



WHPA Annual In-Person Leadership Meeting Day #2– November 18, 2016

This meeting was held at the Hilton Pasadena in Pasadena, California. It was the second day of the two-day WHPA Annual In-Person Leadership Meeting of the WHPA Executive Committee, Council of Advisors, Committee and Working Group Chairs, and Guests.

Call to Order

Jeanne Duvall (PG&E) opened the meeting at 9:03 a.m. PST.

Attendance

Organization	First	Last	WHPA Category	Participated as...	11/17	11/18	WHPA Member Org
ACCA	Don	Langston	Contractor Association	EC, COA, Chair, & Proxy for HARDI	x	x	x
ACCA	Louis	Fuentes	Contractor Association	Guest	x	x	x
AHRI	Garrett	McGuire	HVAC Manufacturer Association	EC & COA Proxy for NATE	x	x	x
ASHRAE	Rick	Danks	Engineering Society	Chair	x	x	x
ASHRAE	Ron	Jarnagin	Engineering Society	EC & COA	x	x	x
BMI	Pete	Jacobs	Energy Efficiency Program Consults	Chair	x	x	x
Cal SMACNA	Chris	Walker	Contractor Association	COA	x	x	x
Cal SMACNA-Natl.	Mark	Terzigni	Contractor Association	Guest	x	x	x
CalCERTS, Inc.	Charlie	Bachand	Certifying Body	Guest	x		x
CCCCO	Jim	Caldwell	Educator, Trainer	COA	x	x	x
CEC	Andrew, Commissioner	McAllister	Government (Other than CPUC)	Speaker	x		x
CEC	Eddie	Rosales	Government (Other than CPUC)	Guest		x	x
CEC	Martha	Brook	Government (Other than CPUC)	Speaker	x		x
Charles F. Segerstrom, EE Consultant	Charles	Segerstrom	Energy Efficiency Program Consultant	Guest	x	x	x
CHF-CIRB	Allison	Paul	Research Organization	Chair	x	x	x
CPUC	Carmen	Best	CPUC	EC & COA	x	x	x
DEO	Irene	Marien	Other Stakeholder	Guest	x	x	x
DEO	Kellye	Johnson	Other Stakeholder	Guest	x	x	x
DEO	Mel	Johnson	Other Stakeholder	Chair	x	x	x
FDSI	Dale	Rossi	Third Party Quality Assurance Provider	Chair	x	x	x
HARDI	Talbot	Gee	Distributor Association	EC & COA	x	x	x
Honeywell E&ES	Mike	Lawing	Controls (Manufacturer or Distributor)	Guest	x	x	x
HVAC Excellence	Eugene	Silberstein	Certifying Body	COA	x	x	x
HVACRedu.com	Chris	Compton	Educator, Trainer	Chair	x	x	x
IHACI	Bob	Wiseman	Contractor Association	EC & COA	x		x
JCEEP	David	Dias	Organized Labor	EC & COA	x	x	x
NCI	Dominick	Guarino	Educator, Trainer	EC & COA	x	x	x
NCI	Rob	Falke	Educator, Trainer	Chair & EC Proxy for NCI	x	x	x
NRDC	Lara	Ettenson	Energy Efficiency Organization	Speaker	x		
PG&E	Jeanne	Duvall	California IOU	EC & COA	x	x	x
PG&E	Adam	Scheer	California IOU	Guest	x		x
PG&E	Chris	Kato	California IOU	Guest	x	x	x
PG&E	Chris	Weber	California IOU	COA	x	x	x



