

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



May 20, 2011

Advice Letter 3825-E

Jane K. Yura
Vice President, Regulation and Rates
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
77 Beale Street, Mail Code B10B
P.O. Box 770000
San Francisco, CA 94177

**Subject: Proposed Amendments to the California Solar Initiative
General Market Program Measurement and Evaluation
Plan**

Dear Ms. Yura:

Advice Letter 3825-E is effective May 1, 2011.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Julie A. Fitch".

Julie A. Fitch, Director
Energy Division

April 1, 2011

ADVICE 2567-E
(Southern California Edison Company U 338-E)

ADVICE 3825-E
(Pacific Gas and Electric Company U 39-E)

ADVICE 16
(California Center for Sustainable Energy)

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
ENERGY DIVISION

SUBJECT: Proposed Amendments to the California Solar Initiative
General Market Program Measurement and Evaluation Plan

Southern California Edison Company (SCE), on behalf of the California Solar Initiative (CSI) Program Administrators (PAs), hereby submits this advice filing to propose amendments to the CSI General Market Program Measurement and Evaluation Plan (M&E Plan). The CSI PAs include, in addition to SCE, Pacific Gas and Electric Company and the California Center for Sustainable Energy.

PURPOSE

Consistent with the procedures established in the Assigned Commissioner Ruling issued on July 29, 2008 (July 2008 ACR) in Rulemaking 08-03-008, SCE submits this advice filing to propose amendments to the M&E Plan for the CSI General Market Program. The recommended revisions to the M&E Plan are in response to the CSI Program Administration budget decrease prescribed by the California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) in Decision (D.) 10-09-046.

BACKGROUND

On July 29, 2008, the Commission issued the ACR which established and adopted the M&E Plan developed by the Commission's Energy Division. The M&E Plan identifies the legislative reporting obligations, delineates the program data and reports for program review, and establishes a budget and schedule for publishing the reports.¹ In the July 2008 ACR, the Commission also established an advice letter process for the CSI PAs to propose updates to the budgets and tasks relevant to the M&E Plan in consultation with the Commission's Energy Division.²

Additionally, the Commission, in Appendix A of the July 2008 ACR, allocated \$46.7 million of the CSI Program Administration budget to the M&E Plan activities which include the following studies, reports, and activities:

1. Impact Evaluation Studies
2. System Retention and Performance Studies
3. Market Transformation Studies
4. Process Studies
5. Cost-Effective Evaluation (CSI and NEM)
6. External Financial Audits
7. Project Coordination

Subsequently, on September 23, 2010, the Commission issued D.10-09-046, which modified the CSI Program budget and shifted \$40 million from the CSI Program administrative budget (\$20 million from the M&E budget and \$20 million from the unallocated portion of the overall administrative budget) to the CSI Program incentive budget. Thus, the \$46.7 million budget originally allocated to the M&E Plan activities was reduced to \$26.7 million with \$25.45 million allocated to CSI General Market Program M&E activities and \$1.25 million allocated to the CSI-Thermal Program M&E Plan. Accordingly, the CSI PAs developed the necessary revisions to the M&E Plan to align the M&E studies, reports, and activities with the reduced M&E budget.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CSI PROGRAM EVALUATION PLAN

The proposed amendments to the M&E Plan are summarized in the table below and the details are included in Attachment A of this advice filing.

¹ July 29, 2008 ACR p. 1

² July 29, 2008 ACR, Appendix A pp. 7-8.

