Application No.:	A.11-05-
Exhibit No.:	SCE-02
Witnesses:	Jill Holmes Jack Parkhill Shahana Samiullah Mark Wallenrod

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON®

An *EDISON INTERNATIONAL*® Company

(U 338-E)

Attachments in Support of SCE's Application for Approval of Low Income Programs and Budgets for Program Years 2012-2014

Before the

Public Utilities Commission of the State of California

Rosemead, California
May 2011

1811076

APPENDIX A – ENERGY SAVINGS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Attachment A-1	Energy Savings Assistance Program Budget Proposal-**J. Parkhill**
Attachment A-1a	Energy Savings Assistance Program-Budget Electric-**J. Parkhill**
Attachment A-1b	Energy Savings Assistance Program-Budget Gas-**J. Parkhill**
Attachment A-2	Energy Savings Assistance Program-Planning Assumptions-**S. Samiullah**
Attachment A-3	Energy Savings Assistance Program-Program Penetration-**J. Parkhill**
Attachment A-4	Energy Savings Assistance Program-Program Detail by Housing Type-**J. Parkhill**
Attachment A-5	Summary of Energy Savings Assistance Program-Cost-Effectiveness-**M. Wallenrod**
Attachment A-6	Energy Savings Assistance Program- Cost Effectiveness –Weather Sensitive Measures-**M. Wallenrod**
Attachment A-7	Energy Savings Assistance Program-Cost-Effectiveness-Non-Weather Sensitive Measures-**M. Wallenrod**
Attachment A-8	Energy Savings Assistance Program-Measurement and Evaluation Studies Proposal-**S. Samiullah**
Attachment A-9	Energy Savings Assistance Program-Pilot or Study Implementation Plans-**S. Samiullah**
Attachment A-10	Low Income Statewide Marketing Plan Strategy-**J. Parkhill**

APPENDIX B – CARE PROGRAM

Attachment B-1	CARE Budgets Proposal-**J. Parkhill**
Attachment B-2	CARE Estimated Participation-**J. Parkhill**
Attachment B-3	CARE Outreach and Penetration Information-**J. Parkhill**
Attachment B-4	CARE Pilots and Studies-**J. Parkhill**

APPENDIX C – LOW-INCOME PROGRAM RATE IMPACTS & CUSTOMER USAGE

Attachment C-1	Energy Savings Assistance Program, CARE, and Cool Center Rate Impacts-**J. Holmes**
Attachment C-2	Rate Impacts Gas-**J. Holmes**
Attachment C-3	Customer Usage-**S. Samiullah**

APPENDIX D – COOL CENTER PROGRAM

Attachment D-1	Cool Center Progam Operations Plan and Budget-**J. Parkhill**

Appendix A

Energy Savings Assistance Programs

Attachment A-1

ENERGY SAVINGS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BUDGET PROPOSAL

PY 2012-2014 Energy Savings Assistance Program Proposed Electric & Gas Budget
Southern California Edison

	PY2011 Authorized $(000)	PY 2012 Authorized $(000)	PY 2013 Authorized $(000)	PY 2014 Authorized $(000)
Energy Savings Assistance Program				
Energy Efficiency				
Appliances		$16,404	$18,521	$17,991
Domestic Hot Water		$40	$45	$44
Enclosure		$210	$237	$229
HVAC		$21,302	$24,049	$23,373
Maintenance		$0	$0	$0
Lighting		$2,554	$2,884	$2,801
Miscellaneous		$3,689	$4,165	$4,046
Customer Enrollment		$4,381	$4,947	$4,805
In Home Education		$972	$1,098	$1,066
Pilot		$0	$0	$0
Energy Efficiency Total		$49,552	$55,946	$54,356
Training Center		$315	$306	$279
Inspections		$1,319	$1,329	$1,352
Marketing and Outreach		$1,252	$1,414	$1,373
Statewide Marketing Education and Outreach		$120	$120	$120
Measurement and Evaluation Studies		$90	$90	$90
Regulatory Compliance		$581	$594	$606
General Administration		$4,428	$4,669	$4,736
CPUC Energy Division		$60	$60	$60
TOTAL PROGRAM COSTS	$63,414	$57,718	$64,528	$62,971
Not Subject to This Application - Funded Outside of Energy Savings Assistance Program Program Budget				
Indirect Costs	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NGAT Costs	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

The budget categories and subcategories for 2012-2014 were revised by the Commission and do not fully align with the categories and subcategories that were authorized for 2009 – 2011. Therefore, SCE has provided only the total authorized annual funding for 2011

Attachment A-1a

ENERGY SAVINGS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM PROPOSED ELECTRIC BUDGET

PY 2012-2014 Energy Savings Assistance Program Proposed Electric Budget
Southern California Edison

	PY2011 Authorized $(000)	PY 2012 Authorized $(000)	PY 2013 Authorized $(000)	PY 2014 Authorized $(000)
Energy Savings Assistance Program				
Energy Efficiency				
Appliances		$16,404	$18,521	$17,991
Domestic Hot Water		$40	$45	$44
Enclosure		$210	$237	$229
HVAC		$21,302	$24,049	$23,373
Maintenance		$0	$0	$0
Lighting		$2,554	$2,884	$2,801
Miscellaneous		$3,689	$4,165	$4,046
Customer Enrollment		$4,381	$4,947	$4,805
In Home Education		$972	$1,098	$1,066
Pilot		$0	$0	$0
Energy Efficiency Total		$49,552	$55,946	$54,356
Training Center		$315	$306	$279
Inspections		$1,319	$1,329	$1,352
Marketing and Outreach		$1,252	$1,414	$1,373
Statewide Marketing Education and Outreach		$120	$120	$120
Measurement and Evaluation Studies		$90	$90	$90
Regulatory Compliance		$581	$594	$606
General Administration		$4,428	$4,669	$4,736
CPUC Energy Division		$60	$60	$60
TOTAL PROGRAM COSTS	$63,414	$57,718	$64,528	$62,971
Not Subject to This Application - Funded Outside of ESAP Program Budget				
Indirect Costs	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NGAT Costs	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

The budget categories and subcategories for 2012-2014 were revised by the Commission and do not fully align with the categories and subcategories that were authorized for 2009 – 2011. Therefore, SCE has provided only the total authorized annual funding for 2011

Attachment A-1b

ENERGY SAVINGS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM PROPOSED GAS BUDGET

PY 2012-2014 Energy Savings Assistance Program Proposed Gas Budget
Southern California Edison

	PY2011 Authorized $(000)	PY 2012 Authorized $(000)	PY 2013 Authorized $(000)	PY 2014 Authorized $(000)
Energy Savings Assistance Program				
Energy Efficiency				
Appliances				
Domestic Hot Water				
Enclosure				
HVAC				
Maintenance				
Lighting				
Miscellaneous				
Customer Enrollment				
In Home Education				
Pilot				
Energy Efficiency Total				
Training Center				
Inspections				
Marketing and Outreach				
Statewide Marketing Education and Outreach				
Measurement and Evaluation Studies				
Regulatory Compliance				
General Administration				
CPUC Energy Division				
TOTAL PROGRAM COSTS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Not Subject to This Application - Funded Outside of ESAP Program Budget				
Indirect Costs	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NGAT Costs	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

The budget categories and subcategories for 2012-2014 were revised by the Commission and do not fully align with the categories and subcategories that were authorized for 2009 – 2011. Therefore, SCE has provided only the total authorized annual funding for 2011

Attachment A-2

ENERGY SAVINGS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS

PY 2012-2014 Energy Savings Assistance Program Planning Assumptions
Southern California Edison

