



**California Technical Forum (Cal TF):  
First Policy Advisory Committee (PAC)  
Stakeholder Organizing Meeting  
Wednesday, December 18, 2013**

**I. Participants**

In Person:

Lauren Casentini, California Energy Efficiency Industry Council (Efficiency Council)  
Margie Gardner, California Energy Efficiency Industry Council (Efficiency Council)  
Don Arambula, Southern California Edison (SCE)  
Devin Rauss, Southern California Edison (SCE)  
Thom Eckhart, National Association of Energy Service Companies (NAESCO)  
Peter Miller, Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)  
Lara Ettenson, Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)  
John Goodin, California Independent System Operator (CAISO)  
Lorenzo Kristov, California Independent System Operator (CAISO)  
Mike Campbell, Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA)  
Jan Berman, Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E)  
Jana Corey, Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E)  
Gillian Wright, Southern California Gas (SoCalGas)  
Pete Skala, California Public Utilities Commission Energy Division (ED)  
Athena Besa, San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E)  
Ted Regul, San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E)  
Annette Beitel, Future Energy Enterprises (FutEE)  
Alejandra Mejia, Future Energy Enterprises (FutEE)

On the Phone:

Sylvia Bender, California Energy Commission (CEC)  
Bryan Cope, Southern California Public Power Authority (SCPPA)  
Tony Andreoni, California Municipal Utilities Association (CMUA)  
Don Gilligan, National Association of Energy Service Companies (NAESCO)  
Melissa Helphingstine, Future Energy Enterprises (FutEE)

## **II. Key Action Items/Proposed Changes**

### Action Items to Discuss at Next PAC

1. Flow Chart of Cal TF Organization and Funding (Gardner, Efficiency Counsel)
2. Flow chart of Commission staff and staff consultant involvement in new WP review process (Reguly, Semptra)
3. Current and future work flow maps for WP Processing – “as is” vs. “to be” (Campbell, DRA; Reguly, Semptra)
4. DAWG and Cal TF overlap/leveraging (Kristov, CAISO)
  - Does Cal TF overlap with DAWG?
  - How would Cal TF work relate to DAWG work?
  - Create flowchart depicting Cal TF/DAWG relationship.
5. Describe problems to be fixed through Cal TF (Reguly, Semptra)
6. Propose metrics that on how Cal TF will be measured in Phase I (Reguly, Semptra)
7. Discuss/settle on mission/vision (Reguly, Semptra)
8. When does Commission staff involvement trigger Bagley-Keene (or ex parte) (Besa, Semptra)
9. Review/discuss comments on organizing documents.
  - attendees want to understand the Cal TF and make information accessible and transparent to members.

### Other Action Items

1. Identify technical issues that PAC may wish to learn about/discuss (Kristov, CAISO)
2. Review/summarize other models and lessons learned from them (Kristov, CAISO)
3. How does Cal TF interface with CEC, CPUC and CAISO? Create flow charts. (Various)

### Proposed Changes to Current Cal TF Model

1. Consensus decision-making for both PAC and TF (Campbell, DRA; Skala, Commission Staff)
2. Consider no recusal for conflicts in consensus decision-making model (Skala, Commission Staff)
3. Greater membership for POUs on PAC (POUs) (Cope, SCPPA; others)
4. Consider name change for Cal TF and PAC in January meeting (Commission staff)

### **III. Agenda Item #1: Opening and Round Table Discussion**

#### **Discussion: What Do You Hope to Get from Cal TF?**

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—We need more accessibility, more transparency. How does collaboration interplay with the scientific truth that staff needs?

Ted Reguly, SDG&E—Cal TF should move towards industry standard best practice, less contentious process, needs to really be a collaborative.

Gillian Wright, So Cal Gas—Wants to have information come from broader set of experts.

Jan Berman, PG&E—Likes the NW RTF model that gathers input from a broad range of tech experts.

Lauren Casentini, Efficiency Council—Cal TF can bring together expertise, while also including “truth on the ground” from those who actually work with customers.

Don Arambula, SCE—We need to be quick about getting to a collaborative process.

Brian Cope, SCPA—Supports every comment, because members are really interested in a truly state-wide database.

Don Gilligan, NAESCO—We seek collaboration, simplicity, predictability, consistency.

Lorenzo Kristov, CAISO—We would like to rely on this effort to help us better model EE; ten years out, location specific.

Silvia Bender, CEC—We need consistent methodologies, more agreement on those numbers, is there a possible link between DAWG and Cal TF?

