



California Technical Forum (Cal TF) Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting Thursday, June 12, 2014

I. Participants

In Person:

Nancy Jenkins, Southern California Edison (SCE)
Steve Galanter, Southern California Edison (SCE)
Jaclyn Marks, California Public Utilities Commission Energy Division (ED)
Mike Campbell, Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA)
Lisa Davidson, San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E)
Jan Berman, Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E)
Margie Gardner, California Energy Efficiency Industry Council (Efficiency Council)
Bryan Cope, Southern California Public Power Authority (SCPPA)
Peter Miller, Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)
Dan Rendler, Southern California Gas (SCG)
Lara Ettenson, Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)
David Jacot, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)
Annette Beitel, Future Energy Enterprises (FutEE)

On the Phone:

Howard Choy, Los Angeles County (LA)
Jonathan Changus, Northern California Power Authority (NCPA)
Beckie Menten, Marin Clean Energy (Marin)
Alejandra Mejia, Future Energy Enterprises (FutEE)

Joined Teleconference at 3:40:

Andrew Steinberg, Southern California Gas (SCG)
Jana Corey, Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E)
Athena Besa, San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E)
Anuj Desai, Southern California Edison (SCE)

II. Key Action Items/Proposed Changes

Technical Forum (TF) Member Selection

- Technical Forum members recommended by evaluation subcommittee approved.
- ACT: Notify applicants not selected for TF but recommended for subcommittee participation that they will be placed on a "subcommittee roster."



- ACT: Identify which TF Members have requested travel funding.
- ACT: Track active participation of TF members through the year for evaluation purposes.

Ex Officio Members

- Mary Ann Piette (LBNL) and Martha Brooks (CEC) approved as *ex officio* members of the Technical Forum.

Mission/Vision Strawman

- Modify “Vision” statement as set forth in attached redlined document.
- “consistent energy values for all utilities and stakeholders in the state” is better than “statewide consistent.”
- Insert “technically rigorous” back into mission.
- Remove “as supported by consensus” from the first Guiding Principle.
- Finalize this document at the next PAC meeting.

IMPORTANT NOTE: All comments about specific individuals are deleted from the meeting notes, even comments that are positive.

III. Agenda Item #1: Opening

Introductions

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—I just want to say that I think this could turn out to be a seminal meeting for a very important new effort in California. Congratulations to all of those who are making it happen.

Annette Beitel, FutEE, Meeting Facilitator —
Review of Agenda and Meeting Objectives

Review and Confirm Selected Technical Forum Members

Annette Beitel

California Technical Forum Members Selection Process Presentation

- Cal TF staff reviewed the applications to ensure they were complete and responsive.



- Bryan Cope requested that Cal TF staff complete evaluation criteria that did not require judgment to ease review by the evaluation subcommittee.
- Subcommittee members evaluated criteria that required judgment.
- Cal TF staff prepared a document that had individual subcommittee members' scores for each applicant and an average score for each applicant.
- The subcommittee members had two "calibration meetings" teleconferences to review individual scores and finalize recommended TF members.
- The TF member recommendation to the full PAC was a consensus recommendation of the applicant evaluation subcommittee.

Peter Miller, NRDC—I would like to make some brief comments about the overall pool of applicants: We heard from 56 applicants, nearly all of who were very well qualified. There was a broad range of experience, affiliations, and locations. I was very pleasantly surprised with the quality of applicants. We received only a few applications from the utilities. The only disappointing aspect of the applicant pool was that there were only a few women, which is something we need to improve next round.

Question from the group—Was it intentional to only have one member from each IOU?

Bryan Cope, SCPPA—I don't think so. There were multiple applicants from a few of the utilities, but we only selected the absolutely best applicants and this was how the TF roster worked out.

Peter Miller, NRDC—Also, a number of people who applied specified that they only wanted to participate in subcommittees.

Dan Rendler, SCG—It is important to talk about how we will communicate back out to applicants selected for subcommittees so we successfully retain their expertise.

- ACT: Notify applicants not selected for TF but recommended for subcommittee participation that they will be placed on a "subcommittee roster."

Question from the group—Did we have any expectation that we would receive any applications from customers?



