

Notes from Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee Meeting #8

8/9/2016 10:00AM to 4:00PM Location: SDG&E's Energy Innovation Center

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

Facilitator/Notes: 2050 Partners, Inc.

Meeting materials can be found at this location: <http://www.caeecc.org/> - [!blank-38/lrfjs](#)

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

Welcome and Background

Brandi Turner: Welcome and safety message

Facilitator

- Working with Co-Chairs to keep process moving forward.
- Reminder: CC members get priority for discussion; non-CC members needs to wait until public comments period for
- Introductions
- Objectives of the Day: agenda review

David Gamson, Chief of Staff for Commissioner Carla J. Peterman:

- We appreciate the fantastic work that this group and subcommittees have been doing. We encourage these ongoing efforts and we look forward to seeing results.
- PD is on Commission's agenda for August 18. Many comments came in yesterday. We intend to get the decision out on August 18 if possible. It will be difficult. We can't guarantee it. We will be putting in all our best efforts to get it done. If it is delayed, we probably won't be able to say until last minute.
- This proceeding is not subject to *ex parte* reporting requirements. There are no equal time issues in this proceeding. I have already met with various parties and am happy to talk to anyone!

Standing Topics – Ted Pope

[No comments.]

Session 1: Discussion: CAEECC meeting process proposal re: COI Guidance – Ted Pope

- This discussion regards the potential conflicts of interest portion of the guidance document issued by the ED. PAs and CAEECC were asked to review the guidance and come up with more specific process for CAEECC meetings to address potential conflict of interest concerns.
- To keep the ball moving, we have drafted a proposed process for CAEECC events.

- Hazlyn made it clear at last CC meeting that there would be no retroactive blocking of participants in this process from later submitting bids for work. Until we get a specific process in place, participants should not worry about being blocked later from bidding for work.
- We expect PA legal teams will provide legal construct and CAEECC leadership will propose the more tactical process for running meetings.
- We want to discuss generally if this draft proposal meets people's expectations or if we are missing things. Then we will send to legal teams for review.
- Philosophically, our process should be inclusive to allow anyone to weigh in and participate. If there is any situation where conflict could arise, by definition it should not be a CAEECC event.
- See [Draft COI Guidance Response](#)
- This proposal is entirely limited to CAEECC events. The Guidance does not address conversations or interactions occurring outside of CAEECC sponsored meetings and events. In the context of CAEECC events, implementers should not get a unique competitive opportunity and we do not want to create an environment that is conducive to improper influencing of PAs.
- The focus of the conflict of interest guidance is on the smaller standing and *ad hoc* working groups. CAEECC meetings are not really a concern. Subcommittee meetings are not as concerning.

Comment: I would propose a quorum requirement for PAs. Two PAs is not sufficient.

Response: I made the number small to accommodate small working groups.

Comment: I think there is a difference if we are taking votes. If not voting, then quorum could be smaller. Are these rules intended to apply to subcommittees as well?

Response: Yes. We are looking for rules that address subcommittees and small working groups. This is why quorum requirements might not work.

Comment: You may want to add that meeting location needs to be publicly accessible by public, generally, either in person or by telephone.

Comment: Regarding rule no. 11 (counter-party performance), this seems to be too broad. As drafted, this may pose a challenge for community choice aggregators if they want to bid for certain programs.

Response: The ED wants to avoid endorsements as well as negative feedback.

Comment: May be an issue if CCA wants to bid for as implementer later.

Comment: I would also assume if there were an evaluation for a program with only one contractor, you could still discuss the evaluation. We need to be able to discuss evaluations. I like this approach. Thank you for working on it.

Comment: With regard to Implementation Plan process, if all these requirements are met, would it be okay for implementers to sit in room and discuss?

Response: We want to be reasonable. If this proposal were approved by ED and PAs, then we will assume at some point that we can move forward with discussions as long as they follow the rules.

Comment: Be careful in going back and forth between “implementers” and “counter-parties.”

