

DRAFT MTAB Meeting Notes

May 26, 2023

NRDC Offices, San Francisco, CA

Margie Gardner opened the May 26 meeting with introductions and an icebreaker. She reviewed the agenda.

Review April Meeting Notes

Margie Gardner called for any changes to the previous orientation meeting notes. There were two small changes that were accepted and the meeting notes were made final.

Summary of "Success"

Margie reviewed the outputs from "what success would look like" exercise from the April orientation meeting.

Overall Request for Ideas/Initiative Development Process

Margie reviewed the schedule for developing MTIs and milestones including the following reports:

RFI Disposition Report, which includes a description of the development process, a summary of ideas collected, and identifies 15-20 ideas for Phase 2.

MTI Advancement Plans, which are activities needed to develop priority ideas into full MTI Plans.

MTI Plans, which is all material to document MTI strategy and implementation—logic model, ROI, stakeholder engagement, data management, etc.

The advisory board members discussed several aspects of the process including questions for clarity:

- For the initiatives that are "highly advanced," is their development the responsibility of the CalMTA staff or the submitter? CalMTA staff will be developing all ideas into MTI Plans, but some will take more time than others. The team will go back to submitters for viable ideas to get more information if needed. It was explained that the more fleshed out the idea, the more likely it

will be a front runner in the prioritization. Those could be something that is already in place in other parts of the country, for example.

- Check points were discussed as important opportunities to engage externally.
- Need to keep checking the state of the market because things change—could provide opportunities to increase stringency if the efficiency level over what we initially thought.
- Discussed whether there was flexibility on funding some of the early opportunities.
- There was further conversation around whether exiting is the right word, but rather a hand off or transition.
- Clarification about whether there were opportunities to adjust the MTI model in Stage 4 Strategy Testing. It was clarified that there would be and that was the really the purpose of that stage—to confirm the approach.
- Monitoring in Stage 6 would be long-term, but the length of the time frame would be described in the plan with defining the indicators for monitoring and on what timeframe. This will be important to understand longer-term progress on workforce development.
- Clarifying discussion about the need for long-term monitoring in market transformation because there should not be the expectation of immediate results. Monitoring is needed to measure the impacts over a longer period of time than you would see in resource-acquisition programs.
- One reason that the exit was highlighted is that we don't want markets to become dependent on the interventions. We need to plan for how the investment can step out.

Margie explained the intake process and advisory board's role. There was further discussion about points at which the advisory board would be needed. She also raised the issue that some of these initiatives would need further design and development before you could adequately prioritize or determine viability of an idea. It was added that this would be a problem with energy savings potential. Proxies would be used in some cases for Phase 1 with the intent to refine in Phase 2. There will be a lot of judgement involved. It was explained that the scoring team is having calibration meetings where these issues are vetted.

It was raised that engagement with disadvantaged communities and community-based organizations in particular may not result in near-term interest, but over time there will be. There needs to be a way to present these "hopeful assumptions."

There was discussion clarifying how much influence and input the MTAB should be putting into the process. It was shared that the members would not be asked to score but should give feedback on the criteria and weighting of the criteria. Also, when we get to the top ideas, the MTAB should be giving advice on whether an idea concept should move forward or not. This process would be relying on the MTAB's expertise and feedback.

There was a question about the option of combining ideas that come in and how that would be handled. Margie explained that those groupings would likely happen naturally by sector or technology. Say, high performance windows—is that for new or existing buildings, which would look very different in an MTI? There was a suggestion that the MTAB could meet together, but also individual conversations could happen to get MTAB members feedback and input.

It was explained that there is no MTAB decision for the priority MTIs to move to Phase 2, but they would have the opportunity to formally object with reasons why. In addition, the Disposition Report is a record of what happened, but there is no check point on the Disposition report by the CPUC.

Intake Materials & Process

Jennifer Barnes gave an overview of the intake process and the ways that the questions and criteria were developed and tested. She added that CalMTA is never rejecting ideas, but archiving those that may not be ready to develop or right for market transformation.

There were questions and discussion about the process including:

- A question about the timing of possible conversations with the submitter. It was explained that this could happen at any time and would depend on the nature of the submission. It was intended to be flexible to address whether the submitter has a stake in the idea or was simply passing on information.
- Further discussion about when ideas are achieved and ensuring that proposals that don't qualify for a full MTI could be supportive of other MTIs that will move forward. Jennifer confirmed that flagging these kind of supportive ideas should be integrated into the development process.
- There was further discussion about mechanisms for passing on ideas that are not right for market transformation to the labs, utilities or other program opportunities. It was clarified that a relationship with CalNEXT and other programs were being developed.

Jennifer explained that the questions mapped back to the scoring categories/criteria. She emphasized that the team tried to balance intent for simplicity with needs around account set up, etc.

- It was suggested that if an idea is archived, then there should be communication if the idea is forwarded to another entity, so the submitter knows the full disposition.
- It would be helpful if someone took the time to submit, they could get linked back to the CPUC decision and the parameters within which we're working. It was clarified that this information was on the website, but we could more to prompt them to access the material.
- There was clarification about language in the questions, how attachments can be accepted, or whether images could be uploaded.
- It was clarified that submissions that were simply to market more product sales would be scored lower. There was discussion about whether that outcome would be considered restraint of trade. Staff agreed to be diligent about documenting decisions related to those types of submissions.

Public comment

Margie called for public comment.

Steve Nadel in the online chat shared that regarding "exit strategies," ACEEE often uses the term "transition strategy." There are multiple potential transition strategies such as strengthening qualifying levels to achieve the next tier of savings or doing promotion activities to help new market players to prosper.