Study Category	CSI M&E Plan Per July 2008 ACR	Proposed Revision to the CSI M&E Plan
Project Coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Required for each CSI program year ▪ Budget: \$1.6 million 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Budget: \$1.2 million ▪ Includes 50% annual budget reduction in 2017
Impact Evaluation and CSI Metering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Required for each CSI program year ▪ Budget: \$23.4 million 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Remaining Impact Evaluations conducted on a biennial basis (2013, 2015, 2017) ▪ Analysis and Reports Budget: \$10.6 million ▪ Metering Budget \$3.7 million
Retention and Performance Studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Currently required for 3 CSI program years ▪ Budget: \$600,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To be conducted as part of Impact Evaluations
Ongoing Progress Studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Required as determined necessary ▪ \$3.6 million 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fund these studies from "Optional Studies" category
Process Evaluations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Required every other year – 4 total ▪ Includes Process Studies, PA Comparative Assessments, Best Practices ▪ Budget: \$2.1 million 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conduct 1 additional Process study in 2014 – two total for entire program ▪ Budget: \$450,000
CSI/NEM Cost-effectiveness studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Required for 2009, 2012, 2015, 2017 ▪ Budget: \$1.9 million 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conduct 1 additional C/E Study ▪ Budget: \$1.35 million
Market Transformation Studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Required 2010, 2013, and 2016 ▪ Budget: \$10 million 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conduct 2 studies – 2011 and 2014 ▪ Budget: \$1.5 million
External Financial Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Required for 2009, 2011, 2013, 2015 ▪ Budget: \$2 million 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Same schedule ▪ Budget: \$900,000
CSI M&E Staffing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ M&E staff time funded from CSI Administration budget 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ M&E staff time funded from CSI M&E budget ▪ Total Budget: \$3.9 million

AB 578 DG Impact Study	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not Included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Biennial Studies (2012, 2014, 2016) ▪ Total CSI portion of budget: \$210,000
CSI Thermal M&E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No specific budget allocation for CSI Thermal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Budget as required by D.10-09-046: \$1.25 million
Optional Analyses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Total Budget: \$1.5 million 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Total Budget: \$1.64 million

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 May 1, 2011, the 30th calendar day after the date filed.

NOTICE

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 mailed to:

CPUC, Energy Division
 Attention: Tariff Unit
 505 Van Ness Avenue
 San Francisco, California 94102
 E-mail: ijnj@cpuc.ca.gov and mas@cpuc.ca.gov

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:

Akbar Jazayeri
Vice President of Regulatory Operations
Southern California Edison Company
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Rosemead, California 91770
Facsimile: (626) 302-4829
E-mail: AdviceTariffManager@sce.com

Bruce Foster
Senior Vice President, Regulatory Affairs
c/o Karyn Gansecki
Southern California Edison Company
601 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 2030
San Francisco, California 94102
Facsimile: (415) 929-5540
E-mail: Karyn.Gansecki@sce.com

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 shall be submitted expeditiously.

In accordance with Section 4 of GO 96-B, SCE is serving copies of this advice filing to the interested parties shown on the attached GO 96-B and R.10-05-004 service lists. Address change requests to the GO 96-B service list should be directed by electronic mail to AdviceTariffManager@sce.com 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 Process_Office@cpuc.ca.gov.

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 <http://www.sce.com/AboutSCE/Regulatory/adviceletters>.

For questions, please contact Gary Barsley at (626) 302-0536 or by electronic mail at gary.barsley@sce.com.

Southern California Edison Company

Akbar Jazayeri

AJ:sl:jm
Enclosures

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ADVICE LETTER FILING SUMMARY ENERGY UTILITY

MUST BE COMPLETED BY UTILITY (Attach additional pages as needed)

Company name/CPUC Utility No.: Southern California Edison Company (U 338-E)

Utility type:

ELC GAS
 PLC HEAT WATER

Contact Person: James Yee

Phone #: (626) 302-2509

E-mail: James.Yee@sce.com

E-mail Disposition Notice to: AdviceTariffManager@sce.com

EXPLANATION OF UTILITY TYPE

ELC = Electric GAS = Gas
 PLC = Pipeline HEAT = Heat WATER = Water

(Date Filed/ Received Stamp by CPUC)

Advice Letter (AL) #: 2567-E

Tier Designation: 2

Subject of AL: Proposed Amendments to the California Solar Initiative General Market Program Measurement and Evaluation Plan

Keywords (choose from CPUC listing): Compliance

AL filing type: Monthly Quarterly Annual One-Time Other

If AL filed in compliance with a Commission order, indicate relevant Decision/Resolution #:

D.10-09-046

Does AL replace a withdrawn or rejected AL? If so, identify the prior AL: _____

Summarize differences between the AL and the prior withdrawn or rejected AL¹: _____

Confidential treatment requested? Yes No

If yes, specification of confidential information:

Confidential information will be made available to appropriate parties who execute a nondisclosure agreement.

