

**From:** [Anderson, Mary](#)  
**To:** [Eilert, Patrick L](#); [Craig Tyler \(craigtyler@comcast.net\)](mailto:craigtyler@comcast.net)  
**Subject:** My Talking Points/Back Up with SCG  
**Date:** Monday, March 21, 2016 1:54:20 PM

---

Here are my thoughts for tomorrow's meeting. I don't necessarily want to hash through all of this but I wanted to put this together.

- Com. Dryers
  - SCG led the residential dryer CASE study and Sue stated that they would lead the Commercial one.
  - For several months afterward in the CEC/IOU bi-weekly calls the CEC stated that the current method (a slightly modified version of the residential CASE study) was not sufficient and asked for more information. SCG staff was on those calls and didn't speak up. The CEC had originally scheduled the rulemaking for June 2015.
  - In June 2015 PG&E decided to do a parallel project on commercial dryers. It was mentioned in weekly calls that SCG had attended for several months before the project got off the ground. Unfortunately PG&E did not make the call to let SCG know this separately, this was our mistake.
  - PG&E agreed with SCG to focus on the portions of the dryers that SCG did not plan on working on. SCG hired TRC to work on com. Dryers. The CEC was displeased with the efforts and didn't have faith in TRC.
  - PG&E had one major meeting and SCG was invited. There was one meeting with the CEC a week or so ago and SCG was not invited.
  - Next steps, the other IOUs will be invited to the upcoming meetings. It is expected that participating folks will be active in the process not just take notes.
- Furnaces
  - No discussion during ES led calls by SCG staff
  - PG&E invited SCG to all of the comment letter calls and shared a copy of our research with SCG
  - SCG didn't share their research until it was filed at DOE. And PG&E had to download it from the docket.
  - Marshall asked Sue about collaborating and was put off. Renler called Berman regarding our position even though the SCG staff had avoided talking to PG&E about the rulemaking.
  - Mary called Sue to let her know that the IOUs were collaborating with the CEC on the IOU comment letter. Even though the IOUs collaborate with the CEC on federal rulemakings regularly and SCG was on the weekly calls that discussed the collaboration, Mary wanted to make sure that it wasn't a surprise.
- Package Boilers Test Procedure and Standard
  - Upcoming meeting with PG&E's ATS.
  - No other meetings have occurred with PG&E
- Administrative Lead
  - PG&E is the administrative lead and completes the SW data requests, PIP, annual reports, leading meetings and managing our projects. This is a lot of effort and while it is a SW program it isn't fair for PG&E to complete all of the work and not get any benefit out of it. It is fair that we get to do some of our own scoping and moving things in a direction that we believe is right. If there is not benefit to doing the admin work we will back out and allow the other IOUs to take a turn.
- Supportive Research
  -

In a research environment it is expected to have several groups working on the same questions. Supportive research allows you to triangulate and get to a better answer than one would have otherwise. The CPUC does this frequently with their EM&V work and with the IOU's EM&V work. PG&E believes this is appropriate and a good use of ratepayer funds.