Measures*	2012-2014 Impact Estimates		PY 2011 Authorized					PY 2012 Planned					PY 2013 Planned					PY 2014 Planned				
	Units & Source		Quantity Installed	kWh (Annual)	kW (Annual)	Therms (Annual)	Projected Expenses	Quantity Installed	kWh (Annual)	kW (Annual)	Therms (Annual)	Proposed Expenses**	Quantity Installed	kWh (Annual)	kW (Annual)	Therms (Annual)	Proposed Expenses**	Quantity Installed	kWh (Annual)	kW (Annual)	Therms (Annual)	Proposed Expenses**
Appliances																						
High Efficiency Clothes Washer	Each																					
Refrigerators	Each	[3]	22,177	16,713,260	2,837	-	14,548,234	20,838	14,625,313	2,492	-	16,403,930	23,527	16,512,450	2,814	-	18,520,566	22,854	16,040,666	2,733	-	17,991,407
Microwaves	Each																					
Domestic Hot Water																						
Domestic Hot Water	Home	[1] [4]	1,526	456,536	100	0	138,865	691	58,081	7	0	39,882	781	65,575	8	0	45,028	758	63,702	8	0	43,742
Water Heater Blanket	Home																					
Low Flow Shower Head	Home																					
Water Heater Pipe Insulation	Home																					
Faucet Aerator	Home																					
Water Heater Repair/Replacement	Each																					
Thermostatic Shower Valve	Each																					
Enclosure																						
Air Sealing / Envelope	Home	[2] [3]	1,527	80,575	316	-	534,486	691	15,439	0	-	209,382	781	17,433	0	-	236,400	758	16,687	0	-	229,645
Caulking	Home																					
Weatherstripping	Home																					
Utility Gaskets	Home																					
Attic Access Weatherstripping	Home																					
Evaporative Cooler Cover	Home																					
AC Vent Cover	Each																					
Attic Insulation	Home																					
HVAC																						
FAU Standing Pilot Light Conversion	Each																					
Furnace Repair/Replacement	Each		464	-	-	-	556,238	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Room A/C Replacement	Each	[3]	838	97,766	112	-	631,526	716	53,948	67	-	554,367	809	60,869	75	-	625,899	786	59,321	73	-	608,016
Central A/C Replacement	Each	[5]	6,188	2,874,816	2,714	-	16,983,621	2,895	616,995	625	-	12,518,039	3,269	696,608	705	-	14,133,270	3,175	676,704	685	-	13,729,462
Heat Pump Replacement	Each	[6]	111	88,056	35	-	334,746	76	58,798	24	-	328,920	86	66,385	27	-	371,362	83	64,489	26	-	360,751
Evaporative Coolers (Replacement)	Each		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Evaporative Coolers (Installation)	Each	[4]	8,794	1,898,232	400	-	7,562,008	8,549	4,181,052	2,052	-	7,903,329	9,652	4,720,542	2,317	-	8,923,113	9,376	4,585,670	2,251	-	8,668,167
Duct Testing and Sealing	Home		4,420	1,221,638	1,739	-	839,895	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maintenance																						
Furnace Clean and Tune	Home																					
Central A/C Tune-up	Home		1,664	1,791,460	1,286	-	249,527															
Evaporative Cooler Maintenance	Home		2,218	156,880	-	-	166,351															
Lighting																						
Compact Fluorescent Lights (CFLs)	Each	[4]	307,673	4,922,766	615	-	1,338,377	345,680	6,755,081	691	-	2,421,142	390,284	7,626,704	781	-	2,733,547	379,133	7,408,798	758	-	2,655,446
Interior Hard wired CFL fixtures	Each		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Exterior Hard wired CFL fixtures	Each	[4]	1,042	264,891	-	-	88,610	610	42,254	5	-	53,405	689	47,706	6	-	60,296	669	35	-	-	58,573
Torchiere	Each	[4]	2,744	524,255	52	-	109,792	1,615	308,386	32	-	79,659	1,823	348,178	36	-	89,937	1,771	338,230	35	-	87,368
Occupancy Sensor	Each																					
LED Night Lights	Each																					
Miscellaneous																						
Pool Pumps	Each	[7]	1,372	1,920,578	741	-	1,289,531	1,195	2,014,027	633	-	1,675,795	1,349	2,273,901	715	-	1,892,026	1,310	2,208,933	694	-	1,837,968
Smart Power Strips	Each	[8]	-	-	-	-	-	63,426	1,861,553	250	-	$2,013,490	71,610	2,101,754	282	-	2,273,295	69,564	2,041,703	274	-	2,208,344
Pilots																						
	Each																					
	Each																					
Customer Enrollment																						
Outreach & Assessment	Home		68,612				8,039,351	68,200				5,255,435	77,000				5,933,555	74,800				5,764,025
In-Home Education	Home		83,445				2,419,922	68,200				972,296	77,000				1,097,754	74,800				3,136,440
Total				33,011,707	10,948	-	55,831,079		30,590,926	6,879	-	44,201,340		34,538,106	7,766	-	49,904,739		33,504,938	7,539	-	48,478,889

* Include all proposed new measures, where appropriate.
** Measure level expenses are projections only. Actual costs will be negotiated with contractors. Utilities are not requesting approval of costs at the measure level.

Legend:

[1] SCE does not pay for or track hot water conservation measure costs down at the individual measure (e.g.: faucet aerator) level. kWh, kW and projected expenses listed in the Domestic Hot Water row represents savings and costs for the average package of DHW measures installed in a home.
[2] SCE does not pay for or track Envelope measure costs down at the individual measure (e.g.: utility gasket) level. kWh, kW and projected expenses listed in the Air Sealing / Envelope row represents savings and costs for the average package of Enclosure measures installed in a home.
[3] 2009 Low Impact Load Impact Study, Table 5.
[4] 2009 Low Income Load Impact Study, Table 71.
[5] 2009 Low Income Load Impact Study, Table 5 in instances where savings estimates were provided for Housing Type/Climate Zones in which SCE performs this service. Otherwise, the most recent Study: 2005 Itron Study for kWh, with kW scaled by DEER, as used in 2009-2011 cycle.
[6] 2009 Low Income Load Impact Study, Table 5 in instances where savings estimates were provided for Housing Type/Climate Zones in which SCE performs this service. Otherwise, DEER RMFm1475RHP13.
[7] SCE Energy Engineering Workpaper WPSCREWP0001.4
[8] PG&E Work Paper WPSCNRCS0002.0

Attachment A-3

ENERGY SAVINGS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM PROGRAM PENETRATION

