



Agenda & Notes

Cal TF Policy Advisory Committee (PAC)

Teleconference #1

September 25, 2019

3:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Time	Agenda Item	Discussion Leader(s)
3:00 – 3:05	Opening	Annette Beitel
3:05 – 3:20	RFQ Results & New Member Affirmation	Tim Melloch, Representative of Bid Evaluation Committee
3:20 – 3:55	Updated eTRM Launch Plan with focus on CPUC Staff Questions/Requests/Benefits	Annette Beitel & Ayad Al-Shaikh
3:55 – 4:00	Close Recap agreements & action items	Annette Beitel

Meeting Materials

- Memo: Final 2019 Cal TF RFQ Scoring Committee Results v 5.0 (Confidential)
- Slide Deck: eTRM Launch Plan v 14.0



Attendees

Cal TF Staff:

- Annette Beitel
- Tim Melloch
- Ayad Al-Shaikh
- Jennifer Barnes

PAC Members:

- Don Gilligan, NAESCO
- Alok Singh, SCE
- Martha Garcia, SCG
- Paul Pruschki, SDG&E
- Bryan Cope, SCPPA
- Greg Wikler, CEDMC
- Scott Fable, PG&E
- Becki Menton, Center for Sustainable Energy
- Peter Miller, NRDC
- Josh Rasin, SMUD

Notes

RFQ RESULTS & NEW MEMBER AFFIRMATION

Presenter: Tim Melloch

Tim Melloch, Cal TF Staff and RFQ evaluator, presented the process and results of the recent RFQ for new members, as follows:

Overview and Background

Cal TF Staff released a Request for Qualification (RFQ) on May 7, 2019 to fill Cal TF Member vacancies starting in October 2019. The RFQ yielded a pool of diverse and highly qualified potential candidates. Jennifer Barnes, Cal TF Staff, led the RFQ and bid evaluation process and worked with a committee of current Cal TF members to evaluate the applications. The evaluation committee consisted of the following individuals:

- Mary Matteson Bryan – Cal TF Member, Independent Consultant
- Doug Mahone – Cal TF Member, retired, formerly Hescong- Mahone Group/TRC



- Armen Saiyan – Cal TF Member, LADWP
- Tim Melloch – Cal TF Staff, Senior Technical Advisor

Candidate Evaluation Process

The scoring process included objective criteria and a calibration exercise. The objective criteria included education, work experience, and other measurable qualifications. The calibration involved consideration of upcoming Cal TF workload needs and prospective members that could best complement the existing membership. The calibration also involved discussion of each candidate's education, areas of technical expertise, technology expertise, affiliation, and evidence of ability to effectively collaborate.

We sought to fill a minimum of 10 openings, with an additional five more that could be added to bring the overall Cal TF membership to a maximum of 35 members. Based on the upcoming Cal TF workload to screen third-party new measure requests, the evaluators recommend 15 candidates.

Results

The Bid Evaluation Committee recommends a highly qualified and experienced set of new Cal TF Members to complement the existing members. The consensus recommended candidates are presented below.



Table 1. Bid Evaluation Committee Recommendations for New TF Members

Applicant Name	Organization
Abhijeet Pande	TRC
Mudit Saxena	Vistar Energy
Dave Hanna	Independent Consultant
Scott Blunk	SMUD
Vrushali Mendon	Resource Refocus
Charles Ehrlich	Independent Consultant (PG&E)
Jeffrey Seto	AESC
Richard Ma	Ecology Action
Randy Kwok	PG&E
Lacey Tan	Frontier Energy
Jonathan Pera	Willdan Energy Solutions
Eric Noller	Energy Resources Integration
Alfredo Gutierrez	Lime Energy
Akhilesh Endurthy	Solaris Technical
Andrew Parker	NREL

Collectively, the prospective members are well-educated and experienced. Twelve of the 15 recommended professionals have advanced degrees; 5 are registered professional engineers. They have on average 17 years of experience.

Through the RFQ process, we sought to enrich capabilities in several areas given the upcoming work Cal TF expects, including modeling, “traditional” EM&V experience, NMEC and codes and standards. The candidate pool is enriched with the skills and expertise that we sought, as follows: modeling (13/15), EM&V (4/15), NMEC (7/15) and codes and standards (11/15). The members represent a broad range of organizations, including: 1) national lab (NREL), 2) independent consultant (2), 3) IOU/POU (2) and energy consulting or technical engineering firm (10). In addition, most have experience with evaluating energy and demand impacts of deemed measures and/or custom projects, this experience spans all building and customer types.



Table 2. Summary of Candidate Characteristics

Candidate Characteristic	Number
Advanced Degrees	12/15
Registered Professional Engineer	5/15
Average Years' Experience	17
Modeling Experience	13/15
EM&V Experience (traditional)	4/15
NMEC Experience	7/15
Codes and Standards Experience	11/15

Q: Are there any questions?

