

## Notes from Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee *Ad Hoc* Working Group Discussion

9/8/2016 1:00 to 4:00PM Location: Sheet Metal Workers Union Local 104 offices

Meeting Co-Chairs: Lara Ettenson, NRDC, Meghan Dewey, PG&E

Facilitator/Notes: 2050 Partners, Inc.

[Meeting materials](#) can be found on the CAEECC website.

*Notes: Presentations are generally not summarized in these notes. Please see presentation slides and other meeting materials on [www.CAEECC.org](http://www.CAEECC.org) website for context. Lack of attribution for meeting participant comments is intentional by agreement of Coordinating Committee.*

### **Welcome, Introductions, Agenda and Ground Rules – Ted Pope**

- Today we are running an *ad hoc* working group, not a full CC meeting.
- We will have discussions but no official business or decisions.
- CC Members have priority for making comments; public comment periods will be included.
- Introductions around the room and from the phone.
- Thank you to Sheet Metal Workers Union Local 104 for hosting.

Safety Announcement – Dave Dias

Agenda review

- Intent of meeting is to provide opportunity to start surfacing stakeholder thoughts and views in light of August 18 Final Decision.
- This is an opportunity for stakeholders to ask questions to PAs about their intentions for BPs.
- PAs are not done with all the work they have to do.
- Agenda topics are not in a particular order. They were provided for review and amended after feedback from CC members.

### **Issue: Statewide Programs**

Michael Callahan presented Guiding Principles developed and agreed to by PAs.

- [Posted on CAEECC website.](#)
- This is not an attempt to resolve all issues regarding Statewide program issues, but a preliminary step.
- One of the biggest issues in deciding leads is losing control over programs.
- Lead PA is responsible for program goals.
- PAs expect that Guiding Principles will lead to a better coordinated process between lead PA and coordinating PAs.
- If stakeholders have ideas about how this should be structured, please let us know.

## Statewide Energy Efficiency Program Administrator Guiding Principles

The following Guiding Principles represent the shared commitments of PAs in the delivery of Statewide Administrated Energy Efficiency programs.

1. **Meet State Policy goals.** Portfolio design will orient around the directive to double energy efficiency in the State by 2030.
2. **Do no harm.** To the best extent possible, given all available information, PAs are committed to making decisions that preserve our collective ability to meet energy savings goals, remain cost-effective and take into consideration impacts on existing local and downstream programs.
3. **Advocate for yourself and for each other.** Recognize that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. Be willing to collaborate with other Portfolio Administrators as a part of good decision-making and planning.
4. **Assume best intentions.** In an environment of shared goals and shared directives, each PA is humble in their approach and ambitious for the broader group's success.
5. **Be good listeners.** Take responsibility for the environment by which decisions are made such that all participants have the opportunity to participate.
6. **Take a stand for customers.** Take into consideration the customer experience and strive for simplicity, clarity and ease.
7. **Wisely pursue change.** Demonstrate open-mindedness to changes in design and adopt a "yes, and...!" approach.

Comment: My initial reaction is that these are great. How do they help you distinguish among administrators?

Response: This is a very iterative process. Who the right administrator is depends on each particular program. These Guiding Principles are just to set the tone for how coordination should take place. The decision making process is next.

Comment: A lot of implementers work on Statewide programs. Is there a way to get input from the field in a neutral way? It would need to be confidential. This could be a helpful source of information.

Response: Great idea. If you have ideas of how we can get that information, please let us know.

Comment: You could do a quick survey monkey.

Comment: What is timeline for steps to picking leads and putting out RFPs?

Response: We intend to have a proposal for lead PAs at the September 21 CC meeting. I don't have a time line for RFPs.

Comment (from Co-Chair): In terms of RFPs, PAs won't want to discuss until BPs are approved.

Comment (from PA): We will discuss this as we are developing it. We are hoping to get something out by the summer for new programs. There are still questions about current programs that we are just extending. Decision says we should be mindful of transition period.

Facilitator: What do PAs think about transition period for Statewide deployment?

Response: We are trying to figure this out as well.

Comment (from ED): We are happy to provide guidance. I don't have anything right now. Being reasonable about it makes the most sense.

