

California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee  
Meeting #21  
June 10, 2019 10:00 to 4:30  
The Energy Coalition, PacMutual Building, 523 W 6th Street  
1<sup>st</sup> Floor Historic Conference Room, Los Angeles  
Facilitators: Dr. Jonathan Raab, Raab Associates, Ltd. & Meredith Cowart, CONCUR

---

On June 10, 2019, the California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee (CAEECC) convened a quarterly meeting of the full CAEECC hosted by The Energy Coalition at the PacMutual Building in Los Angeles. Twenty-two CAEECC Member organizations participated in-person and four participated on the phone. Approximately 23 other stakeholders participated in person and 34 other stakeholders registered to participate via webinar. A full list is provided in Appendix A: In-Person and Webinar Participation.

Meeting facilitation was provided by Dr. Jonathan Raab (Raab Associates Ltd.) and Meredith Cowart (CONCUR). Meeting materials, including presentations, are provided on the CAEECC website at <https://www.caeec.org/6-10-19-coordinating-committee-meet>

In this document, most discussion is captured without attribution. In several instances, the affiliation of the speaker is identified, because their affiliation is relevant to the comment.

Following the presentations, key discussion points, clarifying questions or comments are listed, and relevant responses to questions are noted. Where multiple responses were given, these responses are listed as sub-bullets. Public comment, and any responses given, is included following these discussion sections. Next Steps, at the end of this document, list all next steps discussed at the meeting.

## **SESSION 1: INTRODUCTIONS**

CAEECC Facilitator J. Raab opened the meeting and reviewed the agenda (see link above, *Meeting Agenda 6.6.19*). He explained that the goals of the meeting are to:

- Present the findings and recommendations from the CAEECC evaluation; discuss these findings and recommendations
- Present the challenges of the current Rolling Portfolio (RP) process including the Business Plan (BP) and Annual Budget Advice Letter (ABAL) filings and two alternate straw proposals; discuss these challenges and straw proposals, and discuss the potential for and value of a BP/ABAL Working Group (WG)
- Provide updates from the Investor Owned Utilities (IOUs) on the Third Party (3P) Solicitation Process, and the CPUC on the Procurement Review Group (PRG) processes.
- Discuss the potential for and value of a Data and Intellectual Property (IP) Working Group

- Discuss preparation for and potential alternate structure for the August 7, 2019 ABAL-related full CAEECC Meeting

J. Raab also noted that time would be allocated to public comment throughout the meeting after each major discussion session.

## **SESSION 2: CAEECC EVALUATION**

### ***High-Level Summary of CAEECC Stakeholder Process Evaluation – J. Raab, CAEECC Facilitator***

This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above, *CAEECC Evaluation Slides 5.30.19*).

#### Clarifying Questions and Key Discussion Points:

- I support the recommendation to allow for more public comment during meetings
- The issues to be considered by the CAEECC should not only come from the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), but should also be proposed by CAEECC stakeholders to the CPUC
  - Public Advocates Office: Consistent with D. 15-10-028, the CAEECC should collectively decide upon the topics it wishes to pursue and request to pursue this agenda in an annual advice letter. While the Energy Division (ED) has an advisory role it is not the ultimate decision maker as staff don't speak for the CPUC itself. We need to determine what process we use to set that agenda, including the definition of consensus/decision rules. This group has the experience working together to do that.
  - CAEECC Members should be able to propose topics that it thinks are valuable to pursue. I also agree that a more formal process for agenda setting is important.
  - Agree that there should be a process for us to recommend to CPUC, as representatives of stakeholders
  - CPUC: CPUC/ratepayer funds pay for CAEECC, so each issue that the CAEECC takes on must have clear traction and hold value for stakeholders. The CAEECC cannot take on every issue that is important to stakeholders; there are other avenues for stakeholder discussion that can address certain issues.
- Wherever possible, the CAEECC should collaborate with ongoing multi-stakeholder efforts (e.g. Building Decarbonization), rather than creating new processes
- I also support the recommendation to formalize an onboarding and offboarding process for CAEECC Members; this is important e.g. if a position in an organization changes and there is an opening for someone new.

