**Notes from Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee Meeting/Stakeholder Engagement Forum**

3/18/2016 9 AM to 12 PM

Location: PG&E Pacific Energy Center, SDG&E Energy Innovation Center, SCE Energy Education Center and via internet

Facilitator: BluePoint Planning, Inc.

*All presentations and notes are available on the CAEECC.org website.*

**Welcome – Mindy Craig (BluePoint Planning)**

**OVERVIEW**

The Statewide Workforce Education &Training (WE&T) Stakeholder Engagement Coordinating Committee Meeting was held on March 18, 2016 in three locations via video as well as, webinar/phone: San Francisco, San Diego, and Los Angeles. San Francisco was the host location with all presenters.

Lara Ettenson, NRDC, gave an overview of the Coordinating Committee’s role and introduced the three co-chairs of the WE&T subcommittee: Brandi Turner (SDG&E), Jake Huttner (SCE), and Charles Eley (New Building Institute).

**Agenda**

* Welcome and Meeting Objectives

Mindy Craig (BluePoint Planning)

* Overview of CC & Subcommittee

Lara Ettenson (NRDC)

* SW WE&T GAP Analysis

Brandi Turner (SDG&E)

Jake Huttner (SCE)

Sam Jensen Augustine (PG&E)

* PG&EWE&T GAP Analysis

Robert Marcial (PG&E)

* SCE WE&T GAP Analysis

Jake Huttner (SCE)

* SoCal Gas WE&T GAP Analysis

Rodney Davis (SoCal Gas)

* SDG&E WE&T GAP Analysis

Russell Laub (SDG&E)

* Stakeholder Feedback & Discussion

Moderator: Mindy Craig (BluePoint Planning)

**SUMMARY**

The following provides a summary of the presentations and comments and questions from the meeting. Comment card comments and questions are included as well.

**Websites & Contacts mentioned during the meeting:**

* Coordinating Committee: [www.caeecc.org](http://www.caeecc.org) contact Lara Ettenson, [cochair@caeecc.org](mailto:cochair@caeecc.org)
* Studies lead by the CPUC are available at CALMAC. CALMAC also includes how the evaluations are done. More questions about the studies can be directed to Carmen Best, CPUC, EM&V team lead. California Measurement Advisory Council (CALMAC) [www.calmac.org](http://www.calmac.org)
* Bernie Kotiler: the IBEW Zero Net Energy Center in San Leandro, <http://www.znecenter.org>

**Overview of CC & Subcommittee**

*Lara Ettenson, NRDC*

Lara Ettenson, NRDC, and Meghan Dewey, PG&E are the co-chairs for the Coordinating Committee. The focus of the coordinating committee is to provide input early and often in to the Business Plans and to facilitate a transparent process. The Committee will review the initial design, seek to find efficiencies in various formal and informal processes, improve accessibility of energy efficiency activities, and provide scheduled forums to discuss ideas or resolve differences.

The WE&T subcommittee co-chairs are Brandi Turner, SDG&E, Jake Huttner, SCE, (both PA co-chairs) and Charles Eley (non-PA co-chair), New Building Institute.

Phase 1 includes the Business Plans (input deadline is August 1, Business Plan deadline from the PA’s is September 1) and Phase 3 will encompass policy issues not addresses to date.

**Presentation*:*** *Coordinating Committee Overview*

**Contact:** Coordinating Committee: [www.caeecc.org](http://www.caeecc.org)

Lara Ettenson, [cochair@caeecc.org](mailto:cochair@caeecc.org)

**SW WE&T GAP Analysis**

*Brandi Turner (SDG&E)*

*Jake Huttner (SCE)*

*Sam Jensen Augustine (PG&E)*

The presentation expands on the Vision, the role of the WE&T program administrators, the Statewide WE&T structure, Connections Program, Energy Centers- Reach & Activities, the WE&T activities influence on energy savings, Energy Center knowledge, partners and collaborating, Statewide structure moving forward- linking market potential, the EE audience, large dynamic market place, big trends – interactive learning, digital & online, opportunities and challenges.

**Presentation*:*** *SW WE&T Business Plan*

**COMMENTS, QUESTIONS & ANSWERS**

**Comments**

* There are large groups of community based organizations (CBO) throughout the state that work with the community in which the community workforce know and trust. A partnership with them should be looked at diligently.
* Agreement with partnering with CBO’s. Consider looking at contractors who are not in the EE “game”. Class B contractors should go through in depth training. Information about trainings should be provided to the State Licensing Board.
* High performing market slide (in presentation) shows the San Leandro Zero Net Energy Center retrofit building. Everyone is invited to tour the building, see the apprenticeship training center, and see what can be done. The building shows that the 2030 goals for new buildings, as well as, the 2050 retrofit goals can be achieved. Bernie Kotlier: IBEW Zero Net Energy Center in San Leandro, <http://www.znecenter.org>