Comment: I have questions about when and how PAs intend to deal with the bottom up review of current Statewide review that Commission strongly encouraged you to do. Will the next set of Statewide programs look like what we already have or will they be different. TURN really supports this and sees it as a real opportunity to increase savings and cut costs. Are you planning to do this? We really hope you will. And if so, how will that process fit into your time line?

Response (from PA): Part of our analysis of Statewide programs is the way we address the barriers. A lot of barriers still exist because of the way the programs work. A lot of Statewide programs are in the business sector level. If we need to do a more targeted analysis, there are also EM&V analyses that we could use. As PAs we are not hung up about running the same programs. BPs force us to identify barriers that we need to address and come up with new, better programs. An interesting thing about Statewide programs is that they are programs, and then we have BPs which aren't meant to get into program details. One change is that the past, Public Sector was often treated as part of Commercial. Of course, now public sector will be treated separately.

Comment (from PA): I think one of the challenges facing us now is that we have to rush to identify the needs of Statewide programs and include them in BPs. I would prefer to take a little more time to do a bottom up review. We have an opportunity to take a step back and look at barriers and solutions. We are working very hard on intervention strategies. I would suggest high level sector, and then take time for bottom up review with the Coordinating Committee in working on Implementation Plans. Some of Statewide programs on the list are really old and we are trying to figure out how to slot those.

Comment: I like the principle of considering the customer. I'm interested to see how transition will affect customers. I want to make sure the transition takes into account the long lead time for these projects and not to transition in a way that makes the customer experience more difficult.

Comment: I'm hearing concern that there is something new and it is hard and PAs need to take a long time to figure it all out. We have been talking about Statewide for a long time and I think PAs should have seen this coming. I'm looking for a timeline for when will we see this roadmap for putting things out to bid. ORA is looking for a roadmap.

Comment (from PA): I interpreted these comments differently. PAs are looking at this through a new lens: what is the appropriate level to put in BPs and what goes into IPs? There is a lot of opportunity to get input for new program design. What are all the different ways to look at program design? We don't want to completely abandon the work we did in Stages 1 and 2. This

is a great opportunity. The pause is the result of working on BPs and how to get RFPs out. I think we are looking at this as a new and exciting opportunity.

Comment (from PA): We hear ORA's concern. The Decision expects us to tell a story about how we intend to release all RFPs. We have to say what it is and how it will be implemented. We will provide this at the latest date on January 15 when we file BPs. We probably won't have everything ready when we provide draft chapters on September 21. Maybe lead PA will say how program will work and how RFPs will work, but there will not be a schedule on September 21.

Comment: When NRDC looked at all programs listed in the Decision, we noticed potential duplicative functions, especially upstream and midstream in residential and commercial (e.g., HVAC). How are you planning to address these issues? Can PAs provide any previews on how they will deal with upstream and midstream to make it more efficient? Could we learn from the northwest on how they separate some of these functions out?

Facilitator: These are important issues to be thinking about.

Comment (from PA): We have been discussing this issue and hope to provide more information in October. Maybe at one of our CAEECC meetings, we can get someone from NEEA to provide lessons learned on coordination of upstream and midstream programs. How does that work successfully so we are still focused on customer? I think that would be a helpful discussion at some point.

Comment: NEEA is a single administrator for four states. As an administrator, it has authority to make decisions about how to divide programs. This issue is always difficult.

Comment: I'm hearing two very good points. First, there is a new decision; it is long and there is a lot to absorb. PAs need to digest the material and they want to do a good job. Second, I'm hearing that we need a deadline. Both are true. We want a date for when issues will be resolved.

Comment (from PA): We will outline Statewide administration proposal at CC meeting on September 21. We will also outline what we need to provide in BPs. Dates that we are working toward are those that are included in the Decision.

Comment: Coalition for Energy Efficiency supports the work of energy centers. We think they are an important part of our WE&T program. When we talk about Statewide administration, Coalition did not mean to imply that the role of energy centers would change.

Comment (from PA): Thank you. We agree. Energy centers are run under WE&T. Nothing will change with administration of energy centers. WE&T Connections was called out in Decision. WE&T intends to continue its great work.

