



FILED

07-21-11

04:23 PM

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Southern California Edison Company (U338E) for Approval of its 2012-2014 California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE) and Energy Savings Assistance Programs and Budgets.

Application 11-05-017
(Filed May 16, 2011)

Application of Southern California Gas Company (U904G) for Approval of Low-Income Assistance Programs and Budgets for Program Years 2012-2014.

Application 11-05-018
(Filed May 16, 2011)

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Approval of the 2012-2014 Energy Savings Assistance and California Alternate Rates for Energy Programs and Budget (U39M).

Application 11-05-019
(Filed May 16, 2011)

Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U902M) for Approval of Low-Income Assistance Programs and Budgets for Program Years 2012-2014.

Application 11-05-020
(Filed May 16, 2011)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING CONSOLIDATING RELATED PROCEEDINGS AND SETTING A JOINT PREHEARING CONFERENCE

This ruling consolidates the above-captioned proceedings, sets a date and time for a joint prehearing conference and sets a preliminary proceeding scope and schedule of the consolidated proceeding (Consolidated Proceeding¹). The

¹ Consolidated Proceeding refers to Application (A.) 11-05-017, A.11-05-018, A.11-05-019 and A.11-05-020.

purpose of the joint prehearing conference is not to delve into the merits of any substantive issues raised in the Consolidated Proceeding but is to review the herein preliminary scope and schedule of the Consolidated Proceeding and to address any other issues, including pending protests and filings, relating to the scope and schedule of the Consolidated Proceeding with the goal of thoughtfully and efficiently resolving the 2012-2014 California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE) and Energy Savings Assistance (ESA) Program applications of Southern California Edison Company (SCE), Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas), Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), and San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E) (collectively, IOUs). We will also be establishing the service list.

I. PREHEARING CONFERENCE:

August 8, 2011 at 2:00 p.m.
Commission Courtroom
State Office Building
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

II. PREHEARING CONFERENCE STATEMENT:

Parties should each prepare, file and serve a prehearing conference statement no later than August 1, 2011. Any person or entity that intends to seek party status should also file and serve a prehearing conference statement no later than August 1, 2011. All prehearing conference statements should address the party's (person's or entity's) respective position on the following issues:

- A. The preliminary scope of the Consolidated Proceeding set forth in this ruling;
- B. The preliminary schedule of the Consolidated Proceeding set forth in this ruling; and
- C. Any other issues, including pending protests and filings, relating to the scope and schedule of the Consolidated Proceeding with the goal of thoughtfully and efficiently

resolving the 2012-2014 CARE and ESAP Programs applications.

III. PRELIMINARY SCOPE OF ISSUES IN THE CONSOLIDATED PROCEEDING:

The following is a preliminary list of issues that I deem to be within the scope of the proceeding, in no particular order and should reflect major issues before the Commission for consideration in the Consolidated Proceeding. Be advised that below is an incomplete list and will be finalized in the scoping memo ruling which will be issued after the August 8, 2011 prehearing conference and after further review of the filings to date, including the review and consideration of the prehearing conference statements:

1. Whether the Commission should examine the current ESAP contractors' bidding process and other different delivery models;
2. Whether the Commission should authorize a study and evaluation of the IOUs' energy education programs under the ESAP program to determine if there are ways to optimize or otherwise improve the educational component of the ESAP program;
3. Whether the Commission should retire and approve certain measures proposed by the IOUs from their 2012-2014 approved measures list;
4. How the Commission should categorize homes that receive only energy education from an IOU under the ESAP program (treated, untreated, ineligible or other);
5. Whether redesigning of CARE discount rate structure should be reviewed in the herein Consolidated Proceeding, and if so, whether the Public Utilities Code permits and it is in the public interest to design customized CARE discount rates;
6. Whether the Commission should authorize IOUs' proposals to explore ways to improve the treatment and therefore penetration rate for the multifamily sector;

7. Whether the Commission should authorize the IOUs to conduct another joint 2012-2014 Impact Evaluation Study to capture more accurate energy savings accomplishments in the ESAP program or consider a different evaluation approach that more closely aligns with the non-low income, or mainstream energy efficiency evaluations;
8. Whether the Commission should reevaluate the cost effectiveness methodology adopted in Decision (D.) 08-11-031;
9. Whether the Commission should review the methodology adopted in D.08-11-031 in estimating and calculating eligible low income population;
10. Whether the Commission should review the current CARE categorical enrollment program;
11. Whether the Commission should review the existing refrigerator replacement rules;
12. Whether the Commission should review and/or clarify its Fund Shifting rules;
13. Consideration of IOUs' proposed CARE budgets, and underlying assumptions and estimates;
14. Consideration of IOUs' proposed ESAP budgets, and underlying assumptions and estimates;
15. Whether and how the Commission should continue its coordination with the Department of Community Services and Development (CSD) to most effectively increase the number of overall homes treated in California pursuant to programs administered by the Commission and CSD;
16. Issues we asked the IOUs to address in our March 30, 2011 guidance ruling,
<http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/efile/RULINGS/132944.pdf>;
and
17. Any other issue expressly added by the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) or Commissioner in the final scoping memo ruling, to be issued following the herein prehearing conference.

