

<b>DOCKET</b> <b>11-IEP-1C</b>
DATE <u>OCT 14 2010</u>
RECD. <u>NOV 16 2010</u>

BEFORE THE  
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

In the matter of,	)	
	)	Docket No. 11-IEP-1C
	)	
Preparation of the 2011 Integrated	)	
<u>Energy Policy Report</u>	)	

**Staff Workshop on Electricity Demand Forecast  
Draft Forms and Instructions  
In Support of the 2011 IEPR**

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION  
HEARING ROOM A  
1516 NINTH STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 14, 2010  
9:00 A.M.

Reported by:  
Kent Odell

STAFF (\*Via WebEx)

Tom Gorin

Nick Fugate

Jacqueline Jones, Southern California Edison

Tim Vonder, Southern California Edison

William P. Junker

Andrea Gough

\*Prishkar Vagley

Don Brown

Jedediah Gibson

\*Robert Gomez, PG&E

## INDEX

	Page
Introduction/Housekeeping	
Tom Gorin, IEPR Lead	4
Demand Forms and Instructions	
• Staff Presentation - Nick Fugate	5
• Discussion - All Interested Parties	
Confidentiality Considerations - Tom Gorin	31
Adjournment	33
Certificate of Reporter	34

## P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2 OCTOBER 14, 2010

9:02 A.M.

3 MR. GORIN: I think we should probably get started  
4 now. Welcome to the Electricity Demand Workshop on the  
5 Draft Staff Demand Forecast Forms and Instructions. My name  
6 is Tom Gorin. We will have a few housekeeping items before  
7 we begin. If you are not familiar with this building, which  
8 I think most of the people are here, the closest restrooms  
9 are located outside the door to the left, there are another  
10 set outside the door, back towards the right. There is a  
11 snack bar on the second floor under the white awning. And  
12 in the event of an emergency and the building is evacuated  
13 or a fire drill, because we are probably approaching fire  
14 drill season, please follow a CEC staff member out the  
15 appropriate exit, we will convene in Roosevelt Park located  
16 diagonally across from this building, and proceed calmly and  
17 quickly following employees with whom you are meeting to  
18 safety exit the building. Thank you.

19 I think what we might do for this, Nick has a  
20 presentation on the forms and instructions, but if the  
21 interested parties want to gather around the table after  
22 some of the overview, the reasons for the forms, we may want  
23 to just take comments as we go through the forms along with  
24 people on the phone. So, with that, I will turn it over to  
25 Nick. If the interested parties want to come up to the

1 table?

2 MR. FUGATE: Thanks, Tom. Just to let everybody  
3 know, this meeting is being recorded. Okay, so thank you,  
4 everyone for coming and, for the folks on the phone, thank  
5 you for calling in. As Tom said, this is our first workshop  
6 on the Draft Electricity Demand Forecast Forms and  
7 Instructions. So, this is something that we do every  
8 forecasting cycle. The Energy Commission staff requests  
9 data from all LSEs with peak demand greater than 200  
10 megawatts. The due date this time around is going to be  
11 March 30<sup>th</sup>, 2011. The instructions and procedures are all  
12 summarized in the Forms and Instructions that are posted on  
13 our website. We will also be going over the Forms in a  
14 little bit. I am just going to give a brief presentation  
15 just to provide an overview, and hit some of the important  
16 points, and then we can go into more detail a little bit  
17 later on and get feedback from participants.

18 So, the Demand Forecasts that the Energy Commission  
19 puts together every two years in support of the Integrated  
20 Energy Policy Report is also used for a variety of other  
21 purposes, resource adequacy, procurement and transmission  
22 planning, and particularly in recent years, it's been used  
23 to assess impacts of demand side management programs, energy  
24 efficiency demand response and renewables, in particular.  
25 The data that we are requesting is important for our own

1 forecast development. We compare our forecasts to the  
2 forecasts that you, the LSEs, develop. This data helps us  
3 account for energy efficiency, renewables, and other DSM  
4 impacts, it provides data that we can use for calibration,  
5 for disaggregation by geographic areas, it helps us assess  
6 migrating loads, so it's very important to us in our own  
7 forecasting efforts to have this data.

8           For the most part, the Draft Forms are similar to  
9 what we requested two years ago in the previous cycle for  
10 the 2009 IEPR. Some of the notable changes that we've made  
11 so far are, in Form 2, we removed what was previously Form  
12 2.1, that was the form requesting Econ Demo Assumptions at  
13 the national level, so previously there had been Forms 2.1  
14 through 2.4, and the new 2.1 is the old 2.2, so now it's  
15 just 2.1 through 2.3, so we are no longer requesting Econ  
16 Demo Assumptions at the national level. We altered Form  
17 3.1, which is DSM impacts to distinguish between that and  
18 gross savings, and we made some changes to Form 1.7, it is  
19 now in four parts, particularly, we were looking to  
20 distinguish between technology types possible, that is for  
21 private supply. And we changed our definition of history.  
22 It now no longer goes back to 1990; we are just asking for  
23 2000 to 2010 for historical data.