Comment: NRDC has heard rumors over who should take Codes & Standards. NRDC is very supportive of PG&E keeping Codes & Standards and related programs.

Comment: From our experience and what we have seen, we see PG&E as being a strong leader for Codes & Standards. We would support NRDC in having PG&E stay lead for C&S.

Comment: In consideration of Guiding Principle no. 6 [*Take a stand for customers. Take into consideration the customer experience and strive for simplicity, clarity and ease.*], I'd like to recommend that PAs look at implementers as customers, as well. Implementers work with customers for a long time and developing relationships with them. It takes a long time to develop a new program and get it approved. Once program is finally approved, may take up to 18 months to implement. Often looking at 2-1/2 years before implementer gets paid for anything. New programs are huge investments for implementers.

Comment: We should also think about contractors who operate in our programs as customers. We need to have programs that work for contractors. Programs need to include financial incentives for contractors.

Comment: The process of getting RFPs out will be very important. This should be included in BPs. It would be great if PAs could propose a model transition for contractors. It would be great to have a plan in place which would provide an idea of how PAs could make transitions easier. This issue should be in long term work plan for CAEECC.

Comment: NRDC wonders if the multifamily sector might be a good candidate for Statewide program, without losing local flair. There might have to be minor adjustments in different parts of the state, but this might be a good candidate for Statewide program for more consistency.

Comment: I agree that multifamily is a potential option for a Statewide program. I would love to hear from PAs about potential hurdles. What should we be thinking about in terms of getting multifamily programs started?

Comment (from REN): I don't see this as a good candidate but we'd like to be part of discussions.

Comment (from PA): For those of you promoting this, please tell us the pros and cons of doing it and what problem you're trying to solve. Tell us why it would work as a Statewide program.

Comment: Maybe interested parties can discuss and give PAs the information we have.

Facilitator: Does this need a full CAEECC discussion?

Response: We could present information at a CAEECC meeting and discuss there, if appropriate. Or we could convene the Residential Sector Subcommittee for further discussion. Or we could convene another *ad hoc* discussion.

Comment (from REN): I would advocate for the *ad hoc* proposal. Please be sensitive to time lines that PAs are working against to get draft chapters and BPs out.

Comment: We could give you our thinking in writing before September 21. It doesn't make sense to give comments after drafts have been written and presented.

Comment (from PA): Perhaps we could isolate certain pieces of it that we could sample for downstream or fix in other ways, not Statewide.

Comment (from CCA): One of the biggest concerns is the ability to have tailored offerings downstream. It would be helpful to address this in any proposal.

Facilitator: Do PAs want feedback before September 21 or after draft chapters?

Comment (from PA): Now is a good time. We are happy to get what you have, but don't expect that it will be included in draft chapters on September 21.

Comment (from PA): We are supposed to provide what we are thinking about for four downstream pilots on September 21. The sooner we get stakeholder input, the better. If you have feedback, please send it now.

Facilitator: The deadline for feedback on this issue is as soon as possible. It doesn't seem like setting a date is appropriate. The longer you wait to provide feedback will reduce the probability of substantive change. Provide feedback to facilitator ([facilitator@caeec.org](mailto:facilitator@caeec.org)), or please copy us if you communicate directly with PA.

Comment: We don't want to flood PAs with too many ideas, but we can think of multiple program ideas that would be suitable for downstream treatment. The question goes back to what is the right way to share our thinking with PAs. We work on distinct programs for several PAs that could be good candidates for statewide downstream pilots. I'm not clear what is appropriate for us to say and to whom in view of our involvement as we think about sharing this input.

Facilitator: We will post input online and provide to PAs. If you send your input and comments to facilitator, we will post on the [CAEECC website, so it is all public](#). You always have the option to have private conversations with PAs to share your thoughts.

Comment: Can PAs consider evaluating existing programs that are offered Statewide with single implementer and determine if they can pilot any of those programs as downstream with a single administrator?

Comment (from CCA): I'd invite anyone's proposals for downstream programs.

Comment (from REN): The intent is for PAs to present four downstream ideas at next meeting.

