



**California Technical Forum (Cal TF)
Policy Advisory Committee Meeting #8
October 29th, 2015
12:00pm – 4:30pm
California Energy Commission
Sacramento, CA**

I. Participants

Annette Beitel, Cal TF Facilitator
Alejandra Mejia, Cal TF Staff

Steve Galanter, Souther California Edison (SCE), PAC Member
Mike Campbell, Office of Rate Payer Advocates (ORA), PAC Member
Rachel Huang, Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD), PAC Member
Bryan Cope, Souther California Public Power Authority (SCPPA), PAC Member
Sylvia Bender, California Energy Commission (CEC), PAC Member
Jonathan Changus, Northern California Power Agency, PAC Member
Jan Berman, Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E), PAC Member
David Jacot, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP), PAC Member
Margie Gardner, California Energy Efficiency Industry Council (Efficiency Council), PAC Member
Martha Brook, CEC, PAC Member
Beckie Menten, MCE, PAC Member
Peter Miller, Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), PAC Member

On the Phone

Mary Ann Piette, Lawrence Berkeley National Lab (LBNL), PAC Member
Lisa Davidson, San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E), PAC Member
Donald Gilligan, National Association of Energy Services Companies (NAESCO), PAC Member
Hanna Greene, Center for Sustainable Energy (CSE), PAC Member

II. Key Decisions and Action Items

Update on 2015 Business Plan

- ACT: Cal TF staff to schedule conference call to review measure tracking documentation.



- Cal TF Staff NOTE: This conference call will be scheduled after the winter holidays.

Proposed Policy for PAC Review of Technical Work

- ACT: Incorporate PAC Review of Technical Work language into Manual of Operations.
- ACT: Incorporate General Public Comment language into Manual of Operations.
- ACT: Cal TF staff to communicate PAC request that Technical Forum use best professional judgment in deciding savings values even in cases of contradictory regulatory directives.

Proposed Policy for PAC Review of Technical Work

- ACT: Cal TF staff to share December 3rd Technical Forum meeting details with PAC members who wish to attend.

2016 Business Plan

- ACT: For 2016 Business Plan, consider subcommittee/Technical Position Paper work developing guidelines for ISP studies that would be generally applicable to all ISP studies.
- ACT: Alejandra to reach out to MCE to include their upcoming measures in 2016 workpaper plan.
- ACT: PAC to consider maximum number of TF members, term limits, and member continuation policy in December meeting.

III. Ongoing Cal TF Work Related to SCE Ex Ante Improvement Initiative

Annette Beitel, Cal TF Facilitator—

PowerPoint Presentation

Jonathan Changus—Just to clarify, public power's Technical Reference Manual was designed to be a living document that would house both 'mature' and provisional measures while we use program data to refine our ex ante estimates.

Margie Gardner—Just wondering, why do you think the ISP issue would be such a big endeavour?



Annette Beitel—For various reasons, but mostly because there is significant variability between each ISP study.

Margie Gardner—That’s where I think the Cal TF’s work would be so helpful: In creating process guidelines to reduce that variability.

- ACT: For 2016 Business Plan, consider subcommittee/Technical Position Paper work developing guidelines for ISP studies that would be generally applicable to all ISP studies.

Donald Gilligan—One difference between the regulated utilities and public power is that public power is not at risk for the energy savings. Within the IOU world, wouldn’t the PA be responsible for savings that don’t show up? I imagine that makes them less willing to adopt provisional measures.

Annette Beitel—The draft “Interim Workpaper Guidelines” propose that interim values would be eligible for ex ante claims and not retrospective adjustment for the period of the interim WP. Per the draft guidelines, if final values are not approved within 18 months, the interim WP and associated values would be suspended. Furthermore, these are limited measures, so the magnitude of savings would be relatively small.

Peter Miller—I’ve always struggled with how CPUC staff defines the best available standard. Have you had any clearer guidance from them on how they apply it in practice?

Annette Beitel—We understand from workpaper developers that Energy Division often seeks additional information and analysis beyond what the WP developers are able to provide in their workpapers given existing data. This is the case even when there is no further data available at the time of measure development. When I discussed with staff the question of how they interpret this standard, their response was that they want to be reasonably certain for values so that values are not approved that later need to be reduced when more robust data is available. Staff explained that their approach seeks to protect ratepayers from investing in savings that don’t materialize.

Steve Galanter—I really do think that what Cal TF is working on is really the next step forward for the initiatives I presented during lunch. The two efforts are really compatible. What SCE is doing is attempting to ease the burden for the short-term, and what the Cal TF is doing will fix problems for the long term.



Margie Gardner—Theoretically, what happens to the proposal if the TF approves it *and* Energy Division also likes it? What is the formal process of adopting it?

Annette Beitel—That is an excellent question, and it is something to spend some time discussing and getting right.

Margie Gardner—I think it is a very important question that really gets to the heart of maximizing the potential value in all of the excellent work the Cal TF has been doing. We have to find the best way to ensure that the work is followed.

