

CAEECC Meeting #18 - August 21, 2018  
Final Meeting Summary  
Prepared Tuesday, September 4, 2018

California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee  
Meeting #18  
August 21, 2018 10:00 to 4:00  
Natural Resources Defense Council, 111 Sutter St, San Francisco, CA  
Final Meeting Summary  
Facilitator: Dr. Scott McCreary, CONCUR Inc.

---

On August 21, 2018, the California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee (CAEECC) convened a quarterly meeting of the full CAEECC at the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) office in San Francisco. Over 50 individuals participated in-person, and over 60 more participated via BlueJeans (webinar). A full list of meeting registrants is provided in Appendix A.

Meeting facilitation was provided by Dr. Scott McCreary (CONCUR Inc.) and Meredith Cowart (CONCUR Inc). Meeting materials, including presentations, are provided on the CAEECC website at <https://www.caeecc.org/8-21-18-coordinating-committee-mtg->.

In this document, the majority of the discussion is captured without attribution. In some cases, the affiliation of the speaker is identified, because their affiliation is relevant to the comment. Presentations are summarized only if the presenter's PowerPoint is not available on the CAEECC website (see link above).

Following the presentations, key clarifying questions or comments are listed and relevant *responses to questions* are noted in *italics*. Where multiple responses were given, these responses are listed as sub-bullets. Next Steps, at the end of this document, list all next steps discussed at the meeting.

## **SESSION 1: INTRODUCTIONS**

The CAEECC Facilitator S. McCreary opened the meeting and reviewed the agenda. He explained that the primary focus of the meeting is for stakeholders to receive presentations on the Program Administrator's (PA's) Annual Budget Advice Letters (ABALs), which have been updated since the August 2, 2018 Full CAEECC Meeting #17 and are "near final" in advance of the filing on September 4, 2018. In addition, he noted that the group will also consider the potential addition of new CAEECC Members, discuss the CAEECC workplan for the remainder of the year, and discuss the evaluation of the CAEECC.

## **SESSION 2: CAEECC MEMBER APPLICATIONS**

S. McCreary explained that the CAEECC facilitators received applications from five different parties interested in becoming formal CAEECC Members:

- 1) Local Government Sustainable Energy Coalition (LGSEC)
- 2) Western HVAC Performance Alliance Inc. (WHPA)
- 3) CodeCycle
- 4) The Energy Coalition
- 5) The School Energy Coalition (SEC)

He reviewed the “Potential New Members Analysis” memorandum developed by the facilitation team and posted to the meeting webpage (link above), which discusses how these applicant organization/individuals meet CAEECC criteria including familiarity with CA energy efficiency (EE) policy/cost-effectiveness, and willingness to abide by the CAEECC groundrules. It goes on to discuss how these Members relate to the CAEECC’s size and balance criteria and whether the applicants represent unique interests not covered by current Members.

CAEECC Members then discussed the Membership applications.

Several Members spoke in favor of including LGSEC, WHPA, CodeCycle and the Energy Coalition. Members noted that LGSEC, WHPA and the Energy Coalition have strong experience with implementation and have a wide array of stakeholder representation.

Regarding the SEC, some Members expressed concern that while they recognize the need for representation of school programs on the CAEECC, they were concerned that the applicant may not have sufficient expertise in the highly technical and niche issues that the CAEECC deals with, and might therefore slow down the CAEECC process. Members discussed the idea of a “pathway” to provisionally include the SEC in the near term, giving them time to become involved with CAEECC meetings and issues, with the understanding that Membership would be granted at a later date.

Regarding size of the CAEECC, one Member noted that while the size of the CAEECC (with the addition of the new Members) is not yet too large, the Committee may need to consider consolidating like Members under a single primary Member at some point down the road. S. McCreary noted that such an arrangement was possible, but may entail a revision to the ground rules, when they are revisited.

Regarding representation on the CAEECC, one Member noted that as the size of the CAEECC expands, and representation for certain interest groups (e.g. industry) expands, it may be important to conduct any voting in “clusters”, i.e. Members belonging to one interest group get a single vote. S. McCreary noted that voting on issues before the CAEECC is infrequent, and that ideally decisions will be made on a consensus basis rather than by vote.

An interested citizen noted that SEC should not be categorized as local government representation, as K-12 is the only public sector that does not have its own partnership, and does not yet have representation on the CAEECC.