Energy Savings Assistance Program Penetration
Southern California Edison

	Number of Customers in Utility Service Area [1]	Number of Eligible Low Income Customers [2]	Number of Customers Served by Energy Savings Assistance Program in Past 10 Years [3]	Number of Customers Enrolled in CARE [4]	Number of Eligible and Willing Energy Savings Assistance Program Customers [5] C - 15% of C	LIHEAP Customers Treated Since 2002 [6]	Customers Remaing to Receive Energy Savings Assistance Program Services by 2020 [7] F - D - G	Number of Customers Planned to be Treated by Energy Savings Assistance Program in 2012 - 2014 [8]	Projected Customers Remaining to be Treated by SCE 2015 - 2020 [9] H - I	Percent of Energy Savings Assistance Program Programmatic Initiative Achieved [10] (D + I) / F
PY 2007	4,312,896	1,342,945	235,789	1,024,148	1,141,503	66,080	839,634			
PY 2008	4,330,480	1,396,268	290,424	1,104,556	1,186,828	75,992	820,412			
PY 2009	4,349,433	1,433,778	353,048	1,235,123	1,218,711	85,904	779,759			
PY 2010	4,370,989	1,458,131	474,916	1,381,109	1,239,411	95,816	668,679			
PY 2011	4,414,699	1,472,712	548,716	1,430,000	1,251,805	105,728	597,361			
PY 2012	4,458,846	1,487,439	548,716	1,444,300	1,264,324	115,640	599,968	68,200		
PY 2013	4,503,434	1,502,314	548,716	1,458,743	1,276,967	125,552	602,699	145,200		
PY 2014	4,548,469	1,517,337	548,716	1,473,330	1,289,736	135,464	605,556	220,000		
PY 2015	4,593,953	1,532,510	548,716	1,488,063	1,302,634	145,376	608,542	220,000		
PY 2016	4,639,893	1,547,835	548,716	1,502,944	1,315,660	155,288	611,656	220,000		
PY 2017	4,686,292	1,563,314	548,716	1,517,973	1,328,817	165,200	614,901	220,000		
PY 2018	4,733,155	1,578,947	548,716	1,533,153	1,342,105	175,112	618,277	220,000		
PY 2019	4,780,486	1,594,736	548,716	1,548,485	1,355,526	185,024	621,786	220,000		
PY 2020	4,828,291	1,610,684	548,716	1,563,969	1,369,081	194,936	625,429	220,000	405,429	56%

[1] Technically eligible customers. Actual data through 2010. The figures are escalated by 1% annually in 2011 - 2020.

[2] Number of estimated income eligible customers at or below 200 percent of the Federal Poverty Line. Actual data through 2010. The figures are escalated by 1% annually in 2011 - 2020.

[3] Cumulative customers served from January 2002 through program year. Does not account for homes receiving Energy Savings Assistance Program services beyond 2011.

[4] Actual year-end enrollment data through 2010. The figures are escalated by 1% annually in 2011 - 2020.

[5] A 15% reduction is applied to Column C. As described in testimony, IOUs estimate 15% of customers are not willing or able to participate in the Energy Savings Assistance Program.

[6] Cumulative Data. LIHEAP Homes Treated 2002 - 2007 from D.08-11-031. SCE projects 90% of 2002 - 2007 annual average will be treated in 2008 - 2020.

[7] Does not account for homes receiving Energy Savings Assistance Program services beyond 2011.

[8] Cumulative data. SCE plans to treat 68,200 homes in 2012, 77,000 homes in 2013, and 74,000 homes in 2014.

[9] The annual rate of homes treated is lower than SCE's projections for 2012 - 2014.

[10] SCE assumes it will have achieved 56% of the 2020 goal by December 2014. The 2015 - 2020

Attachment A-4

ENERGY SAVINGS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM DETAIL BY HOUSTING TYPE

Energy Savings Assistance Program Detail by Housing Type
Southern California Edison

	PY 2010		PY 2011 (Projected)		PY 2012 (Projected)		PY 2013 (Projected)		PY 2014 (Projected)	
	Customers Eligible	Customers Treated	Customers Eligible	Customers Treated	Customers Eligible	Customers Treated	Customers Eligible	Customers Treated	Customers Eligible	Customers Treated
Gas and Electric Customers										
Owners - Total										
Single Family										
Multifamily										
Mobile Homes										
Renters - Total										
Single Family										
Multifamily										
Mobile Homes										
Electric Customers (only)										
Owners - Total	601,412	53,630	607,425	30,439	613,500	28,129	619,635	31,759	625,831	30,852
Single Family	486,438	43,926	491,301	24,620	496,215	22,752	501,177	25,688	506,188	24,954
Multifamily	21,988	778	22,208	1,113	22,430	1,028	22,654	1,161	22,881	1,128
Mobile Homes	92,986	8,926	93,916	4,706	94,855	4,349	95,804	4,910	96,762	4,770
Renters - Total	856,719	68,238	865,287	43,361	873,939	40,071	882,679	45,241	891,506	43,948
Single Family	433,891	36,317	438,230	21,960	442,612	20,294	447,039	22,913	451,509	22,258
Multifamily	394,380	30,042	398,324	19,961	402,307	18,446	406,330	20,826	410,394	20,231
Mobile Homes	28,448	1,879	28,733	1,440	29,020	1,331	29,310	1,502	29,603	1,459
Gas Customers (only)										
Owners - Total										
Single Family										
Multifamily										
Mobile Homes										
Renters - Total										
Single Family										
Multifamily										
Mobile Homes										

Attachment A-5

SUMMARY OF ENERGY SAVINGS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM COST-EFFECTIVENESS

Summary of Energy Savings Assistance Program Cost Effectiveness
Southern California Edison

	Ratio of Program Benefits over Program Costs		
	Utility Cost Test	**Modified Participant Test**	**Total Resource Cost Test**
PY 2008	0.59	1.29	0.52
PY 2009	0.74	0.70	0.58
PY 2010	0.73	0.74	0.57
PY 2011	0.72	0.78	0.55
PY 2012	0.64	0.62	0.53
PY 2013	0.64	0.62	0.53
PY 2014	0.64	0.62	0.53

Attachment A-6

ENERGY SAVINGS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM COST-EFFECTIVENESS

WEATHER SENSITIVE MEASURES

Energy Savings Assistance Program Cost-Effectiveness - Weather Sensitive Measures
Southern California Edison

Measure	Measure Group	Type of Home (SF, MH, MF)	Electric or Gas (E,G)	Climate Zone (Number)	Ratio of Benefits Over Costs		
					Utility Cost Test	Modified Participant Test	Total Resource Cost Test
Envelope and Air Sealing	*Enclosure*	Single Family	Electric	6	0.02	0.02	0.02
Envelope and Air Sealing	*Enclosure*	Single Family	Electric	8	0.02	0.02	0.02
Envelope and Air Sealing	*Enclosure*	Single Family	Electric	9	0.13	0.13	0.12
Envelope and Air Sealing	*Enclosure*	Single Family	Electric	10	0.05	0.04	0.04
Envelope and Air Sealing	*Enclosure*	Single Family	Electric	13	0.16	0.16	0.14
Envelope and Air Sealing	*Enclosure*	Single Family	Electric	14	0.04	0.04	0.03
Envelope and Air Sealing	*Enclosure*	Single Family	Electric	15	0.41	0.40	0.33
Envelope and Air Sealing	*Enclosure*	Single Family	Electric	16	0.00	0.00	0.00
Envelope and Air Sealing	*Enclosure*	Multi-Family	Electric	6	0.02	0.02	0.01
Envelope and Air Sealing	*Enclosure*	Multi-Family	Electric	8	0.02	0.02	0.02
Envelope and Air Sealing	*Enclosure*	Multi-Family	Electric	9	0.05	0.05	0.04
Envelope and Air Sealing	*Enclosure*	Multi-Family	Electric	10	0.04	0.04	0.04
Envelope and Air Sealing	*Enclosure*	Multi-Family	Electric	13	0.15	0.15	0.14
Envelope and Air Sealing	*Enclosure*	Multi-Family	Electric	14	0.05	0.05	0.05
Envelope and Air Sealing	*Enclosure*	Multi-Family	Electric	15	0.05	0.05	0.04
Envelope and Air Sealing	*Enclosure*	Multi-Family	Electric	16	-	-	-
Envelope and Air Sealing	*Enclosure*	Mobile Home	Electric	6	0.02	0.02	0.02
Envelope and Air Sealing	*Enclosure*	Mobile Home	Electric	8	0.25	0.25	0.22
Envelope and Air Sealing	*Enclosure*	Mobile Home	Electric	9	0.18	0.18	0.16
Envelope and Air Sealing	*Enclosure*	Mobile Home	Electric	10	0.18	0.18	0.16
Envelope and Air Sealing	*Enclosure*	Mobile Home	Electric	13	0.33	0.32	0.27
Envelope and Air Sealing	*Enclosure*	Mobile Home	Electric	14	0.16	0.16	0.15
Envelope and Air Sealing	*Enclosure*	Mobile Home	Electric	15	0.18	0.18	0.16
Envelope and Air Sealing	*Enclosure*	Mobile Home	Electric	16	0.11	0.11	0.10