Following the discussion, J. Raab noted that, per the recommendation to confirm

new Working Groups/Workshops with Members, a new CAEECC decision rule will need to be developed to formalize the process by which the CAEECC (with direction and input from the CPUC) decides to pursue a topic in a new Working Group or Workshop. He noted that two potential new Working Groups would be discussed today: one on refining the Rolling Portfolio process (per a straw proposal from the Public Advocates office) and another on Data and Intellectual Property (per direction from ED). He noted that when these potential groups are discussed, the Facilitation team will ask participants to respond to a straw poll to gauge the level of support for and interest in participating in these potential groups within the CAEECC Member organizations.

**SESSION 3A AND 3B: REFINING ROLLING PORTFOLIO PROCESS: OVERSIGHT, BUSINESS PLANS, ABALS, CAEECC ROLE, ETC.**

***Public Advocates Office Straw Proposal for EE Process Improvements – Dan Buch, Public Advocates Office***

This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above, *Public Advocates Office—BP ABAL Slides 6.4.19*).

Clarifying Questions and Key Discussion Points:

This presentation was presented in sub-sections, with periodic pauses for Member discussion and public comment. The summary of discussion is organized below according to these sub-sections.

**Problem Statement (Slides 2-3):**

- Agree with the challenges of the current process/approach that the Public Advocates Office presented. This process was originally envisioned with better flow and to allow for longer-term planning and industry certainty.
  - Agree with the challenges - with 60% 3P by 2020 target, and a significant amount of independent review, it is difficult for 3Ps to plan in advance
  - Agree with the problem statement. A big challenge is the level of detail expected in the forecast relative to the timing – stakeholders don't have time to digest the information in a meaningful way. The accuracy of measure level accounting is very rough. It would be helpful to have more structured assumptions for what will go into the ABALs – e.g. old goal and Database for Energy Efficient Resources (DEER) values.
  - Agree with the problem statement, particularly the point about timing – we do not have the capacity to track the filing workshops and filings.
- We have already invested a lot of time to develop this process, and we are now in the growing pains – we shouldn't develop an entirely new process, but work on improving the existing one. We don't yet have even one advice letter out related to one new 3P contract – let's give the process time to let 3Ps come into the portfolio before we reset. The process does have allowances, e.g. triggers that provide the opportunity to reset, and filing

advice letters for ministerial matters.

- Agree that it is important not to “blow up” this process and start again from scratch. We should dive into the root of the problem. It will be important to consider many of the items “not in scope” in the Public Advocates Office proposal.
- Agree that we need to let implementers become part of the process before changing the rules again – otherwise you will cause market dilemma.
- We can already see that this process is not going to work as 3Ps become a greater part of the portfolio. Contracts won’t be signed until December, so we won’t know what part of the portfolio to present in September. This will be the case until the portfolios refresh for the 60% target. Given that reforming this process will take several years, I think it makes sense to begin now.
- We don’t want to change the entire Rolling Portfolio process, but need to recognize that for those on the implementation side, it feels we are constantly in preparation for or in fallout from ABAL filings – we need the ability to focus more on actual program management. Also, we don’t want to scare implementers away by constantly changing rules.
- We agree that we are experiencing growing pains – recall that 30 parties were involved in the development of the Rolling Portfolio process – if we are to make changes let’s build off that process rather than reinventing
- Our time may be better served first focusing on needed policy changes (e.g. cost-effectiveness [CE] framework) and then building a process around that
  - Both policy frameworks and process need to be addressed – in which order is a subject for further discussion
  - Policies (e.g., CE, goals, etc) should be separated from the mechanics of how we improve the process
- Since we are too late for these changes to impact 2020, the earliest likely impact would be 2021 but it may be better to target 2022 to allow more time for RFP process to take hold (and IOUs to transition).

Public comment:

- Agree that we should work to improve the existing process. The root cause is that portfolios are not meeting the Total Resource Cost test (TRC), which is driving resubmissions – policy changes could solve that problem.

