

Notes from Statewide Administration Discussion Follow Up Webinar

10/14/2016 12:00PM to 1:00PM

Meeting Chair: Matt Evans, SCE

Facilitator/Notes: 2050 Partners

Meeting materials can be found at this location: <http://www.caeecc.org/10-14-webinar-statewide>

Notes: Presentations are generally not summarized in these notes. Please see presentation slides on www.CAEecc.org for context. Lack of attribution for meeting participant comments is intentional by agreement of Coordinating Committee.

Introductions – Ted Pope

- This is a CC meeting but with an ad hoc webinar format.
- This is a follow up to discussions from past CAEECC meetings (9/8 and 9/21) – in both of those meetings we had preliminary discussion re statewide administration. The focus today is on options for four pilot programs proposed by Commission – statewide downstream programs and elements that cut across sectors.
- Format of call will be 35 minutes of presentations and 20 minutes of Q&A (first 10 minutes for CAEECC member questions, and then open to public questions).
- We'll end with an update from Brandi Turner re status of statewide administration assignment decisionmaking.

Agenda review – Matt Evans

Agricultural Strategic Energy Management Program – SoCalGas: Shawn Fife

- Talking about agricultural strategic energy management program
- Statewide team has been working on this program for most of the year
- Plan in place to transition continuous energy improvement program to SEM format – championed by Kay Hardy
- Main change is that program will go from non-resourced based program to a resource-based program
- Will give us ability to capture stranded savings
- See [slide](#) for Key Program Features and Benefits
- Part of this SEM approach requires a cultural change – it is a top-down sales pitch, need to get facility fully engaged in this process from management, can't just sell into a facilities manager.

Indoor Agricultural Program – PG&E: Jessica Waggoner

- Although we are collectively presenting on these downstream pilots, today's presenter is not presumptive lead for these pilots. We are just splitting these up to make it more interesting. Leads are still up for discussion.

- Upcoming vote on Prop 64 to legalize marijuana in California, got us thinking about indoor agriculture
- See [slide](#) for Program Description, Current Status, Opportunities and Statewide Potential

Water/Wastewater Pumping Program (Nonresidential Sector(s)/Public Sector) – SCE: Matt Evans

- Existing small scale water infrastructure and efficiency program.
- Focuses on generating savings, particularly in public sector.
- Idea proposed through an open IDEEA solicitation. This was a winning proposal in 2014. SCE is transitioning this to a full program in 2018.
- See [slide](#) for Name, Market Segment, Activity Focus, Past Performance, and Statewide Potential
- Quite successful already with a large pipeline of project savings built up
- SDG&E and PG&E also offering this program

WE&T Career and Workforce Readiness Program – SDG&E: Brandi Turner

- Concept already presented at CAEECC meeting on 9/21
- This is a new program
- Targeting disadvantaged workers or those who live in “disadvantaged communities” (as previously defined)
- We do not want to leave individuals who need assistance behind so they can also be referred by other organizations
- Opportunity to support goals of SB 350 – great way to help people to get skills they need to enter workforce
- We received feedback and have considered it. PAs would not be designing program – want to put it out to bid and also ask implementers to design the program.
- See [slide](#) for Program, Market Segment, Activity Focus, and Other Considerations
- We feel like there has been positive support and we intend to continue down this path

Industrial Strategic Energy Management Program – SoCalGas: Shawn Fife

- Similar to agricultural program in attributes.
- Both programs could potentially be delivered through same implementer.
- Differences are types of products and measures you are looking for – agricultural versus industrial. Need to bring in right expertise to find opportunities.
- Other main difference is delivery method: co-op model for Ag, one-on-one for industrial.
- See [slide](#) for Key Program Features and Benefits

Program Elements – MCE: Mike Callahan

- Elements of similar downstream programs could be handled on a statewide basis instead of taking discreet downstream programs statewide.
- Can touch on all programs. Preserves locally tailored customer interface.
- See [slides](#) for Difference from Other Proposals, Benefits, Recommended Elements, Decision Support

Q&A:

Question: Are we going to hear about proposed Statewide leads?

Answer: We are not discussing at this time, but we are open to suggestions.

Question: I was happy to see Final Decision includes capital projects as part of SEM. It seems to include behavioral as well as—according to the roadmap--includes traditional widgets and capital projects

Answer: Yes, capital projects would be considered. It is possible that those portions of the project could go through a more traditional calculated approach or possible through EM&V plan. This is not fully baked yet and we are still working on this. We would be looking for all opportunities.

Comment: It is important that SEM is comprehensive for customer.

Question: What is plan for finding implementers for proposed agricultural and industrial programs? Will they be bid out?