Mike Campbell, DRA—I support, but I haven’t yet discussed with my management/leadership. I’m unclear as how it will be helpful in addition to what staff already does. Possibly help us with timing discipline, but the commission could do that.

Ted Reguly, SDG&E—We really have to define the process so it won’t be duplicative, and it will be productive.

John Goodin, CAISO—Reiterate, how does it interface with DAWG? We want to avoid duplicity and understand how the outputs interface with the CPUC and CEC—this needs to be defined.

#### **IV. Agenda Item #2: Cal TF Proposal**

##### **Need for/Benefit Of Cal TF**

(on slide 3)

Comments

John Goodin, CAISO—Are technical rigor and transparency not occurring in the current process?

Ted Reguly, SDG&E—There has been a lot of contentiousness, litigation, expense, and not transparency and timeliness.

John Goodin, CAISO—And this will solve it?

Jan Berman, PG&E—In addition, there is currently no statewide consistent process for determining technical values.

Ted Reguly—Also, we want to come to a result that isn't continuously questioned, and values we can all understand and buy into.

Peter Miller, NRDC—There's a real opportunity here to create a national model—DOE, EPA are interested in this.

##### **Other Models**

Lorenzo Kristov, CAISO—What can we learn from the models in the East, Efficiency Vermont and Delaware?

- Review/summarize other models and lessons learned from them.

(on slide 4)

##### **Organizational Structure**

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—What is the organizational structure?

Annette Beitel, FutEE— Co-funding utilities will enter into contract with administrator.

- Create visual of organizational structure.

### **PAC Involvement in Technical Issues**

Lorenzo Kristov, CAISO—CAISO Board of Governors really gets involved in technical issues that it considers.

Peter Miller, NRDC and Annette Beitel, FutEE—We want TF members to have independence on technical issues and not be biased by PAC.

- Identify technical issues that PAC may wish to discuss/learn more about.

### **Cal TF Funding**

John Goodin, CAISO—How is Cal TF funded?

Ted Reguly, SDG&E—I don't know when we address it, but it's important. Are we including the POU's in funding?

Peter Miller, NRDC—In the long term.

### **POU Membership/Funding**

Brian Cope, SCPPA—Cost exposure is an ongoing concern particularly for our small utilities. Immediately helping with funding is more difficult than in the mid-term or next phase of funding. Keep in mind that SCPPA is tasked with representing small and large POU's.

Also, I propose expanding the POU number on the PAC to four members: SCPPA, NCPA, SMUD, LADWP.

Annette Beitel, FutEE—When we approached the POU's, they expressed interest in the Cal TF model, but, for Phase I, the POU's have already funded a separate initiative, a POU TRM (Technical Reference Manual). The values in the POU TRM will not match values in DEER, so the current approach will not lead to statewide- consistent values.

### **Involvement of Other Environmental Groups in Cal TF**

Lorenzo Kristov, CAISO—Is there any way NRDC can work with EDF, etc to provide a more collective representation of environmental interests?

Lara Ettensen, NRDC - Yes, absolutely, NRDC will work with other environmental groups, and has done this in the past on other efforts.

**V. Agenda Item #2 (Continued): Cal TF Funding and Membership**

John Goodin, CAISO—The way I look at it, 5 IOU votes vs. 8 non-IOU doesn't seem balanced.

Ted Reguly, SDG&E—We all have customers, and we need to make sure this benefits those who are funding it.

Brian Cope, SCPA—Not ok with these statements.

Gillian Wright, SoCalGas—Just to be clear, this isn't the voting balance for technical issues, such as savings estimates.

Don Gilligan, NAESCO—On funding: I think we all agree that those to be served are the customers, not the utilities... disproportionate IOU representation may go against all that.

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—You could possibly change the rules... require "two from each pot."

John Goodin, CAISO—Are there shareholder incentives earned in the NW and other models?

Peter Miller, NRDC— Yes, there are shareholder incentives in the NW.

**Voting Discussion**

Mike Campbell, DRA—Worried about DRA having only one vote—prefers "collaborative" decision-making instead of only voting... DRA is more likely to participate the more collaborative it is.

Peter Miller, NRDC—Of course, we will not be successful if we ended up having a lot of split votes.

Lara Ettenson, NRDC—How often do you have to get to a vote at the PAC level? What's the reality on the ground?

Peter Miller, NRDC— More so at the beginning to set it up... much less so later. Like most boards, the feedback will become more important than the voting.

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—I would expect that a big part of the PAC would be strategic work planning.

Mike Campbell, DRA—What does determining work mean?

Brian Cope, SCPPA—I will reiterate that we are not ok with the current representation of POUs on PAC.