WHPA Annual In-Person Leadership Meeting Day #2– November 18, 2016

Organization	First	Last	WHPA Category	Participated as...	11/17	11/18	WHPA Member Org
PG&E	Swapna	Nigalye	California IOU	Guest	x	x	x
Roltay	Buck	Taylor	Other Stakeholder	Chair	x	x	x
SCE	Dario	Moreno	California IOU	Guest	x		x
SCE	Derek	Okada	California IOU	Guest	x		x
SCE	Jack	Shih	California IOU	Guest	x	x	x
SCE	Jake	Huttner	California IOU	Chair	x		x
SCE	Lori	Atwater	California IOU	Guest	x	x	x
SCE	Matt	Horwitz	California IOU	COA	x	x	x
SCE	Scott	Higa	California IOU	COA	x	x	x
SCE	Sean	Gouw	California IOU	Chair	x	x	x
SDG&E	Jeremy	Reefe	California IOU	EC & COA	x	x	x
SDG&E	Brandi	Turner	California IOU	Guest	x	x	x
SDG&E	Michelle	Costello	California IOU	Guest	x	x	x
SMUD	Ravi	Patel	Public Owned Utility	COA	x	x	x
SoCalGas	Carlos	Ruiz	California IOU	Guest	x		x
SoCalGas	Harvey	Bringas	California IOU	EC & COA	x	x	x
SoCalGas	Gary D.	Johnson	California IOU	COA		x	x
SoCalGas	Peter	Tanios	California IOU	Guest	x	x	x
SynergyNexGen	Barbara	Hernesman	Energy Efficiency Program Consultant	Chair	x	x	x
Tre'Laine Associates	Pepper	Hunziker	Energy Efficiency Program Consultant	Chair	x	x	x
UA	Don	Tanaka	Organized Labor	EC & COA		x	x
WHPA Staff							
BBI	Mark	Lowry	Energy Efficiency Program Consultant	Staff	x	x	x
BJGustavson Consulting	Bonnie	Gustavson	Other Stakeholder	Staff	x	x	x
BNB Consulting	Bob	Sundberg	Energy Efficiency Program Consultant	Staff	x	x	x
CLEARresult	Paul	Kyllo	Energy Efficiency Program Consultant	Staff	x	x	x
Galawish Consulting Associates	Elsia	Galawish	Energy Efficiency Program Consultant	Staff	x	x	x
InfoPlast	Wendy	Worrell	Other Stakeholder	Staff	x	x	x
Key Marketing Group	Judy	Johnson	Other Stakeholder	Staff	x	x	x
Empowered Solutions	Shea	Dibble	Energy Efficiency Organization	Staff	x	x	x
Opinion Dynamics	Ellen	Steiner	Energy Efficiency Program Consultant	Staff	x	x	x

To avoid repetition, the abbreviation for the name of the member organization will be used in the body of the minutes.

Agenda

Topic	Discussion Leader
Registration, Breakfast, and Networking	
Honor Bob Baker	Rick Danks, ASHRAE Don Langston, ACCA
Introduction, Meeting Purpose, Agenda Review	Jeanne Duvall and Ron Jarnagin, EC Co-Chairs, and Dominick Guarino, COA Chair
Setting the Stage: Gap Analysis and Stakeholder Action Plan	Dominick Guarino, COA Chair, and Mel Johnson, Gaps Analysis WG Chair
Breakout Sessions: Gaps Analysis Input <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industry, IOUs, Regulatory • Top 5 Things They Need from Each Other 	Dominick Guarino, COA Chair, and Mel Johnson, Gaps Analysis WG Chair
Review of Breakout Session Outputs	Dominick Guarino, COA Chair, and Mel Johnson, Gaps Analysis WG Chair
Setting the Stage: Optimizing the WHPA	Jeanne Duvall, EC Co-Chair, and Scott Higa, COA Vice Chair
Breakout Sessions: Optimizing the WHPA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do we optimize our work to ensure Industry, IOUs, and Regulatory stakeholders are getting what they need? 	Jeanne Duvall, EC Co-Chair, and Scott Higa, COA Vice Chair
Review of Breakout Session Outputs	Jeanne Duvall, EC Co-Chair, and Scott Higa, COA Vice Chair
Meeting Summary and Next Steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2016 Year-End Activities • 2017 Activity Launch 	Jeanne Duvall and Ron Jarnagin, EC Co-Chairs, and Dominick Guarino, COA Chair

Welcome

Jeanne Duvall (PG&E) welcomed the attendees to the final day of the two-day meeting.

