INFORMATIONAL UPDATE OF
THE CALIFORNIA DSM MEASUREMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CADMAC)

Pursuant to Commission Decision (D.) D.93-05-063, and the Ruling of ALJ Gottstein dated February 16, 1994, the California DSM Measurement Advisory Committee (CADMAC), hereby submits an informational update on the statewide measurement and evaluation (M&E) study plans (Attachment 1), and a description of retroactive waivers to protocols agreed to by all CADMAC members (Attachment 2).

In D.93-05-063 (at p. 78), the Commission ordered CADMAC to submit a report in the pending Annual Earnings Assessment Proceeding (AEAP) describing all retroactive waivers approved by CADMAC, and the rationale for supporting such waivers. Subsequent to that decision, during the February 11, 1994, pre-hearing conference, ALJ Gottstein also requested that CADMAC recommend how often it should report this information and provide an update of statewide M&E plans. The April 1, 1994, CADMAC Informational Filing recommended a semi-annual schedule (April 1 and October 1) for subsequent updates.

In the 1996 AEAP, CADMAC recommended that the frequency of these filings be reduced from twice annually to once a year on June 1st. This change was adopted in D.96-12-079.

CADMAC INFORMATIONAL UPDATE

Waivers

During measurement year June 2001 through May 2002, CADMAC approved, through consensus votes, two retroactive waivers for retention evaluation studies of Pre-98 Energy
Efficiency Programs: one for Pacific Gas and Electric Company ("PG&E") and one for Southern California Edison ("SCE"). Attachment 2 contains the cumulative summary report of all CADMAC waivers approved since 1995 and a complete copy of the waivers approved in the last year.

**On-going Statewide Studies**

For the period June 2001 through May 2002, CADMAC continued to conduct one statewide study through its Persistence Subcommittee - - an extension of the Statewide Measure Performance Study, Phase III-B. This study covers compressors and compressed air distribution systems measures. Attachment 1 contains the cumulative Persistence Subcommittee report updated for year 2001. All other subcommittees are now inactive.

This informational update is provided on behalf of and with the unanimous consent of all CADMAC members, by Athena M. Besa of San Diego Gas & Electric Company ("SDG&E") this year’s CADMAC chair. It is being mailed to all parties on the service list of the Annual Earnings Assessment Proceeding A.02-05-002, A.02-05-003, A.02-05-004 and A.02-05-005.

Respectfully submitted,

CALIFORNIA DSM MEASUREMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CADMAC)

By Athena Besa, Chair

By Vicki L. Thompson

Attorney for:
San Diego Gas & Electric Company
101 Ash Street
Post Office Box 1831
San Diego, CA 92112
Phone: (619) 699-5130
Fax: (619) 699-5027
E-Mail: vthompson@sempra.com

June 3, 2002
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OVERVIEW OF CADMAC SUBCOMMITTEES

The following subcommittees produced reports and provided advice to CADMAC on modifications to the Measurement Protocols:

- Retrofit Modeling Subcommittee
- New Construction Modeling Subcommittee
- Persistence Subcommittee
- Measure Cost Subcommittee
- Residential High Efficiency Refrigerators Subcommittee
- Residential High Efficiency Lighting Subcommittee
- Metering and Monitoring Subcommittee
- Special Studies Subcommittee
- Market Effects Subcommittee

All the subcommittees except the Persistence Subcommittee have been inactive since 1999 and no longer have members. No further activity is expected from these subcommittees.

Previous informational filings have outlined the membership and studies of all the subcommittees. This informational filing provides a report only on the one remaining active subcommittee.

Summary tables of all the CADMAC statewide studies and their budgets since 1993 are also provided.
PERSISTENCE SUBCOMMITTEE

CHAIRPERSON: Rafael Friedmann (PG&E)

MEMBERS: Jim Green (SCG)
          Pierre Landry (SCE)
          Rob Rubin (SDG&E)
          Adrienne Kandel (CEC)

GOAL: To assess alternative methods and provide estimates of useful life, effective useful life, technical degradation factors (TDFs), and changes in program load impacts over time.

MEETING SCHEDULE: Meetings will be held as needed. The schedule is tentative and can change depending on members' availability.

WORK IN PROGRESS: “Statewide Measure Performance Study: Residential and Nonresidential Sectors, Phase III-B,” Proctor Engineering Group (Project 2032P)


“Statewide Measure Performance Study: Residential and Nonresidential Sectors,” Proctor Engineering Group, April 1996 (Project 2023P)


“Statewide Measure Performance Study: Residential and Nonresidential Sectors, Phase II,” Proctor Engineering Group, March 1998 (Project 2027P)


“Statewide Direct Assistance Program Measure Retention Study,” Megdal & Associates, March 1999 (Project 2029P)


PROJECT 2021P
Title: Scoping Study Review
Objective: To review the CCIG Scoping Study on persistence methodologies prior to starting statewide work.
Contractor: None (internal to subcommittee)
Method: Literature review
Start date: June 1993
Finish date: June 1993
Current status: Review completed
Budget (by year): $0
Committed (by year): $0
**PROJECT 2022P**

**Title:** DSM Measure Life Project (Per Appendix B: Item V.3.a.)

**Objective:** The purpose of this project was to attempt to obtain consensus among California's investor-owned utility companies, on the "effective useful life" of each DSM measure contained in the utilities' Advice Filings. The project involved the creation of a database of DSM measure life estimates.

**Contractor:** Energy Management Services

**Method:** Series of interviews/meeting with the utilities to refine the database and obtain consensus on as many measure life estimates as possible.

**Start date:** June 11, 1993

**Finish date:** August 16, 1993

**Current status:** Project completed; filed per ALJ's request

**Budget (by year):** $31,400 (1993)

**Committed (by year):** $31,400 (1993)
### PROJECT 2023P

**Title:** Statewide Measure Performance Study: Residential and Nonresidential Sectors  

**Objective:** Assessment of changes in load impacts due to technical degradation of energy efficient measures relative to standard efficiency measures. Phase I studied 13 measures.  

**Contractor:** Proctor Engineering Group  

**Method:** Collection and assessment of performance data on selected demand side management measures from secondary and primary sources, including engineering studies, interviews with manufacturers and technical experts, and on-site visits.  

Analysis of performance data: development of measure performance curves by energy-efficiency-measures for the residential and nonresidential sectors (stratified by market segments, where applicable).  

To perform the same type of analyses on the final set of measures in order to comply with Table 9A (1996).  

**Start date:** March 1995  
**Finish date:** April 1996  
**Current status:** Completed  
**Budget (by year):**  
- Funded by utilities: $150,000  
- Committed (by year): $0 (1996)
PROJECT 2024P

Title: Review of Empirical Studies for DSM Program Spillover Effects (Per Appendix B: Item V.3.c.)

Objectives: Provide a critical review of past and current empirical studies in the area of DSM program spillover effects. Recommend the most promising approaches for future studies.

Contractor: Cambridge Systematics, Inc.

Method: Literature review
Discussion of estimating methodology for spillover effects

Start date: October 7, 1993
Finish date: June 30, 1994

Current status: Report published

Budget (by year): $30,000 (1993)
Committed (by year): $25,000 (1994)
### PROJECT 2025P

**Title:** Coordination of Utility Measure Retention Studies for Pre-1994 Programs  

**Objective:** To compile retention data from 1990-1993 programs in order to consider additions or modifications to adopted measure-ment protocols for lifecycle load impacts.  