Co-Chair: I inserted the Reviewer Note on p.5 of the document. I want to raise the issue of whether there is still a need for peer review groups to review potentially sensitive financial and proprietary information. What is line for what we can talk about in public?

Comment: We need to find balance between PAs and non-PAs. We need language to allow for more balance in these meetings, but not sure how to do that because it’s challenging to have many non-PAs in subcommittees. There would be a benefit to including more non-PA/non-implementers in the room for discussions than what you proposed.

Comment: You think this would apply to *ad hoc* groups? What prevents people from getting together to discuss things that they would like CAEECC to discuss? I think this needs to include something about CAEECC endorsement of the specific *ad hoc* group.

Response: If it doesn’t meet the COI description of a CAEECC meeting, it’s not a CAEECC sponsored event. People can speak to one another, it would then have to come to the CAEECC for a formal review of an issue.

Comment: There are a lot of discussions about outsourcing. Have we considered outsourcing as part of the discussion of what is sensitive? Levels are not the same between Statewide and small local contracts. Could change the allowed participation level based on level of contract importance. Also, the level of detail in our conversations about scoping the work, could be at a higher level of detail, which implies a lesser risk of COI.

Comment: I am not quite understanding. If you outsource implementation activity statewide, if this were adopted, discussion about the statewide program would be okay.

Response: I just want to make sure that is what we are saying. There is a lot of discussion about outsourcing so we may need to revise plan to be more specific.

Comment: Under current proposal, we would be able to talk about a lot of those things if we meet criteria.

Facilitator: This proposal is just to get the ball moving.

Public comments?

Comment: I have a question about timing. What is process to get PA legal teams to review and when might the ED see a draft?

Response: Hope is for sooner rather than later. We would like legal counsel to set up a meeting for review. Probably won’t be resolved until end of September.

Comment: Can we ask legal team to bring copy of response to our next meeting?

Response: We can aim for that.

Comment: I think we have seen some concern about outsourcing as being sensitive. If someone from a PA now wants to become an implementer, will they be prohibited from participating in CAEECC process, or will they be prohibited from doing so since if they already participated in this process?

Response: That is a broad question. We will make a note of it.

Session 2: Discussion: Revised, proposed Business Plan Development & Review Schedule – Ted Pope

- Proposed revised time frame was provided in Constant Contact message sent to everyone. We discussed the prior schedule at our July 13 CC meeting and we had a pretty clear course of action. With further delay in requirement for filing BPs, we have extended deadlines for the new schedule.
- Review of [Updated Proposal for Business Plan Development and Review Schedule](#).
- Proposed revised schedule offers stretched opportunity for stakeholders to review and for PAs to respond to comments.

Comment: MCE is supportive of stretching stakeholder review and schedule as it is laid out. While this is happening, PAs are also discussing consistency so BPs are easier to review and evaluate. It may be difficult to get full drafts ready by October based on these ongoing discussions. Ongoing discussions among PAs will mostly affect format and form of BPs, but could have substantive impact as well.

Comment: We are seeing two passes on comments. I'd like to know why two passes for comments? What is the difference?

Response: Introductory chapters is where we expect PAs to address policy comments and other issues we have discussed among CAEECC. You won't see those until final drafts. We have bounced these issues around. There are still some outstanding issues that may not be locked down by October. It seemed like a decent compromise so you will get a draft that includes most of substance earlier. We also want to require comments in enough time for PAs to address.

Comment: I would think that because 3/4 level draft is so substantive, we maybe should allow more time for this. If I was writing BP, I'd probably want more time to write the chapters.

Response: If you back up deadlines, then you compress on the backend.

Comment: Expectation that ¾ draft will include five market sectors, but there is a separate chapter for cross-cutting which would not come until November 21? That makes it not so great from a reviewing standpoint. I don't want to provide PAs with so many comments in November and then have to do it again. I'd rather see all chapters – including cross-cutting – up front. Otherwise, we have to keep reviewing plans and providing substantive comments multiple times.

