

Soliciting CPUC Staff Feedback on Cal TF Work



CALIFORNIA

TECHNICAL FORUM

**ANNETTE BEITEL
JENNY ROECKS
DECEMBER 11, 2014**

Factors Leading to 2014 Process



- Original plan was for Staff to review both abstract and workpaper documents
- Abstract resembled “fully baked” workpaper, requiring more Staff review time than expected
- Workpaper developer may change methods and data between abstract and workpaper versions
- Staff has limited resources, would like to prioritize review time

2014 Process



- Cal TF Staff sends CPUC Staff measure description and relevant DEER content during measure abstract phase
- Commission Staff agreed to:
 - Review proposed use of DEER
 - Identify additional DEER data, methods, assumptions that should be used
 - Identify relevant prior work (workpapers, dispositions, etc.)
- Cal TF Staff also sends abstract and workpaper documents to CPUC Staff
 - Staff may review additional content at their discretion
- Cal TF Staff has strongly encouraged CPUC Staff feedback, input and participation in Cal TF at all stages
- Cal TF has valued and incorporated all CPUC Staff/consultant feedback

Next Steps for 2015



Cal TF Staff plans to meet with CPUC Staff early in 2015 to evaluate efficiency and effectiveness of 2014 Cal TF process for seeking CPUC Staff input on TF work product, including

- Cal TF - CPUC Staff communications
- Timing and content of documents provided to CPUC Staff for their review
- CPUC Staff feedback on Cal TF work product to ensure it meets DEER requirements and CPUC Staff expectations.