**Contractor:** Various contractors for each utility  

**Method:**  
- PG&E: 1990-1993 Nonresidential Measure Retention Study  
- SCG: 1990-1991 Residential Persistence Study  
- SDG&E: 1990-1993 Nonresidential Measure Retention Study  
- SCE: Effective Measure Life; Commercial Sector Lighting DSM Measures  

**Start date:** January 1994  
**Finish date:** December 1994  
**Current status:** SCG (completed), SDG&E (completed), PG&E (completed), SCE (completed).  
**Budget (by year):** To be funded by utilities  
**Committed (by year):** N/A
PROJECT 2026P
Title: Statewide Multi-Year Billing Analysis
Objective: Estimate net savings by testing a multi-year billing analysis approach for a specific utility program for at least 3 years.
Contractor: Quantum Consulting
Method: Develop and test a multi-year billing analysis approach to estimate net savings for PG&E’s Nonresidential Energy Efficiency Incentives Programs—Commercial Lighting end use.
Discern program effects from the numerous other independent economic, social, and physical factors that also influence energy consumption over time. Focus is on persistence of gross savings and how net savings would change over time.
Start date: December 1997
Finish date: August 1998
Current status: Completed; this study was overseen by the Market Effects Subcommittee.
Budget (by year): Funded by utilities: $200,000
Committed (by year): $0 (1997)
PROJECT 2027P

Title: Statewide Measure Performance Study: Residential and Nonresidential Sectors, Phase II

Objective: Assessment of changes in load impacts due to technical degradation of energy efficient measures relative to standard efficiency equipment. Phase II studied 12 additional measures.

Contractor: Proctor Engineering Group

Method: Collection and assessment of performance data on selected demand side management measures from secondary and primary sources, including engineering studies, interviews with manufacturers and technical experts, and on-site visits.

Analysis of performance data: development of measure performance curves by energy-efficiency-measures for the residential and nonresidential sectors (stratified by market segments, where applicable).

To perform the same type of analyses on the final set of measures in order to comply with Table 9A (1997).

Start date: November 1996
Finish date: March 1998
Current status: Completed
Budget (by year): Funded by utilities: $150,000
Committed (by year): $0 (1997)
### PROJECT 2028P

**Title:** Statewide Measure Performance Study: Residential and Nonresidential Sectors, Phase III-A

**Objective:** Assessment of changes in load impacts due to technical degradation of energy efficient measures relative to standard efficiency equipment. Phase III-A performs additional studies of two measures from the previous Phase I and Phase II studies: commercial direct expansion air conditioners and energy management systems.

**Contractor:** Proctor Engineering Group

**Method:** Collection of data from a representative sample of equipment from (a) laboratory testing and (b) on-site visits.

Analysis of performance data: development of measure performance curves by energy-efficiency-measures for the residential and nonresidential sectors (stratified by market segments, where applicable).

To perform the same type of analyses on the final set of measures in order to comply with Table 9A (1997).

**Start date:** June 1998

**Finish date:** March 1999

**Current status:** Completed

**Budget (by year):** Funded by utilities: $217,500

**Committed (by year):** $0 (pre-1998)
PROJECT 2029P
Title: Statewide Direct Assistance Program Measure Retention Study

Objective: Assessment of overall retention rates of five weatherization measures plus evaporative cooling measures installed under the four utilities' residential Direct Assistance Programs.

Contractor: Megdal & Associates

Method: Perform 250 on-sites across the four utility service territories to determine whether the measures are in place and operable.

Compute the historic percent retention as a function of time for each measure at the statewide level and, as possible, at the utility service territory level.

Compare retention results for each service territory and attempt to identify factors leading to any apparent difference in measure retention based on program design, and empirical and anecdotal data gathered during on-site inspections.

Start date: June 1998
Finish date: March 1999
Current status: Completed
Budget (by year): Funded by utilities: $150,000
Committed (by year): $0 (pre-1998)
PROJECT 2030P
Title: Statewide Measure Performance Study: Summary of Persistence Studies: Assessments of Technical Degradation Factors

Objective: Summarize and consolidate final technical degradation factor (TDF) tables from the three Persistence Studies (Projects 2023P, 2027P and 2028P).

Contractor: Proctor Engineering Group

Method: Collection and assessment of performance data on selected demand side management measures from secondary and primary sources, including engineering studies, interviews with manufacturers and technical experts, on-site visits, and laboratory testing.

Analysis of performance data: development of measure performance curves by energy-efficiency-measures for the residential and nonresidential sectors (stratified by market segments, where applicable).

To perform the same type of analyses on the final set of measures in order to comply with Table 9A (1998).

Start date: June 1998
Finish date: February 1999
Current status: Completed

Budget (by year): $0: Funded by utilities through Project 2028P budget
Committed (by year): $0 (pre-1998)
PROJECT 2031P

Title: Statewide Measure Performance Study: Negative Degradation Factors: Supplement to Persistence Studies

Objective: Four measures from the three Persistence Studies (Projects 2023P, 2027P and 2028P) were determined to have negative technical degradation factors (TDFs) relative to standard efficiency equipment. These were estimated.

Contractor: Proctor Engineering Group

Method: Collection and assessment of performance data on selected demand side management measures from secondary and primary sources, including engineering studies, interviews with manufacturers and technical experts, on-site visits, and laboratory testing.

Analysis of performance data: development of measure performance curves by energy-efficiency-measures for the residential and nonresidential sectors (stratified by market segments, where applicable).

To perform the same type of analyses on the final set of measures in order to comply with Table 9A (1998).

Start date: June 1998

Finish date: October 1998

Current status: Completed

Budget (by year): $0: Funded by utilities through Project 2028P budget

Committed (by year): $0 (pre-1998)
PROJECT 2032P

Title: Statewide Measure Performance Study: Residential and Nonresidential Sectors, Phase III-B

Objective: Further assessment of the technical degradation of the Compressors and Compressed Air Distribution Systems measure studied under Phase II (Project 2027P). However, the TDF used for resource value calculations is set at 1.0 by the Protocols and will not be changed by the results of this study.

Contractor: Proctor Engineering Group

Method: Collection of data from a representative sample of equipment from laboratory testing and on-site visits.

Analysis of performance data: development of measure performance curves for the nonresidential sectors (stratified by market segments, where applicable).

Provide extended metering and specific recommendations to participating customers to increase their energy efficiency, and monitor resulting usage patterns.