Room Air Conditioner	*HVAC*	Single Family	Electric	10	0.11	0.08	0.10
Room Air Conditioner	*HVAC*	Single Family	Electric	13	0.09	0.07	0.09
Room Air Conditioner	*HVAC*	Single Family	Electric	14	0.12	0.08	0.11
Room Air Conditioner	*HVAC*	Single Family	Electric	15	0.24	0.18	0.21
Room Air Conditioner	*HVAC*	Multi-Family	Electric	10	0.05	0.03	0.04
Room Air Conditioner	*HVAC*	Multi-Family	Electric	13	0.06	0.04	0.06
Room Air Conditioner	*HVAC*	Multi-Family	Electric	14	0.08	0.06	0.08
Room Air Conditioner	*HVAC*	Multi-Family	Electric	15	0.17	0.12	0.15
Room Air Conditioner	*HVAC*	Mobile Home	Electric	10	0.13	0.09	0.11
Room Air Conditioner	*HVAC*	Mobile Home	Electric	13	0.18	0.13	0.16
Room Air Conditioner	*HVAC*	Mobile Home	Electric	14	0.24	0.17	0.21
Room Air Conditioner	*HVAC*	Mobile Home	Electric	15	0.49	0.36	0.39
Central Air Conditioner	*HVAC*	Single Family	Electric	14	0.03	0.02	0.03
Central Air Conditioner	*HVAC*	Single Family	Electric	15	0.06	0.05	0.06
Central Air Conditioner	*HVAC*	Multi-Family	Electric	14	0.19	0.13	0.16
Central Air Conditioner	*HVAC*	Multi-Family	Electric	15	0.35	0.25	0.28
Central Air Conditioner	*HVAC*	Mobile Home	Electric	14	0.28	0.20	0.24
Central Air Conditioner	*HVAC*	Mobile Home	Electric	15	0.37	0.27	0.30
Heat Pump	*HVAC*	Single Family	Electric	14	0.26	0.24	0.21
Heat Pump	*HVAC*	Single Family	Electric	15	0.21	0.18	0.17
Heat Pump	*HVAC*	Multi-Family	Electric	14	0.27	0.26	0.22
Heat Pump	*HVAC*	Multi-Family	Electric	15	0.23	0.21	0.19
Heat Pump	*HVAC*	Mobile Home	Electric	14	0.39	0.34	0.31
Heat Pump	*HVAC*	Mobile Home	Electric	15	0.38	0.33	0.30
Evaporative Cooler	*HVAC*	Single Family	Electric	10	0.83	0.64	0.58
Evaporative Cooler	*HVAC*	Single Family	Electric	13	0.86	0.66	0.60
Evaporative Cooler	*HVAC*	Single Family	Electric	14	0.86	0.69	0.59
Evaporative Cooler	*HVAC*	Single Family	Electric	15	2.63	1.46	1.19
Evaporative Cooler	*HVAC*	Single Family	Electric	16	0.44	0.33	0.35
Evaporative Cooler	*HVAC*	Mobile Home	Electric	10	0.82	0.60	0.58
Evaporative Cooler	*HVAC*	Mobile Home	Electric	13	0.81	0.60	0.57
Evaporative Cooler	*HVAC*	Mobile Home	Electric	14	0.82	0.66	0.57
Evaporative Cooler	*HVAC*	Mobile Home	Electric	15	2.79	1.34	1.23
Evaporative Cooler	*HVAC*	Mobile Home	Electric	16	0.61	0.42	0.46

Attachment A-7

ENERGY SAVINGS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM COST-EFFECTIVENESS

NON WEATHER SENSITIVE MEASURES

Energy Savings Assistance Program Cost-Effectiveness - Non Weather Sensitive Measures
Southern California Edison

Measure	Measure Group	Type of Home (SF,MH,MF)	Electric or Gas (E,G)	Ratio of Benefits Over Costs		
				Utility Cost Test	Modified Participant Test	Total Resource Cost Test
Refrigerators	*Appliances*	Single Family	Electric	1.07	1.16	0.67
Refrigerators	*Appliances*	Multi-Family	Electric	0.84	0.91	0.56
Refrigerators	*Appliances*	Mobile Home	Electric	1.06	1.16	0.66
Domestic Hot Water Conservation	*Domestic Hot Water*	All	Electric	0.94	1.04	0.75
Compact Fluorescent Lamps	*Lighting*	Single Family	Electric	0.44	0.42	0.97
Compact Fluorescent Lamps	*Lighting*	Multi-Family	Electric	0.46	0.43	0.98
Compact Fluorescent Lamps	*Lighting*	Mobile Home	Electric	0.47	0.44	0.99
Hard Wired CFL Fixtures	*Lighting*	Single Family	Electric	0.72	0.13	0.65
Hard Wired CFL Fixtures	*Lighting*	Multi-Family	Electric	0.84	0.87	0.65
Hard Wired CFL Fixtures	*Lighting*	Mobile Home	Electric	0.84	0.87	0.65
Torchieres	*Lighting*	Single Family	Electric	3.51	3.65	1.48
Torchieres	*Lighting*	Multi-Family	Electric	3.51	3.65	1.48
Torchieres	*Lighting*	Single Family	Electric	3.51	3.65	1.48
Pool Pumps - Variable Speed	*Miscellaneous*	Single Family	Electric	1.32	1.19	0.78
Smart Power Strips	*Miscellaneous*	All	Electric	0.41	0.45	0.49

Attachment A-8

ENERGY SAVINGS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION STUDIES PROPOSAL

PY 2012 - 2014 Energy Savings Assistance Program Pilots and Studies
Southern California Edison

Line No.	Statewide Study	Total Cost	Percent paid by SCE	Total Cost paid by SCE
1	Impact Evaluation	$600,000	30%	$180,000
2	Energy Education and Assessment	$300,000	30%	$90,000
Total		$900,000		$270,000

Attachment A-9

ENERGY SAVINGS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM PILOT OR STUDY IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

Impact Evaluation of the Energy Savings Assistance Program

Joint Utility Study (PG&E, SCE, SDG&E, SoCalGas)

The Joint Utilities will conduct an Impact Evaluation of the Energy Savings Assistance Program during the 2012-14 program cycle. The primary objective of the study will be to estimate the first-year electric and gas savings for the program for each utility, by housing type, by measure group, and any other program related dimensions Other savings impact-related program issues will likely be addressed as they arise during the program year. This study will start in 2012.

1. **Overview Budget**

	Total Cost	**SCE Cost**
Impact Evaluation of the ESA Program	$600,000	$180.000

2. **Brief Study Description**

- The Joint Utilities propose to conduct an impact evaluation of the 2011 Energy Savings Assistance Program. The 2011 impact evaluation will enhance the previous impact evaluations for the Energy Savings Assistance Program by producing a relatively flexible energy savings projection tool that will not just provide savings estimates for a particular year and program implementation, but inform future program planning.
- The 2011 Impact Evaluation will provide program savings at a needed disaggregation level for the purposes of projecting savings within meaningful categories of population, such as climate zones, dwelling types, dwelling age, etc. Such a level of estimation is critical for guiding current and future program delivery as well as determining program cost-effectiveness.