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—Another option is rotating board seats.

Jan Berman, PG&E—Are we all ok on having the four POU representatives attend?

Note: General indications of support for this idea.

Annette Beitel, FutEE—We don't need to formally define who will be on the PAC now but can note this as an issue to resolve.

- Further discussion of POU representation of POU representatives on PAC.

(on slide 5)

### **Funding Discussion**

Lorenzo Kristov, CAISO—TF members are funding their own activities?

Peter Mille, NRDC—Labor is volunteer, but there is a potential to reimburse expenses.

Ted Regul, SDG&E—What is the cost?

Peter Miller, NRDC—Rough estimate is 1-2 million for the first year.

Annette Beitel, FutEE—The budget is scalable. It depends largely on the number of work papers the TF works on, including the number and types of measures that will get analyzed.

Peter Miller, NRDC—Another question is whether work papers are initiated internally.

### **Process Efficiency**

Ted Regul, SDG&E—The money: have we considered possible synergies? I want faster, better, cheaper... I don't want more bureaucracy.

Pete Skala, ED—Is this group just going to re-review what we already looked at?

Ted Reguly, SDG&E—My hope is to involve Commission staff on the work paper development process so that at the end ED will already have some built-in buy in.

Don Arambula, SCE—At a minimum, this process will get you one work paper instead of four on the same measure. We may have to invest some dollars first before we see lower costs.

Ted Reguly, SDG&E—I just want to make sure we design this thing to enhance the process and not be duplicative of the existing process.

### **Cal TF Work Scope**

Pete Skala, ED—Can we make sure we are all talking about the same work scope? Are we looking at DEER, non-DEER, custom, etc?

Annette Beitel, FutEE—The charter contains a broader vision of what the Cal TF will work on over time. The 2014 work plan has a more narrow scope, focused on new measure workpapers to “prove the concept.”

### **Conflicts and Who Can Be on TF**

Pete Skala, ED—Will any of the TF members be implementers in California?

Peter Miller, NRDC—Yes, but they will have to recuse themselves if they have a conflict.

Pete Skala, ED—I’m not sure recusing them from votes is good enough, because how do you recuse yourself from the consensus-building discussion.

- Consider no recusal for conflicts in consensus decision-making.

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—Have we considered a two step process: strive towards consensus and then vote? It is very important to have the people that know the customers be involved.

Gillian Wright, SoCalGas—The key thing is to strive for balance—no overwhelming majority of any specific bias.

Mike Campbell, DRA—I think giving them [implementers] a chance to vote on the TF is dangerous and a slippery slope.

Lara Ettenson, NRDC—In the NW, the meetings are open and public and opportunity for public comment.



### **What is a Measure?**

Lorenzo Kristov, CAISO—What is the definition of a measure?

Annette Beitel, FutEE— The Commission’s Energy Policy Manual defines a measure as a piece of equipment or practice that reduces energy use while maintaining the same level of service.

Lorenzo Kristov, CAISO—But an audit in itself doesn’t reduce use....

Group—Actually, EM&V would say it does.

Pete Skala, ED—What is a measure combination? That caught us off guard.

Annette Beitel, FutEE— A measure combination is a distinct row in the ex ante measure database tables.

### **Role of Commission (CPUC) Staff and its Consultants**

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—I was happy to see that Commission DEER consultants will be there, is that true? I like that ED can participate at any level, it will make it less duplicative and contentious.

Annette Beitel, FutEE and Peter Miller, NRDC—We absolutely want input from Commission staff and their consultants throughout the WP review process, but there are legal issues that may constrain how they are able to participate in the TF. We need further clarification on this point from Commission staff.

Ted Reguly, SDG&E—We might have to figure out a way to deal with those legal concerns and really get ED involved because that is very important.

- ACT: Get feedback from Commission staff on how and when Commission staff and its consultants will provide input to the TF during the WP development/review process. Create flow chart of same.

Mike Campbell, DRA—I would like to see a work flow map before we even vote on guidelines.

- Create work flow map for WP process – current “as is” and proposed new process.

Gillian Wright, SoCalGas—I’d caution you against “better, faster, cheaper” because, as the old adage notes, you just get to pick two of three. I think at

the beginning it may be helpful to have staff be at an arm's length second set of eyes.

Pete Skala, ED—I'm just trying to understand what gets added here that doesn't already exist.

### **Cal TF and DAWG: Overlap and Synergies**

Lorenzo Kristov, CAISO—CAISO has stepped up its involvement in DAWG (Demand Analysis Working Group). CAISO also considers energy savings. We need to better understand any overlap or synergies between Cal TF and DAWG.