**Issue: Stakeholder thoughts on third party outsourcing by 2020**

Facilitator: There are several questions around third party outsourcing. Most specific details do not need to be established in BPs, but are there questions about how these topics will be treated in BPs?

Comment: From the Final Decision, BPs will include method for delivering. I am not expecting that 40% stays with utilities. I expect that eventually everything will be put out to bid. I think we should have a discussion about what the showing will be. It would be best if utilities shift to pay for performance for utility-implemented programs. PAs need to have discussion about how things will get bid out. ORA does not expect utilities to bid out entire portfolio in the first year. But a roadmap of how you will get there needs to be included in BPs.

Comment (from PA): How do you characterize local business partners? This is an important distinction. There is a pervasive thought that utilities do a lot of implementation. I don't really agree. Please consider this when discussing bidding out the entire portfolio.

Response: I appreciate the clarifying comment. We can remove CCAs from what I was discussing about everything being bid out.

Comment: I would like clarification of other people's thinking. I had to make up how Statewide fits with 60% requirement. In my mind, if Statewide program were bid and allowed to be designed, developed, and implemented by a third party, then it could qualify as part of the 60%?

Response (from several PAs): Correct.

Comment: If there is an existing program and an opportunity to offer up with some modification, that would not qualify as third party under the new definition? If a bidder comes in with this, can it qualify for 60%?

Response: Yes.

Comment (from PA): This is a question of 60% versus Statewide – they are not mutually exclusive because of how you categorize things. Utilities will not all get there the same way, and we will have different budgets.

Comment: PAs can go above 60% Third Party allocation. 60% should not be ultimate goal. The fact that you put a program out to bid is not sufficient. The key to qualify for Third Party is that the program is designed by implementers.

Facilitator: I'm not sure if something that was designed 10 years ago is re-bid is sufficient to meet standard.

Comment (from PA): The Decision talks about different things that portfolio includes. There are administrative services that we can outsource. We are trying to get to most cost effective way of dealing with efficiency. If we outsource inspections, for example, we wouldn't count it towards the 60%.

Comment: Bidders need to design the programs. As we transition to more focus on carbon reduction, having more programs that focus on that would be great. It would be great to have programs that make that transition faster. We need to think about programs that focus on de-carbonizing.

Comment: IDEEA solicitations are a small part of the budget. If you bid out more IDEEA, that counts as part of 60%?

Response: Yes.

Comment: I have received a report from the field that there are thoughts about soliciting/bidding for current programs during December or before BPs are submitted.

Response (from PA): Yes, we have been considering putting existing contracts out to bid before January.

Response (from REN): We have put out an RFP for one of our existing programs. We are in rolling portfolio and budget.

Comment: I'm surprised by that since your BPs have not been approved.

Response: We want to comply with our own company financial processes.

Comment: Seems like they would be extensions rather than re-bids.

Response: We still need to provide services in 2017 so we bid for those.

Response (from PA): We are doing an RFP for residential HOPPS. We have been in bridge transition for four years and we need to move the market. We can make obvious choices about good programs. We hope implementers would be supportive of this natural transition allowing PAs to do our business.

Comment: I am supportive that not everything turn over in July 2017.

Facilitator: Will BPs explain general process for turnover? What kind of detail will be included in BPs that address these issues?

Comment: Just saying, "We'll phase it in" is a good intention but not enough detail. I expect that PAs can provide month and year that they will put certain programs out with more detail.

Response (from PA): Since BPs don't have programs, would it suffice to say, "We would go out to bid for programs that incorporate financial incentives and audits in December 2017"?



In reviewing plans, please provide approaches to articulate how and when to put out to bid. I am not clear how we can make everyone happy.

Comment (from PA): We all want to accommodate this. It is all new to us. Please provide written recommendations about what you want so we don't have to guess.

Comment: Once again we are talking again about deadlines and schedules. I'd like to see months attached to deadlines. We also don't see 60% as a maximum.

Comment: Rolling out RFPs for entire portfolio for everything in California with new programs designed by implementers seems like a lot of work. It will be impossible to do it all at once. If we do it all at once, we will see eight years without new energy efficiency programs.

