

**From:** [Anderson, Mary](#)  
**To:** [Craig Tyler](#)  
**Cc:** [Elert, Patrick L](#)  
**Subject:** RE: My Talking Points/Back Up with SCG  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 22, 2016 9:08:53 AM

---

Here are my responses to Craig's questions. I can provide additional detail if needed.

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 ([docketed July 2013](#)) and Sue stated that they would lead the Commercial one [at the February 2015 C&S Planning Meeting](#).
  - 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. [It was mentioned in the weekly calls after June 2015.](#) Lovell was on the calls a couple of calls before he fell ill. He never responded nor did he call us about it until August 2015. Unfortunately PG&E did not make a specific call to let SCG know this separately, this was our mistake. In August 2015 Sue and Lovell told Pat that they were upset that we took over the Clothes Dryer CASE report without telling them. At that point PG&E/SCG agreed that SCG would focus on coin op dryers and PG&E would do other dryers. PG&E had set up a contract at this point and the ATS lab was setting up their dryer test facility. Lovell hired TRC to work on com. Dryers after PG&E contracted with our ATS to do the com. Dryer work. The CEC was displeased with the efforts and didn't have faith in TRC.
  - [PG&E's lab finalized the lab set up the end of last year. Sean from the CEC was travelling to San Jose for a conference and offered to stop by the ATS lab to see the test set up. This was a last minute request and an informal visit..](#) PG&E had the project kick off earlier this year and SCG attended. There was one meeting with the CEC a week or so ago and SCG was not invited. This was the first of the regular check in calls with the CEC. There have been a few informal calls (direct calls not conference calls) between the CASE authors and the CEC to go over specific questions. I introduced the CASE author to Sean of the CEC to begin the process and facilitate coordination.
    - 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. Our research was a review of DOE's analysis and not a formal report. We reviewed our analysis with the entire group and it was incorporated into PG&E's comment letter. Outside of Yanda who completed the analysis everyone was provided the same opportunity to review the analysis. This is the same analysis we complete for every comment letter. In the weekly call we mentioned that we were

reviewing the NOPR and would be sending out the draft comment letter and all of the IOUs received it at the same time.

- SCG didn't share their research until it was filed at DOE. And PG&E had to download it from the docket.
- **Marshal was identified as the SW IOU representative for furnaces. At the meeting in DC he saw Sue was also in attendance. Normally when you will be attending a DOE we all inform the SW group. At the meeting Marshall asked Sue about collaborating and was put off. Randler called Berman regarding our position even though the SCG staff had avoided talking to PG&E about the rule making. There had been no communication between SCG and the other IOUs. SCG had been invited to all of the SW calls on the subject but either hadn't attended or didn't actively participate in the process. They stated that they would be taking their own position. This position wasn't shared with the IOU team at any of the meetings.**
  
- 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.

**I understand your frustration, but having them take a turn might slow things down a lot. I do not think you want that. I know you are right. But I don't like being called the group's admin. That is demeaning. 😊**

- 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.

**You have a strong point here.**

We respect your privacy. Please review our privacy policy for more information.

<http://www.pge.com/en/about/company/privacy/customer/index.page>

Tyler & Associates  
510-326-7493