

Comment #	PA(s)	Sector	Page #	Comment
NRDC-1	SDG&E	Com	Snapshot (no tracker)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include data sources where relevant or note data sources are in the text</li> </ul>
NRDC – 2	SDG&E	Com	General (no tracker)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Figure Com-2 doesn't track completely with the barriers identified in Figure Com-1. Suggest aligning and update.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Not sure which barrier in Com1 is "transactional nature of programs" (or why that's a barrier)</li> <li>○ Com2 doesn't have reference to the contractors, decision making, misperception of customers, financing,</li> <li>○ Com1 doesn't have problem that customers are small or need to innovate</li> </ul> </li> <li>• P. 43 – suggest rewording that these BP plans are simply complementary. I presume the solicitation strategy may alter existing. I presume the main point SDG&amp;E is trying to make is that current offerings fit within these identified goals and there are new things too.</li> <li>• P.44 – hard to reach has a very unique definition per the policy manual. Would property managers fit? Or is it more of a challenging sector but not HTR per the CPUC definition? (agree it's a challenge, but would it qualify, for example, for the 0.85 TRC)</li> <li>• P.44 – suggest removing the programmatic offerings as listed and bucket them into broader strategies like "Financial offerings" (e.g., incentives, rebates, direct install, financing options) and "Technical Assistance" (e.g., retrocommissioning), "Targeted Approach" (e.g., locational EE). This gets at what you're trying to convey without providing the impression that these are the items that are in scope for bidding.</li> <li>• P.44 – add the other 2 goals</li> <li>• P.46 – why just PG&amp;E for Figure Com-8?</li> <li>• P.48 – what is "other" please provide a footnote</li> <li>• P.54 – add SB 32 and SB 1414</li> <li>• P.57 – similar to other sectors, suggest including headers (or a table format) to clearly indicate which tactics in the text match the various tactics in the boxes</li> <li>• P.57 – presume certifications track to the WE&amp;T and aren't new ones, but using existing opportunities to increase quality training?</li> <li>• P.58 – clarify how there are 2 strategies as they seem integrated.</li> <li>• P.59 – is the "new customer energy hub" akin to the residential new platform? One centralized approach to access multiple offerings?</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.60 – elaborate on raising standards. Perhaps it’s not already known that trade pros have to prove a certain level of standards before participating. Link to the trade pro cite for readers to reference.</li> <li>• P.61 – this is already in place per the advice letter, yes? Would link to the AL and reference what actions are happening</li> <li>• P.61 – does “mutually beneficial” mean explore partnerships with other agencies? And what type of agencies would fall under that tactic?</li> </ul>
NRDC – 3	SDG&E	Com	Metric (non tracker)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See notes above about the differences in statements and barriers from the original table providing an overview (Figure 1)</li> <li>• Whenever there is an “and” in the metrics. Suggest clearly indicating an ‘a’ and ‘b’ version so it does not appear a compounded metric that it hard to decipher</li> <li>• Metric 1 – should it be increase in small leased customers that participate? It doesn’t make sense for the metric to be the % of small customers</li> <li>• Metric 3 – suggest another metric re: conversion to program participation or is that was Metric 4 is? Seems confusing to have it separate since it’s the same desired outcome. Unless there’s another rationale, would make it 3a and 3b.</li> </ul>