

**Comparison Document for Major Items Discussed at the Coordinating Committee**

	Item	Proposal	Rationale	Discussion/ Alternate Proposal	Rationale
1	<p><i>Workforce Certifications</i></p> <p><i>Raised by:</i> CEE</p> <p>See <a href="#">here</a> for original discussion document</p> <p>This item was discussed on DATE, DATE, DATE, and DATE.</p>	<p>PA business plans should include clear and detailed descriptions of how PA incentive programs will ensure EE measures are installed by a skilled and trained workforce in order to increase energy savings by reducing lost or forgone energy savings.</p>	<p>This should be done to address poor-quality workmanship and to ensure engagement of a higher skilled and more effective workforce.</p>	<p>Instead of including specific certifications in the BPs, the BPs will include a stated intent to explore the appropriate workforce standards after BP approval within the sector-specific subcommittee process.</p> <p>For example: “PG&amp;E will consider the appropriate workforce standard requirements, such as any required certifications, minimum performance standards, or pre-qualification process for specific programs in support of its energy efficiency portfolio. As applicable, PG&amp;E will detail workforce standard requirements in each Implementation Plan (IPs).” (Commercial Draft, p.38)</p> <p>[add others]</p>	<p>Certifications are sector/subsector specific. Therefore these discussions should occur at the subcommittee level utilizing available studies, evaluations, and including key experts and stakeholders.</p>

**Comparison Document for Major Items Discussed at the Coordinating Committee**

	Item	Proposal	Rationale	Discussion/ Alternate Proposal	Rationale
2	<p><i>Municipal, Universities, Schools, and Hospitals (MUSH) &amp; Affordable Multifamily (AMF) Sector Programs</i></p> <p><i>Raised by:</i> <i>CEE</i></p> <p>See <a href="#">here</a> for CEE discussion document</p>	<p>Identify and launch programs specific to MUSH and multifamily affordable housing segments to ensure that all energy efficiency opportunities are pursued and savings realized</p>	<p>This sector is currently underfunded compared to the potential for capturing savings.</p> <p>Free ridership should be less of a concern for the CPUC when using funds to support projects for public infrastructure projects.</p>	<p>(1) There was no disagreement that the MUSH &amp; AMF sector has additional energy savings potential, but it is not clear what CPUC-sanctioned potential is available.</p> <p>(2) MUSH will be invested in where cost-effective. However, it is to be determined at the implementation planning level (e.g., through the bidding process).</p> <p>(3) AMF is not addressed within the scope of this proceeding.</p> <p>(4) While AB 802 provides additional opportunities, there continues to be question re: savings opportunities that are claimable. Therefore the cost-effectiveness inhibits further investment in these sectors.</p>	<p>(1) The MUSH sector is not currently included in the CPUC Navigant potential study so there is no CPUC guidance to PAs on this matter.</p> <p>(2) There is an entire chapter dedicated to the Public sector, which includes those buildings identified in MUSH.</p> <p>(3) AMF should be considered under the Energy Savings Assistance Program (with acknowledgement for the need to coordinate with R.13-11-005).</p> <p>(4) AB 802 could address some of the claimable savings concerns. However that guidance is just beginning to be implemented and will be clearer during the implementation planning process.</p> <p>(5) Without additional specifics from the requester, it was unclear how to move forward given the various policy/regulatory/data constraints</p>

**Comparison Document for Major Items Discussed at the Coordinating Committee**

	Item	Proposal	Rationale	Discussion/ Alternate Proposal	Rationale
3	<p><i>Connect WE&amp;T training programs to disadvantaged communities</i></p> <p><i>Raised by: CEE</i></p>	<p>Create an inclusion program to broaden opportunities for workers from minority, low-income and disadvantaged communities to enter rewarding careers related to EE and ensure that jobs generated by ratepayer investment provide living wages and defined pathways for advancement. This inclusion program should be tied to state-certified apprenticeship, which provides the structure and pathways for successful inclusion programs in the construction and utility industries.</p>	<p>TEXT [insert rationale]</p>	<p>The IOUs presented a new WE&amp;T program to address this issue. The details of the program will be determined after approval of the BPs by the CPUC.</p> <p><u>Program:</u> Career &amp; Workforce Readiness</p> <p><u>Audience:</u> People not prepared to enter a traditional energy job/career higher education path:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disadvantaged communities</li> <li>• Disadvantaged workers</li> </ul> <p><u>General Offerings/Purpose:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Career prep/job readiness services (via partnerships)</li> <li>• Job placement</li> </ul> <p><u>Partners:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workforce Investment Boards</li> <li>• Community-based organizations</li> <li>• Job-training organizations</li> </ul>	

