



**California Technical Forum (Cal TF):  
Policy Advisory Committee (PAC)  
Stakeholder Organizing Meeting  
Wednesday, January 29, 2014**

**I. Participants**

In Person:

Scott Fable, Bay Area Regional Energy Network (Bay REN)  
Dan Rendler, Southern California Gas Company (So Cal Gas)  
Andrew Steinberg, Southern California Gas Company (So Cal Gas)  
Mike Campbell, Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA)  
Jaclyn Marks, California Public Utilities Commission Energy Division (ED)  
Jana Corey, Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E)  
Margie Gardner, California Energy Efficiency Industry Council (Efficiency Council)  
Lara Ettenson, Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)  
Ann Kelly, City and County of San Francisco (SF)  
Beckie Menten, Marin Energy Authority (Marin Energy)  
Annette Beitel, Future Energy Enterprises (FutEE)  
Alejandra Mejia, Future Energy Enterprises (FutEE)

On the Phone:

Don Arambula, Southern California Edison (SCE)  
Sang Han, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)  
John Goodin, California Independent System Operator (CAISO)  
Sylvia Bender, California Energy Commission (CEC)  
Melissa Helphingstine, Future Energy Enterprises (FutEE)  
Steve Galanter, Southern California Edison (SCE)\*  
Grant Brohard, Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E)\*  
Chris Ann Dickerson, Demand Analysis Working Group (DAWG)\*

\*On call only for the first agenda item

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

Critical Path, RFQ Changes and Clarifications



1. Narrow conflicts of interest related to bidding on government contracts language for RFQ
  - TF meetings will be open to the public—will this help with the conflict issue? (Corey)
  - Clarify which government contracts are affected by conflict policy (Gardner)
  - Are IOU contracts (ratepayer funds) affected?
  - Look at statutory citation (Beitel)
  - Submit examples to CPUC legal for interpretation
2. Changes to RFQ language—any other changes must be submitted in writing within ten (10) business days of January 29<sup>th</sup>
  - Clarify what “being in the energy efficiency industry” means (Steinberg)
  - Add language about what type of work is expected in the first year (Gardner)
  - Specify that we are looking for both generalists and specialists so applicants don’t self out of pool (Fable)
3. Changes to bid evaluation documents and process
  - A range of one to five doesn’t allow for much variation in rankings (Kelly)
  - Allow for the possibility of interviews and/or further questions (Marks)
4. Group will submit names for potential bidders list ASAP
  - Would like a broad range of experts and backgrounds; breadth of sector experience
  - IOU people, IOU contractors, DOE, academics, implementers, retired engineers, from other states
5. Those interested in serving in the selection committee will e-mail Annette within ten (10) business days of January 29<sup>th</sup>

#### Action Items to Discuss at Next PAC

1. Further clarify the role of the PAC (Gardner, Menten, and Corey)
  - Who is the decision maker on scope of work?
  - Do the roles of ED and IOU staff need to be reflected on organizational diagram?
2. Explain abstract and other details of new WP process (Steinberg, Kelly)
  - What are the guidelines that go into developing a WP abstract? They should be made explicit.
  - Who can submit a WP abstract?
  - Who approves abstracts and/or requests to do/review a WP?
  - Clarify names and roles of those involved (i.e. WP developer, TF member—do these mean implementer, IOU teach lead?)



- Can TF members also develop WPs?
- 3. Name change: The group will propose names for each of the three bodies (currently the Cal TF, PAC, and TF); each name shall be no more than three words and will have a palatable acronym (Beitel).

#### Other Action Items

1. Consider gift restrictions to TF members (Menten)
2. How do we want the DAWG/Cal TF relationship to function in the future? (Steinberg)
3. Consider acknowledging current “Informal to Formal” PAC model in writing

### **III. Agenda Item #1: Opening**

Annette Beitel—Run through of agenda and meeting objectives.

### **IV. Agenda Item #2: December 18<sup>th</sup> Meeting Follow-UP/Report-Out**

#### **Flow Chart of Cal TF Organization and Funding Flow**

Annette Beitel—Runs through organizational and funding flow slides. Explains that different funding entities will hold co-funding agreements with the Sponsoring Entity and the Sponsoring Entity will contract with the TF Administrator. The PAC is an advisory group to the TF.

Andrew Steinberg, So Cal Gas—What is the Sponsoring Entity?

Annette Beitel, FutEE—It is one of the funders, the one that holds all the money and contracts.