Annette Beitel – Cal TF staff did not reach out to customers when developing the list of potential applicants to which the RFQ was sent.

Question from the group—Did we specify how many meetings need to be attended in person?

Peter Miller, NRDC—We did discuss that. The RFQ did not include the ability of a TF Member to participate in person as an evaluative criteria. We do want members to participate as much as possible in person, so the group can build a good working dynamic, but ultimately we decided to go by what we said in the RFQ. The RFQ states that TF Members should attend the first meeting in person, but participation for the rest of the meetings could occur via teleconference. However, we would like to encourage TF members to attend 3 – 4 meetings in-person during the first year.

Annette Beitel—The RFQ stated that TF Members whose travel expenses would not be compensated by their employer might receive travel re-imbursement, and asked applicants to identify whether their participation was contingent upon receiving reimbursement for travel costs.

Peter Miller, NRDC—I would like to see TF Members attend 3 – 4 meetings in person, even though not required in the RFQ. We have to weigh the impact of additional travel on the budget against the benefit to be derived.

Dan Rendler, SCG—It will be particularly important to try to get members to attend in person at the beginning, so that the forum can build a good rapport.

Steve Galanter, SCE – Given the nature of issues to be discussed, I think TF members will be able to participate effectively by phone.

Jaclyn Marks, CPUC – High-quality teleconferencing capabilities can make remote meetings effective, and this should be explored.

Evaluation Subcommittee Members—We were very impressed with the number of applicants with real name recognition in the efficiency space, and are very happy with the group we came up with.

Steve Galanter, SCE—Grant Brohard and I were there to remind the rest of the evaluation committee that, even if a person has a great reputation in the efficiency space, it is vitally important that those we selected had the technical chops to back that up. This group will be doing a lot of heavy lifting, and the people we selected are up to the challenge.



Dan Rendler, SCG—As you can see, most applicants that scored over 12 were accepted. There was a big clustering around 10, and that's where we had to make some cuts based on holistic balancing.

Steve Galanter, SCE, rest of evaluators—
Brief Talk Through List of Selected Members

Jan Berman, PG&E—What happens if people decide not to participate?

Annette Beitel – We sought “up to” 30 Technical Forum Members, with a target of between 20 - 30. As long as at least 20 TF Members accept, we will not seek additional TF Members.

Dan Rendler, SCG—My recommendation in that case would be to review the forum as a whole, and if we still feel like we have a strong group, we move forward anyways. If we feel like we are missing key elements, then we try to build it up some more.

Jan Berman, PG&E—Who is the person from the local governments and/or RENs?

Annette Beitel —The REN representative is Scott Fable from BKi.

Nancy Jenkins, SCE —What is the main motivation for people to want to be on the TF?

Peter Miller, NRDC—Good question. I think applicants viewed it as an opportunity for growth. An opportunity to participate in something new and exciting, take potential groundbreaking national leadership, and to contribute professionally to the field.

Annette Beitel, FutEE—California is viewed as a leader in energy efficiency given its long history of EE, large budget for EE and range of offerings. Also, many other jurisdictions have used DEER values in developing their ex ante savings values. Potential applicants see this opportunity to contribute to an effort that may have national visibility and impact.

Dan Rendler, SCG—Lastly, this is a great opportunity for these folks to network and stay current.



Annette Beitel, FutEE—Is the PAC supportive of the panel as selected by the committee?

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—I personally don't see any changes to be made, and I am supportive of it.

Jaclyn Marks, CPUC staff—I can't speak to any one of these people, since I don't know any of them. I'm sure my people would have something to say. I certainly like the process, but I do want to be on the record on not expressly supporting any one candidate.

Mike Campbell, ORA – Also, I am not here to approve TF Members but am here to observe the process.

Annette Beitel, FutEE—All in favor of the panel of TF Members recommended by the applicant evaluation committee?

Whole group—Ayes

Annette Beitel, FutEE—No objections, panel approved.

- Technical Forum members recommended by evaluation subcommittee approved.

Dan Rendler, SCG—It will be important to communicate the final decisions to all applicants correctly. It's important to clarify that those being recommended for subcommittees aren't actually being assigned to any one subcommittee, since we don't have any of those yet. The right language to use is that they are on the subcommittee roster.