Facilitator: How and to what extent will PAs address in BPs using NMEC and automated metering infrastructure to favor cost effective programs?

Comment: Reading from [comments posted on the CAEECC website](#):

The Coalition's comments called for: Incentive programs to measure real energy savings and to develop automated metering infrastructures to favor more cost-effective programs

From the Decision:

- P. 61: We will not order that all statewide programs be implemented on a pay-for-performance basis, but we encourage the administrators to utilize this contractual option as much as possible, when it makes sense to do so.
- P. 113: "Energy Savings Performance Incentive scores shall be weighted for the utility program administrators based on the proportion of deemed savings and custom measures in each utility's portfolio."

Comment (from ED): I want to comment on discussion so far. I appreciate the tension between the amount of detail that should be included in BPs. The Commission needs to be able to have an appropriate level of detail to review BPs and approve them to give us confidence that they will be effective. Be mindful that while not all detail needs to be included regarding programs and how they will be implemented, an appropriate level of detail needs to be included so that we can evaluate them. We look forward to seeing what happens in January.

**Issue: Ideas on how to develop an open solicitation process that gets meaningful input from stakeholders**

Facilitator: Maybe we need to identify a breakout subcommittee that wants to meet separately and provide a proposal.

Comment (Co-Chair): I would like to provide context. The Peer Review Group was intended to ensure that investor owned utilities were not just bidding out to their friends. PRG reviewed scoring of bidding to make sure it was fair. At this point, we feel there are sufficient processes in place to avoid initial concerns for abuse. Now issue is what is the purpose of this group. Which information is considered “public”? How do we make sure the process is still working well? Independent Evaluator proposal came up to test what is being discussed. This was originally recommended for energy efficiency by a number of parties in 2005. We are circling back to see if it makes sense at this time. Is the cost worth it because EE is a much smaller budget? What is scope of Independent Evaluator in this process? What is proper level of transparency and oversight? Peer Review Group is no longer worthwhile in our view. NRDC rarely participates on it.

Comment: What are you worried about that you need an Independent Evaluator for today? What problem are you trying to solve?

Response (later in the conversation): Good governance, oversight, gut check.

Comment: ORA wants an Independent Evaluator. It would be useful to have someone with expertise in the field of EE who has been part of the contracting process. I would see roles as reviewing how RFP is constructed (makes sense, seems reasonable), reviewing bids that come in, and reviewing each stage to select implementer. When utility submits to Commission for approval, Independent Evaluator will be able to confirm discussion and raise any issues. It will make the process faster and more informed. Better policy will come out of process.

Comment (from Co-Chair): We are proposing a small group that will write out a complete proposal. This does not need to be resolved before BPs are submitted. Since we are going to such a large bidding process, we need a new way to address the PRG. We can work on this for a while. NRDC hopes PAs will include this issue, either in testimony or in CAEECC’s cover letter. At a minimum, we want to address this issue. We recognize current PRG is not as effective as it could be.

Question (from ED): How is the cover letter different from the Comparison Document?

Response: The Comparison Document includes those issues that stakeholders wanted to include in BPs, but remain unresolved as of January 15. The cover letter raises issues that do not really have a place in BPs. Cover letter will provide an opportunity for the Commission to look at issues and prioritize for handling. Many are outstanding policy issues.

Comment (from ED): This is your forum. Please limit cover letter to policy issues. You can come up with your own proposals for resolving outstanding issues.

Response: These items in cover letter are mostly limited to issues being held until Phase 3 of the proceeding.

Comment: Reading from a one-page draft (not approved yet by all members of Coalition), proposal for an Independent Evaluator to generally perform the following functions in conjunction with PRG:

- Review how IOUs structure RFPs to ensure consistency
- Review results of IOUs' evaluation processes
- Provide written assessment of processes and results with suggestions for enhancements

Comment (from Co-Chair): This can be the basis for our *ad hoc* group discussion on this issue.

Comment: In government contracting system, there are a couple places where an RFP could be gamed: 1) where bidder has influence over RFP (can't write spec and also bid on it), and 2) who is evaluating the responses to the RFP. We are required to have a review panel that meets certain specific criteria. Similar requirements could be incorporated into proposal. You should be looking for patterns of abuse or gross malfeasance, not one-offs. PAs do have incentive to pick the best bidder.