Honor Bob Baker – In Memoria

INTRODUCTION by Mark Lowry (BBI) – Bob Baker had an ASHRAE presidential appointment to serve in the WHPA. He brought a lot of passion and energy. He was a member of COA and EC since 2011 and Co-Chair of EC since 2013. He was very active in many WHPA Committees and Working Groups.

- Bob was a serial entrepreneur, and he held six patents.
- HVAC and Indoor Air Quality (IAQ) were his passions.
- He pushed the different organizations that he was involved in to better themselves and to establish standards.
- He was an expert witness about HVAC and IAQ.
- He chaired the Standard 180 Committee at ASHRAE and believed that Standard 180 was sustainable and cost effective.
- He was a prolific author who wrote over three dozen books and articles.
- He was an ASHRAE Fellow and a member of many professional associations.
- He was a true leader in getting people to collaborate to come to a better solution.

COMMENTS by Don Langston (ACCA) – As a commercial contractor doing maintenance, it was a struggle for me when I thought there was a proper (and extensive) scope of work but my competitors came in with a single page of tasks. In 2008, a committee was formed in ASHRAE to set commercial maintenance standards. Bob, who was Chair of the ASHRAE Standard 180 Committee, became a mentor to me as I grappled with what Standard 180 meant.

COMMENTS by Mel Johnson (DEO) – When I joined Occidental College, it took me less than three weeks to be scared by what I saw there. So I put an emergency plan in place, called Bob, and brought him in to help set the stage through the lens of Standard 180. If you were in the presence of Bob, he affected you. It’s about using the position not to better yourself but to better those around you.

COMMENTS by Rick Danks (ASHRAE) – I am the liaison to the WHPA from ASHRAE, succeeding Bob Baker in that role. Bob had this aura that drew people in and an intangible feeling of goodness. Many of us share in the loss.

- Bob was proud of being an ASHRAE Fellow and it was very well deserved. He was the right person to lead the development of Standard 180. This was the first Standard in ASHRAE that was not designed for pre-project, turnover related. There was a big debate over who the responsible party should be, so the Standard specified the building owner as the responsible party or the party to designate responsibility; it was the first Standard in ASHRAE to do that.
- I can’t remember that he ever raised his voice. Bob was always willing to help anybody; continually mentoring someone. Everything he learned he kept giving away.
- Because of Bob, there is now a lot of cross pollination between ASHRAE and the WHPA.

COMMENTS by Ron Jarnagin (ASHRAE) – I met Bob in the corridors of ASHRAE. He was a very selfless person and very knowledgeable.

Setting the Stage: Gap Analysis and Stakeholder Action Plan

COMMENTS by Mel Johnson (DEO), Gaps Analysis Working Group Chair – The idea of this breakout session is to identify the current gaps in communication between regulatory and policy, program administrators, IOUs/POUs, and industry.

Questions for each of the breakout session groups to address:

1. What are the five things that you need from the other stakeholder groups?
2. How effective is communication between the three stakeholder groups?
3. What do you think the other stakeholder groups do well?
4. What do you think the other stakeholder groups can improve upon?

Review of Breakout Session Outputs – Report outs posted on WHPA website

Breakout Sessions	Locations (Rooms)	Groups	Facilitators	Note Takers
Group 1	San Gabriel	Regulatory/Policy (CEC/CPUC/ and Their Consultants, etc.)	Mel Johnson	Shea Dibble
Group 2	Santa Clara	Program Administrators (IOUs, POUs, Their Consultants, etc.)	Scott Higa	Paul Kylo
Group 3	Santa Barbara	Industry Group #1	Dom Guarino	Ellen Steiner
Group 4	Santa Rosa	Industry Group #2	Don Langston	Mark Lowry
Group 5 (combined with 3)	Santa Monica	Industry Group #3	Barbara Hernesman	Wendy Worrell

Group 1: Regulatory, Policy, and Their Consultants

Spokesperson Mel Johnson (DEO); Carmen Best (CPUC), Shea Dibble (Staff), Bob Sundberg (Staff), Dave Dias (JCEEP), Chris Kato (PG&E), Michelle Costello (SDG&E), Matt Horwitz (SCE), Eddie Rosales (CEC), Pete Jacobs (BMI), and others.