Comment (from PA): I agree with comment about waiting for review towards the end. I favor turning in whole draft on November 21, then webinar, and last day for stakeholder input on December 7.

Response: There is a benefit to a live conversation. PAs might be able to review most of written comments and then conversation may clear up any confusion. Hopefully most of issues will be nailed in October review.

Comment: Webinar will be short? PAs will participate and just those who have questions? I see benefit of webinar if stakeholders want clarification on what PAs have written. A small amount of time dedicated to cleanup could be helpful. Then full blown comments on December 7 (between December 1 and December 7)?

Response: Correct.

Comment: As I recall from the last meeting, members wanted to see something to review. At this point, we just want to see something to review. This just keeps getting pushed forward. We want to see something to review.

Comment: For written comments and input, will this all go into the matrix? If so, will it be possible to include links?

Response: We can talk about that when we get to how we are responding to feedback.

Comment: Is there an expectation that Commission will provide another outline for BP? In proposed decision, there were several references, "PAs could include this in the BP ..."

Co-Chair Response: I have combined all the different guidance in one document which is posted on CAEECC website. (See [NRDC Compilation of CPUC Business Plan Guidance and PA Consensus Outline](#)). I will add a new color and include those references.

David Gamson: If PD is voted out on August 18, will it be difficult to get final BPs on January 15?

Response (from PA): We should be able to get it done by January 15. There are other complications (proposal to go to net goals, avoided costs, and doubling targets with SB 350) so we might be required to update BPs very shortly after we file them. We may have to do this all again very soon.

David Gamson: Will it be difficult to achieve final BPs with input from everyone by January 15 if Commission issues final decision on August 18?

Comment: Please don't delay any further. We've had a lot of discussion and we need to get these out.

David Gamson: I hear desire for complete and robust product but we don't want any further delay.

Co-Chair: We have had 2 passes for comments. Is there appetite if we have drafts that split the difference – more robust draft before November 1 but no 3/4 draft? The farther we push this out, the less time we have to try to work on meeting in the middle on outstanding differences. We are hoping to solidify schedule today.

Facilitator: Proposals on the table to include the cross-cutting chapter in initial or more robust draft a little later.

Comment: For small program administrators, this is all new and getting this all together will be difficult. I'm just thinking of small PAs who don't have large writing teams. It might be nice to give them more time to get drafts BPs together.

Facilitator: If people don't bother to comment on ¾ drafts and then slam PAs with comments after final drafts, there is a risk that PAs will not be able to respond to all comments.

Comment (from PA): I'm interested in suggestion for more time for more complete draft. Having one draft would help PAs with more time to incorporate feedback.

Comment: I'd like to see big picture earlier on so we can give PAs better feedback earlier on.

Co-Chair: We expected October meetings would be Q&A discussion format, not PA presentations, assuming everyone will have had time to read drafts and discuss. Not written comments at that time. We need to move on. We will table and circle back later today on the schedule.

Session 3: Discussion: Fall topic schedule, including PD Assignments – Ted Pope

- We want input from CC members about what are we talking about in CC meetings during the fall.
- Review [Draft Plan and Schedule for Fall CC Meetings](#).
- Next meeting: September 21, 9:00am – 5:30pm at ABAG. Discussing voluntary single chapter drafts. No presentations of BP chapters. Format will be Q&A, probably by chapter. Will also discuss allocation of assignment of lead on statewide process and characterization of statewide programs.

Co-Chair: I don't have a grasp about how the statewide assignment will be done. It would be helpful to get some information about how these discussions among PAs have been going.

Co-Chair Comment: Also, with regard to third party, decision asks how PAs will transition from now to 2020. I'd like to hear about that on September 21.

Comment: I also suggest adding local government programs – from PD – to statewide list of topics. PAs should discuss the proposal submitted by LGSEC in the comments filed Friday.

Comment: What is "firming up characterization of statewide programs" and why would CC discuss?

Facilitator: Maybe I should not have included on this list. We will address later today. If flexibility is granted in Final Decision, this issue may go off the schedule.