Facilitator: This issue should be addressed in BPs per the decision (although it's not an order).

Comment: I am worried about slowing the process down. It would help me if we could specifically address what the issue is. If you are worried about PAs having a competitive program, then that should be addressed. Could use random sampling to make sure there is no major malfeasance or abuse. Please be really clear what the problem is that we are trying to solve because it may not be an Independent Evaluator you are looking for.

Comment: Make sure proposal does not conflict with existing legal process for bidding.

Comment (from PA): Would Independent Evaluator be used for every single type of contract? Technical reviewers? Contracts for work papers? We have a lot of different services that support our portfolio. We also have MSAs competitively bid. We also have quick bids that are competitive. Would we need to use an Independent Evaluator for those? Would Independent Evaluator also be used for EM&V? We also have stringent resourcing practices. We have a lot of protocols we have to follow for this.

Comment: Minimum threshold is not what we envisioned. Also it is important to make sure RFP is designed in such a way that it can allow for a meaningful proposal, which may require a very differently written RFP.

Comment: Following up on sampling, it may be impossible to review every program. If you check samples and there is a red flag, we can really go after it.

Comment (from ED): As you develop proposal for Independent Evaluator, I encourage you to speak to the cost. We need to understand costs. Do we need this as well for EE solicitations that

are happening as part of shut down of a major power plant in California? I would not want two solicitation processes. I'd like thought to how this ties to that project.

Co-Chair: I am happy to get this *ad hoc* group going and we will report back to.  
Interested parties from the meeting:

Dave Dias  
Mike Campbell  
Margie Gardner  
Bernie Kotlier  
Meghan Dewey  
Matt Evans  
Mike Callahan

Comment: There are other members who are not here today who would also be interested in participating.

Response: Yes, this is not a formal CAEECC meeting. A request for participation will go out to all CAEECC members.

**Issue: Stakeholder thoughts on what types of implementation work PAs might keep in house**

Comment: In terms of effectively demonstrating that an IOU would be an implementer, it would not be acceptable to say, "We know our customers and we are doing a good job so we are going to keep running our own program." That is not enough. Everything should be put out to bid. PA should put out expectations of cost. Standard for retaining work in house would be that outside firms were not qualified or bids were way higher than what PA expected it to cost. As for cost, it would be inappropriate for PA to reject bids because too high and then go out and do the project at higher than expected cost. Expected cost should set ceiling for what PA can charge to run project.

Comment: Price is an option for handling this issue. I have been trying to figure out what the structural nexus is to business already running a program. Seems like there should be opportunities to tie structural nexus to programs.

Comment: We didn't talk about the contract approval process by CPUC. What types of filings should be required?

Response: We discussed including it in proposal. Right now there is not process/formal review.

Comment: Let's keep it simple.

Comment (from PA): RFOs are a little different (e.g., for Diablo). I would hope that we won't necessarily have to do that for RFPs.

Comment: The role of customer service representatives is often instrumental in getting projects fed into PAs. This may be an exception area. It is helpful to get that feedback from the PAs.

Comment: The concept of the customer service representative is a great segway – there are benefits of having clear distinction between administrators and implementers. There can be issues between accounting for costs.

Comment (from PA): This is an important conversation. Having an account rep is not actually implementing the program. I wouldn't think that I would need to justify an account rep as part of implementation. A field engineer doing actual calculations is probably part of implementation. Account rep is not part of implementation because they are bringing the customer in.

Facilitator: Do you want to further discuss distinction between administration and implementation? Some activities are in grey areas. This is potentially a gap in terms of what CC has discussed so far.

Comment: It is worth defining on paper: administration versus sales job and implementation. The line has been blurry on the past.

Comment: Customer service reps and financing are important issues. Are you cutting off an integrative scope that makes program less or more effective? There should be consideration of these issues. PAs maybe need to explain thinking when putting out RFPs.

Co-Chair: Where do you expect this issue to show up? In testimony? In BPs? This will help us prioritize further discussion.