**“In Scope” v. “Out of Scope” (Slides 4-5):**

- Bus stops should be “in scope” not “out of scope” if we want ABALs to be responsive to Evaluation, Measurement, and Verification (EM&V). Waiting for DEER work papers to catch up so you can meaningfully plan is a real concern.
  - Agree that we need to at least be able to consider interaction of bus stops with ABALs
  - Public Advocates Office: I’m open to that – my understanding was that

- bus stops were for incorporating changes to parameter values (e.g. DEER) without requiring changes to new savings values.
  - An anticipated change to DEER could have a big impact on cost effectiveness, which creates uncertainty
  - We do not need to revisit the concept of bus stops, but the frequency with which they occur. Goals are only updated every other year. Implementers need some control and certainty.
  - Agree that bus stops can be left out of scope, but how often bus stops occur needs to be done, particularly as more implementers come on line.
- We don't necessarily need to move associated policy challenges to "in scope" but we need to have a discussion about these other challenges we face.
  - J. Raab: This could be a discussion in the potential working group, or an agenda item for the full CAEECC.
- "Reporting requirements" should be moved to "in scope"
  - Public Advocates Office: The reason for creating "in scope" and "out of scope" was to keep the discussion focused. Separate items can be addressed separately in a policy track or a budget track.
  - Without scoping in reporting requirements, creating a ground rule about considering impacts on implementers would be helpful
  - There is a scoping memo about reporting requirements – we should revisit this so we can prioritize based on what we can actually influence
    - There is a scoping memo, but it may need to be updated in the current regulatory context – the ED would appreciate our input on this.
- The CAEECC should map out what's "in scope" and "out of scope". As part of that scoping, or within any Working Group should list out the things that are currently "bus-stopped" and see if any should be brought into scope of the Working Group.

**1<sup>st</sup> Straw Proposal: More Robust Business Plans and Ministerial ABALs (Slide 7):**

- What time period are you considering? The original Business Plan went to 2025.
  - Public Advocates Office: We are open to discussion – likely between 3-6 years. Less than 10 years is important - 10-year budget authorizations are difficult to forecast accurately.
  - You cannot accurately forecast more than 2 or 3 years down the road – 3 years should be the maximum for any proposal.
- Could you provide more detail on zero-based budgeting?
  - You don't presume that the current level of funding is justifiable, but build up justification from zero. This is different from "change budgeting" that just looks at the changes from current budgeting.
  - We are open to this option but detailing timing is important. We are getting far enough along with 3P solicitations that zero-based

budgeting makes sense.

- Would all PAs be required to file a new BP following the adoption of these changes?
  - Public Advocates Office: We don't have a strong position – maybe only refile if meet certain characteristics or triggers. Regarding timing, it's reasonable and prudent to look at some items immediately (e.g. PA costs can be scoped into short term and long term activities)
- On slide 7, the words “Requires MUCH more detail on budget, savings, and CE forecasts.” should read “Requires more explanation and justification on budget, savings, and CE forecast.”
- Do you think the lack of justification applies to all measure or just new measures?
  - Public Advocates Office: All measures, and should include fact-based testimony
- CPUC: Regarding this proposal, we still want to review at the program and not sector level, to allow for innovation and flexibility to get to CE as the market changes. I'm concerned we're slipping into a detailed program measure-level review, whereas the principle of the RP process was to allow for greater degree of innovation.
  - Public Advocates Office: Our perspective is that the high-level, hands-off approach isn't working. More detail is needed to justify the BP forecast.
  - CPUC: Do the PAs feel that more detail in the BP would continue to allow you to have the flexibility you see as necessary? Would that be different from you are already doing?
  - The BP is intentionally high level – the detail should be found in the Implementation Plan.
  - Public Advocates Office: To clarify, we are arguing for a change in the application process and not the BP per se. The application proceeding that includes the BPs as an exhibit requires supplementing with testimony justifying forecasts, etc.
- Once the 60% 3Ps target is underway, how does this affect this proposed process?
  - Public Advocates Office: PAs would still provide detailed justification of forecasts based on both submissions and programs that are already underway. Other administrative costs would continue to be included. Since 3P solicitations are competitively procured, some justification of that process would be included.
  - Agree – the PRG oversight of 3P contracts is robust – the application should look only at aspects that were not already reviewed by the PRG process.
  - The scope of review becomes smaller when 60% of savings goals are met by 3Ps – only the remaining 40% needs to be reviewed.