Bryan Cope: One of the candidates does a lot of work for PG&E. Are they required to be independent?

Annette Beitel: Bryan raises a legitimate concern and we've had to respond to questions about conflicts many times in the past. In the solicitation document, we made it clear that the members are expected to render technical opinions based on their best professional judgment. Everyone brings a bias, whether professional or personal. If the independent evaluators like the work we submit, then we feel like we have good balance of TF members. If we start receiving feedback from the ex ante consultants that Cal TF is not submitting objective, well-defended measures with savings estimates that are neither overly optimistic nor overly conservative, which is the Commission's policy, then we'll carefully review whether, as a body, the Cal TF is producing biased values. In 2018 we submitted to the ex ante consultants over 100 statewide, deemed consolidated measures for ex ante consultant review, and we received favorable feedback. We did not receive any feedback that the work Cal TF performed was producing biased results. Cal TF staff regularly monitors for bias and conflicts.

In the past, we have had concerns when we have measures submitted by manufacturers. In these cases, we've needed to ask certain parties to leave during Cal TF deliberations.



Peter Miller: I'm curious about gender balance. The resulting recommendation looks heavily male-weighted.

Annette Beitel: In last solicitation, we actively sought out women and we received more female applicants. We didn't do so much of that outreach this time.

On behalf of the Cal TF 2019 Bid Evaluation Committee, Cal TF Staff is seeking oral affirmation of the recommended slate of 15 candidates.

Annette Beitel: All in favor say "aye" opposed say "nay".
The PAC members unanimously approved the candidates.

UPDATED LAUNCH PLAN

Presenter: Annette Beitel and Ayad Al-Shaikh

CPUC staff core concerns:

1. Can eTRM replace DEER
2. Is eTRM really complete? Does it have everything that DEER has?

Answer to the first question is yes, eTRM can replace DEER.

Regarding the second question, is eTRM complete? Yes and no because we did not pull historical information into eTRM, only information that supports the current active, statewide consolidated deemed measures. In addition, the eTRM does not contain all references supporting DEER modeled measures. Despite considerable effort on Cal TF Staff's part, we were not able to locate all documentation for DEER measures. We have notified CPUC Staff and the current ex ante consultants and sent them a detailed list of DEER measure information that we could not find, which they appreciated. We hope to work with the current ex ante consultants on an ongoing basis to help either find or create documentation for missing DEER measures.

The transition plan is intended to be gradual starting October 15, 2019, with testing and acceptance in 2020. If the CPUC approves eTRM as the "Database of Record", then Cal TF Staff's proposal is that the eTRM would be the "Database of Record" starting 1/1/21.

Manisha and the current ex ante team provided input and guidance on the timeline when Cal TF Staff met with them early in June over a two-day period. We need to discuss the proposed timeline with the current CPUC lead for the eTRM, Amy Reardon, which we have not yet done.



The eTRM will launch on October 15th. The eTRM will include a complete set of statewide deemed measures approved by the CPUC, both DEER and non-DEER measures

Recent Commission Resolution E-5009 clarified that the Commission must approve the eTRM before it can be the Database of Record.

Cal TF Staff worked with the core eTRM organizations (the four IOUs, the two POUs, the CEC and the CPUC) to identify enhancements to the eTRM that we will seek to complete in 2020. The enhancements were largely identified during the two eTRM version 1.0 “testing and acceptance” periods. Some of the items are enhancements or improvements to current features, others are new features. During our meeting with CPUC Staff and the “Group A” ex ante consultants in early June, the CPUC staff and their consultants identified several items on the enhancements list that they consider essential before the eTRM could be the “Database of Record.” We will prioritize those enhancements.

We subsequently met with Jennifer Kalafut at a one-hour “meet and greet” meeting that she asked for. We focused generally on the eTRM launch and did not have time to cover the specific enhancements, so we will need to follow up with the CPUC staff currently assigned to the eTRM project, Amy Reardon.

Martha Garcia: Who did you meet with?

Annette Beitel: Jennifer Kalafut, Peter Lai, Jorge Tagnipes

Can eTRM perform all functions that DEER can perform?

Ayad Al-Shaikh: DEER consists of multiple websites and databases that are not linked. So when we talk about “DEER functions” we are really referring to multiple sites/databases, etc. that are not connected or integrated. Since the sites are not integrated and linked, when utilities and implementers pull measure information, for example to do a cost-effectiveness analysis, the effort is time consuming and the system structure lends itself to delays and mistakes.

Becki Menton: I understand that you are having to do a lot of education with CPUC staff. Is there any institutional knowledge at the higher levels that we would be helpful?



Annette Beitel: We don't sense resistance from the current staff, just that they have to be educated. The system is complex, and we believe it will be an education process over time. At some point we do expect to meet with staff higher in the organization, but we don't plan to do this until the eTRM is released on October 15th.

Next Steps

We have another call scheduled next week.