Bryan Cope, SCPPA—Do we have a policy for reimbursing travel expenses yet?

Jan Berman, PG&E—The problem here is that we don't yet have a financial structure in place to compensate travel.

Dan Rendler, SCG—Another consideration here is equity. As soon as we disburse some funds, pretty soon everybody is going to want support too.

Steve Galanter, SCE—Clearly the dynamic with remote participation is different. But this is a very technical meeting, and us technical folks are used to having this sort of technical discussions on the phone.



- ACT: Identify which TF Members have requested travel funding.

Ex Officio Members

Annette Beitel, FutEE—During “exploratory” stakeholder meetings with potential PAC members and organizations, having ex officio TF Members was discussed and also included in the powerpoint deck that was used as a basis for discussion with stakeholders. Ex officio members will have the same role as other members, but they will be appointed on the basis of their institutional affiliation rather than applying through the RFQ process. Is everybody comfortable with Mary Ann Piette (LBNL) and Martha Brooks (CEC) serving as voting ex officio members?

Jonathan Changus, NCPA and Dan Rendler, SCG—Ex officio members shouldn’t be able to vote, as they didn’t go through the official solicitation. These two individuals may actually prefer a less heavy lifting, ex officio member.

Jaclyn Marks, CPUC staff – The TF process does not involve voting, but will make decisions through consensus decision-making.

Jonathan Changus, NCPA—I think we also need to start thinking more about the ex officio selection process because that’s where we may get some political pressure to appoint less qualified members in the future.

Howard Choy, LA and Jaclyn Marks, ED—It is very important to have a process and not change it after the fact.

Question from the group—What is the role of ex officio members in the TF?

Dan Rendler, SCG—I would say that if we say they are ex officio, they can be part of the conversation, but not the consensus, but any other choice would compromise the integrity of the process we just went through.

Steve Galanter, SCE—I would support that, because I know what they bring to the table and I would prefer to have them in the room.

Annette Beitel—I am hearing that ex officio members would review the materials, and attend and participate in meetings, but when it comes to reaching consensus, memorializing opinions, they would not be included.

Jaclyn Marks, CPUC staff—I think for this round, this is fine, but we need better clarification around the ex officio roles for the next round.



Group—Ayes

- Mary Ann Piette and Martha Brooks approved as ex officio members of the TF.

[Follow-Up Note: Subsequent to the PAC meeting on June 12th, Peter Miller agreed to take the lead in contacting Mary Ann Piette and Martha Brooks to discuss their participation in the Cal TF.]

Peter Miller, NRDC—I think that for all members, we are going to have to evaluate their level of participation over time.

- ACT: Track active participation of TF members through the year for evaluation purposes.

BREAK

Annette Beitel—Given that we only have 45 minutes left, we are going to have to go through the rest of the agenda very quickly and prioritize topics. We don't have time to cover all the agenda items. I recommend quickly discussing the Cal TF templates and flow chart, then spending the remaining time on the proposed "Mission/Vision" document. PAC members will not be asked to approve this document today, but just to discuss and provide initial input. Hopefully the "Mission/Vision" document can be finalized at the next PAC meeting.



IV. Agenda Item #3:

1/29 PAC Meeting Report-Out: Cal TF Workpaper Review Process and Documents

Abstract and Workpaper Templates

Annette Beitel—The Cal TF abstract template is intended to document the proposed approach, methods, and data to be used in workpaper development up-front. It is intended to get people talking, including CPUC staff input, and get agreement on the workpaper development approach at the beginning of the process to avoid unnecessary work or re-work.

Thanks to Jaclyn's staff for reviewing the Cal TF abstract and WP templates.

Workpaper Swim Lanes Flowchart

Annette Beitel, FutEE—The workpaper flowchart depicts how the workpaper will move through the TF process. The workpaper developer will do the actual work, but there is going to be early and frequent discussion with the TF and ED staff during the process. TF subcommittees will provide technical direction during workpaper development, as needed. Does that answer the question from the last meeting about who is going to do the actual work?

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—How will the process work for non-utility-sponsored workpapers?