Start date: June 1998
Finish date: December 2001
Current status: Research underway
Budget (by year): Funded by utilities: $229,000
Committed (by year): $0
### REPORT ON MARKET EFFECTS STUDIES COMPLETED BY UTILITY MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Utility Sponsor</th>
<th>Study ID No.</th>
<th>RFP Mailed Out</th>
<th>Date Contract Signed</th>
<th>Due Date for Draft/Received</th>
<th>Due Date for Final report/Received</th>
<th>Contract Amount ($000)</th>
<th>YTD Expenditures ($000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Market Effects of Residential Information Program</td>
<td>SCG</td>
<td>3701 NA5 5</td>
<td>NA5 5</td>
<td>NA5 5</td>
<td>NA5 5</td>
<td>Jun 1998</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Market Effects of Residential New Construction</td>
<td>SCG</td>
<td>3702 3904</td>
<td>NA5 5</td>
<td>NA5 5</td>
<td>NA5 5</td>
<td>Jun 1998</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Per 1996 AEAP Decision D.96-12-079.
2. Year-to-Date Expenditures as of June 1, 1997
3. NA: Not Available
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBCOMMITTEE</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DUE DATE (Per Appendix B)</th>
<th>START DATE</th>
<th>FINISH DATE</th>
<th>BRIEFING TO CADMAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Side-by-Side Comparison</td>
<td>2003M</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Cancelled</td>
<td>Cancelled</td>
<td>Cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comm. Baseline Assessment</td>
<td>2014N</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination Retention</td>
<td>2025P</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Jan 1994</td>
<td>Dec 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methods Review B</td>
<td>2033B</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spillover</td>
<td>2036B</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect Cost Scoping</td>
<td>2042C</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect Cost Pilot</td>
<td>2043C</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCE Load Data</td>
<td>2052R</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Sep 1994</td>
<td>April 1995</td>
<td>Jun 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transferability</td>
<td>2062L</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect Costs &amp; Benefits Study</td>
<td>2092T</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>May 1996</td>
<td>Apr 1997</td>
<td>May 1997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 This study evolved into Project 2043C.
5 Project 2093T is also referred to as Study ID No. 3301 (PGE) and Study ID No. 3501 (SCE).
### 1993 - 2002 CADMAC STATEWIDE STUDIES BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RETROFIT MODELING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventions (2001M)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size (2002M) (1)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side-by-Side Comp. (2003M) (2)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Choice Models (2004M)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance Guidelines</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventions (2011N)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$60,243</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$60,243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Baseline (2012N)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Base Matrix (2013N)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Base On-Site (2014N) (4)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Base Quant. (2015N)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSISTENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoping Study Rev. (2021P)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Life (2022P)</td>
<td>$31,400</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$31,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance (2023P) (4)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spillover (2024P)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination Retention (2025P) (4)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multyear Billing Analysis (2026P) (4)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance II (2027P) (4)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance III (2028P) (4)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAP Measure Retention (4)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASE EFFICIENCY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Matrix (2031B)</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods Review A (2032B)</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$3,900</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$28,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods Review B (2033B)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. App. Efficiency (2034B)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Savings (2035B)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spillover (2036B)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEASURE COST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Cost Study (2041C)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost Scoping Study (2042C) (3)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost Pilot Study (2043C) (3)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Cost Study (2044C)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES. REFRIGERATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoping Study (2051R)</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE Load Data (2052R)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994 Impact Eval. (2053R) (4)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$11,807</td>
<td>$123,243</td>
<td>$135,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENTIAL LIGHTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting Protocols (2061L)</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferability (2062L)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994 Impact Eval. (2063L) (4)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METERING/MONITORING (2071E)</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLAB.SUMMARY (2081S)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKET EFFECTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Transformation Scoping Study (2091T)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs &amp; Benefits (2092T)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNC Market Transformation (2093T) (4)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Market Effects Studies (2094T)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$11,807</td>
<td>$123,243</td>
<td>$135,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$209,400</td>
<td>$200,243</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>$405,000</td>
<td>$11,807</td>
<td>$123,243</td>
<td>$1,119,693</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes for 1993 - 2002 CADMAC Statewide Studies Budget pages:

1. Proposed project concept and dollar amount approved by CADMAC, September 1994. Scope of work has been expanded.

2. Project no longer necessary/canceled

3. This study evolved into Project 2092E

4. Only participating utilities will fund – not part of CADMAC statewide studies budgets.

5. Funded by the DRA 1% fund for DRA review activities
ATTACHMENT 2

INFORMATIONAL UPDATE
ON
RETROACTIVE WAIVERS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITY</th>
<th>PROGRAM YEAR</th>
<th>PROGRAM NAME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF WAIVER</th>
<th>DATE APPROVED BY CADMAC</th>
<th>DATE FILED WITH CPUC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY94</td>
<td>Residential &amp; Nonresidential New Construction</td>
<td>Delay first year load impact studies for one year; studies that support the second earnings claim will be filed in the 1997 AEAP. PG&amp;E's second earnings claim will be delayed for one year for these two programs.</td>
<td>11/30/94</td>
<td>4/3/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY94</td>
<td>Commercial EEI - Gas Cooking End Use</td>
<td>Evaluate gas cooking end use under Table C-9 instead of Table C-4 because of limited number of participants</td>
<td>3/15/95</td>
<td>4/3/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY94</td>
<td>Commercial/Industrial Energy Management Services</td>
<td>Delay first load impact evaluation for one year from 1996 to 1997. No earnings claim will be made for the PY94 EMS Program.</td>
<td>3/15/95</td>
<td>4/3/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY94</td>
<td>Agricultural Energy Management Services</td>
<td>Use engineering model to estimate savings adjusted by a realization rate, drop comparison group requirement, and drop retention study requirement.</td>
<td>3/15/95</td>
<td>4/3/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>PY94</td>
<td>Residential New Construction</td>
<td>Omit the PY94 studies and replace them with a study that will assist SCE and CEC in assessing the new construction sector. To be completed by 8/31/96.</td>
<td>3/15/95</td>
<td>4/3/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITY</td>
<td>PROGRAM YEAR</td>
<td>PROGRAM NAME</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF WAIVER</td>
<td>DATE APPROVED BY CADMAC</td>
<td>DATE FILED WITH CPUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>PY94</td>
<td>Nonresidential New Construction</td>
<td>Delay first year impact evaluation and second earnings claim for one year. Impact evaluation to be completed no later than 2/28/97; second earnings claim to be filed with 1997 DSM Annual Report, along with second earnings claim for 1995 programs.</td>
<td>3/15/95</td>
<td>4/3/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCG</td>
<td>PY94</td>
<td>Residential New Construction</td>
<td>Delay first year load impact evaluation and second earnings claim for one year. Impact evaluation to be filed on 3/1/97 as opposed to 3/1/96.</td>
<td>6/21/95</td>
<td>9/29/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY94</td>
<td>Residential New Construction</td>
<td>Omit the PY94 studies and replace them with a small study that will assist PG&amp;E and CEC in assessing the new construction sector. To be completed by 8/31/96. The small study will be the same study that SCE and CEC are performing. This waiver supersedes the 1994 Residential New Construction waiver adopted 11/30/94 and filed 4/3/95.</td>
<td>9/20/95</td>
<td>9/29/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCG</td>
<td>PY95</td>
<td>Commercial New Construction</td>
<td>Delay first year load impact evaluation and second earnings claim for one year. Impact evaluation to be filed on 3/1/98 as opposed to 3/1/97.</td>
<td>10/18/95</td>
<td>4/23/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY94</td>
<td>Commercial Energy Efficiency Incentives</td>
<td>Use Industrial Protocols Table C-5 in place of Commercial Protocols Table C-4 for the purpose of evaluating load impacts and net-to-gross ratio of measures installed in San Diego military bases.</td>
<td>1/17/96</td>
<td>4/23/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITY</td>
<td>PROGRAM YEAR</td>
<td>PROGRAM NAME</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF WAIVER</td>
<td>DATE APPROVED BY CADMAC</td>
<td>DATE FILED WITH CPUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY94</td>
<td>Residential Weatherization and Residential Appliance Efficiency Incentives</td>
<td>Delay first year load impact evaluations and second earnings claims for one year. Impact evaluations will be filed on 3/1/97 as opposed to 3/1/96.</td>
<td>2/21/96</td>
<td>4/23/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY94</td>
<td>Residential New Construction Miscellaneous Measures</td>
<td>Waive first year retention study requirement for compact fluorescent fixtures and multi-family dwelling measures.</td>
<td>2/21/96</td>
<td>4/23/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>PY94</td>
<td>Commercial Energy Efficiency Incentives – CFL Manufacturer’s Rebate Program</td>
<td>Use the same measurement method as used for residential CFB manufacturers’ rebate program instead of Table C-4; use Table C-9 default net-to-gross ratio if necessary.</td>
<td>2/21/96</td>
<td>4/23/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>PY94</td>
<td>Residential High Efficiency Lighting Statewide Study</td>
<td>Use Table C-3B methodology to determine the net-to-gross ratio.</td>
<td>2/21/96</td>
<td>4/23/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>PY94</td>
<td>Residential New Construction</td>
<td>Combine SCE and PG&amp;E individual studies into a joint study to be completed by 3/1/97.</td>
<td>5/15/96</td>
<td>6/2/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>PY94</td>
<td>Residential Energy Management Services</td>
<td>Use mail and/or telephone surveys to produce estimates of the pre-installation usage, base usage, and first year load impacts for the participant group. Waive the comparison group requirement.</td>
<td>8/20/96</td>
<td>6/2/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCG</td>
<td>PY95</td>
<td>Industrial Energy Management Services</td>
<td>Replace first year impact study for the Mail-In Energy Use Profile component of the program with a second year load impact study of the PY93 component.</td>
<td>7/10/96</td>
<td>6/2/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY95</td>
<td>Agricultural Energy Efficiency Incentives</td>
<td>Use 0.75 net-to-gross ratio in lieu of using a comparison group. Report load impacts per horsepower as the DUOM for the motors installed under this program. Evaluate heating measures</td>
<td>9/19/96</td>
<td>6/2/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITY</td>
<td>PROGRAM YEAR</td>
<td>PROGRAM NAME</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF WAIVER</td>
<td>DATE APPROVED BY CADMAC</td>
<td>DATE FILED WITH CPUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY94</td>
<td>Residential Appliance Efficiency Incentives - Refrigeration</td>
<td>Allow net savings to be estimated using a 0.97 net-to-gross adjustment based on results of SCE/SDG&amp;E evaluation rather than collect primary data from customers in PG&amp;E’s service territory.</td>
<td>9/19/96</td>
<td>6/2/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY95</td>
<td>Agricultural Energy Efficiency Incentives</td>
<td>Allow use of (1) Simplified Engineering Models supported by telephone and field data collection to estimate impacts for lighting and pumping end uses if the billing analysis does not yield robust results; (2) self-reported and trade ally survey analysis results to estimate net-to-gross; (3) an attempted census for the pumping and lighting end uses; (4) the commercial lighting DUOM for lighting end use; and (5) use a common denominator (same as used in ex ante) for DUOM value for pumping end use.</td>
<td>10/18/96</td>
<td>6/2/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>PY95</td>
<td>Commercial/Industrial/Agricultural Energy Efficiency Incentives</td>
<td>Waive the requirement for impact studies due to low participation in the CEEI Program, no participation in the IEEI or AEEI Programs, and no shareholder rewards.</td>
<td>11/13/96</td>
<td>6/2/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY95</td>
<td>Commercial Energy Efficiency Incentives - Refrigeration</td>
<td>PG&amp;E will perform two net-to-gross analyses and upon filing indicate which method will be used to collect earnings. The DUOM for the refrigeration end use is changed to “per project.”</td>
<td>12/18/96</td>
<td>6/2/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITY</td>
<td>PROGRAM YEAR</td>
<td>PROGRAM NAME</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF WAIVER</td>
<td>DATE APPROVED BY CADMAC</td>
<td>DATE FILED WITH CPUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY95</td>
<td>Commercial Energy Efficiency Incentives - Measures in Military Bases</td>
<td>Use Industrial Protocols Table C-5 in place of Commercial Protocols Table C-4 for the purpose of evaluating load impacts and net-to-gross ratio of measures installed in San Diego military bases.</td>