**Straw Vote Results:**

Members voted individually on each Member application. Facilitators tallied affirmative votes in response to the question “Should [the organization] be seated immediately as a full Member? Sixteen Members or their proxy voted in person, and four Members voted over the phone. Results of the straw vote are as follows:

- **Local Government Sustainable Energy Coalition:** 17/18 votes in favor
- **Western HVAC Performance Alliance:** 16/18 votes in favor
- **CodeCycle:** 16/18 votes in favor
- **The Energy Coalition:** 16/18 votes in favor
- **The School Energy Coalition:** 4/18 votes in favor

The new Members were immediately seated at the CAEECC table. The new Members are as follows:

- Local Government Sustainable Energy Coalition (Lou Jacobson primary, Demian Hardman proxy/alternate)
- Western HVAC Performance Alliance (Elsia Galawish primary Wendy Worrell, proxy/alternate)
- CodeCycle (Dan Suyeyasu primary, Tom Garcia proxy/alternate)
- The Energy Coalition (Laurel Rothschild primary, Marc Costa proxy/alternate)

In discussion following the vote, Members agreed that the School Energy Coalition (Anna Ferrara primary, proxy/alternate not yet identified) provides an important voice and should be seated at the CAEECC in the longer term. Members agreed that CAEECC facilitators, Co-Chairs and other interested Members would convene an offline discussion on potential pathways to Membership for the School Energy Coalition.

**SESSION 3: INDIVIDUAL PA (NEAR FINAL) ABALS**

Each PA provided a short presentation on their near-final ABALs, which have been revised according to stakeholder and CPUC comments at the August 2, 2018 meeting. Each presentation was followed by clarifying questions and feedback from CAEECC Members and other stakeholders, with responses from the PAs. Below, the key clarifying questions or comments are listed and relevant *responses to questions* by the individual PA are noted in *italics*. Some questions centered on cross-cutting themes that apply to all PAs or to all RENs, and are listed in the sections “Cross-

*Cutting Themes – All PA ABALs” and “Cross-Cutting Themes – REN ABALs” following all the individual PA presentations.*

***SCE 2019 ABAL Summary, Tory Weber***

This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above).

Clarifying Questions and Comments on SCE’s presentation:

- In your Budget True-up, the Total Resource Cost (TRC) is blank for 2020 - 2022 – do you plan to fill these in? *Yes, we will fill these in.*
- Can you speak to what the actual budget cuts are for the LGP program from 2018 to 2019?
  - *The main changes are in Direct Implementation (DI) costs for LGP programs. Those cuts have been communicated, and there is more information on this in the ABAL letter. There are no changes to these budget cuts since August 2, 2018.*
  - *PG&E: Question to CPUC: You asked for an understanding of how money is shifting around if there are reductions to the budget year after year. There will be minor changes to the budget across the entire portfolio year to year – can you clarify what the threshold for that might be?*
  - *We’re trying to get a real sense of what is getting cut in order to get to CE. Those numbers should show up in the Budget Filing Detail Report (BFDR) in the California Energy Data and Reporting System (CEDARS). Everyone has access to those numbers. Each PA has to submit on September 4, 2018. We don’t have the BFDR yet for 2019, so we are asking the questions now to get ahead of schedule. There is no ask to the IOUs regarding a threshold, aside from please be supportive of LGPs as they compile information, to allow them to get us a picture of what the changes look like. There is no expectation that these changes be discussed in ABAL narrative.*
- Did you follow the CPUC guidance on reporting regarding IDSM reporting, i.e. how much are you pulling from the EE budget and how much from the ER budget? You need a table that shows this per the guidance in the first tab of the spreadsheet. *We will provide such a table.*
- Can you speak more to what is driving the fluctuations that you mentioned, as some are significant (those in Commercial, Agriculture, Emerging Technology)? *The fluctuations match the Goals and Potentials, and you’ll see the same fluctuations in our Business Plan (BP). It’s hard to say what this will show when we get into those years and Goals and Potentials are updated.*
- In your ABAL narrative you discuss a significant reduction to administrative costs, how did you accomplish that? *We’re not budgeting to backfill vacancies in 2018, we’re not budgeting for a 5% staff turnover, and we’re focusing on outsourcing and insourcing where it makes the most sense.*

- The 2018 TRC forecast for 2018 is right on the razor's edge, will you certainly come in over 1.00? *It's difficult to say, our focus is on getting to 1.00 and meeting the Goals. It's harder and harder to meet the TRC and Goals as Avoided Costs (ACs) continue to drop.*

***SDG&E 2019 ABAL Summary, George Katsufraakis***

This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above).

