



**California Technical Forum (Cal TF)  
Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting # 6  
April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2015  
Lawrence Berkeley National Lab**

**I. Participants**

Annette Beitel, Cal TF Facilitator  
Jenny Roecks, Cal TF staff  
Alejandra Mejia, Cal TF staff

Peter Miller, Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)  
Steve Galanter, Southern California Edison (SCE)  
Margie Gardner, California Energy Efficiency Industry Council (CEEIC)  
Jan Berman, Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E)  
Beckie Menten, MCE  
Mary Ann Piette, Lawrence Berkeley National Lab (LBNL)  
Rachel Huang, Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD)  
Bryan Cope, Southern California Public Power Authority (SCPPA)  
David Jacot, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)  
Mike Campbell, CPUC Office of Ratepayer Advocate (ORA)

Phil Haves, LBNL, Presenter  
Jessica Granderson, LBNL, Presenter  
Chuck Goldman, LBNL

**On the Phone**

Dan Rendler, Southern California Gas Company (SCG)  
Lisa Davidson, San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E)  
Donald Gilligan, National Association of Energy Services Companies (NAESCO)  
Howard Choy, County of Los Angeles (LA)  
Martha Brook, California Energy Commission (CEC)

**III. Key Decisions and Action Items**

**Policy for Admitting New PAC Members**

- ACT: Accept the Center for Sustainable Energy's request for PAC membership.
- Put a hold on all further requests until formal PAC membership policy is in place.



- ACT: Cal TF staff to draft policy that defines criteria for deciding on PAC membership requests for review at next PAC meeting.

#### Progress 2015 Business Plan

- ACT: Discuss high-level metrics for success at July PAC meeting.
- ACT: Set up teleconference to discuss current Savings Below Code work.
- ACT: Cal TF staff to attend April 28<sup>th</sup> Code Baseline CEC-CPUC workshop.
- ACT: Savings Below Code subcommittee to review CSE work on code compliance

#### Ex Ante Development: Current Practice – Future Vision

- ACT: Cal TF staff to prepare short policy statement and one page briefing document on DEER alternatives to be reviewed at the next PAC meeting.

#### Appointment of New Cal TF Members

- ACT: Consider revising scoring criteria for next RFQ.
- ACT: Ensure that all interested PAC members can thoroughly review all application materials from future RFQs.
- Evaluation subcommittee recommendations approved for TF membership.

### **III. Policy for Admitting New PAC Members**

Annette Beitel, Cal TF Facilitator—

Annette Beitel—We have recently received a request for PAC membership from the Center for Sustainable Energy (CSE). The group doesn't currently have a policy for accepting or denying new membership requests, so you need to decide a) if we should grant CSE's request, and b) how to handle similar requests moving forward.

Peter Miller—It seems like the issue is trying to keep the group wieldy while also having representation from all of the major players in the field. In terms of formalizing a policy for new members, I think it brings up the fact that we have been operating on minimal organizational policy documentation. That made sense initially because it made us nimble, but it may not make sense forever.

Dan Rendler—The request does raise the issue of governance. I think regardless of what we do we need to put a policy in place for the future.



Mary Ann Piette—It seems to me that until there is a clear policy, you really can't change anything.

Annette Beitel—We *were* pretty open with membership at the very beginning.

Jan Berman—And we made a really good effort to guarantee that all interests were well represented.

Mary Ann Piette—In that case you can allow CSE in *and* create a policy. In any case we need a formal policy soon.

Mike Campbell—What would be the problem with letting them in?

Peter Miller—The issue is that we have no formal policy, so we run the risk of setting the precedent that all requests will be accepted.

Bryan Cope—Then why don't we cap the number at the existing members plus CSE, and then create a policy in preparation of future requests.

Beckie Menten—I personally think they have a lot to add.

Annette Beitel—So, what I'm hearing from the group is to allow CSE in as the last new member before putting a hold on any future requests until we have a policy in place.

Group—Consensus.

- ACT: Accept the Center for Sustainable Energy's request for PAC membership.
  - Put a hold on all further requests until formal PAC membership policy is in place.
- ACT: Cal TF staff to draft policy that defines criteria for deciding on PAC membership requests for review at next PAC meeting.

Bryan Cope—Should we also talk about how we will be putting such policies in place?

Jan Berman—I think that leads us to a more complex discussion the group needs to have about what the near and mid-term future of the organizational structure should be.



#### **IV. Progress on 2015 Business Plan**

Cal TF Staff—

##### **Power Point Presentation**

##### *Measure Review*

Mike Campbell—To be clear, has the LED workpaper been approved or is it in the pipeline?

Jenny Roecks—Three LED workpapers have been submitted for TF review. Two of them have been approved by the TF and one is still under review. We have received substantial comments from CPUC Staff on that last one.

Mike Campbell—How have those comments been communicated to the Cal TF?

