro* building energy simulation tool. SCE's preliminary analysis indicates that full implementation of the proposed modifications will reduce claimable savings by approximately 50 percent and will require significant program design modifications. Requiring the IOUs to continue non cost-effective programs reduces the cost-effectiveness of their portfolios. However, SCE will work collaboratively with the Commission and its statewide counterparts to develop plans to serve SBD customers while minimizing the negative impact to portfolio cost effectiveness.

As discussed above, many of SCE's third-party programs currently are not cost effective; however, SCE has allocated funding in 2019 to support commitments from previous years as SCE is required to continue these programs. SCE's upcoming third-party solicitations may improve the cost-effectiveness of third-party programs. Below is a list of programs SCE will continue funding to complete committed projects.

- Healthcare EE
- Data Center EE
- Lodging EE
- Food & Kindred
- Primary and Fabricated Metals
- Non-Metallic Minerals & Products
- Residential HVAC
- Comprehensive Chemical Products
- Comprehensive Petroleum

<u>19</u> See D.18-05-041, OP 22

²⁰ IOU PAs are required to fund all statewide programs per D.18-05-041, p. 83.

- Oil Production
- Enhanced Retro-Commissioning
- Medium Size Industrial Customer

SCE is also continuing two low-TRC programs that provide direct installation services to small business and school markets. Commercial Direct Install and School Energy Efficiency will assist customers in these markets with energy savings and enable SCE to meet its 2019 energy savings and demand reduction metrics. Due to the implementation strategy of these direct installation programs, these programs do not result in long-term customer and utility commitments and can rapidly ramp down should SCE's third-party solicitations result in new program concepts that deliver savings in these markets.

None of SCE's Local Government Partnerships are cost-effective; however, SCE is proposing to continue all Local Government Partnerships. Pursuant to D.18-05-041, SCE must work with participating local governments to improve cost-effectiveness and to meet the local governments' needs.²¹

SCE is proposing to continue to offer its nonresidential customized and deemed programs even though the programs are not cost effective. These programs will continue to be offered to allow for participation in energy efficiency in the nonresidential customer segment while new programs are being solicited and ramped up. In addition, these programs provide a means to offer energy efficiency solutions to business customers not served by the third-party markets. Similar to previous years, SCE has offered nonresidential third-party programs along with SCE's nonresidential customized and deemed programs.

SCE's nonresidential customized and deemed programs have experienced declines in cost-effective savings for several reasons. First, CPUC dispositions as well as codes and standards have resulted in reductions of available measures. Second, SCE has shifted some of the remaining available measures to more cost-effective delivery channels, resulting in lower uptake for these programs. Finally, increased participation requirements and uncertainty in rules have caused a reduction in customer participation.

SCE requests the Commission to prioritize the need to stabilize the rules of participation and savings calculations in energy efficiency programs due to the negative impact on customers and California energy efficiency cost-effectiveness. While many of these rules and calculations were discussed in the Track 2 Working Group, little progress has been made to implement substantive changes.²² The cost effectiveness of these programs will continue to be influenced by uncertainty in program rules and measure eligibility, such as the application of Industry Standard Practice baselines and changes in baseline determinations that can occur at any time. These challenges, coupled with

²¹ See D.18-05-041, Ordering Paragraph 30.

²² Track 2 Working Group Final Report on Tasks 1-4, September 7, 2017.

unknown project review timing and changing data requirements, limit the effectiveness of these programs. SCE anticipates that better alignment between measure availability and increased guidance from the Commission on changes to allowable savings will increase program cost effectiveness. Program cost-effectiveness can increase if there is early Commission guidance regarding changes to allowable savings. Such guidance would allow SCE to better align its programs to measure availability, thereby, increasing cost-effectiveness. In addition, providing more certainty in program rules and measure eligibility will provide certainty for customers, third-party implementers, and program administrators; increase customer satisfaction; and foster greater program participation. SCE looks forward to working with the Commission and stakeholders to address these issues in the Custom Projects and Industrial Programs track of Phase III of R.13-10-005 as SCE continues to modernize energy efficiency.

DISCUSSION OF SCE's 2019 FORECASTED TRC RESULT

WHY SCE IS FORECASTING A TRC BELOW 1.25

SCE strives to update its EE portfolio to improve customer participation and optimize portfolio cost-effectiveness while addressing long-term planning and near-term impacts. While SCE forecast a TRC of at least 1.25, several factors make this challenging:

- For SCE's 2019 EE portfolio forecast, the avoided cost calculations effective in 2019 result in reduced energy efficiency benefits of nearly 25% compared to the avoided cost calculations effective in 2017. SCE estimates that the portfolio proposed in this Advice Letter would have achieved a TRC of 1.53 had it used the avoided costs effective in 2017. Avoided cost updates include decreasing natural gas prices, market peak shifting from daytime to evening, and a nearly carbon-free grid mid-day reducing the amount of GHG abated for mid-day kWh savings.
- SCE's 2019 EE Portfolio forecast includes \$17.05 million in incentive payments for streetlight measures that will result in no claimable energy savings. This is due to the direction provided by Commission staff on October 10, 2017 and October 31, 2017. Specifically, the Commission directed SCE to pay customers the 2015 rebate levels for Acquisition Customers and pay the rebate levels in effect at the time of the initial agreement for AB719 Customers. Meanwhile, SCE may only claim savings based on the workpaper in effect at the time of completed equipment installation, and in 2019, it is anticipated that there will be no workpaper available to support savings claims for streetlight measures for Acquisition and Option E customers. SCE is working in collaboration with Commission staff to develop a solution to this mismatch by either allowing SCE to claim the savings for the streetlight measures or remove the costs of providing these rebates from the cost-effectiveness calculations.

- Loss of cost-effective measures due to successful market transformation (code mandated), of transitioning cost-effective savings from incentive programs to building and appliance codes (i.e., CEC Title 24 and Title 20, respectively).
- Goals are created in two-year cycles based upon estimates of the cost-effective potential of measures. However, when significant measure dispositions or avoided cost updates occur within the cycle, these goals are not retrospectively updated. For example, in 2018 the Commission issued two significant lighting measure dispositions²³ that reduced the savings amount associated with the measures available in SCE's lighting programs. In addition, the avoided costs calculations used for 2019 generally reduced the cost-effective measure potential compared to the prior avoided costs calculations used in the 2018 EE Potential & Goal Study. This results in portfolio administrators having to make tradeoffs between the competing goals of cost effectiveness and meeting savings goals that may be outdated or more difficult to achieve based on later developments.

ABILITY TO ACHIEVE AN EVALUATED TRC OF 1.0

Although SCE is not proposing a portfolio that meets a cost benefit ratio of 1.25, SCE is confident it will meet an evaluated TRC of 1.0 for 2019 because SCE will continue to optimize its portfolio throughout the year to lower costs by improving, reducing, or eliminating non-resource programs and non-cost-effective programs and measures. SCE will follow the appropriate regulatory channels to accomplish this outcome.

In addition to increasing cost-effectiveness going forward, SCE will maximize savings from cost-effective measures and programs, encourage statewide programs not led by SCE to also maximize cost-effectiveness, and require new programs to meet a high cost-effectiveness threshold and maximize pay-for-performance.

Furthermore, SCE has included a budget of approximately \$6.8 million for the ramp-up of new third-party programs in 2019 but did not allocate any attributable energy savings to these programs; therefore, the cost burden has been estimated, but only positive savings and cost-effectiveness results are expected to occur. These third-party programs are expected to contribute positively to overall cost-effectiveness of the portfolio once operational and may contribute to the energy savings delivered in 2019.

SCE will continue to improve the cost-effectiveness of both cost-effective and non-costeffective programs. As required by the Commission in D.18-05-041, SCE will work with Local Government Partnership participants to improve the cost-effectiveness of these programs in 2019. SCE will also be developing programs specifically marketed to Disadvantaged Communities (DAC) and Hard-to-Reach (HTR) customers and refocus existing programs to target DAC and HTR customers where possible. Programs that

^{23 2018} Screw-In Lamp Savings Methods Disposition; 2018 Outdoor Lighting Phase 1 Disposition

meet the DAC and HTR criteria are currently eligible to claim at least a 0.85 net-to-gross ratio. SCE will work collaboratively with the Commission to identify the correct documentation requirements and to properly indicate projects installed for DAC and HTR customers.²⁴

SCE anticipates improved ex post results from its nonresidential energy efficiency programs, including third-party and customized projects as well as deemed rebates. This expected improvement is due to the significant efforts by SCE and its implementers in response to the Commission's previous ex post and ex ante recommendations. Since 2015 and ongoing today, SCE has implemented numerous initiatives and EE program policies to address Commission concerns with programs. These efforts include, but are not limited to: requiring increased documentation of EE program influence on customer actions; establishing SCE internal processes to communicate ongoing Commission staff guidance; increased SCE review of large projects; standardization of technical and influence documentation into a Project Feasibility Study (PFS) template; and, detailed guidance of EE program influence via a matrix developed to provide details in alignment with known Preponderance of Evidence guidance from CPUC staff. In 2018, SCE enacted an Early Screening process to provide immediate feedback to customers and project implementers on projects and their likelihood of receiving EE incentives which may improve ex-post results.

SCE's portfolio excludes the cost-effectiveness of its codes and standards advocacy programs which provides a significant buffer to maintain cost-effectiveness above 1.0. Such programs can provide significant, cost-effective energy savings to California which are not captured in the cost-effectiveness metrics.

In addition, SCE is evaluating several measures for reinstatement in 2019. In January 2018, SCE suspended several lighting measures due to guidance received from Commission dispositions, market studies, and industry standard practice (ISP) studies.²⁵ As SCE receives clarifying direction, SCE will determine if and when the measures will be reinstated and available for new project applications. The

- 2017_Workpaper_Guidance_Memo_OUT
- 2017ExteriorLEDFixturesDisposition-Revised2June2017-FINAL
- PGECOLTG178r3_DetailedReview_29Sep2017-final1
- SCE_FinalVersion_2016ESPI_2017-08-21
- 2017ExteriorLEDFixturesDisposition-BaselineClarifications-12Apr2017-Draft
- SCE-16-C-C-0073_0500804246_Ext. LED Lighting
- 2018 Screw-In LED Methods Disposition
- Commission Staff email clarification of the 2018 Screw-in LED Methods Disposition, January 31, 2018

On August 28, 2018, the Commission issued Draft Resolution E-4952, which addresses DAC and HTR net-to-gross values. SCE is in the process of reviewing the recent guidance and look forward to working with Energy Division as necessary.

²⁵ Key elements of the following dispositions and guidance memos are the drivers for SCE suspending high risk measures:

reinstatement of these measures should have a positive impact on the portfolio TRC and savings values.

PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING A FORECASTED TRC OF 1.25

As noted above, SCE will continue to optimize its portfolio in response to competitive solicitations, cost-effectiveness challenges, changes in the marketplace, and other factors to maximize the TRC of its portfolio and strive to achieve a forecasted TRC of 1.25 no later than 2023 while also striving to achieve energy savings goals and other portfolio targets.

Program Administrator's 2019-2025 Budget True-Up

Per D.18-05-041, SCE is providing an update to its budget to support the goals established in D.17-09-025 and D.17-08-022 in Table 6 below.²⁶ See Attachment A for SCE's Annual Rolling Portfolio Budget and Savings Forecast in the Commission issued ABAL template.

For subsequent annual budget advice letters, SCE will continue to revise annual funding levels to reflect more accurate assumptions as business plan implementation progresses. As directed by the Commission, SCE's overall funding amount will not exceed the overall funding amount in its 2018-2025 business plan.²⁷

| | Budget ²⁸ | Energy Savings (kWh) ²⁹ | Demand Reduction (kW) ^{<u>30</u>} | | |
|------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 2018 | \$233,027,000 | 487,525,392 | 79,325 | | |
| 2019 | \$230,575,139 | 524,864,249 | 93,003 | | |
| 2020 | \$275,649,883 | 601,576,898 | 156,666 | | |
| 2021 | \$270,600,813 | 581,128,328 | 153,353 | | |
| 2022 | \$278,583,316 | 595,155,753 | 157,553 | | |

Table 6: Annual Rolling Portfolio Budget and Savings Forecast – True-Up

26 D.18-05-041, p. 132

27 D.18-05-041, p. 130

²⁸ Budget amounts equal IOU only subtotal + IOU EM&V + Lancaster CCA, per Resolution E-4917 from the attached ABAL template

Energy Savings (kWh) equals IOU only subtotal + ESA savings. See Attachment A for additional details.

<u>30</u> Demand Reduction (kW) equals IOU only subtotal + ESA savings. See Attachment A for additional details.

| 2023 | \$286,805,293 | 609,014,812 | 161,886 |
|------|---------------|-------------|---------|
| 2024 | \$295,273,930 | 625,362,865 | 166,440 |
| 2025 | \$303,996,626 | 643,879,191 | 171,367 |

IOU IDSM Budget Allocation

Per guidance provided to the IOU PAs, below is SCE's IDSM Budget Allocation.

Table 6: SCE's IDSM Budget Allocation (\$000)

| Funding Source | Sector | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|-------------------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|----------|----------|
| | Non- | | | | | | | | |
| DR | Residential | \$7,780 | \$8,360 | \$8,871 | \$8,678 | \$8,961 | \$9,253 | \$9,554 | \$9,864 |
| DR | Residential | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 |
| | Non- | | | | | | | | |
| | Residential | | | | | | | | |
| | (Energy | | | | | | | | |
| | Advisor | | | | | | | | |
| EE | Program) | \$ 220 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| EE | Residential | \$ | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Total* | | \$9,000 | \$9,360 | \$9,871 | \$9,678 | \$9,961 | \$10,253 | \$10,554 | \$10,864 |

PROPOSED TARIFF CHANGES

This advice filing will not cause the withdrawal of service nor conflict with any other schedule or rule.

TIER DESIGNATION

Pursuant to General Order (GO) 96-B, Energy Industry Rule 5.2, this advice letter is submitted with a Tier 2 designation.

EFFECTIVE DATE

This advice filing will become effective on October 4, 2018, the 30th calendar day after the date submitted.

<u>NOTICE</u>

Anyone wishing to protest this advice filing may do so by letter via U.S. Mail, facsimile, or electronically, any of which must be received no later than 20 days after the date of this advice filing. Protests should be submitted to:

CPUC, Energy Division Attention: Tariff Unit 505 Van Ness Avenue San Francisco, California 94102 E-mail: <u>EDTariffUnit@cpuc.ca.gov</u>

Copies should also be mailed to the attention of the Director, Energy Division, Room 4004 (same address above).

In addition, protests and all other correspondence regarding this advice letter should also be sent by letter and transmitted via facsimile or electronically to the attention of:

> Gary A. Stern, Ph.D. Managing Director, State Regulatory Operations Southern California Edison Company 8631 Rush Street Rosemead, California 91770 Telephone (626) 302-9645 Facsimile: (626) 302-6396 E-mail: <u>AdviceTariffManager@sce.com</u>

Laura Genao Managing Director, State Regulatory Affairs c/o Karyn Gansecki Southern California Edison Company 601 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 2030 San Francisco, California 94102 Facsimile: (415) 929-5544 E-mail: <u>Karyn.Gansecki@sce.com</u>

There are no restrictions on who may file a protest, but the protest shall set forth specifically the grounds upon which it is based and must be received by the deadline shown above.

In accordance with General Rule 4 of GO 96-B, SCE is serving copies of this advice filing to the interested parties shown on the attached GO 96-B, A.17-01-013 et al and R.13-11-005 service lists. Address change requests to the GO 96-B service list should be directed by electronic mail to <u>AdviceTariffManager@sce.com</u> or at (626) 302-4039. For changes to all other service lists, please contact the Commission's Process Office at (415) 703-2021 or by electronic mail at <u>Process Office@cpuc.ca.gov</u>.

Further, in accordance with Public Utilities Code Section 491, notice to the public is hereby given by filing and keeping the advice filing at SCE's corporate headquarters. To view other SCE advice letters filed with the Commission, log on to SCE's web site at https://www.sce.com/wps/portal/home/regulatory/advice-letters.

For questions, please contact Lisa Mau at (626) 302-3684 or by electronic mail at <u>lisa.mau@sce.com</u>

Southern California Edison Company

<u>/s/ Gary A. Stern, Ph.D.</u> Gary A. Stern, Ph.D.

RGW:lm:jm Enclosures



California Public Utilities Commission

ADVICE LETTER SUMMARY ENERGY UTILITY



| MUST BE COMPLETED BY UTI | LITY (Attach additional pages as needed) |
|---|--|
| Company name/CPUC Utility No.: | |
| Utility type: ELC GAS WATER PLC HEAT | Contact Person: Phone #: E-mail: E-mail Disposition Notice to: |
| EXPLANATION OF UTILITY TYPE ELC = Electric GAS = Gas PLC = Pipeline HEAT = Heat WATER = Water | (Date Submitted / Received Stamp by CPUC) |
| Advice Letter (AL) #: | Tier Designation: |
| Subject of AL: | |
| Keywords (choose from CPUC listing): | |
| AL Type: Monthly Quarterly Annua | al One-Time Other: |
| If AL submitted in compliance with a Commissi- | on order, indicate relevant Decision/Resolution #: |
| Does AL replace a withdrawn or rejected AL? I | f so, identify the prior AL: |
| Summarize differences between the AL and th | e prior withdrawn or rejected AL: |
| Confidential treatment requested? Yes | No |
| If yes, specification of confidential inform Confidential information will be made av nondisclosure agreement. Name and co access to confidential information: | ation: ailable to appropriate parties who execute a antact information to request nondisclosure agreement/ |
| Resolution required? Yes No | |
| Requested effective date: | No. of tariff sheets: |
| Estimated system annual revenue effect (%): | |
| Estimated system average rate effect (%): | |
| When rates are affected by AL, include attach (residential, small commercial, large C/I, agricu | nment in AL showing average rate effects on customer classes ultural, lighting). |
| Tariff schedules affected: | |
| Service affected and changes proposed ^{1:} | |
| Pending advice letters that revise the same tar | iff sheets: |
| - | |

Protests and all other correspondence regarding this AL are due no later than 20 days after the date of this submittal, unless otherwise authorized by the Commission, and shall be sent to:

| CPUC, Energy Division Attention: Tariff Unit 505 Van Ness Avenue San Francisco, CA 94102 Email: <u>EDTariffUnit@cpuc.ca.gov</u> | Name: Title: Utility Name: Address: City: State: Telephone (xxx) xxx-xxxx: Facsimile (xxx) xxx-xxxx: Email: |
|---|---|
| | Name: Title: Utility Name: Address: City: State: Telephone (xxx) xxx-xxxx: Facsimile (xxx) xxx-xxxx: Email: |

ENERGY Advice Letter Keywords

| Affiliate | Direct Access | Preliminary Statement |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| Agreements | Disconnect Service | Procurement |
| Agriculture | ECAC / Energy Cost Adjustment | Qualifying Facility |
| Avoided Cost | EOR / Enhanced Oil Recovery | Rebates |
| Balancing Account | Energy Charge | Refunds |
| Baseline | Energy Efficiency | Reliability |
| Bilingual | Establish Service | Re-MAT/Bio-MAT |
| Billings | Expand Service Area | Revenue Allocation |
| Bioenergy | Forms | Rule 21 |
| Brokerage Fees | Franchise Fee / User Tax | Rules |
| CARE | G.O. 131-D | Section 851 |
| CPUC Reimbursement Fee | GRC / General Rate Case | Self Generation |
| Capacity | Hazardous Waste | Service Area Map |
| Cogeneration | Increase Rates | Service Outage |
| Compliance | Interruptible Service | Solar |
| Conditions of Service | Interutility Transportation | Standby Service |
| Connection | LIEE / Low-Income Energy Efficiency | Storage |
| Conservation | LIRA / Low-Income Ratepayer Assistance | Street Lights |
| Consolidate Tariffs | Late Payment Charge | Surcharges |
| Contracts | Line Extensions | Tariffs |
| Core | Memorandum Account | Taxes |
| Credit | Metered Energy Efficiency | Text Changes |
| Curtailable Service | Metering | Transformer |
| Customer Charge | Mobile Home Parks | Transition Cost |
| Customer Owned Generation | Name Change | Transmission Lines |
| Decrease Rates | Non-Core | Transportation Electrification |
| Demand Charge | Non-firm Service Contracts | Transportation Rates |
| Demand Side Fund | Nuclear | Undergrounding |
| Demand Side Management | Oil Pipelines | Voltage Discount |
| Demand Side Response | PBR / Performance Based Ratemaking | Wind Power |
| Deposits | Portfolio | Withdrawal of Service |
| Depreciation | Power Lines | |

Attachment A Commission Developed ABAL Tables

| Sector Program Year (Pr) Budget PA forecast kWh kW therms (M Residential \$ 96,819,285 396,765,517 72,91 C Commercial \$ 48,787,134 50,825,314 10,778 110,1718 Industrial \$ 20,352,822 32,424,346 3,417 C Agriculture \$ 2,943,042 804,930 92 C Emerging Tech \$ 10,759,664 na na C Public \$ 2,4215,749 10,087,142 1,315 C OBF Loa Pool \$ 1,466,842 - - - IOU Subtolal \$ 2,11,238,652 490,907,249 88,593 IOU Total Program Savings (W/out C&S) CPUC Program Savings Goal 4410 0 IOU Total Program Savings (W/out C&S) \$ 9,907,249 88,593 IOU Total Program Savings (W/out C&S) \$ 24,864,249 9,3003 IOU Total Program Savings (W/out C&S) \$ 9,999,849 1028 | | | | | PA forecast | PA forecast |
|--|---|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|
| Residential \$ 96,819,285 396,765,517 72,991 Commercial \$ 48,787,134 50,825,314 10,778 Industrial \$ 20,352,822 32,424,346 3,417 Agriculture \$ 20,352,822 32,424,346 3,417 Agriculture \$ 10,579,964 na na Public \$ 42,157,749 10,087,142 1,315 WE&T \$ 5,571,814 na na Finance \$ 1,968,842 - - OBF Loan Pool \$ 2 - - IOU Subtotal \$ 21,1,238,652 440,907,249 88,593 ESA Savings - - - IOU Total Program Savings (w/out C&S) - - - Codes and Standards \$ 8,939,320 680,472,783 155,536 IOU PN Sudget Recovery Request \$ 228,501,327 - - IOU PN Budget Recovery Request (excl. CCA Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 20,01,73,822 - - IOU PN Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 20,051,754 </th <th>Sector</th> <th>Progra</th> <th>m Year (PY) Budget</th> <th>PA forecast kWh</th> <th>kW</th> <th>therms (MM)</th> | Sector | Progra | m Year (PY) Budget | PA forecast kWh | kW | therms (MM) |
| Commercial \$ 48,787,134 50,825,314 10,778 Industrial \$ 20,352,822 32,424,346 3,417 Agriculture \$ 20,352,822 32,424,346 3,417 Agriculture \$ 20,352,822 32,424,346 3,417 Agriculture \$ 20,43,042 80,4930 92 Emerging Tech \$ 10,579,964 na na Public \$ 24,215,749 10.087,142 1,315 WE&T \$ 5,571,814 na na Finance \$ 1,968,842 - - OBF Loan Pool \$ - na na IOU Subotal \$ 211,238,652 490,907,249 88,593 ESA Savings - 33,957,000 4,410 IOU Total Program Savings (w/out C&S) - 33,957,000 4,410 Codes and Standards \$ 9,995,849 9,903 - IOU PNAW \$ 9,995,849 1,672,495 - IOU PNAW \$ 230,173,822 - - (LESS) IOU Uncommitted and Unspent Carryover Balance ² | Residential | \$ | 96,819,285 | 396,765,517 | 72,991 | - |
| Industrial \$ 20,352,822 32,424,346 3,417 Agriculture \$ 29,343,042 804,930 92 Emerging Tech \$ 10,579,964 na na Public \$ 24,215,749 10,087,142 1,315 WE&T \$ 5,571,314 na na Finance \$ 1,968,842 - - OBF Loan Pool \$ - na na IOU Subtotal \$ 211,238,652 490,907,249 88,593 IOU Total Program Savings (w/out C&S) - na na na CPUC Program Savings Goal 442,000,000 91,000 - 52,48,64,249 93,003 COU Ends and Standards \$ 9,995,849 100 PY 100 - <t< th=""><th>Commercial</th><th>\$</th><th>48,787,134</th><th>50,825,314</th><th>10,778</th><th>-</th></t<> | Commercial | \$ | 48,787,134 | 50,825,314 | 10,778 | - |
| Agriculture \$ 2,943,042 804,930 92 Emerging Tech \$ 10,579,964 na na Public \$ 24,215,749 10,087,142 1,315 WE&T \$ 5,571,814 na na Finance \$ 1,968,842 - - OBF Loan Pool \$ - 0na na IOU Subtotal \$ 211,238,652 449,097,249 88,593 IOU Total Program Savings (w/out C&S) 524,864,249 93,003 - IOU Total Program Savings (w/out C&S) 524,864,249 93,003 - Codes and Standards \$ 8,939,320 680,472,783 155,536 IOU PN Budget Request ¹ \$ 230,173,822 155,536 - IOU PN Budget Request ¹ \$ 230,173,822 155,536 - IOU PN Budget Recovery Request (excl. CCA Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 20,01,754 - - SCREN PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 2,051,754 - - TOU PN Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 2,051,754 - - SCREN PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspe | Industrial | \$ | 20,352,822 | 32,424,346 | 3,417 | - |
| Emerging Tech \$ 10,579,964 na na Public \$ 24,215,749 10,087,142 1,315 WE&T \$ 24,215,749 10,087,142 1,315 WE&T \$ 5,571,814 na na Finance \$ 1,968,842 - - OBF Loan Pool \$ - na na IOU Subtotal \$ 211,238,652 490,907,249 88,593 IOU Total Program Savings (w/out C&S) - 133,957,000 4,410 IOU Total Program Savings Goal 1193 102% Codes and Standards \$ 8,939,320 680,472,783 155,536 IOU PY Spending Budget Request ¹ \$ 230,173,822 155,536 100 IOU PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. CCA Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 20,017,3822 155,53 155,536 IOU PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 20,51,754 5 1,672,495 IOU Authorized PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. CCA Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) | Agriculture | \$ | 2,943,042 | 804,930 | 92 | - |
| Public \$ 24,215,749 10,087,142 1,315 Finance \$ 5,571,814 na na Finance \$ 1,968,842 - - OBF Loan Pool \$ 1,968,842 - - IOU Subtoal \$ 211,238,652 430,907,249 88,593 ESA Savings 33,957,000 4,410 IOU Total Program Savings (w/out C&S) 524,864,249 93,003 CPUC Program Savings Goal 442,000,000 91,000 Codes and Standards \$ 9,995,849 102% Codes and Standards \$ 9,995,849 105,536 IOU P Spending Budget Request ¹ \$ 230,173,822 155,536 IOU PY Budget Recovery Request \$ 230,173,822 155,536 IOU PY Budget Recovery Request \$ 228,501,327 100 Authorized PY Budget Cap (D.18-05-041) \$ 253,364,000 Lancaster CCA PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. CCA Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 401,318 3CREN PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 17,269,325 Total PA ((IOU+CCAs+RENS) PY Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 17,269,325 1.46 IOU Forecast PY PAC ⁶ 1.18 1.46 | Emerging Tech | \$ | 10,579,964 | na | na | na |
| WE&T S 5,571,814 na na Finance \$ 1,968,842 - na IOU Subtotal \$ - na na IOU Subtotal \$ 211,238,652 490,907,249 88,593 ESA Savings 33,957,000 4,410 5 524,866,249 93,003 IOU Total Program Savings (w/out C&S) 524,866,249 93,003 5 234,866,249 93,003 Codes and Standards S 8,939,320 680,472,783 102% 5 IOU EM&V \$ 9,995,849 102% 5 230,173,822 1,672,495 | Public | \$ | 24,215,749 | 10,087,142 | 1,315 | - |
| Finance \$ 1,688,842 - - - OBF Loan Pool \$ - na na IOU Subtotal \$ 211,238,652 490,907,249 88,593 ESA Savings 33,957,000 4,410 IOU Total Program Savings (w/out C&S) 524,864,249 93,003 CPUC Program Savings Goal 442,000,000 91,000 Codes and Standards \$ 8,939,320 680,472,783 155,536 IOU Prosent Savings Goal 119% 102% Codes and Standards \$ 9,995,849 100 PY Spending Budget Request ¹ \$ 230,173,822 IOU PX Spending Budget Request ³ \$ 228,501,327 100 Loncommitted and Unspent Carryover Balance ² \$ 1,672,495 IOU PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. CCA Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 20,51,754 5 SCCalREN PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 17,269,325 1.18 Total PA (IOU+CCAs+REINS) PY Recovery Budget ⁵ \$ 248,223,723 100 IOU Forecast PY PAC ⁶ 1.18 | WE&T | \$ | 5,571,814 | na | na | na |
| OBF Loan Pool S Ima Ima Ima IOU Subtotal \$ 211,238,652 490,907,249 88,593 IOU Total Program Savings (w/out C&S) 4,410 IOU Total Program Savings (w/out C&S) 524,864,249 93,003 CPUC Program Savings Goal 442,000,000 91,000 Codes and Standards \$ 8,939,320 680,472,783 155,536 IOU EM&V \$ 9,995,849 102 % 102 PY Spending Budget Request ¹ \$ 223,0173,822 IOU PY Spending Budget Request ³ \$ 228,501,327 \$ 1,672,495 \$ 1,672,495 IOU PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. CCA Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 401,318 \$ 253,364,000 Lancaster CCA PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. CCA Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 17,269,325 \$ 5,228,501,327 Total PA (IOU+CCAs+RENS) PY Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 17,269,325 \$ 1,7269,325 Total PA (IOU+CCAs+RENS) PY Recovery Budget ⁵ \$ 248,223,723 \$ 100 IOU Forecast PY PAP 6 ⁶ 1.18 \$ 100 | Finance | \$ | 1,968,842 | - | - | |
| IOU Subtotal \$ 211,238,652 490,907,249 88,593 ESA Savings 33,957,000 4,410 IOU Total Program Savings (w/out C&S) 524,864,249 93,003 CPUC Program Savings Goal 442,000,000 91,000 Forecast savings as % of CPUC Program Savings Goal 119% 102% Codes and Standards \$ 8,939,320 680,472,783 155,536 IOU PY Spending Budget Request ¹ \$ 230,173,822 IOU PY Spending Budget Request ³ \$ 228,501,327 \$ 228,501,327 IOU PY Budget Recovery Request ³ \$ 253,364,000 Lancaster CCA PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. CCA Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 2,051,754 S 248,223,723 Total PA (IOU+CCAs+RENs) PY Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 248,223,723 IOU Forecast PY TRC ⁶ I.18 | OBF Loan Pool | \$ | - | na | na | na |
| ESA Savings 33,957,000 4,410 IOU Total Program Savings (w/out C&S) 524,864,249 93,003 CPUC Program Savings Goal 442,000,000 91,000 Codes and Standards \$ 8,939,320 680,472,783 102% Codes and Standards \$ 9,995,849 000 PY Spending Budget Request ¹ \$ 230,173,822 ILESS) IOU Uncommitted and Unspent Carryover Balance ² \$ 1,672,495 IOU PY Budget Recovery Request ³ \$ 228,501,327 IOU Authorized PY Budget Cap (D.18-05-041) \$ 253,364,000 Lancaster CCA PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. CCA Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 2,051,754 SocalREN PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 248,223,723 IOU Forecast PY TRC ⁵ 1.18 IOU Forecast PY Ref 1.18 | IOU Subtotal | \$ | 211,238,652 | 490,907,249 | 88,593 | - |
| IOU Total Program Savings (w/out C&S) 524,864,249 93,003 COUC Program Savings Goal 442,000,000 91,000 | ESA Savings | | | 33,957,000 | 4,410 | |
| CPUC Program Savings Goal 442,000,000 91,000 Forecast savings as % of CPUC Program Savings Goal 119% 102% Codes and Standards \$ 8,939,320 680,472,783 155,536 IOU EM&V \$ 9,995,849 680,472,783 155,536 IOU PY Spending Budget Request ¹ \$ 230,173,822 155,536 160,472,783 155,536 IOU PY Spending Budget Request ¹ \$ 230,173,822 1,672,495 1,672,495 1,672,495 IOU PY Budget Recovery Request ³ \$ 228,501,327 100 Authorized PY Budget Cap (D.18-05-041) \$ 253,364,000 1 1 Lancaster CCA PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. CCA Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 2,051,754 \$ 2,051,754 \$ 2,051,754 SoCalREN PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 248,223,723 10U Forecast PY TRC ⁶ 1.18 IOU Forecast PY TRC ⁶ 1.18 10U Forecast PY PY C ⁶ 1.46 | IOU Total Program Savings (w/out C&S) | | | 524,864,249 | 93,003 | - |
| Forecast savings as % of CPUC Program Savings Goal 119% 102% Codes and Standards \$ 8,939,320 680,472,783 155,536 IOU EM&V \$ 9,995,849 100 PY Spending Budget Request ¹ \$ 230,173,822 ICUSS) IOU Uncommitted and Unspent Carryover Balance ² \$ 1,672,495 1,672,495 IOU PY Budget Recovery Request ³ \$ 228,501,327 IOU Authorized PY Budget Cap (D.18-05-041) \$ 253,364,000 Lancaster CCA PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. CCA Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 401,318 3CREN PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 2,051,754 SoCalREN PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 17,269,325 Total PA (IOU+CCAs+RENS) PY Recovery Budget ⁵ \$ 248,223,723 IOU Forecast PY TRC ⁶ 1.18 IOU Forecast PY PA C ⁶ 1.18 | | CPUC Pro | gram Savings Goal | 442,000,000 | 91,000 | - |
| Codes and Standards\$8,939,320680,472,783155,536IOU EM&V\$9,995,849IOU PY Spending Budget Request ¹ \$230,173,822(LESS) IOU Uncommitted and Unspent Carryover Balance ² \$1,672,495IOU PY Budget Recovery Request ³ \$228,501,327IOU Authorized PY Budget Cap (D.18-05-041)\$253,364,000Lancaster CCA PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. CCA Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$401,3183CREN PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$2,051,754SoCalREN PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$17,269,325Total PA (IOU+CCAs+RENS) PY Recovery Budget ⁵ \$248,223,723IOU Forecast PY TRC ⁶ 1.18IOU Forecast PY DAC ⁶ 1.46 | Forecast savings a | s % of CPUC Pro | gram Savings Goal | 119% | 102% | 0% |
| IOU EM&V\$9,995,849IOU PY Spending Budget Request ¹ \$230,173,822(LESS) IOU Uncommitted and Unspent Carryover Balance ² \$1,672,495IOU PY Budget Recovery Request ³ \$228,501,327IOU Authorized PY Budget Cap (D.18-05-041)\$253,364,000Lancaster CCA PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. CCA Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$401,3183CREN PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$2,051,754SoCaIREN PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$17,269,325Total PA (IOU+CCAs+RENs) PY Recovery Budget ⁵ \$248,223,723IOU Forecast PY TRC ⁶ 1.18IOU Enrecast PX PAC ⁶ 1.18 | Codes and Standards | \$ | 8,939,320 | 680,472,783 | 155,536 | |
| IOU PY Spending Budget Request ¹ \$ 230,173,822 (LESS) IOU Uncommitted and Unspent Carryover Balance ² \$ 1,672,495 IOU PY Budget Recovery Request ³ \$ 228,501,327 IOU Authorized PY Budget Cap (D.18-05-041) \$ 253,364,000 Lancaster CCA PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. CCA Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 401,318 3CREN PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 2,051,754 SoCalREN PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 17,269,325 Total PA (IOU+CCAs+RENs) PY Recovery Budget ⁵ \$ 248,223,723 IOU Forecast PY TRC ⁶ 1.18 | IOU EM&V | \$ | 9,995,849 | | | |
| (LESS) IOU Uncommitted and Unspent Carryover Balance ² \$ 1,672,495 IOU PY Budget Recovery Request ³ \$ 228,501,327 IOU Authorized PY Budget Cap (D.18-05-041) \$ 253,364,000 Lancaster CCA PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. CCA Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 401,318 3CREN PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 2,051,754 SoCalREN PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 17,269,325 Total PA (IOU+CCAs+RENs) PY Recovery Budget ⁵ \$ 248,223,723 IOU Forecast PY TRC ⁶ 1.18 | IOU PY Spending Budget Request ¹ | \$ | 230,173,822 | | | |
| IOU PY Budget Recovery Request ³ \$228,501,327IOU Authorized PY Budget Cap (D.18-05-041)\$253,364,000Lancaster CCA PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. CCA Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$401,3183CREN PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$2,051,754SoCalREN PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$17,269,325Total PA (IOU+CCAs+RENs) PY Recovery Budget ⁵ \$248,223,723IOU Forecast PY TRC ⁶ 1.18IOU Forecast PY PAC ⁶ 1.46 | (LESS) IOU Uncommitted and Unspent Carryover Balance ² | \$ | 1,672,495 | | | |
| IOU Authorized PY Budget Cap (D.18-05-041) \$ 253,364,000 Lancaster CCA PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. CCA Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 401,318 3CREN PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 2,051,754 SoCalREN PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 17,269,325 Total PA (IOU+CCAs+RENs) PY Recovery Budget ⁵ \$ 248,223,723 IOU Forecast PY TRC ⁶ 1.18 | IOU PY Budget Recovery Request ³ | \$ | 228,501,327 | | | |
| Lancaster CCA PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. CCA Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 401,318 3CREN PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 2,051,754 SoCalREN PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 17,269,325 Total PA (IOU+CCAs+RENs) PY Recovery Budget ⁵ \$ 248,223,723 IOU Forecast PY TRC ⁶ 1.18 IOU Forecast PY PAC ⁶ 1.46 | IOU Authorized PY Budget Cap (D.18-05-041) | \$ | 253,364,000 | | | |
| 3CREN PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 2,051,754 SoCalREN PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 17,269,325 Total PA (IOU+CCAs+RENs) PY Recovery Budget ⁵ \$ 248,223,723 IOU Forecast PY TRC ⁶ 1.18 IOUL Forecast PY PAC ⁶ 1.46 | Lancaster CCA PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. CCA Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ | \$ | 401,318 | | | |
| SoCalREN PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ \$ 17,269,325 Total PA (IOU+CCAs+RENs) PY Recovery Budget ⁵ \$ 248,223,723 IOU Forecast PY TRC ⁶ 1.18 IOU Forecast PY PAC ⁶ 1.46 | 3CREN PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ | \$ | 2,051,754 | | | |
| Total PA (IOU+CCAs+RENs) PY Recovery Budget ⁵ \$ 248,223,723 IOU Forecast PY TRC ⁶ 1.18 IOU Forecast PY PAC ⁶ 1.46 | SoCalREN PY Budget Recovery Request (excl. REN Uncommitted/Unspent Carryover) ⁴ | \$ | 17,269,325 | | | |
| IOU Forecast PY TRC ^o 1.18 IOU Forecast PY PAC ⁶ 1.46 | Total PA (IOU+CCAs+RENs) PY Recovery Budget ⁵ | \$ | 248,223,723 | | | |
| IQUE Forecast PY PAC ⁶ | IOU Forecast PY TRC ° | | 1.18 | | | |
| 1.40 | IOU Forecast PY PAC ⁶ | | 1.46 | | | |

PA PY FORECAST ENERGY SAVINGS (Net)

 SoCalREN EM&V Budget
 \$
 287,822

 3CREN EM&V Budget
 \$
 34,196

 LCE EM&V Budget
 \$
 6,689

 SCE EM&V Budget
 \$
 9,667,142

¹This is amount by which Statewide 25% requirement will be measured, and what the IOU intends to spend in the PY, including carryovers. Includes EM&V funds allocated to SoCalREN, 3CREN, and LCE.

² The balance of unspent uncommitted must reflect the total unspent uncommitted starting Jan 1 2018 through Dec 31 of current year (PY-1). Because each ABAL is filed in Q3, this unspent uncommitted amount will be an estimate for the year in which the ABAL is filed.

³ The amount of funds to be collected (budget recovery) for the Program Year - Line 21 less line 22

⁴ Add a separate row for each REN or CCA

For reference only

⁵ Line 28 is a mix of budget spending and budget recovery for all PAs in the IOU service area

⁶ Cost effectiveness excludes Codes and Standards

2a. IOU budget trueup

| | Annual Rolling Portfolio Budget Forecast - True-up | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|------------------|------|-------------|------------|------|------|-------------|----|-------------|------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Sector | 2 | 018 ¹ | | 2019 | 2020 | | | 2021 | | 2022 | | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | Total |
| Residential | \$ | 86,729,073 | \$ | 96,819,285 | \$ 99,167 | ,981 | \$ | 97,200,134 | \$ | 100,069,314 | \$1 | .03,024,578 | \$ 106,068,906 | \$ 109,204,557 | \$ 798,283,830 |
| Commercial | \$ | 66,759,793 | \$ | 48,787,134 | \$ 90,536 | ,375 | \$ | 89,138,580 | \$ | 91,769,796 | \$ | 94,479,958 | \$ 97,271,796 | \$ 100,147,384 | \$ 678,890,816 |
| Industrial | \$ | 23,443,501 | \$ | 20,352,822 | \$ 29,433 | ,552 | \$ | 28,849,495 | \$ | 29,701,082 | \$ | 30,578,220 | \$ 31,481,792 | \$ 32,412,469 | \$ 226,252,932 |
| Agriculture | \$ | 4,112,448 | \$ | 2,943,042 | \$ 3,289 | ,198 | \$ | 3,223,930 | \$ | 3,319,095 | \$ | 3,417,115 | \$ 3,518,089 | \$ 3,622,092 | \$ 27,445,008 |
| Emerging Tech | \$ | 5,638,909 | \$ | 10,579,964 | \$ 7,961 | ,948 | \$ | 7,803,958 | \$ | 8,034,317 | \$ | 8,271,588 | \$ 8,516,009 | \$ 8,767,763 | \$ 65,574,456 |
| Public | \$ | 22,973,406 | \$ | 24,215,749 | \$ 20,186 | ,685 | \$ | 20,149,735 | \$ | 20,744,521 | \$ | 21,357,151 | \$ 21,988,245 | \$ 22,638,270 | \$ 174,253,763 |
| Codes and Standards | \$ | 5,662,538 | \$ | 8,939,320 | \$ 6,028 | ,843 | \$ | 5,909,211 | \$ | 6,083,641 | \$ | 6,263,304 | \$ 6,448,381 | \$ 6,639,011 | \$ 51,974,249 |
| WE&T | \$ | 6,020,788 | \$ | 5,571,814 | \$ 5,159 | ,707 | \$ | 5,057,322 | \$ | 5,206,606 | \$ | 5,360,368 | \$ 5,518,764 | \$ 5,681,912 | \$ 43,577,282 |
| Finance | \$ | 1,302,632 | \$ | 1,968,842 | \$ 1,666 | ,795 | \$ | 1,633,720 | \$ | 1,681,945 | \$ | 1,731,616 | \$ 1,782,785 | \$ 1,835,488 | \$ 13,603,825 |
| OBF Loan Pool | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Subtotal ² | \$ | 222,643,089 | \$ 2 | 220,177,973 | \$ 263,431 | ,085 | \$2 | 258,966,085 | \$ | 266,610,316 | \$2 | 74,483,898 | \$ 282,594,768 | \$ 290,948,947 | \$ 2,079,856,160 |
| IOU EM&V ⁶ | \$ | 10,011,570 | \$ | 9,995,849 | \$ 11,817 | ,461 | \$ | 11,634,728 | \$ | 11,973,000 | \$ | 12,321,395 | \$ 12,679,162 | \$ 13,047,679 | \$ 93,480,844 |
| LCE Programs | \$ | 372,341 | \$ | 401,318 | \$ 401 | ,338 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,174,996 |
| SoCalREN Program | \$ | 15,536,447 | \$ | 17,269,325 | \$ 17,632 | ,329 | \$ | 18,005,324 | \$ | 18,389,142 | \$ | 18,782,951 | \$ 19,185,086 | \$ 19,599,710 | \$ 144,400,313 |
| 3CREN Program | \$ | - | \$ | 2,051,754 | \$ 2,154 | ,341 | \$ | 2,262,059 | \$ | 2,352,541 | \$ | 2,446,641 | \$ 2,520,041 | \$ 2,595,643 | \$ 16,383,021 |
| Total Portfolio Program Year PA Budget ³ | \$ | 248,563,447 | \$ 2 | 249,896,218 | \$ 295,436 | ,553 | \$2 | 290,868,196 | \$ | 299,324,998 | \$3 | 808,034,885 | \$ 316,979,058 | \$ 326,191,979 | \$ 2,335,295,333 |
| Total Authorized Portfolio PY Budget Cap ³ | \$ | 248,673,631 | \$ 2 | 272,684,179 | \$ 291,638 | ,971 | \$ 2 | 87,071,205 | \$ | 295,526,649 | \$3 | 804,235,713 | \$ 313,181,388 | \$ 322,393,219 | \$ 2,335,404,955 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| IOU Portfolio PY Budget Request ⁴ | \$ | 233,027,000 | \$ 2 | 230,575,139 | \$ 275,649 | ,883 | \$2 | 270,600,813 | \$ | 278,583,316 | \$2 | 86,805,293 | \$ 295,273,930 | \$ 303,996,626 | \$ 2,174,512,000 |
| IOU Authorized PY Budget Cap ⁴ | \$ | 233,027,000 | \$ 2 | 253,364,000 | \$ 271,852 | ,000 | \$2 | 266,803,000 | \$ | 274,785,000 | \$ 2 | 83,007,000 | \$ 291,476,000 | \$ 300,198,000 | \$ 2,174,512,000 |
| Forecast Portfolio PY TRC (through 2022) ⁵ | | 1 00 | | 1 18 | | 1 20 | | 1 22 | | 1 24 | | 1 25+ | 1 25+ | 1 25+ | |
| Forecast Portfolio PY PAC (through 2022) ⁵ | | 1.00 | | 1.10 | | 1.48 | | 1.51 | | 1.53 | | 1.25+ | 1.25+ | 1.25+ | |

¹ "Reset" 2018 budget at or below 2018 annual budget approved in Business plan Decision. "True-up" years 2019-2025.