**Question & Answers**

* Would like to know more about the skills gap in the workforce and tie into working with CBO and the disadvantage community and would like to see what the skills gap is and what level.
  + Response: Agree that they would like to see where the skills gap exists and take a closer look. In other subcommittees, an item discussed, was that there are not technology limitations in the ability to achieve the majority of California energy goals.
* How is the influence on energy savings measured?
  + Response: A CPUC impact evaluation study, The Indirect impact Evaluation Study. It is an estimate of energy savings based on research and discussion of players in the industry.
* Clarification on outcomes vs. output
  + Response: Outcomes may be a ripple effect of jobs, but the team is held to EE standards and requirements outlined by the CPUC. Need to demonstrate outcomes in EE.
  + We are not showing attributing energy savings – we are showing additional estimated energy savings based on our programs. This is a non-resource program so currently there are no energy metrics savings associated with the program. Opinion Dynamics did a survey looking at potential and indirect savings.
* Still working on a metric that connects WE&T expenditures with energy efficiency?
  + Response: It is a gap that the team has identified. The WE&T team wants to move from counting classes to understanding what the impacts are. Impact may or may not be energy savings but “knowledge” gain.
  + Comment: Reminder it is not the authority and jurisdiction of the CPUC to do job development. Believes there should be a change and the connectivity of expenditure dollars and efficiency savings should be a priority and not just part.

**IOU PRESENTATIONS**

**PG&E** WE&T GAP Analysis

*Robert Marcial (PG&E)*

The presentation by PG&E included: EE and WE&T at PG&E, PG&E energy savings, potential EE jobs data, PG&E WE&T program details, summary of trends, gaps, barriers, and opportunities.

**Presentation*:*** *PG&E WE&T Market Assessment and Gap Analysis*

**SCE** WE&T GAP Analysis

*Jake Huttner (SCE)*

SCE’s presentation of their program included: value proposition, a guidance framework, the program overview, a key success (HVAC), market analysis, and vision /guiding principles.

**Presentation:** *SCE WE&T Market Assessment and Gap Analysis*

SoCal GasWE&T GAP Analysis

*Rodney Davis (SoCal Gas)*

The SoCaL Gas presentation was comprised of: SoCal Gas overview, California long term EE strategic Plan, Energy Resource Center, strategies and interventions, education and training (K-8, 9-12, College, adult), gaps, response to programs, and SWOT.

**Presentation*:*** *SoCal Gas WE&T Market Assessment and Gap Analysis*

SDG&E WE&T GAP Analysis

*Russell Laub (SDG&E)*

The WE&T program acts as a bridge for Energy Efficiency and the workforce. The SDG&E presentation consisted of: gaps analysis, marketing and opportunities, barriers, and vision.

A clarifying question was asked by a stakeholder on slide 16: WE&T Opportunity. This slide pertained to overall attendees of classes. The bullet point “More time needed 27%” was explained as meaning 27% of attendees surveyed would like to have more classes, so they can dive deeper. It was not that the class was not long enough. Most of the attendees surveyed thought the classes were fine as is.

**Presentation:** *SDG&E WE&T Market Assessment and Gap Analysis*

**COMMENTS, QUESTION & ANSWERS**

**Comments**

* Speaking from the contractor’s side, one of the issues that came up regularly was contractors moving without notice, which leaves the company/firm shorthanded. How can a small contractor company access the newly certified contractors? An idea is a Facebook style/tool approach. Contractor companies can find trainees quickly via the “tool/list” and this could be an incentive for the trainees to participate in the program. (Participate in the program and be on the list which equals getting a job.) Another idea is offering the incentive to the employer of moving thorough the EM&V process with reduced paperwork, if they have higher trained employees.
* An additional benefit is that contractors tend to be specialized and by giving them ancillary training may make them more comfortable with getting into other specialties.
* There are many different trainings and pathways. Has anyone created a “map”? Where does a trainee start, what are the options? So a trainee can see the path and know where he/she is along it.
* They are working with the IOUs and training energy efficiency and renewable energy for the community. The training includes placement assistant. CBO have a source for workforce development in place and would make a good connection. They look for seeing the market place moving forward and assisting participants with funding. The CBOs want to be partners in the energy efficiency endeavor.
* They are working to expand the CALCTP program. They understand training installers and testers is not enough. With the help of Community Colleges they are developing a building operators training program. UC Davis is also supporting the program. A gap that they see is training for “Design”. When they program is completed they look forward to contributing to the in-depth training. The Don Vial report did make some helpful points and recommendations. A challenge is having a captive audience. When people are in apprenticeship programs they are a captive audience and we should take advantage of this and deliver the trainings in many different areas of energy efficiency.
* WE&T has great programs. Energy Solutions is a program implementation firm and working on the resource program side, he feels there is opportunity to collaborate more with the WE&T programs. We are moving the market, and it’s typically about information gaps. Often people may not know about the new technologies or have uncertainties. As an implementer they are educating the market about programs and opportunities. He would like to see a tighter integration of program implementers working together with WE&T and he would like to be a part of it.
* Adding on to other comments, how to address the barrier of serving incumbent workers. The building operators are very important energy efficiency workers because they are the ones making decisions on purchases. They need to be trained in energy efficiency programs. A suggestion of more third party evaluation of savings to be done, to demonstrate the monetary saving that energy efficiency can give an employer.
  + Response : Stage 3 of the Coordinating Committee has the consideration of evaluation needs in the Business Plan. It could be suggested there by PAs.

