California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee Meeting #22

August 7, 2019 10:00 to 4:30

PG&E Pacific Energy Center, 851 Howard St, San Francisco, CA 94103

Draft Meeting Summary

Facilitators: Dr. Jonathan Raab, Raab Associates, Ltd. & Meredith Cowart, CONCUR

On August 7, 2019, the California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee (CAEECC) convened a quarterly meeting of the full CAEECC at the Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) Pacific Energy Center in San Francisco. Over 70 individuals participated in person (including 24 CAEECC Members or their Proxies seated at the table) and over 50 more participated via webinar. A full list of meeting registrants is provided in Appendix A.

Meeting facilitation was provided by Dr. Jonathan Raab (Raab Associates Ltd.) and Meredith Cowart (CONCUR Inc.). Meeting materials, including presentations, are provided on the CAEECC website at: <https://www.caeecc.org/8-7-2019-coordinating-committee-mtg>.

In this document, the majority of the discussion is captured without attribution. In some cases, the affiliation of the speaker is identified, because their affiliation is relevant to the comment. Presentations are summarized only if the presenter did not use a PowerPoint presentation or if it is not available on the meeting webpage (see link above).

Following the presentations, key clarifying questions or comments are listed and relevant *responses to questions* are noted in *italics*. Where multiple responses were given, these responses are listed as sub-bullets. Public comment, and any responses given, is included following these discussion sections. Next Steps, at the end of this document, list all next steps discussed at the meeting.

**Session 1: Introductions**

The CAEECC facilitator J. Raab opened the meeting and reviewed the agenda. He explained that the primary focus of the meeting is for stakeholders to receive presentations and provide feedback on the Program Administrator’s (PA’s) draft Annual Budget Advice Letters (ABALs), which will be filed with the CPUC on September 3, 2019. In addition, he noted that the group will discuss the draft prospectus on the CAEECC-hosted Energy Efficiency (EE) Filing Processes Working Group (WG), the CAEECC workplan for the remainder of the year, and discuss the agenda for the November 21, 2019 full CAEECC meeting.

**Sessions 2A & 2B: Draft ABALS**

J. Raab provided a brief “level setting” for the ABAL discussion, per the document posted on the CAEECC website (see link above, *ABAL Discussion Framing 7.31.19*). He highlighted a few main points:

1. The Cost effectiveness (CE) framework, which is a central driver of ABAL filings, remains a concern for many Members, but it is constant for 2019 ABAL filings, so its relevance will not be debated at this meeting. He added that PAs face several challenges in meeting the CE threshold, including the loss of primary lighting, and continued decline of gas avoided costs;
2. IOUs and MCE but not RENs are required to meet a 1.25 Total Resource Cost test (TRC), and those with TRCs below 1.0 are considered to have not met criteria; and
3. The third party (3P) implementation requirement means that requests for proposals (RFPs) are currently out to bid but not yet confirmed/contracted, which complicates the development and finalization of ABALs.

***PG&E 2019 ABAL Summary, Michael Burger***

This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above, *PG&E ABAL Slides 8.2.19*).

Clarifying Questions and Comments on PG&E’s presentation:

* What's the difference between the Codes and Standards (C&S) Advocacy Program and the Statewide C&S Program?
  + *My understanding is that the scope of work is very similar between the two - we will shut down the Statewide C&S Programs and transition into the C&S Advocacy Program.*
* What is your process for ramping down, and how much can this benefit your portfolio?
  + *We are taking a look at the non-cost effective programs (the red boxes on the slide # 7 titled "Portfolio Balancing" – see link above, PG&E ABAL Slides 8.2.19), and asking vendors what we can do in the next year with a priority focus on CE. If that program is not cost effective, this is a signal that we need to ramp down that program. The timing of closures is driven through portfolio balancing activities.*
* Do you expect the budget be reduced due to portfolio balancing changes?
  + *We expect that our budget will be reduced further, which should raise TRC somewhat*.
* How are you prioritizing amongst the non-cost effective programs?
  + *The highest priority is those that were heavily reliant on lighting, since we see the most significant decrease there. Other than that, we are trying to be consistent across the board.*
* You mentioned that you are hoping 3P programs will boost your TRC. Are you looking for any specific 3P programs?
  + *The 3P solicitations are broad-based, we are leaving the market open to come to us with ideas. As we see those come in, we hope to find opportunities in each sector.*
* Rather than removing certain programs, do you think there might there be opportunities for consolidation?
  + *That's a great suggestion, and something we would entertain.*
* Energy Division (ED): How do you intend to meet your 2020 goals while both ramping up and ramping down programs?
  + *We won’t be getting savings from new programs in 2020, but for existing (e.g. OBF and Residential Energy Advisor) we will be getting over 50% of our energy savings. We will include the programs we propose to close in our September 3, 2019 filing.*
* Are there some programs you will close right away, or do all closures depend on what the selection of 3P solicitations looks like? How will stakeholders know which programs will be closed?
  + *Some we can close right away, but some rebalancing will occur as we see what is coming in from vendors.*
  + *Some will be signaled in our September 3, 2019 filing. Other closures will follow the Advice Letter (AL) process.*
* In 2019 you mentioned On Bill Financing (OBF) and primary lighting – what has changed and what is the same versus the 2019 ABAL?
  + *Primary lighting was proposed for 2019 only and is now going away. For OBF, we thought we had reached an inflection point where OBF was going to take off, but didn’t realize that existing vendors were dependent on a few specific programs.*
* Which programs that are not solicited through 3Ps will bring up TRC?
  + *There are not a lot of opportunities in house and we prefer to outsource in 2020 to get through the ramp up period and reach CE by 2021.*
* How many programs do you not have control over/are you unable to reduce?
  + *We don’t have much authority over non-resource cost, and we have to allocate a certain amount of our budget to Evaluation, Measurement and Verification (EM&V), but the vast majority we can influence.*
* How will the Decision Modifying the Energy Efficiency Three-Prong Test Related to Fuel Substitution (Decision 19-08-009) (Fuel Substitution Test Decision) impact your draft ABAL and/or 3P solicitations?
  + *This is something we are looking at, though we didn’t have time to include projections for those measures in this draft ABAL. It’s unclear whether we will be able to do a robust enough analysis for the September 3, 2019 filing – but we will pursue this in some fashion.*
* It is difficult to understand the proportional allocation for C&S looking at your documents – please explain.
  + *We have had a back and forth with other IOUs regarding how C&S should be proportionally allocated. Currently we have done this based on load share. PG&E’s opinion is that the correct way to do this is based on savings portions rather than load share, but we are not sure what process is needed to make that change.*
  + Are you seeking CPUC approval to make that change?
    - *We are not sure whether we have that authorization or if not how to obtain that authorization*
  + ED: It makes sense for C&S to be proportional to your goals, there should be no problem with making that change in your September 3, 2019 filing.
  + SCE: SCE’s opinion is that the goals should be based on load share.
* ED: You have listed a low budget and the expectation that you will get to TRC by 2021. But you still need to meet your goals, so don’t put that at risk. Remember that if your ABAL is rejected in the future, your budget reverts to the prior year. *Understood.*

***Marin Clean Energy (MCE) 2019 ABAL Summary, Alice Havenar-Daughton***

This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above, *MCE ABAL Slides 7.31.19*).

Clarifying Questions and Comments on MCE’s presentation:

* How will the Fuel Substitution Test Decision impact your draft ABAL and/or 3P solicitations?
  + *We do not currently have fuel substitution programs, but we intend to launch some following the Fuel Substitution Test Decision.*
* ED: I’m concerned that many of your programs require significant ramp up time (and associated up-front costs), meaning you may not be able to meet your savings goals (and related CE).
  + *Several of these programs launched this year (2019) so have already incurred the up-front costs; we expect to start seeing savings next year (2020).*
* You underspent last year – are there lessons from past performance that should affect your forecast?
  + *Last year we faced several challenges including learning how to bring new programs on board, transitioning from a smaller to a larger portfolio, new requirements, the timing of the Business Plan (BP) approval, and how to accurately project our budget needs in this context. Underspending last year was a result of two 2018 programs launching more slowly than anticipated – these are now up and running and won’t have as big of an impact on the 2020 budget as they did on the 2019 budget.*

***Bay Area Regional Energy Network (BayREN) 2019 ABAL Summary, Jenny Berg***

This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above, *BayREN ABAL Slides 7.31.19*).

Clarifying Questions and Comments on BayREN’s presentation:

* How will the Fuel Substitution Test Decision impact your draft ABAL and/or 3P solicitations?
  + *We intend to launch fuel substitution programs, but haven’t yet had time to update our ABAL slides. We will do this before the September 3, 2019 filing.*
* In the past there have been gaps between PG&E and BayREN offerings – please consider what would be helpful to know next from the IOUs in order to develop your Joint Cooperation Memo (JCM) (which will need to be done before next year’s ABAL).

***Tri-Country Renewable Energy Network (3CREN) 2019 ABAL Summary, Alejandra Tellez***

This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above, *3C-REN ABAL Slides 8.5.19*).

Clarifying Questions and Comments on 3CREN’s presentation:

* There were no questions or comments following this presentation.