## **2<sup>nd</sup> Straw Proposal: 4-Year Application with Mid-Point Review (Slide 8):**

- Is a four year process reasonable, given the complexity and that you would be planning for review after only 1 year of the program up and running?
  - Public Advocates Office: The number is a placeholder, forecasting beyond 3 years (as mentioned earlier) may not be reasonable.
- Currently the PA budget at the end of the year doesn't automatically roll into the next year – how would this process reconcile that?
  - Public Advocates Office: Whatever your biannual budget is, you return to the ratepayers at the end of the cycle
- How is this different from the pre-Rolling Portfolio process?
  - Public Advocates Office: 1) The mid-point review would allow for mid-point corrections, per the changes made in the ABALs 2) The cycle may end up being a different length. 3) There would be no funding cliffs.
- How do you envision flexibility as opposed to mid-point review?
  - Public Advocates Office: This outlines a process that can be filled with whatever substance seems appropriate.
- We could have schedule review of certain sectors rather than a full portfolio. If you are not considering dramatic changes, you could be assumed to be within a certain target by sector.
- What specifically are you looking for in terms of greater detail?
  - Public Advocates Office: We want more transparency on budgets and methods. What is lacking is the justification, which is required for the CPUC to approve the budget as just and reasonable.

## **Overarching Comments:**

- Overall, we should focus our efforts at the CAEECC on building out the challenges before diving into the solution.
  - Note: Several parties spoke up in agreement with this suggestion

## **Proposed Next Steps (Slide 10):**

- Does the process need to be changed through a formal Decision, or can we make changes with Rulings in the interim?
  - Public Advocates Office: Some of the changes we request would likely need to be done with a Decision, but this may be a question for the ED to deliberate on.
- What is to be done in the short term (2020/2021) and what we do in the long term? This process should also figure out what will happen if we do hit a triggering event as defined in D.15-10-028
- It's clear the CAEECC has interest in addressing this issue
- We should be realistic in talking about next steps about policy issues. The CPUC recently issued a Decision, which identified TRC as the CE test for the demand side.
- CPUC: If each PA files differently, the process becomes much more complicated. Agree that it would be helpful to review some materials in

advance. If this group is on the same page and submits a proposal as a group, then it is possible that changes could be made as a Ruling rather than a Decision.

- Public Advocates Office: Whether changes can be made via a Ruling or a Decision is a legal question, it doesn't have to do with whether stakeholders agree or not.

**Straw Poll – Support for and Likely Participation in Proposed CAEECC Rolling Portfolio/ABAL Working Group**

Following discussion, CAEECC facilitators held an informal straw poll to gauge (1) whether Members feel that a WG on this subject should be pursued by the CAEECC (i.e. that it is an appropriate use of CAEECC resources – and regardless of whether that Member would also participate) and (2) whether the Member’s organization would likely participate if the working group is launched (regardless of whether that Member supports the CAEECC pursuing this topic via a WG). Only affirmative votes (“Y”) or “Other” (“O”) are listed here. “Other” includes indicated “no”, “maybe”, and/or “abstain”. The results of the straw poll are below in Table 1.

**Table 1: Straw Poll – Support For and Likely Participation in Potential CAEECC Rolling Portfolio/ABAL Working Group**

Company	First	Last	Biz Plan/ABAL WG	
			CAEECC should pursue? (Yes/Other)	Would participate? (Y/Other)
<b>CAEECC Member/Proxy – Present and Seated at the Table</b>				
3C-REN	Alejandra	Tellez	Y	Y
BayREN	Jenny	Berg	Y	Y
CEDMC	Nate	Kinsey	Y	Y
CEC	Brian	Samuelson	Y	O
CEE	Bernie	Kotlier	Y	Y
CSE	Beckie	Menton	Y	Y
CodeCycle	Dan	Suyeyasu	Y	Y
JCEEP/ smw104	David	Dias	Y	Y
NRDC	Lara	Ettenson	Y	Y
PG&E	Ryan	Chan	Y	Y
Public Advocates Office	Dan	Buch	Y	Y
SCE	Matt	Evans	Y	Y
SBUA	Ivan	Jimenez	Y	O
SDG&E	Athena	Besa	Y	Y
SoCalGas	Elizabeth	Gomez	Y	Y
SoCalREN	Lujuana	Medina	Y	Y
The Energy Coalition	Laurel	Rothschild	Y	Y
WHPA, Inc	Wendy	Worrell	O	O
LGSEC	Lou	Jacobson	Y	Y
MCE	Alice	Havenar-Daughton	Y	Y
SJVCEO	Courtney	Kalashian	Y	Y
CALCTP	Doug	Avery	O	O
<b>Note: “Other” includes those that said no, maybe, and/or abstained.</b>			<b>Y- 20</b>	<b>Y – 18</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>			<b>Other – 1</b>	<b>Other – 3</b>