Clarifying Questions and Comments on SDG&E's presentation:

- CPUC would like you to break out the incentive program from Codes and Standards, so that you can compare program savings with program savings goals. *Yes, we can do that.*
- Can you explain where the True-up data for the out year is, and when can we see this populated? *We're working on it now will send it out by the end of the week. In 2019 we'll file about \$10 M under our allocated budget, and we will allocate that \$10 M evenly across 2020, 2021 and 2022 (so about \$3 M each year). Our budget is flat through 2025 at \$116 M each year, but for 2020 – 2022 it will be about \$119 M.*
- Your LGP budgets are staying the same - can you say a few words on how you are working with Local Governments to maintain these partnerships? *We have contracts expiring in 2020, so the LGP budget will stay the same until then, and then will be reviewed.*
- Does your TRC include market effects, because I don't think they should be excluded for purposes of compliance? SDG&E's TRC is high enough that it should be fine anyway, but you should double check.
  - *My guess is that the TRC does include market effects, but we'll double check.*
  - *D.12-11-015 Ordering Paragraph 37 directs PAs to include markets effects in the TRC. It's also not possible for us to strip out market effects in CEDARS.*
- Are you converting home upgrades from resource to non-resource in order to improve C/E for the portfolio? *Yes, that's correct. From the customer perspective the programs run the same, but the reporting is different. We're excluding measures costs from the TRC because they are not resource savings.*
- In your ABAL narrative, you say you are consolidating across sectors, what do you mean by consolidation? *We will have market verticals – e.g. multi-family, single family, and behavior. Within each market vertical we'll include everything that goes along with that program in a single solicitation, including benchmarking, audits, NMEC, deemed approach, etc. Some firms are larger and can accommodate more than one design or vendor, so we'll see what we get.*
- If you pull out Codes and Standards, you are showing more than 3X achievement – can you explain that? *3X reflects a high forecast, but looking at what we achieved over the last 3 years, a 2X forecast is certainly not*

- unreasonable. In Residential, this achievement is coming from behavior and lighting, in non-residential, it is coming from the Direct Install (DI) or Business Energy Solutions (BES) programs.*
- Will there be opportunities to incorporate NMEC in the commercial space?  
*We always looking to see if we can do NMEC, we're open to those ideas and can talk more about that.*

**SoCalGas 2019 ABAL Summary, Darren Hanway**

This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above).

Clarifying Questions and Comments on SoCalGas's presentation:

- The previous version of the draft ABAL showed a \$30M carryover from the previous year, now there is only \$2M, what changed?
  - *In the previous version our understanding was that 2013-2018 included the entire vintaging of funds, but we received guidance that this was only for 2018.*
  - Follow up: So the rest of the funds will be returned to ratepayers from the balancing account?
  - *Correct. From funds that were collected in 2013, 2014 and 2015.*

**PG&E 2019 ABAL Summary, Adam Scheer**

This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above).

General Clarifying Questions and Comments on PG&E's presentation:

- Slide 6 on Portfolio PAC needs to be updated to exclude Codes and Standards.  
*Thanks, we'll get that fixed.*
- Did you include NMEC approach in your forecast and if so, can we look at what you are expecting by sector or program? *Our role is to administer the programs so we can't dictate what approaches are used – that said we would like to see more programs using NMEC, which allows for more flexibility and verifiability.*
- Have your programs or approach changed since the last meeting, where comments were made about the opportunities still remaining in lighting and advanced lighting controls? *Our portfolio around lighting controls has not changed since the last meeting. If implementers can propose innovative lighting control projects, we are very interested.*
- With a projected TRC of 1.08, you don't have much margin of error. Can you explain how you will meet this target on an evaluative basis? *Meeting TRC has been a very focused effort on this forecast, and we have stressed with all program managers and 3P implementers that we need to achieve these goals in the field. We also hope that some new proposals, e.g. making OBF savings claims part of the resource claim will improve C/E for the portfolio.*

- I'm struck that your ESA savings show huge savings accounting for 70% of the entire Residential sector, is there a mistake? *That's something we're concerned about, and we've asked the team to revisit.*
- In the 2018 budget breakdown, what proportion of the budget is allocated to K-12 for last year, and what is allocated to K-12 for 2019? *I'm not sure, I will run this to ground and let you know.*

Clarifying Questions and Comments on PG&E presentation in relation to Local Government Partnerships:

- Cutting LGP budgets due to low TRC is in direct opposition to the CPUC directive that IOUs should work with LGs to meet their needs, and which discourages drastic cuts. There are two ways to raise C/E – 1) cut costs and 2) raise benefits. It looks in PG&E's ABAL as if you relied on cutting costs and not raising benefits. What was the rationale from PG&E, given the Commission's directive?
  - *PG&E: The Decision is unequivocal that we must hit a 1.0 TRC. We are trying to do that legitimately, but supporting programs in the field that can get as high a TRC as possible. The budget reductions that look large - \$5-7M – only amount to about a 15% reduction, on the order that other sectors have also seen. The pain around this is that the cuts come from the implementation side. We are open to other ideas on how to improve benefits – this was the purpose of putting this portfolio-level exercise out to our public sector partners. We worked extensively with our LGP partners and have allowed them to broaden their offerings where appropriate.*
  - San Francisco Energy Watch, our colleagues in the East Bay, the South Bay, and beyond, all agree that PG&E's process of working with LGPs was not collaborative in the way you describe. We all shared with the IOU our scenarios for improving C/E that got us to the target, and received pushback from PG&E that led us to believe that PG&E had preconceived notions about the needed, and the conversation was had merely to check a box of engagement with LGPs.
  - *Our job as portfolio manager is to verify the accuracy of C/E, and since this was the first time many LGPs worked with C/E, in our verification we found many issues with the quality of inputs. The work with the LGPs did in fact allow us to reduce the number of overall cuts that we had originally been targeting.*
- How is PG&E following the Decision order 69 that IOUs should quantify co-benefits and local economic benefits of LGPs in HTR and DACs before the cuts are implemented?
- *1. PG&E has cut our overhead by 29%, and we are asking the public sector to make similar reductions. 2. The Decision was published at the end of May and it is now August, updates to co-benefits require extensive evaluation. As we*

*continue into the future, if we develop Cost Effective solutions, we'll increase those budgets, but we're not there.*

- After seeing PG&E's ABAL, we are concerned that the administrative costs are hurting the public sector unevenly. It appears that PG&E's changes did not improve e.g. the public sector TRC or PAC – but only moved administrative costs to make room for PG&E's own administrative costs. *We are not asking the public sector to meet a 1.0 TRC – we're not there. If we wanted to manage the public sector to that level there would be more drastic cuts. We're doing our best to compromise.*
- *PG&E: The public sectors' TRC and PAC are much closer than in other sectors because of the prevalence of DI, which trends much more closely to the measure cost.*
- Has PG&E kept any high-risk programs that have the opportunity to increase the baseline average, and has the potential to set an example of C/E LGP programs? Were there good ideas you saw as high risk that you didn't go forward with? *Yes -as we go forward with the 3<sup>rd</sup> party implementation we'll see more of that. If we see a good program but that doesn't have a good prospect of getting an approved savings claim (e.g. it lacks a work paper) we won't go forward with it.*
- The assumption that 3Ps can meet public sector savings is a drastic misunderstanding of the public sector. This will lead to decreases in local government energy efficiency, DACs and HTRs. RENS and IOUs partner with 3Ps but this will be challenging for LGs because of the procurement process. These challenges are not being considered.
- Was there a C/E screening in the Potential and Goals Study, did the TRC metrics for ET – are they congruent with what was used in the ABALs? There may be an incongruence between the P&Gs and what happens in the life of the ABALs. *That's a good point.*
- The PAs have all proposed significant changes to their portfolios in their ABALs to optimize TRC. When I look across all PA offerings, I see a reduction in the savings in what would traditionally be custom, as a result of pressure to reduce budgets in low-TRC programs such as Local Government programs. Is it really the CPUC's intention to be eliminating or reducing the budget of these low C/E programs?
- PG&E's ABAL indicates a \$5-7M budget reduction in the LGP sector, which does not seem like a lot, but I hear LGPs saying they're seeing budget cuts of 30-60% across the board. What does the \$5-7M budget cut mean – is the public sector budget relatively stable but money is distributed differently?
  - *PG&E: A lot of the reduction where pain is being felt is on the contract side.*
  - *City and County of SF: The budget after 2018 continues to go down significantly*
- San Mateo County Energy Watch: Slide 2 shows a public sector cut of \$24M. In fact PG&E did not discuss these budget cuts with us in advance.



- Historically there has been no collaboration between PG&E and the LGs on increasing TRC in our programs or generating savings. *We are not forecasting a budget cut of \$24M, not even close. There has been cost shifting, are uncommitted funds, and a number of things we are starting to curtail.*
- The reality is not that this is a PG&E problem or the CPUC's fault, but that the TRC is "broken". One participant noted that the reality is not that this is a PG&E problem or the CPUC's fault, but that the TRC is "broken". She explained that in its current form, the TRC displaces or distorts energy savings, policy objectives, equity, and impact. She provided a specific example, in which a nonprofit running a residential direct install program was able to meet the 1.15 TRC required by PG&E, but it meant hiring 40 low-income youth instead of 150, serving 2,000 customers instead of 4,000, and serving two cities instead of six counties. She noted that while these effects are not the intent of the TRC, it has had this impact on the ground.

***MCE 2019 ABAL Summary, Michael Callahan***

This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above).

