



# **Agenda & Meeting Notes**

## **California TF Policy Advisory Committee (PAC)**

**September 29, 2022**  
**Location: Teleconference Only**  
**10:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.**

### **Agenda**

- Quick Updates
- Draft 2023 Business Plan
- 2022 Business Plan Update

### **Meeting Materials**

- [Presentation - 2022-09-29](#)
- [DRAFT 2023 Business Plan v2 \(PDF\)](#)
- [DRAFT 2023 Business Plan v2 \(Word\)](#)
- [DRAFT 2023 Business Plan v2 redline](#)
- [DRAFT 2023 Business Plan v1 redline](#)

### **Attendees**

#### Cal TF Staff:

- Annette Beitel
- Ayad Al-Shaikh
- Arlis Reynolds
- Tomas Torres-Garcia
- Chau Nguyen

#### PAC Members and Guests:

- Amy Reardon, CPUC
- Armen Saiyan, LADWP
- Clark Mclsaac, CEDMC
- Emily Lemei, NCPA
- John Zwick, SDG&E
- Marc Costa, The Energy Coalition
- Martha Garcia, SCG
- Peter Miller, NRDC
- Ryan Cho, SCE
- Scott Fable, PG&E



## Meeting Notes

### Draft 2023 Business Plan

Arlis Reynolds presented a summary of the draft 2023 Business Plan (BP), developed based on 2022 activities and stakeholder needs and input. Cal TF Staff will update the BP based on PAC input, present to TF members, and update again based on stakeholder input before bringing back to the PAC for affirmation.

The following list summarizes comments and discussion points:

- Peter Miller – For Goal 6, what are some of the candidate white paper topics?
  - Annette Beitel – We have a list of candidate topics in the BP. One example is to create an Analysis Controller. CPUC staff and consultants have decided to move to EnergyPlus, and when that move is complete, there will be an easier way to pull/push information back and forth to the modeling tool to update measures in a more automated way. The Analysis Controllers would be a way to integrate EnergyPlus to update models and automatically populate updated measure information. We also plan to solicit stakeholder input on topics, and we will be mindful not to duplicate work.
  - Arlis Reynolds – the draft BP plan does show a list of examples topics, so there is an opportunity to give input on topics as part of BP development; and there will also be an opportunity to give additional input as part of the process of discussing and selecting the White Paper topics.
  - Annette Beitel – Cal TF nomenclature is that White Papers are similar to a scoping study: What’s the issue? What’s the regulatory context (CEC and/or CPUC)? What are the issues that parties have identified? What are some proposed approaches to have Cal TF productively engage in helping to work through this set of issues? A TPP is a more formal plan that is much more tactical and would go to the PAC before we do anything. These are planning tools to make sure that, for whatever future work Cal TF may take on, the issue is well documented and socialized across the main stakeholders. The items listed in the BP are illustrative and we can always add more.

John Zwick – A question for the group: Cal TF has focused a lot of its effort on “how we develop measures” and “how we develop technologies to make them into measure packages,” for example. Would there be value in Cal TF working on the “what” side of what we develop. E.g., we have the ET program that does a lot of work on the very front end, and then we have this chasm that ET has to leap to get to the point of being something viable for an energy program. This is a discussion topic for the group or something to consider: Is there value in having Cal TF do a survey of the market and



technologies across other utilities and providing recommendations on *what* we do, and not just streamlining the process of *how* we do it?