## SESSION 4: OTHER IMPORTANT UPDATES

### ***CPUC ABAL-Related Updates***

Following the Sessions 3A and 3B discussion on refining the Rolling Portfolio process (and before the afternoon break—but not on the formal agenda), A. LaBonte provided several ABAL-related updates:

1. The current Avoided Cost Calculator (ACC) should be used for the ABALs presented to the CAEECC on August 7, 2019 and for the September 3, 2019 filing. The filings will be evaluated using any updates to the ACC.
2. DEER work papers will be frozen at a certain date, potentially July 12, 2019, to give PAs enough time to submit ABALs one week in advance of the August 7, 2019 CAEECC meeting.
3. PAs should use the Goals and Potentials – a draft Proposed Decision (PD) will be out by July 12, 2019 and should be used for planning.
4. Regarding solicitations, our view is that IOUs have shown that there is nothing blocking them from a technical perspective from entering 3P information into CEDARS.

### Clarifying Questions and Key Discussion Points:

- It is very problematic to use updated ACC numbers to evaluate ABALs developed based on older ACC numbers. There should be some connection between forecasted savings and actual performance. Did you consider allowing for the evaluation of savings based on the basis of the numbers used to plan?
  - CPUC: I can take that back as an ask
- The Potential and Goals study includes several scenarios, are we using the reference case?
  - CPUC: The PAs should use the proposed scenario in the PD
- When PAs file ABALs we won't yet know the composition of what is exiting the portfolio, as we won't yet have selected 3P contractors. It will be difficult to make broader assumptions about the portfolio until the bids start coming back.
- Can you confirm that the PD scenario will be available July 12, 2019?
  - CPUC: I can't speak to the exact date - my understanding is that the timing should not derail a September 3<sup>rd</sup> filing.

### ***Third Party Programs Solicitation Process Update – Matt Evans, SCE, Elizabeth Gomez, SoCalGas, Lucy Morris, PG&E, and Athena Besa, SDG&E***

This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above, *Third Party Solicitation Process Update Slides 6.4.19*)

### Clarifying Questions and Key Discussion Points:

- Question for SCE: Are there significant savings left in statewide lighting at this time?
  - SCE: No – we are pursuing solicitations in lighting because we were

directed to by the CPUC

- Question for SCE: Is lighting controls part of the lighting solicitation?
  - SCE: We are not being specific, 3Ps can propose lighting controls
- Question for SDG&E: Have you thought about combining some of the local solicitations into broader solicitations?
  - SDG&E: Perhaps – we can talk about that offline at the PRG
- Question for SDG&E: Could you say more about the relationship between the local government programs that will be solicited and local government partnerships?
  - SDG&E: Some current partnerships with contracts will become new local government programs.

Public Comment:

- Question for SDG&E: Do you have an estimate of when the K12 solicitation will launch?
  - SDG&E: We don't have anything more specific than what is listed on this schedule

***Energy Efficiency Third-Party Solicitation Process Update - Cheryl Wynn, CPUC***

This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above, *PRG Update Slides 6.3.19*)

Clarifying Questions and Key Discussion Points:

- Could you extend the input seeking to the non-IOU PAs – as non-IOU PAs are not part of the PRG process?
  - CPUC: Yes
- It is helpful for non-IOU PAs to get a regular short update from the IOU PAs via the CAEECC process on which RFPs have been selected, once the advice letter has been filed
- More specificity (i.e., these are pretty big time windows being shown for RFP releases) and realism of schedule would be helpful for implementers and their resource planning
  - CPUC: That is being discussed, we'd like to get to a monthly schedule

Public Comment:

- What is the objective of the Independent Evaluator Semi Annual report?
  - CPUC: To provide stakeholders with updates on the process and to receive feedback.