Clarifying Questions and Comments on MCE's presentation:

- Will MCE fill in the TRC for 2020 and beyond in the True-up table? *Yes, we will have this by September 4, 2018, and we can make this available earlier if requested.*
- In the BP, you listed savings in groups of years (e.g. year 1-3) rather than annually, but here the targets are listed annually, are you meeting the savings targets listed in the BP in your ABAL? *My understanding is that that savings targets listed in the BP were based on old assumptions (e.g. outdated ACs). The goal with the September 4, 2018 filing is to bring in the savings that were approved, although there may be a challenge meeting those goals, and they may need to be refreshed.*
- Can you explain how you were able to bring your Cost Effectiveness (CE) so much from 2018 to 2019? Are you discontinuing the financing program? *Most of the change comes from expansion into new sectors (Agriculture, Industrial) and changes in existing sectors (Residential going from non-resource to resource). We are discontinuing the financing program, but planning to help our customers access other financing programs.*
- How will you ensure you meet the 1.0 TRC on an evaluative basis, you have a very small margin for drop-off here? *There is some information in the ABAL narrative on this, and some information in final slides for MCE's August 2, 2018 ABAL presentation.*

***SoCalRENs 2019 ABAL Summary, Lujana Medina***

This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above).

- You have a substantial budget for your public sector programs, but no savings attributed – are these non-resource programs? *The majority of our programs are non-resource, but we have a commitment to C/E, and are introducing a small NMEC program for public buildings that will target DAC LGs. Due to the NMEC rulebook, even if we can put the NMEC program on the market in 2018, we won't see savings until 2020. Our other 2 main programs are non-resource.*

Clarifying Questions and Comments on SoCalREN's presentation:

**3-C REN 2019 ABAL Summary, Alejandra Tellez**

This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above).

- In fact the new Hard-to-Reach (HTR) definition for ABALs replaced a much stricter definition of HTR. *Yes, but the policy manual definition was broader.*
- Could you tell us more about the Workforce Education Training (WET) program – what is the program and how does it differ from what the PAs offer? *The programs are the same, but we just work with PAs to fill in any geographic gaps in services.*

Clarifying Questions and Comments on 3-C REN's presentation:

**BayREN 2019 ABAL Summary, Jenny Berg**

This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above).

Clarifying Questions and Comments on BayREN's presentation:

- There were no questions or comments following this presentation.

**Cross-Cutting Themes – All PA ABALs:**

- Each PA must break out a single line for each REN, both in the Budget True-up tables and the 2019 Budget & Cost-Effectiveness tab.
- What is the status of the Independent Evaluator contracts? *All four utilities have put out RFPs, received bids, and held a meeting with the Procurement Review Group (PRG). All four utilities are now ready to offer master contracts to several Independent Evaluators. When specific solicitations are ready, they'll issue more specific contracts for those solicitations.*
- [Follow-up to the Q&A above]: Do the IE contractors have sufficient energy expertise? *We were looking for a wide range of very specific expertises, which greatly narrowed the pool of potential IE contractors. The pool in general is stronger on the technical EE side than on the policy and implementation side. But the utilities will help bring them up to speed, and the PRG feels they will be prepared.*

***Cross-Cutting Themes – REN ABALs:***

- Do any RENs have plans to expand into small commercial, in order to fill in the gaps for HTR?
  - *BayREN: We have a Small-and-Medium Enterprise (SME) program. Because of the need to meet C/E targets, a lot will be targeted to HTR, but balanced with the medium sized businesses. This will be an Normalized Metered Energy Consumption (NMEC)-based program, as far as we know the first of its kind, that we are looking to broaden to all 9 counties of the Bay Area.*
  - *SoCalREN: There is abundant need for SME programs that reach HTR in Los Angeles (e.g. non-English speaking run bodegas/liquor stores and small grocers), but we need to stay within the threshold criteria (HTR definition) we're mandated.*
  - *BayREN: The changed definition of HTR precludes targeting offerings [to the programs described by SoCalREN above], and we are limited to filling the gaps from PG&Es offerings.*
  - *ORA: Wouldn't a Spanish-speaking bodega in a Disadvantaged Community (DAC) qualify under the definition of HTR?*
    - *3-C REN: Yes, but we would need to scan all IOU programs to ensure there is no duplication. We can only run a program if there is a gap.*
    - *SCG: We developed a Joint Cooperation Memo (JCM) which allows duplication of effort if there is an HTR.*
- Can PAs or others in the room speak to whether there is a good way to target non-English speaking customers, but that are not in a DAC? *SoCalREN: When a county gets a permit or business license, they can identify non-primary English speaking business owners. Local Governments (LGs) run workshops for these business owners, so you could work with LGs to identify these populations.*
- Do we anticipate the reduction in LGP budgets impacting the RENs, as they are working in the Public Sector?
  - *BayREN: We don't have a public sector program, and our budget is separate from what is allocated to the utilities, so we don't anticipate the reduction in budget to LGPs will result in more work for the RENs.*
  - *SoCalREN: Our BP emphasized that many of our resources will be allocated to the public sector in the longer terms, so we may be able to help fill the gap.*
- **NRDC:** Do RENs have more flexibility in capturing programs or activities that don't have resource potential or provide system benefit, but provide other types of benefits? Is this something on the CPUC's radar in terms of shifting this in the short term? Ultimately NRDC wants to see effective C/E analysis, but in the near term this could help alleviate the problem.