Name and contact information to request nondisclosure agreement/access to confidential information:

Resolution Required? Yes No

Requested effective date: 5/1/11 No. of tariff sheets: -0-

Estimated system annual revenue effect: (%): _____

Estimated system average rate effect (%): _____

When rates are affected by AL, include attachment in AL showing average rate effects on customer classes (residential, small commercial, large C/I, agricultural, lighting).

Tariff schedules affected: _____

Service affected and changes proposed¹: _____

Pending advice letters that revise the same tariff sheets: None

¹ Discuss in AL if more space is needed.

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

CPUC, Energy Division
Attention: Tariff Unit
505 Van Ness Ave.,
San Francisco, CA 94102
inj@cpuc.ca.gov and mas@cpuc.ca.gov

Akbar Jazayeri
Vice President of Regulatory Operations
Southern California Edison Company
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Rosemead, California 91770
Facsimile: (626) 302-4829
E-mail: AdviceTariffManager@sce.com

Bruce Foster
Senior Vice President, Regulatory Affairs
c/o Karyn Gansecki
Southern California Edison Company
601 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 2030
San Francisco, California 94102
Facsimile: (415) 929-5540
E-mail: Karyn.Gansecki@sce.com

Attachment A

Joint Program Administrators' Proposed Revisions to the California Solar Initiative Program Evaluation Plan

1. Introduction: Proposed Revisions to the CSI Program Evaluation Plan

In Decision (D.) 10-09-046, the California Public Utilities Commission (Commission or CPUC) reduced the California Solar Initiative (CSI) General Market Program Measurement and Evaluation (M&E) budget from \$46.7 million to \$26.7 million with \$25.45 million allocated to non CSI-Thermal M&E activities and \$1.25 million allocated to CSI Thermal M&E. The recommended revisions to the CSI Program Evaluation Plan (M&E Plan) detailed in the following sections are necessary given the budget reduction. The proposed revisions continue to maintain the goals and requirements of the M&E Plan described on page 9 of Appendix A of the Assigned Commissioners Ruling issued on July 28, 2008 (July 2008 ACR) to:

1. *Utilize a standardized process for evaluating programs and reporting program results;*
2. *Provide credible and objective information on program impacts and performance;*
3. *Provide policy and program related information to ensure achievement of CSI program goals and support the "Periodic CSI Review Process" and;*
4. *Produce an accurate assessment of future opportunities to further the goals of SB 1 and established Commission objectives and directives.*

2. CSI M&E Study Schedule and Budgets

The following recommendations were reached through collaboration between the CSI Program Administrators (PAs) and the Energy Division. These recommendations specifically propose changes to the program evaluation study schedules and estimated budgets detailed in Section 4 of Appendix A of the July 2008 ACR.

2.1 Impact Evaluations

The Impact Evaluations provide important analyses of customer-solar installed through the CSI program. The CSI program has conducted Impact Evaluations covering program years 2007 through 2009 and is currently evaluating program impacts for program year 2010. Impact Evaluations also represent a considerable portion of the total CSI M&E budget. The Commission, in the July 2008 ACR, allocates \$23.4 million, or 50%, of the original CSI M&E budget to Impact Evaluations and metering of CSI sites. Furthermore, the Commission requires these studies to be conducted annually.¹ The new CSI M&E budget, however, simply cannot accommodate the same level of analysis for future years as was provided in previous Impact Evaluations. Therefore, the CSI PAs recommend that the CSI

¹ July 2008 ACR, Appendix A, p. 12

Impact Evaluations be conducted on a biennial basis rather than annually. This change would decrease the number of CSI Impact Evaluations for the remainder of the program from six (2012 through 2017) to three (2013, 2015, and 2017) with each study covering the two previous program years.

Additionally, the CSI PAs recommend that the analyses on impacts for CSI to the transmission and distribution system required by the July 2008 ACR be considered optional and funded out of the “Optional Studies” category, as the budget permits.

Finally, beginning with the 2010 CSI Impact Evaluation, the Energy Division has requested that CSI Impact studies estimate the impacts of customer-solar photovoltaic (PV) systems installed through other programs in investor-owned utility (IOU) territories including Emerging Renewables Program, New Solar Homes Partnership Program, and Self Generation Incentive Program (SGIP). Therefore, the CSI PAs recommend that the CSI Impact Evaluations be jointly funded by CSI and SGIP.