24           Okay, so this is just a general timeline, how things  
25 are going to play out if everything goes according to plan,

1 so both our staff and LSEs will have the forecast developed  
2 hopefully by March, since that is when we're requesting this  
3 data be submitted, and then, in April, we will publish a  
4 comparison of utility forecasts and our own forecasts, and  
5 then follow that up with a workshop on the differences  
6 between the two, and that will happen sometime in May. And  
7 following that, once we get some input from stakeholders  
8 from the Committee, from the public, in general, we will  
9 revise our own Forecasts and publish that sometime in the  
10 summer.

11 Conventions for this data request, the forecast  
12 period this time around goes out through 2022. We are going  
13 to stick with the convention that we had last time, of  
14 distinguishing between committed energy efficiency,  
15 renewable, and non-dispatchable demand response impacts.  
16 And just like last time, committed programs are ones for  
17 which funding has been allocated and program plans are in  
18 place. I know, in a lot of cases, there are goals and  
19 targets for future programs, but funding has not been  
20 allocated, those are what we're calling "uncommitted  
21 programs," and those should be described in the forms, there  
22 are forms where we request data on uncommitted program  
23 impacts, but they should not be included in the forecast.  
24 Also, impacts of dispatchable demand response programs are  
25 also - we are requesting that those are also described in

1 the forms, but not included in the forecasts.

2           So, I'm going to go through each of the forms just  
3 very quickly, hit the highlights, and then, after that, we  
4 can actually pull up the forms and go through them in more  
5 detail, and that's when interested parties are encouraged to  
6 provide comments and ask questions.

7           So, Form 1 is the Forecast Form, 1.1 and 1.2 are  
8 related. We are looking for sales both by sector sales to  
9 bundled customers and also, in Form 1.2, sales occurring in  
10 the entire distribution area, so that would include Direct  
11 Access and Community Choice aggregators, and the like. Form  
12 1.3 and 1.4 are similar, but are looking at peak demand. On  
13 these forms, we're asking for assumptions about migrating  
14 load. Forms 1.4 and 1.5, we're looking for peak demand  
15 scenarios, so we are asking for what you would expect to  
16 occur in different weather conditions, a one in five  
17 condition, one in 10, one in 20, etc., where a one in five  
18 would be conditions that would be expected to occur, the 20  
19 percent probability. 1.6A and B, actually both request  
20 hourly loads, 1.6A, I believe it is a breakdown by parts,  
21 and 1.6B is a breakdown by geographic area, but we will look  
22 at that in more detail when we pull up the form. 1.7, that  
23 has been altered a little bit this time around, so 1.7A and  
24 B were in the Forms and Instructions last time around. They  
25 are private supply forecasts, and that includes self-

1 generation, distributed generation on the customer side of  
2 the meter, etc., reports, so 1.7A is demand and 1.7B is  
3 coincident peak, not installed capacity, that is actually -  
4 we are requesting at this time, but that is in Form 1.7C,  
5 which you'll see momentarily. This time around, one of the  
6 notable changes is that we are requesting that this data be  
7 broken out by technology type if that is possible. Like I  
8 said, 1.7C and 1.7D are new, 1.7D is for uncommitted  
9 impacts.

10 Form 2, that's where we go into some assumptions  
11 about economic and demographic data, electricity rates,  
12 customer accounts, basically any drivers that are used in  
13 your forecast, we are looking for the data, and also  
14 descriptions, and descriptions will be filled out in Form 4,  
15 we will get to Form 4 in a moment.

16 Form 3 is where we are requesting DSM impacts. 3.1  
17 is efficiency program, first year impacts; 3.2 is cumulative  
18 impacts. This time around, we are requesting both net and  
19 gross assessments; 3.3 is for renewable and distributed  
20 generation program costs and impacts; and 3.4, demand  
21 response. The methodology and assumptions and such will be  
22 documented in Form 5. We'll talk about that in a moment, as  
23 well.

24 So, Form 4 is very important, it is where we are  
25 asking you to document your forecast methodology and

1 assumptions, all of the data that was reported in Form 1 and  
2 2, we would like clearly described here in Form 4,  
3 definitions of sub-areas, for example, on 1.6B, a  
4 description of how you are accounting for migrating load,  
5 methods used to develop loss factors, I think, will be  
6 especially important this time around, as we're looking  
7 carefully at that. We'll also be looking for methods used  
8 to adjust for weather, what weather stations are used, your  
9 methodology for developing weather sensitivities, if you are  
10 doing an econometric forecast, Form 4 would be where you  
11 present your summary statistics and discuss how well your  
12 back cast matches history.