Comment: It seems premature to include on agenda for future meetings issues that have not yet been taken up by the Commission at this point.

Facilitator: Focus of 9/21 meeting will be statewide and some longer range planning for third party. We may be re-evaluating schedule for October meeting after lunch. Issues for October meeting: maybe carryover on third party issue and maybe something from Final Decision that is relevant to BPs; also scope and format of annualized performance report in addition to metrics. Issues should not be limited to PD. If anyone has other issues, please raise them. We are working on location for November meeting. This is a good time to lock down CAEECC foundational documents including charter and will also discuss Comparison Document (record of all issues raised through this process).

Co-Chair: We have discussed including a CAEECC “cover letter” addressing unresolved policy issues. Intent of “cover letter” is to summarize outstanding unresolved policy issues.

Facilitator: We will also discuss how we are going to address Implementation Plan process in November. In December, we will continue to discuss IP process and resolve CAEECC Comparison Document and cover letter. Any issues we haven't addressed?

[No comments.]

[Lunch]

Facilitator: I understand PAs generally prefer keeping with the current proposed schedule for BP drafts.

Comment: Who makes this decision about the schedule?

Response: We aren't voting but this discussion is for CC members.

Co-Chair: We are circling back on this issue but not enough CC members yet in the room. We want to reach consensus about schedule. PAs need enough time to do the work. Stakeholders need enough time to review and provide feedback.

Facilitator: We'll hold off until later today to work on this.

Session 4: Report Out: PA Progress on Metrics – Shahana Samiullah

Facilitator: A key element to BPs is metrics and goals for metrics. PAs have been working to try to come up with consistent framework for metrics so BPs are easier to review. ED is looking for a consistent framework for metrics. Goals, however, may be different. Grounded Research presented conceptual framework at prior meetings. No specific metrics have been proposed yet. ED has internal staff meeting to address metrics later this month. We can provide feedback for ED before the meeting.

See [Metric Framework Presentation](#).

Comment: regarding Slide 7, it looks like you have three sector strategies, and each has a sector level sector strategy metric. Is this, “If you do all three of these things, you will get to ZNE,” or

“Here are three different ways to measure if you are on track to measure whether you are on track to reach ZNE goal”? I was concerned that there would be one singular metric, and stakeholders wouldn’t be able to understand whether PAs are meeting their targets.

Response: Correct.

Comment: Will there be metrics for each strategy in each sector? Debate: one metric for each sector level strategy versus breaking down each sector. Example: 100% ZNE; Slide 7 shows that you have three strategies and metrics for each strategy.

Response: Yes. This is a hypothetical example.

Comment: Strategy is marketing, programming, etc.

Comment (from PA): We are talking about measuring specific strategies to determine if we are achieving goals. There will be multiple strategies at play. At what level are we expected to measure? What we are expected to include in BP?

Facilitator: This is just the high level BP metrics.

Comment (from PA): You can change your strategies. Lower level strategies will be in Implementation Plans with their own metrics.

Comment: Another way to look at this, if you are looking at three different effects and they each have targets, and if you are doing better with different targets, then you can tell which strategies are doing better.

Facilitator: Regarding Slide 3, lesson learned and continuous monitoring. Will all metrics proposed by PAs require continuous monitoring? Outcome versus output – only measure outcome periodically.

Response: A good example for continuous monitoring is Energy Star brand awareness. This has been going for years. We have done continuous monitoring of awareness by consumers. We were able to see over past 15 years a progression of Energy Star awareness in the market. We need to pick metrics at sector level (not program level) that are conducive to monitoring year after year.

ED Comment: We are in new framework with regard to EE Strategic Plan. I can’t guarantee that you should look at the old framework. Most updated version of plan is 2011. I am cautious about how strongly that directive is developing.

Response: My presentation is about how at the BP level, we need to be clearly connected to Strategic Plan, whatever version we are in. “Market effect” is desired market effect that ties to objective and hence the goals.