² Subtotal equals the denominator by which portfolio 3P bid % will be measured

³ Sum of all PA budgets in IOU Service Area

⁴ IOU only Subtotal (Line 14) + IOU EM&V (Line 15) + Lancaster CCA (Line 16), Per Resolution E-4917

⁵ Cost effectiveness calculation excludes Codes and Standards

⁶ Includes EM&V funds allocated for CCA and RENs.

| | Allitual Kolling Politiono Savings Polecast - True-up (Kwin) | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| Sector | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 ¹ | 2021 ¹ | 2022 ¹ | 2023 ¹ | 2024 ¹ | 2025 ¹ | | |
| Residential | 251,209,773 | 396,765,517 | 246,306,274 | 241,440,660 | 248,577,759 | 255,928,970 | 263,500,717 | 271,299,617 | | |
| Commercial | 81,841,827 | 50,825,314 | 202,284,395 | 198,288,404 | 204,149,902 | 210,187,244 | 216,405,707 | 222,810,723 | | |
| Industrial | 50,689,409 | 32,424,346 | 96,886,842 | 94,972,908 | 97,780,352 | 100,672,018 | 103,650,435 | 106,718,204 | | |
| Agriculture | 14,326,336 | 804,930 | 1,319,149 | 1,293,090 | 1,331,315 | 1,370,686 | 1,411,238 | 1,453,007 | | |
| Emerging Tech | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| Public | 48,847,643 | 10,087,142 | 20,823,238 | 20,411,889 | 21,015,274 | 21,636,760 | 22,276,891 | 22,936,226 | | |
| WE&T | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| Finance | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| OBF Loan Pool | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| IOU - Subtotal | 446,914,989 | 490,907,249 | 567,619,898 | 556,406,952 | 572,854,601 | 589,795,678 | 607,244,988 | 625,217,777 | | |
| ESA Savings | 40,610,404 | 33,957,000 | 33,957,000 | 24,721,375 | 22,301,153 | 19,219,133 | 18,117,877 | 18,661,413 | | |
| LCE Programs | - | 437,487 | 458,405 | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| SoCalREN Program | 2,881,748 | 4,367,008 | 4,420,937 | 4,509,304 | 4,599,620 | 4,691,885 | 4,785,450 | 4,880,964 | | |
| 3CREN Program | - | 173,927 | 232,916 | 325,184 | 472,780 | 653,591 | 691,405 | 74,302,065 | | |
| Total Forecast Portfolio Savings | 490,407,140 | 529,842,671 | 606,689,156 | 585,962,816 | 600,228,154 | 614,360,288 | 630,839,720 | 723,062,220 | | |
| CPUC Goal | 409,000,000 | 442,000,000 | 451,000,000 | 477,000,000 | 494,000,000 | 517,000,000 | 562,000,000 | 583,000,000 | | |
| % of Goal | 120% | 120% | 135% | 123% | 122% | 119% | 112% | 124% | | |
| Codes and Standards | 885,157,836 | 680,472,783 | 577,000,000 | 594,000,000 | 578,000,000 | 640,000,000 | 613,000,000 | 591,000,000 | | |

Annual Rolling Portfolio Savings Forecast - True-up (kWh)

¹ Savings data calculated using gross savings submitted in SCE's 2018-2025 Business Plan. Will be subject to change due to 3P solicitations and optimization of portfolio.

| | Annual Rolling Portfolio Savings Forecast - True-up (kW) | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| Sector | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 ¹ | 2021 ¹ | 2022 ¹ | 2023 ¹ | 2024 ¹ | 2025 ¹ | | |
| Residential | 49,113 | 72,991 | 108,050 | 105,915 | 109,046 | 112,271 | 115,593 | 119,014 | | |
| Commercial | 14,830 | 10,778 | 34,895 | 34,206 | 35,217 | 36,259 | 37,331 | 38,436 | | |
| Industrial | 442 | 3,417 | 6,366 | 6,241 | 6,425 | 6,615 | 6,811 | 7,012 | | |
| Agriculture | 4,015 | 92 | 300 | 294 | 302 | 311 | 321 | 330 | | |
| Emerging Tech | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| Public | 5,160 | 1,315 | 2,644 | 2,592 | 2,669 | 2,748 | 2,829 | 2,913 | | |
| WE&T | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| Finance | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| OBF Loan Pool | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| IOU - Subtotal | 73,560 | 88,593 | 152,256 | 149,248 | 153 <i>,</i> 660 | 158,204 | 162,884 | 167,705 | | |
| ESA Savings | 5,764 | 4,410 | 4,410 | 4,105 | 3,894 | 3,682 | 3,555 | 3,662 | | |
| Lancaster CCA | - | 115 | 122 | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| SoCalREN Program | 685 | 586 | 593 | 605 | 617 | 630 | 642 | 655 | | |
| 3CREN Program | - | 121 | 163 | 235 | 336 | 461 | 499 | 538 | | |
| Total Forecast Portfolio Savings (w/out C&S) | 80,010 | 93,825 | 157,544 | 154,193 | 158,506 | 162,977 | 167,581 | 172,560 | | |
| CPUC Goal | 82,000 | 91,000 | 92,000 | 100,000 | 104,000 | 110,000 | 118,000 | 124,000 | | |
| % of Goal | 98% | 103% | 171% | 154% | 152% | 148% | 142% | 139% | | |
| Codes and Standards | 170,700 | 155,536 | 142,000 | 168,000 | 163,000 | 200,000 | 192,000 | 186,000 | | |

¹ Savings data calculated using gross savings submitted in SCE's 2018-2025 Business Plan. Will be subject to change due to 3P solicitations and optimization of portfolio.

Attachment B CEDARS Filing Confirmation

CEDARS FILING SUBMISSION RECEIPT

The SCE portfolio filing has been submitted and is now under review. A summary of the filing is provided below.

PA: Southern California Edison (SCE)

Filing Year: 2019

Submitted: 06:43:48 on 31 Aug 2018

By: Gary Golden

Advice Letter Number: 3859-E

* Portfolio Filing Summary *

- TRC: 1.3204
- PAC: 3.7379
- TRC (no admin): 1.6232
- PAC (no admin): 7.921
- RIM: 3.7379
- Budget: \$229,845,115.02
- * Programs Included in the Filing *
- SCE-13-ESA: Energy Savings Assistance Program
- SCE-13-ESPI: Energy Savings Performance Incentive
- SCE-13-L-002B: City of Long Beach Energy Leader Partnership
- SCE-13-L-002F: Gateway Cities Energy Leader Partnership
- SCE-13-L-002H: Eastern Sierra Energy Leader Partnership
- SCE-13-L-002I: Energy Leader Partnership Strategic Support
- SCE-13-L-002J: Desert Cities Energy Leader Partnership
- SCE-13-L-002K: Kern County Energy Leader Partnership
- SCE-13-L-002L: Orange County Cities Energy Leader Partnership
- SCE-13-L-002M: San Gabriel Valley Energy Leader Partnership
- SCE-13-L-002N: San Joaquin Valley Energy Leader Partnership
- SCE-13-L-002O: South Bay Energy Leader Partnership
- SCE-13-L-002P: South Santa Barbara County Energy Leader Partnership
- SCE-13-L-002Q: Ventura County Energy Leader Partnership
- SCE-13-L-002R: Western Riverside Energy Leader Partnership
- SCE-13-L-002S: High Desert Regional Energy Leader Partnership
- SCE-13-L-002T: West Side Community Energy Leader Partnership

- SCE-13-L-002U: Local Government Strategic Planning Pilot Program
- SCE-13-L-002V: North Orange County Cities
- SCE-13-L-002W: San Bernardino Association of Governments
- SCE-13-L-003A: California Community Colleges Energy Efficiency Partnership
- SCE-13-L-003B: California Dept. of Corrections and Rehabilitation EE Partnership
- SCE-13-L-003C: County of Los Angeles Energy Efficiency Partnership
- SCE-13-L-003D: County of Riverside Energy Efficiency Partnership
- SCE-13-L-003E: County of San Bernardino Energy Efficiency Partnership
- SCE-13-L-003F: State of California Energy Efficiency Partnership
- SCE-13-L-003G: UC/CSU Energy Efficiency Partnership
- SCE-13-L-003I: Public Sector Performance-Based Retrofit High Opportunity Program
- SCE-13-PB: Pension and Benefits
- SCE-13-SW-001A: Energy Advisor Program
- SCE-13-SW-001B: Plug Load and Appliances Program
- SCE-13-SW-001C: Multifamily Energy Efficiency Rebate Program
- SCE-13-SW-001F: Residential New Construction Program
- SCE-13-SW-001G: Residential Direct Install Program
- SCE-13-SW-002A: Commercial Energy Advisor Program
- SCE-13-SW-002B: Commercial Calculated Program
- SCE-13-SW-002C: Commercial Deemed Incentives Program
- SCE-13-SW-002D: Commercial Direct Install Program
- SCE-13-SW-002F: Nonresidential HVAC Program
- SCE-13-SW-002G: Savings By Design
- SCE-13-SW-002H: Midstream Point of Purchase Program
- SCE-13-SW-003A: Industrial Energy Advisor Program
- SCE-13-SW-003B: Industrial Calculated Energy Efficiency Program
- SCE-13-SW-003C: Industrial Deemed Energy Efficiency Program
- SCE-13-SW-003D: Strategic Energy Management Program
- SCE-13-SW-004A: Agriculture Energy Advisor Program
- SCE-13-SW-004B: Agriculture Calculated Energy Efficiency Program
- SCE-13-SW-004C: Agriculture Deemed Energy Efficiency Program
- SCE-13-SW-005C: Primary Lighting Program
- SCE-13-SW-007A: On-Bill Financing
- SCE-13-SW-007C: New Finance Offerings
- SCE-13-SW-008A: Building Codes and Compliance Advocacy
- SCE-13-SW-008B: Appliance Standards Advocacy
- SCE-13-SW-008C: Compliance Improvement
- SCE-13-SW-008D: Reach Codes
- SCE-13-SW-008E: Planning and Coordination
- SCE-13-SW-008F: National and International Standards
- SCE-13-SW-009A: Technology Development Support
- SCE-13-SW-009B: Technology Assessments

- SCE-13-SW-009C: Technology Introduction Support
- SCE-13-SW-010A: WE&T; Centergies
- SCE-13-SW-010B: WE&T; Connections
- SCE-13-SWMEO: Statewide Marketing, Education & Outreach
- SCE-13-TP-001: Comprehensive Manufactured Homes
- SCE-13-TP-003: Healthcare EE Program
- SCE-13-TP-004: Data Center Energy Efficiency
- SCE-13-TP-005: Lodging EE Program
- SCE-13-TP-006: Food & Kindred Products
- SCE-13-TP-007: Primary and Fabricated Metals
- SCE-13-TP-008: Nonmetallic Minerals and Products
- SCE-13-TP-009: Comprehensive Chemical Products
- SCE-13-TP-010: Comprehensive Petroleum Refining
- SCE-13-TP-011: Oil Production
- SCE-13-TP-018: School Energy Efficiency Program
- SCE-13-TP-021: Enhanced Retrocommissioning
- SCE-13-TP-022: Water Infrastructure Systems Energy Efficiency Program
- SCE-13-TP-023: Midsize Industrial Customer Program
- SCE-13-TP-024: AB793 Residential Pay for Performance
- SCE-13-TP-025: Facility Assessment Program
- SCE-13-TP-026: Residential 3P Solicitation
- SCE-13-TP-027: Commercial 3P Solicitation
- SCE-13-TP-028: Industrial 3P Solicitation
- SCE-13-TP-029: Local Government 3P Solicitation
- SCE-3OV0100: SCE EM&V;
- SCE-3OV0200: CPUC EM&V;

Attachment C

Historical Annual Budget Advice Letter Tables

Attachment C

| Table 1 -Bill Payer Impacts - Rates by Customer Class | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | Gas Average Rate | Total Average Bil | I Total Average | | | | | | | |
| | Electric Average Rate | (Res and Non-Res) | Savings by Year | Lifecycle Bill | | | | | | | |
| | (Res and Non-Res) \$/kwh | \$/therm | (\$) | Savings (\$) | | | | | | | |
| Present Rates - | | | | | | | | | | | |
| System Average | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2013 | \$0.16 | N/A | \$ 87,209,070 | \$ 981,191,659 | | | | | | | |
| 2014 | \$0.17 | N/A | \$ 103,251,635 | \$ 1,090,731,032 | | | | | | | |
| 2015 | \$0.16 | N/A | \$ 93,081,321 | \$ 885,855,957 | | | | | | | |
| 2016 | \$0.15 | N/A | \$ 65,492,695 | \$ 704,523,862 | | | | | | | |
| 2017 | \$0.15 | N/A | \$ 83,570,931 | \$ 726,322,498 | | | | | | | |
| 2018 | \$0.16 | N/A | \$ 88,065,105 | \$ 840,561,019 | | | | | | | |
| 2019 | \$0.16 | N/A | \$ 78,054,253 | \$ 750,127,247 | | | | | | | |

Consistent with SPM TRC/PAC/RIM tests, all savings used from actuals and forecasts in this table are NET.

- Average first year electric bill savings is calculated by multiplying an average electric rate with first year net kWh energy savings.

- Average first year gas bill savings is calculated by multiplying an average gas rate with first year net therm energy savings.

- Total average first year bill savings is the sum of Notes 1 and 2.

- Average lifecycle electric bill savings is calculated by multiplying an average electric rate with lifecycle net kWh energy savings.

- Average lifecycle gas bill savings is calculated by multiplying an average gas rate with lifecycle net therm energy savings.

- Total average lifecycle bill savings is the sum of Notes 4 and 5.

- Total Annual and Lifecycle Bill Savings excluded savings from Codes & Standards and ESA Programs

Table 2a - Electric Bill Payer Impacts - Current and Proposed Revenues and Rates, Total and Energy Efficiency, by Customer Class with the return of unspent/uncommitted PY 2018 funds

| | | | 2017 Energy Efficiency | 2018 Energy Efficiency | 2019 Proposed Energy | | | 2017 Energy Efficiency | | 2018 Energy Efficiency | | |
|------------------------|---------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| | 2017 To | tal Electric Annual | Portion of Total Electric | Portion of Total Electric | Efficiency Electric Annual | 2019 Proposed Percentage | | Portion of Electric Average | 2018 Electric | Portion of Electric Average | 2019 Proposed Electric | 2019 Proposed Percentage |
| | | Revenue | Annual Revenue | Annual Revenue | Revenue Change | Change In Electric Revenue | 2017 Electric Average Rate | Rate | Average Rate | Rate | Average Rate Change | Change In Electric Revenue |
| Customer Classes | | \$000 | \$000 | \$000 | \$000 | and Rates | \$/kwh | \$/kwh | \$/kwh | \$/kwh | \$/kwh | and Rates |
| Bundled | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Domestic | \$ | 4,889,673 | \$ 125,447 | \$ 98,417 | \$ (1,519) | -1.5% | \$ 0.1780 | \$ 0.0048 | \$ 0.1820 | \$ 0.0037 | \$ 0.0037 | -1.5% |
| Lighting SM Med Power | \$ | 4,104,737 | \$ 105,310 | \$ 82,592 | \$ (1,275) | -1.5% | \$ 0.1690 | \$ 0.0045 | \$ 0.1730 | \$ 0.0035 | \$ 0.0035 | -1.5% |
| Large Power | \$ | 1,887,365 | \$ 48,42 | \$ 39,396 | \$ (608) | -1.5% | \$ 0.1160 | \$ 0.0031 | \$ 0.1200 | \$ 0.0024 | \$ 0.0024 | -1.5% |
| Agricultural & Pumping | \$ | 408,437 | \$ 10,479 | \$ 8,898 | \$ (137) | -1.5% | \$ 0.1270 | \$ 0.0034 | \$ 0.1350 | \$ 0.0028 | \$ 0.0027 | -1.5% |
| Street & Area Lighting | \$ | 128,959 | \$ 3,30 | \$ 2,506 | \$ (39) | -1.5% | \$ 0.1810 | \$ 0.0051 | \$ 0.1860 | \$ 0.0038 | \$ 0.0037 | -1.5% |
| Direct Access Service | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Residential | \$ | 39,890 | \$ 1,02. | \$ \$ 1,108 | \$ (17) | -1.5% | \$ 0.1050 | \$ 0.0031 | \$ 0.1090 | \$ 0.0022 | \$ 0.0022 | -1.5% |
| Commercial - Small | \$ | 326,864 | \$ 8,38 | 5 \$ 7,298 | \$ (113) | -1.5% | \$ 0.0790 | \$ 0.0023 | \$ 0.0850 | \$ 0.0017 | \$ 0.0017 | -1.5% |
| Commercial - Medium | \$ | 375,757 | \$ 9,640 | \$ 8,139 | \$ (126) | -1.5% | \$ 0.0550 | \$ 0.0016 | \$ 0.0570 | \$ 0.0012 | \$ 0.0011 | -1.5% |
| Commercial - Large | \$ | 5,579 | \$ 14 | \$ 125 | \$ (2) | -1.5% | \$ 0.0670 | \$ 0.0019 | \$ 0.0660 | \$ 0.0013 | \$ 0.0013 | -1.5% |
| Agricultural | \$ | 4,311 | \$ 11 | \$ 84 | \$ (1) | -1.5% | \$ 0.1210 | \$ 0.0025 | \$ 0.1020 | \$ 0.0021 | \$ 0.0020 | -1.5% |

Table 2b - Gas Bill Payer Impacts - Current and Proposed Revenues and Rates, Total and Energy Efficiency, by Customer Class

| Customer Classes | [1] 2019 EE Portfolio Budget less Unspent/Uncommitted Program Carryover Funds from PY 2018 | 2017 Energy Efficiency Portion of Total Electric Annual Revenue \$000 | 2018 Energy Efficiency Portion of Total Electric Annual Revenue \$000 | 2019 Proposed Energy Efficiency Electric Annual Revenue Change \$000 | 2019 Proposed Percentage Change In Electric Revenue and Rates | 2017 Electric Average Rate \$/kwh | 2017 Energy Efficiency Portion of Electric Average Rate \$/kwh | 2018 Electric Average Rate \$/kwh | 2018 Energy Efficiency Portion of Electric Average Rate \$/kwh | 2019 Proposed Electric Average Rate Change \$/kwh | 2019 Proposed Percentage Change In Electric Revenue and Rates |
|------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bundled | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Domestic | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lighting SM Med Power | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Large Power | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Agricultural & Pumping | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Street & Area Lighting | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Direct Access Service | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Residential | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial - Small | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial - Medium | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial - Large | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Agricultural | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 3 - Budget and Cost Recovery by Funding Source

| | 2019 |
|--|-------------------|
| 2019 EE Portfolio Budget | \$ 249,896,218 |
| Unspent/Uncommitted EM&V Carryover Funds from 2018 | \$ - |
| Unspent/Uncommitted Program Carryover Funds from 2018 | \$ 5,169,321 |
| Unspent/Uncommitted EM&V Carryover Funds from 2017 | \$ - |
| Unspent/Uncommitted Program Carryover Funds from 2017 | \$ 60,401,347 |
| Unspent/Uncommitted EM&V Carryover Funds from 2016 | \$ - |
| Unspent/Uncommitted Program Carryover Funds from 2016 | \$ 54,508,557 |
| Unspent/Uncommitted EM&V Carryover Funds from 2013-2015 | \$ - |
| Unspent/Uncommitted Program Carryover Funds from 2013-2015 | \$ 29,801,403 |
| Unspent/Uncommitted EM&V Carryover Funds from 2010-2012 | \$ 4,187,764 |
| Unspent/Uncommitted Program Carryover Funds from 2010-2012 | \$ 5,519,164 |
| Unspent/Uncommitted EM&V Carryover Funds from Pre 2010 | \$ 913,672 |
| Unspent/Uncommitted Program Carryover Funds from Pre 2010 | \$ - |
| Total Funding Request for 2019 EE Portfolio [1] | \$ 244,726,897 |

[1] 2019 EE Portfolio Budget less Unspent/Uncommitted Program Carryover Funds from PY 2018

Budget by Funding Source

| 2019 Authorized (Before Carryover) | 2 | 2019 Budget | Allocation |
|------------------------------------|----|-------------|------------|
| Electric Procurement EE Funds | \$ | 249,896,218 | 100% |
| Gas PPP Surcharge Funds | \$ | - | |
| Total Funds | \$ | 249,896,218 | |

Revenue Requirement for Cost Recovery by Funding Source

| | | | Allocation after |
|---|----|-------------|------------------|
| | 2 | 019 Revenue | Carryover |
| 2019 Authorized Funding in Rates (including carryover) [1] | F | Requirement | adjustment |
| Electric Procurement EE Funds | \$ | 244,726,897 | 100% |
| Gas PPP Surcharge Funds | \$ | - | |
| Total Funds | \$ | 244,726,897 | |

[1] 2019 EE Portfolio Budget less Unspent/Uncommitted Program Carryover Funds from PY 2018

Unspent/Uncommitted Carryover Funds (in positive \$ amounts)

| | | Electric | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|------|
| Total Unspent/Uncommitted Funds | Electric PGC | Procurement | Total Electric | Gas |
| 2018 | \$ - | \$ 5,169,321 | \$ 5,169,321 | \$- |
| 2017 | \$- | \$ 60,401,347 | \$ 60,401,347 | \$- |
| 2016 | \$- | \$ 54,508,557 | \$ 54,508,557 | \$- |
| 2013-2015 | \$- | \$ 29,801,403 | \$ 29,801,403 | \$ - |
| 2010-2012 | \$- | \$ 9,706,928 | \$ 9,706,928 | \$- |
| Pre 2010 | \$- | \$ 913,672 | \$ 913,672 | \$- |
| Total Unspent/Uncommitted Funds | \$- | \$ 160,501,228 | \$ 160,501,228 | \$- |

| | | Electric | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|-----|
| EM&V Unspent/Uncommitted Funds | Electric PGC | Procurement | Total Electric | Gas |
| 2018 | \$- | \$ - | \$ - | \$- |
| 2017 | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- |
| 2016 | \$- | \$ - | \$ - | \$- |
| 2013-2015 | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- |
| 2010-2012 | \$- | \$ 4,187,764 | \$ 4,187,764 | \$- |
| Pre 2010 | \$- | \$ 913,672 | \$ 913,672 | \$- |
| Total EM&V Unspent/Uncommitted Funds | \$- | \$ 5,101,436 | \$ 5,101,436 | \$- |