1. What are the five things you (regulators and policy groups) need from the other stakeholder groups?

- Data, understanding, and engagement are the three that stand out. Data is critical—program data. Metrics enable decision making to happen. Getting data right is a very important aspect so that decisions can be made. Data in this lens can be numbers as temperatures and pressures; it can be metrics; it can be percentages, but it is usually around what they need for evaluation. Having correct program data will help in alignment of program needs. We think that a good start is capturing what the data is going to be used for as much as possible. Program data is needed from the IOUs, from the implementers, and from the contractors.

- Dale Rossi (FDSI) – When data is requested from the industry, please only request data that you will actually use, because there is a cost to collecting data.
- Mel Johnson (DEO) – There is a need for understanding regulatory policy restraints. As a former program manager, I would ask, “I wonder what was meant by that?” You need as much context around the policy as possible.
- Engagement is being at the right place at the right time to be useful.

2. How effective is communication between the three stakeholder groups?

- Overall, communication is moderate but there are areas that can be improved upon. In the WHPA, some (committee and working group) discussions are documented so well that if you miss a meeting, you can read the notes for a great frame of reference. But we think communication is an area to work on.

3. What do you think the other stakeholder groups do well?

- There are some areas where communication is excellent, depending on the topic. In the WHPA, people are very good about sharing their needs and bringing awareness, and the (industry) people participating have a lot of competency. However, there are areas that are unresolved.

4. What do you think the other stakeholder groups can improve upon?

- Provide problems with solutions. When there is a problem, you need to know about it; but problems without potential resolutions make it difficult to take the next steps.
 - Create links between the goals tied into the policy framework.
 - Matt Horwitz (SCE) – The goals can be broadly defined, and many types of goals are playing in one framework.
 - Increase early engagement. The CAEECC process, which started in 2015, is showing evidence of open communication. It is a place where industry can get involved.
-
-

Group 2 – Program Administrators (IOUs, POUs, Their Consultants, etc.)

Spokesperson Scott Higa (PG&E); Jeanne Duvall (PG&E), Jeremy Reeve (SDG&E), Charles Segerstrom (EE Consultant), Christian Weber (PG&E), Jack Shih (SCE), and others.

1. What are the five things that you (Program Administrators) need from the other stakeholder groups?

- The Program Administrators look through the lens of cost effectiveness, market transformation, customer satisfaction, and savings goals.
- What we need from industry in this pay-for-performance environment is what the barriers are for the contractors? We will be seeking feedback from industry on an ongoing basis.
- Quick review of program design is another need. Change is happening on the programs. We would like to see some feedback on work as it is being proposed. Because of the timeframes that we are under, it will require quick response from the industry.
- Dale Rossi (FDSI) – When is this feedback requested? You say you need input, but I have never heard the proposal.
- Scott Higa (PG&E) – In the past, feedback has been requested by the IOUs.
- Michelle Costello (SDG&E) – There is a new solution getting in place with Implementation Plans to be designed by the industry and not by the IOUs. The IOUs need to bring the voice of the customer to the front line.
- The Program Administrators need to have alignment (with industry) on how energy savings are attributed and calculated so there is a common understanding as to how stakeholders are assessing savings.
- Speeding up the response time from industry would really help the program team respond.
- The Program Administrators need to be informed on how the market is likely to respond to a proposed program.
- Prioritize findings before moving on to further studies. Before additional studies are performed, be sure that previous studies were assessed.
- Have alignment across agencies so there is consistency in policy to help set issues.

2. How effective is communication between the three stakeholder groups?

- Communication has been improving through organizations like the WHPA where there is open dialog and collaboration among all stakeholders. It should be noted and commended that the group assembled by the WHPA is a passionate and committed group and that they have shown their resilience in circumstances where there is no short-term solution.