**Comparison Document for Major Items Discussed at the Coordinating Committee**

	Item	Proposal	Rationale	Discussion/ Alternate Proposal	Rationale
4	<p><i>Disadvantaged workers and jobs.</i></p> <p><i>Raised by:</i> <i>CEE</i></p> <p>See CC Mtg #4 <a href="#">notes</a> for further discussion.</p>	<p>(1) Define “disadvantaged worker” for adoption in PA Business Plans.</p> <p>(2) Fund training programs with a track record of connecting disadvantaged workers to good paying middle class jobs and career pathways/ New projects should include a specific goal to connect disadvantaged worked with high-road energy efficiency jobs.</p> <p>(3) Data collection on job quality, workforce diversity, and other measures.</p> <p>(4) RFP process should include workforce inclusion as a factor in ranking proposals with third party contractors in energy efficiency solicitations</p>	<p>(1) <b>TEXT</b> [obtain rationale for most points]</p> <p>(2)</p> <p>(3) It is important to build a baseline and then track progress of workforce inclusion over time.</p> <p>(4)</p>	<p>(1) Defer to the CEC process rather than pursue a duplicative parallel process.</p> <p><b>TEXT</b> re: 2,3,4</p>	<p>(1) The CEC is currently establishing a definition of “disadvantaged” pursuant to Senate Bill 350 to be used consistently across the state.</p>

**Comparison Document for Major Items Discussed at the Coordinating Committee**

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Rationale</b>	<b>Discussion/ Alternate Proposal</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
5	<p><i>Bottom up Budget Justification</i></p> <p><i>Raised by:</i> <i>ORA</i></p> <p>See CC Mtg #10 <a href="#">notes</a> for further discussion.</p>	<p>BP applications need to have companion budget that includes the basis and justification for the proposed budget, in line with the BP proposal.</p>	<p>Without such a breakdown, the Commission and stakeholders cannot tell how the budget was derived or what the rationale is for the proposed budget.</p>	<p>Alternative proposal for the BPs filing in January should be consistent with Commission direction. Followed by a bottom-up approach analysis done after the BP approval, possibly as an Annual Advice Letter or other form.</p>	<p>The Commission direction was much higher level than this request. In addition, a number of the detailed analyses will change due to the CPUC direction to have at minimum 60% third party programs by the end of 2020.</p>

**Comparison Document for Major Items Discussed at the Coordinating Committee**

	Item	Proposal	Rationale	Discussion/ Alternate Proposal	Rationale
6	<p><i>Statewide Lead Assignments</i></p> <p><i>Raised by: NRDC, ORA,</i></p> <p>See CC Meeting <a href="#">#9</a> and <a href="#">10</a> Notes for discussion</p>	<p>Detail to be added</p>	<p>“[I]f the CAEECC process cannot reach consensus [on the lead administrator roles for specific statewide programs], the business plans should identify the options considered and bring the proposals forward to the Commission to resolve.” D.16-08-019</p>		

DRAFT

**Comparison Document for Major Items Discussed at the Coordinating Committee**

	Item	Proposal	Rationale	Discussion/ Alternate Proposal	Rationale
7	<p><i>LGSEC Statewide Local Government Partnership Program</i></p> <p><i>The LGSEC proposal was discussed at two official CAEECC meetings—10/19/16 and 10/27/16. Webinar. See 10/19 meeting <a href="#">notes</a> and 10/27 meeting <a href="#">notes</a>.</i></p>	<p>[replace placeholder language summary of LGSEC proposal]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o We want to accomplish state goals across one administrative system.</li> <li>o Leveraging LG energy, sustainability, climate action adaptation programs. We want to make sure that holistic approaches continue.</li> <li>o Continuity, Consistency, and Enhanced Measurability and Refinement</li> <li>o Standardized, Enhanced and Responsible Data Access</li> <li>o Leveling of cross-LGP capacity and function</li> <li>o Remediation of Local Government Barriers.</li> <li>o Promote LGP Constituency and Market Reach</li> </ul>	<p>LGPs are vessels for IOU plans and are typically not included in designing programs, but are held accountable for program performance</p> <p>LGPs do not have consistent access to useful energy data</p> <p>LGP contract terms, timeframes, budgets and performance metrics are inconsistent and there are no established mechanisms for contract modifications</p> <p>LGP program funding can be capricious</p> <p>LGPs are not integrated with other energy and climate programs</p> <p>Each of the IOUs use different methods, metrics, accounting and budgeting processes</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The assertions of the identified problems were countered by at least two parties.</li> <li>2. Proposal is betting on uncertain outcomes with respect to total proposed funding, without having certainty.</li> <li>3. Existing PA Local Government Partnerships are generally working and PAs are making improvements, so not worth throwing the whole existing set of programs away.</li> <li>4. Local presence afforded by local PAs and local governments is preferred.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is difficult to assess how the proposal will address the challenges without undermining partnerships or approaches that are seemingly working.</li> <li>2. It is not clear in the submission how a statewide lead would be able to maintain the local flare of partnerships.</li> <li>3. Concerns about co-mingling funding from multiple state sources versus attributing EE savings to part of the commingled funds.</li> <li>4. The issues you raised clearly need to be addressed, even if not applicable to all partnerships. However, the proposal doesn't provide a clear path to how this approach would address the key issues. In particular, how exactly would this improve the data issue that was raised?</li> </ol>