- Also, if your area has a CCA, you could become your own PA and run and design your own programs.
- How we treat non-resource oriented programs can provide potential solutions as well. There are some non-resource bucket of funding that count against the TRC – e.g. ET does not count against the TRC and WET does. Yet both programs serve policy goals and stakeholder priorities. A judgment call needs to be made over time regarding which count towards the TRC and which do not.

#### **SESSION 4: CAEECC WORKPLAN**

S. McCreary reviewed the CAEECC 2018 Workplan Draft (see link above), which includes potential and planned working group/workshops topics for the remainder of the year, workshops and working groups already completed in 2018, and potential topics for full CAEECC quarterly meetings.

#### **Topics for CAEECC Working Groups/Workshops:**

The potential working group/workshop topics included some “above the line” (they currently meet the CPUC guidance for the CAEECC) and some “below the line” (they do not currently meet the CPUC guidance for the CAEECC). S. McCreary asked Members to consider the appropriateness of the topics “above the line” and whether any topics “below the line” would be of interest to the CAEECC should the CPUC direct the CAEECC to be involved.

In response, CAEECC Members agreed that a workshop/webinar on **Implementation Plans** (currently planned for September) in advance of the October 3, 2018 filing is appropriate and desired.

Members also noted that a work group/workshop on **Workforce Standards** (currently “above the line”) would be counterproductive if it slows down the process of finalizing Terms and Conditions. Members agreed such a meeting is only warranted if the CPUC would like to take the time to address divergences in advance of the PD.

A few Members expressed interest in a CAEECC-convened workshop on **Cost Effectiveness (C/E)** (currently “below the line”). However others noted that while it may be beneficial to convene there is currently no pathway to do so, unless the CPUC directs CAEECC involvement.

#### **Communication of CAEECC Recommendations to CPUC:**

In response to a question from the public, members noted that given current procedures there is no means for the CAEECC to submit comments or recommendations to the CPUC. The NRDC representative noted that NRDC typically

files comments on rulings related to issues CAEECC has addressed stating where the CAEECC converged/diverged on these issues without attribution to individual members.

## **SESSION 5: CAEECC EVALUATION FRAMEWORK**

S. McCreary presented the draft evaluation framework for the CAEECC, which the CAEECC Facilitation team has developed under direction from the CPUC. This PowerPoint presentation is available on the meeting webpage (see link above). Following the presentation, stakeholders posed the following questions and made the following comments:

- It would be useful to also be able to bin results by respondent interest group (e.g. ratepayers, implementers, local governments, etc) so that members can be sure the results are balanced and broadly representative
- Engagement should be measured in addition to participation, to determine how robustly stakeholders are providing input. This could be a qualitative question.
- Is the requirement to post materials 5 days in advance 5 business days or 5 calendar days? *Business.*
- A question on “was the amount of time allocated and scheduled for the meeting the right amount of time?” would be useful, since we are convening relatively senior level staff.
- It’s important to anchor the questions on slide 5 in a defined set of goals that exist for the meeting. (The questions on slide 5 read “...To what extent did the XX Working Group Meetings: help to better educate participants on this topic; define and clarify options, elicit constructive feedback, and explore alternative options; narrow points of divergence; seek agreement where feasible on potential solutions and recommendations”)
- One member suggested developing a specific question to gauge whether expectations and goals for the meeting were clearly set, and then whether they were met.
- It’s important to periodically track whether there are different expectations amongst Members regarding the purpose of the CAEECC.

