



Local  
Government  
**SUSTAINABLE ENERGY**  
Coalition

## NOTES

Energy Efficiency Policy Committee  
November 20, 2014

### Participants:

Jen Rosser, Dana Boudreau, Jody London, Lena Luna, Beckie Menten, Shayna Hirshfield-Gold, Alelia Parenteau, Matthew Marshall, Anna Lowe

### 1. CPUC Energy Efficiency Proceeding (R.13-11-005)

#### a. Logistics of 2015 Extension

The group discussed the October decision on Phase 1 (D.14-10-046), authorizing programs through 2015 and establishing the Rolling Portfolio. An issue for some of the governments in SCE territory is SCE's announcement that it will be shutting down the Strategic Plan pilots because the Decision did not authorize them to continue. This was an issue the LGSEC raised in our comments on the Proposed Decision. Jody is going to research what options may be available, and possibly reach out again to SCE.

In the context of discussing perceived biases in the Decision against local governments, the group discussed an emerging LGSEC project, suggested by the Greenhouse Gas Reduction/Cap and Trade Policy Committee, to develop a report on achievements by local governments on energy and climate change. Still in development, one idea would be to catalog the potential for greenhouse gas reductions identified in local government energy and climate action plans. The target audience for a report like this would be elected officials and policy makers, particularly at the State level. There was some concern about how to report this information if not all local governments can afford to develop these types of plans, and tension in some jurisdictions because these plans can be perceived as mandates. **Members agreed to send Jody their ideas on what organizations might have inventory data we could access for this.**

#### b. Rolling Portfolio

The Rolling Portfolio model is scheduled for consideration by the CPUC in Phase 2 of the energy efficiency proceeding. Jody provided an update on the ongoing discussions to work out the implementation details. There is a move to streamline the current work captured in Program Implementation Plans into a Business Plan. This would be a higher level document. Once the CPUC approves the Business Plans, Program Administrators could develop internal work flow in their own implementation plans.

The CPUC is expected to launch Phase 2 any time, now that Commissioner Peterman has been named the new lead Commissioner. The Coordinating Committee for the Rolling Portfolio is aiming to get a letter to the CPUC in the near future that outlines the progress to date.

c. “Baseline” Definition

An ongoing concern for the LGSEC has been the definition of baseline, and the challenge with energy efficiency projects only being eligible for incentives if they exceed an ever-stricter Title 24 code. Jody London updated the group that the LGSEC is moving ahead to identify the type of data the ALJ laments in D.14-10-046 is missing on this issue, data that shows there are energy savings not captured because of this challenge. **Committee members agreed to send Jody any ideas they have for how we can document the challenges with the current CPUC approach.**

2. Integrated Demand Side Management Proceeding (R.14-10-003)

Jody reminded the group of an update memo that had been circulated recently. The LGSEC submitted opening comments in this proceeding in early November, and will submit reply comments on November 24. One of the opportunities in this proceeding is to push for independent administration of integrated demand side management programs; the default does not have to be utility administration. The group discussed this concept.

3. Other

The group discussed frustration that some members are having with the way the CPUC Energy Division is structuring meetings around evaluation, measurement, and verification of local government energy efficiency programs. The meetings appear to be by invitation only from the Energy Division. It was noted that for some programs, for example those operated by community choice aggregators, there is no funding allocated for EM&V. So any evaluation of those programs would have to be covered with funds that would otherwise go to program delivery. The group agreed to continue monitoring this concern.

4. Next Meeting

Thursday, December 4, 3:30 – 4:30 (regular date/ time)