ED Comment: Taking metrics out, I am concerned about the three different approaches to reach one objective. I want consistent metrics so when a PA reports out, ED staff knows what you are talking about. There has to be a clear link to what you are saying in BP, to respond to

what you are doing with your programs. The way we test whether approaches are successful, will be based on what you report out.

Response: Those program level metrics need to be clearly linked to sector strategies in BP. We need to come to agreement about metrics for BPs. IP metrics need to be clearly tied to BP metrics.

ED Comment: Specific metrics at high level may shift based on needs. We may need to have follow up conversation based on what we discuss in our meeting.

Response: This discussion was trying to outline commonalities. What is needed at sector level, and what will be pushed off to program design and implementation

Comment: With regard to Slide 7, I don't see this as three different approaches, but rather three that are nested together. I see them as working together and logical. When you are setting goals, the real target is for what? Countered with: how much solar is being used to get there? Is there an actual calculation we are trying to get to?

Facilitator: Seems like we need to see BPs first.

Comment (from PA): Responding to ED comment regarding meeting with PAs, I would encourage that all PAs be part of the conversation so that we are all involved and not just represented by one party.

Further comment: BPs are implemented by PAs. It doesn't matter which PA is involved. Strategies always need to be working toward goals. Strategies can be changed. Metrics are supposed to be telling us if we are achieving ultimate goals of BP. Metrics in BPs are different from metrics in IPs. You won't see IP metrics until we submit IPs (not at same time as BPs). Of course the first metrics are savings. If BPs are not trying to achieve savings, then we need to be re-thinking what we are doing. We still need to measure savings. We need to decide on a level of metrics for BPs and level of metrics for IPs. We keep going around and around in discussions about this. This is part of the reason why we are not where we should be in developing BPs. You need to see BP, figure out our objective, and then you can determine if the metrics make sense and are sufficient to evaluate BPs.

Facilitator: Sounds like there has been evolution from last meeting and still work to do.

Co-Chair: What are expectations for going forward?

Facilitator: Where are PAs in terms of timing and next steps?

Comment: Strategic policy indicators are those indicators which show progress toward a specific policy; high level at strategic policy level. MTIs are specific to market transformation objectives; they can correspond to indicators that show progress toward market transformation, but may not have one-to-one relationship with programs.

Co-Chair: Sounds like we have two approaches. Is that correct? Do we need to merge these two approaches?

Facilitator: I'm not convinced everyone is clear on the two approaches.

Comment (from PA): No, there are not two approaches. The approach posited by Grounded Research is at strategy level. The issue now is level of detail for metrics.

Comment: Strategies can be at different levels. Both need to be integrated together. High, sector level metrics are needed for BPs. Program/strategy level metrics are required for Implementation Plans.

Facilitator: We need to be clear on terms we are using. There is a difference between market effect and program level strategies.

Comment: BPs will include metrics for market effect at sector level.

Comment: Intervention strategy is the same as implementation strategy. What is confusing is what is an implementation strategy? Where do programs fit in this structure? There are 12 programs, and then there are subprograms and implementation strategies for all of those.

Facilitator: Implementation strategy is what you do in a specific program, whereas intervention strategies are high level strategies. We need to lock down our definitions or abandon words that create confusion and choose new ones or it will be hard to complete this conversation.

Comment: My understanding is that "intervention strategies" are high level for BPs. "Tactics" are relevant to IPs, which will have their own metrics. Tactics are more granular piece of IP.

Comment (from PA): That is how I understood the current disagreement we're having. Do we measure desired market effect or do we measure the intervention strategies? We need Commission staff to help us understand what level of granularity it wants.

Facilitator: That is a clear explanation of the two perspectives. As a point of caution, however, I'm not sure that one is always more granular than the other.

Comment (from PA): There is an expectation of two levels of strategies. First layer is higher level for BPs. We're talking about sectors as a whole. Second expectation is at IP level; will be more detailed. When trying to figure out where we need to be, there will be two levels of metrics. For BPs, the issue is how are we performing relative to Strategic Plan for each sector. ZNE is an objective and strategy in Strategic Plan.

