

Comment #	PA(s)	Sector	Page #	Comment
NRDC-1	MCE	WE&T	General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest reviewing PG&E’s challenges section, p.9 as an example • Suggest reviewing PG&E p.16 for benefits of WE&T across sectors • Suggest reviewing PG&E’s EM&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. • Suggest reviewing SDG&E p.189 Table of legislation and connection to WE&T activities • NRDC looks forward to market characterization of what is happening in the MCE territory • NRDC looks forward to seeing the data to support the problem statements and barriers • Please make metrics font and table bigger (can change orientation) since most stakeholders would likely print these out • 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?
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"> • What partners does MCE engage with (“MCE engages community partners”) • What is used to determine whether something is a “success”? • What are the “gaps” in service? • Is MCE working with existing statewide efforts as well? Says “work with local experts” – does that include BayREN and PG&E? • Are the stackable credential programs new or reorganized existing offerings? • What’s an “off ramp” for workers? Does that mean off ramp from training to get connected to a career?
NRDC – 3	MCE	WE&T	p.52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does Figure 25 link with the metrics table (e.g., I didn’t see job placement in the metrics) • Weatherization in Figure 24 isn’t in Figure 25. • 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.
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"> • 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. • 2nd 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?

				<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2nd row – are grants for the workers? (not MCE winning grants to do this work?)• 3rd 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.• 3rd row – similarly, would think an important metric is how many hard to reach trainees were trained b/c of MCE's monetary contribution• 5th 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?• Generally would like to see a description of how MCE will coordinate with BayREN and PG&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.
--	--	--	--	--