Public Comment on PG&E, MCE, and 3C-RENs’ presentations:

* Question for PG&E: Three existing school energy programs are being ramped down or eliminated – can you elaborate on what these programs covered and how they will be replaced – or whether that will be left entirely to 3Ps?
  + *Generally speaking, the closures and ramp downs will be negotiated through the portfolio balancing activity. We didn’t highlight specific programs that we are ramping down in this presentation – we are looking at all programs across the board in terms of ramp down opportunities. Details of programs can be found in the program Implementation Plans (IPs).*

***Southern California Edison (SCE) 2019 ABAL Summary, Tory Weber***

This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above, *SCE ABAL Slides 7.31.19).*

Clarifying Questions and Comments on SCE’s presentation:

* How will the Fuel Substitution Test Decision impact your draft ABAL and/or 3P solicitations?
  + *We are still looking at what programs or measures could be eligible or best for our portfolio, but we plan to make some changes.*
  + How are you thinking about fuel substitution measures when fuel substitution is not included in the Potential and Goals?
    - *We will follow guidance in the Fuel Substitution Test Decision*
  + Do you have workpapers for fuel substitution approved already, and what is your timeline?
    - *We plan to put aside a budget for fuel substitution for 2020 and anticipate including some measures in our September 3, 2019 filing.*
* Can you explain why your 2020 Public Sector budget doesn’t include money for 3P public programs?
  + *Local Government Partnerships (LGPs) are continuing, as are all statewide funded public venture programs. We also have a High Opportunity Program (HOP) in the public sector.*
* Can you explain why SCE is pulling the Workforce Education and Training (WET) program from the TRC?
  + *SCE’s request in our ABAL is to remove WET from the 2020 CE test – we believe WET provides a lot of value in California and is best aligned with the low-income proceeding.*
  + ED: The ABAL is not the correct vehicle for approving policy recommendations – this request should not be included here.
* Is the Market Based Initiative (MBI) pilot the industrial pilot that you submitted in an AL earlier this year? Y*es.*
* Are you projecting a .85 TRC continuously throughout the year?
  + *SCE doesn’t expect to set up new 3P programs until late 2020 (we have some budget in case some come in late 2020).*
* The 3P public sector solicitation process has already been delayed several times – how realistic is it that we will see true public sector offerings for 3P programs in 2020?
  + *We have current programs in the public sector that will be continuing, but we won’t have 3P public sector programs launched and approved until 2021.*
* Will you include which programs you will be closing in your ABAL? *Yes.*
* Are you communicating with vendors regarding the programs that need to be off-ramped, so as to give them time to plan?
  + *Not yet - we don’t have solicitations in, so don’t yet know which programs needs to be off-ramped.*
* Please explain why for some programs your budget is much lower than PG&Es but you are showing much higher kWh savings.
  + *Our Residential budget dropped significantly because lighting is now gone. Industrial has a new market-based incentive program with a small budget but increased savings since we are adding Normalized Metered Energy Consumption (NMEC) measures. Public has changed from last year because street light savings was removed and we have a new HOPs program*
  + Why is your residential budget so much lower than other IOUs?
    - *I can’t compare our budget to those of other IOUs.*
* Why is SCE increasing the C&S budget so much? Will they continue to be non-resource?
  + *I don’t know, I will get back to you on that.*
* If you have closed all programs that are under .85 TRC, shouldn’t your overall TRC be above .85? Are you getting rid of these programs entirely and not going out to 3P bid?
  + *This is not related to 3Ps. The 3Ps in our portfolio are already cost effective, and we have fewer programs with high TRCs to offset costs. We will continue to look at how we can drive down costs, but it will take time.*
* SCE meets your goals with C&S in one calculation but not in another – why is that?
  + *There is a disconnect between how C&S are done and how the funding allocation is done by load share. The Potential and Goal study goal is about 45% of the total, but calculated by load share it’s 40% -- so there is a 5% gap. We have submitted comment on this in the P&G Potential Decision.*
* The budget shows $7M of emerging technology, but it looks like you are still putting that out to bid.
  + *That budget is our current budget, not the solicitation.*
  + Is $7M consistent with past budgets?
    - *I believe it’s similar.*
* All PA statewide programs showed +/-20% on proportions, can you explain why that is?
  + *The Decision stated that PAs can take advantage of +/- 20% there, though I don’t think we took advantage of that adjustment.*
* Why did SCE not attribute savings to OBF but PG&E anticipates 50% savings?
  + *The line item for PG&E is just for savings attributed to a HOP.*

Public Comment on SCE’s presentation:

* SCE’s ABAL states that SCE’s offerings for large business customers (targeted commercial and industrial 3P programs) experience a 90% decrease in net energy savings from 2014-2018, despite these customers consisting of a large share of all industrial and commercial customers. Can you expand on whether this trend is expected to continue, and any solutions SCE is putting in place to address it?
  + *We are launching a market-based incentive program to test the market. We continue to make improvements in our processes for the core customize and deemed programs over time. We hope 3Ps will bring us new ideas, that make participation simple, and rely on cost effective installations).*

***Southern California Gas (SCG) 2019 ABAL Summary, Darren Hanway***

This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above, *SoCalGas ABAL Slides 8.1.19*).

