

Comment #	PA(s)	Sector	Page #	Comment
NRDC-1	MCE	WE&T	General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest reviewing PG&amp;E’s challenges section, p.9 as an example</li> <li>• Suggest reviewing PG&amp;E p.16 for benefits of WE&amp;T across sectors</li> <li>• Suggest reviewing PG&amp;E’s EM&amp;V trends (p.22) to see if additional evaluation lessons apply. Also suggest including a similar summary to aid the reader in understanding the derivation of the goals.</li> <li>• Suggest reviewing SDG&amp;E p.189 Table of legislation and connection to WE&amp;T activities</li> <li>• NRDC looks forward to market characterization of what is happening in the MCE territory</li> <li>• NRDC looks forward to seeing the data to support the problem statements and barriers</li> <li>• Please make metrics font and table bigger (can change orientation) since most stakeholders would likely print these out</li> <li>• P.51 – there’s no context for Figure 24 so it’s unclear what it is. Are these items linked to the strategies in the metrics table? Are these all exclusively MCE activities? Or is it a graphic description generally what supply side activities are?</li> </ul>
NRDC – 2	MCE	WE&T	p.50	<p>The following items are all questions for clarification around language found on p.50:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What partners does MCE engage with (“MCE engages community partners”)</li> <li>• What is used to determine whether something is a “success”?</li> <li>• What are the “gaps” in service?</li> <li>• Is MCE working with existing statewide efforts as well? Says “work with local experts” – does that include BayREN and PG&amp;E?</li> <li>• Are the stackable credential programs new or reorganized existing offerings?</li> <li>• What’s an “off ramp” for workers? Does that mean off ramp from training to get connected to a career?</li> </ul>
NRDC – 3	MCE	WE&T	p.52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How does Figure 25 link with the metrics table (e.g., I didn’t see job placement in the metrics)</li> <li>• Weatherization in Figure 24 isn’t in Figure 25.</li> <li>• There are interesting items in Figure 25, NRDC looks forward to seeing text describing how they all work together with the other items in the metrics table.</li> </ul>
NRDC – 4	MCE	WE&T	Metrics Supplement for WE&T (no page #)	<p>The following notes are things NRDC will be looking for in the final text that supports the tables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify the objective. Linking trainings is slightly different than have a suite of trainings, which is also different than stackable trainings. All of which are referenced.</li> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> row – how are #2 and #3 strategies different? Is #2 paying the worker when they get training and #3 is MCE going to the location of the workers so they don’t have to travel?</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> row – are grants for the workers? (not MCE winning grants to do this work?)</li><li>• 3<sup>rd</sup> row – would suggest the metric for subsidized training be the increase in trainees that wouldn't be able to participate. Just \$\$ out won't illustrate benefit to the community.</li><li>• 3<sup>rd</sup> row – similarly, would think an important metric is how many hard to reach trainees were trained b/c of MCE's monetary contribution</li><li>• 5<sup>th</sup> row – the IOUs have a statewide effort to work to integrate EE curriculum into partner organizations. Is MCE's strategy different? Or will MCE coordinate? If so, how?</li><li>• Generally would like to see a description of how MCE will coordinate with BayREN and PG&amp;E as the workers are likely working in each territory. MCE has a number of interesting ideas, but could be duplicative and also others may miss out on the potential to build on MCE's ideas if not sufficiently coordinated.</li></ul>
--	--	--	--	--