

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Rulemaking Concerning  
Energy Efficiency Rolling Portfolios,  
Policies, Programs, Evaluation and  
Related Issues.

Rulemaking 13-11-005  
(Filed November 14, 2013)

**REPLY COMMENTS OF THE  
CALIFORNIA EFFICIENCY + DEMAND MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
ON RULING DENYING SEPTEMBER 16, 2020 MOTION AND INVITING  
COMMENTS ON REQUIREMENTS FOR PROGRAM CHANGES**

Date: March 17, 2021

Serj Berelson  
Policy Director  
California Efficiency + Demand Management Council  
1111 Broadway Suite 300  
Oakland, CA 94612  
Telephone: 415-690-0281  
E-mail: [policy@cedmc.org](mailto:policy@cedmc.org)

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Rulemaking Concerning  
Energy Efficiency Rolling Portfolios,  
Policies, Programs, Evaluation and  
Related Issues.

Rulemaking 13-11-005  
(Filed November 14, 2013)

**REPLY COMMENTS OF THE  
CALIFORNIA EFFICIENCY + DEMAND MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
ON RULING DENYING SEPTEMBER 16, 2020 MOTION AND INVITING  
COMMENTS ON REQUIREMENTS FOR PROGRAM CHANGES**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

The California Efficiency + Demand Management Council (“The Council”) appreciates this opportunity to submit these Reply Comments on the Ruling Denying September 16, 2020 Motion and Inviting Comments on Requirements for Program Changes, issued in R.13-11-005 on February 17, 2021 (“February 17 Ruling”). These Reply Comments are timely filed and served pursuant to the CPUC’s Rules of Practice and Procedure and the instructions accompanying the February 17 Ruling.

**II. THE COUNCIL AGREES WITH THE INVESTOR-OWNED UTILITIES THAT THE CURRENT APPROACH TO PROGRAM UPDATES REMAINS APPROPRIATE**

The Council agrees with the positions advanced by the investor-owned utilities (“IOUs”) that the current approach for program updates remains appropriate. For example, Southern California Edison (“SCE”) notes that, “...the current process generally strikes the appropriate balance to allow parties to review and object to changes, while also providing the PAs sufficient flexibility to maximize the benefits and minimize costs of their EE portfolio.”<sup>1</sup> Similarly, Pacific Gas & Electric (“PG&E”) provides a useful table illustrating relative roles of implementation plans and advice letters.<sup>2</sup> Southern California Gas (“SoCalGas”) and San

---

<sup>1</sup> SCE Opening Comments on February 17 Ruling, at p. 3.

<sup>2</sup> PG&E Opening Comments on February 17 Ruling, at p. 4.

Diego Gas & Electric (“SDG&E”) both make similar assertions, and The Council finds the positions put forward by all four IOUs compelling in this matter.

### **III. THE COUNCIL BELIEVES ELECTRIC & GAS EFFICIENCY SHOULD BE TREATED EQUALLY**

The Council disagrees with Sierra Club’s assertion that “Any changes to gas appliance efficiency programs should require advice letter approval given their potential to undermine California’s climate objectives and the public interest in transparency and further scrutiny.”<sup>3</sup> While The Council is fully committed to the goal of decarbonizing California’s buildings, erecting excessive barriers to gas efficiency inappropriately discounts and devalues a valuable source of energy savings as decarbonization policies are ramped up. Requiring gas measures to undergo an additional layer of scrutiny is fundamentally in contravention of the Commission’s goals for energy efficiency. Using this logic, Sierra Club should argue that any program that provides any incentive to any gas process, appliance, or measures should be subjected to an Advice Letter – which would entail almost all programs in California.

As the Council already laid out, an Advice Letter process can result in program delays or shutdowns that can last multiple weeks or months. If, for example, such a process was applied to the forthcoming statewide plug-load appliance program, water heating, or food service programs –even if such programs were seeking simply to add measures to support electrification or fuel-substitution– an Advice Letter requirement would lead to delay, uncertainty, and customer confusion, and negative impacts for all stakeholders including program participants. This would ultimately hurt California ratepayers.

The Council looks forward to continuing our state’s admirable path towards decarbonization, but stranding existing measures is inappropriate at this time.

### **IV. CONCLUSION**

The Council appreciates the opportunity to offer these Reply Comments on requirements for program changes. We urge the Commission to minimize administrative burden to facilitate a bright ecosystem of energy efficiency program

---

<sup>3</sup> Sierra Club Opening Comments on February 17 Ruling, at p. 2.

Dated: March 17, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ SERJ BERELSON

Serj Berelson

Policy Director

California Efficiency + Demand Management Council

1111 Broadway Suite 300

Oakland, CA 94612

Telephone: 415-690-0281

E-mail: [policy@cedmc.org](mailto:policy@cedmc.org)