| | | Electric | | |
|---|--------------|----------------|----------------|------|
| Program Unspent/Uncommitted Funds | Electric PGC | Procurement | Total Electric | Gas |
| 2018 | \$- | \$ 5,169,321 | \$ 5,169,321 | \$ - |
| 2017 | \$- | \$ 60,401,347 | \$ 60,401,347 | \$ - |
| 2016 | \$- | \$ 54,508,557 | \$ 54,508,557 | \$ - |
| 2013-2015 | \$- | \$ 29,801,403 | \$ 29,801,403 | \$ - |
| 2010-2012 | \$- | \$ 5,519,164 | \$ 5,519,164 | \$ - |
| Pre 2010 | \$- | \$ - | \$- | \$ - |
| Total Program Unspent/Uncommitted Funds | \$- | \$ 155,399,792 | \$ 155,399,792 | \$- |
| Table 4 – Budget, S | Spent, Unspent, Carryover Details | | | 2013-2015 Bu | udget, Spent, Unspent | and Carryover | | | | 2016 Budget, Spent | , Unspent and Carryover | | 21 | 017 Budget, Fundshif | s and Spending to Date | | | 2018 E | Budget, Fundshit | fts and Spending to [| Date | 20 | 2019 Proposed Budget | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| New/Existing Program # | Main Program Name / Sub-Program Name | 2013-2015 Authorized Budget [1] | 2013-2015 Total Budget with Commitments & Fundshifts | 2013-2015 Total Budget Spent as of June 30, 2018 | Pre-2013 Commitments Remaining as of 06/30/2018 | 2013-2015 Unspent/Uncommi tted Funds Returned to Ratepayers [2] | 2013-2015 Commitments as of 06/30/2018 | Pre-2016 Unspent/Uncommi tted Funds Available for 2019 offset | 2016 Authorized Budget [3] | 2016 Total Budget with Commitments & Fundshifts [4] 2016 Total Budget Spent as of June 30, 2018 | 2016 Unspent/Uncommitte d Funds Returned to Ratepayers | 2016 Unspent/Uncom itted Funds 8 Available for 20 offset | Im 2017 Authorized Budget with Budget Fundshifts | 2017 Total Budget Spent as of June 30, 2018 | 2017 Unspent/Uncomm itted Funds Returned to Ratepayers | 2017 Unspent/Uncomr as itted Funds Available for 201 offset | ^m 2018 Authorized ₁₉ Budget C | 2018 Total Budget with Commitments & Fundshifts | 2018 Total Budget Spent as of June 30, 2018 | 2018 Unspent/Uncomm itted Funds Returned to Ratepayers | July to December 2018 Forecast to spend and commitment July to Unspent/Uncomm litted Funds Available for 2019 offset | 2019 Proposed Budget | 2019 Budget Offset from 2018 Carryover (Col AB) | 2019 Funds Requested | Program Type | Business Plan Sector | Resource or Non- resource | Program Status | Utility Grouping |
| SCE-13-SW-001 SCE-13-SW-001A SCE-13-SW-001B | California Statewide Program for Residential Energy Efficiency Energy Advisor Program Plug Load and Appliances Program | \$ 141,427,900 \$ 10,910,199 \$ 42,546,469 | \$ 140,714,900 \$ 15,722,199 \$ 43,341,469 | \$ 135,611,825 \$ 15,714,417 \$ 43,307,347 | 5 \$ - 7 \$ - 7 \$ - | s - s - s - | \$ 1,887,518 \$ - \$ - | s - S - S - | \$ 50,527,900 \$ 4,090,800 \$ 13,955,244 | \$ 48,577,900 \$ 41,736,143 \$ 7,290,800 \$ 7,276,732 \$ 7,184,244 \$ 6,596,509 | \$ - \$ 3,426 \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 375 \$ - - \$ - - \$ - | \$ 47,556,605 \$ 46,296,60 \$ 10,564,472 \$ 10,564,47 \$ 6,878,702 \$ 7,238,70 | 5 \$ 38,938,535 2 \$ 8,646,967 2 \$ 7,076,261 | \$ - \$ 4,211,2 \$ - \$ - \$ \$ - \$ - \$ | 248 \$ - - \$ - - \$ - | \$ 46,464,425 \$ \$ 14,419,867 \$ \$ 7,768,580 \$ | 46,464,425 14,419,867 5 7,768,580 5 | \$ 13,286,556 \$ 4,966,904 \$ 2,217,441 | \$ - | \$ 35,360,274 \$ - \$ \$ 8,611,392 \$ \$ 7,976,784 \$ | 50,896,178 11,169,006 9,324,900 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 50,896,178 11,169,006 9,324,900 | Core - SW/3P Core - SW | Residential Residential | Resource Resource | Existing E Existing F | nergy Advisor LA |
| SCE-13-SW-001C SCE-13-SW-001D SCE-13-SW-001E | Multifamily Energy Efficiency Rebate Program Energy Upgrade California Residential HVAC Program | \$ 34,596,613 \$ 29,006,566 \$ 12,599,368 | \$ 27,156,613 \$ 21,236,566 \$ 12,279,368 | 3 \$ 27,141,708 5 \$ 21,249,385 3 \$ 12,265,738 | 8 \$ - 5 \$ - 8 \$ - | \$ - \$ - \$ - | s - s - | \$ - \$ - | \$ 11,100,651 \$ 11,995,785 \$ 5,134,191 | \$ 11,110,651 \$ 10,187,714 \$ 11,985,785 \$ 11,251,866 \$ 2,034,191 \$ 1,991,501 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | - \$ - - \$ - | \$ 8,977,333 \$ 9,683,33 \$ 7,061,692 \$ 5,265,69 \$ 2,295,466 \$ 1,075,46 | 3 \$ 10,094,552 2 \$ 3,901,296 6 \$ 1,107,041 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ 6,7 \$ - \$ | - \$ - 762 \$ - - \$ - | \$ 7,807,963 \$ \$ 2,198,798 \$ \$ 63,404 \$ | 7,807,963 \$ 2,198,798 \$ 63,404 \$ | \$ 2,392,850 \$ 1,011,995 \$ - | | \$ 5,997,547 \$ \$ 1,543,279 \$ \$ 28,831 \$ | 10,022,735 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 10,022,735 | Core - SW Core - SW Core - SW | Residential Residential Residential | Resource Resource Resource | Existing M Discontinu V Discontinu H | IFEER Vhole House IVAC |
| SCE-13-SW-001F SCE-13-SW-001G SCE-13-SW-002 | Residential New Construction Program Residential Direct Install Program Statewide Commercial Energy Efficiency Program | \$ 11,768,685 \$ - \$ 264,756,656 | \$ 20,978,685 \$ | 5 \$ 15,933,231 \$ - 5 312,759,708 | 1 \$ - \$ - 8 \$ - | s - s - s - | \$ 1,887,518 \$ - \$ 1,585,027 | s - s - | \$ 4,251,229 \$ - \$ 93,356,656 | \$ 8,972,229 \$ 4,431,821 \$ \$ \$ 83,896,656 \$ 74,132,096 \$ 0,000,055 \$ 74,132,096 | \$ - \$ 3,426 \$ - \$ \$ - \$ 362 | 375 \$ - - \$ - 994 \$ - | \$ 7,585,870 \$ 7,585,87 \$ 4,193,070 \$ 4,883,07 \$ 82,693,857 \$ 82,693,85 \$ 0,005 F00 \$ 0,005 F0 | 0 \$ 2,514,695 0 \$ 5,597,723 7 \$ 59,461,278 | \$ - \$ 4,204,4 \$ - \$ \$ - \$ 696,1 | - \$ - - \$ - | \$ 6,665,162 \$ \$ 7,540,650 \$ \$ 60,917,142 \$ | 6,665,162 \$ 7,540,650 \$ 60,917,142 \$ | \$ 334,374 \$ 2,362,993 \$ 19,957,774 | \$ - | \$ 6,294,935 \$ \$ 4,907,506 \$ \$ 37,160,029 \$ - \$ | 4,809,556 15,569,981 40,779,326 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 4,809,556 15,569,981 40,779,326 | Core - SW Core - SW/3P | Residential Residential | Resource Resource | Existing N Existing D | lew Construction lirect Install |
| SCE-13-SW-002A SCE-13-SW-002B SCE-13-SW-002C SCE-13-SW-002D | Commercial Deered Incentives Program Commercial Deered Incentives Program Commercial Direct Install Program | \$ 13,295,200 \$ 22,384,072 \$ 46,143,445 \$ 60,225,014 | \$ 0,501,200 \$ 33,550,467 \$ 54,123,793 \$ 102,013,524 | 5 5 6,637,790 7 \$ 32,974,128 8 \$ 52,908,162 | 0 \$ - 8 \$ - 2 \$ - | s - s - s - | \$ - \$ - \$ - | s - s - | \$ 6,230,255 \$ 6,297,012 \$ 11,583,112 \$ 25,149,589 | \$ 2,950,255 \$ 2,950,996 \$ 6,297,012 \$ 5,769,150 \$ 8,623,112 \$ 6,275,727 \$ 21,949,598 \$ 21,172,411 | \$ - \$ 15 \$ - \$ 15 \$ - \$ | - \$ - 285 \$ - - \$ - 631 \$ - | \$ 2,083,300 \$ 2,083,300 \$ 5,974,271 \$ 5,284,27 \$ 7,295,430 \$ 9,895,43 \$ 19,947,927 \$ 19,947,92 | 5 950,815 1 \$ 3,689,701 0 \$ 9,800,588 7 \$ 15,362,859 | \$ - \$ 256.0 \$ - \$ 18.3 \$ - \$ 259.2 | - \$ - 016 \$ - 800 \$ - | \$ 1,362,906 \$ \$ 4,720,422 \$ \$ 7,769,088 \$ \$ 20,661,828 \$ | 4,720,422 \$ 7,769,088 \$ 20,661,828 \$ | \$ 1,255,109 \$ 1,875,059 \$ 9,269,911 | 1 | \$ 2,796,191 \$ \$ 2,768,803 \$ \$ 10,027,435 \$ | 3,181,667 9,966,383 | 5 - 5 5 - 5 5 - 5 | 1,565,363 3,181,667 9,966,383 12,562,236 | Core - SW Core - SW Core - SW Core - SW/3P | Commercial Commercial Commercial | Resource Resource Resource | Existing C Existing C Existing C | alculated Incentive leemed Incentives |
| SCE-13-SW-002E SCE-13-SW-002F SCE-13-SW-002G | Commercial Continuous Energy Improvement Program Nonresidential HVAC Program Savings By Design | \$ 3,878,825 \$ 92,267,570 \$ 26,562,522 | \$ 2,508,825 \$ 92,453,848 \$ 26,550,522 | 5 \$ 2,431,428 3 \$ 92,448,853 2 \$ 23,381,688 | 8 \$ - 3 \$ - 8 \$ - | \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ - \$ - \$ 1,584,696 | s - s - | \$ 1,269,525 \$ 34,087,935 \$ 8,739,228 | \$ 1,269,525 \$ 344,632 \$ 34,087,935 \$ 33,619,920 \$ 8,739,228 \$ 4,354,560 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ 343 | - \$ - - \$ - 078 \$ - | \$ 402,992 \$ 402,99 \$ 26,999,135 \$ 26,999,13 \$ 8,362,566 \$ 8,362,56 | 2 \$ 249,125 5 \$ 20,437,082 6 \$ 2,418,007 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ 155,1 | - \$ - - \$ - 192 \$ - | \$ 15,338,380 \$ \$ 3,877,449 \$ | - 15,338,380 3 3,877,449 3 | \$ 17,874 \$ 5,841,794 \$ 755,728 | 1 1 1 | \$ 363 \$ \$ 11,365,953 \$ \$ 3,141,797 \$ | 7,197,308 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 7,197,308 1,575,095 | Core - SW Core - SW/3P Core - SW | Commercial Commercial Commercial | Non Resource Resource Resource | Discontinue C Existing H Existing N | EI IVAC lew Construction |
| SCE-13-SW-002H SCE-13-SW-003 SCE-13-SW-003A | Midstream Point of Purchase Program Statewide Industrial Energy Efficiency Program Industrial Energy Advisor Program | \$ | \$ 18,439,895 \$ 1,450,548 | \$ | \$ - 1 \$ - 0 \$ - | \$ - \$ - \$ | \$ - \$ - | s - s - | \$ 8,449,087 \$ 1,794,545 | \$ \$ \$ 8,049,087 \$ 4,438,801 \$ 1,394,545 \$ 953,535 \$ 953,535 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | - \$ - 108 \$ - - \$ - | \$ 11,625,949 \$ 9,715,94 \$ 5,642,436 \$ 5,642,43 \$ 762,024 \$ 777,02 \$ 762,024 \$ 777,02 | 9 \$ 6,547,101 6 \$ 3,695,677 4 \$ 771,907 | \$ - \$ 7.4 \$ - \$ 584,5 \$ - \$ | 168 \$ - 588 \$ - - \$ - | \$ 6,987,069 \$ \$ 6,021,426 \$ \$ 415,472 \$ | 6,987,069 \$ 6,021,426 \$ 415,472 \$ | \$ 388,431 \$ 1,775,934 \$ 448,349 | \$- | \$ 6,388,944 \$ \$ 2,948,274 \$ - \$ \$ 347,459 \$ | 4,733,274 5,827,490 1,336,750 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 4,733,274 5,827,490 1,336,750 | Core - SW/3P | Commercial Industrial | Resource Non Resource | Existing L Existing E | ighting Programs |
| SCE-13-SW-003B SCE-13-SW-003C SCE-13-SW-003D SCE-13-SW-004 | Industrial Calculated Energy Efficiency Program Industrial Deemed Energy Efficiency Program Strategic Energy Management Program Statewide Agriculture Energy Efficiency Program | \$ 22,305,902 \$ 10,971,906 \$ 2,425,649 \$ 15,942,620 | \$ 10,969,835 \$ 4,788,863 \$ 1,230,649 \$ 21,026,104 | 3 \$ 10,566,706 3 \$ 4,669,053 9 \$ 1,234,651 1 \$ 17,720,559 | o 3 - 3 \$ - 1 \$ - 9 \$ - | \$ - \$ - \$ - | 3 - 3 - 5 - 5 - | s - s - s - | \$ 4,212,157 \$ 1,555,273 \$ 887,112 \$ 5,482,620 | \$ 4,212,157 \$ 1,053,405 \$ 1,555,273 \$ 1,421,630 \$ 887,112 \$ 428,231 \$ 5,082,620 \$ 3,178,503 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | - \$ - - \$ - 694 \$ - | \$ 3,302,271 \$ 3,302,27 \$ 1,237,966 \$ 1,237,96 \$ 340,174 \$ 325,17 \$ 4,011,346 \$ 4,011,34 | 6 \$ 1,082,633 4 \$ 172,462 6 \$ 2,691,741 | \$ - \$ 504,5 \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ 187,5 | - \$ - - \$ - - \$ - | \$ 3,000,504 \$ \$ 1,470,125 \$ \$ 1,047,245 \$ \$ 4,112,448 \$ | 1,470,125 1,047,245 4,112,448 | \$ 707,384 \$ 412,124 \$ 208,077 \$ 1,176,115 | s - | \$ 1,529,753 3 \$ 411,144 \$ \$ 659,917 \$ \$ 1,593,209 \$ - \$ | 627,067 1,928,629 2,943,042 | 5 - 5 5 - 5 5 - 5 | 1,935,044 627,067 1,928,629 2,943,042 | Core - SW Core - SW Core - SW | Industrial Industrial | Resource Resource | Existing D Revise C | leemed Incentives EI |
| SCE-13-SW-004A SCE-13-SW-004B SCE-13-SW-004C | Agriculture Energy Advisor Program Agriculture Calculated Energy Efficiency Program Agriculture Deemed Energy Efficiency Program | \$ 9,093,983 \$ 4,368,055 \$ 1,772,460 | \$ 5,025,800 \$ 12,670,722 \$ 3,102,460 | 0 \$ 5,135,159 2 \$ 9,260,723 0 \$ 3,099,649 | 9 \$ - 3 \$ - 9 \$ - | \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ \$ \$ | \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ 3,172,896 \$ 1,136,820 \$ 836,138 | \$ 2,772,896 \$ 1,634,270 \$ 1,157,820 \$ 1,067,064 \$ 815,138 \$ 430,251 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ 21 \$ - \$ | - \$ - 694 \$ - - \$ - | \$ 2,050,122 \$ 2,050,12 \$ 1,679,036 \$ 1,679,03 \$ 213,599 \$ 213,59 | 2 \$ 1,365,553 6 \$ 821,624 9 \$ 459,322 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ 187,5 \$ - \$ | - \$ - 584 \$ - - \$ - | \$ 1,917,172 \$ \$ 1,201,133 \$ \$ 994,142 \$ | 1,917,172 \$ 1,201,133 \$ 994,142 \$ | \$ 710,653 \$ 315,223 \$ 142,766 | | \$ 736,898 \$ \$ 761,735 \$ \$ 93,557 \$ | 2,094,016 700,132 148,894 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 2,094,016 700,132 148,894 | Core - SW/3P Core - SW Core - SW | Agricultural Agricultural Agricultural | Non Resource Resource Resource | Existing E Existing C Existing E | nergy Advisor alculated Incentive leemed Incentives |
| SCE-13-SW-004D SCE-13-SW-005 SCE-13-SW-005A | Agriculture Continuous Energy Improvement Program Lighting Program Lighting Market Transformation Program Lighting Gascuties Desema | \$ 708,122 \$ 72,315,318 \$ 986,473 \$ 40,470,704 | \$ 227,122 \$ 71,080,318 \$ 561,473 \$ 561,473 | 2 \$ 225,028 3 \$ 70,799,029 3 \$ 557,168 | 8 \$ - 9 \$ - 8 \$ - | \$ - \$ - \$ | \$ - \$ - \$ - | s - s - | \$ 336,766 \$ 35,254,239 \$ 316,245 | \$ 336,766 \$ 46,918 \$ 46,624,240 \$ 46,751,560 \$ 76,245 \$ 69,764 \$ 0,770,070 \$ 0,772,770 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | - \$ - - \$ - | \$ 68,589 \$ 68,55 \$ 56,620,612 \$ 56,620,61 \$ 93,803 \$ 63,80 <i>C</i> 174,000 \$ 63,80 | 9 \$ 45,242 2 \$ 55,032,792 3 \$ 49,155 400,700 | s - s s - s | - <u>\$</u> - - \$ - | \$ - \$ \$ 34,150,313 \$ \$ 74,804 \$ | - 3 34,150,313 5 74,804 5 | \$ 7,472 \$ 20,725,961 \$ 31,218 \$ 40,507 | \$ - | \$ 1,020 \$ \$ 20,784,725 \$ - \$ \$ 36,882 \$ 6 70.075 | 37,390,809 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 37,390,809 | Core - SW Core - SW | Agricultural Residential | Non Resource | DiscontinueC Discontinu L | El ighting Program |
| SCE-13-SW-005B SCE-13-SW-005C SCE-13-SW-006 SCE-13-SW-007 | Primary Lighting Program Primary Lighting Program Integrated Demand Side Management Program Statewide Finance Program | \$ 51,849,051 \$ 2,052,374 \$ 97,519,770 | \$ 5,199,794 \$ 65,319,051 \$ 922,374 \$ 90,828,504 | \$ 5,497,509 \$ 64,744,272 \$ 919,365 \$ 39,347,510 | 9 3 - 2 \$ - 5 \$ - 0 \$ - | s - s - s - | \$ \$ \$ \$ 48,699,177 | s - s - | \$ 0,812,979 \$ 28,125,015 \$ 697,374 \$ 16,294,768 | \$ 0,775,016 \$ 0,784,070 \$ 39,775,016 \$ 39,884,118 \$ 697,374 \$ 89,400 \$ 16,294,768 \$ 6,854,326 | 5 - 5 5 - 5 5 - 5 5 - 5 5 - 5 6.391 | - 5 - - 5 - - 5 - 100 5 - | \$ 56,052,186 \$ 56,052,18 \$ 725,386 \$ 725,38 \$ 18,651,913 \$ 18,651,91 | 5 480,709 6 \$ 54,502,928 5 \$ 34,634 3 \$ 3,823,273 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ 12.735.4 | - \$ - - \$ - | \$ 33,933,862 \$ \$ - \$ \$ 2,047,887 \$ | 2.047.887 | \$ 20,675,216 \$ - \$ 512,623 | <u>s</u> - | \$ 20,667,888 \$ \$ - \$ - \$ \$ 1.685,280 \$ - \$ | 37,390,809 | 5 - 5 5 - 5 5 - 5 | 37,390,809 | Core - SW | Residential Cross-Cutting | Resource Non Resource | Existing L Discontinued | ighting Program |
| SCE-13-SW-007A SCE-13-SW-007A1 SCE-13-SW-007B | On-Bill Financing Finance Revolving Loan ARRA-Originated Financing | \$ 15,255,475 \$ 77,762,297 \$ 1,644,003 | \$ 8,564,209 \$ 66,257,882 \$ 3,565,973 | 9 \$ 6,612,251 2 \$ 20,497,674 3 \$ 2,736,114 | 1 \$ - 4 4 \$ - | \$ - \$ - | \$ - \$ 45,760,208 \$ - | \$ - \$ - | \$ 4,655,336 \$ 11,200,000 \$ 439,432 | \$ 4,655,336 \$ 1,324,757 \$ 11,200,000 \$ 4,808,900 \$ 439,432 \$ 720,669 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ 6,391 \$ - \$ | - \$ - 100 \$ - - \$ - | \$ 2,285,050 \$ 2,285,050 \$ 15,200,000 \$ 15,200,000 \$ 646,075 \$ 646,07 | 0 \$ 719,736 0 \$ 2,464,590 5 \$ 616,176 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ 12,735,4 \$ - \$ | - \$ - 110 \$ - - \$ - | \$ 745,255 \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 745,255 | \$ 317,937 \$ 68,189 \$ - | \$ - | \$ 719,268 \$ \$ - \$ - \$ \$ 577,103 \$ | 656,710 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 656,710 - - | Core - SW Core - SW Core - SW | Commercial Commercial Finance | Resource Non Resource Resource | Existing F Existing F Discontinu F | inance Program inance Program inance Program |
| SCE-13-SW-007C SCE-13-SW-008 SCE-13-SW-008A SCE-13-SW-008A | New Finance Offerings Codes and Standards Program Building Codes and Compliance Advocacy Appliance Standards Advacacy | \$ 2,857,995 \$ 17,739,328 \$ 5,160,764 \$ 5,160,764 | \$ 12,440,440 \$ 17,739,328 \$ 5,160,764 \$ 5,160,764 | \$ 9,501,471 \$ 9,501,471 \$ 15,378,388 \$ 3,730,611 \$ 5,016,472 | 1 \$ - 8 \$ - 1 \$ - | \$ - \$ - \$ | \$ 2,938,969 \$ - \$ - | s - s - | \$ 5,977,851 \$ 1,739,244 \$ 1,720,244 | \$ 5,290,230 \$ 6,017,851 \$ 5,290,230 \$ 1,739,244 \$ 1,693,652 \$ 1,720,244 \$ 1,693,652 \$ 1,720,744 \$ 1,692,751 \$ 1,720,745 \$ 1,720,745 \$ 1,720,745 \$ 1,720,751 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ | - \$ - - \$ - - \$ - | \$ 520,788 \$ 520,78 \$ 6,135,154 \$ 6,135,15 \$ 1,553,239 \$ 1,553,239 \$ 1,651,055 \$ 1,651,05 | 8 \$ 22,771 4 \$ 3,203,474 9 \$ 684,328 5 \$ 482,022 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ 1,232,7 \$ - \$ 292,6 \$ - \$ 201,6 | - \$ - - * * - - * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * | \$ 1,302,632 \$ \$ 5,662,538 \$ \$ 1,556,111 \$ \$ 1,200,860 \$ | 1,302,632 \$ 5,662,538 \$ 1,556,111 \$ 1,200,860 \$ | \$ 126,498 \$ 1,270,237 \$ 361,874 \$ 00,802 | \$- | \$ 388,909 \$ \$ 4,392,301 \$ - \$ \$ 1,194,236 \$ \$ 1,194,27 \$ | 1,968,842 8,939,320 2,577,006 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 1,968,842 8,939,320 2,577,006 | Core - SW Core - SW | Finance C&S C#S | Resource Resource | Existing F Existing C | inance Program odes and Standards |
| SCE-13-SW-008B SCE-13-SW-008C SCE-13-SW-008D SCE-13-SW-008E | Compliance Improvement Reach Codes Planning and Coordination | \$ 2,419,108 \$ 1,612,739 \$ 3,385,953 | \$ 3,944,108 \$ 1,362,739 \$ 2,110,953 | 3 \$ 4,898,873 3 \$ 647,568 3 \$ 1.084,859 | 7 5 - 3 \$ - 8 \$ - 9 \$ - | s - s - s - | s - s - | s - s - | \$ 1,735,244 \$ 815,270 \$ 543,514 \$ 1,140,579 | \$ 855,270 \$ 1,755,968 \$ 543,514 \$ 294,775 \$ 1,140,579 \$ 493,074 | s - s s - s s - s | - \$ - - \$ - - \$ - | \$ 840,728 \$ 840,72 \$ 511,347 \$ 511,34 \$ 1.578,785 \$ 1.578,78 | 8 \$ 931,566 7 \$ 287,386 5 \$ 818,159 | \$ - \$ 338.4 \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | - \$ - - \$ - | \$ 1,451,200 \$ \$ 404,531 \$ \$ 1.040,835 \$ | 1,451,200 \$ 404,531 \$ 1,040,835 \$ | \$ 558,642 \$ 95,348 \$ 163,570 | | \$ 892,559 \$ \$ 309,183 \$ \$ 877,266 \$ | 1,372,386 498,047 2,281,310 | s - s s - s | 1,372,386 498,047 2,281,310 | Core - SW Core - SW Core - SW | C&S C&S C&S | Non Resource Non Resource Non Resource | Existing C Existing C Existing C | odes and Standards odes and Standards odes and Standards |
| SCE-13-SW-008F SCE-13-SW-009 SCE-13-SW-009A | National and International Standards Emerging Technologies Program Technology Development Support | \$ 31,953,610 \$ 5,557,769 | \$ 31,953,610 \$ 5,557,769 | \$ | \$ - 5 \$ - 8 \$ - | \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ 6,059,483 \$ 6,059,483 | s - s - | \$ 10,768,180 \$ 1,873,259 | \$ \$ 8,019,064 \$ 1,873,259 \$ 1,557,115 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ 755 \$ - \$ 755 | - \$ - 134 \$ - 134 \$ - | \$ 9,827,862 \$ 9,827,86 \$ 855,771 \$ 855,77 | \$ 2 \$ 4,383,279 1 \$ 1,096,638 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ 4,856,7 \$ - \$ 4,856,7 | - \$ - | \$ - \$ \$ 5,638,909 \$ \$ 603,938 \$ | 5,638,909 \$ 603,938 \$ | \$ 2,033,978 \$ 439,321 | \$ - | \$ 6,217,359 \$ \$ \$ 665,891 \$ | 557,037 10,579,964 1,210,738 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 557,037 6,725,302 1,210,738 | Core - SW | C&S Emerging Tech | Non Resource | New C Existing E | odes and Standards |
| SCE-13-SW-009B SCE-13-SW-009C SCE-13-SW-010 | Technology Assessments Technology Introduction Support Workforce Education & Training WERT Constrained | \$ 12,494,955 \$ 13,900,886 \$ 27,154,655 \$ 27,154,655 | \$ 12,494,955 \$ 13,900,886 \$ 27,973,655 | 5 \$ 12,196,331 5 \$ 6,300,486 5 \$ 27,957,687 | 1 \$ - 6 \$ - 7 \$ - | s - s - s - | \$ - \$ - | s - s - | \$ 4,210,158 \$ 4,684,763 \$ 9,164,656 | \$ 4,210,158 \$ 4,138,624 \$ 4,684,762 \$ 2,323,324 \$ 9,964,656 \$ 8,389,192 \$ 0,444,000 \$ 0,000 \$ 0,000 \$ | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | - \$ - - \$ - | \$ 4,963,785 \$ 4,963,785 \$ 3,968,305 \$ 3,968,305 \$ 7,010,307 \$ 7,010,30 \$ 4,005 500 \$ 4,005 | 5 \$ 1,977,504 5 \$ 1,309,137 7 \$ 7,060,487 | | - \$ - - \$ - | \$ 2,986,163 \$ \$ 2,048,808 \$ \$ 6,020,788 \$ | 2,986,163 \$ 2,048,808 \$ 6,020,788 \$ | \$ 986,134 \$ 608,524 \$ 3,100,626 | \$ - | \$ 3,292,489 \$ \$ 2,258,979 \$ \$ 4,335,704 \$ - \$ | 5,514,564 3,854,662 5,571,814 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 5,514,564 5,571,814 | Core - SW Core - SW | Emerging Tech Emerging Tech | Non Resource Non Resource | Existing E Existing E | merging Technology Programs |
| SCE-13-SW-010A SCE-13-SW-010B SCE-13-SW-010C SCE-13-L-001 | WE&I Centergies WE&T Connections WE&T Planning Interartied Demand Side Management Pilot for Eood Processing | \$ 16,714,127 \$ 10,126,167 \$ 314,361 \$ 544,886 | \$ 17,825,127 \$ 9,834,167 \$ 314,361 \$ 257,886 | \$ 17,833,988 \$ 9,831,537 \$ 292,162 \$ 256,524 | 8 \$ - 7 \$ - 2 \$ - | s - s - s - | s - s - | s - s - | \$ 5,614,128 \$ 3,426,167 \$ 124,361 \$ 189,886 | \$ 5,414,128 \$ 5,359,197 \$ 3,426,167 \$ 1,943,346 \$ 124,361 \$ 76,649 \$ 189,886 \$ 3,702 | 5 - 5 5 - 5 5 - 5 | - 5 - - 5 - - 5 - | \$ 4,985,520 \$ 4,985,52 \$ 2,024,787 \$ 2,023,78 \$ \$ 1,00 | 0 \$ 5,151,851 7 \$ 1,739,031 0 \$ 169,605 | | | \$ 5,525,252 \$ \$ 495,536 \$ \$ - \$ | 495,536 | \$ 2,403,682 \$ 696,944 \$ - \$ 76 149 | | \$ 3,121,570 \$ \$ 1,214,134 \$ \$ (76 149) \$ | 1,131,763 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 4,440,051 1,131,763 | Core - SW/3P Core - SW/3P | WE&T WE&T WE&T | Non Resource Non Resource Non Resource | Existing V Existing V Discontinu V | VE&T Program VE&T Program VE&T Program |
| SCE-13-L-002 SCE-13-L-002Rollup SCE-13-L-002A | Energy Leader Partnership Program Energy Leader Partnership Program City of Beaumont Energy Leader Partnership | \$ 45,973,944 \$ 1,246,707 \$ 293,175 | \$ 43,374,757 \$ 386,320 \$ 230,675 | \$ 39,833,451 \$ 156,105 \$ 156,105 \$ 181,971 | 1 \$ - 5 \$ - 1 \$ - | s - s - s - | \$ 96,438 \$ - \$ - | s S | \$ 12,758,860 \$ - \$ 104,193 | \$ 14,030,826 \$ 9,578,850 \$ 534,876 \$ 25,955 \$ 35,000 \$ 20,032 | \$ - \$ 260 \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 701 \$ - - \$ - - \$ - | \$ 13,829,652 \$ 15,529,65 \$ 1,054,726 \$ 894,52 \$ - \$ 20 | 2 \$ 14,798,000 6 \$ 224,308 0 \$ 141 | \$ - \$ 743,8 \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 862 \$ - - \$- - \$- | \$ 15,461,281 \$ \$ 22,048 \$ \$ - \$ | 15,461,281 \$ 22,048 \$ | \$ 4,557,596 \$ 11,386 \$ - | \$ - | \$ 12,144,160 \$ \$ \$ 6,397 \$ \$ 3 | 18,364,739 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 18,364,739 | Govt Partnerships Govt Partnerships | Public Public | Resource Resource | Discontinu O Discontinu O | Sovernment Partnerships Sovernment Partnerships |
| SCE-13-L-002B SCE-13-L-002C SCE-13-L-002D | City of Long Beach Energy Leader Partnership City of Redlands Energy Leader Partnership City of Santa Ana Energy Leader Partnership | \$ 826,422 \$ 721,125 \$ 1,162,083 \$ 020,420 | \$ 3,999,946 \$ 565,375 \$ 1,128,676 | 5 \$ 2,902,691 5 \$ 529,938 5 \$ 916,951 | 1 \$ - 8 \$ - 1 \$ - | s - s - | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | s | \$ 282,379 \$ 173,306 \$ 529,884 | \$ 602,379 \$ 571,598 \$ 173,306 \$ 99,598 \$ 529,884 \$ 189,284 \$ 000 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | - \$ - - \$ - | \$ 1,389,202 \$ 889,20 \$ 221,128 \$ 221,12 \$ 162,159 \$ 162,15 | 2 \$ 527,410 8 \$ 19,825 9 \$ 19,090 | \$ - \$ 3,3 \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 338 \$ - - \$ - - \$ - | \$ 269,916 \$ \$ 9 \$ \$ 19 \$ | 269,916 \$ 9 \$ 19 \$ | \$ 59,612 \$ - \$ - | | \$ 353,131 \$ \$ 2 \$ \$ 5 \$ | 308,202 | s - s s - s s - s | 308,202 | Govt Partnerships Govt Partnerships Govt Partnerships | Public Public Public | Resource Resource Resource | Existing C Discontinu C Discontinu C | Sovernment Partnerships Sovernment Partnerships Sovernment Partnerships |
| SCE-13-L-002E SCE-13-L-002F SCE-13-L-002G SCE-13-L-002H | Gateway Cities Energy Leader Partnership Community Energy Leader Partnership Eastern Sierra Energy Leader Partnership | \$ 290,462 \$ 1,822,030 \$ 5,025,733 \$ 495,364 | \$ 232,402 \$ 1,434,781 \$ 4,573,994 \$ 507,364 | \$ 1,290,600 \$ 4,079,780 \$ 509,766 | 3 3 - 0 \$ - 0 \$ - 6 \$ - | s - s - s - | s - s - | s - s - | \$ 120,492 \$ 676,543 \$ 1,838,227 \$ 160,326 | \$ 26,992 \$ 26,074 \$ 1,122,543 \$ 1,096,506 \$ 1,412,817 \$ 996,445 \$ 160,326 \$ 121,884 | \$ - \$ 20 \$ - \$ 20 \$ - \$ | - 5 - 802 \$ - - \$ - | \$ 1,269,270 \$ 1,269,27 \$ 880,173 \$ 880,17 \$ 86,156 \$ 96,15 | 3 304 0 \$ 437,622 3 \$ 417,372 6 \$ 126,006 | s - s 59,7 s - s 59,7 s - s | - \$ - - \$ - | \$ 503,778 \$ \$ 102 \$ \$ 110 205 \$ | 503,778 \$ 102 \$ 110,205 \$ | \$ 70,091 \$ - \$ 46,209 | | \$ 395,126 \$ \$ 26 \$ \$ 57,541 \$ | 886,097 | 5 - 5 5 - 5 5 - 5 | 886,097 | Govt Partnerships Govt Partnerships Govt Partnerships | Public Public Public | Resource Resource Resource | Existing C Discontinu C Existing C | Sovernment Partnerships Sovernment Partnerships Sovernment Partnerships |
| SCE-13-L-002I SCE-13-L-002J SCE-13-L-002K | Energy Leader Partnership Strategic Support Desert Cities Energy Leader Partnership Kern County Energy Leader Partnership | \$ 1,407,200 \$ 1,320,724 \$ 651,730 | \$ 1,367,192 \$ 1,256,350 \$ 812,951 | 2 \$ 1,348,988 0 \$ 1,254,627 1 \$ 841,898 | 8 \$ - 7 \$ - 8 \$ - | \$ - \$ - \$ - | s - s - | s - s - | \$ 450,115 \$ 441,977 \$ 183,071 | \$ 450,115 \$ 447,088 \$ 441,977 \$ 279,492 \$ 183,071 \$ 110,048 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | - \$ - - \$ - | \$ 468,736 \$ 368,73 \$ 200,019 \$ 215,01 \$ 123,216 \$ 123,21 | 6 \$ 409,001 9 \$ 214,945 6 \$ 87,806 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | - <u>\$</u> - - <u>\$</u> - | \$ 418,761 \$ \$ 175,252 \$ \$ 169,555 \$ | 418,761 \$ 175,252 \$ 169,555 \$ | \$ 81,207 \$ 40,875 \$ 26,149 | | \$ 437,446 \$ \$ 55,100 \$ \$ 86,202 \$ | 488,537 147,804 84,493 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 488,537 147,804 84,493 | Govt Partnerships Govt Partnerships Govt Partnerships | Public Public Public | Non Resource Resource Resource | Existing C Existing C Existing C | Sovernment Partnerships Sovernment Partnerships Sovernment Partnerships |
| SCE-13-L-002L SCE-13-L-002M SCE-13-L-002N | Orange County Cities Energy Leader Partnership San Gabriel Valley Energy Leader Partnership San Joaquin Valley Energy Leader Partnership | \$ 3,311,177 \$ 1,772,135 \$ 3,128,471 | \$ 1,450,904 \$ 2,409,144 \$ 2,014,653 | \$ 1,278,013 \$ 2,357,401 \$ 2,344,606 | 3 \$ - 1 \$ - 6 \$ - | s - s - | \$ \$ \$ \$ | s - s - | \$ 1,115,409 \$ 583,199 \$ 894,159 | \$ 843,409 \$ 774,438 \$ 583,199 \$ 419,371 \$ 594,159 \$ 354,628 | \$ - \$ 24 \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 681 \$ - - \$ - - \$ - | \$ 2,152,439 \$ 2,442,43 \$ 858,304 \$ 608,30 \$ 419,803 \$ 339,80 | 9 \$ 1,764,437 4 \$ 1,459,473 3 \$ 315,312 | \$ - \$ 182,2 \$ - \$ \$ - \$ 5,0 | - \$ - - 979 - | \$ 771,653 \$ \$ 1,352,682 \$ \$ 1,770,858 \$ | 771,653 \$ 1,352,682 \$ 1,770,858 \$ | \$ 512,587 \$ 483,435 \$ 91,348 | | \$ 770,918 \$ \$ 813,883 \$ \$ 1,525,390 \$ | 2,870,565 843,971 384,760 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 2,870,565 843,971 384,760 | Govt Partnerships Govt Partnerships Govt Partnerships | Public Public Public | Resource Resource | Existing C Existing C Existing C | Sovernment Partnerships Sovernment Partnerships Sovernment Partnerships |
| SCE-13-L-0020 SCE-13-L-002P SCE-13-L-002Q SCE-13-L-002R | South Say Energy Leader Partnership South Santa Barbara County Energy Leader Partnership Ventura County Energy Leader Partnership Western Riverside Energy Leader Partnership | \$ 1,172,590 \$ 2,217,985 \$ 1,310,681 | \$ 3,136,812 \$ 1,253,590 \$ 2,473,427 \$ 975.067 | 2 3 3,156,434 0 \$ 1,238,910 7 \$ 2,437,789 7 \$ 928,179 | 4 3 - 0 \$ - 9 \$ - 9 \$ - | s - s - s - | \$ 25,200 \$ - \$ 19,253 \$ - | s - s - | \$ 1,112,391 \$ 362,010 \$ 893,279 \$ 447,518 | \$ 1,574,522 \$ 362,010 \$ 286,786 \$ 893,279 \$ 430,849 \$ 197,518 \$ 181,851 | \$ - \$ 214 \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | - \$ - - \$ - | \$ 717,549 \$ 1,167,54 \$ 324,874 \$ 554,87 \$ 509,945 \$ 739,94 \$ 203,997 \$ 1143,95 | 9 \$ 1,763,891 4 \$ 452,894 5 \$ 768,999 7 \$ 1,267,420 | \$ - \$ 49,5 \$ - \$ 11,4 \$ - \$ 245,5 \$ - \$ | 134 \$ - 134 \$ - 546 \$ - - \$ - | \$ 2,117,495 \$ \$ 447,151 \$ \$ 400,359 \$ \$ 728,629 \$ | 447,151 \$ 400,359 \$ 728,629 \$ | \$ 204,462 \$ 65,224 \$ 130,328 \$ 73,760 | | \$ 2,037,547 3 \$ 358,036 \$ \$ 467,923 \$ \$ 742,729 \$ | 450,646 157,679 1,729,286 4 380,210 | s - s s - s s - s | 450,646 157,679 1,729,286 4,380,210 | Govt Partnerships Govt Partnerships Govt Partnerships | Public Public Public | Resource Resource Resource | Existing C Existing C Existing C | Sovernment Partnerships Sovernment Partnerships Sovernment Partnerships |
| SCE-13-L-002S SCE-13-L-002T SCE-13-L-002U | High Desert Regional Energy Leader Partnership West Side Community Energy Leader Partnership Local Government Strategic Planning Pilot Program | \$ 451,662 \$ 654,869 \$ 7,528,395 | \$ 476,662 \$ 1,060,869 \$ 7,023,346 | 2 \$ 451,441 9 \$ 802,004 5 \$ 6,988,262 | 1 \$ - 4 \$ - 2 \$ - | \$ - \$ - \$ - | | s - s - | \$ 141,699 \$ 249,222 \$ - | \$ 76,699 \$ 148,139 \$ 250,222 \$ 172,926 \$ 846,192 \$ 176,146 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | - <u>\$</u> - - <u>\$</u> - - <u>\$</u> - | \$ 96,625 \$ 286,62 \$ 170,404 \$ 290,40 \$ 1,076,349 \$ 826,34 | 5 \$ 221,803 4 \$ 539,331 9 \$ 248,275 | \$ - \$ 36,0 \$ - \$ 87,9 \$ - \$ | 038 \$ - 938 \$ - - \$ - | \$ 518,492 \$ \$ 482,028 \$ \$ 811,359 \$ | 518,492 482,028 811,359 | \$ 98,760 \$ 212,318 \$ 138,665 | | \$ 285,366 \$ \$ 369,995 \$ \$ 739,789 \$ | 152,135 2,691,891 325,591 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 152,135 2,691,891 325,591 | Govt Partnerships Govt Partnerships Govt Partnerships | Public Public Public | Resource Resource Non Resource | Existing C Existing C Existing C | Sovernment Partnerships Sovernment Partnerships Sovernment Partnerships |
| SCE-13-L-002V SCE-13-L-002W SCE-13-L-002X | North Orange County Cities San Bernardino Association of Governments Water Energy Nexus Program | \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ 185,000 \$ 194,250 \$ - | 0 \$ 69,556 0 \$ 19,077 \$ - | 6 \$ - 7 \$ - \$ - | \$ - \$ - \$ - | s - s - | s - s - | \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ 252,000 \$ 238,367 \$ 160,000 \$ 157,332 \$ 100,000 \$ 20,248 0 000 \$ 20,248 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ 1 \$ - \$ | - \$ - 132 \$ - - \$ - | \$ 157,558 \$ 277,55 \$ 147,386 \$ 992,38 \$ - \$ - | 8 \$ 1,151,593 6 \$ 1,764,963 \$ - | \$ - \$ 3.7 \$ - \$ 3.5 \$ - \$ | 727 \$ - 554 \$ - - \$ - | \$ 1,052,874 \$ \$ 1,729,393 \$ \$ - \$ | 1,052,874 \$ | \$ 135,123 \$ 1,872,988 \$ - | i i | \$ 679,890 \$ \$ 825,405 \$ \$ - \$ | 197,639 1,735,578 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 197,639 | Govt Partnerships Govt Partnerships Govt Partnerships | Public Public Public | Resource Resource | Existing C Existing C Discontinu C | Sovernment Partnerships Sovernment Partnerships Sovernment Partnerships |
| SCE-13-L-003C SCE-13-L-003D SCE-13-L-003E SCE-13-L-003 | County of Los Angeles Energy Efficiency Partnership County of Riverside Energy Efficiency Partnership County of San Bernardino Energy Efficiency Partnership Institutional and Government Core Energy Efficiency Partnershi | \$ 3,132,504 \$ 1,462,819 \$ 1,554,031 \$ 27,952,036 | \$ 2,301,545 \$ 852,325 \$ 1,051,074 \$ 24,536,673 | 5 \$ 1,988,877 5 \$ 480,856 1 \$ 1,068,758 5 \$ 21,916,099 | 7 \$ - 6 \$ - 8 \$ - 9 \$ - | s - s - s - | \$ 51,917 \$ - \$ - \$ 656,590 | s - s - | \$ 974,519 \$ 448,865 \$ 570,078 \$ 10,927,118 | \$ 308,865 \$ 133,822 \$ 428,078 \$ 199,072 \$ 9,655,153 \$ 4,007,862 | S - S S - S S - S S - S 779 | - \$ - - \$ - - \$ - 522 \$ - | \$ 646,861 \$ 446,86 \$ 144,832 \$ 144,83 \$ 347,940 \$ 147,94 \$ 7.546,685 \$ 5.846,68 | 1 \$ 418,460 2 \$ 77,339 0 \$ 99,780 5 \$ 3,322,395 | \$ - \$ 55,5 \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | - \$ - - \$ - - \$ - | \$ 267,893 \$ \$ 813,898 \$ \$ 526,872 \$ \$ 4,864,070 \$ | 267,893 3 813,898 3 526,872 3 4.864.070 3 | \$ 91,581 \$ 38,970 \$ 72,520 \$ 897,395 | s - | \$ 274,592 \$ \$ 794,493 \$ \$ 67,231 \$ \$ 3,631,464 \$ - \$ | 208,148 78,002 169,841 2,815,798 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 208,148 78,002 169,841 2.815,798 | Govt Partnerships Govt Partnerships Govt Partnerships | Public Public Public | Resource Resource Resource | Existing C Existing C Existing C | overnment Partnersnips overnment Partnerships overnment Partnerships |
| SCE-13-L-003A SCE-13-L-003B SCE-13-L-003F | California Community Colleges Energy Efficiency Partnershic California Dept. of Corrections and Rehabilitation EE Partnershic State of California Energy Efficiency Partnership | \$ 8,966,248 \$ 2,598,053 \$ 2,609,966 | \$ 11,185,724 \$ 1,626,561 \$ 1,627,995 | \$ 10,215,665 \$ 1,162,204 5 \$ 1,604,660 | 5 \$ - 4 \$ - 0 \$ - | \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ 538,884 \$ 34,534 \$ 8,778 | \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ 3,075,165 \$ 644,167 \$ 744,787 | \$ 3,075,165 \$ 1,982,006 \$ 644,167 \$ 163,544 \$ 744,787 \$ 377,140 | \$ - \$ 699 \$ - \$ \$ - \$ 80 | 414 \$ - - \$ - 108 \$ - | \$ 2,544,217 \$ 2,244,21 \$ 1,041,388 \$ 641,38 \$ 1,199,182 \$ 799,18 | 7 \$ 1,035,095 8 \$ 217,104 2 \$ 719,143 | \$ - \$ 853,3 \$ - \$ \$ - \$ 45,4 | 853 \$ - - \$ - 100 \$ - | \$ 1,331,446 \$ \$ 658,892 \$ \$ 650,612 \$ | 1,331,446 \$ 658,892 \$ 650,612 \$ | \$ 319,164 \$ 91,971 \$ 97,732 | | \$ 1,729,531 \$ \$ 368,735 \$ \$ 245,128 \$ | 812,533 705,182 199,843 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 812,533 705,182 199,843 | Govt Partnerships Govt Partnerships Govt Partnerships | Public Public Public | Resource Resource Resource | Existing C Existing C Existing C | Sovernment Partnerships Sovernment Partnerships Sovernment Partnerships |
| SCE-13-L-003G SCE-13-L-003H SCE-13-L-003I | UC/CSU Energy Efficiency Partnership Federals Energy Efficiency Partnership Public Sector Performance-Based Retrofit High Opportunity Progra Bendential Third Part Program | \$ 11,698,158 \$ 2,079,611 \$ - | \$ 10,096,258 \$ 135 \$ - | 8 8,933,435 5 \$ 135 \$ - | 5 \$ - 5 \$ - \$ - | \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ 74,394 \$ - \$ - | s - s - | \$ 4,383,388 \$ 2,079,611 \$ - | \$ 3,111,423 \$ 1,485,172 \$ 2,079,611 \$ \$ 2,52,420 \$ 2,722,075 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | - \$ - - \$ - | \$ 2,761,898 \$ 2,161,89 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - | 8 \$ 1,351,052 \$ - \$ - | \$ - \$ 705,5 \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | - \$ - - \$ - | \$ 1,717,087 \$ \$ - \$ \$ 506,033 \$ | 1,717,087 | \$ 346,595 \$ - \$ 41,933 \$ 1 205 781 | | \$ 1,188,411 \$ \$ - \$ \$ 99,659 \$ \$ 2219,864 \$ | 535,638 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 562,602 - 535,638 | Govt Partnerships Govt Partnerships Govt Partnerships | Public Public Public | Resource Resource Resource | Existing C Discontinu C New C | overnment Partnerships overnment Partnerships overnment Partnerships |
| SCE-13-TP-001 SCE-13-TP-024 SCE-13-TP-026 | Comprehensive Manufactured Homes AB793 Residential Pay for Performance Residential 3P Solicitation | \$ 8,173,826 \$ - \$ - | \$ 11,984,626 | \$ 11,977,189 \$ 11,977,189 \$ - | 9 \$ - \$ - | \$ - \$ - | \$ 100 \$ 100 \$ - \$ - | s - S - S - | \$ 3,022,439 \$ 3,022,439 \$ - | \$ 3,852,439 \$ 3,723,975 \$ 3,852,439 \$ 3,723,975 \$ \$ | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | - <u>s</u> - - <u>s</u> - - <u>s</u> - | \$ 4,750,328 \$ 6,010,32 \$ 4,750,328 \$ 6,010,32 \$ \$ | 8 \$ 5,664,530 | \$ - \$ 1,185,9 \$ - \$ 1,185,9 \$ - \$ | 183 \$ - - \$ - - \$ - | \$ 5,212,828 \$ \$ 900,000 \$ \$ - \$ | 5,212,828 \$ 900,000 \$ | \$ 1,306,781 \$ 1,306,781 \$ - \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,318,854 \$ 900,000 \$ \$ \$ \$ | 5,624,032 790,154 2,118,111 | S S S - S - S - | 5,624,032 790,154 2,118,111 | 3P 3P 3P | Residential Residential Residential | Resource Resource Non Resource | Existing F New F New F | tesidential 3P Programs tesidential 3P Programs tesidential 3P Programs |
| SCE-13-TP-002 SCE-13-TP-003 | Commercial Third Party Programs Cool Planet Healthcare EE Program Party Contemporation Full International Internat | \$ 48,848,375 \$ 703,890 \$ 5,034,204 | \$ 34,108,055 \$ 668,890 \$ 5,404,204 | 5 \$ 34,290,264 0 \$ 666,153 1 \$ 5,657,947 | 4 \$ - 3 \$ - 7 \$ - | <mark>\$ -</mark> \$ - \$ - | \$ 161,041 \$ - \$ 50,486 | s - S - | \$ 14,095,663 \$ 240,056 \$ 1,767,331 | \$ 14,095,663 \$ 8,136,067 \$ 240,056 \$ 171,140 \$ 1,767,331 \$ 1,201,374 | \$ - \$ 647 \$ - \$ \$ \$ \$ - \$ \$ \$ \$ - \$ \$ \$ | 310 \$ - - \$ - 870 \$ - | \$ 10,377,574 \$ 10,857,57 \$ 105,759 \$ 135,75 \$ 2,447,965 \$ 2,447,96 | 4 \$ 3,295,108 9 \$ 126,972 5 \$ 354,961 | \$ - \$ 2,071,1 \$ - \$ - \$ \$ - \$ - \$ \$ - \$ 970,5 - | 80 \$ - - \$ - 555 \$ - | \$ 6,570,918 \$ \$ 178,175 \$ \$ 1,495,081 \$ | 6,570,918 5 178,175 5 1,495,081 5 | \$ 1,891,940 \$ 43,884 \$ 90,121 | \$ - | \$ 3,259,026 \$ - \$ \$ 137,434 \$ \$ 683,289 \$ | 9,511,694 1,686,499 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 9,511,694 1,686,499 | 3P 3P | Cancelled Commercial | Non Resource Resource | Discontinu C Existing C | commercial 3P Programs |
| SCE-13-TP-004 SCE-13-TP-005 SCE-13-TP-013 SCE-13-TP-014 | Lodging EE Program Cool Schools Commercial Utility Building Efficiency | \$ 7,234,047 \$ 6,654,161 \$ 5,081,800 \$ 7,439,441 | \$ 7,038,487 \$ 6,041,161 \$ 2,361,800 \$ 2,960,191 | \$ 6,960,368 \$ 6,019,987 0 \$ 2,364,236 \$ 2,958,384 | 8 \$ - 7 \$ - 6 \$ - 4 \$ - | \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ /5,51/ \$ - \$ - \$ - | s - s - | \$ 2,340,661 \$ 2,235,450 \$ 2,834,054 \$ 2,687,097 | \$ 2,340,661 \$ 357,576 \$ 2,235,450 \$ 535,970 \$ 1,334,054 \$ 702,736 \$ 1527,097 \$ 564,530 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ 360 \$ - \$ \$ 174 | - \$ - 170 \$ - - \$ - 876 \$ - | \$ 947,647 \$ 947,64 \$ 1,183,595 \$ 1,183,59 \$ 493,854 \$ 493,85 \$ 493,854 \$ 493,85 | 7 \$ 125,122 5 \$ 199,382 4 \$ 28,518 4 \$ 58,145 | \$ - \$ 29,5 \$ - \$ 397,7 \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | - \$ - - \$ - | \$ 472,142 \$ \$ 1,158,898 \$ \$ 154,339 \$ \$ 29,079 \$ | 4/2,142 3 1,158,898 3 154,339 3 29,079 3 | \$ 49,875 \$ 66,208 \$ 15,628 \$ 9,839 | | \$ 148,310 \$ \$ 148,215 \$ \$ 149,675 \$ \$ 149,675 \$ \$ 21 444 \$ | 515,965 | s - s s - s s - s | 515,965 | 3P 3P 3P | Commercial Concelled Commercial | Resource Resource Resource | Existing C Existing C Discontinu C | commercial 3P Programs commercial 3P Programs commercial 3P Programs |
| SCE-13-TP-017 SCE-13-TP-018 SCE-13-TP-021 | Energy Efficiency for Entertainment Centers School Energy Efficiency Program Enhanced Retrocommissioning | \$ 2,577,117 \$ 11,746,859 \$ 2,376,856 | \$ 1,582,117 \$ 6,370,349 \$ 1,680,856 | \$ 1,578,941 \$ 6,369,518 \$ 1,714,730 | 1 \$ - 8 \$ - 0 \$ - | s - s - s - | \$ - \$ - \$ 35,038 | s - s - | \$ - \$ 1,004,898 \$ 986,116 | \$ | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ 90 | - \$ - - \$ - 394 \$ - | \$ - \$ \$ 3,195,641 \$ 3,645,64 \$ 1,509,260 \$ 1,509,26 | \$ - 1 \$ 2,239,969 0 \$ 162,039 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ 197.9 \$ - \$ 475.3 | - \$ - 997 \$ - 807 \$ - | \$ - \$ \$ 2,215,552 \$ \$ 867,653 \$ | 2,215,552 \$ | \$ - \$ 1,562,053 \$ 54,332 | 1 | \$ - \$ \$ 1,465,299 \$ \$ 505,360 \$ | 2,160,595 2,103,295 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 2,160,595 2,103,295 | 3P 3P 3P | Commercial Public Commercial | Resource Resource Resource | Discontinu C Existing C Existing C | commercial 3P Programs commercial 3P Programs commercial 3P Programs |
| SCE-13-TP-027 SCE-13-TP-025 | Commercial 3P Solicitation Facility Assessment Program Industrial Third Party Programs | \$ - \$ - \$ 72,965,811 | \$ | \$ - \$ - 2 \$ 49,089,962 | \$ - \$ - 2 \$ - | \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ - \$ - \$ 3,164,818 | s - s - | \$ 5 20,368,334 | \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ 20,368,334 \$ 6,674,600 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$,742 | - \$ - - \$ - 473 \$ - | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ 22,273,758 \$ 22,273,75 | \$ - \$ - 8 \$ 3,798,812 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ 2,218,3 | - \$ - - \$ - 122 \$ - | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ 17,422,075 \$ | 17,422,075 | \$ - \$ - \$ 1,099,332 | \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ 9,307,715 \$ \$ | 2,129,290 357,685 14,525,332 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 2,129,290 357,685 14,525,332 | 3P 3P | Commercial Commercial | Non Resource Non Resource | New C | Commercial 3P Programs |
| SCE-13-TP-006 SCE-13-TP-007 SCE-13-TP-008 SCE-13-TP-009 | Primary and Fabricated Metals Nonmetallic Minerals and Products Comprehensive Chemical Products | \$ 13,077,779 \$ 12,409,866 \$ 12,112,742 \$ 10,678,037 | \$ 8,152,156 \$ 18,048,000 \$ 15,753,742 \$ 10,347,037 | 5 5 6,214,252 0 \$ 13,570,037 2 \$ 9,326,088 7 \$ 7,146,783 | 2 \$ - 7 \$ - 8 \$ - 3 \$ - | s - s - s - | \$ 32,985 \$ 857,152 \$ 1,302,088 \$ 99,930 | s - s - | \$ 3,989,783 \$ 4,104,991 \$ 4,627,969 \$ 3,171.077 | \$ 3,989,783 \$ 2,582,085 \$ 4,104,991 \$ 1,453,524 \$ 4,627,969 \$ 1,365,966 \$ 3,171,077 \$ 696,430 | \$ - \$ 54 \$ - \$ 1,934 \$ - \$ 754 \$ - \$ 88 | 890 \$ - 892 \$ - 660 \$ - 610 \$ - | \$ 3,492,256 \$ 3,492,25 \$ 6,607,008 \$ 6,607,00 \$ 5,272,853 \$ 5,272,85 \$ 2,276,581 \$ 2,276,58 | 6 \$ 949,714 8 \$ 983,219 3 \$ 572,824 1 \$ 489,725 | \$ - \$ 67.4 \$ - \$ 1.077.6 \$ - \$ 6.6 \$ - \$ 717.2 | 137 \$ - 155 \$ - 169 \$ - 155 \$ - | \$ 2,598,005 \$ \$ 4,730,172 \$ \$ 3,943,336 \$ \$ 3,759,220 \$ | 2,598,005 3 4,730,172 3 3,943,336 3 3,759,220 3 | \$ 228,868 \$ 358,686 \$ 175,839 \$ 184,170 | | \$ 1,345,842 \$ \$ 3,393,139 \$ \$ 1,260,820 \$ \$ 1,959,508 \$ | 2,974,199 3,003,914 4,361,405 696,816 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 2,974,199 3,003,914 4,361,405 696,816 | 3P 3P 3P | Industrial Industrial Industrial | Resource Resource Resource Resource | Existing II Existing II Existing II | Industrial 3P Programs Industrial 3P Programs Industrial 3P Programs Industrial 3P Programs |
| SCE-13-TP-010 SCE-13-TP-011 SCE-13-TP-012 | Comprehensive Petroleum Refining Oil Production Refinery Energy Efficiency Program | \$ 6,570,184 \$ 10,177,932 \$ 7,939,271 | \$ 3,465,184 \$ 10,377,932 \$ 1,703,271 | \$ 2,688,644 2 \$ 8,441,480 \$ 1,702,678 | 4 \$ - 0 \$ - 8 \$ - | \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ 323,430 \$ 549,233 \$ - | s - s - | \$ 1,101,054 \$ 3,373,460 \$ - | \$ 1,101,054 \$ 330,002 \$ 3,373,460 \$ 246,593 \$ - \$ - | \$ - \$ 367 \$ - \$ 541 \$ - \$ | 649 \$ - 772 \$ - - \$ - | \$ 1,985,196 \$ 1,985,19 \$ 1,136,253 \$ 1,136,25 \$ - \$ | 6 \$ 292,278 3 \$ 187,841 \$ - | \$ - \$ 133,3 \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 318 \$ - - \$ - - \$ - | \$ 1,232,158 \$ \$ 788,282 \$ \$ 185 \$ | 1,232,158 \$ 788,282 \$ 185 \$ | \$ 69,396 \$ 63,967 \$ - | | \$ 963,307 \$ \$ 256,811 \$ \$ 46 \$ | 732,285 358,016 | <u>s</u> - <u>s</u> s - <u>s</u> s - s | 732,285 358,016 | 3P 3P 3P | Industrial Industrial Industrial | Resource Resource Resource | Existing II Existing II Discontinu C | ndustrial 3P Programs ndustrial 3P Programs commercial 3P Programs |
| SCE-13-TP-023 SCE-13-TP-028 | Midsize Industrial Customer Program Industrial 3P Solicitation Cross Cutting Third Party Programs | \$ - \$ - \$ 15,899,606 | \$ | \$ - \$ - \$ 8,332,901 | \$ - \$ - 1 \$ - | s - s - s - | \$ - \$ - \$ 3,116,016 | S | \$ \$ \$ 5,337,369 | \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ 4,507,368 \$ 1,239,464 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ 1,629 | - \$ - - \$ - 583 \$ - | \$ 1,503,613 \$ 1,503,61 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ | 3 \$ 323,209 \$ - 6 \$ 717,823 0 \$ 00,005 | \$ - \$ 215,9 \$ - \$ \$ - \$ 1,622,1 | 988 \$ - - \$ - 171 \$ - | \$ 370,717 \$ \$ - \$ \$ 1,176,041 \$ | 370,717 | \$ 18,406 \$ - \$ 288,024 | \$ - \$ - | \$ 128,241 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ 2,119,526 \$ \$ \$ | 269,406 2,129,290 874,616 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 269,406 2,129,290 874,616 | 3P 3P | Industrial Industrial | Resource Non Resource | Existing II New II | ndustrial 3P Programs ndustrial 3P Programs |
| SCE-13-TP-020 | IDEEA365 Program | 3,346,951 \$ 12,552,655 | 2,816,951 9,102,655 | a 2,834,222 5 \$ 5,498,679 | 9 \$ - | s - | \$ 3,116,016 | s - | 4,142,715 4,194,654 | • 1,142,714 \$ 438,171 \$ 3,364,654 \$ 801,293 | \$ - \$ 1,629 | - - - | \$ 2,244,572 \$ 1,394,57 | 2 \$ 143,799 | s - s | - \$ - | \$ 742,031 \$ | 742,031 | 14,016 \$ 113,267 | | | | s - s | - | 3P | Commercial | Resource | Discontinu N Discontinu 31 | ommercial/Industrial/Agricultural Programs commercial/Industrial/Agricultural |
| SCE-13-TP-022 SCE-13-TP-029 | Water Infrastructure Systems Energy Efficiency Program Local Government 3P Solicitation | \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ - \$ - | \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ - \$ - | s - s - s - | s - s - s - | s - s - s - | \$ - \$ - \$ - | <u>\$</u> - <u>\$</u> - \$ - \$ - | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | - <u>\$</u> - - \$ - - \$ - | \$ 1,727,185 \$ 2,097,18 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - | 5 \$ 475,118 \$ - \$ - | \$ - \$ 1,622,1 \$ - \$ \$ - \$ | 71 \$ - - \$ - - \$ - | \$ 432,503 \$ \$ - \$ | 432,503 | \$ 160,741 \$ - | \$- | \$ 2,048,061 \$ \$ - \$ - \$ | 494,760 379,856 | \$ - \$ \$ | 494,760 379,856 | 3P 3P | Public Public | Resource Non Resource | Existing 3I New C | P Programs Sovernment Partnerships |
| SCE 20/0100 | PA Sub-Total EM&V (PA & CPUC Portions) Total EM&V SCE | \$ 932,469,800 \$ 41,997,374 \$ 11,540,000 | \$ 932,469,800 \$ 41,997,374 | \$ 829,218,386 \$ 38,043,783 | 6 \$ - 3 \$ - | \$ 9,391,000 \$ - | \$ 65,426,208 \$ 3,953,591 | \$ 35,320,567 \$ 5,101,436 | \$ 302,673,000 \$ 13,333,000 \$ 2,000,577 | \$ 302,673,000 \$ 232,243,836 \$ 13,333,000 \$ 778,171 \$ 2,656,675 | \$ - \$ 18,024 \$ - \$ 12,554 | 994 \$ 54,508,55 829 \$ - | 7 \$ 302,725,000 \$ 302,725,00 \$ 13,333,000 \$ 13,333,00 \$ 5,222,000 \$ 13,333,00 | 0 \$ 209,921,838 0 \$ 1,306,225 | \$ - \$ 33,950,3 \$ - \$ 12,026,7 | 22 \$ 60,401,347 | 7 \$ 222,643,088 \$ \$ 10,011,570 \$ | 222,643,088 \$ | \$ 73,957,021 \$ 543,870 | <mark>\$ -</mark> \$ - | \$ 147,081,750 \$ 1,672,495 \$ \$ 9,467,701 \$ \$ | 220,177,973 9,995,849 | \$ 1,672,495 \$ \$ - \$ | 218,505,478 9,995,849 | EM91/ | EMPV | Non Posouro- | Evinti | MeV |
| SCE-30V0100 SCE-30V0200 | EM&V - CPUC Total SCE Portfolio | \$ 30,448,097 \$ 974,467,174 | \$ 30,448,097 \$ 974,467,174 | 9,359,051 \$28,684,732 \$867,262,169 | 2 \$ - 9 \$ - | \$ 9,391,000 | \$ 2,190,226 \$ 1,763,365 \$ 69,379,799 | \$ 1,515,593 \$ 40,422,003 | 3,666,425 9,666,425 316,006,000 | 3,000,575 \$ 726,079 9,666,425 \$ 52,092 \$ 316,006,000 \$ 233,022,006 | • - \$ 2,940 \$ - \$ 9,614 \$ - \$ 9,614 \$ - \$ 30,579 | 333 \$ - 823 \$ 54,508,55 | s 5,535,200 \$ 5,333,20 \$ 7,999,800 \$ 7,999,800 7 \$ 316,058,000 \$ 316,058,000 | 0 \$ 9/1,840 0 \$ 334,385 0 \$ 211,228,063 | \$ - \$ 4,361.3 \$ - \$ 7,665.4 \$ - \$ 45,977,0 | 115 \$ - 197 \$ 60,401,347 | a 4,004,628 \$ \$ 6,006,942 \$ 7 \$ 232,654,659 \$ | 4,004,628 \$ 6,006,942 \$ 232,654,659 \$ | <pre>409,268 \$ 134,602 \$ 74,500,890</pre> | \$ - | 3.595.300 5.872.341 5.6549.451 1.672.495 | 5,998,339 5,997,509 230,173,822 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ 1,672,495 \$ | 5,997,509 228,501,327 | EM&V EM&V | EM&V | Non Resource | Existing E | mav M&V |
| | Lancaster Choice Energy 3CREN SoCaIREN | \$ \$ 53,062,167 | \$ \$ 53,062,167 | \$ \$ \$ 39,211,204 | \$ - \$ - 4 \$ - | \$ \$ \$ 11,660,000 | \$ - \$ 2,190,963 | \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ \$ 17,314,000 | \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 17,314,000 \$ 15,460,144 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ 1,853 | - \$ - - \$ - 856 \$ - | \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 17,262,000 \$ 17,262,000 | \$ - \$ - 0 \$ 14,743,768 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ 2,518,2 | - \$ - - \$ - 132 \$ - | \$ 372,341 \$ \$ - \$ \$ 15,536,447 \$ | 372,341 | \$ 372,341 \$ - \$ 5,278,078 | \$ - \$ - | \$ - \$ - \$ \$ - \$ - \$ \$ 10,258,369 \$ 3,496,825 \$ | 401,318 2,051,754 17,269,325 | \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ 3,496,825 \$ | 401,318 2,051,754 13,772,500 | REN/CCA REN/CCA REN/CCA | CCA REN REN | CCA REN REN | Existing F New F Existing F | EN/CCA EN/CCA EN/CCA |
| | Total EE Portfolio | \$ 1,027,529,341 | \$ 1,027,529,341 | \$ 906,473,372 | 2 \$ - | \$ 21,051,000 | \$ 71,570,762 | \$ 40,422,003 | \$ 333,320,000 | \$ 333,320,000 \$ 248,482,150 | \$ - \$ 32,433 | 679 \$ 54,508,55 | 7 \$ 333,320,000 \$ 333,320,00 | 0 \$ 225,971,831 | \$ - \$ 48,495,3 | 29 \$ 60,401,347 | 7 \$ 248,563,447 \$ | 248,563,447 | \$ 80,151,309 | \$ - | \$ 166,807,820 \$ 5,169,320 \$ | 249,896,218 | \$ 5,169,320 \$ | 244,726,898 | _ | | | | |

D. 12-11-015 and D. 15-01-002
 Approved to return \$21,051,000 2013-2015 unspent/uncommitted fund to offset revenue for 2017 Energy Efficiency program
 Assumed the same authorized budget level as 2015, D. 15-01-002
 Advice Letter 3577-E to shift fund from Commercial Energy Advisor Program and Commercial Deemed Incentive Program to Primary Lighting Program

