Comment #	PA(s)	Sector	Page #	Comment
NRDC-1	PG&E	WE&T	Snapshot/General	- What is the definition of "disadvantaged" used in the snapshot? (based on the WE&T advice letter?) - Where is the data from for "California Education and Training System" - PG&E notes that they will match training to the areas with the most need. To support that goal, NRDC suggests adding potential study information in the market overview (see SCE p.7 and SDG&E p.182). - Suggest adding a reference where it makes sense to the Appendix C/Table 7 (maybe in the text on p.2-3 where the past is compared to the future?) - While PG&E referenced SB 350 for disadvantaged workers in the text, there wasn't a reference to the responsible contractor portion (e.g., see SDG&E p.185). Also curious why PG&E didn't include a table like the other chapters to identify how WE&T can support implementation of other laws (e.g., SDG&E p.189).
NRDC – 2	PG&E	WE&T	p.2	## Observations 1 - Goals look fine, but unclear how they connect to the interventions/tactics or metrics 2 - The intent of the metrics is to see how the various intervention strategies are going. Understandably, a number of the tactics will require implementation plan metrics (e.g., progress toward serving disadvantaged communities). The following recommendations are for the BP level. ## Recommended Action - Under "Approach to Achieving Goals" (p.10) include a summary table of the 4 goals and how the 3 interventions intersect (e.g., goals in rows, intervention strategies as columns, x the boxes that are appropriate). If possible, "outcome" would be useful to get the full picture, but not sure that would work on one table - PG&E could also add a column before the "outcome" column on Table 6 (p.21) to include the goal and/or intervention to make the connection clear. For example, is "increase knowledge gain" measuring Goal 1 and 2 (p.2) as well as Intervention 1? (p.10) Similarly, which goal does outcome 2 track to? This information could be organized differently. The point is that it is hard for the reader to track the various references to similar actions/goals throughout the chapter. - Per the 2nd observation, I see the following missing links to metrics that should be

				addressed.
				  o Articulate how the Goal 4 (p.2) matches with an intervention strategy and which metric is intended to measure progress
				  o Articulate a metric to assess progress toward Goal 3 + Intervention 3 (or clarify how existing metrics address those goals/interventions)

NRDC – 3	PG&E	WE&T	p.2-3	## Observations • It appears Centergies, Connections, and Planning are being modified into Technical Education and Training, partnerships, and K-12 education/career. But based on previous CAEECC conversations, I thought Centergies and Connections were staying, just being modified. A bit more clarification would help. ## Recommended Action • To clarify the transition from current to future a bit more, include language like: "Centergies: PG&E will continue to do X as part of the current centergies program since X got high approval ratings by participant surveys. However, instead of Y, which surveys revealed were not as successful, PG&E will provide a new Technical Education and Training approach to better address the needs of the workforce (see Intervention 1, p.10 for the details of the new approach)"
NRDC – 4	PG&E	WE&T	p.4	## Observations • Some evaluation learnings have citations, others do not ## Recommended Action • Suggest either citing all, or none. Given the feedback thus far, even though I see Section L has a lot of detail (which is great!), I would also cite the studies here for ease of review
NRDC – 5	PG&E	WE&T	p.7-8	## Observations • 1 - "Specialized EE training is typically absent from traditional education institutions. As Such, PG&E's future WE&T initiatives will focus on design, construction, installation, maintenance….demand response." (p.7) • 2 - "PG&E will collaborate with stakeholders to identify organizations that train not only the most relevant members…" (p.8) • 3 – "PG&E also recognizes the needs help students navigate the diverse education and training options" (p.8) [note: this sentence needs to be cleaned up]

				Recommended Action
				• Observation 1: This is a good, but it's unclear what the next steps are. Clarify how that connects to the intervention strategies. Is it Intervention #2 (p.12) since it would help to update traditional education institutions to address this? Or was it intended that PG&E training would include these things that are missing? (or both depending on the topic?) • Observation 2: Is this also Intervention 2? If so, recommend putting a reference after the statement "(See Intervention 2 p.12 for more info)". Otherwise it starts getting hard to follow whether these are linked to your strategies or additional/complementary actions. • Observation 3: NRDC agrees helping link students to the right training is key (whether it's PG&E's or other) however, it's not quite clear that such a service is part of the WE&T effort based on the 3 ensuing interventions (e.g., is it anticipated to be within and outside of PG&E trainings? Would there be a "career counselor" type approach? Etc.). Please clarify or provide reference to the intervention strategy it is linked to.
NRDC – 6	PG&E	WE&T	p.10	• Per the checklist, include change in budget where appropriate (which would also address CEEIC's request for previous 1-2 years of budget to see the trend)
NRDC - 7	PG&E	WE&T	p.15	• Curious why targeting teachers is a medium term effort? I would presume PG&E has data on the teachers/schools that have requested information and/or reached out to PG&E. If so, that could be the start of connecting with teachers with an interest in energy education (short term). If you're thinking of doing a survey and getting new information to process, I could see that being a longer term process. Would suggest making it S-M if the assumed data is already available. • I understand the intent of targeting such teachers/schools is to build and leverage upon their teaching. However, I would strongly encourage PG&E to think about what ways they could help those schools that are not there yet or do not have a fully integrated sustainability/energy approach to teaching. I've been out of teaching for a while, but energy education was part of the required curriculum at that time (maybe not efficiency). This means most schools should be interested in teaching the energy topic generally, making it much easier for PG&E to offer a way to integrate efficiency into existing teaching approaches. Perhaps targeting schools could be through similar avenues like conferences, providing resources as you already do (with a more targeted outreach approach). Or other ways could be to "adopt a district" and explore partnerships to help schools integrate EE into their

				curriculum. While the latter ideas are more programmatic, the BP related item would be to add another Table 5 tactic "Partner with schools/school districts in disadvantaged communities to integrate efficiency education into their curriculum." • I would also recommend that PG&E create some level of criteria to ensure where such support is targeted. If PG&E finds that the majority of the schools that already have interested teachers are in affluent communities, I would suggest a greater shift toward those communities that need it more.
NRDC – 8	PG&E	WE&T	p.10	• Recommend adding a footnote noting what S, M, L means for ease of reviewer who is only reading this one chapter
NRDC-9	PG&E	WE&T	p.19	• Is "technical training" a partner? Seems like it fits back in the intervention strategy unless it's addressing technical training schools