- Summarize Cal TF and DAWG work/roles. Create flowchart that depicts Cal TF and DAWG links and overlap.

## **VI. Agenda Item #3: Next Steps and Document Review**

### **Schedule**

Annette Beitel, FutEE— We would like to limit Cal TF PAC “pre-launch” meetings to no more than three. The “pre-launch” documents were sent out with the agenda for comments, and comments are due **January 10, 2014**. If comments on documents are conflicting, we can redact non-consensus language that is not mission-critical. The draft Technical Forum Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for PAC comment is forthcoming. Meetings will include:

- January PAC Meeting (date tbd): Respond to PAC comments/questions and discuss PAC comments on documents.
- February PAC Meeting: PAC approval of Cal TF launch documents. Approve PAC Co-Chairs/TF Chair.
- March PAC Meeting: PAC selection/approval of TF members.
- First TF meeting: April

### **TF Member Selection**

Athena Besa, SDG&E—Who will go through the RFQ responses?

Annette Beitel, FutEE and Peter Miller, NRDC—whoever from PAC who wants to volunteer. Full PAC will then approve final selection in February.

### **Document Review**

Annette Beitel, FutEE—I will send out latest and greatest documents Friday morning. Document time closer to a month because of the holidays, though normally will be ten (10) business days.

In January, we will discuss name changes in January to “Cal TF” and PAC.

- In January meeting, discuss name changes for Cal TF and PAC.

Pete Skala, ED—I noted some errors in the DEER history.

- Correct error in DEER history, per Commission staff. (Note: Done and reflected in revised documents circulated for review after the PAC meeting. Thanks to Pete Skala for providing his very quick initial review and comments).

Pete Skala, ED—I don’t think making statewide values consistent makes them accurate or credible—making them right makes them credible.

Annette Beitel, FutEE– Pete is right. Consensus does not mean correct. Remember what happened to Galileo.

### **Role of TF vs. Commission Staff in Workpaper Development/Review**

Lorenzo Kristov, CAISO—Elaborate on “approve work papers.”

Annette Beitel, FutEE—The TF will develop and/or review Workpapers. However, ultimately the Commission and staff retain the right to approve WP and ex ante values for the IOUs.

### **Documenting Cal TF Mission, Performance Metrics, “As Is” and “To Be” States**

Ted Reguly, SDG&E—It’s important to document the as-is state and the to-be state, and the problems to be fixed through the Cal TF before we vote on bylaws as part of our fiduciary duty. Also, we need to settle on mission-vision, how will we measure performance, etc?

- Flow chart of WP “as is” and “to be”
- Describe problems to be fixed through Cal TF
- Propose/discuss metrics on how Cal TF performance will be measured in Phase 1 (2014)
- Discuss/settle on mission/vision

Ted Reguly, SDG&E—I still think it’s awesome.

Annette Beitel, FutEE—To be clear, we are not looking to criticize the current model.

### **Applicability of Bagley – Keene (and Ex Parte) to Cal TF**

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—Is CAISO voting or not?

Athena Besa, SDG&E—Does the level of agency representation affect Bagley-Keene?

- When does Commission staff involvement trigger Bagley-Keene open meeting requirements (or ex parte requirements)?

### **What Is Consensus Decision-Making?**

Lorenzo Kristov, CAISO—Does consensus mean unanimity?

Annette Beitel, FutEE, Pete Skala, ED, Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—Basically, “all can live with.”

### **Funding Flow to Support Cal TF**

Margie Gardener, Efficiency Council— How will the funding flow through a non-existing organization?

Annette Beitel, FutEE— The funding entities (in 2014, the IOUs) will enter into a co-funding agreement with one of the funding entities (the “sponsoring entity”). In turn, the sponsoring entity will enter into an agreement with the Cal TF chair/administrator. The funds will be used to fund the chair and Cal TF staff. Would probably be helpful to review a chart in the next PAC meeting to help visualize the funding flow.

- ACT: Create flow chart of funding flow through Cal TF.

### **What Documents Apply to PAC vs. TF**

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—What applies to whom?

Annette Beitel, FutEE—Conflicts policy, code of conduct and code of independence apply to TF. Code of conduct and conflicts policy to all (PAC and TF).