Attachment C

| Category (2013-17 Authorized [1] and 2018 Authorized [2]) | Ele Re | ectric Demand sponse Funds | E E | Electric Energy fficiency Funds | Natural Gas Public Purpose Funds | T Effi | otal Energy iciency Funds |
|---|-----------|-------------------------------|--------|------------------------------------|--|-----------|------------------------------|
| 2013-2015 Annualized Program Funds - Utility | \$ | 11,746 | \$ | 310,823 | | \$ | 322,569 |
| 2013-2015 Annualized Program Funds - REN | | | \$ | 17,687 | | \$ | 17,687 |
| 2013-2015 Annualized Program Funds - CCA | | | | | | \$ | - |
| 2013-2015 Annualized EM&V | | | \$ | 13,999 | | \$ | 13,999 |
| 2013-2015 Total Annualized Portfolio | \$ | 11,746 | \$ | 342,510 | \$ - | \$ | 354,256 |
| 2016 Program Funds - Utility | \$ | 11,746 | \$ | 302,673 | | \$ | 314,419 |
| 2016 Program Funds - REN | | | \$ | 17,314 | | \$ | 17,314 |
| 2016 Program Funds - CCA | | | | | | \$ | - |
| 2016 EM&V | | | \$ | 13,333 | | \$ | 13,333 |
| 2016 Annualized Total | \$ | 11,746 | \$ | 333,320 | \$ - | \$ | 345,066 |
| 2017 Program Funds - Utility | \$ | 10,137 | \$ | 302,725 | | \$ | 312,862 |
| 2017 Program Funds - REN | | | \$ | 17,262 | | \$ | 17,262 |
| 2017 Program Funds - CCA | | | | | | \$ | - |
| 2017 EM&V | | | \$ | 13,333 | | \$ | 13,333 |
| 2017 Annualized Total | Por | tfolio Budget | \$ | 333,320 | \$ - | \$ | 343,457 |
| 2018 Program Funds - Utility | \$ | 8,780 | \$ | 222,643 | | \$ | 231,423 |
| 2018 Program Funds - REN | | | \$ | 15,536 | | \$ | 15,536 |
| 2018 Program Funds - CCA | | | \$ | - | | \$ | - |
| 2018 Program Funds - LCE | | | \$ | 372 | | \$ | 372 |
| 2018 EM&V | | | \$ | 10,012 | | \$ | 10,012 |
| 2018 Annualized Total | \$ | 8,780 | \$ | 248,563 | \$ - | \$ | 257,343 |
| 2019 Requested Program Funds - Utility | \$ | 9,360 | \$ | 220,178 | \$ - | \$ | 229,538 |
| 2019 Requested Program Funds - SCalREN | \$ | - | \$ | 17,269 | \$ - | \$ | 17,269 |
| 2019 Requested Program Funds - 3CREN | \$ | - | \$ | 2,052 | \$ - | \$ | 2,052 |
| 2019 Requested Program Funds - LCE | \$ | - | \$ | 401 | \$ - | \$ | 401 |
| 2019 Requested Funds -ScalREN EM&V | \$ | - | \$ | 288 | \$- | \$ | 288 |
| 2019 Requested Funds - 3CREN EM&V | \$ | - | \$ | 34 | \$- | \$ | 34 |
| 2020 Requested Funds - LCE EM&V | \$ | - | \$ | 7 | \$ | \$ | 7 |
| 2021 Requested Funds - PA EM&V | \$ | - | \$ | 3,670 | \$ | \$ | 3,670 |
| 2019 Requested Funds -CPUC EM&V | \$ | - | \$ | 5,998 | \$ - | \$ | 5,998 |
| 2019 Total Portfolio Request | Por | tfolio Budget | \$ | 249,896 | \$ - | \$ | 259,256 |

[1] Authorized budget excludes reductions from past unspent funds, carryover and is consistent with funding approved in D. 12-11-015, D.14-10-046 and D.15-10-028

[2] 2018 Authorized ABAL Budget, D, 18-05-041

| Accrued funds not yet spent (\$000). | Electric | Natural Gas Public | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------|
| Category | Procurement Funds | Purpose Funds | Total |
| 2013-2015 EM&V Funds | \$3,954 | \$0 | \$3,954 |
| 2013-2015 Program Funds - Utility | \$19,666 | \$0 | \$19,666 |
| 2013-2015 Program Funds - REN | \$2,191 | \$0 | \$2,191 |
| 2013-2015 Program Funds - CCA | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 2016 EM&V Funds | \$12,555 | \$0 | \$12,555 |
| 2016 Program Funds - Utility | \$11,634 | \$0 | \$11,634 |
| 2016 Program Funds - REN | \$1,854 | \$0 | \$1,854 |
| 2016 Program Funds - CCA | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 2017 EM&V Funds | \$12,027 | \$0 | \$12,027 |
| 2017 Program Funds - Utility | \$21,215 | \$0 | \$21,215 |
| 2017 Program Funds - REN | \$2,518 | \$0 | \$2,518 |
| 2017 Program Funds - CCA | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 2018 to date EM&V Funds [2] | \$9,468 | \$0 | \$9,468 |
| 2018 to date Program Funds - Utility [2] | \$147,082 | \$0 | \$147,082 |
| 2018 to date Program Funds - REN [2] | \$6,762 | \$0 | \$6,762 |
| 2018 to date Program Funds - LCE [2] | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 2018 to date Program Funds - CCA [2] | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Total | \$250,924 | \$0 | \$250,924 |

 Table 6 - Accrued Energy Efficiency Program Funding Not Yet Spent [1]

[1] As of June 30, 2018

[2] July to December 2018 forecast to spend and commitments

Attachment C

Table 7 - 2018 Authorized and Spent/Unspent Detail

| Authorized, spent and unspent program funds (excludes EM&V) (\$000) | Pr | Electric ocurement | Natural Gas Public Purpose | |
|--|----|-----------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|
| Category | | Funds | Funds | Total |
| 2018 Annualized Authorized Program Budget | \$ | 238,552 | \$0 | \$238,552 |
| 2018 Actual Spent [1] | \$ | 79,539 | \$0 | \$79,539 |
| 2018 Unspent | | | | |
| 2018 Committed funds [2] | \$ | 153,843 | \$0 | \$153,843 |
| 2018 Unspent/uncommitted - estimated available for | | | | |
| 2019 [3] | \$ | 5,169 | \$0 | \$5,169 |

[1] Actual spent through June 30, 2018

[2] July to December 2018 forecast to spend and commitments

[3] Included REN PY 2018 unspent/uncommitted fund, \$3,496,826

| | | | | Ju | Ily to December | |
|---------------|------|-------------|------------------|----|------------------|-----------------|
| | 2018 | Budget | Spent | Fo | precast to spend | Remaining |
| SCE | \$ | 222,643,089 | \$ 73,888,832 | \$ | 147,081,762 | \$ 1,672,495 |
| EM&V | \$ | 10,011,570 | \$ 543,870 | \$ | 9,467,700 | \$ - |
| REN | \$ | 15,536,447 | \$ 5,278,078 | \$ | 6,761,543 | \$ 3,496,826 |
| LCE | \$ | 372,341 | \$ 372,341 | \$ | - | \$ - |
| Total | \$ | 248,563,447 | \$ 80,083,121 | \$ | 163,311,005 | \$ 5,169,321 |
| Excludes EM&V | \$ | 238,551,877 | \$ 79,539,251 | \$ | 153,843,305 | \$ 5,169,321 |

Attachment D Sector Level Metrics

Southern California Edison - Energy Efficiency Sector Metrics with Targets

Attachment D

Southern California Edison - Energy Efficiency Sector Metrics with Targets

Attachment D - Table of Contents

| | Page # |
|---|--------|
| A. Metrics/Indicators in Energy Division Defined Template | 3 |
| B. Template Column Index | 14 |
| C. Definitions | 16 |

Energy Division Template

| Spreadsheet | Att | A AttA Metho | d Units of | | Metric/ | | | | Baseline | | | | s | hort Term Target | | Mid Term Target | Long Term Target | |
|-------------|---------|--------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|---|
| Index | PA Pag | e Order Code | Measurement | Metric Type | Indicator | Business Plan Att A Description Metric | Sector | Baseline Year | Numerator | Baseline Denominator | Baseline Number | 2017 Number | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | (2021-2023) | (2024-2025) | Methodology |
| 0 | SCE A03 | PL1 G | MT CO2eq | GHG | Metric | RSF2-G••Greenhouse gasses (MT CO2eq) Net kWh savings, CO2-equivalent of net annual kWh savings reported on an annual basis•• | Portfolio Level (PL)– All Sectors | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 252,978 | 236,390 | 225,780 | 242,217 | 256,867 | 259,357 | 279,198 | Per CEDARS |
| 1 | SCE A02 | PL1 S1 | First year annua | I S1: Energy Savings | Metric | PL1-S1- First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante First year annual kW gross | Portfolio Level (PL)- All | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 133,323 | 128,562 | 164,636 | 180,486 | 195,043 | 196,384 | 210,824 | Per CEDARS |
| | | | kW gross | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net)•• | Sectors | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | SCE A02 | PL1 S1 | First year annua | I S1: Energy Savings | Metric | PL1-S1- First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante First year annual kW net | Portfolio Level (PL)- All | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 95,286 | 91,077 | 118,106 | 129,584 | 140,139 | 141,105 | 151,482 | Per CEDARS |
| | | | kW net | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net)•• | Sectors | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | SCE A02 | PL1 S1 | First year annua | I S1: Energy Savings | Metric | PL1-S1- First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante First year annual kWh gross | Portfolio Level (PL)- All | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 694,435,222 | 655,559,016 | 679,050,055 | 723,567,464 | 761,852,925 | 762,209,814 | 815,138,762 | Per CEDARS |
| | | | kWh gross | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net)•• | Sectors | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | SCE A02 | PL1 S1 | First year annua | I S1: Energy Savings | Metric | PL1-S1- First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante First year annual kWh net | Portfolio Level (PL)- All | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 508,866,337 | 469,994,945 | 491,066,876 | 524,233,442 | 552,920,433 | 553,130,110 | 591,502,146 | Per CEDARS |
| | | | kwnnet | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net)•• | Sectors | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | SCE A02 | PL1 S1 | First year annua Therm gross | I S1: Energy Savings | Metric | PL1-S1- First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante First year annual Therm gross | Portfolio Level (PL)- All Sectors | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | incin gross | | | net)++ | 300003 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | SCE A02 | PL1 S1 | First year annua Therm net | I S1: Energy Savings | Metric | PL1-S1- First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante First year annual Therm net (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | Portfolio Level (PL)– All Sectors | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| - | | | | | | net)•• | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | SCE AU2 | PL1 51 | Lifecycle ex-anti kW gross | e S1: Energy Savings | Metric | PL1-S1- First year annual and litecycle ex-ante Litecycle ex-ante kW gross (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | Portfolio Level (PL)– All Sectors | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 1,175,407 | 1,047,642 | 1,428,181 | 1,554,179 | 1,668,548 | 1,679,872 | 1,803,242 | Per CEDARS |
| 0 | CCC 403 | DI 1 61 | tifan ala au ant | C1. Canada Cardana | Mateia | net)•• | Destfalia Lavel (DL) All | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 905.064 | 757 221 | 050 022 | 1.042.520 | 1 110 221 | 1 126 450 | 1 200 759 | D== CEDADC |
| ° . | SCE AUZ | PLI 31 | kW net | e SI. Energy Savings | Weth | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | Sectors | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 805,064 | /5/,231 | 939,022 | 1,042,559 | 1,118,551 | 1,120,459 | 1,209,758 | Per CEDARS |
| 9 | SCE A02 | PI 1 S1 | Lifecycle ex-ant | s S1: Energy Savings | Metric | net)•• PI 1.51- First year annual and lifer yr le ex-ante VMb gross | Portfolio Level (PL) – All | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 6 247 467 909 | 6 259 048 399 | 6 401 370 654 | 6 778 964 111 | 7 096 644 950 | 7 102 208 001 | 7 597 124 947 | Per CEDARS |
| - | | | kWh gross | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | Sectors | | | ., | -, , , | -,,,- | -,,, | -,, | .,, | .,,, | .,,. | |
| 10 | SCE A02 | PL1 S1 | Lifecycle ex-ant | e S1: Energy Savings | Metric | net)•• PL1-S1- First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante Lifecycle ex-ante kWh net | Portfolio Level (PL)- All | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 4,285,849,360 | 4.542.428.022 | 4.417.936.739 | 4.673.429.665 | 4.887.566.448 | 4.893.046.437 | 5.235.291.292 | Per CEDARS |
| | | | kWh net | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | Sectors | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | SCE A02 | PL1 S1 | Lifecycle ex-ant | e S1: Energy Savings | Metric | net)•• PL1-S1- First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante Lifecycle ex-ante Therm gross | Portfolio Level (PL)- All | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | Therm gross | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | Sectors | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | SCE A02 | PL1 S1 | Lifecycle ex-anti | e S1: Energy Savings | Metric | net)•• PL1-S1- First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante Lifecycle ex-ante Therm net | Portfolio Level (PL)- All | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | Therm net | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | Sectors | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | SCE A02 | PL2 S3 | First year annua | I S3: DAC Savings | Metric | PL2-S3- First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante First year annual kW gross in Disadvantaged | Portfolio Level (PL)- All | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 86,933 | 87,207 | 107,351 | 117,686 | 127,178 | 128,052 | 137,468 | Data pull from PA databases |
| | | | kW gross | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and Communities | Sectors | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | SCE A02 | PL2 S3 | First year annua | I S3: DAC Savings | Metric | PL2-S3- First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante First year annual kW net in Disadvantaged | Portfolio Level (PL)- All | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 63,922 | 61,472 | 79,231 | 86,931 | 94,011 | 94,659 | 101,621 | Data pull from PA databases |
| | | | kW net | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and Communities | Sectors | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | SCE A02 | PL2 S3 | First year annua | I S3: DAC Savings | Metric | PL2-S3- First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante First year annual kWh gross in Disadvantaged | Portfolio Level (PL)- All | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 459,918,544 | 453,777,237 | 449,729,078 | 479,212,580 | 504,568,715 | 504,805,080 | 539,859,472 | Data pull from PA databases |
| | | | kWh gross | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and Communities | Sectors | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | SCE A02 | PL2 53 | First year annua | I S3: DAC Savings | Metric | PL2-S3- First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante First year annual kWh net in Disadvantaged | Portfolio Level (PL)- All | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 345,873,831 | 326,357,761 | 333,775,629 | 356,318,773 | 375,817,174 | 375,959,690 | 402,040,965 | Data pull from PA databases |
| | | | kWh net | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and Communities net) in disadvantaged communities | Sectors | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | SCE A02 | PL2 S3 | First year annua | I S3: DAC Savings | Metric | PL2-S3- First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante First year annual Therm gross in Disadvantaged | Portfolio Level (PL)- All | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | Therm gross | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and Communities net) in disadvantaged communities •• | Sectors | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | SCE A02 | PL2 S3 | First year annua | I S3: DAC Savings | Metric | PL2-S3- First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante First year annual Therm net in Disadvantaged | Portfolio Level (PL)- All | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | inerm net | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and Communities net) in disadvantaged communities•• | Sectors | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | SCE A02 | PL2 S3 | Lifecycle ex-ant | e S3: DAC Savings | Metric | PL2-S3- First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante Lifecycle ex-ante kW gross in Disadvantaged | Portfolio Level (PL)- All | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 751,134 | 689,117 | 912,667 | 993,185 | 1,066,272 | 1,073,508 | 1,152,346 | Data pull from PA databases |
| | | | KW BIO35 | | | net) in disadvantaged communities•• | Sectors | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | SCE A02 | PL2 S3 | Lifecycle ex-anti kW net | e S3: DAC Savings | Metric | PL2-S3- First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante Lifecycle ex-ante kW net in Disadvantaged (nre-evaluation) gas electric and demand savings (gross and Communities | Portfolio Level (PL)- All Sectors | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 513,001 | 502,406 | 611,105 | 664,324 | 712,620 | 717,799 | 770,879 | Data pull from PA databases |
| | | | | | | net) in disadvantaged communities | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | SCE A02 | PL2 S3 | Lifecycle ex-anti kWh gross | e S3: DAC Savings | Metric | PL2-S3- First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante Lifecycle ex-ante kWh gross in Disadvantaged (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and Communities | Portfolio Level (PL)– All Sectors | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 4,023,262,366 | 4,199,577,342 | 4,122,373,099 | 4,365,536,820 | 4,570,117,841 | 4,573,700,351 | 4,892,418,391 | Data pull from PA databases |
| 22 | | D1 D CD | - | | | net) in disadvantaged communities•• | D. (C.F. 1. (101) All | 2016 | | | 2 774 505 200 | 2 072 042 050 | 2 0 0 0 0 7 4 0 2 | 2 025 400 226 | | 2 4 67 675 446 | 2 200 220 040 | |
| 22 | SCE AU2 | PL2 S3 | Lifecycle ex-anti kWh net | e S3: DAC Savings | Metric | PL2-S3- First year annual and litecycle ex-ante Litecycle ex-ante kWh net in Disadvantaged (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and Communities | Portfolio Level (PL)– All Sectors | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 2,774,586,309 | 3,072,843,659 | 2,860,097,442 | 3,025,499,236 | 3,164,127,763 | 3,167,675,416 | 3,389,238,940 | Data pull from PA databases |
| 22 | SCE 402 | 01.2 52 | Lifocuclo ov anti | a S2: DAC Savings | Motric | net) in disadvantaged communities•• PL2-S2. First your annual and lifecurin as anto Lifecurin as anto Therm groups in Disadvantaged | Portfolio Lavol (PL)- All | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 25 | SCE AUZ | PL2 33 | Therm gross | e 55: DAC Savings | Weth | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and Communities | Sectors | 2016 | N/A | N/A | IN/A | N/A | N/A | IN/A | N/A | IN/A | N/A | N/A |
| 24 | SCE A02 | PI 2 53 | Lifecycle ex-ant | e S3: DAC Savings | Metric | net) in disadvantaged communities•• PI 2-S3- First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante | Portfolio Level (PL)- All | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | JUL NUL | | Therm net | 55. Brie Savings | meane | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and Communities | Sectors | 2010 | 1975 | 1975 | 1975 | 1975 | 1976 | 1974 | 1975 | 1474 | N/A | 9/6 |
| 25 | SCE A02 | PL3 S4 | First vear annua | I S4: Hard to reach m | narkets Metric | net) in disadvantaged communities•• PL3-S4 - First vear annual and lifecycle ex-ante First vear annual kW gross in Hard-to-Reach | Portfolio Level (PL)- All | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 113.190 | 132.690 | 139.775 | 153.231 | 165.590 | 166.728 | 178.988 | Data oull from PA databases: HTR zipcodes from 2014 Athens Research |
| | | | kW gross | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and Markets | Sectors | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 26 | SCE A02 | PL3 S4 | First year annua | I S4: Hard to reach m | narkets Metric | net) in hard-to-reach markets•• PL3-S4 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante First year annual kW net in Hard-to-Reach Market | ts Portfolio Level (PL)- All | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 613,123 | 668,688 | 730,375 | 793,980 | 851,702 | 857,892 | 921,331 | Data pull from PA databases; HTR zipcodes from 2014 Athens Research |
| | | | kW net | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | Sectors | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | SCE A02 | PL3 S4 | First year annua | I S4: Hard to reach m | narkets Metric | PL3-S4 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante First year annual kWh gross in Hard-to-Reach | Portfolio Level (PL)- All | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 589,112,327 | 657,708,954 | 576,060,581 | 613,826,169 | 646,304,989 | 646,607,750 | 691,509,124 | Data pull from PA databases; HTR zipcodes from 2014 Athens Researc |
| | | | kWh gross | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and Markets | Sectors | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | SCE A02 | PL3 54 | First year annua | I S4: Hard to reach m | narkets Metric | PL3-S4 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante First year annual kWh net | Portfolio Level (PL)- All | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 452,344,193 | 465,588,857 | 436,521,801 | 466,004,403 | 491,504,997 | 491,691,384 | 525,801,261 | Data pull from PA databases; HTR zipcodes from 2014 Athens Research |
| | | | kWh net | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | Sectors | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 | SCE A02 | PL3 54 | First year annua | I S4: Hard to reach m | narkets Metric | PL3-S4 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante First year annual Therm gross | Portfolio Level (PL)- All | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | Therm gross | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) in hard-to-reach markets | Sectors | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | SCE A02 | PL3 S4 | First year annua | I S4: Hard to reach m | narkets Metric | PL3-S4 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante First year annual Therm net | Portfolio Level (PL)- All | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | Therm net | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) in hard-to-reach markets•• | Sectors | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | SCE A02 | PL3 S4 | Lifecycle ex-anti | e S4: Hard to reach m | narkets Metric | PL3-S4 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante Lifecycle ex-ante kW gross | Portfolio Level (PL)– All Sectors | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 889,798 | 916,350 | 1,081,151 | 1,176,533 | 1,263,112 | 1,271,684 | 1,365,077 | Data pull from PA databases; HTR zipcodes from 2014 Athens Research |
| | | | PAA 81072 | | | net) in hard-to-reach markets•• | Jectors | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 32 | SCE A02 | PL3 S4 | Lifecycle ex-ant | e S4: Hard to reach m | narkets Metric | PL3-S4 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante Lifecycle ex-ante kW net | Portfolio Level (PL)– All Sectors | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 613,123 | 668,688 | 730,375 | 793,980 | 851,702 | 857,892 | 921,331 | Data pull from PA databases; HTR zipcodes from 2014 Athens Research |
| | | | NW NCC | | | net) in hard-to-reach markets•• | 30000 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 33 | SCE A02 | PL3 S4 | Lifecycle ex-anti kWh gross | e S4: Hard to reach m | narkets Metric | PL3-S4 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante Lifecycle ex-ante kWh gross (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | Portfolio Level (PL)– All Sectors | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 4,653,473,624 | 5,574,601,257 | 4,768,109,246 | 5,049,362,582 | 5,285,989,552 | 5,290,133,233 | 5,658,775,856 | Data pull from PA databases; HTR zipcodes from 2014 Athens Research |
| | | D12 C4 | - | | | net) in hard-to-reach markets•• | D. (17) 1. (10) 1. (1) | 2016 | | | 2 220 026 540 | 1 070 050 770 | 2 222 655 622 | 2 524 722 040 | 2 602 556 005 | 2 607 600 220 | 2.055.224.202 | |
| 34 | SCE AU2 | PL3 54 | Lifecycle ex-anti kWh net | e S4: Hard to reach m | narkets Metric | PL3-S4 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante Lifecycle ex-ante kWh net (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | Portfolio Level (PL)– All Sectors | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 3,238,836,548 | 4,072,958,779 | 3,338,655,603 | 3,531,732,810 | 3,693,556,985 | 3,697,698,239 | 3,956,334,288 | Data pull from PA databases; HTR zipcodes from 2014 Athens Research |
| 25 | CCC 403 | DI 2 64 | tifan ala au ant | C4. Unod to south m | andunta Mantain | net) in hard-to-reach markets•• | Destfalia Lavel (DL) All | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 21/2 | 21/2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | NI/A | N/A |
| 35 | SCE AUZ | PL3 54 | Therm gross | e 54: Hard to reach m | narkets Metric | PL3-54 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante Lifecycle ex-ante i nerm gross (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | Sectors | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 26 | SCE 402 | 012 54 | Lifocuclo ox ant | . S4: Ward to roach m | aarkote Motric | net) in hard-to-reach markets•• PL2-S4_Sizet year applied lifecycle or ante | Portfolio Loval (PL)- All | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 30 | JUL AU2 | rta 34 | Therm net | | IN NELS IVIELTIC | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | Sectors | 2010 | N/A | N/ A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | IN/ M | N/A | |
| 37 | SCF A07 | PI4 10 | PAC Lovelized | Cost per unit caved | Metric | net) in hard-to-reach markets•• PI4-IC - Levelized Cost (\$/kW) | Portfolio Level (PL) - All | 2016 | \$282 529 425 | 805.064 | \$351 | \$355 | \$295 | \$271 | \$253 | \$251 | \$234 | Per CEDARS |
| | AU2 | | Cost (\$/kW) | 2001 per unit saveu | wieu ic | and kW (use both TRC and PAC) | Sectors | 2010 | yror,323,423 | 003,004 | 1664 | دورب | ووعب | <i>441</i> 1 | ووعب | دوسي | + <i>د</i> کې | |
| 38 | SCE A02 | PL4 LC | PAC Levelized Cost (\$/kWb) | Cost per unit saved | Metric | PL4-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, therm PAC Levelized Cost (\$/kWh) and kW (use both TRC and PAC). | Portfolio Level (PL)– All Sectors | 2016 | \$282,529,425 | 4,285,849,360 | \$0.07 | \$0.06 | \$0.06 | \$0.06 | \$0.06 | \$0.06 | \$0.05 | Per CEDARS |
| 39 | SCE A02 | PL4 LC | PAC Levelized | Cost per unit saved | Metric | PL4-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, therm PAC Levelized Cost (\$/therm) | Portfolio Level (PL)- All | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Per CEDARS |
| 40 | SCE A02 | PL4 LC | Cost (\$/therm) TRC Levelized | Cost per unit saved | Metric | and kW (use both TRC and PAC)•• PL4-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, therm TRC Levelized Cost (\$/kW) | Sectors Portfolio Level (PL)- All | 2016 | \$420,375,326 | 805,064 | \$522 | \$524 | \$438 | \$381 | \$376 | \$373 | \$347 | Per CEDARS |
| 41 | SCF 402 | PLA LC | Cost (\$/kW) | Cost por unit | Mot-1- | and kW (use both TRC and PAC). Plate C - Level and cost of energy efficiency on kMb, therem TBC Level and Cost (CAMAL) | Sectors | 2016 | \$420 275 225 | 4 295 940 260 | 60.000 | ćn ne 7 | ¢0.007 | \$0.0PF | ¢0.007 | \$0.00C | ¢0.09 | Per CEDARS |
| 41 | JCE AU2 | P14 LL | Cost (\$/kWh) | cost per unit saved | WETC | and kW (use both TRC and PAC) | Sectors | 2016 | ə420,375,326 | 4,200,649,360 | ŞU.U98 | ου.U87 | ŞU.U95 | ŞU.U85 | э 0.08 6 | ŞU.UĞb | \$U.U8 | LEI CLAND |
| 42 | SCE A02 | PL4 LC | TRC Levelized | Cost per unit saved | Metric | PL4-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, therm TRC Levelized Cost (\$/therm) and kW (use both TRC and PACI++ | Portfolio Level (PL)- All Sectors | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Per CEDARS |
| 43 | SCE A02 | RSF1 S1 | First year annua | I S1: Energy Savings | Metric | RSF1-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante First year annual kW gross | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 67,811 | 53,901 | 88,390 | 101,567 | 114,277 | 115,385 | 124,212 | Per CEDARS |
| | | | kW gross | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for Single Family Customers. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 44 | SCE A02 | RSF1 S1 | First year annua | I S1: Energy Savings | Metric | RSF1-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante First year annual kW net | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 49,517 | 41,082 | 64,544 | 74,166 | 83,448 | 84,256 | 90,702 | Per CEDARS |
| | | | kW net | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for Single Family Customers•• | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | Key Definitions | Proxy Explanation |
|--------------------|---|-------------------|
| | None | |
| | | |
| | None | |
| | D.18-05-041: DAC = Service accounts in zip codes corresponding to census tracts in the top quartile of CalEnviroScreen 3.0 scores. | |
| | D.18-05-041: DAC = Service accounts in zip codes corresponding to census tracts in the top quartile of CalEnviroScreen 3.0 scores. | |
| | D.18-05-041: DAC = Service accounts in zip codes corresponding to census tracts in the top quartile of CalEnviroScreen 3.0 scores. | |
| | D.18-05-041: DAC = Service accounts in zip codes corresponding to census tracts in the top quartile of CalEnviroScreen 3.0 scores | |
| | D.18-05-041: DAC = Service accounts in zip codes corresponding to census tracts in the top quartile of callewinescroop 2.0 cross | |
| | 0.18-05-041: DAC = Service accounts in zip codes corresponding to census tracts in the top quartile | |
| | D.18-05-041: DAC = Service accounts in zip codes corresponding to census tracts in the top quartile | |
| | or Calenviroscreen 3.0 scores. D.18-05-041: DAC = Service accounts in zip codes corresponding to census tracts in the top quartile | |
| | of CalEnviroScreen 3.0 scores. D.18-05-041: DAC = Service accounts in zip codes corresponding to census tracts in the top quartile | |
| | of CalEnviroScreen 3.0 scores. D.18-05-041: DAC = Service accounts in zip codes corresponding to census tracts in the top quartile | |
| | of CalEnviroScreen 3.0 scores. | |
| | of CalEnviroScreen 3.0 scores. | |
| | D.16-03-04.1. DAR = Service accounts in ap codes corresponding to census in the top quartitie of CalEnviroScreen 3.0 scores. | |
| ens Research study | D.18-US-041 p. 43 - HTR as defined in Resolution G-3497, modified to "include disadvantaged communities (as designated by CalEPA) in the geographic criteria for hard to reach customers." | |
| ens Research study | D.18-05-041 p. 43 - HTR as defined in Resolution G-3497, modified to "include disadvantaged communities (as designated by CalEPA) in the geographic criteria for hard to reach customers." | |
| ens Research study | D.18-05-041 p. 43 - HTR as defined in Resolution G-3497, modified to "include disadvantaged communities (as designated by CalEPA) in the geographic criteria for hard to reach customers." | |
| ens Research study | D.18-05-041 p. 43 - HTR as defined in Resolution G-3497, modified to "include disadvantaged communities (as designated by CalEPA) in the geographic criteria for hard to reach customers." | |
| | D.18-05-041 p. 43 - HTR as defined in Resolution G-3497, modified to "include disadvantaged communities (as designated by CaIEPA) in the geographic criteria for hard to reach customers." | |
| | D.18-05-041 p. 43 - HTR as defined in Resolution G-3497, modified to "include disadvantaged communities (as designated by CalEPA) in the geographic criteria for hard to reach customers." | |
| ens Research study | D.18-05-041 p. 43 - HTR as defined in Resolution G-3497, modified to "include disadvantaged communities (as designated by CalEPA) in the geographic criteria for hard to reach customers." | |
| ens Research study | D.18-05-041 p. 43 - HTR as defined in Resolution G-3497, modified to "include disadvantaged communities (as designated by CaIEPA) in the geographic criteria for hard to reach customers." | |
| ens Research study | D.18-05-041 p. 43 - HTR as defined in Resolution G-3497, modified to "include disadvantaged communities (as designated by CaIEPA) in the geographic criteria for hard to reach customers." | |
| ens Research study | D.18-05-041 p. 43 - HTR as defined in Resolution G-3497, modified to "include disadvantaged communities (as designated by CaIEPA) in the generablic criteria for bard to reach customers." | |
| | D.18-05-041 p. 43 - HTR as defined in Resolution G-3497, modified to "include disadvantaged communities (as designated by CaIEPA) in this generarable criteria for bard to reach customers." | |
| | Communice (as designated by Calc PA) in the geographic Lifer a for hard to react customers. D.18-05-041 p. 43 - HTR as defined in Resolution G-397, modified to "include disadvantaged | |
| | cummumuses (as designated by CalePA) in the geographic criteria for hard to reach customers." | |
| | None | |
| | | |