Clarifying Questions and Comments on SCG’s presentation:

* Will the Fuel Substitution Test Decision have an impact on your programs – are electrification measures something SoCalGas would consider?
  + *We’re exploring opportunities for fuel substitution (not electrification) in various areas, such as switching from electricity to high efficiency natural gas.*
* You project a much higher TRC for 2020 than in the past – what has changed? How realistic is this projection?
  + *We are projecting a slightly higher TRC, because we now have more and bigger partners delivering programs on our behalf, which has enhanced the value proposition and reduced administrative costs.*
* Which programs are you closing, or when will you know, and how will stakeholders and vendors find out?
  + *Our draft ABAL includes a list of solicitation placeholder programs we are closing – these were opened last year in preparation for solicitations launching this year. We may close additional programs, and we will make this clear in our September 3, 2019 filing.*
  + Did expenditures happen on those placeholder programs? *No.*
* The SoCalGas C&S goal is 21 therms but in your draft ABAL (slide 4, see link above, SoCalGas ABAL Slides 8.1.19) you forecast 15 therm – what is the cause of this discrepancy?
  + *We will have to follow up with our consultant – those should be the same.*

***Southern California Renewable Energy Network (SoCalREN) 2019 ABAL Summary, Matt Skolnik (Lujuana Medina was also available via webinar)***

This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above, *SoCalREN ABAL Slides 8.2.19*).

Clarifying Questions and Comments on SoCalREN’s presentation:

* You’ve been late in providing information upfront and that has been problematic in the past.
* Can you say more about the Zero Net Energy (ZNE) program, and what you are planning to fund?
  + *The emphasis is not only on EE but on education, to expand EE longer-term. This primarily funds the report.*
  + Since solar and EE are separate, is the report funding shared between solar and EE?
    - *There is an additional Pathway to Zero report, with a separate pot of money allocated, and the implementer bills to the specific program*
  + How do you evaluate how effective this program is at changing opinions?
    - *For the main program, we don’t claim savings, but we count the savings that we funnel into IOU programs. For ZNE we’ve have developed multiple reports, which tracks items such as actions that agencies take after the fact. We have a strict invoicing protocol, with multiple oversight opportunities.*
  + Your draft ABAL says that you are seeking approval to develop a program – does that mean you will take ABAL approval as approval of that program?
    - *Absolutely not, this is a notification that we are thinking about launching this program, but we are looking for stakeholder input, and the intent is to notify stakeholders of development and then hold a robust stakeholder process. We feel that early notification of new programs allows us the time to develop programs that will be successful.*
  + The public sector resource program lists kWh but no demand or therms savings – will that be updated?
    - *Demand savings (kW) were negligible, so were not included, but therms* *will likely be added for the final ABAL. The program targets kW, kWh and therms.*

Public Comment on SoCalGas or SoCalRENs’ presentations:

* Question for SoCalGas: Have you thought about ways to offer opportunities to 3Ps for merged/multi-fuel programs?
  + *Yes, we have released RFAs for multi-fuel solutions.*

***San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E) 2019 ABAL Summary, Elaine Allyne***

This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above, *SDG&E ABAL Slides 7.31.19*).

Clarifying Questions and Comments on SDG&E’s presentation:

* Which programs are you canceling independent of any result from 3P solicitations?
  + W*e will be ramping down HVAC programs (in anticipation of ramp up of HVAC programs), middle-income direct install and some non-resource programs.*
  + Will the final ABAL make clear which program you are closing? *Absolutely.*
  + Have you already signaled to vendors that programs will be ramped up and ramped down?
    - *We have a two-pronged approach: we’ve notified vendors that we are shutting programs down. For those that will be shut down and then ramped up, we include language in contracts that explains what is coming for that year.*
* At a previous CAEECC Working Group meeting we asked how your TRC was looking and you stated that you were “cautiously optimistic”. But your TRC is now very high at 1.2 – how did it change so much?
  + *We were very uncertain at that time since we were waiting on several measures and our avoided costs were not yet calculated.*
* Please explain why SDG&E’s demand savings are much higher than those of the other IOUs, but at half or more of the budget. 1) Did you remove lighting savings from historical performance-based forecasts? 2) Did you account for a low savings ramp up period for new programs or did you use a more levelized approach?
  + *1)* *Yes, we removed lighting; and 2) With respect to the 3P ramp up, we accounted for a 180-day period in which no savings will occur, and forecast that at the time at which 3Ps begin implementing programs, they will be cost effective. The savings are due to the fact that we reduced non-cost effective programs in each sector, and then reduced non-cost effective measures in every single program along the way. Then we set stretch goals for each of the remaining measures that are already cost effective, but where there could be stretch. The measures with the most capitalization include behavioral, environmental controls, processing heat, circulation, whole building, and commercial refrigeration.*
  + ED: We are not against optimism but forecasting needs to be trued up with realization rates. It would be useful to have more alignment across PAs.
  + ED: It is also confusing that you show a 77% increase in therms from 2019 and a 54% increase in kWh from 2019.
    - *Therms have increased because we don’t have lighting which was a negative therm value last year. I don’t know why kWh has increased so much, I can get more information for you.*
    - ED question to PG&E: Did you take into account these interactive effects – should we see therms increase as well?
      * *Yes, these interactive effects are incorporated into our forecast.*
* You are closing your 2020 HVAC programs, and have an RFA/RFP for HVAC scheduled to go out – will SDG&E have no HVAC programs in 2020?
  + *There are HVAC components in other programs that will be ongoing.*
* This schedule seems optimistic – specifically launching a 3P program in Quarter 4.
* How will the Fuel Substitution Test Decision impact your programs?
  + *We are waiting for the CPUC to work up the guidebook on this Decision so that we can begin evaluating various programs for their cost effectiveness.*

Cross cutting comments:

* It is important to note that the CE of 3P programs statewide is already level set – they are already very cost-effective – so PA reliance on 3P programs to lower TRC further may not necessarily be effective.
* Public Advocates Office: We will review all ABALs closely (including IOUs/MCE and RENs), with the objective of ensuring that ratepayers are getting good value (no “slush”).
* It would be extremely helpful to add a block indicating the 90 days needed for processing after contract negotiations end before implementation begins to the Joint IOU Solicitation Timeline on the CAEECC website (<https://www.caeecc.org/third-party-solicitation-process>, *Joint IOU Solicitation Timeline v.070119 (July 1, 2019)*)
* PG&E and SCE are both refiling their BPs -- 3Ps will need to see the revised BPs before responding to solicitations. When will we see the revised BPs, and how does this affect the timing of solicitations?
  + *The BP revisions will include updates to the budget, savings, CE – but the strategies will not need major revisions – so you may not need to see the revisions in order to refile. We need more clarity from ED regarding what refiling looks like in the coming weeks.*
  + Question for SCE: Do you envision a major strategy change? *We don’t anticipate a major strategy change.* 
    - *It will be beneficial to see what we get through the solicitation process, as that may impact the overall strategy.*
  + ED: It might help for IOUs to speak to strategies that they don’t anticipate shifting in their ABALs so as to provide more certainty to 3Ps.
    - PG&E: *It would be challenging to put in the ABAL what strategies we will pursue/not pursue at this point in time. We agree however that we need to figure out a way to increase transparency on this subject – we suggest that we provide time for stakeholder review into the Business Plan refiling process.*
* It seems 3Ps are being pushed with potentially unrealistic expectations regarding the ability to be cost effective in order to balance IOU TRCs. It would help 3Ps for PAs to offer fixed services already budgeted free of charge to 3Ps– e.g. administrative and monitoring services.
* Public Advocates Office: We appreciate PG&E and SCE’s approach this year as compared with last year. Last year we protested several items we thought were overly optimistic, and if the net results are not cost effective it is fair to show that. On the other hand, the lack of specificity from SoCalGas and SDG&E makes it harder to avoid a protest. We expect we’ll see more detail in the filings on funding for statewide programs based on the discussion today.
* ED: We would like to know from PAs whether the format of today’s presentations (more time spent on content) and the feedback you received today was useful. Also did you receive information from ED in a timely enough manner (e.g. did mid-July delivery of the AL allow sufficient time?)
  + SDG&E: *I’ve been vocal about the IOU need to information from ED in terms of planning assumptions in a timely manner. This worked well for us this year. Getting the AL by mid-July was helpful, as was getting the Proposed Decision (including guiding principles), and knowing which work papers would be approved by September 1, 2019. Until getting these items we thought we were “cautiously optimistic” about reaching TRC, but receiving these items helped us plan with more certainty and gave us more confidence that we can achieve CE.*
  + MCE: *As a smaller PA, we were not always included in the flow of information meant for IOUs, but which also applies to us in some cases. It would be helpful to have guidance for IOUs documented on the CAEECC website.*
  + BayREN: *It would be helpful to have regular check-ins between ED and all PAs (not only IOUs) around filing time.*
* Public Advocates Office: Most PAs should expect to receive feedback from us following this meeting. For some we may have data requests that will go out before the ABAL filing on September 3, 2019