3. What do you think the other stakeholder groups do well?

- The industry responds to customers very well, moves with the market faster than the programs do, is the voice of the customer, and they embrace new technology. The CEC and CPUC have been directly involved in WHPA committees and working groups providing their input.
- For the industry, the training segment has shown collaboration and strong leadership across the various organizations.
- The CEC has taken a more proactive role with stakeholders.
- The regulators have shown themselves to be flexible and resilient themselves.
- Industry and regulatory have been good in taking part in the WHPA.

4. What do you think the other stakeholder groups can improve upon, reiterating the gaps in the first question?

- Framework is one that came up. Having policy provides the framework and goals but does not provide directives.
 - In general, in the market, we need clearly defined problem statements and proposed solutions.
-

Groups 3 and 4 – Industry

Spokesman Don Langston (ACCA); Louis Fuentes (ACCA), Jim Caldwell (CCCCO), Dale Rossi (FDSI), Talbot Gee (HARDI), Dominick Guarino (NCI), Ellen Steiner (Staff), Garrett McGuire (AHRI), Mike Lawing (Honeywell), Mark Lowry (BBI), and others.

- The industry is looking at data, working on communication, and seeing some progress with communication in the WHPA. We are making incremental progress, but we need to have open dialog to get things working better. We have the ability to meet and communicate (within the framework of the WHPA).
- If we look at questions #3 and #4 (“What do the other stakeholder groups do well?” and “What can the other stakeholder groups improve on?”), open dialog is getting better; but we want to see simpler language. Industry needs more help in order to understand some of the acronyms of the IOUs, what they mean, and what their purposes are. Take it down one more level for us.
- Industry is a diverse group. We were invited into the WHPA to help (the IOUs and policy), but we don’t hear a lot back. When we are asked our opinion, we would like some feedback in 30 or 60 days. We are volunteering our time, and sometimes it feels like we’re being *put at the little kids table*.
- There’s a lot of confusion for industry on what the IOU programs are. We don’t know how the programs are doing. The process is not transparent. We don’t know if the programs are meeting plan, beating plan, or failing. We would like for the IOUs to say something like *this is a program, this is how we will measure the program, and we will report (back to industry) on the effectiveness of the program*.
- M&V and program design: There are concerns about the measurement of TRC. Industry would like the IOUs/regulators to open it up and ask what industry thinks about it. Air Rite and NCI are using industry-accepted standards. However, what we see from the other side is “voodoo” in terms of how it is measured. It is being measured and scored in a different way from what industry and customers see.
- Dominick Guarino (NCI) – We in the industry are very diverse. We don’t have a firm understanding of what is expected of us. Are we here (in the WHPA) to be technical subject matter experts or do the IOUs and policy regulators really want our opinion and input on actual policies and programs? We don’t have a true understanding of what the expectation is.
- I can think back to when people were reserved in what they would say; however, there has been increased openness on the part of regulatory and IOUs. Our conversations are much more open, and we realize that we are after the same goals.
- Industry would like to have more input in the metrics. For now we know we have to deal with deemed savings and TRC, but we know there has to be a better way. We want to have a bigger influence in how we calculate savings; and if the WHPA can’t address it, who can? We need to start receiving honest feedback from and giving honest feedback to regulatory about what is and is not working. That, to us, is a gap.
- Don Langston (ACCA) – I believe in keeping it simple. We understand that ratepayer money is being protected, but the amount of bureaucracy that is thrown on these things has impacted the effectiveness of the program. You use the meters to bill the customer. Why can’t you use the meters to assess them? The amount of money spent on third-party implementers is large.
- **ACTION** – We propose that you to let industry do a pilot where we try a new model and see what it looks like. What does that cost effectiveness look like? I have buildings that have improved and cut utility bills 30% and 40%, so the customer bills and the demand show that we have done it. The (current energy savings) model is flawed.