| Spread | sheet AttA | AttA Metho | d Units of | | Metric/ | | | | | Baseline | | | | | hort Term Target | | Mid Term Target | Long Term Target | | | |
|----------|------------|-------------|----------------------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|--|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------|--|---|-------------------|
| 1nd | ex PA Page | Order Code | Measurement | Metric Type | Indicato | r Business Plan Att A Description | Metric | Sector Residential (RSE) | Baseline Year | Numerator | Baseline Denominator | Baseline Number | 2017 Number | 2018 | 2019 229 349 438 | 2020 258 542 680 | (2021-2023) | (2024-2025) | Methodology | Key Definitions | Proxy Explanation |
| 1 | JCL A02 | 311 31 | kWh gross | 51. Lifergy Savings | wiethc | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | list year annuar kwirgross | Residential (RSF) | 2010 | N/A | 17/4 | 327,230,010 | 205,085,120 | 155,125,564 | 223,343,430 | 230,342,000 | 201,048,555 | 201,015,225 | PE CLONIG | NOIE | |
| 46 | SCE A02 | SF1 S1 | First year annua | I S1: Energy Savings | Metric | RSF1-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante | First year annual kWh net | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 251,749,378 | 211,433,999 | 153,190,391 | 176,441,715 | 198,900,483 | 200,828,624 | 216,192,005 | Per CEDARS | None | |
| | | | kWh net | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for Single Family Customers. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 47 | SCE A02 I | SF1 S1 | First year annua Therm gross | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | RSF1-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | First year annual Therm gross | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Per CEDARS | None | |
| 48 | SCE A02 | SF1 S1 | First year annua | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | net) for Single Family Customers•• RSF1-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante | First year annual Therm net | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Per CEDARS | None | |
| | | | Therm net | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for Single Family Customers•• | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 49 | SCE A02 I | SF1 S1 | Lifecycle ex-ante kW gross | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | RSF1-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | Lifecycle ex-ante kW gross | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 511,414 | 550,346 | 666,621 | 765,994 | 861,857 | 870,211 | 936,782 | Per CEDARS | None | |
| 50 | SCE A02 | SF1 S1 | Lifecycle ex-ante | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | net) for Single Family Customers•• RSF1-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante | Lifecycle ex-ante kW net | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 336,304 | 415,539 | 438,367 | 503,714 | 566,753 | 572,247 | 616,024 | Per CEDARS | None | |
| | | | kW net | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for Single Family Customers•• | I | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 51 | SCE A02 | SF1 S1 | Lifecycle ex-ante kWh gross | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | RSF1-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | Lifecycle ex-ante kWh gross | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 2,500,572,493 | 3,147,485,796 | 1,521,607,249 | 1,752,557,656 | 1,975,635,771 | 1,994,787,584 | 2,147,388,747 | Per CEDARS | None | |
| 52 | SCE A02 | SF1 S1 | Lifecycle ex-ante | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | net) for Single Family Customers•• RSF1-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante | Lifecycle ex-ante kWh net | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 1,663,695,085 | 2,414,991,485 | 1,012,364,372 | 1,166,021,608 | 1,314,441,206 | 1,327,183,399 | 1,428,712,871 | Per CEDARS | None | |
| | | | kWh net | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for Single Family Customers•• | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 53 | SCE A02 | SF1 S1 | Lifecycle ex-ante Therm gross | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | RSF1-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (ne-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | Lifecycle ex-ante Therm gross | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Per CEDARS | None | |
| 54 | SCE A02 | SF1 S1 | Lifecycle ex-ante | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | net) for Single Family Customers•• RSF1-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante | Lifecycle ex-ante Therm net | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Per CEDARS | None | |
| | | | Therm net | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for Single Family Customerce. | | | | | | ., | | | ., | | | | | | |
| 55 | SCE A03 | SF2 G | MT CO2eq | GHG | Metric | RSF2-G••Greenhouse gasses (MT CO2eq) Net kWh savings, reported on an annual barings | CO2-equivalent of net annual kWh savings | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 128,460 | 136,978 | 78,168 | 90,033 | 101,493 | 102,477 | 110,316 | Per CEDARS | Definition: Single family are defined as Service account on residential rates, with dwelling code of | |
| 56 | SCE A03 | SF3 D1-D | Lifecycle NET kW | / D1: Depth of | Metric | RSF3-D1D - Average savings per participant in both opt-in and | d Average lifecycle ex-ante kW net savings per | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | 336,304 | 66,721 | 5.0 | 8.9 | 9.2 | 8.6 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 8.3 | D1D: Downstream methodology- ••Numerator: Total downstream savings | Per ED: "Energy savings" = lifecycle NET savings. | |
| | CO5 400 | | | downstream participant | t | and upstream, as feasible). | participant - Opt-in - Downstream | 0 | 2016 | 4 662 695 995 | (C 704 | 24.025 | 54 550 | 24.420 | 40.000 | 40.405 | 10.105 | 40.405 | Claimed**Denominator: rotal number of downstream participants | | |
| 57 | SLE AUS I | 5F3 D1-D | kWh | interventions••Per | Metric | opt-out programs (broken down by downstream , midstream | participant - Opt-in - Downstream | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | 1,663,695,085 | 66,721 | 24,935 | 51,558 | 21,139 | 19,996 | 19,186 | 19,186 | 19,186 | claimed••Denominator: Total number of downstream participants | Per EU: "Energy savings" = Intecycle NET savings. | |
| 58 | SCE A03 | SF3 D1-D | Lifecycle NET | D1: Depth of | t Metric | and upstream, as teasible)•• RSF3-D1D - Average savings per participant in both opt-in and | d Average lifecycle ex-ante Therm net savings per | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | D1D: Downstream methodology- ••Numerator: Total downstream savings | Per ED: "Energy savings" = lifecycle NET savings. | |
| | | | Therms | interventions••Per downstream participant | t | opt-out programs (broken down by downstream , midstream and upstream, as feasible)•• | participant - Opt-in - Downstream | | | | | | | | | | | | claimed••Denominator: Total number of downstream participants | | |
| 59 | SCE A03 I | SF3 D1-M | Lifecycle NET kW | / D1: Depth of interventions••Per | Metric | RSF3-D1M - Average savings per participant in both opt-in and opt-out programs (broken down by downstream, | Average lifecycle ex-ante kW net savings per participant - Opt-in - Midstream | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | D1M: Midstream methodology –NOT FEASIBLE ••••Numerator: Total midstream savings claimed ••Denominator: (not available) number or sector of midstream participants | Per discussion with ED, metric not feasible; PAs instead will report total upstream and midstream savings. Per ED: "Energy savings" = lifecycle NET savings. | |
| 60 | SCE A03 | SF3 D1-M | Lifecycle NET | midstream participant D1: Depth of | Metric | midstream and upstream, as feasible). RSF3-D1M - Average savings per participant in both opt-in | Average lifecycle ex-ante kWh net savings per | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | D1M: Midstream methodology NOT FEASIBLE ••••• Numerator: Total midstream savings | Per discussion with ED, metric not feasible; PAs instead will report total upstream and midstream | |
| | | | kWh | interventions••Per midstream participant | | and opt-out programs (broken down by downstream, midstream and upstream, as feasible)•• | participant - Opt-in - Midstream | | | | | | | | | | | | claimed ••Denominator: (not available) number or sector of midstream participants | savings. Per ED: "Energy savings" = lifecycle NET savings. | |
| 61 | SCE A03 I | SF3 D1-M | Lifecycle NET Therms | D1: Depth of interventions••Per | Metric | RSF3-D1M - Average savings per participant in both opt-in and opt-out programs (broken down by downstream, | Average lifecycle ex-ante Therm net savings per participant - Opt-in - Midstream | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | D1M: Midstream methodology –NOT FEASIBLE••••Numerator: Total midstream savings claimed ••Denominator: (not available) number or sector of midstream participants | Per discussion with ED, metric not feasible; PAs instead will report total upstream and midstream savings. Per ED: "Energy savings" = lifecycle NET savings. | |
| 62 | SCE A03 | SF3 D1-0 | Lifecycle NET kW | midstream participant / D1: Depth of | Metric | midstream and upstream, as feasible). RSF3-D10 - Average savings per participant in both opt-in and | d Average lifecycle ex-ante kW net savings per | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | 6,720 | 492,800 | 0.014 | 0.021 | 0.012 | 0.011 | 0.008 | 0.011 | 0.011 | D10 Methodology: Only ex post savings can be claimed. Per participant savings will be | D10 Key Definitions: 1) The only opt-out program is the Home Energy Report using social norming | |
| | | | | interventions••Per opt out participant | | opt-out programs (broken down by downstream, midstream and unstream, as feasible) | participant - Opt-out | | | | | | | | | | | | calculated in the EM&V study. | through neighborhood comparisons 2) Per ED: "Energy savings" = lifecycle NET savings. | |
| 63 | SCE A03 | SF3 D1-0 | Lifecycle NET kWh | D1: Depth of interventions••Per opt | Metric | RSF3-D10 - Average savings per participant in both opt-in and opt-out programs (broken down by downstream, midstream | d Average lifecycle ex-ante kWh net savings per participant - Opt-out | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | 27,340,091 | 492,800 | 55 | 79 | 47 | 56 | 50 | 60 | 61 | D10 Methodology: Only ex post savings can be claimed. Per participant savings will be calculated in the EM&V study. | D10 Key Definitions: 1) The only opt-out program is the Home Energy Report using social norming through neighborhood comparisons 2) Per ED: "Energy savings" = lifecycle NET savings. | |
| 64 | SCE A03 | SF3 D1-0 | Lifervrle NFT | out participant | Metric | and upstream, as feasible)•• RSF3_D10_Average savings per participant in both ont-in and | d Average liferycle ex-ante Therm net savings ner | Residential (RSE) | 2016 | Ν/Δ | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | D10 Methodology: Only as not cavings can be claimed. Per narticinant savings will be | D10 Key Definitions: 1) The only ont-out program is the Home Energy Report using social norming | |
| 1 | 502 705 | 3,5 010 | Therms | interventions••Per opt | methe | opt-out programs (broken down by downstream, midstream and untroam as fassible). | participant - Opt-out | nesidential (nor) | 2010 | 10/15 | 170 | 1975 | 10/6 | 1975 | 1975 | 17/4 | 170 | 1975 | calculated in the EM&V study. | through neighborhood comparisons 2) Per ED: "Energy savings" = lifecycle NET savings. | |
| 65 | SCE A03 | SF3 D1-U | Lifecycle NET kV | / D1: Depth of | Metric | RSF3-D1U- Average savings per participant in both opt-in and | Average lifecycle ex-ante kW net savings per | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | D1U: Upstream methodology- NOT FEASIBLE •• Numerator: Total upstream savings | Per discussion with ED, metric not feasible; PAs instead will report total upstream and midstream | |
| | COT 400 | | 11/ L. MITT | upstream participant | | opt-out programs (proken down by downstream, midstream and upstream, as feasible) | participant - Opt-in - Opstream | 0 | 2016 | | | 700 | 700 | 700 | 700 | 700 | 700 | 700 | cialmed••Denominator: (not available) number or sector of or upstream participants | savings. Ver ED: "Energy savings" = IITECYCIE NEI Savings. | |
| 66 | SCE A03 I | SF3 D1-U | Lifecycle NET kWh | D1: Depth of interventions••Per | Metric | RSF3-D1U- Average savings per participant in both opt-in and opt-out programs (broken down by downstream, midstream | Average lifecycle ex-ante kWh net savings per participant - Opt-in - Upstream | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | D1U: Upstream methodology–NOT FEASIBLE••Numerator: Total upstream savings claimed••Denominator: (not available) number or sector of of upstream participants | Per discussion with ED, metric not teasible; PAs instead will report total upstream and midstream savings. Per ED: "Energy savings" = lifecycle NET savings. | |
| 67 | SCE A03 | SF3 D1-U | Lifecycle NET | upstream participant D1: Depth of | Metric | and upstream, as feasible) •• RSF3-D1U- Average savings per participant in both opt-in and | Average lifecycle ex-ante Therm net savings per | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | D1U: Upstream methodology- NOT FEASIBLE •• Numerator: Total upstream savings | Per discussion with ED, metric not feasible; PAs instead will report total upstream and midstream | |
| | | | Therms | interventions••Per upstream participant | | opt-out programs (broken down by downstream, midstream and upstream, as feasible)•• | participant - Opt-in - Upstream | | | | | | | | | | | | claimedDenominator: (not available) number or sector of of upstream participants | savings. Per ED: "Energy savings" = lifecycle NET savings. | |
| 68 | SCE A03 I | SF4 P1 | Percent | P1: Penetration of energ efficiency programs in th | gy Metric he | RSF-P1••Percent of participation relative to eligible population•• | Percent of participation relative to eligible population | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | 66,721 | 3,224,146 | 2.1% | 1.5% | 1.5% | 1.8% | 2.1% | 2.1% | 2.3% | P1 Methodology: ••Numerator: Number of downstream participants) ••Denominator: total number of service accounts in the sector | I Definition: "Eligible population" refers to Total number of service accounts in sector/segment, excluding CARE. "Participation" is defined as the first instance of participation, should a customer | |
| | | | | eligible market ••Percer of Participation | nt | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | participate more than once or participate in multiple programs in the calendar year. PAs also need to have enough information about a customer to determine if the customer is in the eligible | |
| 69 | SCE A03 | SF4 P3 | Percent | P3: Penetration of energ | gy Metric | RSF-P3 - Percent of participation in disadvantaged | Percent of participation in disadvantaged | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | 37,392 | 1,601,949 | 2.3% | 0.6% | 1.7% | 2.0% | 2.4% | 2.4% | 2.6% | Numerator: Number of participants in disadvantaged communities. •••• Denominator: Total | population and service territory D.18-05-041: DAC = Service accounts in zip codes corresponding to census tracts in the top quartile | |
| | | | | efficiency programs in th eligible market - DAC | he | communities•• | communities | | | | | | | | | | | | number of customers in disadvantaged communities. | of CalEnviroScreen 3.0 scores. | |
| 70 | SCE A03 | SF4 P4 | Percent | P4: Penetration of energ | gy Metric | RSF-P4 - Percent of participation by customers defined as | Percent of participation by customers defined as | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | 36,205 | 1,552,486 | 2.3% | 0.7% | 1.7% | 2.0% | 2.4% | 2.4% | 2.6% | P4 Methodology: •• Numerator: number of participants in HTR geographic | D.18-05-041 p. 43 - HTR as defined in Resolution G-3497, modified to "include disadvantaged | |
| | | | | efficiency programs in th HTR market | he | "hard-to-reach" •• | "hard-to-reach" | | | | | | | | | | | | area • • Denominator: Total number of service accounts in HTR geographic area | communities (as designated by CalEPA) in the geographic criteria for hard to reach customers." | |
| 71 | SCE A03 | SF5 LC | PAC Levelized | Cost per unit saved | Metric | RSF-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, therm | PAC Levelized Cost (\$/kW) | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | \$69.271.056 | 336.304 | \$206 | \$209 | \$158 | \$138 | \$122 | \$121 | \$112 | Per CEDARS | None | |
| 72 | SCE A03 | SE5 IC | Cost (\$/kW) PAC Levelized | Cost per unit saved | Metric | and kW (use both TRC and PAC) RSE-IC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, therm | PAC Levelized Cost (\$/kWh) | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | \$69,271,056 | 1 663 695 085 | \$0.042 | \$0.036 | \$0.068 | \$0.059 | \$0.053 | \$0.052 | \$0.048 | Per CEDARS | None | |
| 73 | SCE 403 | 545 10 | Cost (\$/kWh) | Cost per unit saved | Metric | and kW (use both TRC and PAC). RSE-IC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kW/h therm | PAC Levelized Cost (\$/therm) | Residential (RSF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Per CFDARS | None | |
| 74 | SUE 103 | SE5 10 | Cost (\$/therm) | Cost per unit stand | Matric | and kW (use both TRC and PAC). RSE-IC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency and kWh them | TRC Levelized Cost (\$/kW) | Residential (RCE) | 2010 | \$102.006.012 | 336 304 | \$202 | \$245 | \$727 | \$203 | \$180 | \$178 | \$16F | Per CEDARS | None | |
| 75 | SCE 403 | 515 66 | Cost (\$/kW) | Cost per unit saved | Motric | and kW (use both TRC and PAC)•• RSE LC Lowelland cost of energy efficiency per kW/h therm | TRC Levelized Cost (\$/kWb) | Residential (RSF) | 2010 | \$102,000,913 | 1 662 605 095 | \$0.061 | \$0.042 | \$0.101 | \$0.097 | \$100 | \$0.077 | \$0.071 | Per CEDARS | None | |
| 76 | SUE 103 | SE5 10 | Cost (\$/kWh) | Cost per unit saved | Metric | and kW (use both TRC and PAC)•• RSE-IC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency on kWh them | TRC Levelized Cost (\$/therm) | Residential (RCE) | 2010 | ν/Δ | N/A | N/8 | N/A | N/A | ν/Δ | N/A | N/A | ,0.0/1 N/A | Per CEDARS | None | |
| 77 | SCE 403 | SEGI EI1 | Cost (\$/therm) | Energy intensity per CF | Indicator | and kW (use both TRC and PAC) •• RSF_F11(Indicator) - Average concruits intensity of signal | Average first year annual kWb erger per hausehol | Id Residential (PCE) | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/å - Indicato- | 2.1 | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicato- | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | Numerator: Total energy used in sectors Dependent or number of conico | Definition: Household refers to a service account | |
| <i>"</i> | SLE AUS I | 5F61 E11 | BIU | household | Indicator | RSF-ELL(Indicator) - Average energy use intensity of single family homes (average usage per household – not adjusted)•• | Average first year annual kwn gross per nousenol | id Residential (RSF) | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | 2.1 | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | Numerator: Total energy used in sector •• Denominator: number of service accounts | Definition: Household refers to a service account | |
| 78 | SCE A03 | MF1 S1-IU | First year annua | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante | First year annual kW gross - In Unit | Residential Sector - | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 1,214 | 1,990 | 1,582 | 1,818 | 2,046 | 2,065 | 2,223 | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any building or property with at least two residential housing | |
| | | | кw gross | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area, and | | Multi-family (RMF) | | | | | | | | | | | | units. | |
| 79 | SCE A03 | MF1 S1-IU | First year annua | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | master metered accounts)•• RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante | First year annual kW net - In Unit | Residential Sector – | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 801 | 1,425 | 1,044 | 1,199 | 1,349 | 1,362 | 1,467 | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any buliding or property with at least two residential housing | |
| | | | kW net | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area, and | 1 | Multi-family (RMF) | | | | | | | | | | | | units. | |
| 80 | SCE A03 | MF1 S1-IU | First year annua | I S1: Energy Savings | Metric | master metered accounts)•• RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante | First year annual kWh gross - In Unit | Residential Sector – | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 18,019,733 | 30,825,482 | 4,317,497 | 4,972,809 | 5,605,784 | 5,660,126 | 6,093,125 | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any buliding or property with at least two residential housing | |
| | | | kWh gross | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area, and | 1 | Multi-family (RMF) | | | | | | | | | | | | units. | |
| 81 | SCE A03 | MF1 S1-IU | First year annua | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | master metered accounts)•• RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante | First year annual kWh net - In Unit | Residential Sector – | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 4,428,720 | 5,943,951 | 2,694,892 | 3,103,924 | 3,499,014 | 3,532,934 | 3,803,203 | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any buliding or property with at least two residential housing | |
| | | | kWh net | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area, and | I | Multi-family (RMF) | | | | | | | | | | | | units. | |
| 82 | SCE A03 | MF1 S1-IU | First year annua | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | master metered accounts) RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante | First year annual Therm gross - In Unit | Residential Sector – | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any buliding or property with at least two residential housing | |
| | | | Therm gross | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for multifamily customers (in-unit common area and | | Multi-family (RMF) | | | | 1975 | | | | | | | | units. | |
| 83 | SCF AD2 | MF1 \$1-00 | First year anoun | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | master metered accounts)•• RME-S1-First year annual and lifecurle ex-ante | First year annual Therm net - In Unit | Residential Sector - | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Savings calculated using CFT: MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any building or property with at least two residential bouries | |
| 63 | JUL AUS I | 31-10 | Therm net | EA 20AIIIR2 | weu IL | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | | Multi-family (RMF) | 2010 | | 19/5 | N/A | 1975 | 19/14 | 19/2 | 1975 | 1975 | ing et | | units. | |
| 84 | SCE 402 | ME1 51 111 | Lifornels and | S1- Enormy Courieron | Motoio | may for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area, and master metered accounts)•• PME S1 First was applied information and information | Lifeorele ex anto kW areas. In Unit | Poridontial Castan | 2010 | N/6 | N/A | 11.070 | 12 1 2 3 | 15 100 | 17 450 | 10 634 | 10 034 | 21.240 | Sovinge calculated using CET: ME designation descends on DA detabase | Definition: Multi family refers to any building or present with at least two anidential the | |
| 04 | SUE AUS I | wir'i 51-1U | kW gross | : ST: Ellergy Savings | wethic | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | checkcie ex-aure kw Brozz - ju Ouit | Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | ny A | 11,650 | 12,1/3 | 13,186 | 17,450 | 19,634 | 19,824 | 21,340 | Javings conculated using CET; wir designation depends on PA database | units. | |
| or | 505 100 | ME1 61 // | Lifernala | S1. Engran Cault | Mater | master metered accounts)•• PME S1 Eiget upper provident liferations in the second sec | Lifeogra ex anto Millant, la U.M. | Poridortial Cart | 2010 | 51/A | 81/A | 7.01 | 0.070 | 0.020 | 11 410 | 13.070 | 12.072 | 13.000 | Source calculated using CET-ME designation depends on 24 March 19 | Definition Multi family refers to any building an annumbulik at the state of the state | |
| 85 | SUE AU3 I | wri S1-IU | Lifecycle ex-ante kW net | : 51: Energy Savings | wetric | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | Lifecycle ex-ante kwinet - In Unit | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 7,624 | 8,679 | 9,938 | 11,419 | 12,849 | 12,973 | 13,966 | Savings carculated Using LET; MF designation depends on PA database | urninition: multi-family refers to any building or property with at least two residential housing units. | |
| | | | | | | ment for multifamily customers (In-unit, common area, and master metered accounts)•• | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Spreadsheet | AttA AttA Method | d Units of | Metric/ | | | | | Baseline | | | - | s | Short Term Target | | Mid Term Target | Long Term Target | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|--|---------------------|--|--|--|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|-------------------|
| Index P 86 SCI | A03 RMF1 S1-IU | Measurement Metric Type Lifecycle ex-ante S1: Energy Savings | Indicator Metric | Business Plan Att A Description RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante | Metric Lifecycle ex-ante kWh gross - In Unit | Sector Residential Sector – | Baseline Year 2016 | Numerator N/A | Baseline Denominator N/A | Baseline Number 70.121.871 | 2017 Number 83.623.851 | 2018 42.669.408 | 2019 49.145.795 | 2020 55.401.424 | (2021-2023) 55.938.485 | (2024-2025) 60.217.777 | Methodology Savings calculated using CET: MF designation depends on PA database | Key Definitions Definition: Multi-family refers to any building or property with at least two residential housing | Proxy Explanation |
| | 765 MM1 5110 | kWh gross | mente | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area, and | Electric exame king out in one | Multi-family (RMF) | 2010 | 1975 | 1975 | 70,121,071 | 03,023,031 | 42,000,400 | 43,243,733 | 33,401,424 | 55,550,405 | 00,217,777 | בייוקט בארבאניגע שאוק בבי, אוי בבאנווגנטיו בבריש איז א שעשטעב | units. | |
| 87 SCI | A03 RMF1 S1-IU | Lifecycle ex-ante S1: Energy Savings | Metric | master metered accounts)•• RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante | Lifecycle ex-ante kWh net - In Unit | Residential Sector – | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 43,823,638 | 60,754,041 | 26,666,840 | 30,714,348 | 34,623,890 | 34,959,534 | 37,633,937 | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any building or property with at least two residential housing | |
| | | kwinel | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area, and master metered accounts) | | Multi-lamily (KMP) | | | | | | | | | | | | units. | |
| 88 SCI | A03 RMF1 S1-IU | Lifecycle ex-ante S1: Energy Savings Therm gross | Metric | RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area, and | Lifecycle ex-ante Therm gross - In Unit | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any building or property with at least two residential housing units. | |
| 89 SCI | A03 RMF1 S1-IU | Lifecycle ex-ante S1: Energy Savings Therm net | Metric | RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area, and | Lifecycle ex-ante Therm net - In Unit | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any building or property with at least two residential housing units. | |
| 90 SCI | A03 RMF1 S1-MM | First year annual S1: Energy Savings kW gross | Metric | master metered accounts)•• RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | First year annual kW gross - Master Metereed | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 14.4 | 10.5 | 18.7 | 21.5 | 24.2 | 24.4 | 26.3 | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any building or property with at least two residential housing units. | |
| 91 SCI | A03 RMF1 S1-MM | First year annual S1: Energy Savings | Metric | net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area, and master metered accounts)•• RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante | First year annual kW net - Master Metered | Residential Sector – | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 9.5 | 7.5 | 12.4 | 14.2 | 16.0 | 16.1 | 17.4 | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any buliding or property with at least two residential housing | |
| 02 50 | 402 04451 51 4444 | kW net | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area, and master metered accounts) ONE G3 (introduced accounts) | First server 1146 meres Marster Mathemat | Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | b) / A | 93.093 | 42.012 | 51 104 | 50.001 | 66.353 | cc 005 | 73 133 | Contract and a state of T. M. destruction descends on DA database | units. | |
| 52 50 | A03 KWH1 31-WW | kWh gross | webic | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area, and master metered accounts). | Thist year annual kwir gloss - waster wetered | Multi-family (RMF) | 2010 | 1/2 | 6/4 | 63,963 | 43,013 | 51,104 | 38,801 | 66,333 | 00,990 | 72,122 | Jamigs Calculated using CET, mit designation depends on PA database | Definition: marchaniny releas to any building or property with a cleast two residential nousing units. | |
| 93 SCI | A03 RMF1 S1-MM | First year annual S1: Energy Savings kWh net | Metric | RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area, and | First year annual kWh net - Master Metered | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 52,421 | 31,388 | 31,898 | 36,740 | 41,416 | 41,818 | 45,017 | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any building or property with at least two residential housing units. | |
| 94 SCI | A03 RMF1 S1-MM | First year annual S1: Energy Savings Therm gross | Metric | master metered accounts)*• RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area, and | First year annual Therm gross - Master Metered | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any building or property with at least two residential housing units. | |
| 95 SCI | A03 RMF1 S1-MM | First year annual S1: Energy Savings Therm net | Metric | master metered accounts)•• RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | First year annual Therm net - Master Metered | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any buliding or property with at least two residential housing units. | |
| 96 SCI | A03 RMF1 S1-MM | Lifecycle ex-ante S1: Energy Savings | Metric | net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area, and master metered accounts)•• RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante | Lifecycle ex-ante kW gross - Master Metered | Residential Sector – | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 138 | 64 | 180 | 207 | 232 | 235 | 253 | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any building or property with at least two residential housing | |
| | | kW gross | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area, and master metered accounts)•• | | Multi-family (RMF) | | | | | | | | | | | | units. | |
| 97 SCI | A03 RMF1 S1-MM | Lifecycle ex-ante S1: Energy Savings kW net | Metric | RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area, and | Lifecycle ex-ante kW net - Master Metered | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 90 | 46 | 118 | 135 | 152 | 154 | 165 | Savings calculated using CET, MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any building or property with at least two residential housing units. | |
| 98 SCI | A03 RMF1 S1-MM | Lifecycle ex-ante S1: Energy Savings kWh gross | Metric | RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area, and | Lifecycle ex-ante kWh gross - Master Metered | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 830,001 | 441,593 | 505,058 | 581,716 | 655,761 | 662,118 | 712,770 | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any buliding or property with at least two residential housing units. | |
| 99 SCI | A03 RMF1 S1-MM | Lifecycle ex-ante S1: Energy Savings kWh net | Metric | master metered accounts). RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for multifamily customers (in-unit. common area. and | Lifecycle ex-ante kWh net - Master Metered | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 518,720 | 320,825 | 315,643 | 363,552 | 409,827 | 413,800 | 445,456 | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any building or property with at least two residential housing units. | |
| 100 SCI | A03 RMF1 S1-MM | Lifecycle ex-ante S1: Energy Savings Therm gross | Metric | master metered accounts)•• RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and path for multificially increasers (in unit is components) and | Lifecycle ex-ante Therm gross - Master Metered | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any building or property with at least two residential housing units. | |
| 101 SCI | A03 RMF1 S1-MM | Lifecycle ex-ante S1: Energy Savings Therm net | Metric | master metered accounts). RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | Lifecycle ex-ante Therm net - Master Metered | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any building or property with at least two residential housing units. | |
| 102 SCI | A03 RMF1 SI-CA | First year annual S1: Energy Savings | Metric | net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area, and master metered accounts) RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (response) and the state of demand environ (response) | First year annual kW gross - Common Area | Residential Sector – | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 1,855 | 5,531 | 2,417 | 2,778 | 3,125 | 3,156 | 3,397 | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any building or property with at least two residential housing | |
| 103 SC | A03 RMF1 SI-CA | kw gross First vear annual S1: Energy Savings | Metric | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area, and master metered accounts)•• RMF-51-First vear annual and lifecycle ex-ante | First year annual kW net - Common Area | Residential Sector – | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 1.223 | 3.961 | 1.595 | 1.832 | 2.062 | 2.082 | 2.241 | Savines calculated usine CET: MF designation depends on PA database | units. | |
| | | kW net | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area , and master metered accounts) | | Multi-family (RMF) | | | | | | | | | | , | | units. | |
| 104 SCI | A03 RMF1 SI-CA | First year annual S1: Energy Savings kWh gross | Metric | RMI-S1-First year annual and litecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area, and master metered accounts). | First year annual kWh gross - Common Area | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 10,840,480 | 22,637,155 | 6,596,470 | 7,597,686 | 8,564,774 | 8,647,801 | 9,309,358 | Savings calculated using CE1; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any building or property with at least two residential housing units. | |
| 105 SCI | A03 RMF1 SI-CA | First year annual S1: Energy Savings kWh net | Metric | RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area, and | First year annual kWh net - Common Area | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 6,766,403 | 16,519,211 | 4,117,380 | 4,742,319 | 5,345,955 | 5,397,779 | 5,810,708 | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any building or property with at least two residential housing units. | |
| 106 SCI | A03 RMF1 SI-CA | First year annual S1: Energy Savings Therm gross | Metric | RMF-51-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area , and | First year annual Therm gross - Common Area | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any buliding or property with at least two residential housing units. | |
| 107 SCI | A03 RMF1 SI-CA | First year annual S1: Energy Savings Therm net | Metric | master metered accounts)** RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area, and | First year annual Therm net - Common Area | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any building or property with at least two residential housing units. | |
| 108 SCI | A03 RMF1 SI-CA | Lifecycle ex-ante S1: Energy Savings kW gross | Metric | master metered accounts)•• RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area, and | Lifecycle ex-ante kW gross - Common Area | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 17,800 | 33,830 | 23,202 | 26,660 | 29,997 | 30,288 | 32,605 | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any building or property with at least two residential housing units. | |
| 109 SCI | A03 RMF1 SI-CA | Lifecycle ex-ante S1: Energy Savings kW net | Metric | master metered accounts) RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for multifamily customers (in-unit. common area, and | Lifecycle ex-ante kW net - Common Area | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 11,649 | 24,122 | 15,184 | 17,447 | 19,631 | 19,821 | 21,337 | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any building or property with at least two residential housing units. | |
| 110 SCI | A03 RMF1 SI-CA | Lifecycle ex-ante S1: Energy Savings kWh gross | Metric | master metered accounts)•• RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and path (semplation))(fight)(compare area and | Lifecycle ex-ante kWh gross - Common Area | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 107,135,425 | 232,404,327 | 65,192,287 | 75,087,209 | 84,644,848 | 85,465,395 | 92,003,494 | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any building or property with at least two residential housing units. | |
| 111 SCI | A03 RMF1 SI-CA | Lifecycle ex-ante S1: Energy Savings kWh net | Metric | master metered accounts) •• RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | Lifecycle ex-ante kWh net - Common Area | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 66,955,773 | 168,845,392 | 40,742,826 | 46,926,795 | 52,899,974 | 53,412,787 | 57,498,863 | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any building or property with at least two residential housing units. | |
| 112 SCI | A03 RMF1 SI-CA | Lifecycle ex-ante S1: Energy Savings | Metric | net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area, and master metered accounts)** RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (nre-evaluation) eas electric and demand savings (pross and | Lifecycle ex-ante Therm gross - Common Area | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any building or property with at least two residential housing | |
| 113 SCI | A03 RMF1 SI-CA | Lifecycle ex-ante S1: Energy Savings | Metric | net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area, and master metered accounts)•• RMF-S1-First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante | Lifecycle ex-ante Therm net - Common Area | Residential Sector – | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Savings calculated using CET; MF designation depends on PA database | Definition: Multi-family refers to any building or property with at least two residential housing | |
| 114 | 403 01150 - | Therm net | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) for multifamily customers (in-unit, common area , and master metered accounts) ••• | | Multi-family (RMF) | 2010 | ,./. | | 1013 | 0 774 | | 100- | 4 505 | | | 0 | units. | |
| 114 SCI | AUS KMFZ G | WI COzeq GHG | wetric | RIVIF-U** Greennouse gasses (MT CO2eq) Net kWh savings, reported on an annual basis** | CO2-equivalent of net annual kWh savings | Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 4,947 | 8,724 | 1,185 | 1,365 | 1,539 | 1,554 | 1,673 | PEL LEDARS | Deminuon: will the term of | |
| 115 SCI | A04 RMF3 D3a | Lifecycle NET kW D3: Depth of intervention per building | ons Metric | RMF-D3 - Energy savings (kWh, kw, therms) per project (building)•••• | Lifecycle ex-ante kW net per project (building) | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | 19,363 | 5,018 | 3.9 | 2.0 | 7.0 | 6.6 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.3 | ••D3 Methodology: ••Numerator: Total Savings claimed for MF building retrofits ••Denominator: Number of buildings that have been retrofitted, per application (assumed 7.4 units per building (CALMAC http://www.clange.org/apublication/MECEP retroits fully 120005 (1) | D3 Key Definitions: Project applications are made at the property level (premise ID and service account number) not the building level; building information will be used as is available on project applications••*Energy savings [*] = Lifecycle NET savings | |
| 116 SCI | A04 RMF3 D3a | Lifecycle NET D3: Depth of intervention kWh per building | ons Metric | RMF-D3 - Energy savings (kWh, kw, therms) per project (building) | Lifecycle ex-ante kWh net per project (building) | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | 111,298,132 | 5,018 | 22,178 | 13,755 | 18,802 | 17,785 | 17,064 | 17,064 | 17,064 | ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••• | D3 Key Definitions: Project applications are made at the property level (premise ID and service account number) not the building level; building information will be used as is available on project applications••"Energy savings" = Lifecycle NET savings | |
| 117 SCI | A04 RMF3 D3a | Lifecycle NET D3: Depth of intervention Therms per building | ons Metric | RMF-D3 - Energy savings (kWh, kw, therms) per project (building) | Lifecycle ex-ante Therm net per project (building) | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | nttp://www.calmac.org/publications/MFER Process Evaluation FINAL 130415.pdf)) O3 Methodology.enNumerator: Total Savings claimed for MF building retrofits.encominator: Number of buildings that have been retrofitted, per application (assumed 7.4 units per building (CALMAC | D3 Key Definitions: Project applications are made at the property level (premise ID and service account number) not the building level; building information will be used as is available on project applications•• "Energy savings" = Lifecycle NET savings | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | http://www.calmac.org/publications/MFEER Process Evaluation FINAL 130415.pdf)) | | |

| Spreadshee | t AttA | AttA Method | d Units of | | Metric/ | | | | | Baseline | | | | : | hort Term Target | | Mid Term Target | Long Term Target | I. | | |
|------------|-----------|--------------|--|--|-------------|---|--|--|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|---|--|-------------------|
| Index | PA Page | Order Code | Measurement | Metric Type | Indicator | Business Plan Att A Description | Metric | Sector | Baseline Year | Numerator | Baseline Denominator | Baseline Number | 2017 Number | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | (2021-2023) | (2024-2025) | Methodology | Key Definitions f D4 Definitions "Project (respects)" is defined by a unique project ID. "Energy cavings" = Lifectule | Proxy Explanation |
| 110 | SCE AU4 N | UVIF5 D4 | LITECYCLE NET KV | per property | s weuric | (property). | ct Enecycle ex-ante kw net per project (property) | Multi-family (RMF) | 2018 | 19,303 | 33,362 | 0.58 | 0.27 | 1.05 | 0.99 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | participating properties (i.e., premise ID x service account). | NET savings | |
| 119 | SCE A04 R | tMF3 D4 | Lifecycle NET kWh | D4: Depth of intervention per property | s Metric | RMF-D4 - Average savings per participant Savings per proje (property)•• | ct Lifecycle ex-ante kWh net per project (property) | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | 111,298,132 | 33,362 | 3,336 | 1,859 | 2,828 | 2,675 | 2,567 | 2,567 | 2,567 | ••D4 Methodology:••Numerator - Total downstream savings ••••Denominator - number of participating properties (i.e., premise ID x service account}•• | f D4 Definition: "Project (property)" is defined by a unique project ID. "Energy savings" = Lifecycle NET savings | |
| 120 | SCE A04 R | tMF3 D4 | Lifecycle NET Therms | D4: Depth of intervention per property | s Metric | RMF-D4 - Average savings per participant Savings per proje (property)•• | ct Lifecycle ex-ante Therm net per project (property) |) Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | ••D4 Methodology:••Numerator - Total downstream savings ••••Denominator - number participating properties (i.e., premise ID x service account}•• | f D4 Definition: "Project (property)" is defined by a unique project ID. "Energy savings" = Lifecycle NET savings | |
| 121 | SCE A04 R | tMF3 D5 | Lifecycle NET kV | V D5: Depth of interventions••Per square | Metric e | RMF-D5•• Energy savings (kWh, kw, therms) per square foot•• | Lifecycle ex-ante kW net per square foot | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | 19,363 | 51,666,229 | 0.00037 | 0.00035 | 0.00068 | 0.00064 | 0.00062 | 0.00062 | 0.00062 | D5 Methodology: ••(Numerator) Total downstream savings ••••(Denominator) Total MF square foot per Assessor data | Per ED: "Energy savings" = lifecycle NET savings. | |
| 122 | SCE A04 R | tMF3 D5 | Lifecycle NET kWh | D5: Depth of interventions••Per square | Metric e | RMF-D5•• Energy savings (kWh, kw, therms) per square foot•• | Lifecycle ex-ante kWh net per square foot | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | 111,298,132 | 51,666,229 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | D5 Methodology: ••{Numerator] Total downstream savings ••••{[Denominator] Total MF square foot per Assessor data | Per ED: "Energy savings" = lifecycle NET savings. | |
| 123 | SCE A04 R | tMF3 D5 | Lifecycle NET Therms | D5: Depth of interventions••Per squar | Metric e | RMF-D5•• Energy savings (kWh, kw, therms) per square foot•• | Lifecycle ex-ante Therm net per square foot | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | D5 Methodology: ••[Numerator] Total downstream savings •••••[Denominator] Total MF square foot per Assessor data | Per ED: "Energy savings" = lifecycle NET savings. | |
| 124 | SCE A04 R | tMF4 P1-P | Percent | P1: Penetration of energy efficiency programs in the eligible market ••Percent of Participation | Metric 2 | RMF-P1P ••Percent of participation relative to eligible population (by unit, and property)•• | Percent of participation relative to eligible population by property | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | 33,362 | 1,081,850 | 3.1% | 11.4% | 2.2% | 2.7% | 3.2% | 3.2% | 3.4% | P1 Methodology: ++Numerator: Number of downstream participating properties (unique project ID) ++Denominator: total number of properties (unique service account) in the sect | Participation is defined as the first instance of participation, should a customer participate more w. than once or participate in multiple programs in the calendar year. PAs also need to have enough information about a customer to determine if the customer is in the eligible population and service territory | |
| 125 | SCE A04 R | IMF4 P1-U | Percent | P1: Penetration of energy efficiency programs in the eligible market ••Percent of Participation | Metric e | RMF-P1U ••Percent of participation relative to eligible population (by unit , and property)•• | Percent of participation relative to eligible population by unit | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | 37,136 | 1,081,850 | 3.4% | 6.3% | 2.5% | 3.0% | 3.5% | 3.6% | 3.8% | P1 Methodology: ••Numerator: Number of downstream participating MF units (unique service account = "unit") ••Denominator: total number of units (service accounts) in the sector. | Participation is defined as the first instance of participation, should a customer participate more than once or participate in multiple programs in the calendar year. PAs also need to have enough information about a customer to determine if the customer is in the eligible population and service territory | |
| 126 | SCE A04 R | tMF4 P2 | Percent | P2: Penetration of energy efficiency programs in terms of square feet of eligible population | Metric | RMF-P2 - Percent of square feet of eligible population participating (by property) •• | Percent of square feet of eligible population participating (by property) | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | 51,666,229 | 1,505,146,221 | 3.4% | 6.3% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.5% | 3.6% | 3.8% | P2 Methodology: ••••Numerator: # service accounts participating X average sqft/service account)••••Denominator: Square footage of all eligible accounts (per Assessor) | | |
| 127 | SCE A04 R | IMF4 P3: DAC | Percent | P3: Penetration of energy efficiency programs in the eligible market - DAC | Metric | RMF-P3 - Percent of participation in disadvantaged communities•• | Percent of participation in disadvantaged communities | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | 23,053 | 606,578 | 3.8% | 5.4% | 3.3% | 3.3% | 3.9% | 3.9% | 4.2% | Numerator: Number of participants (service accounts) in disadvantaged communitiesDenominator: Total number of customers (service accounts) in disadvantaged communities. | D.18-05-041: DAC = Service accounts in zip codes corresponding to census tracts in the top quartile of CalEnviroScreen 3.0 scores. | |
| 128 | SCE A04 R | tMF4 P4: HTR | Percent | P4: Penetration of energy efficiency programs in the HTR market | Metric e | RMF-P4+• Percent of participation by customers defined as "hard-to-reach"+• | Percent of participation by customers defined as "hard-to-reach" | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | 17,312 | 559,519 | 3.1% | 5.6% | 2.7% | 2.7% | 3.2% | 3.2% | 3.5% | P4 Methodology: ••Numerator: number of participants in HTR geographic area ••Denominator: Total number of service accounts in HTR geographic area | D.18-05-041 p. 43 - HTR as defined in Resolution G-3497, modified to "include disadvantaged communities (as designated by CaIEPA) in the geographic criteria for hard to reach customers." | |
| 129 | SCE A04 R | tMF5 B1 | Percent | B1: MF Benchmarking Penetration | Metric | RMF-B1 - Percent of benchmarked multi-family properties relative to the eligible population •••• | Percent of benchmarked multi-family properties relative to the eligible population | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | 45 | 1,081,850 | 0.0042% | 0.0045% | 0.0036% | 0.0036% | 0.0043% | 0.0043% | 0.0046% | Total benchmarked units in RMF sector •• Total number of service account in RMF sector •••• Benchmarked via Portfolio Manager •••• 2019 MF with 17 or units MUST Benchmark •••• | | |
| 130 | SCE A04 R | tMF5 B6 | Percent | B6: Benchmarking of HTR Properties | Metric | B6(RMF) - Percent of benchmarking by properties defined a "hard-to-reach" •••• | Percent of benchmarking by properties defined as "bard-to-reach" | s Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | 6 | 1,996 | 0.30% | 0.48% | 0.26% | 0.26% | 0.31% | 0.31% | 0.34% | Benchmarking per Portfolio Manager. Service accounts in HTR market | | |
| 131 | SCE A04 R | tMF6 LC | PAC Levelized | Cost per unit saved | Metric | RMF-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, therr | n PAC Levelized Cost (\$/kW) | Residential Sector – | 2016 | \$282,529,425 | 19,363 | \$14,591 | \$8,173 | \$11,194 | \$9,742 | \$8,658 | \$8,575 | \$7,966 | Per CEDARS | None | |
| 132 | SCE A04 R | IMF6 LC | PAC Levelized | Cost per unit saved | Metric | RMF-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, there | n PAC Levelized Cost (\$/kWh) | Residential Sector – | 2016 | \$282,529,425 | 111,298,132 | \$2.54 | \$1.17 | \$4.17 | \$3.62 | \$3.21 | \$3.18 | \$2.96 | Per CEDARS | None | |
| 133 | SCE A04 R | IMF6 LC | PAC Levelized | Cost per unit saved | Metric | and kW (use both TRC and PAC)•• RMF-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, there | n PAC Levelized Cost (\$/therm) | Residential Sector – | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Per CEDARS | None | |
| 134 | SCE A04 R | IMF6 LC | Cost (\$/therm) TRC Levelized | Cost per unit saved | Metric | and kW (use both TRC and PAC)•• RMF-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, there | n TRC Levelized Cost (\$/kW) | Multi-family (RMF) Residential Sector – | 2016 | \$420,375,326 | 19,363 | \$21,710 | \$12,091 | \$16,656 | \$14,495 | \$12,883 | \$12,759 | \$11,852 | Per CEDARS | None | |
| 135 | SCE A04 R | IMF6 LC | Cost (\$/kW) TRC Levelized | Cost per unit saved | Metric | and kW (use both TRC and PAC). RMF-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, there | n TRC Levelized Cost (\$/kWh) | Multi-family (RMF) Residential Sector – | 2016 | \$420,375,326 | 111,298,132 | \$3.78 | \$1.73 | \$6.21 | \$5.39 | \$4.78 | \$4.73 | \$4.40 | Per CEDARS | None | |
| 126 | SCE 404 R | IMEG LC | Cost (\$/kWh) | Cost por unit rayod | Motric | and kW (use both TRC and PAC). | n TPC (auglized Cort (\$/thorm) | Multi-family (RMF) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Der CEDADS | Nore | |
| 130 | JCL 704 1 | | Cost (\$/therm) | Cost per unit saved | wied ic | and kW (use both TRC and PAC) | in the Levenzed Cost (synthermy | Multi-family (RMF) | 2010 | 11/2 | 174 | NA | | N/A | N/A | | N/A | 14/74 | | NOTE | |
| 137 | SCE AU4 R | IMF7i EI2 | BTU/unit | Energy Intensity per MF unit | Indicator | RMF-E12[Indicator] - and Average energy use intensity of multifamily units. including in-unit accounts) | Average first year ex-ante kWh gross per unit | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | 0.0009 | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | Numerator: Total usage of Res MF sector •••• Denominator: total units (service accounts) in Res MF sector | | |
| 138 | SCE A04 R | tMF7i EI3 | BTU/sqft | Energy Intensity per MF unit square foot | Indicator | RMF-E13[Indicator] Average energy use intensity of multifamily buildings (average usage per square foot – not | Average first year ex-ante kWh gross per square foot | Residential Sector – Multi-family (RMF) | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | 1.3 | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | Numerator: Total usage of Res MF sector •••• Denominator: average number of units in MF building times average square footage of MF units | | |
| 139 | SCE A05 C | c1 S1 | First year annua kW gross | I S1: Energy Savings | Metric | adjusted •• C-S1•• - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross ar | First year annual kW gross | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 45,083 | 33,377 | 46,069 | 47,451 | 48,400 | 48,869 | 52,607 | per CEDARS | None | |
| 140 | SCE A05 C | 21 S1 | First year annua kW net | I S1: Energy Savings | Metric | C-51••• First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross ar net)•• | First year annual kW net nd | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 31,955 | 23,680 | 32,653 | 33,633 | 34,306 | 34,638 | 37,288 | per CEDARS | None | |
| 141 | SCE A05 C | 21 S1 | First year annua kWh gross | I S1: Energy Savings | Metric | C-S1•• - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross ar net)•• | First year annual kWh gross nd | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 220,966,133 | 179,894,418 | 270,505,278 | 278,620,436 | 284,192,845 | 286,947,810 | 308,899,305 | per CEDARS | None | |
| 142 | SCE A05 C | 21 S1 | First year annua kWh net | I S1: Energy Savings | Metric | C-S1•• - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross ar net)•• | First year annual kWh net | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 157,299,046 | 124,846,862 | 192,564,451 | 198,341,384 | 202,308,212 | 204,269,388 | 219,895,987 | per CEDARS | None | |
| 143 | SCE AUS C | 1 51 | First year annua Therm gross | I S1: Energy Savings | Metric | C-S1•• - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross ar net)•• C-S1•• Eirst year annual and lifecycle ex-ante | First year annual Therm gross | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | per CEDARS | None | |
| 144 | SCE AUS C | 1 51 1 51 | Therm net | S1: Energy Savings S1: Energy Savings | Metric | C-S1•• - First year annual and inecycle ex-ance (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross ar net)•• | nist year annuar menn net Id | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 456 346 | 324.836 | 466 320 | 480 309 | 489.916 | 494.665 | 532 507 | per CEDARS | None | |
| 146 | SCE A05 C | 1 S1 | kW gross | S1: Energy Savings S1: Energy Savings | Metric | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross ar net)•• C-51•• - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante | Lifecycle ex-ante kW net | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 327,480 | 226,331 | 334,638 | 344,677 | 351,570 | 354,979 | 382,134 | per CEDARS | None | |
| 147 | SCE A05 C | 21 S1 | kW net Lifecycle ex-anti | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross ar net)•• C-S1•• - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante | ud Lifecycle ex-ante kWh gross | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 2,364,015,445 | 1,796,810,180 | 2,894,012,063 | 2,980,832,425 | 3,040,449,073 | 3,069,923,187 | 3,304,772,176 | per CEDARS | None | |
| 148 | SCE A05 C | 1 S1 | kWh gross Lifecycle ex-ant | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross an net)•• C-S1•• - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante | Lifecycle ex-ante kWh net | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 1,674,932,399 | 1,237,502,671 | 2,050,441,158 | 2,111,954,393 | 2,154,193,481 | 2,175,076,233 | 2,341,469,469 | per CEDARS | None | |
| 149 | SCE A05 C | 21 S1 | kWh net Lifecycle ex-ant | e S1: Energy Savings | Metric | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross ar net)•• C-S1•• - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante | Lifecycle ex-ante Therm gross | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | per CEDARS | None | |
| 150 | SCE A05 C | 1 S1 | Lifecycle ex-ant | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross ar net)•• C-51•• - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pro organization) are electric and demand chines (gross ar | Lifecycle ex-ante Therm net | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | per CEDARS | None | |
| 151 | SCE A05 C | c1 S2 | Percent first yea | r S2: Percent Overall Sectoral Savings | Metric | (p) e-evaluation, gas, electric, and demand savings (g) os an netto- C-S2 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) as a | n) Percent first year annual kW gross | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | 45,083 | 3,277,426 | 1.4% | 1.0% | 1.4% | 1.4% | 1.5% | 1.5% | 1.7% | S2 Methodology:••Numerator = Metric C1 ••Denominator = Total sectoral usage, from PA billing database | None | |
| 152 | SCE A05 C | c1 S2 | Percent first yea annual kW net | r S2: Percent Overall Sectoral Savings | Metric | percentage of overall sectoral usage •• C-S2 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) as a | n) Percent first year annual kW net | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | 31,955 | 3,277,426 | 1.0% | 0.7% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.1% | 1.0% | 1.1% | - S2 Methodology: •• Numerator = Metric C1 •• Denominator = Total sectoral usage, from PA billing database | None | |
| 153 | SCE A05 C | 21 52 | Percent first yea annual kWh | r S2: Percent Overall Sectoral Savings | Metric | percentage of overall sectoral usage•• C-S2 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) as a | n) Percent first year annual kWh gross | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | 220,966,133 | 12,312,761,919 | 1.8% | 1.5% | 2.2% | 2.3% | 2.4% | 2.5% | 2.7% | 52 Methodology: ••Numerator = Metric C1 ••Denominator = Total sectoral usage, from PA billing database | None | |
| 154 | SCE A05 C | c1 52 | gross Percent first yea annual kWh net | r S2: Percent Overall Sectoral Savings | Metric | percentage of overall sectoral usage. C-S2 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) as a | n) Percent first year annual kWh net | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | 157,299,046 | 12,312,761,919 | 1.3% | 1.0% | 1.6% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.9% | S2 Methodology:••Numerator = Metric C1 ••Denominator = Total sectoral usage, from PA billing database | None | |
| 155 | SCE A05 C | C1 S2 | Percent first yea annual Therm | r S2: Percent Overall Sectoral Savings | Metric | percentage of overall sectoral usage C-S2 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) as a percentage of overall sectoral usage | n) Percent first year annual Therm gross | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | S2 Methodology: ••Numerator = Metric C1 ••Denominator = Total sectoral usage, from PA billing database | None | |
| 156 | SCE A05 C | ci 52 | Percent first yea annual Therm net | Sectoral Savings | Metric | Percentage of over an sectoral USage•• C-S2 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) as a percentage of overall sectoral uscape•• | n) Percent first year annual Therm net | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | S2 Methodology: ••Numerator = Metric C1 ••Denominator = Total sectoral usage, from PA billing database | None | |
| 157 | SCE A05 C | 21 S2 | Percent lifecycle ex-ante kW gros | s Sectoral Savings | Metric | C-S2 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) as a percentage of overall sectoral usage | n) Percent lifecycle ex-ante kW gross | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | 456,346 | 3,277,426 | 13.9% | 9.6% | 16.9% | 16.8% | 18.2% | 17.7% | 20.5% | S2 Methodology: ••Numerator = Metric C1 ••Denominator = Total sectoral usage, from PA billing database | None | |
| 158 | SCE A05 C | 21 52 | Percent lifecycle ex-ante kW not | S2: Percent Overall | Metric | C-S2 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation gas, electric, and demand savings (pross and net) as a | n) Percent lifecycle ex-ante kW net | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | 327,480 | 3,277,426 | 10.0% | 6.7% | 11.5% | 11.5% | 12.4% | 12.0% | 13.2% | S2 Methodology: ••Numerator = Metric C1 ••Denominator = Total sectoral usage, from PA billing database | None | |
| 159 | SCE A05 C | 1 S2 | Percent lifecycle ex-ante kWh | S2: Percent Overall Sectoral Savings | Metric | percentage of overall sectoral usage •• C-S2 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) as a | n) Percent lifecycle ex-ante kWh gross | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | 2,364,015,445 | 12,312,761,919 | 19.2% | 14.7% | 31.6% | 33.3% | 34.9% | 35.8% | 40.6% | S2 Methodology:••Numerator = Metric C1 ••Denominator = Total sectoral usage, from PA billing database | None | |
| | | | gross | - | | percentage of overall sectoral usage •• | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Spreadsheet | AttA AttA | Method | Units of | | Metric/ | | | | | Baseline | | | - | Sh | nort Term Target | ı | Mid Term Target | Long Term Target | | |
|--------------|--------------|---------|------------------------------------|--|---------------------|---|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|--|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|--|--|
| Index 160 | PA Page Orde | s2 Code | Measurement Percent lifecycle | Metric Type S2: Percent Overall | Indicator Metric | Business Plan Att A Description C-S2 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) | Metric Percent lifecycle ex-ante kWh net | Sector Commercial Sector (C) | Baseline Year 2016 | Numerator 1,674,932,399 | Baseline Denominator 12,312,761,919 | Baseline Number 13.6% | 2017 Number 10.1% | 2018 20.4% | 2019 21.3% | 2020 | (2021-2023) 22.6% | (2024-2025) 25.0% | <u>Methodology</u> 52 Methodology:••Numerator = Metric C1 ••Denominator = Total sectoral usage, from PA | Key Definitions Proxy Explanation None |
| | | | ex-ante kWh net | Sectoral Savings | | gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) as a percentage of overall sectoral usage•• | | | | | | | | | | | | | billing database | |
| 161 | SCE A05 C1 | S2 | Percent lifecycle ex-ante Therm | S2: Percent Overall Sectoral Savings | Metric | C-S2 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) as a | Percent lifecycle ex-ante Therm gross | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | S2 Methodology:••Numerator = Metric C1 ••Denominator = Total sectoral usage, from PA billing database | None |
| 162 | SCE A05 C1 | S2 | gross Percent lifecycle | S2: Percent Overall | Metric | percentage of overall sectoral usage•• C-S2 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) | Percent lifecycle ex-ante Therm net | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | S2 Methodology: ••Numerator = Metric C1 ••Denominator = Total sectoral usage, from PA | None |
| | | | ex-ante Therm net | Sectoral Savings | | gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) as a percentage of overall sectoral usage•• | | | | | | | | | | | | | billing database | |
| 163 | SCE A05 C2 | G | MT CO2eq | GHG | Metric | C-G••Greenhouse gasses (MT CO2eq) Net kWh savings, reported on an annual basis | CO2-equivalent of net annual kWh savings | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 74,707 | 62,331 | 91,456 | 94,200 | 96,084 | 97,015 | 104,437 | Per CEDARS | |
| 164 | SCE A05 C3 | D2 | Percent lifecycle gross kW | D2: Depth of interventions by project | Metric | Energy savings (gross kWh, therms) as a fraction of total project consumption. | Percent lifecycle gross kW | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Did not calculate as Attachment A states: "Energy savings (gross kWh, therms) as a fraction of total project consumption. | Definition: "Project" is defined as "per application" |
| 165 | SCE A05 C3 | D2 | Percent lifecycle gross kWh | D2: Depth of interventions by project | Metric | Energy savings (gross kWh, therms) as a fraction of total project consumption. | Percent lifecycle gross kWh | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | 220,966,133 | 4,754,674,459 | 4.6% | 3.9% | 5.7% | 5.9% | 6.0% | 6.0% | 6.5% | D2 Methodology (ED Ok)**Numerator: Energy savings claimed for project**Denominator: Energy Usage Baseline on application, against which project savings is calculated. | Definition: "Project" is defined as "per application" |
| 166 | SCE A05 C3 | D2 | Percent lifecycle gross Therms | D2: Depth of interventions by project | Metric | Energy savings (gross kWh, therms) as a fraction of total project consumption. | Percent lifecycle gross Therms | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | D2 Methodology (ED Ok)**Numerator: Energy savings claimed for project**Denominator: Energy Usage Baseline on application, against which project savings is calculated. | Definition: "Project" is defined as "per application" |
| 167 | SCE A05 C4 | P1L | Percent | P1: Penetration of energy efficiency programs in the eligible market ••Percent of Participation | Metric | •••CP1M••Percent of participation relative to eligiblepopulation for small, medium, and large customers•• | Percent of participation relative to eligible population for large customers | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | 943 | 5,006 | 18.8% | 18.9% | 18.3% | 18.8% | 19.2% | 19.4% | 20.8% | PI Methodology: ••Numerator: Number of downstream participating (service accounts) ••Denominator: total number (service accounts) in the sector. | Participation is defined as the first instance of participation, should a customer participate more than once or participate in multiple programs in the calendar year. PAs also need to have enough information about a customer to determine if the customer is in the eligible population and service territory |
| 168 | SCE A05 C4 | P1M | Percent | P1: Penetration of energy efficiency programs in the eligible market ••Percent of Participation | Metric | •••CP1M••Percent of participation relative to eligiblepopulation for small, medium, and large customers•• | Percent of participation relative to eligible population for medium customers | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | 2,055 | 28,873 | 7.1% | 7.7% | 6.9% | 7.1% | 7.2% | 7.3% | 7.9% | PI Methodology: ••Numerator: Number of downstream participating (service accounts) ••Denominator: total number (service accounts) in the sector. | Participation is defined as the first instance of participation, should a customer participate more than once or participate in multiple programs in the calendar year. PAs also need to have enough information about a customer to determine if the customer is in the elligible population and service territory |
| 169 | SCE A05 C4 | P1S | Percent | P1: Penetration of energy efficiency programs in the eligible market ••Percent of Participation | Metric | •C-P1L••Percent of participation relative to eligiblepopulation for small , medium, and large customers•• | Percent of participation relative to eligible population for small customers | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | 15,405 | 421,665 | 3.7% | 3.3% | 5.0% | 5.0% | 5.0% | 5.0% | 5.0% | P1 Methodology: ••Numerator: Number of downstream participating (service accounts) ••Denominator: total number (service accounts) in the sector. | Participation is defined as the first instance of participation, should a customer participate more than once or participate in multiple programs in the calendar year. PAs also need to have enough information about a customer to determine if the customer is in the eligible population and service territory |
| 170 | SCE A05 C4 | P2 | Percent | P2: Penetration of energy efficiency programs in terms of square feet of eligible population | Metric | C-P2 - Percent of square feet of eligible population•• | Percent of square feet of eligible population | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | 423,825,264 | 2,581,749,800 | 16.4% | 11.5% | 15.9% | 16.4% | 16.7% | 16.9% | 18.2% | P2 Methodology: ••••Numerator: square footage of participating service accounts (x Premise ID3)••••Denominator: Square footage of commercial buildings per 2015 CEC analysis (Mohsen Abrishami) | |
| 171 | SCE A05 C4 | P4 | Percent | P4: Penetration of energy efficiency programs in the HTR market | Metric | C-P4- Percent of participation by customers defined as "hard-to-reach" •• | Percent of participation by customers defined as "hard-to-reach" | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | 6,170 | 21,343 | 28.9% | 41.1% | 28.0% | 28.9% | 29.4% | 29.7% | 32.0% | P4 Methodology•••Numerator: number of participants in HTR geographic area••Denominator: Total number of service accounts in HTR geographic area. | D.18-05-041 p. 43 - HTR as defined in Resolution G-3497, modified to "include disadvantaged communities (as designated by CalEPA) in the geographic criteria for hard to reach customers." |
| 172 | SCE A05 C5 | B2 | Percent | Square Footage of Commercial Benchmarking Penetration | Metric | C-B2 - Percent of benchmarked square feet of eligible population •• | Percent of benchmarked square feet of eligible population | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | 77,943,576 | 2,581,749,800 | 3.0% | 3.0% | 2.9% | 3.0% | 3.1% | 3.1% | 3.3% | Method: ••••Numerator: Total square footage of benchmarked commercial buildings in Portfolio Manager ••••Denominator: Total square footage of commercial sector per 2015 CEC analysis (Mohsen Abrishami) | |
| 173 | SCE A05 C5 | B5L | Percent | Benchmarking Penetration for | Metric | B5(C)L Percent of benchmarked customers relative to eligible population for large customers | Percent of benchmarked customers relative to eligible population for large customers | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | 155 | 5,006 | 3.1% | 3.3% | 3.0% | 3.1% | 3.2% | 3.2% | 3.4% | Methodology: ••••Numerator: Number of large commercial customers that have been benchmarked on Portfolio Manager••••Denominator: Total number of S, M, and L | |
| 174 | SCE A05 C5 | B5M | Percent | Benchmarking Penetration for | Metric | B5(C)M Percent of benchmarked customers relative to eligible population for medium customers | Percent of benchmarked customers relative to eligible population for medium customers | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | 269 | 28,873 | 0.93% | 0.95% | 0.90% | 0.93% | 0.95% | 0.96% | 1.03% | commercial customer accounts. Methodology: ••••Numerator: Number of Medium commercial customers that have been benchmarked on Portfolio Manager••••Denominator: Total number of S, M, and L | |
| 175 | SCE A05 C5 | B5S | Percent | Commercial Sector Benchmarking | Metric | B5(C)S••Percent of benchmarked customers relative to | Percent of benchmarked customers relative to | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | 555 | 421,665 | 0.13% | 0.14% | 0.13% | 0.13% | 0.13% | 0.14% | 0.15% | commercial customer accounts. Methodology: ••••Numerator: Number of Small commercial customers that have been | |
| 176 | SCE 405 CE | PG | Porcont | Penetration for Commercial Sector | Matric | eligible population for small customers | eligible population for small customers | Commorcial Sector (C) | 2016 | 55.9 | 21 242 | 2.6% | 2.0% | 2.5% | 2.6% | 2.7% | 2.7% | 2.0% | benchmarked on Portfolio Manager •••• Denominator: Total number of S, M, and L commercial customer accounts. Benchmarking nor Benchicia Manager. Songico accounte x promise IDc in HTP. | |
| 1,0 | 562 765 65 | 50 | i ci cen | Properties | mene | "hard-to-reach". | "hard-to-reach" | connector sector (e) | 2010 | 550 | 22,343 | 2.070 | 5.070 | 2.376 | 2.075 | 2.770 | 2.770 | 2.370 | market+•••Proxy, if characteristics other than size and geo location aren't known, develop proxy using just size and geo location.•• | |
| 177 | SCE A05 C6 | LC | PAC Levelized Cost (\$/kW) | Cost per unit saved | Metric | C-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, therm and kW (use both TRC and PAC) | PAC Levelized Cost (\$/kW) | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | \$95,666,526 | 327,480 | \$292 | \$316 | \$286 | \$278 | \$272 | \$269 | \$250 | Per CEDARS | None |
| 178 | SCE A05 C6 | LC | PAC Levelized Cost (\$/kWh) | Cost per unit saved | Metric | C-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, therm and kW (use both TRC and PAC). | PAC Levelized Cost (\$/kWh) | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | \$95,666,526 | 1,674,932,399 | \$0.057 | \$0.058 | \$0.047 | \$0.045 | \$0.044 | \$0.044 | \$0.041 | Per CEDARS | None |
| 179 | SCE A05 C6 | LC | PAC Levelized Cost (\$/therm) | Cost per unit saved | Metric | C-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, therm and kW (use both TRC and PAC). | PAC Levelized Cost (\$/therm) | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Per CEDARS | None |
| 180 | SCE A05 C6 | LC | TRC Levelized Cost (\$/kW) | Cost per unit saved | Metric | C-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, therm and kW (use both TRC and PAC). | TRC Levelized Cost (\$/kW) | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | \$162,083,151 | 327,480 | \$495 | \$526 | \$484 | \$470 | \$461 | \$457 | \$424 | Per CEDARS | None |
| 181 | SCE A05 C6 | LC | TRC Levelized Cost (\$/kWh) | Cost per unit saved | Metric | C-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, therm and kW (use both TRC and PAC) | TRC Levelized Cost (\$/kWh) | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | \$162,083,151 | 1,674,932,399 | \$0.097 | \$0.096 | \$0.079 | \$0.077 | \$0.075 | \$0.075 | \$0.069 | Per CEDARS | None |
| 182 | SCE A05 C6 | LC | TRC Levelized Cost (\$/therm) | Cost per unit saved | Metric | C-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, therm and kW (use both TRC and PAC) •• | TRC Levelized Cost (\$/therm) | Commercial Sector (C) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Per CEDARS | None |
| 183 | SCE A06 C7i | N1 | Percent | NMEC | Indicator | C-N1[Indicator] Fraction of total projects utilizing Normalized Metered Energy Consumption (NMEC) to estimate savings | Percent of total projects utilizing Normalized Metered Energy Consumption (NMEC) to estimate | Commercial Sector (C) | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | 0% | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | Per CAEECC meeting: "Fraction of total custom projects utilizing NMEC to estimate savings"Data from CMPA (Custom Measure and Project Archive) | |
| 184 | SCE A06 C7i | N2 | Percent | NMEC | Indicator | C-N2[Indicator] Fraction of total savings (gross kWh and | savings Percent of total savings (gross kWh and therm) | Commercial Sector (C) | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | 0% | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | Per CAEECC Meeting: "Fraction of total custom savings derived from NMEC | |
| 185 | SCE A06 C8i | CS | Percent | Satisfaction | Indicator | therm) derived from NMEC analysis. C-CS[Indicator] Improvement in customer satisfaction. | derived from NMEC analysis Percent Improvement in customer satisfaction | Commercial Sector (C) | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | TBD | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | analysis".••••Data from CMPA.•• Per CAEECC Meeting: M&E will develop and field a consistent survey instrument annually. | |
| 186 | SCE A06 C8i | TS | Percent | Satisfaction | Indicator | C-TS[Indicator] Improvement in trade ally satisfaction •• | Percent Improvement in trade ally satisfaction | Commercial Sector (C) | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | TBD | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | Per CAEECC Meeting: M&E will develop and field a consistent survey instrument annually. | |
| 187 | SCE A06 C9i | F1 | Percent | Investment in energy | Indicator | C-F - [Indicator] Fraction of total investments made by | Percent of total investments made by ratepayers | Commercial Sector (C) | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | 60.2% | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | C-F: Per CAEECC meeting and ED •• Numerator: Total Incentive •• Denominator: Total Project | |
| 188 | SCE A06 P1 | S1 | First year annual | efficiency S1: Energy Savings | Metric | ratepayers and private capital P-S1 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) | and private capital First year annual kW gross | Public Sector (P) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 3,445 | 4,338 | 3,728 | 3,840 | 3,917 | 3,955 | 4,257 | cost•• per CEDARS | None |
| 190 | SCE 406 P1 | 61 | kW gross | S1: Enormy Stavingr | Motric | gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) across Public Sector programs•• 0.51 Extraor programs•• | First year appual kW pat | Public Soctor (P) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 2 260 | 2 1 4 2 | 2 564 | 2 641 | 2 602 | 2 720 | 2.029 | pg CEDADS | Nass |
| 185 | SEL AUD FI | 31 | kW net | SI. Lifetgy Savings | WELL | gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) across Public Sector programs•• | | rubic sector (r) | 2010 | N/A | N/A | 2,309 | 3,143 | 2,304 | 2,041 | 2,055 | 2,720 | 2,926 | | ivuie |
| 190 | SCE A06 P1 | S1 | First year annual kWh gross | I S1: Energy Savings | Metric | P-S1 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) across Public Sector programs | First year annual kWh gross | Public Sector (P) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 26,337,042 | 52,345,935 | 28,686,906 | 29,547,513 | 30,138,463 | 30,430,625 | 32,758,567 | per CEDARS | None |
| 191 | SCE A06 P1 | S1 | First year annua kWh net | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | P-S1 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) across Public Sector programs | First year annual kWh net | Public Sector (P) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 19,217,190 | 35,661,969 | 20,931,800 | 21,559,754 | 21,990,949 | 22,204,130 | 23,902,745 | per CEDARS | None |
| 192 | SCE A06 P1 | S1 | First year annual Therm gross | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | P-S1 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) across Public Sector programs. | First year annual Therm gross | Public Sector (P) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | per CEDARS | None |
| 193 | SCE A06 P1 | S1 | First year annual Therm net | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | P-S1 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) across Public Sector programs•• | First year annual Therm net | Public Sector (P) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | per CEDARS | None |
| 194 | SCE A06 P1 | 51 | Litecycle ex-ante kW gross | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | P-S1 - First year annual and litecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) across Public Sector programs•• | Litecycle ex-ante kW gross | Public Sector (P) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 50,429 | 53,499 | 54,567 | 56,204 | 57,328 | 57,884 | 62,312 | per CEDARS | None |
| 195 | SCE A06 P1 | S1 | Lifecycle ex-ante kW net | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | P-S1 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) across Public Sector programs•• | Lifecycle ex-ante kW net | Public Sector (P) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 35,594 | 38,541 | 38,515 | 39,670 | 40,464 | 40,856 | 43,981 | per CEDARS | None |
| 196 | SCE A06 P1 | S1 | Lifecycle ex-ante kWh gross | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | P-S1 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) across Public Sector programs•• | Lifecycle ex-ante kWh gross | Public Sector (P) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 269,178,268 | 596,048,410 | 293,195,094 | 301,990,947 | 308,030,766 | 311,016,816 | 334,809,589 | per CEDARS | None |
| 197 | SCE A06 P1 | S1 | Lifecycle ex-ante kWh net | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | P-S1 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) across Public Sector programs•• | Lifecycle ex-ante kWh net | Public Sector (P) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 198,143,730 | 406,742,864 | 215,822,658 | 222,297,338 | 226,743,285 | 228,941,334 | 246,455,336 | per CEDARS | None |
| 198 | SCE A06 P1 | S1 | Lifecycle ex-ante Therm gross | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | P-S1 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) across | Lifecycle ex-ante Therm gross | Public Sector (P) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | per CEDARS | None |
| 199 | SCE A06 P1 | S1 | Lifecycle ex-ante Therm net | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | P-S1 - First year annual and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) across | Lifecycle ex-ante Therm net | Public Sector (P) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | per CEDARS | None |
| 200 | SCE A06 P2 | G | MT CO2eq | GHG | Metric | Public Sector programs•• P-G••Greenhouse gasses (MT CO2eq) based on net lifecycle kWh and Therms savings, reported on an annual basis, | CO2-equivalent of net annual kWh savings | Public Sector (P) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 10,906 | 17,390 | 11,879 | 12,235 | 12,480 | 12,601 | 13,565 | Per CEDARS | |
| 201 | SCE A06 P3i | D3b | Percent annual NET kW | D3: Depth of intervention | s Indicator | Incorporating average fuel/technology mix•• P-D3[Indicator] Average percent energy savings (kWh, kw, therms) per project building or farility•• | Percent annual net kW per project building or facility | Public Sector (P) | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | 0.8% | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | ••D3 Methodology:••Numerator: Total savings claimed for public sector building retrofits••Denominator: Energy usage of buildings that have been retrofited per | D3 Key Definitions: Project applications are made at the property level (premise ID and service account number) not the building level. •• "Enervy Swines" refers to Annual Net curings in Assering |
| 202 | SCE A06 P3i | D3b | Percent annual | D3: Depth of intervention: | s Indicator | P-D3[Indicator] Average percent energy savings (kWh, kw, | Percent annual net kWh per project building or | Public Sector (P) | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | 6.5% | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | application. ••D3 Methodology:•• Numerator: Total savings claimed for public sector building straffite* Ploamementor Englishment for public sector building | with ED direction to use Net savings if otherwise not specified (Lifecycle Net). D3 Key Definitions: Project applications are made at the property level (premise ID and service consult authorized to the huilding and the service |
| | | | INE I KWN | per building | | coentis) per project building of facility++ | iounty | | | | | | | | | | | | application. | eccount number) not the building level. •• chergy Savings: refers to Annual Net Savings, in keeping with ED direction to use Net savings if otherwise not specified (Lifecycle Net). |