13 Forms 5 and 6 are where you would describe your  
14 methodology and assumptions used to assess DSM program  
15 impacts. Form 5 is for committed programs, Form 6 is for  
16 uncommitted programs, especially for uncommitted programs,  
17 we would be interested in understanding how you are  
18 estimating impacts for programs that don't necessarily have  
19 plans in place, and also how coincident peak impacts were  
20 developed for the renewable programs.

21 Form 7 is for ESP forecasts of contracted load by  
22 IOU area. ESPs may also submit an expected load forecast to  
23 be consistent with resource plan submittals, and we would  
24 like an explanation of the basis for that.

25 Form 8.1, we're looking specifically at data from

1 2008 through the forecast period; 2008-2010 should be in  
2 nominal dollars; 2011 and beyond should be in 2009 real  
3 dollars. Form 8.1A, specific to revenue requirements,  
4 there are three versions of this form, depending on what  
5 type of utility you represent. IOUs, for example, we're  
6 asking for revenue requirements by cost category, and for  
7 POU's, it's by expense category, and for LSE's, it's estimated  
8 power supply costs. For 8.1B, it's revenue allocation,  
9 there are two versions of this, one having to do with  
10 bundled customer and rate class, and the other by Direct  
11 Access service customers. Form 8.2, we are requesting data  
12 on the distribution of energy use by tier, so this is only  
13 applicable if a utility employs a tiered rate structure  
14 where customers are billed based on percentage of a baseline  
15 usage. And we had this form last time around, but I think  
16 perhaps we were not very descriptive in how we wanted it  
17 filled out, so what we are looking for is - well, it's  
18 easier to talk about it if I have the form in front of me,  
19 so I'll describe exactly what we're looking for once we pull  
20 the form up here in a minute.

21 I'm going to hold off on confidentiality requests.  
22 Tom Gorin will go over that after we review these forms. So  
23 now I'm going to pull up the actual Demand Forms, and we can  
24 go through them here and -

25 MS. JONES: Excuse me. This is Jacqueline Jones  
California Reporting, LLC  
52 Longwood Drive, San Rafael, California 94901 (415) 457-4417

1 from Edison. Before we start to talk about the Forms  
2 individually -

3 MR. FUGATE: Jacqueline, can you talk into the  
4 microphone so the folks on the Web can hear you?

5 MS. JONES: This is Jacqueline Jones from Southern  
6 California Edison. I was hoping, before we talk about the  
7 forms, that maybe we could talk about the schedule.

8 MR. FUGATE: Oh, sure.

9 MS. JONES: Do you know how this coincides with the  
10 Long Term Procurement Plan process? I know the Demand  
11 Forecast is supposed to be used in that process, right?

12 MR. VONDER: We also - this is Tim Vonder from  
13 Edison - we also noticed - I had a question there, too,  
14 because in the Supply Form Instructions, the Supply Forms -  
15 you haven't had the workshop yet for that -

16 MR. FUGATE: Right.

17 MR. VONDER: -- which is scheduled for the 26<sup>th</sup> of  
18 October, but in the instructions that were distributed for  
19 review, the due date for the Supply Forms is February 17<sup>th</sup>,  
20 whereas the due date for the Demand Forms is March 30<sup>th</sup>, so,  
21 if the Demand Forms are to be used in the Resource Planning  
22 process, then we've kind of got the cart before the horse.  
23 So, our question, and maybe -

24 MS. JONES: Yeah, I have that question also.

25 MR. VONDER: -- is, for the Supply side, are they

1 depending or planning on using IEPR 2009? Or are they  
2 planning on using the demand from IEPR 2011? So it's kind  
3 of confusing.

4 MR. FUGATE: I don't see any of our supply folks  
5 here. Tom, do you have any insight?

6 MR. GORIN: This is Tom Gorin. Let me try and  
7 tackle both questions. The reason that we chose March 30<sup>th</sup>  
8 for the Demand Forms was, in the 2009 IEPR, I believe the  
9 forms were due mid-February, February 13<sup>th</sup> or something, and  
10 all the IOUs, to my knowledge, maybe with the exception of  
11 one, asked for extensions until the end of March and that is  
12 when we received the forms. The other thing is that the  
13 settlement data from the ISOs isn't finalized for the entire  
14 year until the end of March. So, the loads for the year  
15 aren't finalized by then, and we were trying to make it  
16 easier for the utilities to not have to file for extensions  
17 and be able to get a full year's worth of 2010 data  
18 available to use for the demand forecasts. I'm not quite  
19 sure why the Supply Forms are being asked to be filed  
20 earlier.

21 MS. JONES: Well, we would need to do the supply  
22 forms in order to fill out the Form 8 for the revenue  
23 requirements, unless we're using old data.