These recommended modifications to the CSI Impact Evaluation and Metering budget are projected to reduce the CSI M&E budget from \$24.7 million to \$14.3 million. Of this \$14.3 million, \$10.6 million would be allocated to the Impact Evaluation studies and \$3.7 million would be allocated to metering expenses that support the impact analyses. This reduced budget does not include a co-funding contribution from SGIP.

2.2 Process Evaluations

In Section 3.3.5 of the July 2008 ACR, the Commission requires biennial Process Evaluations, which include Program Administration Comparative Assessments and Best Practice Studies. Thus far, the CSI program has conducted one Process Evaluation covering program years 2009 and 2010.

The CSI PAs recommend that the CSI Program requires one remaining Process Evaluation – in 2014 rather than the three remaining – in 2012, 2014, and 2016. Further, it is recommended that the CSI PAs and Energy Division staff periodically review the program administration data provided quarterly by the CSI PAs to the Energy Division for publication into the publically available CSI Progress Report Data Annex. Such data include reservation application processing times; incentive claim processing times; payment times; interconnection times; trainings offered; and program dropouts. These data give a glimpse into the processing and administrative challenges and issues that PAs may face. This recommended change will reduce the CSI M&E budget for these studies from \$1 million to \$450,000. If, after examination of these data, the Energy Division and the CSI PAs determine that another Process Evaluation would help in identifying and remedying administrative issues that may arise, another Process Evaluation could be performed and funded out of the “Optional Analysis” category.

2.3 Cost-Effectiveness Studies

In Section 3.3.6 of the July 2008 ACR, the Commission requires that a CSI Cost-Effectiveness study be performed every third year – in 2009, 2012, 2015, and 2017. In 2010, the CSI program has conducted a CSI Cost-Effectiveness and a net energy metering (NEM) Cost-Benefits study as prescribed in Section 3.3.7 of the July 2008 ACR.

After review of the planned timing and budget of the CSI Cost-Effectiveness studies, the CSI PAs have determined that given the reduced budget, it would be more effective to reallocate the funding for these studies to support M&E research that informs other areas that the program may help address, e.g., research into identifying additional opportunities that facilitate market transformation. It is therefore recommended that the CSI program completes one remaining Cost-Effectiveness study prior to the end of the program. This recommended change will reduce the budget for the CSI/NEM Cost-Effectiveness studies from \$1.9 million to \$1.35 million.

2.4 Market Transformation Studies

The Commission, in the July 2008 ACR, requires Market Transformation studies to be conducted in 2010, 2013, and 2016. The CSI PAs agree with the timing of these studies, but recommend that the final Market Transformation study – in 2016 – be considered optional and only performed if determined necessary by the Energy Division and the CSI PAs. It is further recommended that the budget for these studies be reduced from \$10 million to \$1.5 million.

2.5 On-going Progress Studies

The Commission, in the July 2008 ACR, allocates \$3.6 million to On-going Progress Studies. Section 3.2.2 of the July 2008 ACR describes these studies as studies to be used to assess programmatic issues in the Energy Division's Progress Reports. The PAs recommend that the budget for these studies be reallocated to the "Optional Studies" category. This change would make funds available for higher priority research activities. Progress Studies may still occur if the Energy Division places a higher priority on these studies than on other "optional" studies.

2.6 External Financial Audits

The budget allocated for the External Financial Audits in the July 2008 ACR is \$2 million. The Financial Audit of the CSI PAs that was completed in 2010 cost the program \$200,000. Given the lower cost of this audit, the CSI PAs recommend that the total budget for the Financial Audits be reduced to \$900,000.

2.7 AB 578 DG Impacts Study

In response to Assembly Bill (AB) 578 (Blakeslee, 2008), the CSI and SGIP programs produced a study on the impacts of distributed generation (DG) on California's transmission and distribution (T&D) systems. AB 578 requires that follow-up studies be conducted and submitted to the Legislature on a biennial basis. The CSI PAs recommend that this study be co-funded by the CSI and SGIP

programs with 70% of the funding to come from CSI and 30% from SGIP. The PAs recommend that total CSI budget for these studies be \$210,000. Additionally, inasmuch as AB 578 does not specify that *only* customer-side DG installed through CSI, SGIP, and NEM is to be included in the analysis, and that wholesale DG would conceivably have more concentrated effects on California's T&D system, the CSI PAs are recommending that additional funding for this study be provided by wholesale DG programs.