| Spreadshee | t A | ttA AttA | Method | Units of | | Metric/ | | | | | Baseline | | | | | Short Term Target | | Mid Term Target | Long Term Targe | |
|------------|--------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------------|--|----------------|--|--|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---|
| Index | PA P | age Order | Code | Measurement | Metric Type | Indicator | Business Plan Att A Description | Metric | Sector | Baseline Year | Numerator | Baseline Denominator | Baseline Number | 2017 Number | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | (2021-2023) | (2024-2025) | Methodology |
| 203 | SCE A | 06 P3i | D3b | Percent annual NET Therms | D3: Depth of intervention per building | s Indicator | P-D3[Indicator] Average percent energy savings (kWh, kw, therms) per project building or facility | Percent annual net Therms per project building or facility | Public Sector (P) | N/A - Indicator | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | D3 Methodology: Numerator: Total savings claimed for publ retrofits Denominator: Energy usage of buildings that have been buildings |
| 204 | SCE A | 06 P3i | D5 | Annual NET kW | D5: Depth of | Indicator | P-D5[Indicator] Average annual energy savings (kWh, kw, | Average annual net kw savings per project building | g Public Sector (P) | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | 0.0004 | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | application. D5 Methodology: ••[Numerator] Total downstream savings ••• |
| | | | | | interventions ••Per square | e | therms) per project building floor plan area •• | floor plan area | | | , | , | , | | , | , | | , | , | number of service accounts participating. x average square foot |
| 205 | SCE AI | D6 P3i | D5 | Annual NET kWh | D5: Depth of | Indicator | P-D5[Indicator] Average annual energy savings (kWh, kw, | Average annual net kw savings per project building | g Public Sector (P) | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | 4.3 | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | D5 Methodology: •• [Numerator] Total downstream savings •••• |
| | | | | | foot | e | therms) per project building floor plan area •• | noor plan area | | | | | | | | | | | | number of service accounts participating, x average square foota |
| 206 | SCE A | D6 P3i | D5 | Annual NET Therms | D5: Depth of interventions••Per square | Indicator e | P-D5[Indicator] Average annual energy savings (kWh, kw, therms) per project building floor plan area •• | Average annual net Therm savings per project building floor plan area | Public Sector (P) | N/A - Indicator | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | D5 Methodology: ••[Numerator] Total downstream savings ••• number of service accounts participating. x average square foota |
| 207 | SCE A | 06 P3i | W1 | Annual NET kW | foot Water | Indicator | P-W1[Indicator] Average annual energy savings (kWh, kW | Average annual Net kW savings per annual flow | Public Sector (P) | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | TBD | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | Numerator: claimed savings from water/wastewater customers |
| | | | | | | | therms) per annual flow through project water/wastewater | through project water/wastewater facilities | | | | | | | | | | | | of flow data available. Propose study to collect and baseline. |
| 208 | SCE A | D6 P3i | W1 | Annual NET kWh | Water | Indicator | P-W1[Indicator] Average annual energy savings (kWh, kW | Average annual Net kWh savings per annual flow | Public Sector (P) | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | TBD | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | Numerator: claimed savings from water/wastewater customers |
| | | | | | | | facilities •• | through project water/wastewater facilities | | | | | | | | | | | | galions of now data available. Propose study to collect and base |
| 209 | SCE A | 06 P3i | W1 | Annual NET Therms | Water | Indicator | P-W1[Indicator] Average annual energy savings (kWh, kW therms) per annual flow through project water/wastewater | Average annual Net Therms savings per annual flow through project water/wastewater facilities | Public Sector (P) | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | Numerator: claimed savings from water/wastewater customerse gallons of flow data available. Propose study to collect and base |
| 210 | SCE A | D7 P4 | P1 | Percent | P1: Penetration of energy | Metric | facilities•• P-P1 - Percent of Public Sector accounts participating in | Percent of Public Sector accounts participating in | Public Sector (P) | 2016 | 1,059 | 63,650 | 1.7% | 4.5% | 1.6% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.8% | P1 Methodology: ••Numerator: Number of downstream particip |
| | | | | | efficiency programs in the eligible market ••Percent of Participation | 2 | programs•• | programs | | | | | | | | | | | | Denominator: total number of (service accounts) in the sector |
| 211 | SCE A | D7 P4i | P2 | Percent | P2: Penetration of energy efficiency programs in terms of square feet of eligible population | Indicator | P-P2[Indicator] Percent of estimated floorplan area (i.e., ft2) of all Public Sector buildings participating in building projects—estimate within +/-15% of sector-wide building area, +/-5% of project building area• | Percent of estimated floorplan area (i.e., ft2) of all Public Sector buildings participating in building projects | Public Sector (P) | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | 3.6% | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | P2 Methodology: ••••Numerator: square footage of participatin sqft/project X # of projects)••••Denominator: Square footage of analysis (Mohsen Abrishami) |
| 212 | SCE A | 07 P4i | W2 | Percent | Water | Indicator | P-W2[Indicator] Percent of Public Sector water/wastewater | Percent of Public Sector water/wastewater flow | Public Sector (P) | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | TBD | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | No MM gallons of flow data available. Propose a study to collect |
| | | | | | | | flow (i.e., annual average Million Gallons per Day) enrolled in non-building water/wastewater programs— estimate within +/-20% of flow through eligible facilities (treatment facilities pumping stations), -(10% of flow through engine facilities | enrolled in non-building water/wastewater programs | | , | | , | , | | , | , | , | , | | |
| 213 | SCE A | 07 P5 | LC | PAC Levelized | Cost per unit saved | Metric | P-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, therm and | PAC Levelized Cost (\$/kW) | Public Sector (P) | 2016 | \$17,923,325 | 35,594 | \$504 | \$223 | \$465 | \$452 | \$443 | \$439 | \$408 | Per CEDARS |
| 214 | SCE A | 07 P5 | LC | PAC Levelized | Cost per unit saved | Metric | P-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, therm and | PAC Levelized Cost (\$/kWh) | Public Sector (P) | 2016 | \$17,923,325 | 198,143,730 | \$0.090 | \$0.021 | \$0.083 | \$0.081 | \$0.079 | \$0.078 | \$0.073 | Per CEDARS |
| 215 | SCE A | 07 P5 | LC | Cost (\$/kWh) PAC Levelized | Cost per unit saved | Metric | kW (use both TRC and PAC)•• P-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, therm and | PAC Levelized Cost (\$/therm) | Public Sector (P) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Per CEDARS |
| 216 | SCE A | 07 P5 | LC | Cost (\$/therm) TRC Levelized | Cost per unit saved | Metric | kW (use both TRC and PAC) •• P-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, therm and | TRC Levelized Cost (\$/kW) | Public Sector (P) | 2016 | \$30,886,051 | 35,594 | \$868 | \$1,228 | \$802 | \$779 | \$763 | \$756 | \$702 | Per CEDARS |
| 217 | SCE AI | 07 P5 | LC | Cost (\$/kW) TRC Levelized | Cost per unit saved | Metric | kW (use both TRC and PAC). P-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, therm and | TRC Levelized Cost (\$/kWh) | Public Sector (P) | 2016 | \$30,886.051 | 198,143.730 | \$0.16 | \$0.12 | \$0.14 | \$0.14 | \$0.14 | \$0.13 | \$0.13 | Per CEDARS |
| 218 | SCF A | 17 PS | 10 | Cost (\$/kWh) | Cost per unit saved | Metric | kW (use both TRC and PAC)++ P-IC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, there and | TRC evelized Cost (\$/therm) | Public Sector (D) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | ν/Δ | N/A | | N/A | N/A | Per CEDARS |
| 210 | SCE A | 07 06: | 52 | Cost (\$/therm) | lowerterent in CC | Indiantes | kW (use both TRC and PAC)•• | Total assessme basked financian distributed to | Public Sector (P) | 2010 | N/A | N/A | N/A ladiation | (2.222.0F1 | N/A Indicator | N/A ladiantes | N/A | N/A Indicator | N/A Indiantes | |
| 219 | SUE AI | J7 P6I | F2 | \$ | Investment in EE | Indicator | P-F2 - [indicator] Total program-backed financing distributed to Public Sector customers requiring repayment (i.e., loans, | Public Sector customers requiring repayment | Public Sector (P) | N/A - Indicator | N/A | N/A | N/A - Indicator | \$2,322,051 | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | P-F2 Method: Total amount loaned through PA programs |
| 220 | SCE A | D7 P7 | B3 | Percent | Public Sector Benchmarking Penetration Calendar Yea | Metric r | OBF)++ P-B3 - Percent of Public Sector buildings with current benchmark++++ | Percent of Public Sector buildings with current benchmark | Public Sector (P) | 2016 | 957 | 63,650 | 1.5% | 1.6% | 1.6% | 1.7% | 1.8% | 1.9% | 2.1% | |
| 221 | SCE A | 07 P7 | FI4 | Btu | Energy Intensity per | Metric | P-F14 Average energy use intensity of all Public Sector | Average energy use intensity of all Public Sector | Public Sector (P) | 2016 | 2 188 910 | 63.650 | 34 | 34 | 34 | 33 | 34 | 33 | 34 | Method (ED Okay) •••• Numerator: Total sector-level energy use |
| 222 | SCE 41 | 7 07; | P.4 | Porcont | public sector building | Indicator | buildings•• | buildings | Bublic Sector (B) | N/A Indicator | N/A Indicator | N/A Indicator | N/A Indicator | 1.6% | N/A Indicator | N/A Indicator | N/A Indicator | N/A Indicator | N/A Indicator | data••••Denominator: Number of public sector accounts |
| | Sec 74 | | 54 | referit | Benchmarking Penetration in Calendar | marcator | buildings with current benchmark | buildings with current benchmark | Tublic Sector (T) | N/N matator | NyA indicator | NyA malator | N/N Indicator | 1.070 | HIN HURCHON | in the second | Nyx matator | Ny marcator | NyX Indicator | Portfolio Manager •••• Pennonator: Total square footage of all huildings. in Portfolio Manager |
| 222 | 505 A | 00 1-1 | 61 | Circle under anderen | Year | Mataia | In Class First upon any pliced and life upon an arts | First and a second ball second | Industrial (I) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 12.456 | 2.215 | 8 120 | 0.374 | 0 5 42 | 0.635 | 0.284 | |
| 223 | SUE A | JØ 111 | 31 | kW gross | ST. Energy Savings | wetric | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | First year annual kw gross | industrial (I) | 2018 | N/A | N/A | 12,450 | 3,315 | 8,130 | 6,374 | 8,342 | 6,025 | 9,264 | percebars |
| 224 | SCE A | 08 ln1 | S1 | First year annual | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | net) in industrial sector•• In-S1••- First year annualized and lifecycle ex-ante | First year annual kW net | Industrial (I) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 8,396 | 2,160 | 5,480 | 5,645 | 5,758 | 5,814 | 6,258 | per CEDARS |
| | | | | kW net | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) in industrial sector •• | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 225 | SCE A | 08 ln1 | S1 | First year annual kWh gross | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | In-S1••- First year annualized and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | First year annual kWh gross | Industrial (I) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 89,591,965 | 27,647,751 | 127,633,478 | 131,462,482 | 134,091,732 | 135,391,617 | 145,749,070 | per CEDARS |
| 226 | SCF A | 08 In1 | \$1 | First year annual | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | net) in industrial sector. | First year annual kWh net | Industrial (I) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 60 890 582 | 18 131 707 | 86 745 242 | 89 347 600 | 91 134 552 | 92.018.010 | 99.057.384 | Der CEDARS |
| | 562 70 | | 51 | kWh net | ST. EICIEF SUMISS | Mictile | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | | industrial (i) | 2010 | 176 | 170 | 00,030,302 | 10,131,707 | 00,743,242 | 03,347,000 | 51,154,552 | 52,010,010 | 55,057,504 | |
| 227 | SCE A | 08 ln1 | S1 | First year annual | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | net) in industrial sector•• In-S1••- First year annualized and lifecycle ex-ante | First year annual Therm gross | Industrial (I) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | per CEDARS |
| | | | | Therm gross | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) in industrial sector •• | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 228 | SCE A | 08 ln1 | S1 | First year annual Therm net | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | In-S1••- First year annualized and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | First year annual Therm net | Industrial (I) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | per CEDARS |
| 229 | SCE A | 08 In1 | \$1 | Liferurle ex-ante | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | net) in industrial sector. | Liferurle ex-ante kW gross | Industrial (I) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 117 756 | 25.918 | 76 866 | 79 172 | 80 756 | 81 539 | 87 776 | Der CEDARS |
| | 562 76 | | 51 | kW gross | 51. 111.57 5011.55 | Mictile | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | Encode exame king too | industrial (i) | 2010 | 1976 | 170 | 117,750 | 23,510 | 10,000 | 73,172 | 66,750 | 01,555 | 07,770 | per cebrico |
| 230 | SCE A | 08 In1 | S1 | Lifecycle ex-ante | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | In-S1++- First year annualized and lifecycle ex-ante | Lifecycle ex-ante kW net | Industrial (I) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 79,381 | 16,890 | 51,817 | 53,371 | 54,438 | 54,966 | 59,171 | per CEDARS |
| | | | | kW net | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) in industrial sector. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 231 | SCE A | 08 ln1 | S1 | Lifecycle ex-ante kWh gross | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | In-S1••- First year annualized and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | Lifecycle ex-ante kWh gross | Industrial (I) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 848,405,827 | 239,803,337 | 1,208,646,178 | 1,244,905,564 | 1,269,803,675 | 1,282,113,152 | 1,380,194,752 | per CEDARS |
| 232 | SCE A | 08 In1 | \$1 | Lifervole ex-ante | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | net) in industrial sector•• In-S1••- First year annualized and liferycle ex-ante | Lifecycle ex-ante kWh net | Industrial (I) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 577,260,340 | 157 565 386 | 822 370 005 | 847 041 105 | 863 981 927 | 872 357 368 | 939.092.669 | ner CEDARS |
| 1 | | | | kWh net | o,, b, | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) in industrial sector. | | | | | | ,===,040 | ,, | | ,, | | ,, | | |
| 233 | SCE A | 08 In1 | \$1 | Lifecycle ex-ante | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | In-S1••- First year annualized and lifecycle ex-ante | Lifecycle ex-ante Therm gross | Industrial (I) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | per CEDARS |
| | | | | Therm gross | | | (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and net) in industrial sector. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 234 | SCE A | 08 ln1 | S1 | Lifecycle ex-ante Therm net | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | In-S1••- First year annualized and lifecycle ex-ante (pre-evaluation) gas, electric, and demand savings (gross and | Lifecycle ex-ante Therm net | Industrial (I) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | per CEDARS |
| 235 | SCE A | 08 In2 | G | MT CO2eq | GHG | Metric | net) in industrial sector•• I-G- Greenhouse gasses (MT CO2eq) Net kWh savings. | CO2-equivalent of net annual kWh savings | Industrial (I) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 29,812 | 8,945 | 42,471 | 43,745 | 44,620 | 45,052 | 48,499 | Per CEDARS |
| 236 | SCE A | 08 In3 | P1L | Percent | P1: Penetration of energy | Metric | reported on an annual basis•• •In-P1L••Percent of participation relative to eligible | Percent of participation relative to eligible | Industrial (I) | 2016 | 16 | 53.329 | 0.03% | 0.01% | 0.03% | 0.03% | 0.03% | 0.03% | 0.03% | P1 Methodoloev: ••Numerator: Number of downstream particip |
| | | | | | efficiency programs in the eligible market ••Percent of Participation | 2 | population for small , medium and large customers•• | population for small customers | | | | | | | | | | | | Denominator: total number of (service accounts) in the sector |
| 237 | SCE A | 08 In3 | P1M | Percent | P1: Penetration of energy efficiency programs in the eligible market ••Percent of Participation | Metric 2 | In-P1M - Percent of participation relative to eligible population for small, medium and large customers - | Percent of participation relative to eligible population for medium customers | Industrial (I) | 2016 | 32 | 6,012 | 0.53% | 0.20% | 0.52% | 0.53% | 0.54% | 0.55% | 0.59% | P1 Methodology: ••Numerator: Number of downstream particip ••Denominator: total number of (service accounts) in the sector |
| 238 | SCE A | 08 In3 | P15 | Percent | P1: Penetration of energy efficiency programs in the eligible market ••Percent of Participation | Metric e | In-P1S••In-P1M••In-P1L••Percent of participation relative to eligible population for small, medium and large customers•• | Percent of participation relative to eligible population for large customers | Industrial (I) | 2016 | 106 | 2,397 | 4.4% | 3.2% | 4.3% | 4.4% | 4.5% | 4.5% | 4.9% | P1 Methodology: ••Numerator: Number of downstream particip ••Denominator: total number of (service accounts) in the sector |
| 239 | SCE A | 08 In4i | P5L | Percent | New participation | Indicator | I-P5[Indicator] Percent of customers participating that have not received an incentive for the past three years, anoually | Percent of large customers participating in reporting year that have not received an incentive | Industrial (I) | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | 1.45% | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | Numerator: Annual number of Large Industrial participants (by s received a downstream incentive for the nast 3 years (from date |
| | | | | | | | by small, medium and large customer categories. | for the past three years | | | | | | | | | | | | payment)Denominator: Total number of Large Industrial servi sector/segment |
| 240 | SCE A | 08 In4i | P5M | Percent | New participation | Indicator | I-PS[Indicator] Percent of customers participating that have not received an incentive for the past three years, annually, by small, medium and large customer categories•• | Percent of medium customers participating in reporting year that have not received an incentive for the past three years | Industrial (I) | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | 0.12% | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | Numerator: Annual number of Medium Industrial participants (b not received a downstream incentive for the past 3 years (from + payment)••Denominator: Total number of Medium Industrial se |
| 241 | SCE A | 08 In4i | P5S | Percent | New participation | Indicator | I-P5[Indicator] Percent of customers participating that have not received an incentive for the past three years, annually, by small, medium and large customer categories•• | Percent of small customers participating in reporting year that have not received an incentive for the past three years | Industrial (I) | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | 0.01% | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | sector/segment+++ Numerator: Annual number of Small Industrial participants (by s received a downstream incentive for the past 3 years (from date payment)++Denominator: Total number of Small Industrial servi |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | sector/segment ••• |

| | Key Definitions | Proxy Explanation |
|---|--|-------------------|
| r public sector building ve been retrofitted, per | D3 Key Definitions: Project applications are made at the property level (premise ID and service account number) not the building level. ••"Energy Savings" refers to Annual Net savings, in keeping | |
| s ••••[Denominator] Total footage of property | with ED direction to use Net savings if otherwise not specified (Lifecycle Net). | |
| s •••••[Denominator] Total footage of property | | |
| s •••••[Denominator] Total | | |
| mers••Denominator: No MM gal | | |
| mers••Denominator: No MM | | |
| mers••Denominator: No MM | | |
| sticipating (service accounts) | Participation is defined as the first instance of participation, should a customer participate more | |
| ector. | than once or participate in multiple programs in the calendar year. PAs also need to have enough information about a customer to determine if the customer is in the eligible population and service territory | |
| ipating service accounts (Avg age of sector per 2015 CEC | | |
| ollect and baseline. | | |
| | | |
| | None | |
| | Define: "Total program backed financingrequiring repayment" = total loan amount | |
| | Def: "current" = "within calendar year" | |
| uuro from PA hilling | | |
| marked within calendar year, in | | |
| of all benchmarked Public sector | | |
| | None | |
| | | |
| articipating (service accounts) ector. | Participation is defined as the first instance of participation, should a customer participate more than once or participate in multiple programs in the calendar year. PAs also need to have enough information about a customer to determine if the customer is in the eligible population and service territory | |
| articipating (service accounts) ector. | Participation is defined as the first instance of participation, should a customer participate more than once or participate in multiple programs in the calendar year. PAs also need to have enough information about a customer to determine if the customer is in the eligible population and service territory.** | |
| articipating (service accounts) ector. | Participation is defined as the first instance of participation, should a customer participate more than once or participate in multiple programs in the calendar year. PAs also need to have enough information about a customer to determine if the customer is in the eligible population and service territory. | |
| (by service account) that had not date of incentive service accounts in the | PAs will use PA-specific definition for S, M, & L customers, because BP strategies were developed for customers segmented by those definitions. | |
| nts (by service account) that had rom date of incentive ial service accounts in the | PAs will use PA-specific definition for S, M, & L customers, because BP strategies were developed for customers segmented by those definitions. | |
| (by service account) that had not date of incentive service accounts in the | PAs will use PA-specific definition for S, M, & L customers, because BP strategies were developed for customers segmented by those definitions. | |