<td>12/18/96</td>
<td>6/2/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>PY95</td>
<td>Nonresidential DSM Bidding</td>
<td>Waive the requirement for first year load impact and persistence studies of this program and treat as a skipped year due to low participation and no earnings.</td>
<td>1/15/97</td>
<td>6/2/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY94</td>
<td>Nonresidential New Construction</td>
<td>Allow use of the “whole building” DUOM instead of reporting impacts on a per square foot basis per end use as prescribed in the previous version of the Protocols</td>
<td>2/19/97</td>
<td>6/2/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY94</td>
<td>Nonresidential New Construction</td>
<td>Allow use of a reduced sample which, although below the minimum listed in the Protocols, was drawn at a level of 90/10 precision based upon estimated square footage. Report load impact results on a “whole building” level.</td>
<td>2/19/97</td>
<td>6/2/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>PY96</td>
<td>Industrial &amp; Agricultural Energy Management Services</td>
<td>Substitutes two market effects studies for the Protocol-required load impact studies.</td>
<td>5/21/97</td>
<td>6/2/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY96</td>
<td>Commercial/Industrial/Agricultural Energy Management Services</td>
<td>Delays the first year load impact evaluations for one year from 1997 to 1998.</td>
<td>5/21/97</td>
<td>6/2/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCG</td>
<td>PY95</td>
<td>Nonresidential New Construction</td>
<td>(1) use Simplified Engineering model, (2) change sample size, and (3) use discrete choice analysis because 95% of savings is contributed by cooking measures versus whole building, which is what the Protocols prescribe.</td>
<td>6/18/97</td>
<td>6/3/98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary Listing of Retroactive Waivers - 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITY</th>
<th>PROGRAM YEAR</th>
<th>PROGRAM NAME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF WAIVER</th>
<th>DATE APPROVED BY CADMAC</th>
<th>DATEFiled WITH CPUC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCG</td>
<td>PY96</td>
<td>Commercial Energy Management Services</td>
<td>Allow use of telephone survey of larger sample rather than on-site survey of smaller sample prescribed by Protocols.</td>
<td>6/18/97</td>
<td>6/3/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY96</td>
<td>Agricultural Energy Efficiency Incentives</td>
<td>(1) use a default 0.75 net-to-gross ratio in lieu of using a comparison group; (2) change the DUOM for motors to “load impacts per horsepower;” (3) evaluate lighting measures as a separate end use, and (4) treat process and exterior lighting end uses as miscellaneous measures per Protocols Table C-9.</td>
<td>6/18/97</td>
<td>6/3/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>PY96</td>
<td>Agricultural Energy Efficiency Incentives</td>
<td>(1) Use two engineering analyses for gross savings estimation for water pumping: (a) a “true-up” to overcome potential upward bias in the ex ante algorithm used for variable speed drives as applied to pumping measures, and (b) an independent engineering estimate developed from on-site and metered data by an engineering firm specializing in hydraulic services. (2) Treat HVAC as a non-miscellaneous end use, per the Protocols rule that end uses contributing to more than 15% of sector net resource benefits be subjected to ex post evaluation. (3) Use “load impacts per acre foot of water pumped” as the DUOM for pumping and “load impacts per square foot of conditioned space” for HVAC. (4) Use the 0.75 default net-to-gross ratio for pumping and</td>
<td>7/22/97</td>
<td>6/3/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITY</td>
<td>PROGRAM YEAR</td>
<td>PROGRAM NAME</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF WAIVER</td>
<td>DATE APPROVED BY CADMAC</td>
<td>DATE FILED WITH CPUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY96</td>
<td>Agricultural Energy Efficiency Incentives</td>
<td>(1) use a Simplified Engineering Model supported by telephone surveys and on-site data collection to estimate the gross impacts for indoor lighting end use and Customized Incentive Program measures, (2) perform an <em>ex ante</em> algorithm review to estimate the gross impact for pump adjustments which represent less than 0.1% of the pumping end use avoided cost, (3) use discrete choice analysis including participant and non-participant survey data, backed up with self-report analysis, to estimate net-to-gross effects, and (4) specify the Designated Unit of Measurement (DUOM) for agricultural indoor lighting to be the same as commercial lighting for Agricultural EEI measures.</td>
<td>7/22/97</td>
<td>6/3/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>PY96</td>
<td>Nonresidential New Construction</td>
<td>(1) Use a reduced sample size that meets precision requirements. (2) Waive the requirement for use of 9 months of billing data and allow use of short-term whole premise metering data or reduced amounts of billing data for calibration of building simulation models (DOE-2). (3) Use two different methodologies to estimate program net savings impacts and specify selection criteria to determine which of the two estimates will be used to calculate earnings for this program.</td>
<td>8/20/97</td>
<td>6/3/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY96</td>
<td>Nonresidential New Construction</td>
<td>Exempted from the Table 5 sampling</td>
<td>8/20/97</td>
<td>6/3/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITY</td>
<td>PROGRAM YEAR</td>
<td>PROGRAM NAME</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF WAIVER</td>
<td>DATE APPROVED BY CADMAC</td>
<td>DATE FILED WITH CPUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>requirements, that is, the sample size and random sample methodology, for first year load impact study. SDG&amp;E was allowed to supplement the PY95 NRNC study sample (both participants and non-participants) with a sample of PY96 participants and a selected non-participant group. The resulting combined PY95 and PY96 sample will be used for the PY96 NRNC first year load impact study. PY97 will then be a skipped year and the PY96 study results will be used to modify the second earnings claim for PY97.</td>
<td>9/24/97 6/3/98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>PY96</td>
<td>Residential Appliance Efficiency Incentives - Space Conditioning End Use</td>
<td>Waives the requirement to conduct a first year impact study and subsequent persistence studies because (1) the program was very small and the low number of installations made the measure non cost-effective, (2) SCE completed a PY94 study of achieved savings that documents claimed savings were achieved, and (3) the usefulness of another study is questionable from the perspective of its worth for future program planning directions.</td>
<td>9/24/97 6/3/98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY96</td>
<td>Nonresidential New Construction</td>
<td>(1) use a reduced sample size to achieve requisite precision and confidence levels, (2) use short-term whole premise metering in addition to or instead of billing data for calibration of DOE-2 building simulation models and eliminate the requirement for a minimum of 9 months of billing data, and (3) use</td>
<td>9/24/97 6/3/98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITY</td>
<td>PROGRAM YEAR</td>
<td>PROGRAM NAME</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF WAIVER</td>
<td>DATE APPROVED BY CADMAC</td>
<td>DATE FILED WITH CPUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY96</td>
<td>Agricultural Energy Management Services</td>
<td>(1) estimate gross impacts using telephone surveys collection to determine installation rates, then multiply these rates by the average EEI impact for the same measures, (2) use discrete choice analysis including participants and nonparticipants, backed up with self-report analysis, to estimate net-to-gross effects or use a default net-to-gross ratio of 0.75 in trade for a study of market transformation effects, and (3) submit a market effects study on April 30 to the Market Effects Subcommittee.</td>
<td>7/22/97 and subsequently on 11/21/97</td>
<td>6/3/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY96</td>
<td>Commercial Energy Efficiency Incentives - Lighting End Use</td>
<td>use a Simplified Engineering Model supported by telephone surveys and on-site data collection to estimate the gross impacts for indoor lighting end-use and Customized Incentive (CI) Program measures, (2) perform an ex ante algorithm review to estimate the gross impact for pump adjustments which represent less than 0.1% of the pumping end-use avoided cost, (3) use discrete choice analysis including participant and non-participant survey data, backed up with self-report analysis, to estimate net-to-gross effects, and (4) specify the DUOM for agricultural indoor lighting to be the</td>
<td>11/21/97</td>
<td>6/3/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITY</td>
<td>PROGRAM YEAR</td>