IV. Update on 2015 Business Plan

Annette Beitel, Cal TF Facilitator—

PowerPoint Presentation

POU TRM/DEER Documentation

Jan Berman—I am really concerned by the RPP freezer UES recommendation. The Cal TF is an independent technical body, you would maybe expect them to be the ones asking the IOUs for lower values. However, here you are telling us that the IOU WP developer refused to take a value 20% higher and chose to go instead with the undocumented, lower DEER value.

Steve Galanter—Well, the IOUs are under a regulatory directive to use DEER values when they exist.

Jan Berman—Yes, but the TF exists to render impartial technical recommendations. The independent technical recommendations should not be modified due to regulatory directives.

Steve Galanter—I hear what you are saying, but we've been warned in the past that making such suggestions about more rigorous data could affect our ESPI scores.

Jan Berman—I completely understand. The PAs are free to submit the values they choose to submit, and they of course should submit values that abide by all regulatory directives. However, the Technical Forum's recommendations should be the most rigorous answers regardless of policy constructs.

Margie Gardner—The differences in rigor should at least be documented for transparency's sake.



Annette Beitel – At the TF meeting, the TF requested that the WP developer note in a WP footnote that the WP developer could not identify the source of the DEER value and that the TF recommended freezer UES values based on engineering equations since the values were documented and credible.

Annette Beitel—Ok, then at the end of this meeting I will ask the group to affirm that you want to send this message back to the TF.

Measure Review

Peter Miller—Can you speak a little more about what is delaying workpaper submission to the CPUC after TF approval?

Annette Beitel—Some of those have been issues with product and program requirements. The type that concerns me most is when Cal TF approves an abstract and the developer takes months to address Cal TF directives for workpaper development.

Peter Miller—That exact problem has led the NW RTF to become increasingly more staff-driven.

Jan Berman—I too would be interested in seeing more detail about the linear progression of measures through the Cal TF and then CPUC review.

Annette Beitel—Perfect. We will schedule a conference call for those who are interested to go through our detailed measure tracking sheet.

- ACT: Cal TF staff to schedule conference call to review measure tracking documentation.
 - Cal TF Staff NOTE: This conference call will be scheduled after the winter holidays.

Crosscutting Technical Position Papers

Mike Campbell—What exactly is a technical position paper?

Annette Beitel—They are documents that we prepare as concrete deliverables from our crosscutting technical issue subcommittees.

Mike Campbell—So there are no individual savings numbers associated?



Annette Beitel—No. The technical position papers cover technical topics that arise time and again during the consideration of individual measures. By addressing these technical “cross-cutting” topics generally, Cal TF can be more efficient and effective. Cal TF saves time by addressing cross-cutting issues once rather than multiple times through individual measures. Cal TF is more effective and credible if issues are treated consistently across measures.

Martha Brook—I recommend that your EnergyPlus recommendation focus on non-residential modeling, since that is what that model does really well.

Peter Miller—There is also a possible legal issue with sticking with DOE2.2, since the CPUC code requires that all modeling code be accessible to all parties. In short, the CPUC does have an Open Source requirement for its modeling software.

Martha Brook—However, it’s very difficult to define what “publically available” means.

Jonathan Changus—Are DOE2.2 and EnergyPlus really the only two modeling choices?

Annette Beitel—No, they are not. We are recommending that EnergyPlus be the default modeling tool, but there definitely is not a one-size-fits-all approach. For some measures and circumstances, modeling tools other than DOE 2.2 or EnergyPlus might be more appropriate to use.

David Jacot—Has the TF considered the discussions being had around the Open Meter efforts?

Annette Beitel—Yes, but more on the topics of general guiding principles than around specific technology providers.

Martha Brook—The subcommittee should definitely focus on what gets standardized rather than individual vendor providers.

Group—Agreement.

Statewide Coordination

Beckie Menten—Could we reach out to Cal TF staff to be included in the 2016 work plan effort?



- ACT: Alejandra to reach out to MCE to include their upcoming measures in 2016 workpaper plan.

Conclusion

Margie Gardner—How likely are you to get increased CPUC Staff participation?

Annette Beitel—I think very likely. We are very encouraged by their recent enthusiasm for the project.

V. DEER Alternative/Electronic TRM Initiative

Annette Beitel, Cal TF Facilitator—

PowerPoint Presentation

Annette Beitel—I really want to give Bryan Cope credit for pushing for this project early this year. I now strongly believe this project can make significant improvements in California's energy efficiency, and it would not be happening without Bryan's leadership.

When we first presented the idea in April, there was a lot of requests for taking the proposal straight to policy makers and Commissioners. However, back in April while we had identified problems with the status quo, we had not developed clear recommendations on how to address. We now have clear recommendations that are described in the deck and 2016 Business Plan and that are being further characterized in a Technical Position Paper. Prior to presenting to Commissioners, we would like to discuss the details further with Commission staff and get their input and hopefully support. I therefore recommend that we continue discussing technical details with ED, make sure that we are creating something that works for everybody, and then find the best way to bring it to the attention of the decision makers together.