At the close of this session, J. Raab asked Members to consider what timing and format would be appropriate for additional feedback from CAEECC Member/Proxies and other stakeholders to PAs. Stakeholder. Members determined that any additional feedback will be due by COB Wednesday, July 14, 2019 (and sooner is better). Feedback should be provided in either a redline draft of the ABAL or written comments directly to each applicable PA. (Note: Further guidance on the process for submitting additional ABAL feedback to PAs is available on the CAEECC website [here](https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/b49f75_6f7088b9e2ea4e99aa3829982e35a6e1.docx?dn=Process%20for%20Submitting%20Additional%20ABAL%20F)).

**Session 3: CAEECC-Hosted Energy Efficiency Filing Processes Working Group**

J. Raab reminded Members that at the last Full CAEECC Meeting #21 on June 10, 2019, the facilitation team polled the group regarding their (a) support for and (b) likely participation in a Working Group on refining the Rolling Portfolio process. The results of the straw poll indicated that the great majority of Members (a) support launching such a WG and (b) that if launched, they would participate (straw poll results and related discussion can be found in the meeting summary for the June 10, 2019 Full CAEECC Meeting #21 [here](https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/849f65_ffb6f74d49c9423ca99175df0d94a24c.pdf)). In order to move forward with this WG, the Public Advocates Office, Co-Chairs, Facilitator and CPUC worked together following that meeting to further refine the draft WG prospectus, which is also available on the CAEECC website (see link above, *EE Portfolio Filing Processes WG Prospectus 7.29.19*).

J. Raab provided an overview of the draft prospectus, noting that the goals of this WG are to develop updated and improved EE Portfolio filing processes that include a clear understanding of what information is needed to enable sufficient oversight. The deliverables would include a report delineating the WG recommendations, made by consensus where possible. The intention is for the WG to meet 2-3 times: during the week of October 21, 2019; on November 20, 2019; and in January or February (if needed). The WG would be open to representatives from any CAEECC member organization, and other parties from efficiency proceedings.

J. Raab asked CAEECC Members to provide feedback on the prospectus and provide any additional thoughts on launching the EE Filing Processes Working Group. As CAEECC Members provided comments, J. Raab captured this feedback in redline edits to the draft prospectus. The revised prospectus with redline edits is posted to the CAEECC website (see link above, *EE Portfolio Filing Processes WG Prospectus 8.7.19 redline*). The key points captured in redline edits are also summarized below:

Key Comments on EE Filing Processes WG Draft Prospectus:

*In-Scope, Out of Scope:*

* We should add “closely related bus stops important to improving the process” as a bullet point under “In-scope”. Exactly what is meant by “closely related” should be defined through the WG process as it will depend on the timing and approach that we take. We need to be sure that the bus stops align well in order to ensure greater market certainty.
* Please also specify “implementation plans” in the “In-Scope” bullet reading “Additions to and/or elimination of requirements in BPs and ABALs”.

*Key Questions to Address:*

* We should clarify that any new framework would likely need to be included or addressed in a CPUC rulemaking.
* Why is “as soon as possible” so far out (i.e., 2021 or beyond)?
  + *2021 is the most aggressive timing we could realistically consider, given that a motion would not likely be filed earlier than February, the time needed for the CPUC to comment, and the time required to issue a Decision.*
* The WG could also consider whether any improvements can be implemented during the transition to a new process but prior to the actual Decision (e.g. any refiling of BPs under the current regime).

*Working Group Members:*

* It may not be wise to open up the WG more broadly. Stakeholders involved in this process should be well-versed in the existing policy regime so as to improve the efficiency and quality of the process.

*Deliverables:*

* If the objective of the report is to put a motion on record for the CPUC consideration, that should be included as well.

*Timing:*

* The first WG meeting during the week of October 21st, should not be held on October 24

J.Raab stating in closing that the facilitators would work with the CAEECC Co-Chairs in launching the WG including establishing the schedule, recruiting the members, and developing a detailed meeting-by-meeting strategy.

**Session 4: CAEECC Planning**

J. Raab introduced goals of this planning session -- to discuss the CAEECC workplan for the remainder of 2019 and to identify agenda topics for the November 21, 2019 Full CAEECC Meeting. A presentation on these items is available on CAEECC website (see link above, *CAEECC Planning Slides 7.31.19*).