***Data and Intellectual Property Rights – Working Group Proposal***

J. Raab introduced a proposal for a Data and Intellectual Property Working Group, developed jointly by ED, The Energy Coalition, SCE, and the facilitation team, at the request of ED. The working group would strive to delineate what types of data and intellectual property should be collected from 3<sup>rd</sup> Party implementers and made available and to whom. The proposal is available on the CAEECC website (see link above, *Data & IP Working Group Proposal 5.30.19*)

### Clarifying Questions and Key Discussion Points:

- What kind of data are you talking about?
  - CPUC: That is a component of the discussion. This concept came from D. 10-18-08 in Standard Terms and Conditions for 3<sup>rd</sup> Party contracts, which notes interest in making available intellectual property if it can be used to advance the sector as a whole. The question for this Working Group would be which data and intellectual property will be most useful if it is made more accessible.
- I'm aware that SCE is leading an effort to develop an energy atlas – there may be an opportunity to leverage those efforts in coordination with this.
- Could you confirm that the concept is to make 3P data available, and not utility data?
  - SCE: No, the concept is to consider what 3P *and* utility data to be made available.
  - The Energy Coalition: The original concept was to include only non-Advanced Metering Infrastructure data, but this was removed. The end goal is to develop better programs. We need to consider what can be shared during the solicitation process, as well as what can be shared afterwards—and should include both 3P and utility data.
  - CSE: Agree this should be broader, so that a disproportionate burden is not placed on implementers. The more that is asked of 3P providers the more difficult it is for them to participate in the market. We need to identify which data needs are essential, and then which of these essential needs *must* be extracted from 3Ps as opposed to other parties.
- The language in the proposal suggests that 3Ps are not already innovative – but this should not be assumed. Data requests of this nature may prevent solicitations for those programs.
  - J. Raab: We will tone down the implication that programs are not already innovative in the proposal language
- I suggest we reframe the language so that it doesn't appear from the 3P perspective that we are asking for their intellectual property
  - J. Raab: We will reframe language in points 3 and 4 to become “if that information needs to come from 3<sup>rd</sup> Parties”
- This is a great subject for the CAEECC to address, but the proposed timeframe for this potential work group is problematic as it conflicts with ABAL season
- 1) CEDARS already sets up a basic delineation of what kinds of data are considered intellectual property and confidential, so this is not a nebulous question. Most contracts have a way of handling intellectual property and confidential data already. 2) This may implicate work papers as well, since some people consider models for calculating savings proprietary.
- This process would benefit from participation of non-CAEECC members as well.

Following discussion, CAEECC facilitators held an informal straw poll to gauge (1) whether Members feel that this working group should be pursued by the CAEECC (i.e. that it is an appropriate use of CAEECC resources – and regardless of whether that Member would also participate) and (2) whether the Member’s organization would likely participate if the working group is launches (regardless of whether that Member supports the CAEECC pursuing this topic via a Working Group). Members were asked to vote affirmatively only for both questions; their votes are recorded here as “Y” if they voted “Yes”, or “O” for “Other” if they indicated “no”, “maybe”, and/or “abstained”. The results of the straw poll are captured in **Table 2** below.

Note that four Members who supported CAEECC pursuing this WG did not also vote that they would participate if it is launched; conversely four different Members who did not support pursuing this WG noted that they would participate if it is launched.

**Table 2: Straw Poll – Support For and Likely Participation in Proposed CAEECC Data and Intellectual Property Working Group**

Company	First	Last	Data/IP WG	
			CAEECC should pursue? (Y/Other)	Would participate? (Y/Other)
<b>CAEECC Member/Proxy – Present and Seated at the Table</b>				
3C-REN	Alejandra	Tellez	O	O
BayREN	Jenny	Berg	Y	Y
CEDMC	Nate	Kinsey	O	O
CEC	Brian	Samuelson	Y	O
CEE	Bernie	Kotlier	O	O
CSE	Beckie	Menton	Y	O
CodeCycle	Dan	Suyeyasu	Y	Y
JCEEP/ smw104	David	Dias	Y	O
NRDC	Lara	Ettenson	O	O
PG&E	Ryan	Chan	Y	O
Public Advocates Office	Dan	Buch	O	O
SCE	Matt	Evans	O	Y
SBUA	Ivan	Jimenez	O	O
SDG&E	Athena	Besa	O	Y
SoCalGas	Elizabeth	Gomez	O	Y
SoCalREN	Lujuana	Medina	O	O
The Energy Coalition	Laurel	Rothschild	O	Y
WHPA, Inc	Wendy	Worrell	Y	Y
LGSEC	Lou	Jacobson	Y	O
MCE	Alice	Havenar-Daughton	Y	O
SJVCEO	Courtney	Kalashian	Y	O
CALCTP	Doug	Avery	O	O
<b>Note: “Other” includes those that said no, maybe, and/or abstained.</b>			<b>Y – 10</b>	<b>Y – 7</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>			<b>Other – 11</b>	<b>Other – 14</b>