24 MR. GORIN: Right. My understanding is, now the  
25 LTTP - is there a representative from the PUC here or on the

1 phone? No. I mean, IOUs can maybe answer this question, my  
2 understanding is the LTTP currently is using the IEPR 2009  
3 Forecast.

4 MS. JONES: The IEPR 2009 Forecast?

5 MR. VONDER: I think at this point.

6 MS. JONES: Because I know they don't have a Scoping  
7 Memo out yet.

8 MR. GORIN: This is the 2011 LTTP?

9 MR. VONDER: She's right. We haven't seen the  
10 Scoping Memo.

11 MR. GORIN: So, in -

12 MR. VONDER: I guess we're asking you - our question  
13 is really a supply side question. A concern of ours is  
14 that, if the supply side folks are planning on using the  
15 IEPR 2011 Demand Forecast, you know, in their process, then  
16 it wouldn't be practical for us to give them that  
17 information before we develop it for our process, so I just  
18 see kind of a bump there. Unless they - and there is no  
19 place in the instructions that I saw on the supply side that  
20 says which Demand Forecast they are planning on using, if  
21 it's 2009 or 2011. So it's just kind of a question up in  
22 the air, which they are planning to use.

23 MR. GORIN: I understand that, but my concern is  
24 that, if we ask for the forecast forms in mid-February that  
25 we would get last year's forecast from the utilities.

1 MR. VONDER: Yeah, right.

2 MR. GORIN: So, from a Demand Forecast perspective,  
3 I would rather get a more current utility forecast, given  
4 the variances of the current economy and its impact on  
5 electric use.

6 MR. VONDER: Oh, I'm not proposing doing the  
7 forecasts, the 2/11 Demand Forecasts, any earlier than the  
8 30<sup>th</sup>, it is just on the supply side, I think -

9 MS. JONES: Well, and also for the Form 8.

10 MR. GORIN: We could - are you saying that the Form  
11 8 would be based on older data?

12 MS. JONES: Well, actually, I don't know what it  
13 would be based on other than re-doing our resource plan  
14 because we're likely to have a new forecast, so -

15 MR. GORIN: Right, we could wait on the Form 8.1 and  
16 8.2.

17 MS. JONES: I think that would be helpful.

18 MR. GORIN: Yeah. I mean, the Form 8.1's - I think  
19 we would want the Form 8.2 data.

20 MS. JONES: Because that is the historical.

21 MR. GORIN: The historical distribution of loads by  
22 region. Sorry I don't have a more definitive answer.

23 MR. VONDER: Oh, I know, I'm just throwing it out  
24 there and -

25 MR. GORIN: Well, that's good.

1 MR. GOMEZ: This is Robert from PG&E. Can anyone  
2 hear me there?

3 MR. FUGATE: Yes, we can hear you.

4 MR. GOMEZ: Great. You know, I was just looking at  
5 the supply forms. It does mention in there that they expect  
6 in the supply forms for the same numbers to be used from  
7 Forms 1.3, you know, etc. Technically, it doesn't say which  
8 year, but it's implied, I think, the 2011. So it sounds  
9 like the easiest thing to do would be to have the supply  
10 forms be due at the same time as the Demand Forms. It would  
11 help.

12 MR. VONDER: Well, that doesn't give the supply  
13 folks in our shops any time to prepare their analysis and  
14 complete their forms, because if they're going to use the  
15 Demand Forecasts from 2011, they need some time to receive  
16 it, and I'm sure everyone in all of the utilities in their  
17 demand forecasting areas will be working hard just to get  
18 their demand forms ready on time by March 30<sup>th</sup>, rather than  
19 have to have everything ready earlier than that for the  
20 supply folks to prepare their forms.

21 MS. JONES: I agree.

22 MR. VONDER: So, it sounds to me like, if the supply  
23 folks could delay their filing date until sometime after the  
24 demand forecast is filed, that's kind of putting the horse  
25 where it belongs relative to the cart.

1 MR. GOMEZ: Yeah, this is Robert Gomez for PG&E. I  
2 agree with that.

3 MR. GORIN: So you would suggest not moving up the  
4 demand form filing date?

5 MR. VONDER: That is right, yes.

6 MR. GORIN: We will take that up - probably need to  
7 take that up in the Supply Form Instruction Workshop.

8 MR. JUNKER: This is Bill Junker. We will work -

9 MR. GORIN: You have to speak into a microphone.

10 MR. JUNKER: ...from the Demand Analysis Office.  
11 We'll work it before then so that, hopefully, the supply  
12 side will have a better response, or a more full response,  
13 maybe have the answer for you that you want by that time.  
14 So we won't wait until that workshop.

15 MR. VONDER: Okay, thank you.

16 MR. GORIN: Okay.

17 MR. FUGATE: Do we have any other questions about  
18 the timeline or anything else before we go through the  
19 forms?

