



Final MTAB Meeting Notes

September 8, 2023

Virtual Meeting

Review September 8 Meeting Notes

Stacey Hobart opened the September 8 meeting with introductions. She reviewed the agenda and called for any changes to the previous meeting notes. There were no changes.

MTI Development Process & MTAB COI

Stacey Hobart outlined the three phases of the CalMTA MTI Development Process and described the activities required in each stage and the gates to determine if the MTI will proceed. Stacey reminded the group of the eligibility and recusal requirements of serving on the MTAB and meeting norms that were set in September 2022.

Comments and questions from MTAB members included:

- Clarification about the topics for 2024 MTAB meetings, which would be Batch 2 and Batch 3 of the MTI concepts.
- Clarification that the Application submission would set the process for approving subsequent MTIs going forward.
- It was explained that the Advancement Plan implementation would start in early 2024 and that staff would provide updates via the MTAB meetings, in reports and updates on the website, and through email. Other updates could be provided as needed.

MT Idea Submission & Scoring Update

Jeff Mitchell summarized the RFI metrics:

- 117 Submissions
- 63 Unique submitters
- 32 Outreach presentations
- 118 Webinar registrations
- 21 Office Hour meetings
- 14 Q&A board posts

Duplicative ideas were combined for a total of 75-80 unique submissions. Jeff provided self-reported data on the industries the submitters work in and the target business sector the

proposed idea targeted. Ideas were evenly divided between residential and commercial sectors. Comments and questions from MTAB members included:

- There was a request for additional detail about the category definitions specifically who makes up the consultant category.
- It was noted that there are very few industrial proposers yet a large number of process proposals. Jeff agreed that this may be misrepresented due to the combining of similar proposals and would update.
- It was clarified that a full Disposition Report was being developed that would share the status of all the ideas submitted through the RFI.
- Clarified that the idea must save energy over the baseline even though how much may not be able to be measured at this point.
- The main challenge of this development phase is the tight timeline to go from an idea to an Advancement Plan for the front runners.
- Suggested that staff work for clarity on what criteria is needed to bring forward archived ideas on the watch list for future consideration.
- There was a question about how many of the submissions meet the MT alignment criteria and if more education was needed to improve alignment to the goal. Jeff thought more education would be helpful and explained that he didn't know yet how the ideas met the MT alignment **criteria**.

MTI Criteria Weighting

Jennifer Barnes detailed the process for scoring criteria and criteria weighting. Questions raised include:

- Clarification about how much the scores change between Stage 1 and Stage 2 given the limited difference in weighting between the stages. It was explained that as more information is learned, the scores can change.
- The overall importance of portfolio cost-effectiveness may mean that at this stage, the cost-effectiveness calculation is a first estimate.
- Jennifer clarified what constitutes TRC in the scoring.
- It was asked whether the calculation takes into account the cost reduction estimate of market adoption over time. Karen Horkitz explained that it did.
- It was asked how close to the ideal MTI was received from the RFI. Jeff explained that the RFI submissions in Stage 1 scoring landed between 3.8 and 8.2.
- It was clarified that the two-stage process helped cull some of the ideas through Stage 1 scoring. Likely 25-30 will move to Stage 2.

MTI Evaluation Framework

Karen Horkitz covered the key points of the Evaluation Framework and the key elements of the evaluation process, including the logic model blueprint and the assessment of market progress and causality. Comments and questions from MTAB members included:

- A strong concern was raised by one member that the proposed approach to look at overall market impacts might allow MT to take credit for RA impacts that would not otherwise be attributable to MT. Would rather see MT impacts on their own even if those incremental impacts were low.
- Others shared that determining whether MT is a certain % responsible for market change is not answerable. But rather should ask if the effort of CalMTA is critical to the outcome.
- It was suggested that examples be developed to show how combined evaluation accounting between RA and MT efforts (under the proposed framework) would play out in a real-life situation.
- There is a desire to have synergies between the programs so that the total was greater than the sum of the parts. If so, then there would need to be close coordination between existing program and CalMTA evaluations.

Public Comment

- Richard Fennelly voiced concerns about the regular cleaning of HVAC coils as an energy efficiency matter and shared a link to a related study.

Upcoming Meetings & Wrap Up

- Stacey noted that CalMTA meetings are available on demand online and the CalMTA team has added a link on the website where stakeholders can continue to comment in writing after the conclusion of the live meeting.
- Lujuana Median invited the MTAB to hold an upcoming meeting in the Los Angeles area. It was agreed that an upcoming meeting would be sited around Los Angeles.

The meeting was adjourned.

Attendees

MTAB Members

Cyane Dandridge, Strategic Energy Innovations
Haley Goodson, TURN
Fred Gordon, Energy Trust of Oregon
Jeff Harris, Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance
Randall Higa, Southern California Edison

Peter Miller, Natural Resources Defense Council
Christie Torok, California Public Utilities Commission
Ky-An Tran, California Public Advocates
Lujana Medina, County of Los Angeles County Environmental Division Manager

Staff and Consultants

Taqua Ammar, CalMTA (administered by Resource Innovations)
Jennifer Barnes, 2050 Partners on the CalMTA team
Lynette Curthoys, CalMTA (administered by Resource Innovations)
Jim Giordano, CalMTA (administered by Resource Innovations)
Stacey Hobart, CalMTA (administered by Resource Innovations)
Karen Horkitz, Consultant to CADMUS on the CalMTA team
Jeff Mitchell, CalMTA (administered by Resource Innovations)
Nils Strindberg, CalMTA (administered by Resource Innovations)

Guests

Carol Yin, ETCC	Allegra Steenson, PNNL
Katharine Bierce, Building Decarbonization Coalition	Kevin Hamilton, Central Cal Asthma
Christophe LaBelle, UCLA	Kate Zeng, SDGE
Saki Nakagawa, Daikin Comfort	Hellen Chen, ACEEE
Marc Costa, Energy Coalition	Andrew Hoffmeister, ACEE
Shelly Adams, Cascade Energy	Christopher Malotte, SCE
Nick Michel, NEEA	Merry Sweeney, SDGE
Denis Livchak, Synergy NRG	Ortensia Lopez
Richard Fennelly, Coilpod	Edward Merkel, IFSJob
Ben Bunker, Pearl Certification	Tom Ries
Emily Pelstring, CPUC	Angel Swanson, Beira Consulting
Melinda Lopez, Ortiz Group	Jordan Elliott, Pearl Certification
Don Aramabula	Carlo Gavina, SoCalGas
Kevin Lin, SCE	Sarah Price, LBNL
Pat Eilert, PG&E	Conrad Asper, PGE
Stacie Riskey, SDGE	Mark Isaacs, Wonderwindow
Mananya Chansanchai, PG&E	Jenny Chen
Karen Herter, Herter Energy	Megan Campbell, Opinion Dynamics
Paola Trzebiatowski, Sempra Utilities	Leo Sommaripa, DNV
	Dan Suyeyasu, CodeCycle