Jana Corey, PG&E—PG&E will be the Sponsoring Entity for the first year.

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—Thanks this is very helpful.

#### **“Old” vs. “New” Workpaper Process Flowcharts**

Annette Beitel, FutEE—Challenges with the current WP development process:

1. WPs are duplicative and there is little coordination across utilities
2. Quality of WPs should be better
3. There is a lack of IOU manager support for CPUC input
4. The process and timelines are long
5. Lack of transparency
6. Lack of collaboration between IOUs, and between IOUs and CPUC staff



## 7. Unclear and constantly changing WP requirements

Mike Campbell, DRA—What does “more collaboration” mean?

Jaclyn Marks, ED—Part of that means the Commission directive to staff to collaborate with the IOUs earlier in the WP development process. This has been difficult to implement. Another part is greater collaboration among the IOUs.

Peter Miller, NRDC—It also means getting statewide consistency between IOUs and POUs.

Annette Beitel, FutEE—Opportunities through the Cal TF

1. Clear coordination
2. Early involvement of CPUC staff and IOU consultants
3. Defined stages for CPUC staff and TF feedback
4. Defined feedback period
5. Public TF review process
6. Technical collaborations
7. Explicit guidelines

Ann Kelly, SF—Speaking as an implementer, I want to speak up for collaboration with those of us on the ground. WPs often don’t reflect reality. For example, if WP based on a hotel in San Diego says that hallway lights are only on for 6 hours a day, but reality is that the hotel in San Francisco keeps their light on all the time, then we miss out on those savings. It is important that there is a reality check here.

Annette Beitel, FutEE—Other benefits

1. Statewide consistency
2. Peer review by national technical experts

Mike Campbell, DRA—Are there milestones or key gate points where somebody makes a “go/no go” call?

Annette Beitel, FutEE—The first gate point should be whether the WP is should be developed at all, the second is if the abstract is good, and the third is whether the WP is taken to the Commission.

New WP development process, simplified version

1. First key gate check: Should the WP go through in the first place?
2. WP abstract development



- Explicit guidelines for development of the WP
  - Input from IOU tech leads
  - Early input from CPUC staff and consultants
  - Key CPUC input on applicable policies, guidelines, DEER data
3. Second gate check: If the abstract isn't solid, the WP development can be stopped

Peter Miller, NRDC—Another thing is that upstream there is the advisory council that determines the work scope of the TF. So determining the work scope is another gate point.

Andrew Steinberg, So Cal Gas—Is that PAC work scope decision reflected in the current model?

Annette Beitel, FutEE—Not right now, because it will be a decision made by commission staff and IOU tech lead for the first year.

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—That additional group should be on the chart.

Scott Fable, Bay REN—What exactly is an abstract?

Peter Miller, NRDC and Annette Beitel, FutEE—It is more of a proposal, a plan that lays out the baseline assumptions and data that will be used for the WP.

Scott Fable, Bay REN—And who develops the WP?

Annette Beitel, FutEE—Currently WPs are developed by a contractor to the utilities. What is in the model right now is because staff others and themselves to have a say on who develops the WP.

Steve Galanter, SCE—Early on in the new measure WP is where we really want to be collaborating, agreeing on the parameters and assumptions before the heavy lifting is handed off to contractors. Later on in the process, feedback would also be needed if we encounter any problems—but mostly, feedback is needed early on. This would also make for a much more transparent process.

Grant Brohard, PG&E—To echo Steve, this will keep us from going down the wrong path before we hand it off to the contractor to do the heavy lifting.

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—If someone is on the TF, can they develop a WP?



Annette Beitel, FutEE—That needs to get worked out.

- Decide if and how TF members can develop WPs.

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—It's important for my members to understand where they want to be involved, because they don't want to forgo opportunities. I need clarity on the options I can give to my members.

Annette Beitel, FutEE—I don't think this will be much of an issue. IOUs use matrix technical contracts anyways.

- Will TF members be prevented from bidding on IOU contracts?

Ann Kelly, SF—What are the guidelines for WP data?

Annette Beitel, FurEE—This will vary on a case-by-case basis, if it's a new measure that hasn't been piloted in California or if the measure is very small. Sometimes it's a matter of an engineering calculation.

Ann Kelly, SF—There needs to be guidelines for what needs to go in an abstract. We have lots of data and often wish we could put it into a WP.