- As a contractor, we are working through layers of implementers who are hired by the utilities even though they don't know our industry or how to score things. The implementers in past programs had challenges in being able to implement and engage, so there's another gap! We contractors are down here with the customers.
 - **SUGGESTION** by Dale Rossi (FDSI) – It would be nice if implementers were in the WHPA.
 - Dominick Guarino (NCI) – Sometimes we are (required to) collect an insane amount of data, but it's not data; it's check-the-box stuff. In some programs, it seems like there are 1,000 data points yet others have only 50 or 60. This is another gap we don't understand; we are not privy to the reason.
-
-

Group #5 – Industry

Spokesperson Barbara Hernesman (SynergyNexGen); Allison Paul (CHF-CIRB), Ron Jarnagin (ASHRAE), Rob Falke (NCI), Chris Compton (HVCRedu.net).

- We talked about a regulatory policy and that the regulators need to understand what is happening in the real world. There is disconnect between regulatory and industry; an example is in permit pulling.
- We talked about Title 24, which is not something that the contractors are implementing, and there are reasons for that. It's because regulators tell the contractors to do things that they can't do in the real world. Contractors are not engaged in the process.
- The solution is for contractors to provide regulatory with a realistic view as to what can be implemented in the field. You need to go to the contractors first and let them tell you how it can happen.
- There needs to be industry involvement in the new code cycles. When the regulatory agencies put the codes into discussion, they should get input from the industry.
- There is a need for contractors to self-verify and self-regulate. You can bring in a quality control QA program, but you need to allow them to get their work done based on what the consumers are asking for.
- We need to share data across stakeholder groups.
- We really do believe the communication channels have vastly improved.
 - The CPUC is communicating better with the IOUs, thanks to Carmen Best's leadership.
 - The IOUs are doing their bit to make sure the industry understands the program.
 - The CEC has stepped up to take our feedback and do something productive with it.
 - It is not perfect, but it is hugely improved.
- There's a need to set up some environment, aside from the WHPA, that allows the regulatory agencies, IOUs, implementers, and industry to meet in the early stages of decision-making. WHPA should play a role in that activity.
- If we are going to do this, it should be an annual or semi-annual activity as a facilitated and/or mediated process. As Jim Caldwell says, it's time for action.
- We also need to develop our internal leadership in the WHPA. We think there is a need to strengthen the leadership skills of some WHPA chairs and co-chairs.

Ron Jarnagin (ASHRAE) – Baseball analogy: I have the perception, looking at California from afar, that in the energy and building environment, everyone is playing on a baseball team where they value home runs. You go to extremes sometime as to what you are asking for in order to show off California. When, in fact, baseball success comes from hitting a lot of singles. The benefit of a single is that you don't have a big leap at once, so people can conceptualize it and make adjustments as they go along. Instead of, "Here comes a new Title 24 version – duck!" you should take it just *one step at a time*. My personal perception is that California is not helping itself with that approach.

Barbara Hernesman (SynergyNexGen) – We need objectives that build fundamentals with appropriate value propositions rather than end results without required infrastructure.

Setting the Stage: Optimizing the WHPA

INTRODUCTION by Jeanne Duvall (PG&E) – We are setting the stage for where we want the WHPA to go in the future. Keeping the input from the Gaps analysis discussion that we just had in mind...

- What is the potential for the WHPA and how can we optimize it? There is a whole new landscape of legislation, regulatory environment, and business plans. We need what I call “strike teams,” dynamic teams that come together, do good work, and disband.
- This is not instead of our big SMART Goals, but in addition to them. Long-term committees still go for SMART Goals.
- We see short-term committees as operating up to one year in duration, yet some probably even shorter durations because the IOU programs can change very quickly.

We would like these breakout sessions to focus on **“How do we optimize the work of the WHPA to ensure that industry, IOU, and regulatory stakeholders are getting what they need?”**

Review of Breakout Sessions Output – Report outs posted on WHPA website

Questions for the Breakout Sessions:

- Groups 1 and 4 – What should the WHPA goals be?
- Groups 2 and 5 – What should the WHPA look like?
- Groups 3 and 6 – What are future trends in HVAC and how does that impact the organization?