MTI Criteria & Prioritization

Jeff Mitchell introduced the scoring exercise and process. MTAB members broke into groups of two to discuss the example idea and create their own scores based on the criteria provided. The members compared scores and discussed reasoning for their choices. Some key points in the discussion include:

- Need to make assumptions on information gaps in the idea. Acknowledged the aspect of subjectivity of the scorer in determining what was reasonable to assume.

- Questions about how the readiness scoring is defined and how accessibility is assessed. Also need to recognize that current low adoption may not be an indicator of a product not being ready and needs further assessment.
- The challenge of numeric scoring and that it doesn't tell the story of market transformation potential.
- The potential overlap with codes and standards to affect market change.
- Cost-effectiveness will be a factor, but not at this stage since more information would need to be collected to make that determination.
- Discussed determining whether an MTI would be "economically feasible" as a broad consideration and would encompass supply and demand.
- What was the power of the reviewer to take a score from 1 to a higher number if they collected missing information? For example, there wasn't anything in the example that brought the partnership for ESJ so it would be scored low. But scorers could say, "if they partnered with a willing organization, it could have more opportunity."
- ESJ partners are a particular element and role that could simply be a messenger and community outreach partner as opposed to a technical partner. This messenger is trusted, tied to the community, etc. and is as important as those doing the work. Also noted that it is important to fund partners who are doing the outreach.
- Emphasized the opportunity for submitters to upload documents that would fill in some of the information gaps that could not be addressed because of the brevity of the answer format.

2023 Operations Plan

Margie introduced the operations plan and the purpose to inform all of CalMTA stakeholders about the work underway and to be completed this year (2023). This is in the process of being finalized and will be posted on the website and shared.

2024 Budget Planning & MTAB Role

Jim Giordano presented the 2024 budget planning process and the MTAB's role in recommending the budget for approval through an Annual Budget Advice Letter (ABAL). He reviewed the budget format with background on how the decision provides funding to the CalMTA.

The MTAB members discussed the typical timing of approval and process for an ABAL submission. There was a question about what would happen if a budget was

not approved by Jan. 1 and whether Ordering Paragraph 5 would apply to CalMTA. This would allow the program to work from the previous year's budget until the ABAL was finalized.

It was recommended that CalMTA submit the budget through an ABAL filing as soon as possible to see if there are any protests. If there are and that delays the decision, then CalMTA could collaborate with the CPUC on a path forward and potentially file a motion to clarify if unspent funds could be used or if the ordering paragraph applies.

There was further discussion about how the timeline for approval could play out.

Next Steps & Next Meeting

Given the pressing need for the budget recommendation, the MTAB members discussed upcoming meeting dates for review and feedback as well as the MTI concept development review later in the year. Discussed how to get review and feedback from members who could not attend particular meetings.

The upcoming meeting schedule includes:

2-hr Virtual Meetings

- Thursday, June 8, 11 am - 1 pm
- Friday, June 30, Noon - 2 pm
- Friday, Sept. 8, Noon - 2 pm

All-Day in-person Meeting

- Thursday, Nov.30, Noon - 5 pm & Friday, Dec. 1, 9 am - 3 pm
- Thursday, Jan. 25, 9 am - 5 pm

Public Comment

Margie called for public comment.

Hale Forester (CEE) asked about the prioritization process. She stated that this is an interesting conversation and was struck by how thoughtful this process is. When she is thinking about a market intervention and the components: audience, product or practice, content of intervention, and delivery. Want to acknowledge that you are soliciting ideas based on the audience and technology, but how are you aligning

what you're soliciting with that list of scores? A second question is how you are you differentiating this list of criteria for the MT initiative from the RA programs?

Jeff Mitchell explained that the differentiation happens in Phase 2 where the MT story is identified and we finalize the differentiation. We test interventions and then move to a full MTI deployment plan, which is where we actually implement the interventions in the market.

Other questions on the scoring criteria

There was further discussion on the scoring criteria and how MTIs will collaborate with other efforts in California including codes and standards and emerging technology. It was shared the MTIs that are coordinated would score higher.

Ensuring that MTIs that related to other programs would receive special attention to ensure savings are properly attributed between them. From a ratepayer standpoint, we want to draw out the leveraging as much as possible, but we need to ensure that savings are not double counted or inappropriately attributed. It was suggested that the best way to approach this is to bring partners together for co-creation.

The members discussed the requirement that a coordination plan be created to address overlapping efforts. It was mentioned that this is part of the MTI Plan Outline.

There was a final question about whether these criteria are final at the end of this meeting or what are the next steps. Particularly where is risk assessed? It was shared that risk would be looked at on a portfolio basis. Staff would take the MTAB feedback and adjust the criteria accordingly and then finalize for purposes of the RFI.

The meeting was adjourned.

Attendees

MTAB Nominees

Christie Torok, California Public Utilities Commission

Peter Miller, Natural Resources Defense Council

Ky-An Tran, California Public Advocates

Fred Gordon, Energy Trust of Oregon

Lujuana Medina, So Cal REN

Haley Goodson, The Utility Reform Network

Jeff Harris, Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance
Randall Higa, Southern California Edison
Steven Miller, Strategic Energy Innovations (proxy for Cyane Dandridge)

Staff & Consultants

Stacey Hobart, CalMTA (administered by Resource Innovations)
Margie Gardner, CalMTA (administered by Resource Innovations)
Karen Horkitz, CADMUS
Jeff Mitchell, CalMTA (administered by Resource Innovations)
Nils Strindberg, CalMTA (administered by Resource Innovations)
Taqua Ammar, CalMTA (administered by Resource Innovations)
Jennifer Barnes, 2050 Partners
Lynette Curthoys, Resource Innovations

Guests

Carol Yin, Yinsight, Inc., in-person
Leo Sommaripa, Senior Consultant, Business Development
Carlo Gavina, Southern California Gas