Key Comments on CAEECC Planning:

* SDG&E may be able to host the full CAEECC meeting and second EE Filing Process WG on November 21 and 20, 2019, respectively. If SDG&E is not available, CSE may be able to host.
* No additional Workshops or Working Groups were identified.
* Several additional potential Full CAEECC meeting topics include:
  + Update on Building Decarbonization Staff Proposal SB1477
  + Any updates on PG&E and SCE Business Plan revisions (assuming their TRC remains below 1.0 in their respective ABAL filings)
  + Updates on how PAs are integrating the Fuel Substitution Test Decision into programs for 2020

**Next Steps:**

* CAEECC Members:
  + Fill out the post-meeting evaluation survey, and review and comment on the draft meeting summary
  + Provide any additional comments on ABALs directly to the applicable PA(s) by Friday, August 24, 2018. Further guidance on the process for submitting additional ABAL feedback to PAs is available on the CAEECC website [here](https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/b49f75_6f7088b9e2ea4e99aa3829982e35a6e1.docx?dn=Process%20for%20Submitting%20Additional%20ABAL%20F).
  + Submit any additional topics for the November 21, 2019 Full CAEECC Meeting as they arise.
  + Complete any needed “homework” in advance of the first EE Filing Processes WG
* Program Administrators:
  + Consider any additional stakeholder feedback on their ABALs by Wednesday, August 24, 2019
  + Finalize and submit ABALs to the CPUC by September 3, 2019
  + The IOU in charge of the Joint IOU Solicitation Timeline on the CAEECC website (<https://www.caeecc.org/third-party-solicitation-process>, *Joint IOU Solicitation Timeline v.070119 (July 1, 2019)*) will add a block indicating the 90 days needed for processing after contract negotiations end before implementation begins.
* Facilitation Team
  + Work with Co-Chairs and CAEECC Members to track current issues and develop draft agenda for November 21, 2019. Determine based on array of topics whether to hold a half day meeting, full day meeting, or phone call only.
  + Identify date for the first meeting of the EE Filing Processes WG during the week of October 21, 2019 (but not October 24). (Note: the second meeting will take place on November 20, 2019; a potential third meeting will take place in January or February 2020).
  + Work with Co-Chairs to develop application format for non-CAEECC Member stakeholders interested in participating in the EE Filing Processes WG.
  + Work with the Co-Chairs in launching the WG including establishing the schedule, recruiting the members, and developing a detailed meeting-by-meeting strategy
* Interested Stakeholders
  + Provide any additional comments on ABALs directly to the respective to PA(s) by Wednesday, August 14, 2019
  + Submit applications for consideration in the EE Filing Processes WG if interested in participating in the WG, and meet the criteria.

**Appendix A: In-Person and Webinar Participation**

*Note: The list of attendees joining in person reflect actual participation as captured via sign in to the meeting; the list of attendees joining via webinar reflect registration only. If individuals participated in the webinar but did not register, or registered but did not participate in the webinar, these last-minute changes are not reflected here.*

**Participants Attending in Person:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **First** | **Last** |
| **CAEECC Member/Proxy - Seated at the Table** | | |
| CALCTP | John | Martin |
| California Energy Commission | Brian | Samuelson |
| CEDMC | Nate | Kinsey |
| CEE | Bernie | Kotlier |
| Center for Sustainable Energy | Beckie | Menten |
| City & County of SF, Dept of ENV | Lowell | Chu |
| CodeCycle | Dan | Suyeyasu |
| CPUC | Alison | LaBonte |
| LGSEC - County of Contra Costa | Demian | Hardman |
| MCE | Alice | Havenar-Daughton |
| MTC (BayREN) | Jenny | Berg |
| NRDC | Lara | Ettenson |
| PG&E | Ryan | Chan |
| Public Advocates Office | Michael | Campbell |
| SBUA | Ivan | Jimenez |
| Southern California Edison | Matt | Evans |
| SDG&E | Athena | Besa |
| Sheet Metal Workers Local 104 | David | Dias |
| SJVCEO | Courtney | Kalashian |
| SoCalREN | Matt | Skolnik |
| Southern California Gas Company | Elizabeth | Gomez |
| The Energy Coalition | Laurel | Rothschild |
| Tri-County REN | Alejandra | Tellez |
| WHPA Inc. | Elsia | Galawish |
| **Other Participants Attending in Person** | | |
| Bidgely | Jordana | Temlock |
| Build It Green | Brett | Bishop |
| CEDMC | Gary | Wikler |
| CLEAResult | Joanne | O'Neill |
| CLEAResult | Peter | Calvin |
| **Company** | **First** | **Last** |
| CONCUR | Meredith | Cowart |
| CPUC | Nils | Strindberg |
| CPUC | Peter | Franzese |
| CPUC | Jason | Symonds |
| CPUC | Jessica | Allison |
| Franklin Energy | Susan | Osbeck |
| Frontier Energy | Lacey | Tan |
| Frontier Energy | Nancy | Barba |
| Gemini Energy Solutions | Anthony | Kinslow II |
| Gemini Energy Solutions | Javier | Luna |
| Google Nest | Serj | Berelson |
| ICF | Julie | Tan |
| ICF | Katy | Berquist |
| Independent | Halley | Fitzpatrick |
| Joule Smart Solutions | Dennis | Quinn |
| Lockheed Martin | Spencer | Lipp |
| Lockeheed Martin | David | Paton |
| MCE | Qua | Vallery |
| PG&E | Michael | Burger |
| PG&E | Al | Gaspari |
| PG&E | Mananya | Chansanchai |
| PG&E | Eva | Chin |
| PG&E | Jennifer | Roecks |
| PG&E | Lucy | Morris |
| PG&E | Maya | Biery |
| Public Advocates Office | Henry | Burton |
| Raab Associates, Ltd. | Jonathan | Raab |
| Resource Innovations | Corey | Grace |
| SCE | Gary | Golden |
| SCE | Jesse | Feinberg |
| SCE | Cody | Taylor |
| SCE | Tory | Weber |
| SCE | Paul | Kubasek |
| SDG&E | Doug | White |
| SDG&E | Sandra | Baule |
| SDG&E | Elaine | Allyn |
| SoCalGas | Darren | Hanway |
| Strategic Energy Innovations | Stephen | Miller |
| The Energy Coalition | Marc | Costa |
| Western Riverside Council of Govts | Anthony | Segura |