Breakout Sessions	Locations	Topics	Facilitators	Note Takers
Group 1 and 4 (Chairs)	Main room	Goals	Ellen Steiner/Mark Lowry	Wendy Worrell
Group 2 and 5 (Mix)	Santa Clara Room	Org Structure	Shea Dibble	Bob Sundberg
Group 3 and 6 (Mix)	Santa Barbara Room	Future	Paul Kylo	Volunteer

Groups 1 and 4 – Goals

Spokesperson Mark Lowry (BBI); Don Langston (ACCA), Ellen Steiner (Staff), Scott Higa (PG&E), Jeremy Reeve (SDG&E), Brandi Turner (SDG&E), and others.

What is WHPA’s role and function today? What should it be?

- The WHPA’s role today is to inform IOU programs and strategic roadmap planning as long as the CLTEESP is in place to help update the HVAC Action Plan.
- On a more immediate time frame, provide input, including guidance and revision, into the design of (IOU and regulatory) programs.
- The WHPA should represent a diverse industry.
- We spend a lot of time in committees and working groups trying to figure out what question is being asked? We think if we were provided with better defined problem statements, then these committees and working groups could put more of their energy into solution statements.
- We have concerns about conflict of interest.
- We have concerns that other stakeholder categories should also be present within the WHPA—such as legislative staff members—to help bridge the gap between Sacramento and the industry.
- In the short term, measures and program measurements are the same, but the WHPA industry members are looking forward to the new program design measures and to the changes in how programs are measured.
- **ACTION** – The group identified the need for the WHPA to help define program within the current parameters as well as having the WHPA look longer at M&V.

Groups 2 and 5 – Organizational Structure

Spokesperson Mel Johnson (DEO); Shea Dibble (Staff), Jeanne Duvall (PG&E), Dale Rossi (FDSI), Barbara Hernesman (SynergyNexGen), Jim Caldwell (CCCCO), Sean Gouw (PG&E), Ron Jarnagin (ASHRAE), Elsia Galawish (Staff), Bob Sundberg (Staff), Don Tanaka (UA), and others.

1. How do we accommodate short turnaround requests?

- Documents and program requests create a rapid response team, like a volunteer group. Perhaps we can create a database of skills and put out an e-blast with what's-in-it-for-you, objectives, and purpose. This request might identify the SMEs who could participate then develop a forum to help guide the formation of the team.

2. What is the appropriate mix of short-term and long-term goals (committees vs. working groups)?

- It depends on the mix of needs. We think you can develop a form for mobilization.
- If we look into our cultural context, it is evident that the **ACTION** that the WHPA organizational structure needs is to set up an organizational structure to respond to it. It will depend on filtering and having good leadership in place.

3. Is the California Long Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan (CLTEESP) the right organizing framework for the WHPA or should it be AB 758, SB 350, or other legislative frameworks?

- This question makes you think about solution. Remember the slide on Day #1 with the wedges? The Strategic Plan is the current structure that the WHPA is transacting on. As legislation is enacted, it has touch points to the Strategic Plan. The WHPA can create points of connection to the framework of the Strategic Plan.
- Carmen Best (CPUC) – It makes sense to keep the CLTEESP as the guiding framework because the legislation has been underneath it so far, with a caveat “so far.” Think of the Strategic Plan as a nexus for the WHPA.

4. How does the CAEECC organizing structure align with the WHPA structure?

- It's hidden. It's a new structure and it exists for a certain place and time for input. The WHPA has been around for some time, and we capture some very broad things and bring them down to detail. To put the two together (CAEECC and the WHPA), the outcomes are yet to come.
- Jeanne Duvall (PG&E) – CAEECC is working off of a plan with 60% of the programs done by external party implementers. Currently the IOUs have programs to implement, and in the future the IOUs will still have 40% of the programs to implement.

5. How do we develop a clear feedback loop so that WHPA Work Product is effectively leveraged and that WHPA members receive feedback on which recommendations were accepted by the intended audience, which recommendations were not accepted, and why?

