



**CEESP Goal 1: WHPA Compliance Online Permitting Working Group
Teleconference Summary Notes
Monday, August 28, 2017
Scheduled for 9:00am – 10:00m PDT**

Call to Order

The Online Permitting Working Group (OPWG) Committee Chair Louis Fuentes (Air Conditioning Guys) called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m. PDT. The meeting audio was recorded.

Roll Call

WHPA Staff (Wendy Worrell) conducted roll call based on the current WHPA Online Permitting Working Group roster. As no voting panel has been assigned in favor of consensus voting, members are organized by voting eligibility status. The meeting was attended by the following 14 participants (or proxies) with a quorum (8+) of eligible members.

Organization	First Name	Last Name	WHPA Category	Attendance
Voting Eligible				
Air Conditioning Guys (Becerril Air/dba A/C Systems)	Louis	Fuentes	Contractor (Residential)	P (OPWG Chair)
CALBO (California Building Officials)	Bob	Barks	Codes & Standards Official (Association or Jurisdiction)	P (Compliance Chair)
CALBO (California Building Officials)	Mark	Meyers	Codes & Standard Official (Association or Jurisdiction)	P
CalCERTS	Russ	King	Certifying Body	P
CEC (California Energy Commission)	Judy	Roberson	Government (Other than CPUC)	P
Charles F. Segerstrom, Energy Efficiency Consultant	Charles	Segerstrom	Energy Efficiency Program Consultant	P
Enalasy	Eric	Taylor	Third Party Quality Assurance Providers	P
EnerGtech Experts	Brent	Locke	Energy Efficiency Program Consultant	P (last 38 min)
Energy CA LLC, The	Eric	Beriault	Third Party Quality Assurance Providers	P
IHACI (Institute of Heating and Air Conditioning Industries)	Bob	Wiseman	Contractor Association	P
SCE (Southern California Edison)	Gary	Shushnar	California IOU	P
Guests				
Building Media, Inc.	Craig	Savage	Educator, Trainer	P
WHPA Staff				
CLEAResult	Paul+	Kyllo	Other Stakeholder	P (Best Practices Memo)
InfoPlast	Wendy	Worrell	Other Stakeholder	P (Host/Scribe)
Opinion Dynamics	Ellen	Steiner	Other Stakeholder	(Survey Memos)

*** Organization is Not a Member of the WHPA; + Individual is NOT Registered with the WHPA; (P) = Member Organization is Pending Approval from the WHPA Executive Committee.*

Agenda

The following agenda was distributed to the roster prior to the meeting.

GENERAL REMINDERS

- Adherence to the WHPA **Code of Conduct** is required.
- Disclose any potential conflicts of interest as it relates to meeting content, particularly prior to any votes that may occur.
- Identify yourself prior to speaking, clarifying the organization on whose behalf you are speaking, or if you are making a personal comment.
- Mute yourself when not speaking. (*6 will take you on and off mute.)

AGENDA ITEMS

1. **Roll Call** – WHPA Staff – 5 min
2. **Prior Minutes Approval** – Chair – 2 min
 - a. August 14, 2017
3. **Memo Finalization and Escalation Voting** – Chair – 50 min
 - a. Contractor Survey Results Memo
 - b. Jurisdictional Survey Results Memo
 - c. Best Practices Memo
4. **Meeting Next Steps Overview** – Chair - 3 min
 - a. Next Meeting: Monday, September 11th from 9am – 10am PDT (if needed)
 - b. Next Agenda: TBD



**CEESP Goal 1: WHPA Compliance Online Permitting Working Group
Teleconference Summary Notes
Monday, August 28, 2017
Scheduled for 9:00am – 10:00m PDT**

5. **Adjournment** by 10:00am PDT – Chair

Prior Minutes Approval

The August 14, 2017 Draft Meetings Notes Summary was emailed to the roster for review prior to the meeting.

Eric Taylor (Enalaysys) motioned and Mark Meyers (CALBO) second the motion to approve the August 14, 2017 meeting minutes. The motion carried with no discussion.

ACTION: WHPA Staff to post the final August 14, 2017 Meeting Minutes to the WHPA Online Permitting Working Group’s webpage.

Memo Finalization and Escalation Voting

The following reference documents dated August 21, 2017 were email to the roster for review prior to the meeting:

- Contractor Survey Results Memo DRAFT
- Jurisdictional Survey Results Memo DRAFT
- Best Practices Memo DRAFT

The Chair reported that the three Memos referenced above were updated and are ready for review and voting.

