

- I. Purpose (p.68)
  - a. Provide an ongoing forum for stakeholders to bring ideas for consideration (e.g., new ideas) that could be referred to the appropriate topic specific subgroup;
  - b. Leverage what is working;
  - c. Identify and aim for resolution and/or propose recommendations for CPUC consideration on timely and critical issues;
  - d. Seek to find efficiencies in the process (e.g., review opportunities for combining meetings, prioritize key issues for stakeholders to discuss, etc.); and
  - e. Coordinate activities important to implementing a “rolling portfolio.”
  
- II. Joint Party suggested refinements to previous processes (p.70)
  - a. A clear charter or mission;
  - b. Defined and measurable outcomes (e.g., deliverables or decision points);
  - c. Process to keep track of discussions;
  - d. An independent facilitator and administrative support;
  - e. Committed and representative membership;
  - f. Presentation of ideas at an appropriate time to allow for input early in development;
  - g. Resources to “follow through” with action items and decisions; and
  - h. A feedback loop for PAs to update stakeholders on actions taken after a discussion.
  
- III. Responsibilities (pp. 74, 76-77)
  - a. PAs are responsible for the content of what PAs file with the Commission (i.e., applications and advice letters) – see Rules of Practice and Procedure: Rule 1;
  - b. PAs also bear responsibility for what PAs post to Commission-maintained web sites pursuant to this decision (e.g., implementation plans);
  - c. The Coordinating Committee’s role is to advise the PAs. The Coordinating Committee therefore needs both stakeholder and PA participants, but PAs must not dominate Coordinating Committee proceedings;
  - d. PAs must provide the Coordinating Committee with information in a form and on a timeline that allows for meaningful stakeholder input;
  - e. PAs must be willing to take Coordinating Committee as a source of useful input as opposed to presenting decisions already made;<sup>1</sup>
  - f. PAs should be willing to review its implementation plans with subcommittees, whether developed in-house or externally; and
  - g. CC members are responsible for understanding key concepts (e.g., cost-effectiveness and the CC shall have or develop the expert skills needed to make useful recommendations that enable the portfolio to comply with all Commission direction.

---

<sup>1</sup> If the Coordinating Committee becomes a “forum[] for the utilities to present decisions already made rather than to seek input in a collaborative manner,” rather than a source of useful input, then we will be back to the drawing board.” (D.15-10-028, pg. 77)

IV. Scope and Guidance for the CC (p.71)

a. **Intervenor Compensation (Icomp)**

- i. There will be a stakeholder process associated with business plan (BP) preparation and annual advice letter filings. Participants in that stakeholder process may be eligible for intervenor compensation. Two assumptions of eligibility re: Icomp
  1. Subcommittee participation to support BP development is eligible, and
  2. Ongoing discussions and presentations of progress necessary to provide meaningful input into the annual advice letters are also eligible.
- ii. D.07-11-024 guidance will apply to claims for stakeholder participation in processes around developing and revising business plans.
- iii. Claims must include enough information for the Commission to make the findings required by §§ 1801-1812.

b. **One Statewide Coordinating Committee (CC)**

- i. 1-2 Chairs;
- ii. No PA-specific Program Advisory Groups (PAGs);
- iii. Likely longer (but fewer) meetings; and
- iv. The CC chooses the Chair/co-chair.

c. **Charter of Mission for the Coordinating Committee and its Members**

- i. Scope of work (p.73)
  1. Provide input into development of BPs *prior to and throughout the drafting process* (see notes below re scope of input and timing);
  2. Provide input into development of implementation plans, again, *prior to and throughout the drafting process*;
  3. Provide input into development of annual budget advice letters, again, *prior to and throughout the drafting process*;
  4. Provide input into development and revision of metrics for inclusion in business plans and implementation plans as part of i and ii; and
  5. Provide a clearinghouse for discussion of the scope and schedule of other stakeholder processes.<sup>2</sup>

**\*\*Additional work is allowed but not eligible for claiming Icomp\*\***

- ii. Staff is authorized to participate:
  1. Staff to develop a scope pending legal consultation;
  2. Proposed scope will be put out for comment (no timeline); and
  3. Until scope is approved, Staff can participate at high-level guidance

---

<sup>2</sup> As noted on p.78, some current processes will have to give way and the CC should take this issue up with PAs in initial meetings. As included in joint comments/NRDC comments, any such proposal should be based on criteria such as effectiveness. In addition, participant perspectives of how the working group is working should be integral to the decision of whether or not to combine or modify existing groups. In particular the Commission stated: “we do not prescribe here which current processes should change (or cease altogether). As joint parties noted in comments on the proposed decision, this is something that the Coordinating Committee itself should take up with PAs in initial meetings.”

- iii. PAs should work with the CC in the spirit of collaboration.
  - iv. Non-PAs should focus on program/strategy/intervention design consistent with the Strategic Plan, statewide coordination, market characteristics, and particularly on cost effectiveness as defined by our adopted cost-effectiveness methodologies.
- d. **Group Agenda (note this is #6 in the decision on p.74 – the numbering is off)**
- i. The agenda should be developed by the CC; and
  - ii. In addition, a PA will file a Tier 1 AL in January setting out meeting plans and agendas for the year. Changes need to be posted online.
- e. **Run by facilitator with an operating budget (p.75)**
- i. Stakeholders arrange for a facilitator;
  - ii. PAs will fund the facilitator budget “pro-rata based on their share of the overall authorized annual EE spending;”<sup>3</sup>
  - iii. Budget will be filed with the Tier 1 AL and be the minimum amount required; and
  - iv. Commission Staff will review the success of a facilitator.
- f. **Coordinating Committee Meeting Process (p.75-76)**
- i. Chairperson is responsible for convening CC meetings;
  - ii. More meaningful/earlier input;
  - iii. Equal input opportunity – individual PAs or non-PAs should not dominate;
  - iv. Sufficient review of documents;
  - v. Records of meeting outcomes – including a decision/advice trail; and
  - vi. More reliable conference/meeting equipment.
- g. **Subcommittees (not a number in the decision, p.76)**
- i. Chair for subcommittees;
  - ii. Everyone can participate;
  - iii. Subcommittees should be based on sectors (e.g., residential, commercial, industrial, agriculture, public, cross-cutting per p.47);
  - iv. Sector-specific subcommittees should also simplify translation of subcommittee work to business plans, which will also be organized by sector;<sup>4</sup>
  - v. Ad hoc subcommittees are not prohibited, but encouraged to be the exception, not the norm; and
  - vi. Sector-specific subcommittees should also simplify translation of subcommittee work to business plans.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> D.15-10-028, p.75

<sup>4</sup> Sector organization should promote uniformity across PAs by having all PAs discuss all statewide programs for a sector in a single statewide forum (D.15.10-028, p.77-78)

<sup>5</sup> D.15-10-028, p.78