Facilitator: If any non-PA members feel strongly about this issue, please speak up now. Otherwise, we encourage PAs to work further on metrics. Then issue falls to ED to stipulate how it should be done. Progress has been made. Any non-PA comments?

[No comments.]

Session 6: Updating/revising the current behavioral definition – Meghan Dewey

See [PG&E proposal regarding Draft Behavioral Definition](#) and [PG&E's California Behavioral Definition: Review and Recommendations](#)

PG&E will host a Behavioral Seminar/Workshop in SF on September 29. More details will be provided later.

Comment: SDG&E has provided comments. This is a restrictive definition. Control groups need to be released once you prove something. Control groups are counter-factual. We consciously set aside a group of customers who will not participate so we can watch how the behavior develops. Behavioral program definition was created through legislation. If we are going to change definition, is that affected by legislation?

Comment: I think SB488 expired last year. I need to confirm.

Updated: See [here](#) for bill. "(d) This section shall become inoperative on July 1, 2015, and, as of January 1, 2016, is repealed, unless a later enacted statute, that becomes operative on or before January 1, 2016, deletes or extends the dates on which it becomes inoperative and is repealed."

Comment: In PD, when it recommends changes to how behavioral programs are treated, is it correct that there is not an accepted definition?

Response: Definition is in place and PAs want to change it.

Session 5: Discussion: Comments and Reply Comments for PD – Ted Pope

There may be some responses to PD that everyone has consensus on so we could coordinate reply comments. We'd like to see if there is any commonality among CC members on any of the following issues:

- Clarification on effective date of AB 802 rules. What about programs that are already in existence? What are rule sets for grandfathering for customers or programs as a whole?
- Do we want to recommend flexibility in process for assigning which PA will be lead in statewide program?
- Flexibility to assigning program work that may be broken out differently from the hierarchy presented in the PD
- Codes and standards – how C&S programs will be treated going forward
- Clarification on Ag and Industrial

Co-Chair: We are not pre-supposing consensus, but want to use this forum to see if there is any consensus.

Comment: NRDC put forward C&S topic. Issue is whether there is some level of overlap between below code and the fact that we have already allocated savings so we don't want to double count them. There are three different buckets:

- 1) C&S credit related to existing buildings for retrofits – clearest issue for double credit
- 2) C&S apply to new construction – zero below code
- 3) Appliance standards – no potential for building upgrade

NRDC proposal: keep credit for new construction and appliance standards. There were probably about 10 comments that agree with this.

Comment (from PA): We suggested something very similar.

Comment: I appreciate the proposal but am concerned about proposal related to appliance standards. Equipment would be available as part of certain energy programs. We could still have a double counting issue. Not sure this proposal solves the problem.

Response: HVAC is preempted by federal standards. Main point is that there are specific things that you can make maybe specifically exempt. If there are other white goods that could be counted as upgrades, we can remove those things that fall in overlap.

Comment: All plug loads could be counted under metered approach. So may need to remove all plug loads from pay for performance.

Response: If there is overlap, we would need to address that.

Comment: How would you do that? Remove plug load from pay for performance programs? Deal with it after?

Response: I think you raise an important point. Maybe it is not that easy, but we can work it out.

Comment: In the absence of a concrete proposal, we can't come to consensus on this issue.

Response: Part of discussion is to raise issues and talk more about possibility of consensus.

Comment: Energy Commission thinks Proposed Decision made valid argument in terms of existing baseline in existing building standards. We were okay with proposal that stakeholders go out and get better information. Argument really only applies to existing buildings. We don't think there is a good argument for not counting codes and standards for other instances. There could be a better short term decision about how to deal with this. There are so many people who upgrade with incentive program. We need to continue looking at this.

Comment: We did ask in our comments that there be at least a conscious transition before CAEECC on how existing programs will be transitioned by January 1. Could we at least discuss in CAEECC what plan is for transition to January 1?

Comment (from PA): We assume we get the advice letter approved for implementation by January 1. We want to implement in 2017 but there will be discussion between now and then.

