



California Energy Commission  
Joint IEPR and Electricity and Natural Gas Committee Workshop

**INCREMENTAL IMPACTS OF ENERGY POLICY INITIATIVES RELATIVE  
TO THE ADOPTED DEMAND FORECAST**

February 17, 2010 — 1:00 pm

**AGENDA**

<b>DOCKET</b>	
<b>09-IEP-1C</b>	
DATE	FEB 17 2010
RECD.	FEB 18 2010

**Introduction**

Suzanne Korosec, IEPR Lead

**Opening Comments**

Commissioners Karen Douglas, Jeffrey D. Byron, and Robert B. Weisenmiller

**Background**

Mike Jaske, Electricity Supply Analysis Division  
Carmen Best, California Public Utilities Commission

**Overview of Analysis and Results**

Chris Kavalec, Demand Analysis Office

**Other Results and Technical Issues**

Mike Ting, Itron

**Caveats and Recommendations**

Mike Jaske, Electricity Supply Analysis Division

**Incremental Uncommitted Savings in a Managed Forecast**

Simon Baker, California Public Utilities Commission

**Questions for Stakeholders**

General Discussion

**Public Comments**

**Adjourn**

## Questions for Stakeholders

1. This project's origins derive from confusion about "overlap" between committed savings in the Energy Commission forecast and uncommitted savings. Has this report resolved the overlap issue for this IEPR/LTPP cycle, or do questions remain?
2. Are the three scenario analyses undertaken by the staff team sufficiently consistent with the policy initiative groupings established by the CPUC in the original *2008 Goals Study* that underlies D.08-07-047?
3. Does the staff report and its multiple appendices provide sufficiently detailed results such that the CPUC can understand the broad assumptions and use the results in the forthcoming 2010 LTPP proceeding?
4. The policy uncertainties associated with major, sustained efforts to increase energy efficiency savings have been addressed by developing three scenarios, but other uncertainties are only qualitatively described. Is it the policy or the technical uncertainties that are more likely to dominate the overall uncertainty of achieving large energy efficiency savings goals?
5. The staff report and the Itron Attachment identify replacement savings from decay of committed programs as an analytical issue for the CPUC to address. Is the concept of savings lost through measure decay sufficiently described for the CPUC to understand the choices it must consider about savings decay with respect to cumulative goals?
6. The difficulties in meshing two complex analytic efforts to produce consistent savings estimates are described in the staff report and the Itron Attachment. How might efforts to develop such estimates in future IEPR/LTPP cycles be revised to improve consistency?
7. The staff demand forecast analyses and the energy efficiency studies of both potential savings and expected savings from hypothetical programs are highly complex topics. Transparency, constructive criticism, collaborative projects, etc. are means by which stakeholders can engage in the details and improve analytic products compared to efforts by staff alone. What might serve as a workable standard of transparency to satisfy the legitimate concerns of stakeholders and policy makers? What elements would be critical? How might it be created? Given the current absence of such a standard, does the published documentation satisfy such legitimate concerns?