<td>PROGRAM NAME</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF WAIVER</td>
<td>DATE APPROVED BY CADMAC</td>
<td>DATE FILED WITH CPUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>same as commercial lighting for AEEI measures for the 1996 first year evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>PY96</td>
<td>Nonresidential DSM Bidding Pilot</td>
<td>(1) use a sample of facilities for metering “chain” facilities projects, (2) use the self-report interview methodology for developing the net-to-gross ratio, and (3) extend the deadline for study completion to May 1, 1998.</td>
<td>12/17/97</td>
<td>6/3/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>PY96</td>
<td>Residential Refrigerator Recycling</td>
<td>(1) Use a combination of data from a secondary source and independently developed DOE test results to estimate unit energy consumption for appliances retired by the program. (2) Replicate customer survey methods used in 1994 to develop the required net-to-gross ratio. (3) Extend the deadline for study completion to May 1, 1998.</td>
<td>12/17/97</td>
<td>6/3/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY96</td>
<td>Residential New Construction</td>
<td>Waives the requirement for the first year load impact evaluation required by Table 8A of the Protocols, instead, applying the net load impact results from the PY94 RNC first year load impact evaluation to PY96.</td>
<td>1/21/98</td>
<td>6/3/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY96</td>
<td>Commercial Energy Efficiency Incentives - Military Measures</td>
<td>Identical waiver request for PY96 to that submitted for PY94 and PY95 which allows the use of Protocols Industrial Table C-5 in place of the Commercial Table C-4 for measures installed on military bases.</td>
<td>2/18/98</td>
<td>6/3/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITY</td>
<td>PROGRAM YEAR</td>
<td>PROGRAM NAME</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF WAIVER</td>
<td>DATE APPROVED BY CADMAC</td>
<td>DATE FILED WITH CPUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>PY94 PY96</td>
<td>Nonresidential New Construction</td>
<td>(1) treat the &quot;measure&quot; for these programs as the &quot;whole building,&quot; rather than as a collection of separate measures, (2) use the sampling plan and whole building modeling from the 1994 and 1996 impact evaluations as the basis of the persistence study sample and models, (3) calculate a program-wide &quot;effective useful life (EUL)&quot; on the basis of changes in the whole building energy efficiency level over time, (4) calculate a program-wide &quot;technical degradation factor&quot; on the basis of a ratio between current whole building energy savings calculated using degraded equipment efficiency and the whole building energy savings calculated in the original impact study, and (5) combine the persistence studies for program years 1994 and 1996 into a single study to be filed in March, 1999. The sample for this study will be drawn from a pooled sample from the PY94 and PY96 impact studies.</td>
<td>4/15/98</td>
<td>6/3/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>PY97</td>
<td>Residential Energy Management Services</td>
<td>Waives the requirement for first-year load impact study of the 1997 program per M&amp;E Protocol Table 8 A.</td>
<td>6/17/98</td>
<td>6/1/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITY</td>
<td>PROGRAM YEAR</td>
<td>PROGRAM NAME</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF WAIVER</td>
<td>DATE APPROVED BY CADMAC</td>
<td>DATE FILED WITH CPUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>PY97</td>
<td>Agricultural Energy Efficiency Incentives</td>
<td>Approve a plan for analysis of 1997 AEEI program first-year impacts that includes: a) a default net-to-gross ratio of 0.75, applicable to pumping, process, and refrigeration end uses; b) an engineering analysis for estimation of gross savings in the water pumping, process and refrigeration end uses; c) process and refrigeration treated as non-miscellaneous end uses, in accord with the Protocols rule that end uses contributing to more than 15 percent of sectoral net resource benefit are to be evaluated empirically; d) the designated unit of measurement for the process and refrigeration end uses is ‘load impacts per project,’ consistent with the Protocols-specified DUOM for the industrial process end use.</td>
<td>6/17/98</td>
<td>6/1/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGE</td>
<td>PY97</td>
<td>Agricultural Energy Efficiency Incentives</td>
<td>Approve deviations from, or clarifications of, the Protocols for the first year impact evaluation of the 1997 AEEI program as follows: . (1) use a Simplified Engineering Model supported by telephone surveys and on-site data collection to estimate the gross impacts for the refrigeration and greenhouse end-uses, and (2) conduct a market effects study in place of a net-to-gross analysis, applying a default net-to-gross ratio to the sector.</td>
<td>6/17/98</td>
<td>6/1/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGE</td>
<td>PY97</td>
<td>Commercial Energy Efficiency Incentives</td>
<td>1. Use a load impact regression model (LIRM) to estimate first year electric energy impacts. The LIRM will include</td>
<td>6/17/98</td>
<td>6/1/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITY</td>
<td>PROGRAM YEAR</td>
<td>PROGRAM NAME</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF WAIVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>calibrated engineering estimates of energy savings, based on interim results from the 1994 and 1995 Commercial Lighting Programs to estimate the following parameters: full load hours of operation, coincident diversity factors, HVAC interactive effects, and burned-out lamp rates. 2. For the estimation of first year electric capacity load (kW) impacts, a calibrated engineering (CE) model will be used, based on interim results from the 1994 and 1995 Commercial Lighting Programs to estimate the following parameters: coincident diversity factors, HVAC interactive effects, and burned-out lamp rates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITY</td>
<td>PROGRAM YEAR</td>
<td>PROGRAM NAME</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF WAIVER</td>
<td>DATE APPROVED BY CADMAC</td>
<td>DATE FILED WITH CPUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY97</td>
<td>Commercial Energy Efficiency Incentives - Measures in Military Bases</td>
<td>Use Industrial Protocols Table C-5 in place of Commercial Protocols Table C-4 to evaluate gross load impacts and net-to-gross ratio of measures installed in San Diego military bases.</td>
<td>10/21/98</td>
<td>6/1/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGE</td>
<td>PY97</td>
<td>Commercial Energy Efficiency Incentives</td>
<td>Use self report-based algorithms to estimate free ridership and spillover effects for certain technologies should the discrete choice and LIRM models fail to produce statistically reliable results of net-to-gross estimates.</td>
<td>1/20/99</td>
<td>6/1/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>PY94-PY97</td>
<td>Residential Appliance Efficiency Incentives-Refrigerator Recycling</td>
<td>Conduct one fourth and one ninth year retention study to be applied to the four program years, 1994-1997</td>
<td>1/20/99</td>
<td>6/1/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY94</td>
<td>Commercial/Industrial Energy Efficiency Incentives Nonresidential New Construction Residential Appliance Efficiency Incentives-Refrigerators</td>
<td>Substitute “top ten measures” criteria in Table 9A with (1) commercial measures be identified by the top 50% of the “incentive basis” (IB) as defined in the shareholder mechanism in place at that time; and (2) that residential refrigerator measures be identified as the top 50% of gross kWh savings.</td>
<td>2/17/99</td>
<td>6/1/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGE</td>
<td>PRE-98</td>
<td>Modification to 3rd and 4th Earnings Claim Methodology</td>
<td>All 3rd and 4th earnings claim impacts be calculated as the sum of the measure level AEAP values as adjusted by appropriate ex post Technical Degradation Factors (TDF) and Effective Useful Life (EUL) values.</td>
<td>2/17/99</td>
<td>6/1/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITY</td>
<td>PROGRAM YEAR</td>
<td>PROGRAM NAME</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF WAIVER</td>
<td>DATE APPROVED BY CADMAC</td>
<td>DATE FILED WITH CPUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>PY96-PY97</td>
<td>Commercial/Industrial/Agricultural Energy Efficiency Incentives</td>
<td>Modify the requirement to conduct completely new and separate studies for the 1996-97 program years. Instead replace these by a continuation and supplementation of the study currently underway for the 1993-94 programs years for all three sectors.</td>
<td>5/20/99</td>
<td>6/1/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGE</td>
<td>PRE-98</td>
<td>Agricultural Energy Efficiency Incentives</td>