3. **Study Rationale and Expected Outcome**

- The study will provide a set of program energy savings estimates at a disaggregated level that will be used for both reporting purposes and future program development. In addition, it will provide useful information on participant energy consumption and characteristics. The study will also provide a comparison with the results from previous years, and, if needed, could provide rigorous examination of whether savings achieved in the 2011 program for given measure groups or measures are significantly different, adding a cumulative, knowledge-building aspect to the evaluation effort that has been missing in most work done in the previous two Impact Evaluations.
- D.03-10-041 specified that Energy Savings Assistance Program impact evaluations should occur every two years. The Joint Utilities completed an Impact Evaluation of the 2009 Program and, as such, will be implementing the next Impact Evaluation for the 2011 program.
- The 2009 Impact Evaluation approach did not provide viable Impact estimates for some of the key measures installed via the programs. In particular, pool pumps, and various weatherization measures were assigned a "0" energy savings value. In addition, the modeling approach aggregated the central air conditioning and room air conditioning into one "cooling savings" estimate. This study product severely limits the availability of disaggregated information for future program planning in trying to ascertain the additive benefits and cost effectiveness of various different measures and program delivery methods in the program. Another problem, among others, is that while the impact estimates of several measures/measure groups were provided for specific housing types, the mechanism used to achieve this was indirect, and required the assumption that the difference between impacts for multi-family and single family dwelling *only* involved differentials in their distribution over pre-program consumption "strata."

- The 2011 Impact Evaluation will assess, causally, the impact of measures/assessments/education from the Energy Savings Assistance Program, and how their effectiveness is mitigated or enhanced by the characteristics of dwellings and households to which Energy Savings Assistance Program is delivered. The proposed Impact Evaluation will be required to use methodologies and analytical strategies that will not only result in producing reliable Impact estimates for the program but also provide energy savings estimates at a level that is useful for future program planning.
    - The 2011 Impact Evaluation will take full advantage of available analytical methods tried elsewhere in program evaluation studies to provide robust, unbiased set of savings estimates, generalizing to the entire population of participants using techniques and/or data such as:
        - Taking advantage of small geographic area data as an aspect of sample design and as a sensible basis for providing ecological control in the impact evaluation.
        - An optimally stratified, population-representative sample design to serve the various purposes of the study, including supporting the gross savings regression by maximizing variability across measures, climate zones, building types, tenure arrangements, and bill payer status as possible.
        - Estimating gross savings over the 2010 and previous program samples, with appropriate weights, stratification-related terms reflective of the sample divisions, sample years etc.
        - Combining various primary data collected through phone and/or on-site to produce a joint (tracking only and survey-assisted subsample) gross savings regression with appropriate terms reflecting measure class, and/or measure-specific impacts on kWh

- Only as determined to be necessary, develop a secondary regression to disaggregate the savings estimates for measure groups obtained in a main gross savings analysis regression, based on constraining coefficients to values or ranges that can come from engineering priors, for example.
- Build in flexibility in the model so that the interaction of population characteristics with measure delivery allows for estimating effects in the projected population that incorporate changes in the program population, for instance increased placement of particular measures in conjunction with other measures, in changed concentrations by climate zone, in changed concentrations by dwelling type, etc.

- The 2009 Impact Evaluation utilized an analytical approach that resulted in savings estimates that were limited for a variety of technical reasons. Alternative approaches are available and have the potential to provide more robust and reliable Impact results for the Energy Savings Assistance Program, and to assess, causally, the impact of measures/assessments/advice from Energy Savings Assistance Program and how their effectiveness is mitigated/enhanced by the characteristics of dwellings and households to which the program is delivered.
  For example, an approach that clarifies the relationship between the small area data and better wed the tracking regression to the other data sources (e.g., survey or onsite data) is recommended. Likewise, technical issues including using calculations of degree days in terms of averages as was used in the 2009 Impact evaluation rather than the temperature-hours above or below the base temperature; multi-collinearity; and assigning the same dummy variable to homes that received different mixtures of measures diluted the attribution of causal impact that might be better explained using other analytical approaches.
- In addition, the impact evaluation will determine the Energy Savings Assistance Program's contribution to providing energy resource benefits to California.

4. **Pilot or Study Implementation**

The following implementation steps will be conducted for this study:

- Development of a detailed research plan to be submitted for approval to the joint utilities,
- Development of a sampling plan and weights,
- Data collection and verification,
- Development of a regression model for estimating energy savings,
- Analysis and evaluation of regression results, and
- Presentation of conclusions and recommendations.
- In addition, the study may include customer surveys or other data collection and analysis as approved by the Joint Utilities.
- The study will commence in 2012 and is expected to be completed in 2014.

5. **Study Budget & Timing Table**

While no proposal has been received, we anticipate the following evaluation activities to be cost drivers for this study:

Activity	Estimated Cost	Estimated Commencement
Review of current program implementation and delivery	2,500	March 2012
Review of program tracking data, measures, participant customer characteristics	2,500	March 2012
Review of prior impact studies and methodologies	2,500	March 2012
Interviews with program staff on future program planning issues	2,500	March 2012
Development of a data collection plan (sample design, sampling frames, data collection instruments) and an analysis plan (combination of statistical billing with engineering data) grounded in a sound theoretical rationale.	5,000	April 2012
Development of an Analysis Plan identifying appropriate combination of statistical billing and , engineering analyses)	5,000	April 2012
Development of draft and final Research Plans	5,000	May 2012
Gathering of billing data and secondary engineering data & preliminary analyses	10,000	May 2012
Refinement of an Analysis Plan & Preliminary Results review	10,000	June 2012
Primary Data collection through a combination of onsite, telephone, in person surveys, and Secondary Data collection (small geography demographic data)	300,000	June 2012
Full Data Analysis	150,000	Dec 2012
Reporting (early findings memos, draft and final reports & presentation of findings)	80,000	March 2013
Final Report Completion		*September 2013*
General Project management	25,000	ongoing

Energy Education Assessment for the Energy Savings Assistance Program

Joint Utility Study (PG&E, SCE, SDG&E, SoCalGas)

The purpose of the Education Assessment and Needs Analysis Study is to identify ways to optimize and/or improve the educational component of the Energy Savings Assistance Program. This study is intended to examine the current and potential value of the Education that is provided to participants of the Energy Savings Assistance Program.

1. **Study Budget Table**

Statewide Study	Total Cost	SCE Cost
Energy Education Assessment	$300,000	$90,000

2. **Projected Pilot Impacts Table**.

Not Applicable for Studies

3. **Brief Study Description**.

The Energy Education Assessment Study will examine current and potential practices related to the educational materials, delivery mechanisms, and relative value (and possible savings) associated with the education component of the Energy Savings Assistance Program. The specific research objectives may include one or more of the following:

Description of Study Objectives:

- Understand and improve practices related to the education delivery to customers, including, but not limited to (1) contractor training (2) contractor practices (3) customer responsiveness and needs. This would include examining how other similar programs deliver similar information and relevant "best practices" both in terms of customer and contractor experience. Assess opportunities for improving cost-effectiveness of how energy education is delivered.