Jenny Roecks—It is our policy to submit all abstracts to Energy Division staff for their comments on previous work and applicable DEER requirements.

Steve Galanter—That is on top of very preliminary conversations had between Energy Division and IOU staff when the measure idea is first originated.

Jan Berman—The goal is that all of this collaboration will yield more fleshed-out, consensus workpapers.

Beckie Menten—How long does the CPUC approval process take? I'm just wondering how we are going to define success.

Steve Galanter—I think speed of approval shouldn't be the only metric of success. I would argue that bringing openness and transparency to the measure development process is even more valuable.

Margie Gardner—I do think it is very important that we put down very clear metrics for success, on a higher-level than the business plan, and I would urge us to discuss this at the next meeting.

- ACT: Discuss high-level metrics for success at July PAC meeting.

Bryan Cope—I've recently had some interesting conversations about the performance of Mini Ducts. How can other members of the public get involved in that particular discussion?



Jenny Roecks—We can touch base on this off line, but the rule of thumb is that all TF meetings are open to the general public. All information is posted ahead of time on the Technical Forum section of the website.

#### *Statewide Coordination Discussion*

Mike Campbell—So, the SDG&E Advance Power Strips workpaper will be able to be used statewide?

Jenny Roecks—Yes. All of our workpapers are intended for statewide use. We only label it as 'SDG&E' because they developed and submitted it to the CPUC.

#### *Crosscutting Technical Subcommittees*

Mike Campbell—What will happen if any of the groups represented around this table have a serious objection with any of the final work products from any of these subcommittees?

Annette Beitel—The policy has always been that this group isn't asked to approve technical work.

Margie Gardner—I think this the Savings Below Code subcommittee a special case, because as technical as you keep the work, the end product will probably have some policy implications.

Mike Campbell—I agree and think that the group would benefit from regular updates on that particular subcommittee's work.

- ACT: Set up teleconference to discuss current Savings Below Code work.

Martha Brook—You should make sure to track the April 28<sup>th</sup> joint CPUC-CEC workshop on that issue.

Beckie Menten—CSE is also doing some interesting work on that issue.

- ACT: Cal TF staff to attend April 28<sup>th</sup> Code Baseline CEC-CPUC workshop.
- ACT: Savings Below Code subcommittee to review CSE work on code

#### **V. Ex Ante Value Development: Current Practice – Future Vision**



Annette Beitel, Cal TF Facilitator—

### Power Point Presentation

Chuck Goldman—What I liked about the original DEER is that it differentiated measures by end uses, market segments, etc. First generation TRMs did not do that but I hear that has changed now. How do other jurisdictions like the Northwest do that now without having the endless number of entries DEER has?

Peter Miller—The RTF just has workbooks that can be used to do that scaling.

Annette Beitel—Many of the best ones we've reviewed use drop-down menus.

Beckie Menten—Does the cost of engineering, DEER maintenance, etc. fall under the cost effectiveness mandate?

Jan Berman—All of the workpaper development costs must be included in the cost effectiveness calculations.

Beckie Menten—So the cost of DEER is potentially a drag on portfolio cost effectiveness.

Peter Miller—Another thing that the Northwest benefits from is that you can have independent reviewers and stakeholders review the actual calculations. That is really helpful in detecting errors. We can't do that with DEER because it is just too complicated to understand any of the calculations or values. I have personally given up on using READI.

Jan Berman—I don't use DEER myself, but what I've heard is that it's like the difference between using a linked model and a flat, cut-and-pasted spreadsheet. It's very difficult to track down and reproduce individual values.

Steve Galanter—And every time DEER changes, the utility tracking systems also have to change. There is a cost associated with that.

Mike Campbell—So the recommendation is to create a new template that could then be populated with potentially some of the information that already exists in DEER?

Annette Beitel—Yes.



Margie Gardner—When the Cal TF Staff makes statements on the record, does that mean individual PAC members support them?

Annette Beitel—No, the comments that were submitted this week were very clearly made by Cal TF staff only. We specified that we were not representing the opinions of the PAC or TF.

Martha Brook—I think we should add to the list of problems that the DEER management contract isn't really competitively bid. We get a lot of people coming up with ideas to replace DEER, but nobody knows who to talk to.

Mary Ann Piette—For instance, DOE and NREL have a proposal. You would have to really constrain the models, but it would be open source.

Chuck Goldman—I've had a lot of experience developing TRMs for other jurisdictions, and I tend to agree with a lot of what Cal TF staff is saying. In my opinion the Northwest RTF is really the best model.

I would also mention that the CPUC staff appears to be really invested in continuing this process. This group really needs to continue communicating with policy makers to educate them about the real needs.

*[Jan Berman was not in the room for the following discussion]*

Margie Gardner—I appreciate that, since it's very useful for me to finally get some data and analysis to back up the arguments I've been hearing from my members for years.

Beckie Menten—I agree. I think this is a really compelling story, and that it needs to be presented at the Commissioner level.