<td>(1) Use a Simplified Engineering Model supported by telephone surveys and on-site data collection to estimate the gross impacts for the Refrigeration end-use. (2) Report results in more appropriate DUOMs. (3) Conduct a market needs study in place of a net-to-gross analysis, applying a default net-to-gross ratio to the sector.</td>
<td>5/20/99</td>
<td>6/1/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGE</td>
<td>PRE-98</td>
<td>Commercial Energy Efficiency Incentives—Net-to-Gross Analysis</td>
<td>Allow the use of self-report based algorithms to estimate free ridership and spillover effects for certain technologies should the discrete choice and LIRM models fail to produce statistically reliable results of net-to-gross estimates.</td>
<td>5/20/99</td>
<td>6/1/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGE</td>
<td>PRE-98</td>
<td>Commercial Energy Efficiency Incentives—Traffic Signal</td>
<td>Follow Table C-4 of the Protocols, which was developed primarily for the lighting and HVAC end uses for traffic signals.</td>
<td>5/20/99</td>
<td>6/1/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGE</td>
<td>PRE-98</td>
<td>Commercial Energy Efficiency Incentives—Process End Use</td>
<td>For the estimation of first year gross kW, kWh, and therm impacts, project-specific engineering models will be utilized. The engineering analysis will be applied to projects representing at least 70% of the total kW, kWh, and therm savings for the process end use. In addition, verification of installation will</td>
<td>5/20/99</td>
<td>6/1/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITY</td>
<td>PROGRAM YEAR</td>
<td>PROGRAM NAME</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF WAIVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>be conducted for all projects in the evaluation sample. This approach is consistent with acceptable methods outlined in the Protocols Table C-5 for the Industrial process end use. For the estimation of first year net impacts, customer self-report data will be used to construct project-specific net-to-gross ratios. These net-to-gross ratios will be multiplied by gross impacts to provide net impact estimates. A comparison group will not be used. This approach is consistent with acceptable methods outlined in the Protocols Table C-5 for the Industrial process end use. Define the DUOM for the process end use as the number of projects rebated, where a project is uniquely defined as the combination of customer control number and application number.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITY</td>
<td>PROGRAM YEAR</td>
<td>PROGRAM NAME</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF WAIVER</td>
<td>DATE APPROVED BY CADMAC</td>
<td>DATE FILED WITH CPUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PGE     | PRE-98       | Commercial Incentives—Lighting                   | 1. For the estimation of first year electric energy impacts, a load impact regression model (LIRM) will be performed. In addition, the LIRM will include calibrated engineering estimates of energy savings, based on interim results from the 1994 and 1995 Commercial Lighting Programs to estimate the following parameters: full load hours of operation, coincident diversity factors, HVAC interactive effects, and burned-out lamp rates.  
2. For the estimation of first year electric capacity load (kW) impacts, a calibrated engineering (CE) model will be used, based on interim results from the 1994 and 1995 Commercial Lighting Programs to estimate the following parameters: coincident diversity factors, HVAC interactive effects, and burned-out lamp rates. | 5/20/99                | 6/1/99               |
| PGE     | PRE-98       | Agricultural Energy Efficiency Incentives—Green house Heat Curtain End Use | 1. For the estimation of first year electric energy impacts, allow the use of Simplified Engineering Models (as specified in Appendix A, page A-2 of the Protocols) supported by census on-site data collection to estimate gross impacts for the Greenhouse Heat Curtain end use.  
2. For the estimation of first year electric energy impacts, allow reporting of results in more appropriate DUOMs for the Greenhouse Heat Curtain end use. The results for this end use will be reported as | 10/20/99               | 6/1/00               |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITY</th>
<th>PROGRAM YEAR</th>
<th>PROGRAM NAME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF WAIVER</th>
<th>DATE APPROVED BY CADMAC</th>
<th>DATE FILED WITH CPUC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
<td>PRE-98 (PAID '98)</td>
<td>Nonresidential New Construction</td>
<td>Achieve requisite precision and confidence levels with a reduced sample size. Permit the use of short-term whole premise metering in addition to or instead of billing data for calibration of building simulation models (DOE-2) and eliminate the requirement for a minimum of nine months of billing data</td>
<td>10/19/99</td>
<td>6/1/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
<td>PRE-98 (PAID '98)</td>
<td>Nonresidential New Construction – Industrial</td>
<td>Analyze the gross savings for the new construction industrial projects using a methodology that is consistent with the industrial retrofit methodology using measure-specific analysis instead of whole-building analysis. Analyze the net savings for the new construction industrial projects using a methodology that is consistent with the industrial retrofit methodology using a self-reported net-to-gross analysis instead of a non-participant sample.</td>
<td>12/15/99</td>
<td>6/1/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY95</td>
<td>Power Savings Partners –DSM Bidding Program</td>
<td>Use of existing summary of site specific M&amp;V reports, supported by random verification, is sufficient to support PG&amp;E’s 1995 PSP Program third earnings claims.</td>
<td>2/16/00</td>
<td>6/1/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITY</td>
<td>PROGRAM YEAR</td>
<td>PROGRAM NAME</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF WAIVER</td>
<td>DATE APPROVED BY CADMAC</td>
<td>DATE FILED WITH CPUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>PY95</td>
<td>DSM Bidding Program</td>
<td>Omit the fourth and ninth year retention studies for the 1995 Nonresidential DSM Bidding Program. SCE will provide an analysis of the Annual Power Savings Reports submitted by the program participants for the 1995-97 programs that will assist in addressing retention issues for the 1996-97 program years.</td>
<td>12/15/99</td>
<td>6/1/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>PRE-1998/PAID IN 1999</td>
<td>Nonresidential New Construction</td>
<td>Permit a smaller sample size, based on model-based sampling, that is designed to meet the precision requirements specified in Table 5 with a lower sample size than Table 5 requires. The sample size will be based on precision for energy savings estimates, rather than annual energy use, since estimating energy savings is the objective of the study.</td>
<td>6/16/99</td>
<td>6/1/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGE</td>
<td>PRE-1998/PAID IN 1999</td>
<td>Nonresidential New Construction</td>
<td>Permit use of a self-report method of net-to-gross ratio estimation, as is permitted for the Industrial Energy Efficiency Incentives Program, rather than a non-participant sample method.</td>
<td>1/24/01</td>
<td>6/1/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG&amp;E</td>
<td>PY94</td>
<td>Residential Appliance Efficiency Incentives—Refrigerators; Commercial Energy Efficiency Incentives; Industrial Energy Efficiency Incentives; Nonresidential New Construction</td>
<td>Allow determination of which measures must be included in retention studies by using incentive basis for the nonresidential programs and gross energy savings for the residential program, rather than net resource value as the ranking criterion required by the Protocols. The Protocols require the top 50% of measures (or the top 10) as ranked by net resource value to be included.</td>
<td>1/24/01</td>
<td>6/1/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITY</td>
<td>PROGRAM YEAR</td>
<td>PROGRAM NAME</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF WAIVER</td>
<td>DATE APPROVED BY CADMAC</td>
<td>DATE FILED WITH CPUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGE</td>
<td>PY96</td>
<td>Residential (Multi-family) Lighting</td>
<td>Allow the continued use of the ex ante expected useful life (EUL) in lieu of conducting a new sixth year retention study for the 1996 Residential Lighting Program. Results of the third year and sixth year retention studies for the 1994 and 1995 programs, and the results of the third year retention study for the 1996 program determined that the ex ante estimates of useful life are very conservative estimates.</td>
<td>3/20/02</td>
<td>6/03/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>PY97</td>
<td>Residential Lighting</td>
<td>Allow the continued use of the results of the 1994 program studies (Study ID Nos. 524 and 535) in lieu of conducting new third and sixth year retention studies for the 1997 Residential Lighting Program.</td>
<td>3/20/02</td>
<td>6/03/02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY

WAIVER REQUEST FOR
1996 RESIDENTIAL (Multi-Family) LIGHTING PROGRAM
RETENTION STUDIES
(Study ID No. 372R2)

Approved by CADMAC on March 20, 2002

Summary

PGE proposes not to conduct a new sixth year retention study for the 1996 Residential Lighting Program, but instead to continue using the ex ante expected useful life (EUL) estimates. Results of the third year and sixth year retention studies for the 1994 and 1995 programs, and the results of the third year retention study for the 1996 program determined that the ex ante estimates of useful life are very conservative estimates. The sixth year retention study for the 1994 and 1995 programs rejected the ex ante EULs for two lighting technologies because the ex ante EULs were outside the 80 percent confidence interval and were smaller than the estimated EULs. The Study ID numbers for the 1994 and 1995 retention studies are 384bR1, 384bR2, 401bR1 and 401bR2. The Study ID number for the 1996 third year retention study is 372R1.

Parameter

Required retention studies for 1996 programs.

Protocol Requirement

Table 8A, study requirements for Residential Appliance Efficiency Incentive Programs (lighting), Persistence Studies Measurement Schedule: third and sixth year retention studies for 1996 programs, combined with Table 9A, Item 1. Frequency of Studies and Due Dates for Retention and Performance Studies.

Waiver Alternative

Omit the sixth year retention study for the 1996 Residential Lighting Program. Instead, continue to use the ex ante expected useful lives (EUL) of 10 years for hardwire CFL fixtures, 15 years for HID fixtures and 16 years for T-8 fixtures. These estimates are confirmed to be very conservative by three other PG&E studies of the residential lighting programs.

Program Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Cost - $ (thousands)</th>
<th>Incentive Cost - $ (thousands)</th>
<th>Resource Benefits, Net - $ (thousands)</th>
<th>Earnings - $ (thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$118</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rationale

PG&E’s 1996 program only included carry-over funds from the 1995 program and had limited participation of 87 sites. The lighting technologies rebated in the 1996 program were identical to the technologies rebated in the 1995 and 1994 programs. The third year retention studies for the 1994, 1995 and 1996 programs determined that the ex ante EUL estimates for all measures were conservative. The sixth year retention studies for the 1994 and 1995 programs rejected the ex ante EUL for two lighting technologies since the ex ante EULs were outside the 80 percent confidence interval and were smaller than the estimated EULs. Since the results of the previous retention studies were consistent and determined that the ex ante EUL estimates were conservative, there is no reasonable expectation that a new retention study would yield EULs with shorter lives than the ex ante estimates. The specific results for each study follow.

The third year retention study for PG&E’s 1994 and 1995 programs (Study # 384bR1 and #401bR1) determined ex post EULs of 89, 15.4 and 136 years for hardwire CFL fixtures, HID fixtures and T-8 fixtures respectively. For hardwire CFL and T-8 fixtures, the ex ante EULs were outside the 80 percent confidence interval and were smaller than the estimated EULs. Since the protocols require a sixth year retention study, there was no recommendation to reject the ex ante EULs for hardwire CFL and T-8 fixtures.

The sixth year retention study for PG&E’s 1994 and 1995 programs (Study # 384bR2 and # 401bR2) determined ex post EULs of 78, 37, and 36 years for hardwire CFL fixtures, HID fixtures and T-8 fixtures respectively. This study rejected the ex ante EULs for both hardwire CFL and HID fixtures, since the ex ante EULs were outside the 80 percent confidence interval and were smaller than the estimated EULs. This study also justified increasing the EULs to 16 years for both CFLs and HID fixtures.

The third year retention study for PG&E’s 1996 program (Study # 372R1) determined ex post EULs of 37, 37 and 37 years for hardwire CFL fixtures, HID fixtures and T-8 fixtures respectively. Due to a small number of participants and the lack of certainty in specifying the most appropriate survival model function, there was no recommendation to reject the ex ante EULs.

PG&E is proposing to retain its ex ante EUL estimates for the 1996 program, of 10 years for hardwired CFLs, 15 years for HID fixtures and 16 years for hardwired T-8 fixtures.
Table A
Summary of Waiver for Study # 372R2
Retention Measurement Requirements - Tables 6B and 7B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Protocol Requirements</th>
<th>Waiver Alternative</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tables 8A and 9A</td>
<td>Perform a sixth year retention study for the 1996 program year of the residential lighting incentive program.</td>
<td>Omit this study; use PG&amp;E’s ex ante EUL estimates of 10 years for hardwire CFLs, 15 years for HID fixtures and 16 years for T-8 fixtures for the 1996 program.</td>
<td>1. The earnings for the PY96 program are small. 2. Three other retention studies, performed by PG&amp;E, have found effective useful lifetimes for the 1996 lighting measures that either modestly or in most cases substantially exceed PG&amp;E’s original ex ante estimates. The sixth year retention study for the 1994 and 1995 programs rejected the ex ante EULs for hardwire CFLs and HID fixtures and also justified increasing the EULs to sixteen years for hardwire CFLs and HID fixtures. Hence, there is no realistic expectation that a shorter lifetime would be found by another study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

SCE proposes not to conduct new third year and sixth year retention studies for the 1997 Residential Lighting Program for purposes of the third and fourth earnings claims, but instead to continue using the results of the retention studies of the 1994 program, which are Study ID Numbers 524 and 535.

However, SCE will perform a replacement study of fluorescent lights (CFLs) if CADMAC determines at its next meeting that this would provide needed information.

Parameter

Required retention studies for 1997 programs

Protocol Requirement

Table 8A, study requirements for Residential Appliance Efficiency Incentive Programs (lighting), Persistence Studies Measurement Schedule: third and sixth year retention studies for 1996 programs, combined with Table 9A, Item 1. Frequency of Studies and Due Dates for Retention and Performance Studies.

Waiver Alternative

Omit the third and sixth year retention studies for the 1997 Residential Lighting Program. Instead, continue to use the ex ante expected useful life of 6 years that is confirmed as conservative by 5 other SCE, PG&E, and SDG&E studies of the residential lighting programs.

SCE will do a replacement study of consumer acceptance and retention of CFLs if CADMAC determines at its next meeting that this would provide important information beyond that available in other studies recently completed or in progress.

Program Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Cost</th>
<th>Incentive Cost</th>
<th>Resource Benefits, Net</th>
<th>Earnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$144,344</td>
<td>$1,019,974</td>
<td>$783,871</td>
<td>$178,829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rationale

The first retention study for SCE’s 1994 program included data drawn one, three and five years after the program year. Using conservative methodologies, this study estimated a 6.1 year effective useful life (EUL) for CFLs.

SDG&E’s third-year retention Study #921 for its 1994-1995 residential lighting program estimated an ex post EUL of 10.2 years as the EUL. Its sixth-year Study #922, with additional years of data, provided an ex post estimate of 8 years as the EUL. SDG&E’s third-year Study #984 for the 1996 and 1997 programs provided an ex post estimate of 6.4 years.

PG&E’s Study #384CR1 for its 1994-1995 residential lighting and appliance programs determined that a 10-year EUL estimate was justified.

Given these facts, it is an unnecessary expenditure of measurement funds to perform yet another pair of retention studies for residential CFBs, for a program with very small earnings.

SCE is proposing to retain its 6.0-year ex ante EUL estimate for the 1997 program, which is lower than the EUL estimate arising from any of the other five studies.
Table A  
Summary of Retroactive Waiver for Studies #551 and 556  
Retention Measurement Requirements - Tables 8A and 9A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Protocol Requirements</th>
<th>Waiver Alternative</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tables 8A and 9A</td>
<td>Perform a third and a sixth year retention study for the 1996-1997 program years of the residential lighting incentive programs.</td>
<td>Omit these two studies; use SCE's ex ante estimate of a 6-year effective useful life (EUL) for the 1997 program.</td>
<td>1. The PY96 program was not eligible for shareholder earnings and the earnings for the PY97 program are small.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
<pre><code>                                                                                                                                                                                             | Perform a replacement study if CADMAC decides such a study is needed.                                                          | 2. Five other CFB retention studies, performed by SCE, SDG&amp;E, and PG&amp;E, have found effective useful lifetimes for CFBs that either modestly or substantially exceed SCE's ex ante estimate of 6 years. Hence, there is no realistic expectation that a shorter lifetime would be found by another study. |
</code></pre>