- Examine and explore needs related to educational materials. The purpose of this piece of the project would be to look at the materials and explore other curriculums and best practices with regard to energy education. In addition, understanding what consumers need and want and how they can best receive this information. What do customers not know? Where is their knowledge lacking or erroneous? What do they "want" to know more about – to assist them in being more energy efficient? Explore customized education delivery – within and across households. While additional data collection may be warranted to understand this, some of this can be garnered from data already collected (but not yet analyzed) during the 2009-2011 program cycle.
- Examine potential savings Impacts of energy education on Energy Savings Assistance program participants. The purpose of this would be to determine if we can assign reliable and valid savings estimates to education – Historically, education has not counted as a "measure" that delivers savings, and as such has received relatively less attention in the Impact Evaluations. Getting better and more focused data on this component may provide a justification to consider claiming savings for this measure. A Quasi-experimental design should allow us to examine with greater rigor, the extent to which we could attribute savings to (perhaps – even - different types of) education.

4. **Pilot or Study Rationale and Expected Outcome**

- Research findings from the 2009-2011 program cycle[1] suggest that learning more about ways that we can maximize the benefit of our customer education may produce additional meaningful savings benefits for our low income customers. For example, the Process

[1] "Impact Evaluation of the 2009 California Low Income Energy Efficiency Program" conducted by EcoNorthwest for the CPUC (Draft Final Report issued March, 2011); California Low Income Energy Efficiency Program 2009-2010 Process Evaluation, conducted by Research Into Action for the CPUC, (Draft Final Report issued March,2011); and Low Income Energy Efficiency Program Household Segmentation Study, conducted by Hiner and Partners for SCE & PG&E, (Preliminary Draft Report available March 2011; and High Usage Needs Assessment, conducted by Hiner and Partners for SCE, (Preliminary Draft Report available March 2011).

Evaluation recognizes that education delivery is not consistent across the utilities, yet more information is needed to determine the extent to which this difference is reflected in any overall savings. Likewise, the Segmentation and High Usage Needs Assessment Studies point to some general findings that show that customers are either oblivious to, don't know about, (or don't care about) things that are resulting in unusually high energy usage - a strong education component as the potential to assist in increasing customer knowledge and thereby mitigate actions that contribute to high usage that may be causing more energy burden for these Low Income customers.

- The joint IOUs recognize cursory findings from the Evaluations that suggest customers would benefit from more / different information and education at multiple phases of the program delivery including marketing and outreach, assessment and enrollment, and measure installation. The proposed study is expected to garner additional more in-depth data that would allow the IOUs to maximize the educational component of the program.
- Moreover, the educational component of the Energy Savings Assistance Program has the capability to take on a more significant role within the program with the introduction of and potential of the Smart Meter technology as well as national and statewide strategic initiatives become increasingly directed towards inciting long term behavior and attitude changes in customers to reach long-term GHG goals.
- Given how the program is delivered (in person/one-on-one), relative to other types of programs, social science research suggests that the Energy Savings Assistance Program has the potential to induce knowledge, attitude and behavior changes related to energy efficiency.
- In addition, understanding customer attitudes toward program messages and energy saving opportunities will inform marketing and outreach plans which will help achieve penetration goals.
- This combination of factors suggests the need for a more focused evaluation effort on the education component of the Energy Savings Assistance Program

1. **Pilot or Study Implementation**
    - Development of the Request for Proposals, Solicitation of Bids, Award of Research Project
    - Development of a detailed research plan (by proponent contractor)
    - Data collection methods and analyses plan.
    - Types of data collection and analyses may include:
        - Program Delivery analyses (contractor interviews & surveys; staff interviews; customer interviews; training material and practice review; literature and other program review)
        - Energy Savings analyses (examination of savings impacts of differentiated education treatments)
        - Curriculum analyses & best practices (training material and practice review; comparative material review (w/ other programs and based on cost & assessed value)
        - Customer needs assessment for education and marketing (contractor interviews & surveys; staff interviews; customer interviews; in home assessments; secondary review of other RASS, ME&O, etc research on relevant issues for this population AND national & state trends)
    - Data Analysis
    - Presentation of conclusions and recommendations.

5. **Study Budget & Timing Table**

While no proposal has been received, we anticipate the following evaluation activities to be cost drivers for this study:

Activity	Estimated Cost	Estimated Timing
Review of current program implementation and delivery, and materials	5,000	March 2012
Development of a detailed research plan	5,000	April 2012
Data collection methods and analyses plan.	5,000	May 2012
Primary and Secondary Data Collection which may include:	170,000	June 2012
• Program Delivery analyses (interviews & surveys; literature and other program review) • Energy Savings analyses (examination of savings impacts of differentiated education treatments) • Curriculum analyses & best practices (training material and practice review) • Customer needs assessment for education and marketing (interviews & surveys; in home assessments; focus groups, secondary review of existing data)		
Data Analysis	50,000	Dec 2012
Reporting (early findings memos, draft and final reports)	50,000	April 2013
General Project management	15,000	ongoing

Attachment A-10

LOW INCOME STATEWIDE MARKETING PLAN STRATEGY

Low-Income Statewide Marketing Plan

STRATEGY

To help customers become smarter energy users and move them through the continuous engagement cycle, the utilities plan to implement the following Statewide ME&O strategies and efforts during 2012-2014:

1. **Incorporating the Energy Savings Assistance Program name, logo, and messaging into Engage 360 efforts as appropriate.** This will include tactics such as brochures, promotional items, website, press releases, outreach scripts and talking points.

2. **Utilizing Engage 360 grassroots opportunities.** At the core of the approach are the tactics of grassroots marketing, with a focus on overcoming the barriers that limit the reach of traditional awareness campaigns. Community-based grassroots marketing acknowledges the necessity of speaking to the interests, concerns and motivations of the individual as a member of the community, and of using community networks to drive awareness of energy efficiency programs and behaviors.

   Grassroots marketing has proven particularly effective in reaching the low-income market. This marketing strategy enables the development of personal relationships with low-income consumers and breaks trust barriers commonly held by the low-income segment.

Grassroots Marketing Techniques	
I.	***Connecting with Individual Consumers***
II.	***Connecting with Community Leaders***

Grassroots Marketing To The Low-Income Consumer Breaking Trust Issues By Connecting To The Community	
I. **Connecting with Individual**	**II.** **Connecting with Community Leaders**
Using One-on-One Marketing through:	Using Community Spokespeople such as:
Events (Community- and Faith-based)	*Church Leaders*
Door-to-Door Outreach	*Small Business Leaders*
	Politicians
	Pundits

Low-Income Statewide Marketing Plan (continued)

I. Connecting with Individual Consumers

This approach concentrates on providing information about Engage 360 to one customer at a time by identifying and then meeting their individual needs through interaction at outreach events and door-to-door outreach. These individuals will be asked to participate in the program in the form of personal commitments and menus of actions. When applicable, for instance in underserved communities, individuals will be made aware and provided with information on the Energy Savings Assistance Program. Customers will be reached on an individual level through a combination of Engage 360 outreach activities, as well as through the utilities' network of community based organizations.

II. Connecting with Community Leaders

Progressive marketing organizations often forge partnerships with key community figures such as church leaders, hoping to use them as spokespeople in the community. According to a 2004 Gallup Poll, more than two-thirds of those surveyed trust the ethics and integrity of their church leaders. Engage 360 will utilize these community leaders to deliver the campaign messages to their constituents and drive awareness when appropriate for Energy Savings Assistance Program. Engage 360 will forge new partnerships with community leaders, in addition to leveraging the extensive partnerships that already exist between utilities and key community organizations.