Steve Galanter, SCE—Non-utility-sponsored workpapers need to be submitted to a Portfolio Administrator (IOU, POU) to be considered by the Cal TF. If there is no Portfolio Administrator willing to implement the proposed measure in their portfolios, would not be good use of Cal TF resources to consider.

Question from the group—Is the timeline on calendar or working days?

Annette Beitel, FutEE—They are working days.

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—In the first year, is there any possibility that workpaper developers and staff will work on products together?

Jaclyn Marks, CPUC staff—No. The initial notification step is just to let us know that work is starting so we have an opportunity to give feedback early.



Steve Galanter, SCE—One of the key benefits of having this swim lanes documents is that, since we have so many participants, each individual stakeholder can look at the chart and know what is expected from them.

Jaclyn Marks, CPUC staff—Is the flow chart indicating that staff only gets five days to review the abstract?

Annette Beitel – No, as we’ve discussed, staff will get ten working days to review and comment on the Cal TF abstract and draft workpaper. We consider staff’s input at these two points to be critical.

V. Agenda Item #4: Cal TF Alignment with Federal, State Policies and Regulatory Language

Mission/Vision Strawman Document

Annette Beitel—The intention of this agenda item now is to bring this working document to the PAC’s attention, get initial feedback, and then to have a fuller discussion next PAC meeting that will hopefully lead to approval of this document.

Question from the group—Why do we need the word “standard in the vision?

Steve Galanter, SCE and Alejandra Mejia, FutEE—“Standard” was added in order to convey the idea of statewide consistency and predictability in the final work products.

Comments from the group—What Cal TF will bring consistency to is the methodologies used, not necessarily the values.

- ACT: Modify “statewide consistent” to “consistent energy values for all utilities/stakeholders in the state.”

Annette Beitel—Maybe we should start by discussing the Guiding Principles. Are there any initial reactions to those?

- ACT: Remove “as supported by consensus” from the first Guiding Principle.

Annette Beitel and Peter Miller, NRDC—Any other objections?



Howard Choy, LA—I am assuming we can still provide edits to this document after this meeting?

Annette Beitel—Of course.

Annette Beitel—What I’m hearing is that there isn’t much enthusiasm for changing the guiding principles.

Nancy Jenkins, SCE—Vision: does not need to include “national” and should refer specifically to California values.

Jaclyn Marks, CPUC staff—Mission: Why is the phrase “technically rigorous” missing now?

- ACT: Insert “technically rigorous” back into mission.
- ACT: Discuss further edits at the next PAC meeting and seek to finalize document.

Remaining Policy Work

Annette Beitel—We did not have time to discuss other agenda items relating to policy research, but can discuss the work at another time.

VI. Agenda Item #6: Next Steps

Annette Beitel—Tomorrow we will notify TF member that they have been selected to serve on the TF. Subcommittee members will be notified that they will be placed on the subcommittee roster.

Dan Rendler, SCG—What is the plan for the first TF meeting?

Annette Beitel —A draft agenda was circulated and discussed with the utilities. The agenda and meeting materials have been finalized and will be sent to TF members shortly after they have been notified of their selection. In brief, the agenda includes welcoming members, introductions, and an overview of Cal TF, including templates/processes that have been developed. The first TF meeting is a working meeting, and also includes discussion and TF Member review/input on the first five abstracts.



Dan Rendler, SCG—Should we expect the PAC to be a part of the welcome presentation?

Peter Miller, NRDC—I am scheduled to do the introductory presentation on behalf of the PAC, but I would welcome any support from other PAC members.

Margie Gardner, Efficiency Council—I think that would go a long way and show a good, supportive coalition behind the organization.

Annette Beitel/Peter Miller, NRDC – The initial TF Meeting will be at NRDC, which will not be the regular meeting space for TF Meetings. Other options available on this date were very expensive. Future TF Meetings will be held at the PEC, which was not available on June 26th. We have space limitations for the first TF Meeting.

- ACT: PAC members may participate at the beginning of inaugural TF meeting.

Attachment: Redlined “Mission Vision” Document

Upcoming PAC Meetings:

Two more planned for the year, one in September, one in late November, early December. We would like to hold the next PAC meeting in LA, and the following meeting in Sacramento.