Comment: Can we discuss at September CAEECC meeting what the process will be to get implementation phase going?

Response: Implementer phase is dependent on what PAs offer in BPs.

Comment: It would be helpful to discuss but may be hard to be ready to discuss in September. We'd be happy to see what implementers would like.

Facilitator: Any discussion on issue of providing flexibility to PAs to assigning leadership role for statewide or defining program names used in PD? Programs may be split between PAs where work that falls under one topic. Proposed decision offers flexibility to step away from naming convention so PAs can divide the work.

Comment: NRDC read from TURN's comments in support of this (PD should be modified to clarify that the PAs may propose statewide programs that do not necessarily track existing programs/subprogram structure)

Comment (from PA): With regard to Ag/Industrial issue, PG&E proposed a modified table to show what can be done with existing buildings in Ag and Industrial sectors. There are still retrofit opportunities in industrial *buildings* even if not processes.

Comment: This issue needs clarification, especially if existing buildings do qualify. We'd like to include all industrial buildings.

Facilitator: For those who are willing, please support these issues in your reply comments.

Comment: SDG&E is providing feedback to ED about reporting requirements. We are going into 2017 filing. Reporting requirements include accounting information. That also needs to be worked on. It is very important to understand these rules. They dictate your financial management. This is one critical issue that we need to step up and work on.

Comment: NRDC supports more open, collaborative method for EM&V. Non-PAs are not allowed in those discussions. We have argued that we should be included in these discussions. We need opportunity to be allowed in earlier. Different parties will have different interests and we need to be allowed in discussions.

Comment (from PA): I need help understanding why certain parties feel so strongly against IOUs having any role in shaping program design? It is important to remember that there are instances for IOUs to identify important needs and help shape programs around those needs. I'd love some perspective on this issue.

Comment: CEEIC has had a lot to say about outsourcing of implementation work. But, we think there should be some design input from IOUs. Our comments were focused on creating more

opportunity for implementer design input than the current 20%. We were surprised to see comments that there should be 100% exclusion of IOU program design.

Comment: It is important for outsiders to have some influence on designing programs, but I don't see how you can shut out IOUs. How can you run a portfolio without any input on program design?

Comment: I agree that there should be more third party input, but should not shut out IOUs.

Comment: How can IOUs select among bids without any control over design? It seems almost impossible to preclude IOUs from program design.

Comment: Program design is usually very detailed. It requires input from PAs as well as stakeholders. There should be some PA input in this process.

Comment: As an implementer, we have designed programs that have never been done before by utilities and we have been awarded programs where IOU had no input but we can't totally exclude IOUs from the process.

Facilitator: Public comments?

Comment: I totally agree to advocating for collaboration with PAs.

Session 7: EBE AP update and Discussion – Martha Brook

See [CEC proposal regarding Existing Building Energy Efficiency Action Plan](#) and [CEC presentation regarding Existing Buildings Energy Efficiency Action Plan, 2016 Update](#)

SB350 requires an updated EEBE Action Plan on January 1, 2017. We are treating this as an update to current plan. We are not replacing the current plan. We are just providing an update of what we have done in the past year. There is not a lot of progress to report based on recent policy changes. There are lots of issues to consider in drafting BPs.

Schedule:

- ED staff is working on update now.
- We are obligated to provide a draft to management by August 31.
- 10/3 Workshop to work on update
- 11/30 Final draft
- 12/14 Business meeting

We want your input. Please give us details on what you have been working on this past year.

We'd really like to hear from local governments regarding data access. We have identified strategies for data access and we need to know if those strategies are working or not so we can update our plan regarding that issue.

We would like to hear if we are missing strategies in our workforce education and training goals.

If there are problems with our strategies (for example, if they are impossible to implement) we'd like to know. We can work on them and make them better.

If there are other programs that we should be highlighting in financing, please let us know.

Questions?

Comment (from PA): We received a data request from your team. If there are other questions that you want answered as well, please let us know as soon as you can.

Response: It may be easier to just set up a call to give us answers.