CONTRACTOR SURVEY RESULTS MEMO

The Chair asked for comments on the updated Contractor Survey Results Memo Draft dated August 21, 2017. As no comments were made, the Chair asked for a motion to approve the Memo.

VOTE: Eric Taylor (Enalaysys) motioned to approve and escalate the Contractor Survey Results Memo to the WHPA Compliance Committee. Mark Meyers (CALBO) seconded the motion. The motion carried with a voiced consensus unanimous “aye” vote without further discussion.

JURISDICTIONAL SURVEY RESULTS MEMO

The Chair asked for comments on the updated Jurisdictional Survey Results Memo Draft dated August 21, 2017. As no comments were made, the Chair asked for a motion to approve the Memo.

VOTE: Eric Taylor (Enalaysys) motioned to approve and escalate the Jurisdictional Survey Results Memo to the WHPA Compliance Committee. Mark Meyers (CALBO) seconded the motion. The motion carried with a voiced consensus unanimous “aye” vote without further discussion.

BEST PRACTICES IN ONLINE PERMITTING MEMO

The Chair asked for comments on the updated Best Practices Memo Draft dated August 21, 2017 and facilitated discussion about the “Conclusions” section of the document.

Finalization Discussion

WHPA Staff (Wendy Worrell) commented that the following “Conclusions” section bullets, which were highlighted in the Memo draft, seemed somewhat duplicative and asked if they should be combined:

- *The system should integrate with other State-implemented systems (e.g. HERS registries) and agencies (e.g. CSLB for license verification) to facilitate permit approvals;*
- *The system should integrate with HERS registries to allow for exchange of data/forms and with the CSLB website to validate contractor licenses;*

DECISION: There was consensus agreement that the referenced bullets should remain separated “as is” since one bullet addresses permit approval and the other addresses license validation, combined with the fact that the integration process of the two is different.



CEESP Goal 1: WHPA Compliance Online Permitting Working Group
Teleconference Summary Notes
Monday, August 28, 2017
Scheduled for 9:00am – 10:00m PDT

Mark Meyers (CALBO) suggested that **Conclusions Bullet #1** (“A singular OPS should be developed and utilized by all statewide jurisdictions to maintain procedural consistency and expedite the permitting process.”) needed adjustment to reduce the risk of alienating jurisdictions that already have their own permitting systems by telling them they must use someone else’s. He proposed modifying the language to clarify use of a singular contact point to be directed to the Online Permitting Systems (OPS) of the local jurisdiction or a statewide system as redirection to the applicable system would gain higher support. Mark reported that solar permitting ran into a similar problem initially with jurisdictions not wanting to be told that they were required to only use one system when they already had a variety of other systems across jurisdictions. The best solution is to allow integration to existing systems or make a system available to those that do not have one. The fee structures will always be different based on California State Law so direction to an OPS to account for those differences is key.

- Judy Roberson (CEC) suggested changing the bullet to read, “A singular OPS should be developed and available to all statewide jurisdictions.”
- Bob Barks (CALBO) agreed that the first bullet should be adjusted per the above comments as well as to clarify a specific coordinated interaction with State Agencies, the Registries, and the local Jurisdictions.
- Eric Taylor (Enalaysys) noted his belief that the OPS should be a CEC approved, integrated system that is made available to the jurisdictions because not all systems integrate into the paper flow that the CEC requires. He suggested that the system should be approved by the State for criteria credibility, then made available to the jurisdictions, and then integrated into the HERS process.
 - The Chair suggested adjusting the bullet to clarify that, “an approved OPS system should be utilized or should be one that merges into the statewide OPS.”
 - Eric Taylor (Enalaysys) agreed with that statement noting that based on their Pilot experience, a top down process is needed.
- Mark Meyers (CALBO) noted that many departments have existing software, some of which are fully integrated with the CSLB to verify license status. The system he had could be integrated to also encompass the HERS Registries and download and capture that information with a simple modification. Most local departments will object if they have to go to a separate system to obtain permit approval. Asking local jurisdictions to abandon local systems will result in pushback due to the costs involved to retain their current systems. They will not want to abandon their current information for permits.
 - Eric Taylor (Enalaysys) pointed out that Bullet #8 covers the concerns Mark Meyers (CALBO) raised. (“An OPS system should be easy for Building Departments to use and should integrate with their current systems and processes.”) An open API would enable integration to the current Building Department’s system.
 - Mark Meyers (CALBO) agreed with Eric Taylor’s (Enalaysys) comments and suggested **integrating bullet point #8 into #1.**
- Bob Barks (CALBO) commented that the sunk costs jurisdictions have on their systems also needs to be addressed for concept buy-in. They need to know that the costs they incurred for an OPS will not be completely lost with integration. They will want to know how they are going to pay for integration.
 - Eric Taylor (Enalaysys) noted that the OPS being developed burdens the costs of integrating into existing systems. If they have an open API, it is a code base to get the data into the system that can then be manipulated as needed.
 - Mark Meyers (CALBO) pointed out that there are probably not even 25 software vendors for over 430 jurisdictions so it is “probably a smaller number that need to find a solution to this than trying to think of it for all jurisdictions.”
- The Chair suggested revised language to read, “A singular OPS should be developed and available to use by all statewide jurisdictions to maintain procedural consistency and expedite the permitting process with standardized data; it should be