Comment: I think this should be included in Implementation Plans. IPs will be part of utility applications of what is expected to work. To extent IPs are divergent, there will be comments to the Commission.

Comment: On the topic of what IOU needs to be a part of for implementing programs, account rep is role that only the IOU can fulfill. IOUs bring these to the customers. EE is what IOUs bring to customers. EE is a big component. We rely on account reps to help with the process and informing customers about EE. You would lose a step in the process if no account rep.

Comment: Utilities need to keep a certain amount of expertise in house. They need to stay involved with programs on a day to day basis. We will lose continuity without utility knowledge of how programs run.

Comment (from PA): I agree. Historically, those position are charged to DINI [direct implementation, non-incentive], not admin. This may require re-defining certain terms.

Comment (from CCA): CCA and REN account reps can also serve in these roles.

**Issue: Additional stakeholder thoughts on how BP chapters should address the goal of ensuring and continuously improving workforce and installation quality for energy efficiency measures, including ensuring that minority, low-income, and disadvantaged communities fully participate in training and education programs**

Comment: Coalition for Energy Efficiency filed [comments](#) which are posted on the CAEECC website. Reading from comments:

The Coalition's comments called for: "the business plans to include clear and detailed descriptions of how incentive programs will ensure energy efficiency measures are installed by a trained, skilled and diverse workforce, and amended to include actual metrics to assess the achievement of these goals." The 2008 Long Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan requires that, by 2020, "California's workforce is trained and fully engaged to provide the human capital necessary to achieve California's economic energy efficiency and demand-side management potential." The Plan also includes a goal to "ensure that minority, low-income and disadvantaged communities fully participate in training and education programs at all levels of the demand-side management (DSM) and energy efficiency industry." D.12-11-015, Decision Approving 2013-2014 Energy Efficiency Programs and Budgets to develop a comprehensive approach to increasing the demand for skilled workers through skills standards and certification requirements for utility incentive programs.

From the Decision:

- P. 63: We clarify that nothing in this decision modifies any of those prior directives [Long Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan and D.12-11-015], and the Commission still expects the business plans and program designs to address the issue of ensuring and continuously improving workforce and installation quality for energy efficiency measures.
- P. 92: We clarify that nothing in this decision contradicts those prior directives [Long Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan and D.12-11-015], and the Commission continues to emphasize the need to address these issues in the business plan filings and energy efficiency program design in general.
- P. 111: "Each utility program administrator shall include in its business plan filing the objectives and metrics that will be met with each statewide or third-party program or subprogram...."

Comment (from PA): I'd like to clarify that workforce standards for programs is not a WE&T issue. There are differences in the level of detail for specific programs at IP versus BP level. We will not be talking about specific program requirements in BPs.

Comment (from ED): Regarding WE&T issues, I leave it to the PAs to set forth approach in BPs once you develop programs that reflect this information. When you develop programs for IPs, it would be great to understand how we will track this. How do we get information? If you want a

certain level of detail addressed in IPs, please make a proposal. I want to understand the level of detail that is expected.

Comment: I think comments of Coalition for Energy Efficiency address workforce standards for the portfolio as a whole.

Comment (from ED): CEC is conducting a [workshop](#) on September 13 regarding disadvantaged communities. This issue will be covered. Encourage everyone to participate in this workshop.

Comment: I'd like to request for another meeting, could the CPUC/PAs bring schedule for when and how ISP and customer review issues will be resolved? What is the schedule? How can we participate?

Comment (from PA): I know there have been some conversations that we need to get this started. SoCalGas was going to lead it.

Comment (from PA): This is a hot topic for us. We have had staff turnover, and we are working on refilling the position. It is a priority. We can have timelines available at next meeting on September 21.

Comment: Independent facilitator is a very important part for us to have this ISP/custom conversation.

Comment (from ED): What document did this first appear in?

Response: It is in two locations in the Final Decision. Katie (from ED) is working on it.

Comment: San Francisco Department of the Environment is trying to incorporate investor protocols for corporate financing (investor confidence project). Using consistent protocols for everyone helps make it easier to have faith in projects so that corporations will help finance them.

Comment: PG&E supports you.

[Adjourn.]