IV. ISSUES OUTSIDE SCOPE:

Unless expressly added by the assigned ALJ or Commissioner, any issues not set forth in the final scoping memo ruling will be outside the scope or are issues that will not be addressed in detail in upcoming decision on the IOUs' 2012-14 ESAP and CARE budgets. The parties are therefore directed to examine the above list and make certain all major issues they wish to have considered in the Consolidated Proceeding are added by way of prehearing statements identifying those issues, with clear cross-references to the exact pages in the applications and other filings in the Consolidated Proceeding. Parties are reminded not to reiterate the contents of their prior filings in detail in the prehearing conference statement; rather the prehearing conference statement should merely capture the issues they wish to be included to the scope that are not reflected above.

V. PRELIMINARY PROCEEDING SCHEDULE IN THE CONSOLIDATED PROCEEDING:

The below is the preliminary schedule for the Consolidated Proceeding. Several workshops are currently being planned and scheduled by the Commission's Energy Division staff. Staff will prepare agenda for those workshops and parties will be served notices.

DATE	EVENT
August 1, 2011	Prehearing Conference Statement (served and filed)
August 8, 2011	Prehearing Conference at 2:00 p.m. Commission Courtroom State Office Building 505 Van Ness Avenue San Francisco, CA 94102
August 2011	Scoping Memo Ruling
August 2011	Tentative Workshop or Workshops (To be determined and noticed)
September 7, 2011	Reply brief and/or comment: All

	parties may serve and file reply briefs and/or comments on issues within scope of the Consolidated Proceeding AND raised in an opening brief and/or comment. (Total page limit shall not exceed 15 pages unless ALJ permission is previously granted)
September 7, 2011	Notice of Intent To Claim Compensation (served and filed)
October 2011	Proposed Decision

The Commission is committed to resolving this Consolidated Proceeding as soon as practicable; we anticipate that the resolution will not exceed 18 months from issuance of the scoping memo that will issue, following the prehearing conference, pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 1701.5. The assigned ALJ and Commissioner may alter the schedule for this Consolidated Proceeding as they see fit.

VI. CATEGORY OF PROCEEDING AND HEARINGS:

This proceeding has been categorized as ratesetting. Examination of the filings in the Consolidated Proceeding to date does not demonstrate that hearings are necessary.

VII. COMMUNICATIONS WITH DECISION MAKERS (EX PARTE COMMUNICATION):

Pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(c), ex parte communications are prohibited in this proceeding except under the following circumstances. Oral ex parte communications may be permitted at any time by any Commissioner if all interested parties are invited and given not less than three days' notice.

Written ex parte communications are permitted by any party provided that copies of the communication are transmitted to all parties on the same day. Commission Rule 8.1 et seq. explains the ex parte rules in more detail. The Commission's rules are available on the www.cpuc.ca.gov website at http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/published/RULES_PRAC_PROC/70731.htm.

VIII. DISCOVERY DISPUTES:

If the parties experience discovery disputes they are unable to resolve by meeting and conferring, they shall contact the assigned ALJ, Kimberly H. Kim, to determine whether a written or oral motion is required.

IT IS RULED that:

1. Application (A.) 11-05-017, A.11-05-018, A.11-05-019 and A.11-05-020 are consolidated for all purposes.
2. Prehearing Conference is set for August 8, 2011 at 2:00 p.m. in the Commission Courtroom, State Office Building, 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102.
3. By August 1, 2011, all parties should each prepare, file and serve a prehearing conference statement.
4. By August 1, 2011, all persons or entities that intend to seek party status should also file and serve a prehearing conference statement.
5. All prehearing conference statements shall address the party's (person's or entity's) respective position on the following issues:
 - The preliminary scope of the Consolidated Proceeding set forth in this ruling;
 - The preliminary schedule of the Consolidated Proceeding set forth in this ruling; and
 - Any other issues, including pending protests and filings, relating to the scope and schedule of the Consolidated Proceeding with the goal of thoughtfully and efficiently resolving the 2012-2014 CARE and ESAP Programs applications.
6. Pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(c), ex parte communications are prohibited except as set forth above and in Commission Rule 8.1 et seq.

7. If the parties experience any discovery dispute they are unable to resolve by meeting and conferring, they shall contact Administrative Law Judge Kimberly H. Kim to determine whether a written or oral motion is required.

8. This ruling shall also be served on all parties on the current service list of proceeding A.08-05-022 et al.

Dated July 21, 2011, at San Francisco, California.

 /s/ KIMBERLY H. KIM
Kimberly H. Kim
Administrative Law Judge