Margie Gardner—I think the socialization process you are recommending sounds very good. In addition to that, it seems like this proposal is already answering a lot of the questions the Commission just directed the IOUs and stakeholders to jointly investigate. It seems like the new stakeholder group could be the right actor to bring the fully fleshed out proposal to the Commission.

Jan Berman—I agree with that. I like to think of the Cal TF as vetting individual savings values and the stakeholder group as vetting the larger vision for the



framework. The stakeholder group would be a good entity to put the final proposal on the record.

PowerPoint Presentation

Peter Miller—The Commission can, and in fact they just did, approve final values. However, in order to do that, you need a credible, transparent, and functional process in place so they don't have to hold up the entire industry for six weeks just for one value.

Jonathan Changus—Going back to the US EPA draft guidelines, are they looking for actual usage data, or can it be well documented but still assumption-based deemed values?

Peter Miller—While that is an important point, it is possibly less of a sticking point for a mass-based state like California is likely to be.

Jan Berman—Would this form of TRM be able to hold “scenarios” of savings values, for instance for variations in baselines and climate zones?

Annette Beitel—Yes. EnergyPlus permits parametric analysis, and Open Studio, the front end for EnergyPlus, readily allows for different baselines.

Jonathan Changus—Ideally I would like to see more interaction between the three databases (ex ante, tracking, and reporting) in the very future state.

Peter Miller—When we do get to the point of specifying the actual tool, it would be really great to go around and make sure you are providing the most important functionalities for all stakeholders.

Annette Beitel—Those are all really good suggestions. We have investigated the possibility of using all currently available commercial software tools for the “Electronic TRM” interface. However, our preference would be to use “Open Source” Electronic TRM interface and modeling tools, which Amir Roth from DOE has indicated he believes that DOE could provide as a front-end to EnergyPlus and Open Studio.

Donald Gilligan—What are the procedural requirements for this proposal?

Margie Gardner—What do others think that adoption process should be?



Jonathan Changus—I think the POUs want to be respectful of the fact that we are not regulated so don't want to be a distraction; however, we are fiercely supportive of the electronic TRM project.

Bryan Cope—I echo Jonathan's support, but do warn that we will be devoting a lot of time and resources to implementing SB350 and AB802 in 2016.

Peter Miller—I think expressing your support is one of the biggest things the POUs can do for this effort.

Jonathan Changus—And we can also be the first utilities to start using the new tool.

Steve Galanter—I agree with everybody here that an electronic TRM would be fantastic for the state, but the devil will really be in the implementation details.

Annette Beitel—These detailed questions are a great segue for the next discussion on the proposed 2016 Business Plan, so let's take two last comments from Peter and Mike and then break before the Business Plan discussion.

Peter Miller—I think we need to emphasize the possible gains in process efficiency and optimization of staff resources as we continue to socialize the proposal.

Mike Campbell—To answer the question you ask in the agenda: Should this initiative be included in the 2016 business plan? Yes.

I also strongly support your proposal to continue to secure CPUC staff buy in, as it would add huge legitimacy to the end product and end runs directly to Commissioners are really resented at the staff level. I do think that independent advocacy may be the best strategy, but we can discuss details later on.

VI. Proposed 2016 Business Plan

Annette Beitel, Cal TF Facilitator—

Proposed 2016 Business Plan Document

Bryan Cope—Do we have a maximum number of TF members?



Annette Beitel—The PAC never really settled on a solid maximum or minimum. This would be a good conversation to have in December, as well as figuring out if there should be term limits, and other logistics issues.

Jonathan Changus—I fully support that.

- ACT: PAC to consider maximum number of TF members, term limits, and member continuation policy in December meeting.

Bryan Cope—I really like the idea of focusing goal four on “Electronic TRM” instead of trying to get rid of DEER. It will be important as we move forward to focus on the future instead of the past.

Peter Miller—I think the cost of the six week delay of the entire Rolling Portfolio Phase II B order because of a dispute about a single savings value (DEER freezers for Appliance Recycling Programs) would be enough to show significant possible savings from this project. The electronic TRM would also help us make significant strides towards tightening the link between ex ante and EM&V results.

Steve Galanter—I couldn’t agree more. The two should go hand in hand, as was the case several years ago.

VII. Proposed Policy for PAC Review of Technical Work

Alejandra Mejia, Cal TF Staff—

PowerPoint Presentation

Annette Beitel—Does the group affirm the proposed additions to the Manual of Operations?

Group—Yes.

- ACT: Incorporate PAC Review of Technical Work language into Manual of Operations.
- ACT: Incorporate General Public Comment language into Manual of Operations.

Annette Beitel—Lastly, in regards to the language to remind the Technical Forum of their mission of independence and technical accuracy, does the group affirm the proposed language up on the screen?



Group—Yes.

- ACT: Cal TF staff to communicate PAC request that Technical Forum use best professional judgment in deciding savings values even in cases of contradictory regulatory directives.

VIII. Closing

Group—Discussion about upcoming Assemblyman Quirk visit to Technical Forum.

- ACT: Cal TF PAC to share December 3rd Technical Forum meeting details with PAC members who wish to attend.