- What are the guidelines that go into developing a WP abstract? They should be made explicit.

Becky Menten, Marin Energy—Isn't the ex-ante team currently working on a better way of defining what goes into a WP?

Jaclyn Marks, ED—Well, that is a different project. Let's remember that we're starting off with a very limited scope of work of several new statewide measures.

Jana Corey, PG&E—Why are we limiting the scope? Isn't the intention to let everyone come in with a WP?

- Who can submit a WP abstract?

Jaclyn Marks, ED—Well, we want to limit it so we can test it out before we spend too much money and efforts on it.

Jana Corey, PG&E—I believe there is value on giving everyone a voice.



Annette Beitel, FutEE—The way the RFQ is drafted is we will focus our first year efforts on IOU WPs, but this may change in the future.

Jana Corey, PG&E—Who is the decision maker on scope?

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—That's the missing box in the organizational diagram.

- Who is the decision maker on scope of work?
- Do the roles of ED and IOU staff need to be reflected on organizational diagram?

Peter Miller, NRDC—Anyone can suggest a WP, then it goes through screening review.

- Who approves abstracts and/or requests to do and/or review a WP?
- Clarify names and roles of those involved (i.e. WP developer, TF member—do these mean implementer, IOU teach lead?)

Jaclyn Marks, ED—It's important to remember that the current WP will still be in place for measures that don't go through the TF.

Andrew Steinberg, So Cal Gas—We would hope to know what is needed for an abstract and/or WP.

Annette Beitel, FutEE—One of the intentions is making the guidelines and requirements more clear. I'm a big proponent of templates and checklists.

- What are the guidelines that go into developing a WP abstract? They should be made explicit.

Janna Corey, PG&E—On the issue of what contracts TF members can bid on, my understanding is that TF members will be asked to put on their "best technical judgment" hats and leave organizational interests behind—so they should be able to chime in and then leave the room for voting if they have a conflict.

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—My members are hesitant to reply to the RFQ. They are scared to be conflicted out of paid work and that nothing will come out of it. How can we clarify conflict rules so I can better pitch it to my members?



- Narrow conflicts of interest related to bidding on government contracts language for RFQ.

Becky—I see there is CPUC involvement in the new WP process, but then it goes back to staff. I know you can't make any promises, but is there any way we could get some sort of assurance that the Cal TF process won't be followed by the kind of protracted revision process we're dealing with now?

Jaclyn Mark, ED—Well, it will be the same people. Anyways, the long process is a matter of quality, and that's the whole point of setting this up.

Mike Campbell, DRA—Can't the quality be assured by adding a loop to the existing process? I don't really see what this is fixing.

Steve Galanter, SCE—The current process does have an early review component; what it doesn't do is involve other independent reviewers and transparency.

Peter Miller, NRDC—A good comparison is a technical journal—it can help to submit an abstract to the editors, but that is not the same as peer review of the abstract.

Annette Beitel, FutEE—And another benefit is bringing in perspectives from outside California.

Jaclyn Marks, ED—All of that is good, but it won't assure us the quality we are looking for. That's why staff has proposed that the TF select the contractor and manage the WP development.

Annette Beitel, FutEE—That is a suggestion that is currently being discussed.

Jaclyn Marks, ED—That's a big change, and it is what we are proposing.

Andrew Steinberg, So Cal Gas—What deficiencies did you see in the original peer review proposal?

Jaclyn Marks, ED—We didn't think it was enough of an improvement. Since we have a faulty process, why don't we have the quality TF run the process?





Peter Miller, NRDC—The NW RTF in essence allows for both processes, but the one you are proposing is much more expensive because you need more staff

Jaclyn Marks, ED—That's what we liked; we think the NW RTF is a good model.

### **Possible Cal TF/DAWG Overlap**

Chris Ann Dickerson, DAWG, Presentation:

- DAWG is a stakeholder working group with staff from different parts of regulatory organization participating
- Purpose:
  - To discuss and improve demand forecasts
  - CEC IEPR targeted that the CEC forecast would be used for procurement
  - Energy demand was set by the CEC forecast
    - CAISO uses this forecast for transmission planning
  - Also forecast for IOU/POU
- Demand forecasting – improve, coordinate where possible and understand differences; utilities not required to have same forecast but the coordination helps to see where there are differences and why differences might occur
- Incorporation of demand modifiers
  - EE
    - DAWG founded due to controversy regarding EE in forecasts
    - Demand forecasters needed to understand the effects of EE (spillover, NTG,) on the forecast
    - 'Additional achievable EE' used in conjunction with the IEPR forecasts – based on EE potential study response (as previously EE was not included)
- DAWG Operation
  - Working group, not party to regulatory proceedings
    - Stakeholders submit comments in regulatory proceedings as desired (as reps of their organizations)
    - No consensus based decision-making
  - Uses demand modifier results from proceedings and regulatory reports (as opposed to influencing)
    - Monitors processes, and occasionally provides input
  - Commissioners like informal DAWG input
    - Request DAWG review of relevant issues/materials
- Key Issues in 2014-2015 IEPR cycle
  - Disaggregating forecasts in transmission planning



- Lots of interest in tracking EE at disaggregated levels (service territory, climate territory, but would like to break down to smaller territory)
- Enables possibility of targeting EE more effectively to specific areas to address evolving nature of grid resources
- o Process alignment
  - Improve coordination between demand forecasting, inputs to demand forecasting
- o Smart meter data

Alejandra Mejia, FutEE—We worked with Chris Ann to better understand DAWG and to answer the group's qualms about possible duplication of efforts between the two agencies. As you saw from Chris Ann's presentation, the two groups differ in two key ways:

- Structurally
  - o DAWG is a state agency working group.
  - o The Cal TF will be a much more independent organization that will advise the utilities.
- Subject Matter
  - o DAWG focuses on forecasting
  - o Cal TF will produce much more granular values that will only become the building blocks after many iterations of regulatory processes.

Because of these reason, the two groups are much more likely to leverage than to duplicate each other's efforts.

Ann Kelly, SF—What is the busbar level?

John Goodin, CAISO—The busbar level are the larger substations. We are working to understand EE at the Locational Marginal Pricing (LMP) level.

Andrew Steinberg, So Cal Edison—How do we want the future relationship between the two groups (DAWG and Cal TF) to function?

- Map out what we want the DAWG/Cal TF relationship to function in the future

Annette Beitel, FutEE—That is certainly something for us to consider once we get up and running.

### **Remaining Organizational Questions from Last PAC Meeting**

Annette Beitel, FutEE—There were other key questions asked about the proposed organization at last month's meeting:



- Why is the Cal TF an important enterprise?
- What will the Cal TF accomplish?
- How will its success be measured?

### Mission

Annette Beitel, FutEE—The Mission Statement that is currently in the draft Business Plan and introduction slide deck hasn't changed since we started sharing it with stakeholders six months ago. One of the chief purposes of the organization is to involve the best technical experts in the ex-ante review process.

### Guiding Principles

Annette Beitel, FutEE—The guiding principles are also in the Business Plan. The group can still provide comments in writing.

### Proposed Metrics

Annette Beitel, FutEE—The draft Business Plan also breaks out the roles of the Cal TF and the IOUs/POUs and how success will be measured for each of these roles.

### **Bagley-Keene Triggers**

Annette Beitel, FutEE—Our objective with respect to the Bagley-Keene Open Meetings Act is to live up to the spirit of the law without triggering it. Triggering Bagley-Keene would involve a lot of administrative requirements.

We have consulted with legal council and the short answer is that there is no bright line, but the chance of triggering Bagley-Keene increases with greater participation from the regulatory agencies.

### **V. Agenda Item #3: Proposed Name Change**

Annette Beitel, FutEE—We have received various comments about the actual names of the Cal TF, the Technical Forum, and the PAC.

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—It seems to me that the PAC will have more of a steering function than an advisory role. Shouldn't the name reflect that?

Jaclyn Marks, ED—And we would prefer not to have another acronym.



Peter Miller, NRDC—We need to finalize the names, but we can do it over e-mail since this is not a critical path action item.

- The group will propose names for each of the three bodies (currently the Cal TF, PAC, and TF); each name shall be no more than three words and will have a palatable acronym. Suggestion will be submitted in writing within ten days of January 29<sup>th</sup>.

#### **VI. Agenda Item #4: Review TF RFQ, Selection Criteria, and Selection Process**

Annette Beitel, FutEE—Our highest priority right now is getting the Technical Forum staffed and running. For that we need to release the RFQ as soon as possible.

There are three components to the RFQ document package: The RFQ, bid evaluation scorecard, and bid evaluation matrix. We are asking the group to submit comments in writing within ten business days of today.