CEESP Goal 1: WHPA Compliance Online Permitting Working Group
Teleconference Summary Notes
Monday, August 28, 2017
Scheduled for 9:00am – 10:00m PDT

easy for Building Departments to use and should integrate with their current systems and processes by allowing an open API platform for integration.”

To enable more productive language development, WebEx control was passed to WHPA Staff (Paul Kylo) for live edits to the document at this point in the meeting.

- There was agreement to Russ King’s (CalCERTS) suggestion that the words **“jurisdictions” and “statewide” needed to be in the reverse order.**
- Eric Taylor (Enalasy) stressed that wording should include “shall” and not “may” use the system since there needs to be something that makes the jurisdiction use the system.
- Mark Meyers (CALBO) pointed out that jurisdictions have numerous fees and numerous ways of collecting fees. “Who will maintain 432 different pricing schedules/activities? How do you make the system so flexible it can calculate fees for 432 entities in one process?” He indicated that the answer would be allowing integration into a system.
 - Eric Taylor (Enalasy) agreed that it is a good question. He noted that in their Pilot program they built a utility for the Building Department requiring them to only fill in a blank for the price that then updated the system.
 - Mark Meyers (CALBO) clarified that his point was that “there is a lot in there.” For example, there are different prices for furnaces per bracket. There are also bracketed prices for HVAC based on tonnage, etcetera. There is no question a system can be built robust enough to handle it, but the practicality of it is another issue.
- WHPA Staff (Wendy Worrell) reminded that the bullets in the “Conclusions” need to be drawn from the reviewed resources, and suggested that some of the discussion may fall into more of a “Recommendations” section instead.
- Gary Shushnar (SCE) reminded that a lot of the larger Jurisdictions and some of the smaller ones have permitting systems, but that the packages they use typically get updated on an annual basis. Especially the smaller jurisdictions do not have the budgets nor the resources to maintain these systems. Unless the Energy Commission plans on paying for all of this, he anticipates a great deal of implementation resistance. He also noted that the Building Inspector (CBO) works for the City Manager, and that the City Manager must control the budget and ensure efficient running of the city.
 - The Chair asked how to get the idea across that if there is a singular OPS that has an open API interface, that means that all jurisdictions statewide would only need an update to the one system. Each city would need to enter their own prices, but each individual system would also need to update for general systems maintenance.
 - Mark Meyers (CALBO) countered that it sounded like the suggestion was for the statewide system to have the ability to look into the Building Department databases to get what they need out of it, which is opposite of what it should be.
 - Eric Taylor (Enalasy) clarified that “there is no pulling of information back and forth like that”.
 - Mark Meyers (CALBO) clarified that his point is that the fee information is not withdrawn from the Jurisdictional system so additional information is maintained as a second system “in the cloud”. He noted that for some, pricing changes every six months. He suggested avoiding the time for updates in two systems by allowing the local system to integrate to the statewide system.
- The Chair expressed concern over integration and the landing page noting that he was not sure if the ability to integrate back into a singular online permitting database could be done as needed.
 - Mark Meyers (CALBO) felt it was easy if you start with the address that would automatically link to the correct jurisdiction’s site.



CEESP Goal 1: WHPA Compliance Online Permitting Working Group
Teleconference Summary Notes
Monday, August 28, 2017
Scheduled for 9:00am – 10:00m PDT

- Eric Beriault (EnerGuy) agreed with the revised first bullet as shown on screen. He noted that “we don’t all share the same vision,” and that while he does agree with Mark Meyers’ vision, he also feels that Eric Taylor’s (Enalaysys) vision is the end game. Initially we need the two systems. If the OPS saves time, people would pull more permits.
 - Language was suggested stating that, “Customers would be redirected to jurisdictions that already have existing online permitting systems for the completion of their permit.”