20 MR. VONDER: Yeah, I did have - with regard to  
21 schedule, again, Tom Vonder from SDG&E, I notice that  
22 according to your slide there, staff will be putting  
23 together their forecast at the same time that the utilities  
24 will be putting together their forecasts, so you'll be  
25 putting together your forecast without the benefit of having

1 our forecast. But aside from the forecast years going  
2 forward, the historical years are important to both of us,  
3 and I think in past IEPRs, we've kind of submitted our  
4 historical data prior to submitting our forecast forms, and  
5 that way we both can see, you know, what the historical data  
6 is, we can get agreement on the historical data, and we  
7 could both start from the same place with regard to  
8 forecasts. But I don't see anything in your schedule here  
9 that is asking for historical data prior to our March 30<sup>th</sup>  
10 filing. So, then, we might be missing the opportunity to -

11 MR. FUGATE: Sure. I don't think any of our  
12 forecasters would be opposed to exchanging historical data  
13 prior to March 11<sup>th</sup>. It looks like Andrea would like to  
14 chime in on this.

15 MS. GOUGH: I'm Andrea with the Energy Commission.  
16 There is - I'm not sure where in the instructions, but  
17 somewhere there it says in December we're going to  
18 disseminate what we have for history and get your feedback,  
19 so it's somewhere in the instructions - I swear.

20 MR. GORIN: This is Tom Gorin. From the QFER data  
21 perspective, we're going to send to the utilities what we  
22 believe the LSEs have told us the historical consumption  
23 levels were and they can either confirm or deny that  
24 historical record.

25 MR. VONDER: And hourly?

1 MR. GORIN: That - we -

2 MR. VONDER: I know it's a big job getting that done  
3 early, for sure.

4 MR. GORIN: We have the hourly load by TAC area,  
5 which for San Diego is very similar to San Diego on a daily  
6 basis from the ISO. But, if utilities would want to submit  
7 other historical data earlier, we would not oppose that.

8 MR. VONDER: Okay.

9 MR. FUGATE: Any other questions on the phone? I  
10 believe all the lines are open. Okay, then I think what  
11 we'll do now is pull up the forms. Now, a lot of these are  
12 pretty much identical to what you saw last time around, so I  
13 don't want to spend time rehashing things that you're  
14 already familiar with. So I guess, if there are particular  
15 forms - I think all the forms have been distributed, I think  
16 everyone has seen them. Are there particular forms that  
17 people would like to go over in detail?

18 MS. JONES: Um, I have - I guess this is sort of a  
19 general question relative to Form 3, in all its versions,  
20 with respect to committed and uncommitted, does it matter if  
21 the years that are committed and uncommitted are not  
22 consistent? So, for example, the demand response committed,  
23 the program approval is through 2011, but for energy  
24 efficiency it is through 2012.

25 MR. FUGATE: No, no, the actual timeframe doesn't

1 matter as much as the actual definition that we're providing  
2 of committed and uncommitted. So, if funding and program  
3 plans are in place, then call it "committed." Otherwise,  
4 call it "uncommitted." And if the efficiency programs, you  
5 know, are committed through a different timeframe than the  
6 demand response programs, for example, that's fine.

7 MS. JONES: Also, on those same forms, we - the  
8 total market gross goals for energy efficiency, they only go  
9 through 2020, not through 2022. What do we do for the other  
10 two years? Estimate or -

11 MR. FUGATE: You mean as far as uncommitted  
12 efficiency savings go?

13 MS. JONES: Yeah.

14 MR. FUGATE: Well, I would - I think in the  
15 instructions, we describe uncommitted programs as ones that  
16 have been scheduled, so if goals, for example, have not been  
17 scheduled past 2020, I don't think we would expect you to  
18 guess. Tom, do you have any thoughts?

19 MR. GORIN: Not really, but I would agree with Nick.  
20 At some point, the target year for the goals may be  
21 reexamined, but the people that are designing the goals at  
22 the point they start in 2020 was a round number.

23 MS. JONES: Right.

24 MR. GORIN: But we're in the process of developing a  
25 10-year forecast, so there are various ways we could

1 estimate, but I would just probably not do that yet.

2 MS. JONES: Okay, and one last question with respect  
3 to the TMG goals, the forms are split between net and gross,  
4 so for energy efficiency for 2013 to 2020, there is no net  
5 value.

6 MR. FUGATE: Because the goals are Total Market  
7 Gross.

8 MS. JONES: Gross, right.

9 MR. GORIN: That's something we'll probably have to  
10 think about a little bit.

11 MS. JONES: Okay.

12 MR. FUGATE: Were there any questions about Form  
13 1.7? That's one that was revamped this time around. It's  
14 similar to what you saw last time, but we have it broken out  
15 by different technology types - photovoltaic, CHP. Does  
16 anyone have any comments or questions on that?