- Annette – This is a great strategic question that we could talk for hours about. We are going to note that question and come back to this when we talk about the planning process. This ties into Goal 8.
- Marc Costa – I’ll come back to this on comments for Goal 8.
- Annette – Let’s segway into Goal 8. This ties into something that Peter has commented about and relates to the process that the Northwest Regional Technical Forum (RTF) does, and that we’ve heard about from Greg and Don – this need for multi-year planning and the need for strategic planning. What’s the big picture? What’s the highest and best value? Pre-COVID, we would have day long in-person meetings, quarterly, rotating around the state. We would update on the BP and budget, and then we would have the whole afternoon to talk strategically about various issues, sometimes longer term or shorter term, related to the BP activities. So many of you have so many great ideas and thoughts. One of my wishes is to go to quarterly or at least twice a year in-person PAC meetings so the PAC can really be a body that provides strategic guidance and not just a checklist on BP goals. We would provide much better value for the whole enterprise of statewide coordination and really tackling issues collectively that matter most. It looks like we have some support for that.
- Marc Costa – I’m pleased to see the Goal 8 and agree with getting back in person for a whole day and then maybe going to happy hour and talking more. I’m glad Amy is on today and I’m not sure how many people have seen the latest OIR that the Commission issued on a “Comprehensive Customer Program Framework.” There are a lot of tie-ins to Cal TF. The Commission is recognizing that 1) we need a comprehensive framework to tie together all of the programs available to customers, including DER programs, and to consolidate/streamline the management, oversight, and authorization of programs that are in siloes. In Track 1, the first three tasks have a lot of alignment and synergies with what the TF does: creating a consistent set of metrics across all DERs, including EE and DR. We have the framework for that – the how, the process. There may be a home for that in the Business Plan. Task 2 has to do with equipment performance standards – we again have the technology framework for housing those kinds of metrics on technologies. The last is a programmatic review across all these, the starting block of how the Commission will get its arms around these issues. Lastly, the Commission recognize their authority to intervene across all utilities in the state, that further reinforces the nature of the TF where we have the municipal utilities as member utilities. There are a lot of synergies in at least the initial track, and maybe there can be some conversations around that once the Commission issues the scoping memo. Maybe there is a primer conversation at the staff level.
  - [Draft OIR Customer Program Framework](#)



- Annette Beitel – The Business Plan is tactical and what you’re talking about is more vision, and that’s what the roadmap is for. I’d be reluctant to put too much more in the Business Plan. Another thing I want to add to the discussion is that we have all this new Federal legislation and funding that could be used to leverage all the utilities efforts; this is probably something we want to be thinking about.

***ACT – Cal TF will post the updated versions of the Business Plan; PAC members should review and provide feedback by October 13 (two weeks).***

### 2022 Business Plan Update

Arlis Reynolds presented a high-level status summary of the 2022 Business Plan tactics, including tactics completed, in progress, paused, and not started.

The following list summarizes comments and discussion points:

- Armen Saiyan – The governance items are a good example for an item that is better discussed in person.
- Annette Beitel – Agreed, this requires some concentrated discussion. This will require having documents in front of people and a deeper discussion. We could put in the BP that we will schedule a day-long in-person meeting to get meaningful input on these documents.

Arlis Reynolds asked for feedback on what the PAC would like to see in the quarterly BP updates.

- Annette Beitel – In previous years, we would present BP updates in our quarterly, in-person PAC meetings, using a PowerPoint presentation posted on Cal TF website. For each goal, we would show what we have done, what remains, what’s going well, and challenges/successes; and we would tee-up any issues that we thought would be beneficial for the PAC to discuss.
- John Zwick – There are two kinds of things to provide status in an easy format: milestones and KPIs. For example, for Measure Package Updates, you could provide a number by month. E.g., how many MP updates were completed each month and YTD. That provides a better picture of the workload. Other examples are number of review comments.
- Annette Beitel – It is important to show the metrics that PAC may be interested in. For example: How many new measures did you get this month; how many measure package updates, etc. We could put together a template specific to the 2023 Business Plan with high-level metrics that the PAC would find useful, with appendixes that the WP development team would find useful.
- John Zwick – Tracking the data helps show the successes and highlight the challenges. We need to communicate the level of effort and value that the Cal TF team has been providing.



Annette Beitel asked for input on returning to in-person meetings:

- Armen Saiyan – Agree that in-person sessions have a lot more engagement; we get a lot more feedback as well.
- Peter Miller – Agree on the move back to in-person. We are also trying to get back to in-person at work. It's better attention, we have better side-bar discussions, better for building relationships.
- Scott Fable – Also look forward to the opportunity for in-person.
- Martha Garcia – Agree with everyone on the in-person meetings. It will be good to alternate locations. Appreciate Cal TF affirming that it will not be duplicating ongoing efforts.
- Ryan Cho – No objections to in-person; in-person meetings will be helpful.
- Clark McIsaac – Agree to in-person.
- Emily Lemei – Support meeting in person whenever possible.

### **Next Steps**

PAC members should review and provide input on the draft 2023 Business Plan by Thursday, October 13, 2022.