Margie Gardener, Efficiency Council—Are the subcommittees made up the TF members?

Annette Beitel, FutEE—Yes, but outside experts can be brought in as well.

Peter Miller, NRDC—The NW RTF has non-voting corresponding members that add specialized knowledge.

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—It just seems odd that there is such screening over the TF, but none for people in the subcommittees.

Annette Beitel, FutEE—The RFQ asks for applicants with a technical degree in engineering, science, or math, as well as at least five years experience in the energy efficiency industry.

Jaclyn Marks, ED—Those requirements seem broader than what we had proposed.

Annette Beitel, FutEE—Yes, they are.

Jaclyn Marks, ED—We'll have feedback on that.

Andrew Steinberg, So Cal Gas—Do we need to clarify what being in the EE industry means?



- Clarify what “being in the energy efficiency industry” means

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council, Peter Miller, NRDC—Yes, and we also need to allow people from academia to apply.

Andrew Steinberg, So Cal Gas—Let's try and widen the application pool with lower requirements; then we can have a tough screening process.

Annette Beitel, FutEE—There will also be an opportunity for questions and answers during the application process.

Jana Corey, PG&E—Jaclyn, what are your doubts about the looser requirements?

Jaclyn Marks, ED—They if we are too general, we may draw policy people rather than the technical experts we need.

Becky Menten, Marin Energy—Are you aiming for depth or breath of experience?

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—Is there a way of specifying what type of work we are expecting in the first term?

Annette Beitel, FutEE—That's a great idea.

- Add language about what type of work is expected in the first year

Becky Menten, Marin Energy—And what is the length of the first term?

Annette Beitel, FutEE—We are calling the first year a “proof of concept” year.

Scott Fable, Bay REN—Are we looking for generalist or specialists, and we should clarify so people don't self-select out? Maybe as a postscript to Margie's suggestion?

- Specify that we are looking for both generalists and specialists so applicants don't self out of pool

Annette Beitel, FutEE—Also a good idea.



Annette Beitel, FutEE—The next section for the group to discuss is the obligatory disclaimer about TF participants possibly being conflicted out of EM&V contracts. What is currently on the RFQ is very slightly revised language from staff. We tried to narrow it down a bit.

Jaclyn Marks, ED—We could possibly be more specific on what contracts are involved in the conflict. It would be helpful if you wrote out what questions you had for us.

- Submit specific conflict questions to CPUC legal for interpretation

Jana Corey, PG&E—I don't understand why we have this—because we are asking TF members to leave their organizational hats at home and use their best professional judgments.

Jaclyn Marks, ED—I know its not what we want to hear, but being involved in the TF gives them inside information on government contracts.

Jana Corey, PG&E—But these will be open meetings that anyone can attend.

Jaclyn Marks, ED—Also, let's remember that we're talking about government contracts, not IOU contracts.

Jana Corey, PG&E, Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—It's vague phrases like "any government contract" that may drive potential applicants away.

Jaclyn Marks, ED—Yes, we need to run these questions past law.

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council, Peter Miller, NRDC—It's a good idea to have a small group of us work these things out.

Becky Menten, Marin Energy—Have you thought of gift restrictions of TF members?

- Consider gift restrictions to TF members

Jaclyn Marks, ED—But we wont have voting rules, it will be consensus based, so gift restrictions won't be necessary.

Annette Beitel, FutEE—We did research on the decision-making question, and consensus-based is really the norm in groups like the Cal TF.



Jaclyn Marks, ED—I don't see where formal voting rules get you, we just need a cut off discussion time.

Marge Gardner, Efficiency Council—I was leaning towards formal voting because it makes it easier to recuse people, this may help with Jaclyn's government contract issues.

Annette Beitel, FutEE—It is very important for the group to define what a conflict is, and also for TF members to declare any possible conflicts beforehand.

Annette Beitel, FutEE—The key questions to ask when reviewing these documents are: Are we capturing all the info we need and are we asking for info we won't look at?

Jana Corey, PG&E—I see there is a late March deadline; can the process be accelerated?

Annette Beitel, FutEE—Depends on what we hear back from applicants and stakeholders—probably not. We also need to settle on the conflicts language before we release the RFQ.

Annette Beitel, FutEE—In terms of the bid evaluation form, we definitely need the threshold criteria, but do we also want to have numeric scoring? That would give us more flexibility, but my instinct is that we will still need a system to keep us unbiased.