17 MR. [UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER]: This is Prishkar Vagley  
18 [ph.] here from \* - could we go back to the Form 3.1, 3.2?  
19 I just have a quick question on that.

20 MR. GORIN: Could you speak louder?

21 MR. FUGATE: I am sorry, we are having trouble  
22 hearing you.

23 MR. VAGLEY: Okay, the name is Prishkar Vagley [ph.]  
24 from \* - can you hear me?

25 MR. GORIN: From - who are you representing?

1           MR. VAGLEY: With Plain RTI [ph.], we represent the  
2 Bay Area Municipal Utilities. And the question is - I am  
3 sort of new to the process, so pardon my ignorance and that,  
4 but I was just trying to - I understand the distinction  
5 between the gross and the net savings, but could you  
6 describe how this amount is actually used in the final  
7 forecast?

8           MR. FUGATE: Sorry, it was difficult to hear you,  
9 but it sounds like you're asking about the distinction  
10 between net and gross impacts and you are asking for a  
11 description of how they are used in - are you asking in the  
12 CEC Forecast?

13           MR. VAGLEY: Yeah, in the IEPR overall forecast, how  
14 are both of these numbers sort of utilized? You represent a  
15 different final load forecast number adjusting for net  
16 savings vs. gross savings separately, how that -

17           MR. FUGATE: Well, I know in this previous cycle, in  
18 the 2009 IEPR, we subtracted some of the program savings off  
19 of our forecast and those were what we called "net realized  
20 savings." So, the savings we subtracted off of the  
21 forecast took into account net to gross ratios and  
22 realization rates, some of that information came from the  
23 PUC's EM&V process. But I think we would be interested in  
24 seeing - comparing our assessment with your assessment, as  
25 well.

1 MR. VAGLEY: Let's see, so basically I understand  
2 the net savings basically exclude basically out those  
3 [inaudible] conservation standards, and so on. I was just  
4 trying to see, would you represent the numbers separately  
5 for gross and the net savings? Or how - what would be the  
6 output of the load forecast as a result of that?

7 MR. FUGATE: Sorry, Prishkar, I'm having trouble  
8 understanding your question. Could you try speaking up just  
9 a little bit louder?

10 MR. VAGLEY: Can you hear me now? Okay?

11 MR. FUGATE: Yes, that's a little better.

12 MR. VAGLEY: Okay, I'm sorry for - but I was just  
13 trying to understand, you know, from the description it  
14 looks like the net savings exclude basics of the fee drivers  
15 and the [inaudible] state and federal conservation  
16 standards, and so on. Are you envisioning presenting the  
17 overall load forecast numbers, you know, adjusting for only  
18 net energy efficiency savings vs. gross savings? Would you  
19 be having sort of two separate numbers that will come as an  
20 output of this process?

21 MR. FUGATE: We wouldn't be expecting two separate  
22 forecasts. It's the net savings that we incorporate into  
23 our forecast last cycle. I'm sorry, was that your question?  
24 Would we have two -

25 MR. VAGLEY: Yeah, the question would be, since you

1 had two different numbers, you will have them netted out  
2 with two different kinds of energy efficiency savings, or it  
3 will be focused just purely on the net savings?

4 MR. GORIN: We are mainly focused on the net  
5 savings, but we want to look at the gross savings to  
6 determine the difference in the two, and the way we look at  
7 savings in our models is, some of the programs are captured  
8 in our models, so we want to look at the savings values that  
9 are reported vs. what our model outputs report as savings.  
10 Does that help?

11 MR. VAGLEY: Got it, got it. I think that explains.  
12 Thank you so much.

13 MR. FUGATE: Okay, are there other questions?

14 MS. JONES: This is Jacqueline Jones with Edison  
15 again. I do have a question about 1.7. I'm not sure that  
16 we have the ability to disaggregate our data into that many  
17 sectors. I believe we just have res and non-res. Would  
18 that be adequate?

19 MR. FUGATE: I think if you're not able to provide  
20 this level of disaggregation, then give us what you've got.

21 MS. JONES: We also have an issue with the  
22 coincident peak demand.

23 MR. FUGATE: Okay.

24 MS. JONES: We have the energy information, but not  
25 the coincident peak demand.

1 MR. FUGATE: Okay. That's for the private supply?

2 MS. JONES: Yes.

3 MR. GORIN: Do you have estimate of the coincident  
4 peak demand?

5 MS. JONES: Well, I think it varies based on the  
6 location. We could probably make a general assumption, then  
7 just document that assumption.

8 MR. GORIN: Or, you know, we could put our staff in  
9 touch with your staff that's preparing that and come to some  
10 agreements.