Attachment

1. Meeting Agenda
2. Attendee Contact Information

**Attachment 1:**  
**Agenda**  
**California Technical Forum (Cal TF):**  
**First Policy Advisory Committee (PAC)**  
**Stakeholder Organizing Meeting**  
**Wednesday, December 18, 2013**

Natural Resources Defense Council  
111 Sutter Street, 20<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California  
1:00 pm – 4:00 pm  
Conference Line: 760-569-6000, 844452#

<b>Time</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Discussion Leader</b>
1:00 – 1:30	<b>Opening</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Welcome</li><li>• Introductions</li><li>• <u>Roundtable</u>: What do you hope to get from the Cal TF?</li></ul>	Peter Miller, NRDC
1:30 – 2:45	<b>Cal TF Proposal</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Overview of Proposal and Key Attributes</li><li>• Guiding Principles: Overview and how Cal TF proposal will achieve</li><li>• <u>Roundtable</u>: Questions, comments, discussion</li></ul>	Peter Miller, NRDC
2:45 – 3:00	<b>Break</b>	
3:00 – 3:50	<b>Next Steps</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Upcoming Schedule</li><li>• Document Review<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ <b>NOTE</b>: Participants are <b>not</b> expected to review documents below prior to the meeting (except for the Cal TF proposal). This section will be a brief discussion of attached documents to ease subsequent review and comment.</li></ul></li></ul>	Annette Beitel, FutEE
3:50 – 4:00	<b>Closing</b>	Peter Miller, NRDC

**Meeting Materials - DRAFT DOCUMENTS FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT**

- Cal TF Presentation – Deck
- Charter
- Bylaws
- Conflicts of Interest Policy
- Code of Independence/ Code of Conduct
- 2014 Business Plan
- Technical Forum Member Request for Qualifications (RFQ) (forthcoming)

## Attachment 2: Meeting Attendee Contact List

Name	Organizational Affiliation	E-Mail
Lauren Casentini	California Energy Efficiency Industry Council	lcasentini@rsgrp.com
Margie Gardner	California Energy Efficiency Industry Council	mgardner@efficiencycouncil.org
Don Arambula	Southern California Edison	don.arambula@sce.com
Devin Rauss	Southern California Edison	<a href="mailto:Devin.rauss@sce.com">Devin.rauss@sce.com</a>
Thom Eckhart	National Association of Energy Service Companies	<a href="mailto:tom@ucons.com">tom@ucons.com</a>
Don Gilligan	National Association of Energy Service Companies	donaldgilligan@comcast.com
Peter Miller	Natural Resources Defense Council	<a href="mailto:pmiller@nrdc.org">pmiller@nrdc.org</a>
Lara Ettenson	Natural Resources Defense Council	lettenson@nrdc.org
John Goodin	California Independent System Operator	<a href="mailto:jgoodin@caiso.com">jgoodin@caiso.com</a>
Lorenzo Kristov	California Independent System Operator	<a href="mailto:lkristov@caiso.com">lkristov@caiso.com</a>
Mike Campbel	Division of Ratepayer Advocates	<a href="mailto:Michael.campbell@cpuc.ca.gov">Michael.campbell@cpuc.ca.gov</a>
Jan Berman	Pacific Gas & Electric	<a href="mailto:JSBA@pge.com">JSBA@pge.com</a>
Jana Corey	Pacific Gas & Electric	<a href="mailto:JRCJ@pge.com">JRCJ@pge.com</a>
Gillian Wright	Southern California Gas	<a href="mailto:gwright@semprautilities.com">gwright@semprautilities.com</a>
Pete Skala	California Public Utilities Commission	<a href="mailto:Pete.skala@cpuc.ca.gov">Pete.skala@cpuc.ca.gov</a>
Athena Besa	San Diego Gas & Electric	<a href="mailto:abesa@SempraUtilities.com">abesa@SempraUtilities.com</a>

Ted Reguly	San Diego Gas & Electric	<a href="mailto:treguly@SemptraUtilities.com">treguly@SemptraUtilities.com</a>
Annette Beitel	Future Energy Enterprises	<a href="mailto:Annette.Beitel@futee.biz">Annette.Beitel@futee.biz</a>
Alejandra Mejia	Future Energy Enterprises	<a href="mailto:Alejandra.Mejia@futee.biz">Alejandra.Mejia@futee.biz</a>
Melissa Helphingstine	Future Energy Enterprises	<a href="mailto:Melissa.Helphingstine@futee.biz">Melissa.Helphingstine@futee.biz</a>
Sylvia Bender	California Energy Commission	Sylvia.bender@energy.ca.gov
Bryan Cope	Southern California Public Power Authority	<a href="mailto:bcope@scppa.org">bcope@scppa.org</a>
Tony Andreoni	California Municipal Utilities Association	<a href="mailto:tandreoni@cmua.org">tandreoni@cmua.org</a>