

**California Energy Commission
2008 Integrated Energy Policy Report Update
Committee Workshop on Improved Efficiency Measurement
And Attribution in Energy Demand Forecasts
Tuesday, August 12, 2008, 10:00 a.m., Hearing Room A
Call-in Number: 1-888-566-5914, Passcode: IEPR Call Leader: Suzanne Korosec**

DOCKET	
00-IEPR-IC	
DATE	AUG 12 2008
RECD.	AUG 14 2008

A G E N D A

1. Introduction (Suzanne Korosec, IEPR Lead)
(5 minutes)
2. Opening Remarks (IEPR Committee)
Commissioner Jeffrey Byron
Chairman Jackalyne Pfannenstiel
(10 minutes)
3. Workshop Overview and Objectives
 - Energy Commission (Michael Jaske)
 - California Public Utilities Commission (Michael Wheeler)
(30 minutes)
4. Concepts and Vocabulary: Consistency Across Studies and Agencies
(Mike Rufo, Itron)
(30 minutes)
5. Energy Efficiency Attribution and Measurement in the Energy
Commission's Energy Demand Forecast (Chris Kavalec/Tom Gorin, CEC)
(45 minutes)

Lunch Break

6. Panel Discussion on Efficiency Attribution and Quantification
(see Technical Questions for the EE Quantification Panel below)
(90 minutes)

Moderators

Tentative Panel

Michael Jaske (CEC)	Tom Gorin (CEC)	Chris Kavalec (CEC)
Mike Rufo (Itron)	Rick Aslin (PG&E)	Jasmin Ansar (PG&E)
	Art Canning (SCE)	Andrea Horwatt (SCE)
	Tim Vonder (SDGE)	Athena Besa (SDGE)
	Nate Toyama (SMUD)	Rich Cordina (SMUD)
	Michael Cockayne (LADWP)	Other Interested Utilities

7. Framework for Future Conservation Quantification Progress (see Project Implementation Questions below)
(45 minutes)
- Energy Commission Conceptual Plan (Michael Jaske, CEC)
 - Conservation Quantification Approach for 2008/2009 IEPR (Mike Rufo, Itron)
 - Discussion about Working Group (All Interested Parties)
8. Public Comment
(30 minutes)

Technical Questions for the EE Quantification Panel:

1. Structural/end-use forecasting models have the benefit of avoiding double-counting of proposed efficiency measures and their impacts, but require lots of data and labor intensive efforts to keep current. Econometric models tied to customer counts and sales records avoid the data issues, but miss the benefits of end-use and measure representation of EE programs.
 - a. How do you evaluate the pros and cons of each in the current political climate stressing high levels of energy efficiency measure penetration?
 - b. How does your organization use these two different forms of model to develop a forecast?
 - c. Are there alternative ways to quantify EE program impacts and combine these with a simpler forecasting model? If so, how is this done?
 - d. What flaws do you see and what improvements would you recommend for in terms of avoiding program duplication, attribution to programs and measurement of overall energy efficiency in your methods for preparing energy demand forecasts?
2. Quantification of the impacts resulting from those forces motivating end-users to adopt EE measures (state and federal standards, utility programs, direct weatherization programs, loan or grant programs, unaided response to market prices, market effects, etc.) may become more difficult if rates begin to increase as costs of generation increase and if new programs are established through state and federal GHG mitigation efforts.
 - a. Is there an established construct to guide attribution among these many forces?
 - b. If customer prices were projected to rise, how should price response and market forces be addressed? What complications exist due to the AB1X rate freeze affecting IOU rate designs for the residential sector?
 - c. How do various models address requirements of building or appliance efficiency standards and utility incentive programs impacting the same end-use or measure?
3. There is uncertainty in various independent dimensions for EE program – the scale of programs, their design, duplication among multiple programs, market and price response by customers separate from programs, etc.
 - a. How should we treat the uncertainty of whether programs will be funded to achieve the energy efficiency goals established by the CPUC

or as GHG emission reduction strategies by ARBin any demand forecasts adopted by the Energy Commission?

- b. Is the current paradigm of including only “committed” program savings in the baseline demand forecast still the correct approach?
 - c. Does exclusion of “uncommitted” program impacts truly focus attention on developing program designs, conducting cost-effectiveness tests, and securing commitments from policy makers?
4. There can be alternative perspectives of energy efficiency program specialists versus forecasters in measuring efficiency program impacts. Forecasters may be focused on net effects incremental to all previous and contemporaneous programs, while program measurement specialists may be interested in gross program impacts.
- a. Is this notion of alternative perspectives accurate?
 - b. Can both (or additional) perspectives be pursued simultaneously and yet used appropriately in forums that understand the differences?

Project Implementation Questions:

1. Staff’s conceptual program plan and the Itron contractual efforts focus on Energy Commission and Itron models.
 - a. What improvements in utility forecasting and quantification already under way? What additional or expand efforts are appropriate?
 - b. Are some activities, such as creating a measure saturation database tracking penetration through time, of joint interest to Energy Commission, Itron, utilities and others?
2. In earlier comments filed with the CPUC for the June 2, 2008 EE goals workshop, DRA suggested that a working group be formed to tackle coordination and consistency between Itron potential studies and Energy Commission forecasting efforts.
 - a. What recommendations would you make for designing a working group to discuss program attributions and future efficiency impacts on energy consumption?
 - b. What goals can such a working group attempt to achieve.
 - c. What timeframe is reasonable for it to operate?