**Participants Attending Remotely:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **First** | **Last** |
| **CAEECC Member/Proxy** | | |
| California Energy Commission | Michael | Kenney |
| Center for Sustainable Energy | Stephen | Gunther |
| SoCalREN/County of Los Angeles | Lujuana | Medina |
| **Other Participants** | | |
| American Electric Supply | Kathy | Mastrianni |
| BayREN, MTC | Shraddha | Mutyal |
| California Energy Commission | Payam | Bozorgchami |
| City of Fremont | Rachel | DiFranco |
| City of Fresno | Ann | Kloose |
| City of Santa Clarita | Heather | Merenda |
| Clean Power House | George | Wiltsee |
| CLEAResult | Jeff | Strauss |
| County of Kern | Kimberly | Fleming |
| County of Ventura | Leigh | Walker |
| CPUC | Christina | Torok |
| CPUC | Jason | Symonds |
| DAC | Don | Arambula |
| EEM Advisors LLC | Brian | Haines |
| Franklin Energy | Kenneth | Williams |
| Frontier Energy | Willie | Calvin |
| Greenbank Associates | Alice | Sung |
| Grounded Research | Jenn | Mitchell-Jackson |
| ICF | Chip | Fox |
| IHACI | Bob | Wiseman |
| Jay Luboff Consulting LLC | Jay | Luboff |
| LADWP | Jim | Kemper |
| Leidos | Nicole | Cusick |
| Lockheed Martin | Matt | Smizer |
| MCE | Martin | Bond |
| Milepost Consulting SPC | Dave | Backen |
| MWC | Mark | Wallenrod |
| NAESCO | Donald | Gilligan |
| NEEA | Jon | Clark |
| NEEA | Jeff | Mitchell |
| Nexant | Kimberly | Rodriguez |
| Okapi Architecture Inc. | Ying | Wang |
|  |  |  |
| **Company** | **First** | **Last** |
| PacifiCorp | Nancy | Goddard |
| PG&E/Policy Shaping, Analysis & Compliance | Roopa | Reddy |
| Raab Associates, Ltd. | Susan | Rivo |
| Resource Refocus LLC | Vrushali | Mendon |
| San Diego Gas & Electric | De De | Henry |
| Santa Maria Valley Chamber of Commerce | Dave | Cross |
| SCE | Mike | Bushey |
| SCE | Larry | Tabizon |
| SDG&E | Alex | Kim |
| Sierra Business Council | Paul | Ahrns |
| Silent Running | James | Dodenhoff |
| Sonoma County Regional Climate Protection Authority | Chris | Cone |
| Southern California Edison | Jose | Buendia |
| Southern California Edison | Matthew | Horwitz |
| Southern California Edison | Pei-Chi | Chou |
| Southern California Edison | Brian | Maloney |
| Southern California Gas Company | Sharareh | Moaddeli |
| Staples & Associates Inc. | Dennis | Guido |
| TEAA | Caleb | Witzaney |
| TEAA, The Energy Alliance Association | Ross | Colley |
| TEC | Rebecca | Hausheer |
| The Energy Coalition | Christopher | Ford |
| thirdACT | Diane | Schrader |
| USGBC-LA | Edmund | Novy |
| Willdan | Vemetria | Muhammad |