2.8 Project Coordination

The CSI Project Coordinator, described in Section 3.3.1 of the July 2008 ACR, is responsible for coordinating the research, planning and budget tracking activities of the CSI M&E effort. However, the proposed reductions in numbers of studies conducted in this plan implicitly require a reduction in scope for the Project Coordinator. It is therefore recommended that the total budget for this activity be reduced from \$1.6 million to \$1.2 million. This revised budget assumes a 50% reduction in expenditures for this task in 2017 for program closeout.

2.9 M&E Staffing Expenditures

The Commission, in the July 2008 ACR, requires that funding for CSI PA staffing for support and management of CSI M&E come out of the CSI program administration budget. However, in the Staff Proposal for Program Modifications to the CSI Program attached as an appendix to the Administrative Law Judge's Ruling issued on July 26, 2010, the Energy Division recommended that M&E staff time at the CPUC (up to 3 PURA positions) and CSI PAs (up to 2 FTEs per CSI PA) be charged to the CSI evaluation budget. The CSI PAs recommend that \$3.9 million be allocated for M&E staff time through 2017. This budget assumes 1.5 FTEs per CSI PA and 1.5 PURA positions at the CPUC with a 50% reduction in staff time in 2017 for program closeout.

2.10 M&E Plan Periodic Review and Revisions

The CSI PAs recommend that the Energy Division be given flexibility to review and, in consultation with the CSI PA, to make changes to the CSI M&E plan and budget allocations to each study area as needed without requiring the CSI PAs to file an Advice Letter. This flexibility will allow for a more efficient planning and review process for the CSI M&E plan.

3 M&E Plan Revisions Summary

The recommended revisions to the CSI M&E plan are provided in Table 1. The CSI M&E budget and scheduling planning worksheet based on the proposed revised CSI M&E budget are included in Table 2.

Table 1 – CSI PA M&E Plan Revisions Summary

Study Category	CSI M&E Plan Per July 2008 ACR	Proposed Revision to the CSI M&E Plan
Project Coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Required for each CSI program year ▪ Budget: \$1.6 million 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Budget: \$1.2 million ▪ Includes 50% annual budget reduction in 2017
Impact Evaluation and CSI Metering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Required for each CSI program year ▪ Budget: \$23.4 million 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Remaining Impact Evaluations conducted on a biennial basis (2013, 2015, 2017) ▪ Analysis and Reports Budget: \$10.6 million ▪ Metering Budget \$3.7 million
Retention and Performance Studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Currently required for 3 CSI program years ▪ Budget: \$600,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To be conducted as part of Impact Evaluations
Ongoing Progress Studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Required as determined necessary ▪ \$3.6 million 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fund these studies from “Optional Studies” category
Process Evaluations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Required every other year – 4 total ▪ Includes Process Studies, PA Comparative Assessments, Best Practices ▪ Budget: \$2.1 million 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conduct 1 additional Process study in 2014 – two total for entire program ▪ Budget: \$450,000
CSI/NEM Cost-effectiveness studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Required for 2009, 2012, 2015, 2017 ▪ Budget: \$1.9 million 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conduct 1 additional C/E Study ▪ Budget: \$1.35 million
Market Transformation Studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Required 2010, 2013, and 2016 ▪ Budget: \$10 million 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conduct 2 studies – 2011 and 2014 ▪ Budget: \$1.5 million
External Financial Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Required for 2009, 2011, 2013, 2015 ▪ Budget: \$2 million 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Same schedule ▪ Budget: \$900,000
CSI M&E Staffing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ M&E staff time funded from CSI Administration budget 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ M&E staff time funded from CSI M&E budget

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Total Budget: \$3.9 million
AB 578 DG Impact Study	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not Included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Biennial Studies (2012, 2014, 2016) ▪ Total CSI portion of budget: \$210,000
CSI Thermal M&E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No specific budget allocation for CSI Thermal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Budget as required by D.10-09-046: \$1.25 million
Optional Analyses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Total Budget: \$1.5 million 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Total Budget: \$1.64 million