## **SESSION 6: TOPICS FOR DECEMBER 6 CAEECC MEETING AND CONCLUDING ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Suggested topics for full CAEECC Meeting (or one member suggested possible workshops as needed instead of a full day meeting) included:

- Progress on solicitations
- Workpaper process

- Replacing Database for Energy Efficiency Resources (DEER)/Electronic Technical Reference Manual (eTRM) update
- Standard Terms and Conditions decision debrief
- Possible other Member or public proposal for topics
- Procurement Review Group update
- Normalized Metered Energy Consumption (NMEC) if a decision is out in sufficient time and CPUC directs the CAEECC to hold a workshop
- Template for documents and process for workshop to address ABALs lower than 1.25
- PA-led discussion on the potential templates and process of addressing ABALs with TRC lower than 1.25

Members noted that ABALs are not likely to be approved by early December, so are not likely to be addressed at the December 6, 2018 CAEECC Meeting.

### ***Concluding Announcements***

- K. Kriozere (SBUA) announced that she is moving to a new job, and that SBUA is still in the process of identifying her replacement on the CAEECC. She will forward the contact information for SBUA staff that can be reached in her absence.
- J. Denver (City and County of SF) announced that the City of San Francisco and the Governor's Office are hosting the Climate Action Summit in September, with over 400 affiliate events that may be of interest to CAEECC Members and other stakeholders.

### **NEXT STEPS**

- CAEECC Members:
  - Submit any additional topics for the December 6, 2018 Full CAEECC Meeting as they arise. Those that arise more than 6-8 weeks prior to the meeting may not leave sufficient preparation time to address them at the December 6, 2018 meeting.
  - Provide any additional comments on ABALs to PAs by Friday, August 24, 2018.
  - An Implementation Plan CAEECC Ad Hoc Workshop (webinar) will likely be held in September, in advance of the October 3, 2018 filing.
  - K. Kriozere will provide CAEECC Facilitators and Co-Chairs with contact information for SBUA staff who can be reached regarding her replacement on the CAEECC.
- Program Administrators:
  - Receive any additional stakeholder feedback on their ABALs by Friday, August 24, 2018
  - Finalize and submit ABALs to the CPUC by September 4, 2018
- Facilitation Team

## CAEECC Meeting #18 - August 21, 2018

### Final Meeting Summary

Prepared Tuesday, September 4, 2018

- Continue to revise Evaluation Framework per stakeholder feedback and begin to implement right away
- Work with Co-Chairs to develop draft agenda for December 6, 2018 Full CAEECC meeting. Continue to refine agenda based on stakeholder input, CPUC direction, and issues that may arise.
- Post process for considering topics for full CAEECC and Working Group meetings/Ad Hoc Workshops
- Finalize dates and agenda for Implementation Plan CAEECC Ad Hoc Workshop (webinar) in September (*Note: will be on 9/17*), notice CAEECC Members and other interested stakeholders.
- Consider pathway to Membership for the School Energy Coalition with Co-Chairs
- Add new Members to CAEECC Member/Proxy list serves and on CAEECC website
- Revise CAEECC 2018 Workplan as changes arise
- Interested Stakeholders
  - Submit any additional topics for the December 6, 2018 Full CAEECC Meeting as they arise. Those that arise more than 6-8 weeks prior to the meeting may not leave sufficient preparation time to address them at the December 6, 2018 meeting.
  - Provide any additional comments on ABALs to PAs by Friday, August 24, 2018.

**Appendix A: Registration List**

*Note: The list below reflects registration. If individuals participated but didn't register, or registered but didn't participate, these last-minute changes are not reflected here.*

***CAEECC Members/Proxies Joining in Person (including new Members seated at the meeting):***

Lara	Ettenson	NRDC
Erin	Brooks	SoCalGas
Henry	Burton	ORA
Ryan	Chan	PG&E
Michelle	Vigen	CEDMC
Jenny	Berg	MTC/BayREN
Jessie	Denver	City and County of San Francisco
Brian	Samuelson	CEC
George	Katsufakis	SDG&E
Michael	Callahan	Marin Clean Energy
Alejandra	Tellez	County of Ventura
David	Dias	Sheet Metal Workers Local 104
Kate	Kriozere	Small Business Utility Advocates
Bernie	Kotlier	CEE
Lujuana	Medina	EnergyRSC/SoCalREN
George	Katsufakis	SDG&E
Kathleen	Bryan	SF Department of Environment
Tory	Weber	SCE
Dan	Suyeyasu	CodeCycle
Marc	Costa	The Energy Coalition
Elsia	Galawish	Western HVAC Performance Alliance Inc. (WHPA)
Demian	Hardman	Local Government Sustainable Energy Coalition

***Representatives of CAEECC Member Organizations Joining in Person:***

Adam	Scheer	PG&E
Darren	Hanway	SoCalGas
Jenny	Roecks	PG&E
Justin	Kjeldsen	PG&E
Lucy	Morris	PG&E
Elizabeth	Baires	SoCalGas
Joey	Lande	MCE
Michael	Kenney	California Energy Commission
Paul	Kubasek	SCE