Answer: We may have to come back to you on this. Since we aren't solidified on statewide leads, we can't really say at this time. We need to follow up on this.

Question: I am assuming agricultural and industrial SEM would also be bid out?

Answer: That is correct.

Questions:

- 1) How will these be included in BPs?
- 2) One or two of your four proposals did not really provide enough information to enable reviewers to form an opinion. Waste water and indoor agricultural proposals provided a bit more information that allows me to better gauge the opportunity. Do you have more specific information and just aren't providing it or do you know a lot less about those program ideas.
- 3) Is there an expectation that wastewater and indoor agriculture proposals will be put out to bid?

Answer: Regarding SEM, we intend to provide more detail in Business Plan if this is a downstream program that we select.

Question: Have you already developed this information?

Answer: We are in process of developing it.

Answer: We are still developing estimates re the SEM programs. We do not have comparative stats at this time.

Answer: Regarding bidding, at least for the wastewater pumping program, it is an existing program with vendor already in contract with multiple IOUs. We need to look at when the contracts end, and then we anticipate putting it out to bid.

Answer: Given that the proposed indoor agricultural program is new, it is well positioned to go to bid. That is the framing for it at this point.

Question: Can you provide a general sense of when they would all be going out to bid?

Facilitator: Not yet for waste water program, we just heard. What about elements [proposed by MCE], would they all be bid out?

Answer: I wouldn't say that it is necessarily the case for all the elements. Development of work papers or deemed measures might not be bid out but instead handed off to entities such as CalTF that are well-positioned to serve that type of function. We would like to bid out where it makes sense. These elements are a starting point. We are definitely open to more ideas.

Question: With regard to proposed water and wastewater programs, discussion included gross savings. Commission is moving to net savings. How would you characterize this in a net environment? How would this effect your expectations going forward?

Answer: Good question. I don't have answer for that right now.

Comment: Please consider this going forward

Question: Regarding SEM program, how will saving be estimated given behavioral measures part of the offering?

Answer: We are working with consultant to develop EM&V protocol to address that. Baseline will be established.

Question: Will it be meter-based?

Answer: Yes.

Question: For wastewater pumping, are you planning to use CPUC approved calculator? Are you collaborating with water companies in rolling out the program?

Answer: I'm checking if we are planning to use CPUC calculator for this program.

Answer: We collaborate quite a bit with water agencies in the water space. I don't have a lot of detailed information in that regard at this time, however, to be more specific here.

Question: Regarding the Industrial program, have PAs considered making that approach available across the sector with certain specific requirements that might be available to any customer or any third party implementer?

Answer: We don't have final solution yet. CPUC staff is looking for Statewide consistent model.

Answer: I think that this might get to MCE's elements approach. It cuts across programs and sectors.

Answer: Without having chosen leads for these programs, none of the PAs have invested all of the time to fully answer these questions that will be addressed in Implementation Plans. Right now, we don't have all the answers since we are just looking for high-level feedback

Comment: I would encourage PAs to consider making SEM approach available throughout the sector to take advantage of results from long history of industrial programs and customer relationships in the market. I encourage PAs to consider this.

Response: We have let our staff lead, Kay Hardy, know and there has been discussion about bringing additional stakeholders into the SEM planning process.

Comment: I strongly support MCE's element approach (vs. program approach). It is the kind of innovative thinking and strategic approach we have been wanting to see.

Facilitator: Is there a clear next step on how PAs will process the elements approach? How will this concept be moved forward?

Answer: One thing that could help move the conversation forward is more feedback on whether stakeholders prefer program vs. elements approach. We are not at consensus. In formal proceeding, we may let Commission sort this out. If stakeholders have opinions about what is the better approach, it would be helpful to share feedback now. That might help us reach consensus. The Decision asked for four downstream pilots. MCE believes statewide elements is a better approach to programs. Ultimately it is better for rate payers and program design to look at elements instead of programs.

Comment: We want to provide an update on the Statewide lead discussion. We received a lot of feedback from initial presentation in September. The reason we have not come back is we are taking feedback very seriously. We are considering how can we maximize resources and efficiencies. We are really trying to look at this with a bottom up review. We are making a lot of head-way. It has been a rewarding experience and a healthy exercise. We are very close. We expect to provide different proposal very soon with new and innovative ways to group things. We expect our new proposal really makes sense for the future. We hope to share our thoughts with you very soon.

Comment: Please make sure to include objective criteria for choosing Statewide leads in revised proposal.

Response: We are. We are also looking at the future and the vision. We don't want to just look at the past. Hopefully you all will see that we have looked at all the comments we received and are providing a fresh view.

Comment: Thank you to everyone for attending. We really appreciate all feedback and comments.