Table 2 – CSI M&E Budget and Schedule Planning Worksheet

Study Category	Current Expenditures (Contracted To Date)	Forecast Expenditures	Total Current and Forecast Expenditures	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Project Coordination	\$466,180	\$733,820	\$1,200,000	\$233,090	\$233,090	\$112,895	\$112,895	\$112,895	\$112,895	\$112,895	\$112,895	\$56,448
Impact Evaluation/ Performance Studies	\$6,018,875	\$4,581,125	\$10,600,000	\$2,346,048	\$2,346,048	\$1,326,780		\$1,527,042		\$1,527,042		\$1,527,042
CSI Metering	\$3,700,000		\$3,700,000		\$1,700,000	\$213,656	\$220,066	\$226,668	\$233,468	\$240,472	\$247,686	\$617,984
Process Evaluations	\$241,324	\$208,676	\$450,000		\$241,324				\$208,676			
CSI/NEM Cost-effectiveness studies	\$945,648	\$404,352	\$1,350,000		\$945,648			\$404,352				
CSI M&E Personnel		\$3,900,000	\$3,900,000		\$520,000	\$520,000	\$520,000	\$520,000	\$520,000	\$520,000	\$520,000	\$260,000
External Financial Audit	\$200,000	\$700,000	\$900,000	\$200,000		\$233,333		\$233,333		\$233,333		
Market Transformation Study		\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000			\$750,000			\$750,000			
AB578 DG Impacts		\$210,000	\$210,000				\$70,000		\$70,000		\$70,000	
CSI Thermal M&E		\$1,250,000	\$1,250,000									
Optional Analysis		\$1,640,000	\$1,640,000									
Total	\$11,572,027	\$15,127,973	\$26,700,000									

**PG&E Gas and Electric
Advice Filing List
General Order 96-B, Section IV**

AT&T	Dept of General Services	Northern California Power Association
Alcantar & Kahl LLP	Douglass & Liddell	Occidental Energy Marketing, Inc.
Ameresco	Downey & Brand	OnGrid Solar
Anderson & Poole	Duke Energy	Praxair
Arizona Public Service Company	Dutcher, John	R. W. Beck & Associates
BART	Economic Sciences Corporation	RCS, Inc.
Barkovich & Yap, Inc.	Ellison Schneider & Harris LLP	Recurrent Energy
Bartle Wells Associates	Foster Farms	SCD Energy Solutions
Bloomberg	G. A. Krause & Assoc.	SCE
Bloomberg New Energy Finance	GLJ Publications	SMUD
Boston Properties	GenOn Energy, Inc.	SPURR
	Goodin, MacBride, Squeri, Schlotz & Ritchie	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Braun Blaising McLaughlin, P.C.	Green Power Institute	Santa Fe Jets
Brookfield Renewable Power	Hanna & Morton	Seattle City Light
CA Bldg Industry Association	Hitachi	Sempra Utilities
CLECA Law Office	In House Energy	Sierra Pacific Power Company
CSC Energy Services	International Power Technology	Silicon Valley Power
California Cotton Ginners & Growers Assn	Intestate Gas Services, Inc.	Silo Energy LLC
California Energy Commission	Lawrence Berkeley National Lab	Southern California Edison Company
California League of Food Processors	Los Angeles Dept of Water & Power	Spark Energy, L.P.
California Public Utilities Commission	Luce, Forward, Hamilton & Scripps LLP	Sun Light & Power
Calpine	MAC Lighting Consulting	Sunshine Design
Cardinal Cogen	MBMC, Inc.	Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan
Casner, Steve	MRW & Associates	Tabors Caramanis & Associates
Chris, King	Manatt Phelps Phillips	Tecogen, Inc.
City of Palo Alto	McKenzie & Associates	Tiger Natural Gas, Inc.
City of Palo Alto Utilities	Merced Irrigation District	TransCanada
Clean Energy Fuels	Modesto Irrigation District	Turlock Irrigation District
Coast Economic Consulting	Morgan Stanley	United Cogen
Commercial Energy	Morrison & Foerster	Utility Cost Management
Consumer Federation of California	NLine Energy, Inc.	Utility Specialists
Crossborder Energy	NRG West	Verizon
Davis Wright Tremaine LLP	Navigant Consulting	Wellhead Electric Company
Day Carter Murphy	Norris & Wong Associates	Western Manufactured Housing Communities Association (WMA)
		eMeter Corporation
Defense Energy Support Center	North America Power Partners	
Department of Water Resources	North Coast SolarResources	