| Snre | dsheet | A++ A | AttA Method | Units of | | Metric/ | | | | | Baseline | | | | Sha | rt Torm Torget | | Mid Term Target | Long Term Target | |
|------|--------|---------|-------------|--------------------------------------|---|-----------|--|---|---------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|----------------------|-----------------|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|------------------|--|
| l | dex PA | Page O | rder Code | Measurement | Metric Type | Indicator | Business Plan Att A Description | Metric | Sector | Baseline Year | Numerator | Baseline Denominator | Baseline Number | 2017 Number | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | (2021-2023) | (2024-2025) | Methodology |
| 242 | SCE | A08 In | 5 LC | PAC Levelized | Cost per unit saved | Metric | I-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, therm and KW (use both TRC and PAC) | PAC Levelized Cast (\$/kW) | Industrial (I) | 2016 | \$18,491,067 | 79,381 | \$233 | \$513 | \$357 | \$346 | \$340 | \$227 | \$313 | Per CEDARS |
| 243 | SCE | A08 In | 5 LC | PAC Levelized | Cost per unit saved | Metric | I-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, therm and | PAC Levelized Cost (\$/kWh) | Industrial (I) | 2016 | \$18,491,067 | 577,260,340 | \$0.032 | \$0.055 | \$0.022 | \$0.022 | \$0.021 | \$0.014 | \$0.020 | Per CEDARS |
| 244 | SCE | A08 In | 5 LC | PAC Levelized | Cost per unit saved | Metric | KW (use both TRC and PAC)•• I-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, therm and | PAC Levelized Cost (\$/therm) | Industrial (I) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Per CEDARS |
| 245 | SCE | A08 In | 5 LC | Cost (\$/therm) TRC Levelized | Cost per unit saved | Metric | KW (use both TRC and PAC) I-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, therm and | TRC Levelized Cost (\$/kW) | Industrial (I) | 2016 | \$38,263,428 | 79,381 | \$482 | \$858 | \$738 | \$717 | \$703 | \$696 | \$647 | Per CEDARS |
| 246 | SCE | 408 In | 5 10 | Cost (\$/kW) TRC Levelized | Cost per unit saved | Metric | KW (use both TRC and PAC). | TRC Levelized Cost (\$/kWb) | Industrial (I) | 2016 | \$38 263 428 | 577 260 340 | \$0.066 | \$0.092 | \$0.047 | \$0.045 | \$0.044 | \$0.030 | \$0.041 | Per CEDARS |
| 240 | 500 | 100 11 | | Cost (\$/kWh) | | | KW (use both TRC and PAC)•• | | | 2010 | \$30,203,420 | 577,200,540 | \$0.000 | 20.052 | \$0.047 | 20.045 | | | 20.041 | |
| 247 | SCE | A08 In | 5 LC | TRC Levelized Cost (\$/therm) | Cost per unit saved | Metric | I-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, therm and KW (use both TRC and PAC)•• | TRC Levelized Cost (\$/therm) | Industrial (I) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Per CEDARS |
| 248 | SCE | A08 In | 6 S2 | Percent first yea annual kW gross | r S2: Percent Overall Sectoral Savings | Metric | I-RC - Reduction in consumption (proposed by SCE and SDG&E)•• | Percent first year annual kW gross | Industrial (I) | 2016 | 12,456 | 4,444,607 | 0.28% | 0.08% | 0.18% | 0.19% | 0.19% | 0.20% | 0.21% | S2 Methodology: ••Numerator = Metric C1 ••Denominator = Total sect billing database |
| 240 | 665 | 400 1- | c (2) | Descent first see | - C2: Decement Occurrell | Mateia | LDC Deduction is comparation (account in CCC and | Descent first see and 100 ant | Industrial (I) | 2016 | 0.200 | 4 444 607 | 0.10% | 0.05% | 0.12% | 0.128/ | 0.12% | 0.120/ | 0.14% | C2 Mathedalarus Museuster - Matrix C1 - Description - Tabland |
| 249 | SCE | AU6 III | 0 32 | annual kW net | Sectoral Savings | Wethe | SDG&E)++ | Percent first year annual kw net | industrial (I) | 2016 | 8,390 | 4,444,007 | 0.19% | 0.05% | 0.12% | 0.13% | 0.13% | 0.13% | 0.14% | billing database |
| 250 | SCE | A08 In | 6 S2 | Percent first yea | r S2: Percent Overall | Metric | I-RC - Reduction in consumption (proposed by SCE and | Percent first year annual kWh gross | Industrial (I) | 2016 | 89,591,965 | 15,970,349,281 | 0.56% | 0.18% | 0.80% | 0.83% | 0.85% | 0.87% | 0.94% | S2 Methodology: ••Numerator = Metric C1 ••Denominator = Total sect |
| | | | | annual kWh | Sectoral Savings | | SDG&E)++ | | | | | | | | | | | | | billing database |
| 251 | SCE | A08 In | 6 S2 | Percent first yea | r S2: Percent Overall | Metric | I-RC - Reduction in consumption (proposed by SCE and | Percent first year annual kWh net | Industrial (I) | 2016 | 60,890,582 | 15,970,349,281 | 0.38% | 0.12% | 0.54% | 0.56% | 0.58% | 0.59% | 0.63% | S2 Methodology: ••Numerator = Metric C1 ••Denominator = Total sect |
| | | | | annual kvvn net | Sectoral Savings | | SUG&E)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | biling database |
| 252 | SCE | A08 In | 6 S2 | Percent first yea annual Therm | r S2: Percent Overall Sectoral Savings | Metric | I-RC - Reduction in consumption (proposed by SCE and SDG&E)•• | Percent first year annual Therm gross | Industrial (I) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | S2 Methodology: ••Numerator = Metric C1 ••Denominator = Total sect billing database |
| 253 | SCE | 408 In | 6 52 | gross Percent first yea | r S2: Percent Overall | Metric | I-RC - Reduction in consumption (proposed by SCE and | Percent first year annual Therm net | Industrial (I) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$2 Methodology:Numerator = Metric C1Denominator = Total cert |
| 255 | Jer | 100 11 | 5 | annual Therm | Sectoral Savings | Wittin | SDG&E)++ | | industrial (i) | 2010 | 1975 | 1975 | 1975 | 1975 | 1975 | 1975 | 1975 | 1975 | 197 | billing database |
| 254 | SCE | A08 In | 6 S2 | Percent lifecycle | S2: Percent Overall | Metric | I-RC - Reduction in consumption (proposed by SCE and | Percent lifecycle ex-ante kW gross | Industrial (I) | 2016 | 117,756 | 4,444,607 | 2.6% | 0.6% | 1.7% | 1.8% | 1.9% | 1.9% | 2.1% | S2 Methodology: ••Numerator = Metric C1 ••Denominator = Total sect |
| | | | | ex-ante kW gros | s Sectoral Savings | | SDG&E)•• | | | | | | | | | | | | | billing database |
| 255 | SCE | A08 In | 6 S2 | Percent lifecycle | S2: Percent Overall | Metric | I-RC - Reduction in consumption (proposed by SCE and | Percent lifecycle ex-ante kW net | Industrial (I) | 2016 | 79,381 | 4,444,607 | 1.8% | 0.4% | 1.2% | 1.2% | 1.3% | 1.3% | 1.4% | S2 Methodology: •• Numerator = Metric C1 •• Denominator = Total sect billion database |
| 256 | SCE | A08 In | 6 S2 | Percent lifecycle | S2: Percent Overall | Metric | I-RC - Reduction in consumption (proposed by SCE and | Percent lifecycle ex-ante kWh gross | Industrial (I) | 2016 | 848,405,827 | 15,970,349,281 | 5.3% | 1.6% | 7.6% | 8.4% | 9.4% | 10.5% | 12.6% | S2 Methodology: ••Numerator = Metric C1 ••Denominator = Total sect |
| | | | | ex-ante kWh gross | Sectoral Savings | | SDG&E)•• | | | | | | | | | | | | | billing database |
| 257 | SCE | A08 In | 6 S2 | Percent lifecycle ex-ante kWh net | S2: Percent Overall Sectoral Savings | Metric | I-RC - Reduction in consumption (proposed by SCE and SDG&E)•• | Percent lifecycle ex-ante kWh net | Industrial (I) | 2016 | 577,260,340 | 15,970,349,281 | 3.6% | 1.0% | 5.1% | 5.6% | 6.0% | 6.5% | 7.5% | S2 Methodology: ••Numerator = Metric C1 ••Denominator = Total sect billing database |
| 258 | SCE | A08 In | 6 S2 | Percent lifecycle | S2: Percent Overall | Metric | I-RC - Reduction in consumption (proposed by SCE and | Percent lifecycle ex-ante Therm gross | Industrial (I) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | S2 Methodology: ••Numerator = Metric C1 ••Denominator = Total sect |
| | | | | ex-ante Therm gross | Sectoral Savings | | SDG&E)•• | | | | | | | | | | | | | billing database |
| 259 | SCE | A08 In | 6 S2 | Percent lifecycle ex-ante Therm | S2: Percent Overall Sectoral Savings | Metric | I-RC - Reduction in consumption (proposed by SCE and SDG&E)•• | Percent lifecycle ex-ante Therm net | Industrial (I) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | S2 Methodology: ••Numerator = Metric C1 ••Denominator = Total sect billing database |
| 260 | 505 | A00 A1 | C1 | net First voor oppuo | S1: Enormy Stavingr | Motric | Ag S1 Einst year and lifegyrlo or anto (pro evaluation) | First your appual kW gross | Agricultural (A) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 1 412 | 1 576 | 420 | 423 | 441 | 445 | 470 | POR CEDARS |
| 200 | SCE | AU9 A. | 1 31 | kW gross | SI: Ellergy Savings | Wethic | annualized gas, electric, and demand savings in agriculture | rifst year annual kw gross | Agricultural (A) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 1,415 | 1,576 | 420 | 432 | 441 | 445 | 479 | per CEDARS |
| 261 | SCE | A09 A1 | L 51 | First year annua | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | sector, gross and net•• Ag-S1 - First year and lifecycle ex ante (pre-evaluation) | First year annual kW net | Agricultural (A) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 987 | 1,065 | 293 | 302 | 308 | 311 | 335 | per CEDARS |
| | | | | kW net | | | annualized gas, electric, and demand savings in agriculture sector, gross and net •• | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 262 | SCE | A09 A1 | L 51 | First year annua | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | Ag-S1 - First year and lifecycle ex ante (pre-evaluation) | First year annual kWh gross | Agricultural (A) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 12,141,150 | 6,129,011 | 1,817,680 | 1,872,210 | 1,909,654 | 1,928,166 | 2,075,671 | per CEDARS |
| | | | | KWN gross | | | annualized gas, electric, and demand savings in agriculture sector, gross and net•• | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 263 | SCE | A09 A1 | L S1 | First year annua kWh net | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | Ag-S1 - First year and lifecycle ex ante (pre-evaluation) annualized gas, electric, and demand savings in agriculture | First year annual kWh net | Agricultural (A) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 8,338,811 | 4,085,061 | 1,248,423 | 1,285,875 | 1,311,593 | 1,324,308 | 1,425,617 | per CEDARS |
| 264 | SCE | A09 A1 | 51 | First year annua | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | sector, gross and net•• Ar-S1 - First year and lifecycle ex ante (pre-evaluation) | First year annual Therm gross | Agricultural (A) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | ner CEDARS |
| 204 | Sec | 105 11 | | Therm gross | 27. EUCLEY 2011162 | Wittin | annualized gas, electric, and demand savings in agriculture | This year annual them gross | Agriculturar(A) | 2010 | 1975 | 1975 | 1975 | 1975 | 1974 | 1975 | 1975 | 1975 | 10/1 | |
| 265 | SCE | A09 A1 | L 51 | First year annua | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | sector, gross and net•• Ag-S1 - First year and lifecycle ex ante (pre-evaluation) | First year annual Therm net | Agricultural (A) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | per CEDARS |
| | | | | Therm net | | | annualized gas, electric, and demand savings in agriculture sector. gross and net | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 266 | SCE | A09 A1 | L 51 | Lifecycle ex-ante | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | Ag-S1 - First year and lifecycle ex ante (pre-evaluation) | Lifecycle ex-ante kW gross | Agricultural (A) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 9,638 | 11,287 | 2,862 | 2,948 | 3,007 | 3,036 | 3,268 | per CEDARS |
| | | | | KW gross | | | sector, gross and net•• | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 267 | SCE | A09 A1 | L 51 | Lifecycle ex-ante kW net | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | Ag-S1 - First year and lifecycle ex ante (pre-evaluation) annualized gas, electric, and demand savings in agriculture | Lifecycle ex-ante kW net | Agricultural (A) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 6,734 | 7,697 | 1,999 | 2,059 | 2,101 | 2,121 | 2,283 | per CEDARS |
| 268 | SCE | A09 A1 | 51 | Lifervrle ex-ante | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | sector, gross and net•• Ar-S1 - First year and lifecycle ex ante (pre-evaluation) | Lifervicle ex-ante kWh gross | Agricultural (A) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 85,795,016 | 46 216 454 | 12 844 571 | 13,229,908 | 13 494 506 | 13 625 322 | 14.667.659 | ner CEDARS |
| | | | | kWh gross | | | annualized gas, electric, and demand savings in agriculture | B | - 8 | | | | | ,, | | ,, | | | ,, | |
| 269 | SCE | A09 A1 | L 51 | Lifecycle ex-ante | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | Ag-S1 - First year and lifecycle ex ante (pre-evaluation) | Lifecycle ex-ante kWh net | Agricultural (A) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 59,271,769 | 31,076,397 | 8,873,714 | 9,139,926 | 9,322,724 | 9,413,099 | 10,133,200 | per CEDARS |
| | | | | kWh net | | | annualized gas, electric, and demand savings in agriculture sector, gross and net•• | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 270 | SCE | A09 A1 | L 51 | Lifecycle ex-ante | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | Ag-S1 - First year and lifecycle ex ante (pre-evaluation) | Lifecycle ex-ante Therm gross | Agricultural (A) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | per CEDARS |
| | | | | merni gross | | | sector, gross and net. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 271 | SCE | A09 A1 | L 51 | Lifecycle ex-ante Therm net | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | Ag-S1 - First year and lifecycle ex ante (pre-evaluation) annualized gas, electric, and demand savings in agriculture | Lifecycle ex-ante Therm net | Agricultural (A) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | per CEDARS |
| 272 | SCE | A09 A2 | . 6 | MT CO2eq | GHG | Metric | sector, gross and net•• A-G - Greenhouse gasses (MT CO2en) Net kWh savings | CO2-equivalent of net annual kWh savings | Agricultural (A) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 4.146 | 2 022 | 621 | 639 | 652 | 658 | 709 | Per CEDARS |
| | 500 | 105 14 | | in cozeq | | meene | reported on an annual basis. | | Agriculturur (A) | 2010 | | | 4,140 | 2,022 | 021 | | 0.52 | | | |
| 2/3 | SCE | AU9 A: | Particpants | Percent | efficiency programs in the | e Wietric | Ag-P15••Percent of participation relative to eligible population for small, medium and large customers•• | population for large customers | Agricultural (A) | 2016 | 23 | 369 | 6.2% | 5.3% | 6.0% | 6.2% | 6.5% | 6.4% | 6.9% | Methodology: ••Numerator: Number of downstream participating ••Denominator: total number of (service accounts in the sector. |
| | | | | | eligible market ••Percent of Participation | t | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 274 | SCE | ۵۵۹ ۵3 | 2 P1- | Percent | P1: Penetration of energy | Metric | Ac.P1M.Percent of participation relative to elicible | Percent of participation relative to eligible | Agricultural (A) | 2016 | 104 | 6 668 | 1.6% | 1 5% | 1 5% | 1.6% | 1.6% | 1.6% | 1 7% | P1 Methodology: ••Numerator: Number of downstream participating |
| | | | Particpant | | efficiency programs in the | e | population for small, medium and large customers. | population for medium customers | - 8 | | | -, | | | | | | | | ••Denominator: total number of (service accounts) in the sector. |
| | | | | | eligible market ••Percent of Participation | t | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 275 | SCE | A09 A3 | 8 P1: | Percent | P1: Penetration of energy | y Metric | Ag-P1L••Percent of participation relative to eligible | Percent of participation relative to eligible | Agricultural (A) | 2016 | 27 | 19,795 | 0.14% | 0.25% | 0.13% | 0.14% | 0.14% | 0.14% | 0.15% | P1 Methodology: ••Numerator: Number of downstream participating |
| | | | Particpants | | efficiency programs in the | e t | population for small, medium and large customers | population for small customers | | | | | | | | | | | | ••Denominator: total number of (service accounts) in the sector. |
| | | | | | of Participation | L . | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 276 | SCE | A09 A4 | LC LC | PAC Levelized | Cost per unit saved | Metric | A-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, therm and | PAC Levelized Cost (\$/kW) | Agricultural (A) | 2016 | \$4,038,372 | 6,734 | \$600 | \$437 | \$2,020 | \$1,961 | \$1,922 | \$1,904 | \$1,769 | Per CEDARS |
| 277 | SCE | A09 A/ | | Cost (\$/kW) PAC Levelized | Cost per unit saved | Metric | kW (use both TRC and PAC). | PAC Levelized Cost (\$/kWb) | Agricultural (A) | 2016 | \$4.038.372 | 59 271 769 | \$0.068 | \$0.11 | \$0.46 | \$0.44 | \$0.43 | \$0.43 | \$0.40 | Per CEDARS |
| 270 | | | | Cost (\$/kWh) | | | kW (use both TRC and PAC) •• | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | | | **** | | | ***** | |
| 2/8 | SCE | AU9 A4 | , it | Cost (\$/therm) | Cost per unit saved | Metric | A-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per KWN, therm and kW (use both TRC and PAC) | PAC Levelized Cost (\$/therm) | Agricultural (A) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Per CEDAKS |
| 279 | SCE | A09 A4 | LC LC | TRC Levelized Cost (\$/kW) | Cost per unit saved | Metric | A-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, therm and kW (use both TRC and PAC) | TRC Levelized Cost (\$/kW) | Agricultural (A) | 2016 | \$7,130,682 | 6,734 | \$1,059 | \$846 | \$3,566 | \$3,462 | \$3,395 | \$3,362 | \$3,123 | Per CEDARS |
| 280 | SCE | A09 A4 | LC LC | TRC Levelized | Cost per unit saved | Metric | A-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, therm and kW (use both TRC and PAC) as | TRC Levelized Cost (\$/kWh) | Agricultural (A) | 2016 | \$7,130,682 | 59,271,769 | \$0.12 | \$0.21 | \$0.80 | \$0.78 | \$0.76 | \$0.76 | \$0.70 | Per CEDARS |
| 281 | SCE | A09 A4 | LC LC | TRC Levelized | Cost per unit saved | Metric | A-LC - Levelized cost of energy efficiency per kWh, therm and | TRC Levelized Cost (\$/therm) | Agricultural (A) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Per CEDARS |
| 282 | SCE | A10 C5 | i1 S1 | Cost (\$/therm) Net GWh | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | kW (use both TRC and PAC) Net Energy Savings: GWH, M Therms and MW (demand) | Net GWh savings | Codes & Standards (CS) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 1,402 | 1,889 | 1245 annual average | 1327 annual | 1323 annual | TBD | TBD | EM&V study |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | average | average | | | |
| 283 | SCE | A10 C5 | i1 S1 | Net MMTherms | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | Net Energy Savings: GWH, M Therms and MW (demand) | Net MMTherms savings | Codes & Standards (CS) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 29 | N/A | 44 annual average | 56 annual | 55 annual | TBD | TBD | EM&V study |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | average | average | | | |
| 284 | SCE | A10 C5 | 51 S1 | Net MW | S1: Energy Savings | Metric | Net Energy Savings: GWH, M Therms and MW (demand) | Net MW savings | Codes & Standards (CS) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 272 | 346 | 286 annual average | 389 annual average | 415 annual average | TBD | TBD | EM&V study |
| 285 | 505 | A10 C | 2 1 | Count | Advocacy-Building | Metric | Number of measures supported by CASE studies in | Number of measures supported by CASE chudior in | Codes & Standards (CC) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 12 | 23 | 12 total | - 12 total | 12 total | TRD | TRD | Measures supported by CASE |
| 200 | | | | | . arocacy-building | Met ic | rulemaking cycle (current work) | rulemaking cycle (current work) | Contra Standards (CS) | 2010 | 11/A | 11/2 | 14 | 2.5 | 4210101 | 12 10101 | 12 Will | 100 | | And the second second second |
| 286 | SCE | A10 CS | 2 2 | Count | Advocacy-Building | Metric | Number of measures adopted by CEC in rulemaking cycle (indicator of past work) | number of measures adopted by CEC in rulemaking cycle (indicator of past work) | codes & Standards (CS) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 12 | U | 12 total | 12 total | 12 total | TBD | TBD | weasures adopted by CEC |
| 287 | SCE | A10 CS | 3 1 | Count | Advocacy-Appliance | Metric | Number of T-20 measures supported by CASE studies in rulemaking cycle (current work) | Number of T-20 measures supported by CASE studies in rulemaking cycle (current work) | Codes & Standards (CS) | 2017 | N/A | N/A | 5 | 5 | 10 total | 10 total | 10 total | TBD | TBD | T-20 measures supported by CASE |
| 288 | SCE | A10 C5 | 3 2 | Count | Advocacy-Appliance | Metric | Number of measures adopted by CEC in current year | Number of measures adopted by CEC in current year | Codes & Standards (CS) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 4 | 0 | 10 total | 10 total | 10 total | TBD | TBD | Measures adopted by CEC |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | Key Definitions | Proxy Explanation |
|---|---|-------------------|
| | None | |
| or = Total sectoral usage, from PA | Define: "Reduction in consumption" = energy savings. | |
| | | |
| pr = Total sectoral usage, from PA | Define: "Reduction in consumption" = energy savings. | |
| or = Total sectoral usage, from PA | Define: "Reduction in consumption" = energy savings. | |
| | | |
| or = Total sectoral usage, from PA | Define: "Reduction in consumption" = energy savings. | |
| or = Total sectoral usage, from PA | Define: "Reduction in consumption" = energy savings. | |
| | | |
| or = Total sectoral usage, from PA | Define: "Reduction in consumption" = energy savings. | |
| or = Total sectoral usage, from PA | Define: "Reduction in consumption" = energy savings. | |
| | | |
| or = Total sectoral usage, from PA | Define: "Reduction in consumption" = energy savings. | |
| or = Total sectoral usage, from PA | Define: "Reduction in consumption" = energy savings. | |
| or = Total sectoral usage, from PA | Define: "Reduction in consumption" = energy savings. | |
| or = Total sectoral usage, from PA | Define: "Reduction in consumption" = energy savings. | |
| 2 | | |
| or = Total sectoral usage, from PA | Define: "Reduction in consumption" = energy savings. | |
| | None | |
| | | |
| | None | |
| | None | |
| | | |
| | None | |
| | None | |
| | | |
| | None | |
| | Naza | |
| | NORE | |
| | None | |
| | | |
| | None | |
| | None | |
| | No. | |
| | None | |
| | None | |
| | | |
| | | |
| participating (service accounts) sector. | Participation is defined as the first instance of participation, should a customer participate more than once or participate in multiple programs in the calendar year. PAs also need to have enough | |
| | Intormation about a customer to determine if the customer is in the eligible population and service territory | |
| participating (service accounts) | Participation is defined as the first instance of participation, should a customer participate more | |
| esector. | than once or participate in multiple programs in the calendar year. PAs also need to have enough information about a customer to determine if the customer is in the eligible population and service | |
| | territory.•• | |
| participating (service accounts) e sector. | Participation is defined as the first instance of participation, should a customer participate more than once or participate in multiple programs in the calendar year. PAs also need to have enough | |
| | information about a customer to determine if the customer is in the eligible population and service territory | |
| | None | |
| | 2018-2025 consistent with adopted goals from D.17-09-025, Tables 1, 2, and 3, p. 37-39; 2016 from | |
| | CEDARS (spillover not included). Values summed across all four IOUs. "Savings" is defined as Net First year savings. | |
| | 2018-2025 consistent with adopted goals from D.17-09-025, Tables 1, 2, and 3, p. 37-39; 2016 from CEDARS (spillover not included). Values summed across all four IOUs. "Savings" is defined as Net | |
| | First year savings. 2018-2025 consistent with adopted goals from D.17-09-025, Tables 1, 2, and 3, p. 37-39; 2016 from | |
| | CEDARS (spillover not included). Values summed across all four IOUs. "Savings" is defined as Net First year savings. | |
| | Baseline and targets for measures supported are for 3 year cycle rather than annual. | |
| | Baseline and targets for measures supported are for 3 year cycle rather than annual. | |
| | Baseline is annual. Targets for measures supported are for 3 year cycle rather than annual. 2017 chosen as baseline since 2016 was zero. | |
| | Baseline is annual. Targets for measures adopted are for 3 year cycle rather than annual. | |
| | | |

| Spreads | neet AttA | AttA Metho | od Units of | | Metric/ | , | | | | Baseline | | | | s | hort Term Target | | Mid Term Target | Long Term Target | | |
|---------|-----------|--------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|---|-------------|--|--|--|-----------------|------------------|---|--|
| Index | A PA Page | Order Code | e Measurement | Metric Type | Indicator | r Business Plan Att A Description | Metric | Sector | Baseline Year | Numerator | Baseline Denominator | Baseline Number | 2017 Number | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | (2021-2023) | (2024-2025) | Methodology | Key Definitions Proxy Explanation |
| 289 | SCE A10 | CS4 1 | Count | Advocacy-Federal | Metric | Number of federal standards adopted for which a utility advocated (IOUs to list advocated activites) | Number of federal standards adopted for which a utility advocated (IOUs to list advocated activites) | Codes & Standards (CS) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 22 | 7 | 21 | 20 | 20 | TBD | TBD | Standards adopted | Baselines and targets are annual. Any federal standards based upon Title 20 that were adopted will still be included in the federal count. |
| 290 | SCE A10 | CS4 2 | Count | Advocacy-Federal | Metric | Percent of federal standards adopted for which a utility advocated (#IOU supported / # DOE adopted) | Percent of federal standards adopted for which a utility advocated (#IOU supported / # DOE | Codes & Standards (CS) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | TBD | TBD | # IOUs supported + # DOE adopted | Baselines and targets are annual. |
| 291 | SCE A10 | CS5 1 | Count | Reach Codes | Metric | The number of local government Reach Codes implemented (this is a joint IOU and REN effort) | adopted) The number of local government Reach Codes implemented (this is a joint IOU and REN effort) | Codes & Standards (CS) | 2016 | N/A | N/A | 6 | 12 | 25 total | 25 total | 25 total | TBD | TBD | Reach Code ordinances implemented | Targets are total for a three-year Title 24 code cycle. Jurisdictions having multiple reach codes will be counted by reach code rather than by jurisdiction. Accomplishments will be reported from the CEC Reach Codes website (http://www.energy.ca.gov/title24/2013standards/ordinances/). |
| 292 | SCE A11 | CS6 1 | Count | Compliance Improvem | nent Metric | Number of training activities (classes, webinars) held, numb of market actors participants by segment (e.g. building officials, builders, architects, etc.) and the the total size (number of the target audience) by sector. (M) Number of training activities | er Number of training activities (classes, webinars) held, number of market actors participants by segment (e.g. building officials, builders, architects, etc.) and the the total size (number of the target audience) by sector. (M) Number of | Codes & Standards (CS) | 2017 | N/A | N/A | 138 | 118 | 138 | 138 | 138 | TBD | TBD | Number of training activities | 118 live training sessions and 20 webinars in 2017; short, mid, and long-term targets are annual |
| 293 | SCE A11 | CS6 2 | Count | Compliance Improvem | nent Metric | Number of training activities (classes, webinars) held, numb of market actors participants by segment (e.g. building officials, builders, architects, etc.) and the the total size (number of the target audience) by sector. (M) Number of participants | I annue activities er Number of training activities (classes, webinars) held, number of market actors participants by segment (e.g. building officials, builders, architects, etc.) and the the total size (number of the target audience) by sector. (M) Number of participants | Codes & Standards (CS) | 2017 | N/A | N/A | 3,600 | 3,000 | 3,600 | 3,600 | 3,600 | TBD | TBD | Number of participants | 3000 attendees for live training and 600 attendees for webmas in 2017; short, mid, and long-term targets are annual. Attendees will be shown by major segment (i.e., building officials, builders, architects, HEKS raters) and target size of each segment will be provided during first metrics reporting. |
| 294 | SCE A11 | CS6 3 | Score | Compliance Improvem | .nent Metric | Increase in code compliance knowledge pre/post training | Increase in code compliance knowledge pre/post training | Codes & Standards (CS) | 2017 | N/A | N/A | 20% | 20% | 20% | 20% | 20% | TBD | TBD | Knowledge score | Code compliance knowledge increase will be tested via pre and post training questionaires. Surveys will be conducted for training that lasts longer than three hours (in order to preserve time for instruction in shorter training sessions). Questionaires will be made available during the first metric renormitie |
| 295 | SCE A11 | CS6R 1 | Percent | Compliance Improvem | aent Metric | The percentage increase in closed permits for building projects triggering energy code compliance within participating jurisdictions | The percentage increase in closed permits for building projects triggering energy code compliance within participating jurisdictions | Codes & Standards (CS) | 2017 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | |
| 296 | SCE A11 | CS6Ri 1 | Count | Compliance Improvem | nent Indicator | Number and percent of jurisdictions with staff participating an Energy Policy Forum | in Number and percent of jurisdictions with staff participating in an Energy Policy Forum | Codes & Standards (CS) | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | | |
| 297 | SCE A11 | CS6Ri 1 | Percent | Compliance Improvem | nent Indicator | Number and percent of jurisdictions with staff participating | in Number and percent of jurisdictions with staff | Codes & Standards (CS) | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | | |
| 298 | SCE A11 | CS6Ri 2 | Count | Compliance Improvem | nent Indicator | Number and percent of jurisdictions receiving Energy Policy technical arrittance | Number and percent of jurisdictions receiving | Codes & Standards (CS) | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | | |
| 299 | SCE A11 | CS6Ri 2 | Percent | Compliance Improvem | nent Indicator | Number and percent of jurisdictions receiving Energy Policy | Number and percent of jurisdictions receiving | Codes & Standards (CS) | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | | |
| 300 | SCE A11 | CS6Ri 3 | Count | Compliance Improvem | nent Indicator | technical assistance. Buildings receiving enhanced code compliance support and delivering compliance data to program evaluators | Energy Policy technical assistance. Buildings receiving enhanced code compliance support and delivering compliance data to | Codes & Standards (CS) | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | N/A - Indicator | | |
| 301 | SCE A12 | WET-1 1 | Count | Collaborations | Metric | Number of collaborations by Business Plan sector to jointly develop or share training materials or resources. | program evaluators Number of collaborations by Business Plan sector to jointly develop or share training materials or resources | Workforce Education and Training (WET) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Collaboration agreements are not required. | *Collaborations* mean sharing mutually-beneficial resources such as training materials, expertise, and marketing/outreach tactics that help achieve WE&T goals and outcomes and that support the collaboration correlation() crants and objectives |
| 302 | SCE A12 | WET-2 1 | Count | Penetration | Metric | Number of participants by sector | Number of participants by sector | Workforce Education and Training (WET) | N/A | N/A | N/A | 12,141 | 12,134 | 14,216 | 14,216 | 14,216 | 17,401 | 17,574 | Report from class registration database. | "Sector" refers to: a. Residential versus non-residential b. Energy efficienty training topic area (e.g., Lighting, HVAC, Agriculture) "Participants" means aggregate class attendance, meaning that one person attending two classes throughout the year would qualify as two participants. This is an accurate measurement of audience interse per topic/ sector. Please note that the IOUs will begin using a standard categorization of training topic areas in 2018. |
| 303 | SCE A12 | WET-2 1 | Percentage | Penetration | Metric | Percent of participation relative to eligible target population for curriculum | Percent of participation relative to eligible target population for curriculum | Workforce Education and Training (WET) | 2016 | 12,141 | 139,375 | 9% | 9% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 12% | 12% | Numerator: Report from class registration database. Denominator: Advanced Energy Economy Institute (AEEI) report finding: "Energy Efficiency accounts for the largest share of advanced energy jobs in California. About six in 10 advance energy workers are employed in the Energy Efficiency sector; these firms support over 321,000 jobs: "Sume advanced Energy Efficiency jobs are commisered with population fo each PA territory. PG&E's share of 321,000 jobs is approximately 132,380. | "Participation" means unique participants, meaning that one person attending two classes throughout the year would be counded as one participant. d "Curriculum" refers to the portfolio of training programs and training materials offered by WE&T "Eligible target population" refers to the energy efficiency labor workforce within each PA's service territory based on the proportion of the IOU's territory population compared to that of California's population. |
| 304 | SCE A12 | WET-3 1 | Percentage | Diversity | Metric | Percent of total WE&I training program participants that meet the definition of disadvantaged worker. | Percent of total WE&I training program participants that meet the definition of disadvantaged worker. | Workforce Education and Training (WET) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | Report of provided µip codes from class registration database cross-referenced with the list of "disadvantaged worker" iz jo codes. Please note that heres up codes are a mixture of home and work addresses. By the end of 2018, IOUs will specifically request participants' home zip codes. | "Disadvantaged Worker" means a worker that (1) has a referral from a collaborating community- is based organization (EGb), state agency, or workforce investment board or (2) lives in a 2P code that is in the top 25% in one or more of the five socioeconomic indicators as defined in the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's CaliEnviroScreen Tool. These socioeconomic indicators are educational attainment, housing burden, linguistic isolation, poverty, and unemployment. "Participant" means a unique participant, meaning that one person attending two classes thorement the socioeconomic interact works of the conomic of the conomic of the conomic "Participant" means a unique participant, meaning that one person attending two classes |
| 305 | SCE A12 | WET-3 1 | Percentage | Diversity | Metric | Percent of incentive dollars spent on contracts ⁴ with a demonstrated commitment to provide career pathways to disadvantaged workers | Percent of incentive dollars spent on contracts* with a demonstrated commitment to provide career pathways to disadvantaged workers | Workforce Education and Training (WET) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | Disadvantaged worker tracking is currently not required by PA contract terms and condition | Information Life ear would be clustered and the life and the life equipment where the incentive is paid to an entity other than a manufacturer, distributor, or retailer of equipment. This applicability standard is adopted from the language the hully 9th ruling on workforce standards. It excludes contracts such as those for upstream incentives, Codes and Standards, and mid-stream distributor programs. ⁴⁷ Demonstrated commitment ⁴⁷ means that the vendor submits a plan describing how the program will provide disadvantaged workers with improved access to career opportunities in the energy efficiency industry. Inst they regularly report the percentage of their workforce qualifying as ⁴⁷ disadvantaged ⁴ , and that they have long-term targets for the percentage of their workforce qualifying as "disadvantaged". ⁴⁴ |
| 306 | SCE A12 | WET-3i 1 | Count | Diversity | Indicator | Number Career & Workforce Readiness (CWR) participants who have been employed for 12 months after receiving the training | Number Career & Workforce Readiness (CWR) participants who have been employed for 12 months after receiving the training | Workforce Education and Training (WET) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | TBD | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | CWR program does not yet exist. | че псаниалтарел молкет аллие N/A |
| 307 | SCE A13 | ETP- 1 M1 | Count | Research Prioritization | n Metric | ETP-M1 Number of TPMs initiated (gas and electric combined), including one technology-focused pilot (TFP) TPI *This number will be updated once all third party contracts have been awarded | ETP-M1 Number of TPMs initiated (gas and electric or combined), including one technology-focused pilot (TFP) TPM | Emerging Technologies (ET) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | tbd TPMs* | tbd TPMs* | 6 TPMs total*1 | TBD | TBD | Data for this metric will be gathered from 3P TPM Implementers annually. | 1) Technology priority maps (TPM6) are defined in the Business Plan 2) Technology-focused pilot: See ETP-M7 |
| 308 | SCE A13 | ETP- 1 M2 | Count of TPMs | Research Prioritization | n Metric | ETP-M2 Number of TPMs updated *This number will be updated once all third party contracts have been awarded. | ETP-M2 Number of TPMs updated | Emerging Technologies (ET) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | tbd TPMs* | tbd TPMs* | 3 TPMs total*1 | TBD | TBD | Data for this metric will be gathered from 3P TPM Implementers annually. | 1) Technology priority maps (TPMs) are defined in the Business Plan |
| 309 | SCE A13 | ETP- 1 M3 | Count of Project | s Projects | Metric | ETP-M3 Number of projects initiated *This number will be updated once all third party contracts have been awarded. | ETP-M3 Number of projects initiated | Emerging Technologies (ET) | 2017* To be updated with ED/IOU | N/A | N/A | 61 projects | 53 | tbd projects* | tbd projects* | 61 projects total ^{*1} | TBD | TBD | Data for this metric will be gathered from 3P TPM Implementers annually. | Technology priority maps (TPMs) are defined in the Business Plan 2) Projects are considered "initiated" when project budget has been approved and funding allocated. |
| 310 | SCE A13 | ETP- 1 M4 | Count of Events | Outreach | Metric | ETP-M4: Number of outreach events with technology developers with products <1 year from commercialization, including new technology vendors, manufacturers, and entrepreneurs. This number will be updated once all third party contracts have been awarded. | ETP-M4: Number of outreach events with technology developers with products <1 year from commercialization, including new technology vendors, manufacturers, and entrepreneurs | Emerging Technologies (ET) | 2017 | N/A | N/A | 5 | 5 | tbd events* | tbd events* | 5 events total*1 | TBD | TBD | Each ETP event will provide data for ETP-M4 and ETP-M5 simultaneously.**Data for this metric will be gathered from TPM Implementers annually based on methodology to be determined. | "Technology developers" – Any organization or company that develops energy efficiency and demand response technology suitable for inclusion in PA incentive programs 2) "Events" – ET Summit, webinars, and in-person meetings, as proposed by ETP implementers. |
| 311 | SCE A13 | ETP- 1 M5 | Count of Events | Outreach | Metric | ETP-MS: Number of outreach events with technology developers with products <9 years from commercialization, including new technology vendors, manufacturers, and entrepreneurs. "This number will be updated once all third narty contracts have been awarded | ETP-M5: Number of outreach events with technology developers with products <5 years from commercialization, including new technology vendors, manufacturers, and entrepreneurs | Emerging Technologies (ET) | See ETP-M4 | N/A | N/A | See ETP-M4 | See ETP-M4 | See ETP-M4 | See ETP-M4 | See ETP-M4 | TBD | TBD | Each ETP event will provide data for ETP-M4 and ETP-M5 simultaneously.**Data for this metric will be gathered from 3P TPM Implementers annually based on methodology to be determined. | "Technology developers" – Any organization or company that develops energy efficiency and demand response technology suitable for inclusion in PA incentive programs. 2) "Events" – ET Summit, webinars, and in-person meetings, as proposed by ETP implementers. |
| 312 | SCE A14 | ETP- 1 M6 | Count of TFPs | Pilots | Metric | ETP-M6: Number of projects initiated with cooperation from other internal IOU programs associated with each Technolo focused Pilot "This number will be updated once all third nativ contracts have been avoided. | ETP-M6: Number of projects initiated with gv- cooperation from other internal IOU programs associated with each Technology-focused Pilot | Emerging Technologies (ET) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | tbd* | tbd* | 2 total*1 | TBD | TBD | ETP-M6 metric is a subset of ETP-M7 and counted towards ETP-M7 targets. All targets will b determined by 3P TPM implementers. | *Cooperation* is defined as a process by which all parties work towards a mutual objective. |
| 313 | SCE A14 | ETP- 1 M7 | Count of TFPs | Pilots | Metric | ETP-M7 Number of Technology-Focused Pilot (TFP) initiated as part of the TFP TPM. *This number will be updated once a third party contracts have been awarded. | ETP-M7 Number of Technology-Focused Pilot (TFP) Ill initiated as part of the TFP TPM | Emerging Technologies (ET) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | tbd* | tbd* | 3 total*1 | TBD | TBD | Data for this metric will be gathered from 3P TPM Implementers annually. | A technology-focused pilot (TFP) will identify market barriers for a diverse range of high-impact technologies through studies, and subsequently breaking down identified barriers in collaboration with other relevant programs. 2¹¹ Enchology-focused filot²¹, Pilot that have been proposed by 3Ps in response to PA needs and that have been approved through the existing ED Ideation Process. These includes TFPs conducted in cooperation with other programs. |
| 314 | SCE A15 | ETP-T1 1 | Percent of New Measures | Measure Tracing | Metric | ETP-T1: Prior year: % of new measures added to the portfoli that were previously ETP technologies *The PAs believe this not suited for a metric with targets because ETP does not make decisions about new measures. | ETP-T1: Prior year: % of new measures added to is the portfolio that were previously ETP technologies | Emerging Technologies (ET) | Per ED, to be determined by an ED study* | Per ED, to be determined by an ED study* | Per ED, to be determined b an ED study* | by Per ED, to be determined by an ED study* | TBD | Per ED, to be determined by an ED study* | Per ED, to be determined by an ED study* | Per ED, to be determined by an ED study* | TBD | TBD | Per ED: Baseline, methodology, and targets need to be determined by ED evaluation contractors. ED evaluators can make recommendations on what suitable targets would be. ETP Tracking Metrics 1 – 5 need to be determined at the same time as part of acluating savings (ETP-TS), and because ETP impact and savings are involved, ED evaluators need to make these determinations. Baselines will not be available until then. | ETP-T1 through ETP -T8 are in a table titled "Emerging Technologies Tracking (Reporting)" and are separate from the metrics ETP-M1 through ETP-M7 in the table titled "Emerging Technologies Metrics" in Attachment A of D.18-06-01. APA and proposed that tracking metrics have no targets in the July 14, 2017 metrics filing, however the commission ruled that these tracking metrics must have targets. |

| Spre | adsheet | AttA AttA | Method | Units of | | Metric/ | | | | | Baseline | | | | | Short Term Targ | et | Mid Term Target | Long Term Targe | | | |
|------|---------|-------------------|-----------|---|------------------------------|----------|---|--|-------------------------------|--|--|---|--|------------|---|--|---|------------------|-----------------|---|---|-------------------|
| | ndex PA | Page Order | Code | Measurement | t Metric Type | Indicato | Business Plan Att A Description | Metric | Sector | Baseline Year | Numerator | Baseline Denominator | Baseline Number | 2017 Numbe | er 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | (2021-2023) | (2024-2025) | Methodology | Key Definitions | Proxy Explanation |
| 315 | SCE | A15 ETP-T2 : | 1 0 | Count of New Measures | Measure Tracing | Metric | ETP-T2: Prior Year: # of new measures added to the portfolio that were previously ETP technologies. *The PAs believe this is not suited for a metric with targets because ETP does not make decisions about new measures. | ETP-T2: Prior Year: # of new measures added to the portfolio that were previously ETP technologies | Emerging Technologies (ET) | Per ED, to be determined by an ED study* | N/A | N/A | Per ED, to be determined by an ED study* | TBD | Per ED, to be determined by an study* | Per ED, to b ED determined b ED study* | e Per ED, to be y an determined by an ED study* | TBD Y | TBD | Per ED: Baseline, methodology, and targets need to be determined by ED evaluation contractor. ETP Tracking Metrics 1 – 5 need to be determined at the same time as part of calculating savings (ETP-TS), and because ETP impact and savings are involved, ED evaluator need to make these determinations. Baselines will not be available until then. | ETP-T1 through ETP-T8 are in a table titled "Emerging Technologies Tracking (Reporting)" and are separate from the metrics ETP-M1 through ETP-M7 in the table titled "Emerging Technologies Metrics" in Atthemet Ad 0.128.05.041. PAs had proposed that tracking metrics have no targets in the July 14, 2017 metrics filing, however the commission ruled that these tracking metrics must | |
| 316 | SCE | A15 ETP-T3 : | 1 F | Percent | Measure Tracing | Metric | ETP-T3: Prior year: % of new codes or standards that were previously ETP technologies. *The PAs believe this is not suited for a metric with targets because ETP does not make decisions about new codes or standards. | ETP-T3: Prior year: % of new codes or standards that were previously ETP technologies | Emerging Technologies (ET) | Per ED, to be determined by an ED study* | Per ED, to be P determined by an ED study* | Per ED, to be determined by an ED study* | y Per ED, to be determined by an ED study* | TBD | Per ED, to be determined by an study* | Per ED, to b ED determined b ED study* | e Per ED, to be y an determined by an ED study* | TBD Y | TBD | Per ED: Baseline, methodology, and targets need to be determined by ED evaluation contractor. | have targets. EIP-11 through EIP-18 are in a table titled "Emerging Technologies Tracking (Reporting)" and are separate from the metrics EIP-M1 through EIP-M27 in the table titled "Emerging Technologies Metrics" in Attachment A of D.18-05-041. PSA and proposed that tracking metrics have no targets in the July 14, 2017 metrics filing, however the commission ruled that these tracking metrics must have targets. | |
| 317 | SCE | A15 ETP-T4 : | 1 (| Count | Measure Tracing | Metric | ETP-T4: Prior Year: # of new codes and standards that were previously ETP technologies. *The PAs believe this is not suited for a metric with targets because ETP does not make decisions about new codes or standards. | ETP-T4: Prior Year: # of new codes and standards that were previously ETP technologies | Emerging Technologies (ET) | Per ED, to be determined by an ED study* | N/A | N/A | Per ED, to be determined by an ED study* | TBD | Per ED, to be determined by an study* | Per ED, to b ED determined b ED study* | e Per ED, to be y an determined by an ED study* | TBD Y | TBD | Per ED: Baseline, methodology, and targets need to be determined by ED evaluation contractor. ETP Tracking Metrics 1 – 5 need to be determined at the same time as part of calculating signaling (ETP-TS), and excause ETP impact and savings are involved, ED evaluator need to make these determinations. Baselines will not be available until then. PAs will work with ED to support matching ETP content to partfolio content. | nave unjects. ETP-11 through ETP-18 are in a table titled "Emerging Technologies Tracking (Reporting)" and are separate from the metrics ETP-M1 through ETP-M7 in the table titled "Emerging Technologies Metrics" in Attachment Ad D 12.80-2014. Rohad approach that tracking metrics have to targets in the July 14, 2017 metrics filing, however the commission ruled that these tracking metrics must have targets. | |
| 318 | SCE | A15 ETP- : T5a | 1 1 | Lifecycle net kW | / Savings Tracing | Metric | ETP-T5a: Savings of measures currently in the portfolio that were supported by ETP, added since 2009. Ex-ante with gross and net for all measures, with ex-post where available. The PAs believe this is not suited for a metric with targets because ETP is a non-resource program and does not claim any savines. | ETP-T5a: Savings of measures currently in the portfolio that were supported by ETP, added since 2009. Ex-ante with gross and net for all measures, with ex-post where available | Emerging Technologies (ET) | Per ED, to be determined by an ED study* | N/A | N/A | Per ED, to be determined by an ED study* | TBD | Per ED, to be determined by an study* | Per ED, to b ED determined b ED study* | e Per ED, to be y an determined by an ED study* | TBD Y | TBD | Per ED: Baseline, methodology, and targets need to be determined by ED evaluation contractor. ETP Tracking Metrics 1 = 5 need to be determined at the same time as part of calculating savings (ETP-TS), and because ETP impact and savings are involved, ED evaluator need to make these determinations. Baselines will not be available until then. | EIP-11 through EIP-18 are in a table titled "Emerging Technologies Tracking (Reporting)" and are spearate from the metrics EIP-44 Linvogh ETP-47 in the table titled "Emerging Technologies 5 Metrics" in Attachment A of D.18-05-041. PAs had proposed that tracking metrics have no targets in the July 14, 2017 metrics filling, however the commission ruled that these tracking metrics must have targets. EIP is a non-resource program and does not make savings claims. | |
| 319 | SCE | A15 ETP- : T5b | 1 L | Lifecycle net kWh | Savings Tracing | Metric | ETP-T5b: Savings of measures currently in the portfolio that were supported by ETP, added since 2009. Ex-ante with gross and net for all measures, with ex-post where available. The PAs believe this is not suited for a metric with targets because ETP is a non-resource program and does not claim any savines. | ETP-T5b: Savings of measures currently in the portfolio that were supported by ETP, added since 2009. Ex-ante with gross and net for all measures, with ex-post where available | Emerging Technologies (ET) | Per ED, to be determined by an ED study* | N/A | N/A | Per ED, to be determined by an ED study* | TBD | Per ED, to be determined by an study* | Per ED, to b ED determined b ED study* | e Per ED, to be y an determined by an ED study* | TBD Y | TBD | Per ED: Baseline, methodology, and targets need to be determined by ED evaluation contractor. ETP Tracking Metrics 1 = 5 need to be determined at the same time as part of a calculating savings (ETP-TS), and because ETP impact and savings are involved, ED evaluatoon need to make these determinations. Baselines will not be available until then. | CIP-T1 through ETP-T8 are in a table titled "Emerging Technologies Tracking (Reporting)" and are separate from the metrics ETP-M1 trough ETP-M1 in the table titled "Emerging Technologies 5 Metrics" in Attachment A of D 18-05-041. PAs had proposed that tracking metrics have no targets in the July 14, 2017 metrics filling, however the commission ruled that these tracking metrics must have targets. ETP is a non-resource program and does not make savings claims. | |
| 320 | SCE | A15 ETP- : T5c | 1 L 1 | Lifecycle net Therms | Savings Tracing | Metric | ETP-TSc: Savings of measures currently in the portfolio that were supported by ETP, added since 2009. Ex-ante with gross and net for all measures, with ex-post where available. The PAs believe this is not suited for a metric with targets because ETP is a non-resource program and does not claim any savines. | ETP-T5c: Savings of measures currently in the portfolio that were supported by ETP, added since 2009. Ex-ante with gross and net for all measures, with ex-post where available | Emerging Technologies (ET) | Per ED, to be determined by an ED study* | N/A | N/A | Per ED, to be determined by an ED study* | TBD | Per ED, to be determined by an study* | Per ED, to b ED determined b ED study* | e Per ED, to be y an determined by an ED study* | TBD Y | TBD | Per ED: Baseline, methodology, and targets need to be determined by ED evaluation contractor. ETP Tracking Metrics 1 = 5 need to be determined at the same time as part of calculating savings (ETP-TS), and because ETP impact and savings are involved, ED evaluatoon need to make these determinations. Baselines will not be available until then. | CIP-T1 through ETP-T8 are in a table titled "Emerging Technologies Tracking (Reporting)" and are spanate from the metrics ETP-M1 trough ETP-M7 in the table titled "Emerging Technologies 5 Metrics" in Attachment A of D.18-05-041. PAs had proposed that tracking metrics have to targets in the July 14, 2017 metrics filling. Nowever the commission ruled that these tracking metrics must have targets. ETP is a non-resource program and does not make savings claims. | |
| 321 | SCE | A15 ETP- : T6a | 1 () i | Count of projec | t Project Idea Tracing | Metric | ETP-TGs Number and source (as reported by submitter) of project ideas submitted OUTSDE OF the annual TPM research planning process, for these categories of sources: PA, national lab, manufacturer, entrepreneur, etc.) "The PAs believe this is no stude for a metric with targets because ETP does not control the number of submissions nor their sources. Targets are set in a way to avoid forcing ETP to arbitrarily change existing processes in a way that may negatively impact the effectiveness of the program. Targets and sources may be updated in collaboration with ED after all 3P contracts. | ETP-TGa Number and source (as reported by submitter) of project ideas submitted OUTSDE OF the annual TPM research planning process by PA | Emerging Technologies (ET) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | TBD | tbd* | tbd* | 4 cumulative ³ | ¹ TBD | TBD | Data for this metric will be gathered from 3 PTPM Implementers annually. // lideas are submitted both outside and as part of the TPM-aligned research planning process, it can be reported under both ETP-T6 and ETP-T7. Ideas may be submitted by more than one source and will be counted under each. | CTP-T1 through ETP-T8 are in a table titled "Energing Technologies Tracking (Reporting)" and are separate from the metrics ETP-AI through ETP-API in the table titled "Energing Technologies Metrics" in Attachment A of D.18-05-041. PAs had proposed that tracking metrics have no targets in the July 14, 2017 metrics filing, however the commission ruled that these tracking metrics must have targets. "Submitted" refers to an idea submitted through a formal submission process. | |
| 322 | SCE | A15 ETP- : T6b | 1 () i | Count of projec ideas by nation labs | t Project Idea Tracing al | Metric | ETP-T6b Number and source (as reported by submitter) of project ideas submitted OUTSDE OF the annual TPM research planning process, for these categories of sources: PA, national lab, manufacturer, entrepreneur, etc.) The PAs believe this is no suited for a metric with targets because ETP does not control the number of submissions nor their sources Targets are set in a way to avoid forcing ETP to arbitrarily change existing processes in a way that may negatively impact the effectiveness of the program. Targets and sources may be updated in collaboration with D after all 3P | ETP-T6D Number and source (as reported by submitter) of project ideas submitted OUTSIDE OF the annual TPM research planning process by National Lab | Emerging Technologies (ET) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | TBD | tbd* | tbd* | 2 cumulative ¹ | ¹ TBD | TBD | Data for this metric will be gathered from 3 P TPM Implementers annually. // lideas are submitted both outside and as part of the TPM-aligned research planning process, it can be reported under both TP-T6 and ETP-T7. Ideas may be submitted by more than one source and will be counted under each. | CTP-11 through ETP-T8 are in a table titled "Emerging Technologies Tracking (Reporting)" and are separate from the metrics ETP-411 through ETP-4N7 in the table titled "Emerging Technologies Metrics" in Attachment A of D.18 do 5-041. PAs had proposed that tracking metrics have no targets in the July 14, 2017 metrics filing, however the commission ruled that these tracking metrics must have targets. "Submitted" refers to an idea submitted through a formal submission process. | |
| 323 | SCE | A15 ETP- : T6c | 1 (i | Count of projecc ideas by manufacturers | t Project Idea Tracing | Metric | contracts are awarded. ETP-Tcs Kumber and source (as reported by submitter) of project ideas submitted OUTSIDE OF the annual TMA research planning process, for these categories of sources: PA, national lab, manufacturer , entropreneur, etc.) "The PA's believe this is not suited for a metrix with targets because ETP does not control the number of submissions nor their sources. Targets are set in a way to avoid foring ETP to arbitrarity change existing processes in a way that may negatively impact the effectiveness of the program. Targets and sources may be updated in collaboration with ED after all 3P contracts are awarded | ETP-T6c Number and source (as reported by submitter) of project ideas submitted OUTSIDE OF the annual TPM research planning process by Manufacturer | Emerging Technologies (ET) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | TBD | tbd* | tbd* | 2 cumulative ³ | 1 TBD | TBD | Data for this metric will be gathered from 3P TPM Implementers annually. If ideas are submitted both outside and as part of the TPM-aligned research planning process, it can be reported under bit TP-76 and EPT-77. Ideas may be submitted by more than one source and will be counted under each. | ETP-T1 through ETP-T8 are in a table titled "Emerging Technologies Tracking (Reporting)" and are separate from the metrics ETP-M1 through ETP-M2 in the table titled "Emerging Technologies Metrics" in Attachment A do 11.8-05.41. RNA and proposed that tracking metrics have no targets in the July 14, 2017 metrics filing, however the commission ruled that these tracking metrics have targets. "Submitted" refers to an idea submitted through a formal submission process. | |
| 324 | SCE | A15 ETP- : T6d | 1 () i | Count of projec ideas by entrepreneurs | t Project Idea Tracing | Metric | ETP-TG4 Number and source (as reported by submitter) of project ideas submitted OUTSDE OF the annual TPM research planning process, for these categories of sources: PA, national lab, manufacturer, entrgeneur , etc.) "The PA's believe this is not suited for a metrix with targets because ETP does not control the number of submissions nor their sources. Targets are set in a way to avoid forcing ETP to arbitrariy change existing processes in a way that may negatively impact the effectiveness of the program. Targets and sources may be updated in collaboration with ED after all 3P contracts are awarded | ETP-TGO Number and source (as reported by submitter) of project ideas submitted OUTSIDE OF the annual TPM research planning process by Entrepreneur | Emerging Technologies (ET) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | TBD | tbd* | tbd* | 1 cumulative ¹ | ¹ TBD | TBD | Data for this metric will be gathered from 3 P TPM Implementers annually. // lideas are submitted both outside and as part of the TPM-aligned research planning process, it can be reported under both E TP-T6 and ETP-T7. Ideas may be submitted by more than one source and will be counted under each. | CTP-11 through ETP-18 are in a table titled "Energing Technologies Tracking (Reporting)" and are separate from the metrics ETP-41 through ETP-4A1 in the table titled "Energing Technologies Metrics" in Attachment A of D.18-05-041. PAs had proposed that Tracking metrics have no targets in the July 14, 2017 metrics filling. "Submitted" refers to an idea submitted through a formal submission process. | |
| 325 | SCE | A15 ETP- : T7a | 1 (| Count of projec ideas by PA | t Project Idea Tracing | Metric | ETP-T7a Number and source (as reported by yubmitter) of project ideas submitted AS PART OF the annual TPM reserved planning process, for these categories of sources: PA, national lab, manufacturer, entrepreneur, etc.) "The PAs believe this is no stude for a metric with targets because ETP does not control the number of submissions nor their sources Targets are set in a way to avoid forcing ETP to arbitrarily change existing processes in a way that may negatively impact the diffectiveness of the program. Targets and sources may be updated in collaboration with ED after all 3P | ETP-77a Number and source (as reported by submitter) of project ideas submitted AS PART OF the annual TPM research planning process by PA | Emerging Technologies (ET) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | TBD | tbd* | tbd* | 6 cumulative ³ | 1 TBD | TBD | Data for this metric will be gathered from 3P TPM Implementers. If ideas are submitted bott outside and as part of the TPM-aligned research planning process, it can be reported under both (TPT-5n eller TP-7.7 ideas may be submitted by more than one source and will be courted under each. | ETP-T1 through ETP-T8 are in a table titled "Energing Technologies Tracking (Reporting)" and are separate from the metrics ETP-M1 through ETP-M7 in the table titled "Emerging Technologies Metrics" in Attachment A of 0.18 40-301. PAs had proposed that tracking metrics have no targets in the July 14, 2017 metrics filing, however the commission ruled that these tracking metrics must have targets. "Submitted" refers to an idea submitted through a formal submission process. | |
| 326 | SCE | A15 ETP- : T7b | 1 (i | Count of projec ideas by nationa labs | t Project Idea Tracing al | Metric | Contrast and effectives EPT-TP humber and source (as reported by submitter) of project clieas submitted AS PART OF the annual TPM research planning process, for these categories of sources: PA, national lab, manufacturer, entrepreneur, etc.) "The PAs believe this is no suited for a metric with targets because ETP does not control the number of submissions nor their sources Targets are set in a way to avoid forcing ETP to arbitrarily change existing processes in a way that may negatively impact the directioness of the gragma. Targets and sources may be updated in collaboration with ED after all 3P | ETP-T7b Number and source (as reported by submitter) of project ideas submitted AS PART OF the annual TPM research planning process by National Lab | Emerging Technologies (ET) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | TBD | tbd* | tbd* | 2 cumulative1 | 1 TBD | TBD | Data for this metric will be gathered from 3P TPM Implementers. If ideas are submitted bott outside and as part of the TPM-aligned research planning process, it can be reported under both (ETP-To are ETP-T7. Ideas may be submitted by more than one source and will be counted under each. | ETP-T1 through ETP-T8 are in a table titled "Emerging Technologies Tracking (Reporting)" and are separate from the metrics ETP-M1 through ETP-M7 in the table titled "Emerging Technologies Metrics" in Attachment A do 11.8-05.41. RNs had proposed that tracking metrics have to targets in the July 14, 2017 metrics filing, however the commission ruled that these tracking metrics have targets. "Submitted" refers to an idea submitted through a formal submission process. | |