Jana Corey, PG&E—Your instincts are right, but we also need some discretionary capacity.

Jaclyn Marks, ED—Is there going to be a process for interviews?

Peter Miller, NRDC—The NW RTF doesn't interview TF applicants; the key issue here is time requirements.

Jaclyn Marks, ED—I would recommend interviews, not necessarily for everyone...

Annette Beitel, FutEE—How about "there may be follow up questions" language on the RFQ?

Becky Menten, Marin Energy—Another option is to ask for references.



Jaclyn Marks, ED—I suggest getting outside validation, sort of the human touch.

Annette Beitel, FutEE—The RFQ currently heavily emphasizes experience, but I think I’m hearing that may not be the best judgment?

Jaclyn Marks, ED—You still need to go through the RFQ process as it is, but then loop back around, and have some wiggle room for the “human touch.”

- Allow for the possibility of interviews and/or further questions

Ann Kelly, SF—Does a five-point scale leave enough room for variation?

Annette Beitel, FutEE—We need to know via e-mail who wants to be involved in the selection committee. Most urgently, we need each and every one of you to send us a list of technical people you think would be strong TF members. We are looking for utility people, contractors, DOE, academics, and implementers. Please send us these list within ten days of today.

- Those interested in serving in the selection committee will e-mail Annette within ten (10) business days of January 29<sup>th</sup>
- Group will submit names for potential bidders list ASAP

## **Regular Meetings**

Annette Beitel, FutEE—Lastly, we need to pick a standing meeting day. Scheduling this meeting was very difficult—it was impossible to find a date that worked for the majority of those who wanted to attend.

## **VII. Agenda Item #5: Draft Organizing Documents**

Peter Miller, NRDC—After we sent out the draft organizing documents, we heard back from a lot of people that there was too much formality too soon. So we wanted to end the meeting with a conversation about the best way to move forward without unnecessarily complicating the matter:

- We want to balance transparency and expediency
- We decided we had more specifics than we needed
- All we need for now is informal (4 items) and move towards more formal, specific seats, etc
- Are people comfortable with this model?





- If so, how are we going to run the logistics?

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—Will we be having completely open meetings?

Peter Miller, NRDC—No, we want to slowly be more formal, but it would be important to have a set group of members from the beginning.

Jana Corey, PG&E—Well, it seems like we have a good model with designated members and alternates. Job one is getting the TF up and running.

Andrew Steinberg, So Cal Gas—But we should start memorializing the formal organization while we get organized.

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—Why not formalize the organization from the very beginning?

Peter Miller, NRDC—So we can focus on critical path.

Annette Beitel, FutEE—First and foremost, the RFQ needs to go out in two weeks at the latest.

Ann Kelly, SF—Is there a limit to the number of people on the PAC?

Jana Corey, PG&E—The idea is to be representative and balanced—no utility majority, but also fair representation—without becoming unwieldy.

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—How does PUC staff feel about this model?

Annette Beitel, FutEE—Staff's chief concern is that the Cal TF be a consensus-based organization.

Peter Miller, NRDC—Next thing up is having to seat 30 people on the TF, and we need to see if that is workable without formal votes.

Andrew Steinberg, So Cal Gas—It will be helpful to get working—it will show us what will work and won't.

Annette Beitel, FutEE—Getting the RFQ out will be the first test.

Scott Fable, Bay REN—Would it help to make first year provisional?



Annette Beitel, FutEE—Yes, right now we are calling the first year a “proof of concept” term. The critical thing is to get a committed core group that gets working. Maybe we just let the number of seats work itself out—but people need to speak up if they want to participate.

Scott Fable, Bay REN—Would we still allow the meetings to be as open as they currently are—that may assuage people’s fears of not being represented?

Annette Beitel FutEE—We’ve heard the discussions, have gotten written comments already, so we will organize, sort, and circulate them before next meeting.

Peter Miller, NRDC—So take a look at those summaries with an eye to detail as well with an eye to what you would be willing to live with.

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—If there are people on the list not participating, they should get taken off.

Annette Beitel, FutEE—Everybody on the list has committed to participating.

Becky Menten, Marin Energy—Do we have an openness policy?

Annette Beitel, FutEE—not right now, but we will once we have formalized more.

Ann Kelly, SF—We may want to come up with language that acknowledges these things.

- Consider acknowledging current “Informal to Formal” PAC model in writing