Bryan Cope—I think it's important for the Cal TF staff to hear if there is anyone in the room who disagrees with that approach. I completely support that approach and would go the next step and bring CEC Commissioner McAllister along to the CPUC Commissioner briefings.

Chuck Goldman—And be prepared to show that the bottom of the barrel TRMs aren't the norm, that there are some excellent models out there, and that there are also systems that can be transparent and independent.

Bryan Cope—Strategy-wise, you should try to bring representatives from this collaborative too.



Mike Campbell—I have the same sort of question I had with the Savings Below Code. This issue is very technical but has policy implications. I think this group would really benefit from regular updates, and we could even draft a short policy statement that can be used to communicate the group’s support. I really appreciate all of the work you’ve done on the issues already and think appending the PAC’s support would be very valuable.

Bryan Cope—Yes, and it would also be useful to have a concise one-page briefing document like what we used to brief the legislature in March.

- ACT: Cal TF staff to prepare short policy statement and one page briefing document on DEER alternatives to be reviewed at the next PAC meeting.

## **VI. Sacramento**

Peter Miller, NRDC—

First I would like to thank the Cal TF staff and PG&E government affairs in Sacramento for all of their hard work on this project. We all know scheduling things at the Capitol is difficult, and they made it all possible in the same day. It was also great to have representation from our broad collaborative—it was a really great first impression to give to everybody we met with.

We met with Sue Kately, Kipp Lepner, and staff from both Senate and Assembly committees. We also had very good attendance at our brown bag presentation: around 15 staffers.

The most frequently asked question was why the Cal TF was needed. Most of the people we spoke with quickly understood our explanation, which we found to be indicative of the growing awareness of the issue at the legislature. Sue Kately asked us to come back in a year and show her evidence of success.

## **VII. RFQ**

Alejandra Mejia, Cal TF staff—

### **Power Point Presentation**

Margie Gardner—Was there an expiration date for the initial term? How were members replaced?





Alejandra Mejia—Since we are very happy with how the group performed this first year, we asked the 29 current members if any of them wanted to stay on for another term. We were to have 30-50% step down, but only 3 members chose to do that. So going into this second RFQ process we only needed to fill three seats.

Peter Miller—I think the scoring was pretty straightforward. I don't think the additional scoring from the subcommittee changed the rankings much. There was a natural break at these 10 candidates. The question is, do we want more than 30 members, and if so, do we want these recommended members?

Steve Galanter—This was a very good pool of people. I think there were good people beyond these 10, but we needed to draw a line somewhere. There was a broader expertise base with these candidates—I appreciate that they bring refrigeration and HVAC experience to the TF. I'll also agree with Peter in that there were really no big discrepancies in any of the scores.

Bryan Cope—I think the same thing happened last year. We were pretty close in evaluating candidates. I recognize a few names on the list, and am so glad to see Mark Modera on there. He's a fantastic HVAC expert.

Beckie Menten—Did the scoring get sent out to us in advance this time?

Alejandra Mejia—That is a process question we struggled with. We didn't want to share the information too broadly, since it does include the evaluator's subjective evaluations. What we ended up doing was forwarding the deck with the final recommendations and asking that you contact me individually if you needed more information.

Beckie Menten—It's just tough to evaluate these candidates without the information.

Annette Beitel—Off course. This is something we can try to fine-tune next time around.

Howard Choy—I suggested on the evaluator call that we think about tweaking the criteria, otherwise we can end up at a point in time where the whole committee is retired IOU employees. However, I think this is something to keep in mind for the future—not an immediate issue with the current group. We may want to talk about how to ensure a good industry segmentation too.



Peter Miller—We also want to think about cycling people off at some point if people they want to keep staying on.

Annette Beitel—I agree. Howard, you're right. We've observed that the retired members are great contributors. They have a lot of experience. However, we do want to broaden the group representation.

Beckie—Next time it would be good to see what the holes are in the group's expertise and the resumes of the candidates that are being considered to fill those gaps.

- ACT: Consider revising scoring criteria for next RFQ.
- ACT: Ensure that all interested PAC members can thoroughly review all application materials from future RFQs.

Rachel Huang—How many people of the 29 or 30 in the current group actively participate? As we make decisions about the number of people on the forum, it would be good to know generally how many people participate.

Annette Beitel—Attendance varies, but a majority of members participate either in person or by phone. We also have regular participation from out-of-state members.

Mike Campbell—I don't think I'll be able to vote because I haven't reviewed these candidates, but going from how well the group functioned this year I have faith that these are good recommendations. I trust the process. My largest concern is ensuring that there is broad representation in the group and that appears to be the case here.

Annette—Does anyone have any objections to this list of recommended TF members?

Group—No

Annette—All in favor?

Abstaining—Beckie Menten and Mike Campbell.

Rest of group—Approve recommended list for TF membership.

- Evaluation subcommittee recommendations approved for TF membership.