11 MS. JONES: Oh, that sounds good.

12 MR. FUGATE: Okay. Other questions? Anyone on the  
13 phone?

14 MR. Don Brown: Yes. This is Don from Los Angeles  
15 Department of Water and Power.

16 MR. GORIN: Can you speak up, please?

17 MR. FUGATE: Could you please speak up?

18 MR. Don Brown: This is Don Brown, LADWP. I want to  
19 talk about the Form 1.7. You are asking the historical data  
20 for the 2000 through 2009, and then I don't think we have  
21 distinguished by the technology and also we do not track  
22 down like how much industry to get - we have only the data  
23 for the combined with the commercial/industrial, something  
24 like in the previously, but now we adopted - we can have  
25 data for the future, but how do we provide those data we

1 don't have for the historic, by technology?

2 MR. FUGATE: I'm sorry, it was difficult to hear  
3 you. But it sounds like -

4 MR. BROWN: I guess my question is that we do not  
5 have all data by technology type to provide you for the  
6 historic data.

7 MR. FUGATE: Okay.

8 MR. BROWN: Yeah. How do we provide, then?

9 MR. FUGATE: So you do not have - for history, you  
10 do not have a break-out by technology type?

11 MR. BROWN: Yeah. And also, we have only like  
12 combined data for the commercial and industrial together, we  
13 do not distinguish between commercial and industrial.

14 MR. FUGATE: Okay. Well, then, I think that is  
15 similar to what Jacqueline just asked. And so, we would  
16 just request that you provide us with what you have.

17 MR. BROWN: Okay, do you put some comment under that  
18 form so we can provide that comment right there, so there  
19 will be no -

20 MR. FUGATE: You are asking if we can modify the  
21 forms to reflect that comment?

22 MR. BROWN: Yeah.

23 MR. FUGATE: Okay, yes.

24 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

25 MR. FUGATE: Thank you.

1 MR. GIBSON: Hi. This is Jed Gibson from Ellison,  
2 Schneider and Harris. I had a question on Form 7.

3 MR. FUGATE: Form 7.

4 MR. GIBSON: I don't know if this is out of order at  
5 all or -

6 MR. FUGATE: No.

7 MR. GIBSON: In the Powerpoint presentation, the  
8 slide for Form 7 says to include an explanation of the basis  
9 of the forecast. I did not see that requirement in the  
10 Forms or Instructions anywhere, so I'm wondering if that's  
11 just something to include in the cover letter or -

12 MR. FUGATE: Yeah, the form is just a template. You  
13 are free to modify it in any way you would like, including  
14 how you present the descriptive information, or you could  
15 provide that separately in another sheet or an attached  
16 file.

17 MR. GIBSON: But that is something you would like to  
18 see accompanying the form?

19 MR. FUGATE: Yes.

20 MR. GORIN: Yeah, if you're going to forecast out  
21 past the end of the contract periods.

22 MR. GIBSON: Okay.

23 MR. FUGATE: I -

24 MR. GOMEZ: This is Robert Gomez from PG&E. Can you  
25 hear me fine?

1 MR. FUGATE: Yes, loud and clear.

2 MR. GOMEZ: Great, thank you. On Slide 20, talking  
3 about Forms 8.1, the 8.1, you mention now that you'd like to  
4 see 2011 and beyond in real dollars as opposed to nominal,  
5 which is what it was before. And I'm just wondering what  
6 the reason behind that is. There just would seem that  
7 nominal is an easier way to do that, the only real  
8 difference between nominal and real is just an inflation  
9 rate, and so everyone is going to be just assuming different  
10 inflation rates, so maybe trying to compare these might be a  
11 little difficult, but also, in many other venues, like the  
12 Long Term Plan, nominal is the preferred nomenclature.

13 MR. FUGATE: Did we ask for nominal last time?

14 MR. GOMEZ: Yeah, I just happened to look at the  
15 forms.

16 MR. GORIN: These are the -

17 MS. JONES: Revenue requirements -

18 MR. GORIN: So, the future revenue requirements  
19 would be in nominal dollars.

20 MR. GOMEZ: I mean, that's what I would suggest and  
21 that's how it was, that's how it's been previously.

22 MR. GORIN: Last time, it was worded the same way.

23 MR. GOMEZ: Oh, I just opened up - I just looked at  
24 our forms.

25 MR. GORIN: Maybe you supplied to that -

1 MR. GOMEZ: Oh, unless we submitted it in nominal.

2 MR. GORIN: But I would say just identify which kind  
3 of dollars you're using.

4 MR. GOMEZ: Okay.

5 MR. GORIN: I mean, our thought was it is easy to  
6 see what you spent in the dollars you spent them in,  
7 forecasting past the end of your revenue requirements, it  
8 may be a little bit more difficult than in nominal, I don't  
9 know.

10 MR. GOMEZ: Yeah, it's true, it might be that we  
11 submitted it in nominal, I don't remember if that was in the  
12 form, if that was in the instructions.

