Notes from Energy Efficiency Residential and Commercial Sectors Stage 2 Webinar

4/25/2016 1:00pm – 3:00pm

Location: Online Webinar, Only

Facilitator/Notes: 2050 Partners

[No pre-meeting documents were created for this webcast.]

*Lack of attribution for meeting participant comments is intentional by agreement of Coordinating Committee.*

Welcome and Background – Facilitator

* Introductions around the phone
* Role of the Coordinating Committee (CC) and Subcommittees (SC)
	+ early opportunities to weigh into BPs
	+ stay high level
* Facilitator noted that written comments are not due on Stage 2 presentation until May 18

**Commercial Sector Portion**

**Comment**: facilitator noted lack of significant amount of public input during 4/15 and 4/18 meetings.

**Response**: It is very difficult to staff these meetings while people continue their everyday program work, but please don’t interpret lack of attendance as lack of interest in and support for these public input meetings.

**Comment:** How will PAs address end use-related problem statements? We know there are end use challenges for some measures…how do we do that in the business plan given that the main orientation of problem statements is by sector?

**Response:** We can address HVAC (for example) within the context of the sector problem statements.

**Response**: Deal with it where it makes most sense.

**Comment:** I’ve read through two of the four presentations already. So far I’ve noticed that PAs are using different boxes (segmenting sector by different factors—e.g., 5 market segments, each broken into small, medium, and large versus by end uses, etc.) Not clear whether that is OK or not. Should there be a common framework for segmenting the sector?

**Response:** No, the PAs should be free at this point to approach the analysis of their sector markets differently.

**Question:** Did PAs talk about standardizing these “boxes”.

**Response**: No we didn’t get quite that far in our conversations. They do plan to before the PBs are completed.

**Comment:** Yes, to the extent reasonably, PAs should lean towards consistency.

**Comment:** We tried to consider who they were serving. Don’t know demand, but know square footage.

**Comment:** In the two presentation/narratives I read, I didn’t always see consistent representation of barriers, observations, solutions, and metrics nor consistent linkages between them. Often 3 of 4 were shown in a given presentation, but not all four. PAs should do a more consistent job of that as they refine the documents. Please show how you get to your metrics tie into the strategies—do they really measure that strategy.

**Response:** We’re looking to have metrics for each problem statement. We are just starting off with sector-wide metrics at this point. We were thinking along the lines of 1-3 metrics per sector, but we need to decide collectively what the expectation generally is.

**Comment**: It also wasn’t always clear from the two documents how the strategies actually addressed the problem statement, nor did they articulate what’s new, what’s old and justification for keeping the old programs going. Examples given from both PG&E and BayREN documents referring to specific tables showing how linkages hadn’t been consistently made.

**Comment**: Since Implementation Plans (IPs) are very specific to each program, it is worth cleaning up the PIPs for programs that are being continued and changed a bit.

**Comment**: My impression from reading some of these documents is that with respect to the line between the BP and the IP, you stopped too soon (not enough detail in Business Plans). The ED staff are issuing guidance shortly.

**Response**: Yes, the ED completed an unofficial draft guidance document but it hasn’t been distributed yet.

**Comment**: We should try to settle on boxes. BayREN is thinking of CO2 goals.

**Response**: We should look at ED guidance. Recommend putting the “conforming the boxes” topic on the PA coordination meeting.

**Comment**: Stage 1 analyses were helpful, but it appeared that everyone was using Navigant Potential study’s “market” potential values. I think you should be considering economic potential as well, given that “market” potential presupposes current program strategies. Economic potential isn’t biased by past EE program practices. Not expecting miracles on this, but think at least footnotes that point out the much large economic potential should be included.

**Question**: As you look at implementation strategies, please be sure to include consideration for trigger points in your solutions.

**Comment**: Could consider alignment with AB802 benchmarking. As PAs provide data and get building level data, they can target low performers. This starts in 2017 (expected January 1 per law) but CEC will be working on the benchmarking process into 2018, so the resource isn’t quite ready.

**Response**: Yes, it will take a good 18 months before the data starts coming back out of the benchmarking process.

**Comment**: The drafts don’t talk much about the importance of RE transactions as a trigger.

**Response**: We talked about that but decided it was more appropriate in the Implementation Plans.

**Response:** PA should address that in the BP.

**Question:** How will Commercial sector team coordinate with Public Sector…how do you work together to prevent duplication of program designs?

**Response**: Was there confusion on this due to NAICS codes?

**Response**: No, I read it in the documents. Some things look like commercial buildings but are in the public sector.

**Comment:** Need to work on simplifying offerings, especially from the customer perspective. Consistency across the market sector.

**Residential Sector Portion (starting at 2:00 PM)**

**Comment:** There seems to be a general consensus in discussion of the desire to move to a “one stop shop” for residential programs. What do PAs think will be put into the Business Plans?

**Response:** We need more clarification on what you are proposing. Needs more detail before being able to answer.

**Response:** A single point of contact is a direction SDG&E is moving towards.

**Response:** Do you mean for MF or SF or both? We recommend both for MF and SF. BayREN is moving in that direction.

**Response:** SoCalGas is also moving in that direction.

**Response**: SCE is using the Home Energy Advisor (an online tool) to point people to various solutions and services.

**Response:** Even though MCE and the other PAs support the move toward single point of contact, because customer confusion is such a large barrier, the single point of contact approach needs to be discussed in all the Business Plans.

**Response**: Is there specific “ask” on that we can respond to for this topic?

**Comment**: We need more emphasis on real estate triggers in the Business Plans

**Response**: One of PG&E problems statements has to do with triggers.

**Comment:** We need to better account for non-energy benefits in our program cost effectiveness analyses, including comfort, health benefits, etc. We also need to capture in increase in home values that accrues after EE retrofits are completed. There is plenty of value to the apparently non-cost effective residential upgrade programs, but we aren’t capturing it.

**Comment**: This is a Phase 3 issue with EE proceeding and also in the IDER proceeding. Furthermore. There should be a new audit tool that includes both the types of things the PAs need for cost-effectiveness, etc. and then also include those items that matter to people (even if they can’t use that value in the cost-effectiveness, they can use it to sell the project to the customer).

**Comment:** There are no end-use problem statements set forth, but they are still important challenges. How will they be addressed in the Business Plans?

**Comment:** Can we look at differential variations by climate zone in the Business Plan description of the challenges and solutions.

**Response:** Consistency is key across the business plans, so everyone should attempt to address this if some already are.

**Comment:** When BayREN was started in 2012/2013 some of the meetings were held for coordinating program administration. We think some PA meetings would be helpful.

**Response:** PG&E has regularly scheduled meetings with BayREN. We can talk there or we’d be willing to set up additional discussions, if necessary.