## SESSION 5: CAEECC PLANNING

### ***Session 5: CAEECC Planning – Structuring and Preparation for the August 7<sup>th</sup> ABAL-Related Meeting – J. Raab, CAEECC Facilitator***

This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above, *8/7 ABAL CAEECC Mtg Slides 6.6.19*)

J. Raab noted that, given the CPUC ABAL-related updates provided at the close of Session 3, it is confirmed that the August 7, 2019 meeting will be held as planned.

#### Clarifying Questions and Key Discussion Points:

- Given this schedule, draft ABALs will be provided to the CAEECC no later than July 31, 2019 as planned (posted on a rolling basis when submitted, individually).
- An August 14, 2019 deadline for submitting optional written feedback to PAs may allow enough time to review each ABAL – we will discuss this timing at the August 7, 2019 meeting.
- Option 1 (status quo) is preferable, a regional approach would be problematic for stakeholders involved in many regions
- Focusing presentations on the changes, rather than presenting all details of the portfolio, would provide more time for meaningful dialogue
  - Agree - providing guidance on goals and principles of the presentations, rather than a rigid template, would provide for more latitude amongst PAs and more meaningful presentations
- PAs could present in order of the budget – who uses most ratepayer dollars
- Once Members have reviewed the proposals, we could vote on which ABALs we feel need to be given the most time for discussion. If PAs highlight major changes in their presentations, stakeholders can select the most important topics for discussion. (However, there likely won't be sufficient review time for this approach)
- Presentations first by an IOU and then by any other PAs operating in the same region would be most useful
  - Presentations could be organized regionally, with the PA with the highest budget presenting first
- Simply drawing lots would speed the decision
- A set of questions to guide stakeholder feedback may be useful for some stakeholders
  - In addition, non-PAs could submit questions they have for PAs in advance of the August 7, 2019 meeting
- It would be helpful for PAs to receive feedback from ED during the meetings, rather than after the fact in supplemental filings.

## NEXT STEPS

- CAEECC Members:
  - Fill out post-CAEECC meeting #21 evaluation survey by close of business (COB) on Friday, June 14, 2019, COB.
  - Review/comment on this meeting summary by Friday, June 21, 2019, COB
  - PAs provide draft ABALs (along with any accompanying slides) before July 31<sup>st</sup> to Facilitation Team for posting. Presentation format revised according to forthcoming guidance from CAEECC/ED.
  - Review draft ABALs (submitted and posted by July 31, 2019) before Aug 7, 2019 meeting
  - Discuss timing of potential CAEECC Member written feedback at August 7, 2019 meeting
- Facilitation Team:
  - Develop CAEECC #21 Draft Meeting Summary (this document) for member review and finalization by Monday, June 17, 2019, COB.
- Co-Chairs/Facilitation Team:
  - Work w/ED and interested stakeholders to improve structure of the August 7, 2019 ABAL meetings. Develop any relevant guidance for PAs and for non-PAs.
  - Work with ED to determine whether Biz Plan/ABAL WG will be undertaken, and if so develop draft charter
  - Work with ED to determine whether Biz Plan/ABAL WG or Workshop process will be undertaken, and if so refine Data/IP charter and re-circulate to CAEECC
  - Develop schedule and launch WGs/Workshops as appropriate

## Appendix A: In-Person and Webinar Participation

*Note: The list of attendees joining in person reflect actual participation as captured via a sign in sheet circulated during the meeting; the list of attendees joining via webinar reflect registration only. If individuals participated in the webinar but did not register, or registered but did not participate in the webinar, these last-minute changes are not reflected here.*