3. **Leveraging Engage 360 social media activities.** The social web has given rise to a new way of marketing: people are engaged in conversations online and markets have become conversations. The most trusted form of advertising today is a recommendation from another person 'just like me.' Engage 360 will tap into these conversations and determine where the audience is spending time online and what subjects and issues are of interest to them. To reach the consumer successfully Engage 360 will tell stories directly such as tips and how-to, co-creation with people and other groups, and curation of existing content—all in a way intended to spark conversations. When applicable, Energy Savings Assistance Program will become a part of those conversations.

4. **Incorporating Energy Savings Assistance Program messaging onto the Engage 360 website.** Engage 360.com will act as the knowledge library and information portal for the effort. Information and links for program sign up will be incorporated into website.

Appendix B

CARE Programs

Attachment B-1

CARE BUDGETS PROPOSAL

PY 2012 - 2014 CARE Proposed Program Budget
Southern California Edison

CARE Budget Categories	2011 Authorized $ (000)	2012 Planned $ (000)	2013 Planned $ (000)	2014 Planned $ (000)
Outreach	$ 2,230	$ 2,050	$ 2,100	$ 2,155
Processing, Certification, Recertification	$ 900	$ 530	$ 559	$ 588
Post Enrollment Verification		$ 700	$ 700	$ 700
IT Programming	$ 1,000	$ 950	$ 950	$ 1,000
Cool Centers	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pilots	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Measurement and Evaluation	$ 56	$ 50	$ 50	$ 50
Regulatory Compliance	$ 145	$ 251	$ 265	$ 264
General Administration	$ 948	$ 680	$ 702	$ 725
CPUC Energy Division Staff	$ 206	$ 140	$ 140	$ 140
SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT COSTS	$ 5,485	$ 5,351	$ 5,465	$ 5,622
Subsidies and Benefits	$ 211,400	$ 330,200	$ 376,900	$ 416,800
TOTAL PROGRAM COSTS & CUSTOMER DISCOUNTS	$ 216,885	$ 335,551	$ 382,365	$ 422,422

The budget categories and subcategories for 2012-2014 were revised by the Commission and do not fully align with the categories and subcategories that were authorized for 2009 – 2011. Post Enrollment Verification in 2011 was included within the Processing, Certification, and Recertification category.

CARE customers are exempt from paying costs for Department of Water Resources Bonds, CARE Public Purpose Program, and the California Solar Initiative. During the 2012 - 2014 period, SCE estimates these exemptions will total $340.3 million

Attachment B-2

CARE ESTIMATED PARTICIPATION

PY 2012 - 2014 CARE Estimated Participation
Southern California Edison

	Total Enrolled 12-31-10	Total Enrolled Through March 2011	PY 2011 Estimated Eligible	Estimated Net PY 2011 Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2011 Participation	Estimated PY 2011 Goal Rate	Estimated PY 2012 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2012 Participation	Estimated PY 2012 Goal Rate (a)	Estimated PY 2013 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2013 Participation	Estimated PY 2013 Goal Rate (a)	Estimated PY 2014 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2014 Participation	Estimated PY 2014 Goal Rate (a)
(Source)	(1)	4/21/11 RD Report	(2)	(3)	(Col. B+E)	(Col. F/D)	(2)	(Col. F+H)	(Col. I/D)	(2)	(Col. I+K)	(Col. L/D)	(2)	(Col. L+N)	(Col. O/D)
SCE	1,381,109	1,414,720	1,444,199	48,891	1,430,000	98%	14,300	1,444,300	98%	14,443	1,458,743	98%	14,587	1,473,330	98%

(a) Estimated PY2012, PY2013 and PY2014 Goal Rate will fluctuate based on updated CARE Eligibility information to be filed October 2011, October 2012 and October 2013

(1) CARE Annual Reports, dated 5/1/2011

(2) SCE's 2011 eligible estimate is based on eligibility rates filed. To project future enrollment and "goal rate" SCE has escalated eligibility and participation by 1% annually through 2014.

(3) Most recent estimates of net enrollments.

Attachment B-3

CARE OUTREACH AND PENETRATION INFORMATION

PY 2010-2011 CARE Outreach and Penetration Information
Southern California Edison

CARE PY 2010				
Outreach Method	**Total Cost**	**Estimated # of Customers Reached**	**Estimated # of Customers Enrolled**	**Percent of Net Enrollments for PY 2007**
Annual Solicitation	$ 544,685	2,900,000	22,067	5.7%
Call Center Mailer	$ 547,417	100,000	56,933	14.7%
Call Center Online	$ -	100,000	56,299	14.5%
3rd Party Call Center Online	$ 12,215	100,000	6,108	1.6%
Capitation	$ 513,809	100,000	25,755	6.6%
Customer Internet	$ 11,052	100,000	55,467	14.3%
General Outreach	$ 730,788	800,000	48,574	12.5%
Direct Marketing	$ 764,477	800,000	42,838	11.1%
External Data	$ 29,038	65,266	65,266	16.8%
Internal Data Sharing	$ 35,616	8,185	8,185	2.1%
Total	**$ 3,189,098**	**5,073,451**	**387,492**	**100.0%**

CARE PY 2011				
Outreach Method	**Total Cost**	**Estimated # of Customers Reached**	**Estimated # of Customers Enrolled**	**Percent of Net Enrollments for PY 2007**
Annual Solicitation	$ 550,000	3,000,000	22,500	6.0%
Call Center Mailer	$ 500,000	100,000	50,000	13.3%
Call Center Online	$ -	100,000	25,000	6.7%
3rd Party Call Center Online	$ 100,000	100,000	50,000	13.3%
Capitation	$ 450,000	100,000	22,500	6.0%
Customer Internet	$ 10,000	100,000	55,000	14.6%
General Outreach	$ 692,000	800,000	43,600	11.6%
Direct Marketing	$ 700,000	800,000	40,000	10.6%
External Data	$ 29,000	60,000	60,000	16.0%
Internal Data Sharing	$ 35,000	7,000	7,000	1.9%
Total	**$ 3,066,000**	**5,167,000**	**375,600**	**100.0%**

Attachment B-4

CARE PILOTS AND STUDIES

PY 2012 - 2014 CARE Pilots and Studies
Southern California Edison

Line No.	Statewide Study	Total Cost	Percent paid by Utility	Total Cost paid by Utility
	N/A			
Total		$0		$0

Appendix C

Low-Income Programs Rate Impacts & Customer Usage

Attachment C-1

ENERGY SAVINGS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, CARE, AND COOL CENTER RATE IMPACTS

ELECTRIC

PY 2012 - 2014 CARE and Energy Savings Assistance Program Rate Impacts - Electric
Southern California Edison

PY 2012 Customer Type	Average Rate Excluding CARE/ Energy Savings Assistance Program Surcharge	CARE Subsidy Portion of Rate	CARE Administration Portion of Rate	Energy Savings Assistance Program Portion of Rate	Energy Savings Assistance Program Administration Portion of Rate	Total CARE/Energy Savings Assistance Program Surcharge	Average Rate Including CARE/Energy Savings Assistance Program Surcharge	Average Rate Including CARE/Energy Savings Assistance Program Cool Center Surcharge
Residential (Non-CARE)	19.27	0.41	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.00	0.51	19.78
Residential (CARE)	14.87	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.01	0.00	0.07	14.93
Commercial	17.45	0.41	0.01	0.07	0.01	0.00	0.50	17.96
Industrial	11.86	0.41	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.00	0.49	12.35
Agricultural	13.64	0.41	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.00	0.47	14.11
Lighting	21.69	0.00	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.00	0.07	21.76
System	16.22	0.41	0.01	0.07	0.01	0.00	0.50	16.72