| Spreadshee | t AttA | AttA | Method | Units of | | Metric/ | | | | | Baseline | | | | She | ort Term Target | | Mid Term Target | Long Term Target | | | |
|------------|---------|---------------|--------|--|----------------------|-----------|--|--|------------------------------------|---------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| Index | PA Page | Order | Code | Measurement | Metric Type | Indicator | Business Plan Att A Description | Metric | Sector | Baseline Year | Numerator | Baseline Denominator | Baseline Number | 2017 Number | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | (2021-2023) | (2024-2025) | Methodology | Key Definitions | Proxy Explanation |
| 327 | SCE A15 | ETP- 1 T7c | | Count of project Proj ideas by manufacturers | ject Idea Tracing | Metric | TFP-TrC Number and source (as reported by submitter) of project ideas submitted AS PART OF the annual TPM resear planning process, for these categories of sources: PA, nation iab, manufacturer , entrepreneur, etc.) ⁺ The PAb believe this is not suited for a metrix with trapest because ET does not control the number of submissions nor their sources. Target are set in a way that may negatively inpact the effectiveness of the program. Targets and sources may be updated in collaboration with ED after all 3P contracts are avaarded | EFP-T7C Number and source (as reported by 6 submitted) of project ideas submitted AS PART OF hal the annual TPM research planning process by 8 Manufacturer 15 | Emerging Technologies (ET) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | TBD | tbd* | tbd* | 2 cumulative1 | TBD | TBD | Data for this metric will be gathered from 3.9 TPM Implementers. If ideas are submitted both outside and as part of the TPM-aligned research planning process, it can be reported under both ETP-TG and ETP-T7. Meas may be submitted by more than one source and will be counted under each. | eTP-11 through ETP-18 are in a table titled "Emerging Technologies Tracking (Reporting)" and are separate from the metrics ETP-M11 through ETP-M7 in the table titled "Emerging Technologies Metrics" in Attachment A dD 1.845-041. PA had proposed that tracking metrics have no targets in the July 14, 2017 metrics filing, however the commission ruled that these tracking metrics mat have targets. "Submitted" refers to an idea submitted through a formal submission process. | |
| 328 | SCE A15 | ETP- 1 T7d | | Count of project Proj ideas by entrepreneurs | ject Idea Tracing | Metric | ETP-TT4 Number and source (as reported by submitter) of project ideas submitted AS PART OF the annual TPM resear planning process, for these categories of sources: PA, nation Iab, manufacturer, entropreneur , etc.) ^T The PAb believe this is not suited for a metrix with trapest because ETP does not control the number of submissions nor their sources. Target are set in a way to avoid forcing ETP to arbitrarily change existing processes in a way that may negatively impact the effectiveness of the program. Targets and sources may be updated in collaboration with ED after all 3P contracts are awarded | ETP-T74 Number and source (as reported by h submitted) of project ideas submitted AS PART OF hal the annual TPM research planning process by s Entrepreneur | Emerging Technologies (ET) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | TBD | tbd* | tbd* | 1 cumulative1 | TBD | TBD | Dat for this metric will be gathered from 39 TPM Implementers. If ideas are submitted both outside and as part of the TPM-aligned research planning process, it can be reported under both ETP-T6 and ETP-T7. Meas may be submitted by more than one source and will be counted under each. | EP-11 through ETP-18 are in a table titled "Emerging Technologies Tracking (Reporting)" and are separate from the metrics ETP-M1 through ETP-M7 in the table titled "Emerging Technologies Metrics' in Intachment A of D.18-05-041. PAS had proposed that tracking metrics have no targets in the July 14, 2017 metrics filing, however the commission ruled that these tracking metrics mut have targets. "Submitted" refers to an idea submitted through a formal submission process. | |
| 329 | SW A16 | ETP-T8 1 | | Number of lists Stat | tewide Goal Alignmen | it Metric | CTP-TS: List of CTP projects aligned with statewide goals thus were initiated in the reporting year with specificity as to wh spect of each goal it is fulfilling. Goals will also be labeled the CTP database. A list of eligible goals will be developed collaboratively with ED. | t ETP-18: List of ETP projects aligned with statewide last goals that were initiated in the reporting year with n specificity as to what aspect of each goal it is fulfilling | e Emerging Technologies th (ET) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 3 lists cumulative | 3 lists cumulative | e 2 lists cumulative | TBD | TBD | Data for this metric will be gathered from 39 TPM Implementers. An ETP project may align with multiple statewide goals and will be listed under each goal. ** | EIP-11 through EIP-18 are in a table titled "Emerging Technologies Tracking (Reporting)" and are separate from the metrics ETP A11 through ETP-A17 in the table titled "Emerging Technologies Metrics" in Attachment Ad D.1340-5041. PAS had proposed that tracking metrics have no targets in the July 14, 2017 metrics" filing, however the commission ruled that these tracking metrics must have targets. The "Statewide goals" will be tracked will be developed and updated in collaboration with ED as needed. Projects are considered "initiated" when project budget has been approved and finding allocated. | |

¹In the August 6, 2018 metrics compliance filing, SCE inadvertantly reported these targets for 2018 when in fact, they should have been reported as targets for 2020.

Column Index

Southern California Edison

EE Sector Metrics with Targets - ED Template Column Index

Each metric in this workbook can be mapped to the Final Business Plan Decision Attachment A metric using page number (AttA Page) and the order of the metric within the table of sectorlevel metrics (AttA Order). Because there are some collinear metrics in Attachment A and some multi-part metrics, we have further coded the metric with Metric Type (Method Code is a shorthand for Metric Type) to make distinctions between the multiple parts of the metric. Note that (net vs gross), (kW vs kWh vs Therm) and (PAC vs TRC) have not been coded separately, but instead can be distinguished by looking at the "Units of Measurement" column.

Each unique metric, including each part of a multi-part metric, is a separate row. Baselines, 2018, 2019, 2020, Mid-, and Long-Term targets for each metric is reported on the same row.

| Column Name | Column Description |
|----------------------|--|
| PA | Program Administrator |
| AttA Page | Attachment A Page |
| AttA Order | Attachment A order of metric in the sector metrics table in Attachment A |
| Method Code | (PA use) Code indicating a unique metric calculation methodology or definition was used |
| Metric Type | (PA Use) Metric type |
| Metric Language | Language of the metric from D.18-05-041 Attachment A |
| Sector | Sector |
| Baseline Year | Baseline year is 2016, unless there was no activity in 2016, in which case the baseline was set for a year in which there was activity |
| Baseline Number | Data from PA |
| 2018 Target | Data from PA |
| 2019 Target | Data from PA |
| 2020 Target | Data from PA |
| Mid Term Target | Data from PA |
| (2021-2023) | |
| Long Term Target | Data from PA |
| (2024-2025) | |
| Units of Measurement | Units of measurement |
| | |
| Methodology | Short description of metric calculation |
| Key Definitions | Key definitions for metric |
| Was Proxy Used? Y/N | Flag for use of proxy in calculation of metric |
| Proxy Explanation | Explanation of how proxy was calculated, what secondary data sources were used, and when PA plans to be able to use primary data for metric. |

Definitions

Southern California Edison

EE Sector Metrics with Targets - Definitions

| | Term | Definition |
|----|--|--|
| 1 | Service Account | A service account is a system generated number that uniquely identifies a billable entity |
| 2 | Eligible Population | Total number of service accounts in sector/segment |
| 3 | Disadvantaged Communities | Service account address located in zip codes that contain CalEnviroScreen 3.0 census tracts. |
| 4 | Hard-to-Reach | D p. 43 - Resolution G-3497, modified to "include disadvantaged communities (as designated by CalEPA) in the geographic criteria for |
| | | determined by 2014 Aspen Research study. |
| 5 | MT CO2eq | Conversion of kWh and Therms to MTCO2eq as reported by CEDARS |
| 6 | Levelized Cost | PAC and TRC cost (excluding C&S), as output from the CET Tool |
| 7 | Residential Single Family | Service account on residential rates, with dwelling code of single family home or single family dwelling. |
| 8 | Participant | A unique person or entity identified through a service account and who participants in a ratepayer funded energy efficiency interventi |
| 9 | Household | Residential serivce account |
| 10 | Opt-In/Opt-Out Program | Opt-in programs are voluntary and participation is at the discretion of the individual and/or entity. Opt-out programs are those where |
| | | their option to opt-out. Opower/HER is the only Opt-Out program. |
| 11 | Residential Multifamily | MF/SF designation based on dwelling codes in service accounts. Number of units = 2 or more. |
| 12 | Project | Energy efficiency efforts where the customer financial incentives and energy savings are determined using a site-specific analysis of th |
| | | building components |
| 13 | Building | Any structure used or intended to support or shelter any use or occupancy, that receives energy from a utility |
| 14 | Property | A property is a collection of buildings and/or structures within a defined proximity and is intended to support or shelter any use or occ |
| 15 | Energy Savings per Square Foot (depth of intervention) | Sq footage of EE-addressed space, as defined by individual implementation plans |
| 16 | Square feet of eligible population participating (by property) | Sq footage of participating properties captured when provided. |
| 17 | In Unit | Living space as designated by a unique service account and/or dwelling codes. |
| 18 | Common Area | Shared space within a property, designated by dwelling codes, a "common area" flag, and/or by use of a commercial meter. |
| 19 | Master Metered | Define using rate class, or rate class and/or by dwelling code. Non-overlapping with in-unit |
| 20 | Unit | Service accounts within MF property. Non-overlapping with Master Metered. |
| 21 | Square Feet of Eligible Population | Sq footage of defined space per metric definition. |
| 22 | Public Sector | Per SDG&E BP application (p. 102), "the public sector came to be defined as the group of customers that are tax-payer funded, have p |
| | | budgeting and decision-making process." |
| | | Local Gov't: Cities, Counties, Special Districts, Solid Waste Facilities, Water / Wastewater Facilities, Hospitals, Correctional Facilities. |
| | | State: State Buildings, State Park Facilities, Hospitals, Correctional Facilities. |
| | | Federal: Federal Buildings, US Postal Service, Hospitals, Ports, Military Bases. Native American Tribes |
| | | Public Education (double check): K-12 Schools (Schools, Admin Buildings), Higher Education (e.g., UC/CSU), community colleges |
| | | Special exceptions on a case by case basis, determined by PAs based on customer of record. |
| 23 | Facility | A structure or collection of structures, covered or uncovered, that typically encompass processing or production capabilities |
| 24 | Project Building Floor Plan Area | Sq footage of EE-addressed space, as defined by individual implementation plans |
| 25 | Program-Backed Financing | Loan amount |
| 26 | Water/Waste Water Facility | A structure or collection of structures, covered or uncovered, that encompass water/waste water treatment processes. EE savings are |
| 27 | Annual Flow | Flow (in millions of gallons per day) of water/wastewater as reported by the water/waste water facility |
| 28 | Current Benchmark | Benchmarked via Portfolio Manager in the calendar year |
| 29 | Investments made by ratepayers and private capital | Project incentive vs project cost |
| 30 | Customer Satisifaction | Per consistent survey, to be developed |
| 31 | Trade Ally Satisfaction | Per consistent survey, to be developed |
| 32 | Customer Size - Small | A service account with <50 kW demand |
| 33 | Customer Size - Medium | A service account with 50 - 250 kW demand |
| 34 | Customer Size - Large | A service account with >250 kW demand |

| eria for hard to reach customers." Hard-to-reach zipcodes |
|---|
| |
| |
| |
| tervention |
| |
| se where individuals and/or entities are defaulted into with |
| |
| vsis of the customer's existing and proposed equipment and/or |
| |
| se or occupancy, that receives energy from a utility |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| , have political mandates, and that must go through a public |
| lities. |
| |

vings are intended to be captured at the facility level.

Attachment E Description of Program Changes

Description of Program Changes

Programs and Subprograms Proposed To Be Discontinued

Resource Programs:

1. Energy Upgrade California Program (SCE-13-SW-001D)

SCE has made multiple improvements since program inception to improve the Energy Upgrade California Home Upgrade ("Home Upgrade") program; however, the Home Upgrade program continues to have a very low cost-effectiveness ratio as shown in the table below. SCE does not anticipate the TRC improving, and therefore SCE proposes to discontinue this program to improve the costeffectiveness of its EE portfolio. SCE has communicated to Southern California Gas Company, vendors, and contractors its intention to close this program.

| | | Brogram | | Histori | cal TRC | |
|----------------|---------------------------|----------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|
| Program ID | Program Name | Category | 2015 ¹ | 2016 ¹ | 2017 ¹ | 2018 ² |
| SCE-13-SW-001D | Energy Upgrade California | Resource | 0.16 | 0.20 | 0.18 | 0.18 |

[1] TRC calculation for 2015-2017 includes 5% Market Effects and was run using the 2013 set of avoided costs.[2] TRC calculation for 2018 uses 2017 actuals, rerun using 2018 avoided costs, with 5% market effects.

2. IDEEA 365 (SCE-13-TP-020)

The intent of the IDEEA365 Program is to find, fund, and foster the best EE and IDSM delivery approaches available in the marketplace; however, because SCE will be conducting open solicitations for innovative and cost-effective third-party proposed, designed, and implemented programs as directed in D.18-01-004, this program is no longer needed. As such, SCE proposes to close this program and direct future program ideas to its open solicitations.

| Program ID | | Brogram | | Histori | cal TRC | |
|---------------|-------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | Program Name | Category | 2015 ¹ | 2016 ¹ | 2017 ¹ | 2018 ² |
| SCE-13-TP-020 | IDEEA365 Program ³ | Resource | 0.06 | 0.70 | - | - |

[1] TRC calculation for 2015-2017 includes 5% Market Effects and was run using the 2013 set of avoided costs.

[2] TRC calculation for 2018 uses 2017 actuals, rerun using 2018 avoided costs, with 5% market effects.

[3] Starting 2017, MICE and WISE were removed from IDEEA365 and became standalone programs.

3. Cool Schools Program (SCE-13-TP-013)

The Cool Schools program assists public and private schools with energy efficiency and conservation. Cool Schools utilizes the knowledge and communication channels of trusted institutions and provides financial assistance to accelerate the replacement of existing equipment near the end of its useful life with new, more energy-efficient equipment.

The Cool Schools program is not as financially attractive to customers as turnkey programs. Furthermore, the reduction in Proposition 39 funding has caused many school customers to only bring their buildings up to code instead of achieving savings above code. For these reasons, SCE does not foresee the cost effectiveness of this program increasing over time. In order to maintain the cost-effectiveness of the overall portfolio, SCE proposes to discontinue the Cool Schools program. Please see the table below for the Cool Schools Program's historical TRC ratio.

In 2016, SCE notified vendors that this program will be closed pending Commission approval. In addition in 2017, SCE stopped marketing the program to customers and stopped accepting new project applications.

| Program ID | | Brogram | | Histori | rical TRC | |
|---------------|--------------|----------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|
| | Program Name | Category | 2015 ¹ | 2016 ¹ | 2017 ¹ | 2018 ² |
| SCE-13-TP-013 | Cool Schools | Resource | - | 0.47 | 0.54 | 0.47 |

TRC calculation for 2015-2017 includes 5% Market Effects and was run using the 2013 set of avoided costs.
 TRC calculation for 2018 uses 2017 actuals, rerun using 2018 avoided costs, with 5% market effects.

4. Commercial Utility Building Efficiency (SCE-13-TP-014)

Commercial Utility Building Efficiency (CUBE) provides audits, technical assistance, and incentives to support installation of recommended EE equipment at privately owned commercial office buildings. Changes in claimable energy savings due to Title 24 updates and changes in Industry Standard Practice (ISP) assumptions have drastically reduced the number of eligible measures for CUBE; therefore, SCE does not believe the cost effectiveness of this program will increase in the future. In order to improve the cost-effectiveness of the overall portfolio, SCE proposes to discontinue the program. Please see the table below for the CUBE Program's historical TRC ratio.

The existing commercial building customer base can be served by other programs in SCE's portfolio. In 2016, SCE notified vendors that this program will be closed pending Commission approval. In 2017, SCE stopped marketing the program to customers and stopped accepting new projects.

| Program ID | | Brogram | Historical TRC | | | | |
|---------------|--|----------|--------------------------|---|------|--------------------------|--|
| | Program Name | Category | 2015 ¹ | 15 ¹ 2016 ¹ 2017 ¹ | | 2018 ² | |
| SCE-13-TP-014 | Commercial Utility Building Efficiency | Resource | 0.75 | 0.51 | 0.86 | 0.62 | |

[1] TRC calculation for 2015-2017 includes 5% Market Effects and was run using the 2013 set of avoided costs.

[2] TRC calculation for 2018 uses 2017 actuals, rerun using 2018 avoided costs, with 5% market effects.

5. Energy Leader Partnership Program (SCE-12-L-002Rollup)

The intent of the Energy Leader Partner (ELP) Program is to support new local governments in SCE's service territory by identifying and implementing EE opportunities in municipal facilities and increasing community awareness of, and participation in, demand-side-management programs. SCE proposes to close this program and not add new Partnerships while we focus on improving cost effectiveness in this segment. SCE will provide similar support to local governments through its existing Local Government Partnership (LGP) programs and, if needed and cost effective, SCE will file an Advice Letter to create a new program when a local government is interested in becoming an LGP.

Although the ELP Program is considered a resource program, SCE has not claimed any savings for the program from 2015-2018, as shown below. As such, SCE does not anticipate the TRC improving over time.

| | | Brogram | Historical TRC | | | | |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Program ID | ID Program Name Category | Category | 2015 ¹ | 2016 ¹ | 2017 ¹ | 2018 ² | |
| SCE-13-L-002Roll | Energy Leader Partnership Program | Resource | - | - | - | - | |

TRC calculation for 2015-2017 includes 5% Market Effects and was run using the 2013 set of avoided costs.
 TRC calculation for 2018 uses 2017 actuals, rerun using 2018 avoided costs, with 5% market effects.

6. ARRA- Originated Financing - EmPower (SCE-13-SW-007B)

The emPower Central Coast Energy Efficiency Financing Program is a continuation of financing programs originally supported by American Recovery and Reinvestment Act ("ARRA") stimulus funding in 2012 and implemented by the County of Santa Barbara. Subsequently in 2015 it was scaled up to include Ventura and San Luis Obispo counties. The Program was created to streamline the process of attaining low-cost unsecured loans, recruitment and training of local contractors, and directing customers to utility rebates to help homeowners overcome the high upfront cost associated with energy efficiency upgrades. EmPower was also meant to coordinate with and enhance the Participating Utilities Energy Upgrade California program ("EUC Program") by driving customer participation and qualifying those projects for loans.

After careful consideration and on-going evaluation of the program's performance and expenditures, the IOUs (SoCalGas, PG&E, SCE) have uniformly determined that the program has not achieved the level of unsecured loans and energy efficiency project savings to make it cost-effective, and therefore to discontinue the program. A contributing factor has been lack of success in generation of direct participation in Investor-Owned Utilities Core EE residential rebate programs, particularly with respect to Energy Upgrade CA. Other reasons for program closure include the recent 3CREN approval to move forward with a program that will include Workforce Education and Training in the same counties for contractors and the CHEEF Residential Energy Efficiency Loan (REEL) program, which is duplicative of emPower's residential home loan efforts. On July 26th, an official communication was delivered to the County stating the utilities decision to discontinue funding of the program, and the submittal of such intention through the 2019 ABAL. In partnership with the County, current discussions are underway to develop and provide input as to their program activities ramp-down plan, as well as a stakeholder communication plan.

| Program ID | | Brogram | | Histori | cal TRC | |
|----------------|--|----------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------|-------------------|
| | Program Name | Category | 2015 ¹ | 2016 ¹ 2017 ¹ | | 2018 ² |
| SCE-13-SW-007B | ARRA-Originated Financing ³ | Resource | - | - | - | - |
| | | - | | | | |

[1] TRC calculation for 2015-2017 includes 5% Market Effects and was run using the 2013 set of avoided costs.

[2] TRC calculation for 2018 uses 2017 actuals, rerun using 2018 avoided costs, with 5% market effects.

[3] Financing programs are considered resource, but do not have savings attributed to the program.

Non- Resource Programs:

1. Cool Planet Program (SCE-13-TP-002)

The Cool Planet Program is a non-resource program that provides utility business customers with education and technical training to measure and manage their energy use and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Customers earn public recognition and awards of 1-, 2-, or 3-year memberships with The Climate Registry based on meeting kWh energy savings or demand response program participation thresholds. The Cool Planet Program also includes a water-energy GHG education pilot program that offers a clear means to quantify, compare, and analyze the GHG emissions embedded in delivered water using a consistent and transparent methodology.

Due to the lack of success of the program and to improve the cost-effectiveness of the overall portfolio, SCE will discontinue the Cool Planet Program. As an added benefit, this effort will also allow for alignment to SCE's Public Sector design and open up new opportunities for both water-energy initiatives and education. At the end of the year, SCE will communicate the program closure to customers as well as through the program vendor (i.e., The Climate Registry) and water districts.

2. Lighting Market Transformation Program (SCE-13-SW-005A)

Lighting Market Transformation (LMT) is a non-resource program that promotes efficient lighting technologies. This includes developing innovative data-driven program strategies to use in utility lighting programs. However, due to the adoption of LED technology in the market, LMT's success in supporting efficient progression of lighting solutions into customer EE programs, and the adoption of code requirements for efficient lighting technologies, LMT is no longer necessary.

3. Lighting Innovation Program (SCE-13-SW-005B)

Lighting Innovation (LI) is a non-resource subprogram that evaluates products or program approaches that are new to the market and could potentially enter the Primary Lighting Program or the Commercial, Industrial, and Agricultural EE Programs. While the program provides valuable information on lighting challenges and barriers that exist, activities conducted in the LI subprogram can be administered in the Emerging Technologies Program. Emerging Technologies will continue to support programs by evaluating products and or program approaches under a new Technology Focused Pilot activity. This includes evaluating innovative data-driven program strategies to use in lighting programs and coordination with Codes & Standards. However, it will be up to third parties that are new to the market and could potentially enter the Primary Lighting Program or the Commercial, Industrial, and Agricultural EE Programs to do so.

4. WE&T Planning (SCE-13-SW-010C)

Workforce Education and Training (WE&T) is a non-resource program that involves management and execution of several strategic statewide planning tasks, including holding annual WE&T public workshops and stakeholder engagement sessions, conducting needs assessments, and hiring industry subject matter experts and consultants to assist in the development of a comprehensive approach to WE&T program design and implementation. While the program does provide some value to customers, the program is not cost-effective because it does not deliver energy savings. Thus, WE&T Planning will be discontinued to improve the cost effectiveness of the portfolio. As noted above, SCE recommends the Commission consider removing the costs of WE&T programs from the cost-effectiveness evaluations as part of the Market Transformation policy issues that will be considered in Phase III of R.13-11-005.

5. WE&T – Mobile Energy Unit

The Mobile Education Unit (MEU) Program is a non-resource customer outreach program designed to increase awareness and participation in SCE's Energy Efficiency, Demand Response, Self-Generation, and Income Qualified programs. MEU attends various community-based events throughout SCE's service territory. While the program does provide some value to end user residential customers, the program is not cost-effective because it does not deliver energy savings. Thus, MEU will be discontinued. Internal and external stakeholders, including the Customer Call Center, will be notified of the program's closure through website updates, email blasts, and formal communication.

6. WE&T – Community Language Efficiency Outreach

The Community Language Efficiency Outreach (CLEO) Program is a non-resource, language-based customer outreach program designed to increase awareness and participation in SCE's Energy Efficiency, Demand Response, Self-Generation, and Income Qualified programs. CLEO attends various community-based events throughout SCE's service territory to educate customers on the programs and services available to them in their primary language. While the program does provide some value to end user residential customers, the program is not cost-effective because it does not deliver energy savings. Thus, CLEO will be discontinued. Internal and external stakeholders, including the Customer Call Center, will be notified of the Program's closure through website updates, email blasts, and formal communication.

7. Sustainable Communities Pilot Program (SCE-13-TP-019)

SCE's Sustainable Communities Program (SCP) is a non-resource program that provides design and technical assistance, training, and other professional resources to new construction projects. The purpose of SCP is to advance new construction projects beyond Title 24 requirements to achieve Zero Net Energy (ZNE). As part of the 2018 –2025 EE Business Plan, SCEs Codes and Standards program already plans to enhance its Planning and Coordination sub-program to include ZNEpreparedness activities to support the building industry in reaching ZNE; specifically, ZNE-preparedness activities with an emphasis on residential new construction through design and technical assistance, pilots, and other industry-supporting activities. Additionally, the Codes and Standards and Emerging Technologies Programs will continue to coordinate activities to leverage the successes of the past SCP and ZNE projects. SCE is eliminating the SCP to avoid overlapping efforts and, thereby, optimizing the cost-effectiveness of the EE portfolio.

8. Integrated Demand Side Management Program (SCE-13-SW-006)

SCE's Energy Efficiency Integrated Demand Side Management Program (EE IDSM) is a non-resource program that encourages programs to integrate the full range of demand-side management (DSM) options; however, a specific EE IDSM program is no longer needed as SCE transitions to third-party proposed, designed, and implemented programs through the upcoming third party solicitations where bidders will be encouraged to propose IDSM approaches in support of the IDSM efforts directed by the Commission in D.18-05-041. SCE will also continue to foster IDSM through the DR IDSM program and associated budget.

Program Realignments

1. Strategic Energy Management (SCE-13-SW-003D)

SCE will consolidate the Agriculture Continuous Energy Improvement Program (SCE-13-SW-004D), Commercial Continuous Energy Improvement Program (SCE-13-SW-002E), and the Industrial Continuous Energy Improvement Program (SCE-13-SW-003D), into a single program named the Strategic Energy Management program (previously the program number for the Industrial Continuous Energy Improvement Program). The Strategic Energy Management (SEM) program is a resource program that provides a concierge approach in identifying, assisting, and implementing EE projects with a whole facility focus. SEM is a milestone-based program with eight workshops that span 26 months. The purpose of the workshops is to educate and deliver savings to the customer. The concierge service will have one implementer and one point of contact to assist the contractor through the sunrise and sunset of EE projects with a whole-building approach.

2. Commercial Continuous Energy Improvement (SCE-13-SW-002E)

Per the discussion above, SCE will consolidate the Agriculture Continuous Energy Improvement Program, Commercial Continuous Energy Improvement Program, and the Industrial Continuous Energy Improvement Program into a single program named the Strategic Energy Management (SEM) program.

3. Agricultural Continuous Energy Improvement (SCE-13-SW-004D)

Per the discussion above, SCE will consolidate the Agriculture Continuous Energy Improvement Program, Commercial Continuous Energy Improvement Program, and the Industrial Continuous Energy Improvement Program into a single program named the Strategic Energy Management (SEM) program.

4. Industrial Continuous Energy Improvement

Per the discussion above, SCE will consolidate the Agriculture Continuous Energy Improvement Program, Commercial Continuous Energy Improvement Program, and the Industrial Continuous Energy Improvement Program into a single program named the Strategic Energy Management (SEM) program.

New Programs and Subprograms

The following programs are existing programs that began as pilots but do not have formal implementation plans and Programs IDs.

1. Midstream Point of Purchase (SCE-13-SW-002H)

The Midstream Point of Purchase (MPOP) program provides incentives at the point of purchase through participating distributors of certain pre-approved energy-efficient products. The MPOP program encourages distributors to purchase and stock higher quantities of high-efficiency equipment. MPOP's instant rebate at the point of purchase facilitates customer decisions to purchase high-efficiency equipment by reducing both the equipment cost premium and the effort required to submit an application. SCE reimburses the participating distributor a pre-authorized incentive amount for each qualifying product sold to an eligible business customer. The distributor collects the customer information at the point of purchase and provides product data to SCE through an online tool for invoice processing. SCE validates the customer and product data and issues payment to the distributor. MPOP began as a pilot in SCE's Lighting Innovation program. Below is the forecasted TRC of the program.

| Reagent ID | Program ID Program Name | Brogram Category | Forecasted TRC |
|----------------|-----------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Program ID | Program Name | Program Category | Year 2019 |
| SCE-13-SW-002H | Midstream Piont of Purchase | Resource | 1.12 |

2. Water Infrastructure and System Efficiency Program (SCE-13-TP-002)

The Water Infrastructure and System Efficiency Program (WISE) program is the result of a successful IDEEA365 offering from 2014. The WISE program will leverage data from the Pump Efficiency Services Program (a successful SCE waterenergy program that produces significant water and energy savings) as a baseline for the new pump measures. WISE will target water-energy solutions at all major areas of water in SCE's service territory (e.g., source water pumping, water treatment, water distribution, and waste water treatment). WISE will also look at benchmarking opportunities and audit functions as well as installations with an emphasis on measures such as system optimization, pump efficiency, and pump repair for customers, including those from SCE's Government and Institutional Partnership programs. Below is the forecasted TRC of the program.

| Program ID | Program Name | Brogram Catagory | Forecasted TRC |
|---------------|---|------------------|----------------|
| | Program Name | Program Category | Year 2019 |
| SCE-13-TP-002 | Water Infrastructure and System Effciency Program | Resource | 0.36 |

3. AB793 Residential Pay for Performance Program (SCE-13-TP-024)

California Assembly Bill 793 (AB 793), and the associated Commission Resolution E-4820, mandates all IOUs to develop and implement incentive programs targeting residential customers who acquire Energy Management Technologies (EMTs). Pursuant to Resolution E-4820, program offerings should include a mechanism to incentivize residential customers to acquire EMTs to meet EE savings goals under a pay-for-performance model. In 2017, SCE issued a Request for Offer (RFO) to seek cost effective, and "ready-to-implement" proposals from qualified third-parties to initiate a Pay-for-Performance program that links incentives directly to measured energy savings. As a result, SCE awarded Home Energy Analytics (HEA) a contract to design, implement, and administrator the Home Intel Program. The Home Intel Program will assist residential customers to quickly and accurately understand their home's energy usage and implement a cost-effective path to savings. Below is the forecasted TRC of the program.

| Brogram ID | rogram ID Program Name | Brogram Category | Forecasted TRC |
|---------------|--|------------------|----------------|
| Program ID | Program Name | Program Category | Year 2019 |
| SCE-13-TP-024 | AB 793 Residential Pay for Performance | Resource | 0.73 |

4. Facilities Assessment (SCE-13-TP-025)

Pursuant to AB 793 described above, SCE created the Facilities Assessment Program, a third-party implemented program that will provide services to SCE customers that will allow them to better manage their energy usage, identify behavioral, retro-commissioning, and operational-based energy saving opportunities, and achieve energy savings by utilizing energy management technology or software. The program will be a resource program designed to leverage the investment SCE has made in its Advanced Meter Infrastructure (AMI) deployment through data analytics and customer engagement. Savings resulting from the Facilities Assessment Program will be calculated using the Normalized Metered Energy Consumption (NMEC) approach.

| Brogram ID | Program Name | Branco m Coto com | Forecasted TRC |
|---------------|-----------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Program ID | Program Name | Program Category | Year 2019 |
| SCE-13-TP-025 | Facilities Assessment | Resource | 0.61 |

5. <u>National and International Standards (Sub-Program of the Codes &</u> <u>Standards Program)</u>

National and International Standards is a new category of activities that focuses on both federal regulations as well as voluntary codes that are developed at a national level and directly impact IOU customers. California codes and standards need to align with and reflect international as well as national standards. The purpose of this new category is to help ensure such an alignment by identifying and participating in the various processes associated with national code development bodies such as the U.S. Department of Energy, the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE), the International Code Council (ICC), as well as national organizations that oversee national voluntary standards such as the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the U.S. Green Building Council, the Collaborative for High Performance Schools (CHPS), and other national organizations such as the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) and the U.S. Legislature. This will be a non-resource program, so no TRC estimate is provided as shown in the table below.

| Program ID | Program Name | Brogram Category | Forecasted TRC |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| | Program Name | Flogram Category | Year 2019 |
| SCE-13-SW-008F | National and International Standards | Non-Resource | N/A |

Expanded Programs (By More Than 40 Percent Change in Funding)

1. <u>Residential Direct Install (SCE-13-TP-024)</u>

Residential Direct Install is a cost-effective program designed to provide comprehensive EE measures to residential customers and enhance the EE knowledge and program participation of the residential market segment in an effort to drive them to undertake deeper EE activities and retrofits. Funding for this program increased by greater than 40% due to the increase of potential high TRC projects that will be completed in 2019. In addition, this program has an increased budget due to its cost-effectiveness when compared with other portfolio offerings. No significant program modifications are proposed for 2018; however, SCE will continue to review this and other programs for potential improvements to cost-effectiveness.

2. Enhanced Retro-commissioning (SCE-13-TP-021)

The Enhanced Retro-commissioning Program provides comprehensive IDSM solutions for customers by using advanced analytical tools to identify retrocommissioning opportunities in complex buildings, including large commercial offices, hospitals, and resorts. This program has the potential to capture significant cost-effective savings in the future using an NMEC approach. The funding level increased by greater than 40% to ramp-up program activities.

3. Local Government Programs

Local Government Programs provide support to local governments in SCE's service territory in order to identify and address EE opportunities in municipal facilities, take actions that support the California Long-Term EE Strategic Plan (CLTEESP or "Strategic Plan") and increase community awareness of, and participation in, demand-side management opportunities. A key goal of SCE's Local Government Partnerships is to help cities and counties lead by example by addressing EE first in their own municipal facilities. Funding for the following programs has been increased

by greater than 40% to allow for increased activities and participation in these programs:

- Gateway Cities (SCE-13-L-002F)
- Orange County Cities (SCE-13-L-002L)
- Ventura County (SCE-13-L-002Q)
- Western Riverside (SCE-13-L-002R)
- West Side (SCE-13-L-002T)

4. Statewide Codes and Standards

The Statewide Codes and Standards (C&S) Program saves energy on behalf of ratepayers by influencing appliance and building standards and code-setting bodies, such as the CEC and the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), to strengthen and advance energy efficiency regulations by continuous improvements in and advancement of energy regulations, improving compliance with existing codes and standards, assisting local governments in developing ordinances that exceed statewide minimum requirements, and coordinating with other programs and entities to support the State's ambitious policy goals. The California Energy Commission recently underscored that they will place added focus on the Title 24 Building Efficiency Standards activities that continue to work towards the State's GHG reduction goals and move to a more GHG-based metric that promotes electrification. The Planning and Coordination subprogram will need to plan for additional energy efficiency activities that can support the CEC accordingly. The CEC has indicated a priority for the Title 24 Standards to be better harmonized with the electric grid which will require greater efforts to coordinate with the SCE transmission and distribution organization. In addition, increasing SCE's C&S budget will better align with the overall statewide Advocacy budget in preparation for the transition to the new statewide program model where funding will be based on load and saving allocation will be based on the funding provided by each statewide program administrator.

5. WE&T Connections (SW-13-SW-010B)

The WE&T Connections subprogram promotes energy efficiency and other DSM concepts, as well as energy awareness and green career pathways, through age appropriate education and teacher training at all grade levels from K-12 to postsecondary, as well as through community outreach. While the proposed program budget in this 2019 Advice Letter reflects an increase of greater than 40% from the current 2018 budget, SCE will be shifting funds to increase its 2018 budget as well. Once the fund shift occurs, the resulting budget difference between 2018 and 2019 will likely be less than 40%. Additional budget will be used to incorporate support for workforce standards into training curriculum offered through this program. SCE will continue to look for opportunities to increase the value of this and other non-resource programs.

6. Statewide Emerging Technologies Program (ETP)

The statewide Emerging Technologies Program (ETP) helps to bring new technologies and savings opportunities to the California IOUs' EE Portfolios. As the program administrators transition to the new statewide administration and third party model, ETP anticipates that additional funding is needed in several key areas including: developing a new statewide emerging products database and intake process; developing and executing the third party solicitations and associated documentation; developing the required Technology Focused Pilots (TFP); and, establishing a new quality management function associated with the new statewide and third party implemented program model.

In addition, ETP placed a number of projects on hold that were previously slated to be launched and committed under the 2018 budget due to uncertainty earlier in the year regarding the overall 2018 EE budget and other contracting delays. Some of these projects are now scheduled to begin in 2019, for which there are already negotiated scopes of work and in some cases signed letters of commitment. In late 2017 and into 2018, ETP also signed a record number of letters of commitment with partners for proposed projects associated with the California Energy Commission's Electric Program Investment Charge (EPIC) Program solicitations and Department of Energy solicitations. The signed letters of commitment are associated with key focus areas for SCE and the State of California, including ZNE and GHG reduction efforts. ETP would like to ensure that there is enough budget in 2019 to meet our commitments and to help transition to the new statewide and third party model.

Reduced Programs (By More Than 40 Percent Change in Funding)

1. Nonresidential HVAC Program (SCE-13-SW-002F)

The Nonresidential HVAC Program is a statewide program that implements a comprehensive set of strategies to promote high efficiency HVAC equipment and high quality installation and maintenance. Market penetration and associated budget and savings projections are significantly diminished due to impacts from a reduction in cost-effective measures, as well as a scarcity of equipment in the market that meet DEER high efficiency tier eligibility requirements. Due to these impacts, SCE has projected a reduced budget for this non-cost-effective statewide program.

2. Industrial Deemed Energy Efficiency Program (SCE-13-SW-003C)

The Industrial Deemed Energy Efficiency Program offers eligible business customers incentives that encourage common, standardized EE equipment retrofits. Deemed retrofit measures have fixed incentive amounts per measure unit and are intended for projects that have well defined energy and demand savings. SCE has seen reduced activity in this area in recent years. This can be attributed to reduced measure availability and decreased customer interest. The budget reduction reflects the current forecast of project commitments for 2019.

3. Agriculture Deemed Energy Efficiency Program (SCE-13-SW-004C)

The Agriculture Deemed Incentive Program offers eligible agricultural customers incentives that encourage common, standardized EE equipment retrofits. Deemed retrofit measures have fixed incentive amounts per measure unit and are intended for projects that have well defined energy and demand savings. SCE has seen reduced activity in this area in recent years. This can be attributed to reduced measure availability and decreased customer interest. SCE is reducing the 2019 budget given the reduced level of activity.

4. Lodging Energy Efficiency Program (SCE-13-TP-005)

The Lodging Energy Efficiency Program (LEEP) is a comprehensive EE retrofit program that delivers multi-measure retrofits and retro-commissioning to small, medium, and large lodging facilities. The Program provides an integrated approach to EE that is specifically tailored to the hotel and motel market segment, including spas and resorts, within SCE's service territory. The program also seeks out DR opportunities in this market segment. In 2019, SCE will begin to ramp down existing third-party programs and transition to new third-party program designs as part of SCE's third-party solicitation effort. The program will continue to be funded to complete committed projects in the pipeline as of the end of 2018.
5. <u>Comprehensive Chemical Products (SCE-13-TP-009)</u>

The Comprehensive Chemical Products Program delivers electric energy savings and demand reduction for the chemical and allied products, transportation equipment manufacturing, and beverage industries throughout SCE's service territory. In 2019, SCE will begin to ramp down existing third-party programs and transition to new third-party program designs as part of SCE's third-party solicitation effort. The program will continue to be funded to complete committed projects in the pipeline as of the end of 2018.

6. Comprehensive Petroleum Refining (SCE-13-TP-010)

The Comprehensive Petroleum Refining program targets all the major petroleum refineries and petroleum product manufacturers in SCE's service territory to produce long-term, cost-effective electrical energy savings. The program achieves this goal by implementing a comprehensive set of calculated and deemed approaches to address every major electrical operation within the oil refining and petroleum manufacturing industry. In 2019, SCE will begin to ramp down existing third-party programs and transition to new third-party program designs as part of SCE's third-party solicitation effort. The program will continue to be funded to complete committed projects in the pipeline as of the end of 2018.

7. Oil Production (SCE-13-TP-011)

The Oil Production program targets oil production facilities in SCE's service territory with the goal of producing long-term, cost-effective electrical energy savings by replacing or retrofitting existing motor and pumping systems with more efficient systems. In 2019, SCE will begin to ramp down existing third-party programs and transition to new third-party program designs as part of SCE's third-party solicitation effort. The program will continue to be funded to complete committed projects in the pipeline as of the end of 2018.

8. Local Government Programs

Local Government Programs provide support to local governments in SCE's service territory in order to identify and address EE opportunities in municipal facilities, take actions that support the California Long-Term EE Strategic Plan (CLTEESP or "Strategic Plan") and increase community awareness of, and participation in, demand-side management opportunities. A key goal of SCE's Local Government Partnerships is to help cities and counties lead by example by addressing EE first in their own municipal facilities. However, funding for the following programs has been reduced to align with a decrease in opportunities projected for 2019.

- Kern County (SCE-13-L-002K)
- San Joaquin Valley (SCE-13-L-002N)
- South Bay (SCE-13-L-002O)

- South Santa Barbara (SCE-13-L-002P)
- High Desert Regional (SCE-13-L-002S)
- North Orange County (SCE-13-L-002V)
- County of Riverside (SCE-13-L-003D)
- County of San Bernardino (SCE-13-L-003E)
- State of California (SCE-13-L-003F)
- UC/CSU Energy Efficiency (SCE-13-L-003G)

Attachment F Near Term EM&V Activities Identified

Near Term EM&V Activities Identified for the Additional Budget Request

1. Market Assessments for Baseline and Industry Standard Practice

SCE agrees with the Commission's perspective as laid out in this section of D.16-08-119:

We also agree with the CEEIC's contention in its EM&V comments that broader ISP studies should be used as an approach to market assessment. How these studies should be designed and carried out should be clarified in the revision to the existing ISP Guidance Document and any associated EM&V plans. (p.41)

A key outcome of such studies is the overall determination of the appropriate baseline for Accelerated Replacement/Early Replacement deemed measures, which appears to be a new requirement. Determining customer and project characteristics for upstream or midstream deemed programs is by necessity data intensive. Whereas a direct install program delivery model allows for these characteristics to be identified at installation, upstream or midstream programs will require market studies. SCE views this deemed measure research program as the analog of the custom industry standard practice research. Such research is better suited for a formal market study research program, guided by a market study PCG group.

2. <u>Market and Customer Studies to Support Metrics Reporting and Market</u> <u>Transformation</u>

Studies will also be needed to support portfolio metrics reporting where gathering data through program implementation is not feasible or readily available (e.g. square footage, customer satisfaction, or other data that are not captured by PAs or implementers). Appropriate data on market indicators can be gathered in these studies to also support strategic market transformation programs to track and monitor achievement of desired market responses to inform entry and exit strategy for such programs.

3. Customer Segmentation Research

Improving the performance of EE programs is a major priority for SCE. In order to do so, it is essential to have a strong understanding of whom to target and how to target (e.g. channels, messaging, incentives, etc.). An in-depth psychographic and behavioral segmentation of SCE's customer bases will allow SCE to uncover the attitudinal and behavior drivers that impact the customer decision making process and inform SCE and its third party implementers to design best-in-class EE programs tailored to customer needs and communicated through the most impactful channels with the most impactful messages.

4. Normalized Meter-Based Consumption (NMEC) Analysis

Meter-based programs, such as NMEC, will provide additional avenues to attain capacity, energy savings, and GHG goals of California. However, support for this effort will require increased EM&V resources to realize the potential. NMEC projects and programs will require substantial modeling and analytic efforts to ensure that grid savings and emission reductions are well supported.

In summary, SCE requests incremental funding to enhance the value proposition of energy efficiency for SCE and other statewide policymakers and stakeholders. SCE looks forward to coordinating with Energy Division Staff, the other PAs, and stakeholders as we update the EM&V Research Roadmaps to incorporate the aforementioned research activities that are anticipated to bring forth the benefits that good research produces.