CAEECC Meeting #18 - August 21, 2018  
 Final Meeting Summary  
 Prepared Tuesday, September 4, 2018

Cody	Taylor	SCE
Becky	Estrella	Southern California Gas Company

***CPUC Staff Joining in Person:***

Peter	Franzese	CPUC
Alison	LaBonte	CPUC
Christina	Torok	CPUC
Nils	Strindberg	CPUC
Mona	Dzvova	CPUC

***Other Stakeholders Joining in Person:***

Lisa	Schmidt	Home Energy Analytics
Martin	James	CESC
Timothy	Bingham	Strategic Energy Innovations
Kimberly	Goodrich	CodeCycle
Amanda	Booth	City of San Pablo
Serj	Berelson	Nest
Craig	Perkins	The Energy Coalition
David	Siddiqui	Green Evolution
Dennis	Quinn	JouleSmart Solutions
Steve	Campbell	AMBAG Energy Watch
Alice	Sung	Greenbank Associates
Dana	Armanino	County of Marin
Jeanne	Clinton	Interested Party
Siva	Sethuraman	Cascade Energy
Corey	Grace	Resource Innovations
Lowell	Chu	City & County of SF, Dept of ENV
Andrew	Gustafson	Lockheed Martin Energy
Jason	Ruhl	Cascade Energy

***CAEECC Members/Proxies Joining via Webinar:***

Courtney	Kalashian	San Joaquin Valley Clean Energy Organization
Sarah	Farell	San Joaquin Valley Clean Energy Organization
Cody	Coeckelenbergh	Lincus
Jon	Griesser	County of San Luis Obispo
Rebecca	Menten	Center for Sustainable Energy
Matt	Evans	SCE

***CPUC Staff Joining via Webinar:***

CAEECC Meeting #18 - August 21, 2018  
 Final Meeting Summary  
 Prepared Tuesday, September 4, 2018

Amy	Reardon	CPUC
-----	---------	------

***Representatives of CAEECC Member Organizations Joining via Webinar:***

Raghav	Murali	SDG&E
Kimberly	Conley	PG&E
Mike	Bushey	SCE
Leticia	Ayala	SoCalGas
Leigh Lain	Walker	County of Ventura
Joe	Cruz	SoCalGas
Chauncy	Tou	SoCalGas
Richard	Chien	SF Department of the Environment
Veronica	Padilla	SoCalGas
Kimberly	Rodriguez	SCE
Robert	Brunn	SCE
Kerynn	Gianotti	PG&E
Becky	Estrella	SoCalGas
Derrick	Clifton	SoCalGas
Jack	Solis	SCE
Michael	Ellison	SCE
Alma	Briseno	SoCalGas
Gustavo	Sevilla	SoCalGas

***Other Stakeholders Joining via Webinar:***

Ben	Mattio	RCEA
Karalee	Browne	Institute for Local Governments
Kim	Springer	C/CAG- County of San Mateo
Russell	Lowery	Competitive Edge Advantage
Barbara	Hernesman	Western HVAC Performance Alliance
Patrick	Owen	Redwood Coast Energy Authority
Jake	Wise	InTech Energy
Michelle	Lewis	FESS Energy, Inc.
Don	Arambula	DAC
Steffanie	Agerkop	FESS Energy
Pam	Bold	High Sierra Energy Foundation
Mushtaq	Ahmad	AECOM
Steve	Campbell	AMBAG
Jim	Reese	California Manufacturing Technology Consulting
Maria	Fields	JouleSmart Solutions
Joanne	O'Neill	CLEARresult
Jennifer	West	StopWaste

CAEECC Meeting #18 - August 21, 2018  
 Final Meeting Summary  
 Prepared Tuesday, September 4, 2018

Paul	Ahrns	Sierra Business Council
Matt	Smizer	Lockheed Martin
Nick	Brod	CLEAResult
Leanna	Huynh	City of San Jose
Nancy	Barba	Frontier Energy
Ashley	Watkins	County of Santa Barbara
Donald	Gilligan	NAESCO
Barry	Scott	National Energy Education Development Project
Leslie	Villavicencio	ICF
Lou	Jacobson	Redwood Coast Energy Authority
Mabell Garcia	Paine	ICF
Jordan	Garbayo	County of San Luis Obispo
David	Myers	Build It Green
Josiah	Adams	Ecology Action
Ying	Wang	Okapi Architcture Inc
Mark	Wallenrod	Mark Wallenrod Consulting
Ted	Pope	2050 Partners
Cynthia	Mitchell	Economic Consulting Inc
Nora	Hernandez	Los Angeles County