

Commenter Name:

Commenter Affiliation:

Program Administrator to receive feedback:

Date:

Considerations for reviewing and providing comments on PA Business Plan Chapters

Instructions: Please make comments specific, reference pages where appropriate, and be focused on Business Plan level strategies.

Commenter: Please Fill In This Part Of The Form					For PA Use	
Comment #	Sector	Page #	Comment	Rationale for Comment (include references to evaluations, studies, etc., if applicable)	Integrated (Y/N)	Rationale for Y/N
CPUC/CLN-1	Residential	9, 12	RE: coherency, clear reasoning, and justification for activities, I am confused on how THIS BP works in relation to the PG&E Service area BP – e.g. where some program activities are offered by the REN and perhaps other activities for the same market segment(s) are offered by PG&E. Further, how do these 2 relate to a “statewide” residential sector strategy?			
CPUC/CLN-2	Residential	5	I was pleased to see the energy savings and cost-effectiveness data presented for SF and MF. But that said, I am astounded to see that BayREN thinks ANY expenditures on their part are warranted if the strategies will produce only a 0.25 cost-effectiveness outcome. It would seem BAYEEN may have a “winning strategy” for pursuing multi-family buildings. If so, Perhaps should stick with that.	Repeat as above		
CPUC/CLN-3	Residential	6	Not all the strategies are “key strategies” and in fact some sound like supporting activities. I recommend your nesting or bundling as appropriate, and indicate where you have certain implementing tactics or supporting activities. E.G. For single family, R1 and R3 seems to be key on the “supply side (streamlining program and increasing numbers of trained contractors), while R2, R4, R5 seem to be supporting activities to somehow drive demand. But unclear how this will actually do so. The MF strategies seem more coherent. But we need to know more about ownership profiles relative to the strategy for pursuing on-going relationships – would this be for a specific building, or with owners who have portfolios of buildings? I look forward to seeing more about how market demand will be driven via traction and success on green labels and MLS data. I had time to read only to p. 12.			
CPUC/CLN-4	Residential	1 and 20	Text mislead on degree of “central systems”. These are mostly for water heating			

Commenter Name:

Commenter Affiliation:

Program Administrator to receive feedback:

Date:

			only, and unlikely to bring about a “whole building upgrade”. P. 20 suggests only 20% of the MF markets has both central water AND space heating, and thus a circumstances that might support a landlord’s investment. I assume that in this case there is a central GAS meter, but unclear if individual units are metered for and pay for electricity. (lighting, appliances, plug loads?)			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--