13 MR. GORIN: Yeah, but if you do that, just annotate  
14 it.

15 MR. GOMEZ: Okay, great.

16 MR. GORIN: And we can use the deflation factor that  
17 you used.

18 MR. GOMEZ: Gotcha. Thank you.

19 MR. FUGATE: Other questions about the forms?

20 MR. GORIN: I would like to make an emphasis on Form  
21 4 on the methodology and data used to calculate losses,  
22 which was not explained by many of the parties last time.  
23 People are looking at losses with a little more scrutiny now  
24 and trying to figure out how they're calculated, and what  
25 the geographical boundaries are, so we would like that

1 information and description of what data is used to  
2 calculate them if we could.

3 MR. FUGATE: I think the descriptive information is  
4 very important. Another way that that came up last time  
5 around is in the description of impacts from demand response  
6 programs. In a lot of the filings, it was unclear to us  
7 which programs were dispatchable and which were non-  
8 dispatchable, so, yes, the form - well, that would be Form 5  
9 and 6, but the descriptive information is particularly  
10 important. Other questions about specific forms? Anyone on  
11 the phone? Well, if there are no other specific questions,  
12 I think I'll turn it back over to Tom and he can discuss -  
13 oh, I'm sorry, there was one other point I wanted to cover  
14 before we move on. I just wanted to mention what we were  
15 looking for on Form 8.2 because we got a variety of  
16 responses last time around. So, we're looking for customer  
17 accounts and energy use by - is there any way to zoom in on  
18 this so it's a little more clear? No. So, for Form 8.2,  
19 this was the monthly residential electricity sales by  
20 baseline percentages, only for tiered customers, and what we  
21 were looking for here, I think the easiest way to explain it  
22 is just by an example. If you have one customer, for  
23 example, and that's one customer in your entire baseline  
24 territory who uses 80 percent of - between 80 and 90 percent  
25 of the baseline, then you would just provide one customer,

1 and then their energy use and there would be nothing in any  
2 of the other rows, as opposed to what we saw frequently last  
3 time, which was that - well, I won't confuse that point.  
4 So, each row on this form would represent only the customers  
5 that are using, for example, here between 80-90 percent of  
6 their baseline, and then the energy would be only the energy  
7 used by those customers. So, hopefully that is clear.

8 MR. GORIN: The other thing to note on that form, if  
9 you've already submitted 2008, we would just be looking for  
10 2009 and 2010, and I think in the case of Edison, we would  
11 for 2010 want the new baseline territories.

12 MR. FUGATE: Okay, so if there are no other  
13 questions, I'm going to turn it back over to Tom. He's  
14 going to talk a little bit about confidentiality.

15 MR. GORIN: The Requests for Confidentiality are  
16 essentially the same as they were last year, there is an  
17 appendix that discusses how to file -- identify or describe  
18 the data, citations, and non-disclosure justifications. You  
19 must sign under penalty of perjury certification, or we will  
20 send it back to you and pretend it hasn't been filed yet.  
21 If there are defects, they need to be corrected within 14  
22 calendar days, and if the information is similar to the  
23 information that was previously deemed confidential, you can  
24 state that, and the facts are unchanged, and we will  
25 disclose some confidential efforts aggregated to mask the

1 people - or to mask any specific entity or person. And I  
2 have a spreadsheet that may clarify some questions that we  
3 had last time, and they may be helpful, and I can present  
4 them, and we may put this in the Revised Forms and  
5 Instructions. One of the utilities last time submitted a  
6 form of retail sales for both combined, bundled, and Direct  
7 Access customers, which was not asked - which they did not  
8 ask confidentiality for -

9 MR. FUGATE: Tom, I just want to point out that  
10 this, what we're looking at here, I don't think, was  
11 provided in all of the materials -

12 MR. GORIN: No, it isn't provided, but we will  
13 provide it afterwards online. And then - so the bundled and  
14 Direct Access customers is not confidential because you  
15 can't determine the value for each of the parts if you have  
16 the sum. Then, they provided retail sales by sector for  
17 bundled customers only, which we granted in the past three  
18 years of confidentiality for the first three years of the  
19 forecast, so that may be a way to alleviate some of the  
20 questions on that form. And also, Form 1.2, we in the past  
21 have not rendered confidentiality for total sales or total  
22 distribution requirements or losses; we have granted  
23 confidentiality for three years for the parts. And we have  
24 in the past granted confidentiality for the weather  
25 adjustment procedures. And there are other forms that we

1 have granted confidentiality for, the various parts of Form  
2 1.6, which is the load, the individual parts, but not the  
3 total, and with the exception of the forecast year. So, are  
4 there any questions about confidentiality filings? If not,  
5 are there any other questions about forms or any of the  
6 procedures? Then, I think we will adjourn. Thank you for  
7 coming.

8 [Adjourned at 10:09 A.M.]

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25