### Participants Attending in Person:

Company	First	Last
<b>CAEECC Member/Proxy - Seated at the Table</b>		
3C-REN/County of Ventura	Alejandra	Tellez
BayREN	Jenny	Berg
CEDMC	Nate	Kinsey
California Energy Commission	Brian	Samuelson
CEE	Bernie	Kotlier
Center for Sustainable Energy	Beckie	Menton
CodeCycle	Dan	Suyeyasu
JCEEP/ smw104	David	Dias
NRDC	Lara	Ettenson
PG&E	Ryan	Chan
Public Advocates Office	Dan	Buch
SCE	Matt	Evans
SBUA	Ivan	Jimenez
SDG&E	Athena	Besa
SoCalGas	Elizabeth	Gomez
SoCalREN	Lujuana	Medina
The Energy Coalition	Laurel	Rothschild
WHPA, Inc	Wendy	Worrell
<b>CAEECC Proxy - Not Seated at the Table</b>		
Center for Sustainable Energy	Stephen	Gunther
The Energy Coalition	Marc	Costa
<b>CPUC Staff</b>		
CPUC	Alison	LaBonte
CPUC	Cheryl	Wynn
CPUC	Peter	Franzese
<b>From a CAEECC Member Organization (but not a Designated Member or Proxy)</b>		
PG&E	Tim	Michel

PG&E	Lucy	Morris
SCE	Paul	Kubasek
SCE	Cody	Taylor
SoCalGas	Paul	Deang
The Energy Coalition	Craig	Perkins
<b>Other Participants/Stakeholder (but not from a CAEECC Member Org or CPUC)</b>		
Cascade Energy	Siva	Sethuraman
CLEAResult	Chad	Ihrig
CLEAResult	Joanne	O'Neill
E Source	Lisa	Markus
EEM Advisors LLC	Brian	Haines
Frontier Energy	Nancy	Barba
Greencat Inc.	Charles	Holmes
Jay Luboff Consulting, LLC	Jay	Luboff
JouleSmart Solutions	Maria	Fields
Silent Running	James	Dodenhoff
Strategic Energy Innovations	Hernan	Gallo
Synergy	David	Shallenberger
Western Riverside Council of Govts.	Casey	Dailey
Western Riverside Council of Govts.	Anthony	Segura

**Participants Attending Remotely:**

<b>Company</b>	<b>First</b>	<b>Last</b>
<b>CAEECC Member/Proxy</b>		
CALCTP	Doug	Avery
LGSEC	Lou	Jacobson
MCE	Alice	Havenar-Daughton
SJVCEO	Courtney	Kalashian
<b>CPUC Staff</b>		
CPUC	Christina	Torok
CPUC	Nils	Strindberg
CPUC	Joanna	Perez-Green
<b>From a CAEECC Member Organization (but not a Designated Member or Proxy)</b>		

MCE	Jana	Kopyciok-Lande
SCE	Kevin	Thompson
SCE	Ellen	Berman
WHPA, Inc.	Barbara	Hernesman
<b>Other Participants/Stakeholder (but not from a CAEECC Member Org or CPUC)</b>		
AJL Resources LLC	Al	Lutz
AESC	Allison	Bially
AESC	Patsy	Dugger
City of Santa Clarita	Heather	Merenda
CLEAResult Consulting Inc	Jerff	Strauss
Common Spark Consulting	Michelle	Vigen Ralston
County of San Mateo	Kim	Springer
DuctTesters, Inc.	Dave	Hegarty
Energy Commission	Ingrid	Neumann
Energy Efficiency, Inc.	David	Clark
FESS Energy, Inc.	Jim	Crossman
Friedmann Clean Energy	Rafael	Friedmann
Frontier Energy	Lacey	Tan
Google Nest	Serj	Berelson
Greenbank Associates	Alice	Sung
Green Evolution	David	Siddiqui
IBEW Local 569	Micah	Mitrosky
Lime	Tony	Coonce
Lincus	Cody	Coeckelenbergh
Lincus	Hob	Issa
Nexant	Kimberly	Rodriguez
Resource innovations	Margie	Gardner
Resource Innovations	Corey	Grace
San Bernardino County Transportation Authority	Nicole	Soto
SANDAG	Anna	Lowe
Sierra Business Council	Paul	Ahrns
Sierra Business Council	Kerri	Timmer