

Comments/questions in response to 10-14 statewide Downstream proposals

From A. Sung October 26, 2016

1. Regarding the “Career & Workforce Readiness Program” slide with bullets:

For those of us who missed the live webinar presentation and discussions, I’m afraid these powerpoint slides do not give enough information to comment upon, as they seem to simply state general goals or restate CPUC Program goals, without giving any material information on *what* exactly is being proposed, and to exactly what end (measurable outcome) nor *HOW* it would be implemented. I’d like to suggest that every proposal bullet in future presentations be clear in these aspects: what, to what end (measurable desired outcomes) and HOW the proposed action will be achieved.

- “ The PAs recognized that a system already exists to address career readiness in disadvantaged communities. “

2. Comment: Please identify these ‘systems,’ and clarify what population (age groups) these serve, and that this assumption has no gaps, is fully effective statewide, and is equitably available. Does this statement mean that the Program Administrators are not reaching out to Partner and support them? What about the Community college district technical programs?

- “Influence existing workforce development agencies and organizations through an infusion of EE into existing efforts. ´ Please see CAEEEC website for full concept proposal. “

3. Comment: Please provide the “full concept proposal”, or at least recap here what you mean by “Influence existing workforce ...agencies...through an *infusion of EE*...”?

- “Market Segment ´ Disadvantaged workers/communities that are not prepared to enter a traditional energy higher education or job/career path as defined per WE&T Advice Letter A 3567-G/4592-E. Activity Focus ´ Support California’s energy efficiency and green energy goals by training the energy workforce (SB 350). “

4. Comment: What is this bullet really intended to say? **How** does the PA intend to train the energy workforce, and in what skillsets, and then how will it assist actual job placement? Is this something that could be better handed over to all the CCD’s (chancellor’s office)as a Program Administrator, to then partner with trades such as IBEW , and various non-profits locally where it made sense?

- “Provide career preparation and readiness for disadvantaged/communities to enter core education or job/career pathway. “

5. Comment: Again, similar to above comment—what action is this statement proposing?

- “ Funded orgs should provide soft skills, job development, workforce training and potentially job placement offerings that fall outside the scope of EE funding and training. “

6. Question—What entities are eligible to serve as Program Administrators? Could the CPUC define a more broad, and appropriate eligibility for Statewide Program Administrator for certain scopes or programs, potentially allowing for more of the dollars to go directly to the training, or program implementation of education/awareness, behavior change, EE leading to RE and ZNE?

- “Other Considerations ´ Non-resource program ´ Open to one or multiple vendors/ Budget TBD ´ Feedback received from Rising Sun & Blue Green Alliance”

7. Comment: What is the intent of the bullet ? What is a “non-resource” program? Please clarify.

8. Additional question—May we give feedback on the current Public sector Proposed Business plans and Statewide mid-upstream administration (10/19 presentations)? What is the deadline for those comments?

9. Why does it appear that the K-12 sector has largely been excluded, or ignored, or otherwise possibly marginalized by being “lumped in with commercial sector,” when by square footage and impact, our K-

12 public schools are together potentially the largest building energy/water opportunity for ZNE and GHG reductions in any singular portfolio (albeit 1000 LEA's) Statewide? I don't see any specific applications of program benefits focused on the K-12 schools statewide. (Only see "Workforce Education and Training • K-12 Connections (PG&E)"—What is meant by this bullet?

10. If I have missed how the PA's have proposed to expend these public dollars to benefit EE for school facilities, on the road to getting them to ZNE by 2030, please clarify for me; but so far it has been difficult to see what of the Draft October 18, 2016 Energy Efficiency Business Plan, Public Sector Chapter, applies to public schools. Would appreciate some clarity in how K-12 schools are being addressed. Thank you.