Comment: Do you have anything in mind right now that you think needs to be updated?

Response: We are going to reference the plan. We are going to write new text for each set of strategies. Then we will update strategies. We will summarize HOPPS programs and what we have been doing with AB 802 benchmarking.

Comment: Can you elaborate on benchmarking, especially building owners getting tenant data?

Response: That will be updated at high level. We will summarize that data access for building owners is a principle part of our regulations that we are in the middle of right now as part of AB 802 benchmarking.

Comment: Will you post presentation slides on website?

Response: [Yes](#).

Continuation of Session 2: Discussion: Revised, proposed Business Plan Development & Review Schedule

Facilitator: Circling back to schedule and October CC meeting ... There are a couple options: do we stay with schedule as presented? There is a proposal for an alternative schedule. If we do $\frac{3}{4}$ draft, can it include cross-cutting chapter? Some PAs would like to stay with current schedule.

Alternate proposal placed on whiteboard during lunch:

- 9/13 – voluntary draft BP chapters (same as before)
- 10/18 – full BP draft (1 week later but more robust than previously anticipated)
- 11/2 – CAEECC discussion
- 11/21 – final comments due

Comment (from PA): I don't have a strong issue with original proposal but I would support alternate schedule.

Comment: MCE supports alternate schedule. It alleviates some unnecessary workload, and gives more time for feedback and incorporation of feedback.

Comment: Cross-cutting was not going to be included in ¾ draft. I like alternative schedule so that we will get a more complete draft. It is better from reviewer's perspective to get whole draft in one review. Schedule offers less turn-around time for review and incorporation of comments.

SDG&E, SoCalGas and SoCalREN all approve of alternative proposal.

Comment: What is important is how input is structured. I want PAs to be transparent about whether input was incorporated.

Co-Chair: Ted and I are working on a way to easily see how the previous items were addressed.

Comment: In either case, after January 15 filing, will there be a CAEECC meeting to discuss BPs? I like alternate proposed schedule.

Comment: Coalition for Energy Efficiency also favors alternate schedule.

Co-Chair: This is pending Final Decision on August 18. This proposal may be affected if the Final Decision is delayed.

Comment: We are happy to see full drafts, but we are concerned about further delay in schedule.

Facilitator: Single chapter drafts will still be provided September 13. These will give good idea of what is coming later. September 13 draft is a provisional working draft because certain issues (like metrics) are still being resolved.

Comment: We are generally concerned that deadlines keep slipping and we still haven't seen anything yet.

Comment: We also don't want delay but we are talking about same date for voluntary draft chapters and moved up date for complete draft BP.

Facilitator: Sounds like majority agreement for alternate proposal.

Co-Chair: We are still looking at meeting on September 21. We should keep October meeting date for spillover issues from September 21 meeting. We can cancel if we don't need it. October meeting should be third Wednesday in October. We only have one day for discussing draft BPs. We will have another meeting around November 2.

Comment: We are missing what EE savings goals are that we are required to meet. Goals are trending downwards now. We know that the goals will change and the trajectory will go

upwards. We need to know goals and budgets to support those goals. We can file BPs without goals, but then we may need to change BPs once we know goals. BPs need to meet goals that we don't know yet.

Co-Chair: We will send follow up communication to everyone with new schedule.

ED Comment: I want to understand about 9/13 voluntary chapters ...

- 10/18 revised date for BP drafts
- 10/19 for CAEECC meeting
- 11/2 meeting to discuss BP drafts
- 11/21 written comments due
- 1/15/2017 BPs due

Co-Chair: Ted and I will work with PAs to make sure that input has been incorporated or reason for why it has not been included.

Public Comments Period

Comment: I wonder if PAs can provide a short sentence on issue of 2017 budgets?

Response: We are still in planning stage; will be filed September 1.

Comment: Revised schedule looks really good. What happens after 1/15/2017?

Response: This is a subject for November meeting. What is process for Implementation Plans?

We expect it will take a few months for Commission to review and respond to BPs.