PY 2013 Customer Type	Average Rate Excluding CARE/ Energy Savings Assistance Program Surcharge	CARE Subsidy Portion of Rate	CARE Administration Portion of Rate	Energy Savings Assistance Program Portion of Rate	Energy Savings Assistance Program Administration Portion of Rate	Total CARE/Energy Savings Assistance Program Surcharge	Average Rate Including CARE/Energy Savings Assistance Program Surcharge	Average Rate Including CARE/Energy Savings Assistance Program Cool Center Surcharge
Residential (Non-CARE)	20.77	0.44	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.00	0.55	21.32
Residential (CARE)	16.10	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.01	0.00	0.07	16.17
Commercial	18.97	0.44	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.00	0.54	19.51
Industrial	13.11	0.44	0.01	0.07	0.01	0.00	0.53	13.64
Agricultural	14.81	0.44	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.00	0.51	15.32
Lighting	22.70	0.00	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.00	0.08	22.78
System	17.62	0.44	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.00	0.54	18.16

PY 2014 Customer Type	Average Rate Excluding CARE/ Energy Savings Assistance Program Surcharge	CARE Subsidy Portion of Rate	CARE Administration Portion of Rate	Energy Savings Assistance Program Portion of Rate	Energy Savings Assistance Program Administration Portion of Rate	Total CARE/Energy Savings Assistance Program Surcharge	Average Rate Including CARE/Energy Savings Assistance Program Surcharge	Average Rate Including CARE/Energy Savings Assistance Program Cool Center Surcharge
Residential (Non-CARE)	21.51	0.46	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.00	0.57	22.08
Residential (CARE)	16.70	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.01	0.00	0.07	16.77
Commercial	19.63	0.46	0.01	0.07	0.01	0.00	0.55	20.18
Industrial	13.52	0.46	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.00	0.54	14.06
Agricultural	15.31	0.46	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.00	0.52	15.83
Lighting	23.66	0.00	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.00	0.08	23.74
System	18.23	0.46	0.01	0.07	0.01	0.00	0.55	18.78

Attachment C-2

ENERGY SAVINGS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, CARE, AND COOL CENTER RATE IMPACTS

GAS

PY 2012 - 2014 CARE and ESAP Rate Impacts - Gas
Southern California Edison

PY 2012 Customer Type	Average Rate Excluding CARE/ Energy Savings Assistance Program Surcharge	CARE Subsidy Portion of Rate	CARE Administration Portion of Rate	Energy Savings Assistance Program Portion of Rate	Energy Savings Assistance Program Administration Portion of Rate	Total CARE/Energy Savings Assistance Program Surcharge	Average Rate Including CARE/Energy Savings Assistance Program Surcharge	Average Rate Including CARE/Energy Savings Assistance Program Cool Center Surcharge
Residential (Non-CARE)	19.27	0.41	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.00	0.51	19.78
Residential (CARE)	14.87	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.01	0.00	0.07	14.93
Commercial	17.45	0.41	0.01	0.07	0.01	0.00	0.50	17.96
Industrial	11.86	0.41	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.00	0.49	12.35
Agricultural	13.64	0.41	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.00	0.47	14.11
Lighting	21.69	0.00	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.00	0.07	21.76
System	16.22	0.41	0.01	0.07	0.01	0.00	0.50	16.72

PY 2013 Customer Type	Average Rate Excluding CARE/ Energy Savings Assistance Program Surcharge	CARE Subsidy Portion of Rate	CARE Administration Portion of Rate	Energy Savings Assistance Program Portion of Rate	Energy Savings Assistance Program Administration Portion of Rate	Total CARE/Energy Savings Assistance Program Surcharge	Average Rate Including CARE/Energy Savings Assistance Program Surcharge	Average Rate Including CARE/Energy Savings Assistance Program Cool Center Surcharge
Residential (Non-CARE)	20.77	0.44	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.00	0.55	21.32
Residential (CARE)	16.10	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.01	0.00	0.07	16.17
Commercial	18.97	0.44	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.00	0.54	19.51
Industrial	13.11	0.44	0.01	0.07	0.01	0.00	0.53	13.64
Agricultural	14.81	0.44	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.00	0.51	15.32
Lighting	22.70	0.00	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.00	0.08	22.78
System	17.62	0.44	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.00	0.54	18.16

PY 2014 Customer Type	Average Rate Excluding CARE/ Energy Savings Assistance Program Surcharge	CARE Subsidy Portion of Rate	CARE Administration Portion of Rate	Energy Savings Assistance Program Portion of Rate	Energy Savings Assistance Program Administration Portion of Rate	Total CARE/Energy Savings Assistance Program Surcharge	Average Rate Including CARE/Energy Savings Assistance Program Surcharge	Average Rate Including CARE/Energy Savings Assistance Program Cool Center Surcharge
Residential (Non-CARE)	21.51	0.46	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.00	0.57	22.08
Residential (CARE)	16.70	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.01	0.00	0.07	16.77
Commercial	19.63	0.46	0.01	0.07	0.01	0.00	0.55	20.18
Industrial	13.52	0.46	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.00	0.54	14.06
Agricultural	15.31	0.46	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.00	0.52	15.83
Lighting	23.66	0.00	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.00	0.08	23.74
System	18.23	0.46	0.01	0.07	0.01	0.00	0.55	18.78

Attachment C-3

LOW-INCOME CUSTOMER USAGE

Low Income Customer Usage Levels
Southern California Edison

		PY 2010		PY 2011 (Projected)		PY 2012 (Projected)		PY 2013 (Projected)		PY 2014 (Projected)	
		Number of CARE Customers	Number of Customers Treated by Energy Savings Assistance Program	Number of CARE Customers	Number of Customers Treated by Energy Savings Assistance Program	Number of CARE Customers	Number of Customers Treated by Energy Savings Assistance Program	Number of CARE Customers	Number of Customers Treated by Energy Savings Assistance Program	Number of CARE Customers	Number of Customers Treated by Energy Savings Assistance Program
Electric	**Total**	1,381,109	121,868	1,430,000	73,800	1,444,300	68,200	1,458,743	77,000	1,473,330	74,800
	Tier 1*	563,604	53,261	583,556	32,253	589,392	29,806	595,285	33,652	601,238	32,691
	Tier 2*	203,061	18,476	210,249	11,189	212,352	10,340	214,475	11,674	216,620	11,340
	Tier 3*	374,449	32,810	387,704	19,869	391,581	18,361	395,497	20,730	399,452	20,138
	Tier 4*	173,695	13,186	179,844	7,985	181,642	7,379	183,459	8,331	185,293	8,093
	Tier 5*	66,300	4,135	68,647	2,504	69,333	2,314	70,027	2,613	70,727	2,538
Gas	**Total**										
	Below Baseline*										
	Above Baseline*										

* Utility may include a more detailed breakdown of gas customers' usage level and an explanation of measurement breakdown employed.
The usage tier should be reported as the tier the customer was on, the maximum number of months, in the reported year.

Appendix D

Cool Center Program

Attachment D-1

COOL CENTER PROGRAM OPERATIONS PLAN AND BUDGET

PY 2012 - 2014 Cool Centers Proposed Program Budget
Southern California Edison

CARE Budget Categories	2011 Authorized	2012 Planned	2013 Planned	2014 Planned
Operations	$ 575,000	$ 550,000	$ 550,000	$ 550,000
Marketing	$ 15,000	$ 20,000	$ 20,000	$ 20,000
General Administration	$ 202,000	$ 187,000	$ 188,000	$ 196,000
Measurement & Evaluation	$ -	$ 10,000	$ 10,000	$ 10,000
Total Program Costs	$ 792,000	$ 767,000	$ 768,000	$ 776,000