Bob Wiseman (IHACI) commented that we are also discussing a process larger than permitting that also includes the HERS process. He was unaware of many building departments that incorporate anything about HERS documentation and the HERS processes. Because of that, he was unsure if redirecting would accomplish what is desired.

- Craig Savage (Building Media) agrees that the redirect concept will not work. He understands that the concept is for a centralized system to capture data and then have other systems harvest it, but thinks it is a mistake to let jurisdictions feed information back into the centralized system. He suggested letting jurisdictions fill out the Home Performance XML schema that defines the fields in one place (cloud based, etcetera) and then have it move to the proprietary systems once the form is completed. He indicated that if new data happens at a jurisdiction that then needs to go back to the central system, it would complicate the two-way interaction.
 - Eric Taylor (Enalaysys) clarified that Craig Savage’s (Building Media) comments mirror what they found in their Pilot. The CF1R drives off this with the information needing input into the CEC database. If we start decentralizing what is attempting to be accomplished, nothing will change. He suggested the need for a standard process that all understand and is available to those who want to use it. The final key is for the contractor to understand that this is a service to help them. He reported that CEC made a judgment a couple years ago that HERS raters can fill out permits for contractors. With that, if all are trying to use existing building department systems without integration, it will not work. Centralization is key.
 - The Chair suggested **adding a second bullet with the following language: “Jurisdictions with existing OPS systems shall incorporate an open API platform to comply with CEC requirements.”**
 - Eric Taylor (Enalaysys) agreed with the proposed language.
- Mark Meyers (CALBO) expressed concern about the software provider cost for the amount of work done and believes this is “destined for failure if the redirect is not done”.
 - Bob Barks (CALBO) confirmed that when they were looking to upgrade software in Fresno, the cost was \$300,000. He agrees that an OPS either needs to be a redirect or that it needs to automatically integrate into the jurisdiction. The question is how to pay for that.
 - The Chair felt that we are at least discussing an option and reminded that the deliverable is a “best practices” memo.
- Bob Barks (CALBO) suggested equating this to an HOA that has a regular fee to maintain the system noting that there should be some type of monies available for system upgrades.
 - The Chair suggested **adding a third bullet to clarify that “A regular impact fee that is included to pay for system upgrades should be required.”**

Based on the above discussion content, WHPA Staff (Paul Kylo) updated the beginning Conclusions bullets to read:

1. *A singular Online Permitting System should be developed and made accessible for all jurisdictions statewide to maintain procedural consistency and expedite the permitting process with standardized data. It should be easy for Building Departments to use and should integrate with current systems and processing by allowing an open API interface;*
2. *Jurisdictions with existing online systems should incorporate an open API interface that complies with CEC requirements;*
3. *A regular impact fee that is included to pay for system upgrades should be required;*



**CEESP Goal 1: WHPA Compliance Online Permitting Working Group
Teleconference Summary Notes
Monday, August 28, 2017
Scheduled for 9:00am – 10:00m PDT**

ACTION: WHPA Staff to number the Best Practices Memo “Conclusions” bullets.

Escalation Vote

Mark Meyers (CALBO) suggested tabling the vote so the updates made during the meeting could be properly absorbed. Eric Taylor (Enalasy) and Bob Wiseman (IHACI) voiced their agreement.

DECISION: Eric Beriault (EnerGuy) motioned and Eric Taylor (Enalasy) seconded the motion to table the Best Practices Memo vote to enable further discussion at the next meeting on September 11th. There was unanimous consensus with no further discussion so the motion carried.

MEETING NEXT STEPS OVERVIEW

The next Online Permitting Working Group meeting was confirmed for September 11th from 9:00am – 10:00am PDT. The agenda will focus on finalization and voting on the Best Practices in Online Permitting Memo.

CLOSING COMMENTS/ADJOURNMENT

Eric Taylor (Enalasy) motioned and the Chair seconded the motion to adjourn the meeting. The Chair adjourned the meeting at 10:05 am PDT following unanimous approval.

* * * * *

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS AND KEY DECISIONS (from above)

ACTION ITEMS

1. WHPA Staff to post the final August 14, 2017 Meeting Minutes to the WHPA Online Permitting Working Group’s webpage. (DONE)
2. WHPA Staff to number the Best Practices Memo “Conclusions” bullets and finalize edits reflective of the August 28, 2017 meeting discussion. (DONE)

KEY DECISIONS

1. Both the Contractor and Jurisdictional Survey Results Memos were approved for escalation to the WHPA Compliance Committee.
2. The Best Practices Memo vote was tabled to enable further discussion at the next OPWG meeting on September 11th.