**Question & Answers**

* Would like to know more about the possibilities of connecting the Centergies Program with the Connections Program.
  + Response: There is an opportunity to look at a more holistic program that moves with the student through to workforce. Looking at it as one program with a continuous thread rather than two individual programs. This will be explored in phase two.
  + There has also been a shift as many programs had been based on energy awareness and they want to continue this, but also educate on the different types of careers and opportunities that energy efficiency encompasses. They want to streamline the experience to offer better opportunities for people to “plug” in to the program whether they are a student or worker.
* Appreciative of the Community College partnership with the IOU’s. There have been great programs. Surprise at the scale of the incumbent worker problem and believe that many cannot get the time off to attend programs at a center or college. Seems a concerted effort to deal with that gap is needed. Possibly working with partners, training providers, leveraging on line learning solutions, and looking at what the employers “value” in terms of competency.
  + Response: There is agreement with what was said. Technology has changed the learning experience. They are trying different technics in class and online. The questions are what is the right class, the right audience, how can it be made more flexible for people? They see the opportunity to be more creative and innovative in the delivery method. Would love to hear feedback and ideas on successful models.
  + Some of the programs are directly connected to employers and employers don’t always see the “value”. Programs are open to the general public and having the right people in the “audience” is important. Currently, there isn’t data to know if people are using the information provided in the classes (there is a ODC study underway).
  + In the last workshop, bundled classes offering a deeper dive and in the field training were brought up and both of these will be explored heavily and will be brought up in phase 2 and phase 3 of the business plan.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM COMMENT CARDS**

**Los Angeles Comment Cards**

Comment:

A barrier mentioned was “siloed professionals.” I would also add “siloed WE&T programs” with WE&T & there is opportunity for collaboration & coordination between Connections & Centergies programs. Connections programs are key to reaching *­****all*** age/education levels as well as reaching disadvantaged communities, yet they seem to be almost absent from the gap barrier, opportunity discussions.

Comment:

Additional opportunity: Study/explore behavior change/energy savings in k-12 education as well as track increased interest in energy /sustainable/STEM careers

**San Francisco Comment Cards**

Comment:

Building Operator Certification – Following up on comments about employer involvement in this effort, is there a process or mechanism to get the input over the next few months?

Comment:

There is a huge group of community based organizations that work directly with low income disadvantage populations that can partner with the utilities to outreach, train, and assist with employment achievement.

**San Diego Comments**

Comment:

The technology was positive it increases statewide participation. It allows each WET IOU to interact in real time. The only negative – technical bugs (e.g. gaps in audio) and inconsistent camera angles.

A.) It was great discussion on how training outcomes are determined. Specifically how they’re measured (this may have come up during Robert Marcial’s presentation). The explanation was the degree to which training “influenced” workers, businesses, government, etc. to implement what was learned. This seems a bit subjective; finding more meaningful metrics might be worth further exploration.

B.) A disproportionate amount of time seemed to be spent on gap analysis. As a newcomer I tried to follow the explanations on root cause, and it took a while to get my bearings. I think different presenters interpreted gap analysis a little differently. But things became more clear as the meeting progressed.

C.) Russ Laub gave a great presentation! Stayed on point, he presented information on training programs in easy to interpret format. He was the only presenter to show survey results which told a positive story.

Comment:

I thought it was very informative. It was a pleasure to see how each IOU approached the gap analysis and what it findings it produced. The Centers continue to seek ways to maximize their value to the marketplace with very limited resources. I’m very interested in what new metrics will be developed and hope we have an opportunity to contribute to that effort at some point.

Comment:

Susan shared that the meeting was very informative and she appreciates how the IOU’s are very transparent with what they are trying to accomplish. Below are some recommendations to help improve the process:

* Provide a clear pathway of process for providing input/feedback on the Business Plans & Program Implementation Plans
* Framework for stakeholder participation
* Provide clear reasons and background for reasons for stakeholder input
* Provide resources for stakeholders to help understand why we are gathering this information
* Provide various forms of mechanism to submit input/feedback. Public meetings, emails, website, contact person, etc…
* Provide clear direction as to what we need from the stakeholder