- There was a lot of discussion. We think a responsible party should be assigned from within the WHPA the Executive Committee to ensure the feedback process is completed; the COA should help.
- Jeanne Duvall (PG&E) – I think the feedback loop needs to be based on who the client is (for the Work Product). For example, if CQM creates a Work Product for the IOUs and the Work Product is approved by the EC and the IOUs never touch it, the IOUs should come back to the WHPA and say, “This is how we used it (or did not use it) and why.”
- The IOUs also discussed putting (a response back) in Base Camp.
- Carmen Best (CPUC) – The CPUC has a form titled “Response to Recommendation” that is used for the evaluation process to make sure that somebody read it and either used it or did not use it.

6. Which of the top 5 needs of each stakeholder group identified in the Gap Analysis breakout sessions can the WHPA address?

- Cross-cutting communication seems to be the one thing that has come up a lot. Although the WHPA is doing a pretty effective job of communicating and we are hearing good things, cross-cutting communication is vital and is not as strong.
- Jeanne Duvall (PG&E) – Sometimes the IOUs, CPUC, and CEC work in (separate) silos. The WHPA can sometimes be the tool to invite both cross-cutting communication and transparency.

Groups 3 and 6 – Future Trends

Spokesperson Paul Kylo (Staff); Carmen Best (CPUC), Christian Weber (PG&E), Swapna Nigalye (PG&E), Jeremy Reefer (SDG&E), Rick Danks (ASHRAE), and others.

1. **What new market technologies (for example, controls) should we be assessing to further HVAC energy savings and carbon reduction?**
 - We started listing out some new technology – VRF, DFDD – but then we started talking about the whole building. Rick Danks (ASHRAE) brought up training for the operating and maintaining of high performance buildings. So we think that we should not just look at HVAC but instead look at the whole building.
 - It's not just about energy efficiency, it's also about comfort when you look at the whole building. You consider occupant comfort when you look at new technologies.
 - Through controls and looking at the data, you can extract the overall energy savings at the building level.
2. **How do we better align the WHPA and the state's perceived move to addressing energy efficiency from a whole building standpoint?**
 - This question is related to the first question. We need to sub-meter and get data for all the different end users in the building.
 - This may be more readily applicable to commercial, but we need to find a way to do it for residential as well. We need to get to the meter in every situation.
 - The WHPA doesn't have a lot of people knowledgeable about data analytics or who are representing building owners. We need to bring in more of these people and not just focus on the HVAC end users.
 - Discussion on how you integrate the different trades into the whole house and whole building.
3. **How should Demand Response (DR), IDER, and Zero Net Energy be integrated with the work of the WHPA?**
 - On DR, we need to be sure that all systems and every piece of equipment installed is DR enabled.
 - **ACTION** – How can the WHPA help with that?
 - On IDER, stay tuned to the proceedings.
 - **ACTION** – WHPA will monitor the proceeding and report out as needed.
 - On ZNE, it is an intersection of building operations and maintenance and not losing sight of that. You really have to operate and maintain the building over the long term.
4. **What HVAC future topics and trends should the WHPA be discussing? What can the WHPA do to develop a model for a whole building approach?**
 - We need something that will work out in the field. Presently, the WHPA is not *taking it down to the street* to see how the customer interacts with this.
 - Building officials have different priorities than ZNE, primarily health and safety.
 - How do we get IOUs and regulators involved?
 - In all discussions:
 - Keep the customer in mind
 - Be sure that we don't give them what they don't want
 - Focus on the fact that it must be cost effective
5. **What decision criteria should we use to prioritize what future trends and technologies the WHPA focuses on?**
 - The big thing is trying to align WHPA activity with what the IOUs need and how the IOUs are measured.
 - We should ask the customer what they want.
 - Codes and standards are driving actions in the field, so we should have the “lens” of what is going on and align with people in the real world who are complying (or not complying) with codes and standards.

Meeting Summary and Next Steps

COMMENT by Jeanne Duvall (PG&E) – This has been a long meeting of trying to figure out where we want to be and where we do not want to be. We are not there yet, but we now have building blocks. I think we all agree we want to do the correct work at the correct time.

COMMENT by Mark Lowry (BBI) – At least 20 Work Products are coming out. The WHPA and the IOUs both want to be sure that there is a feedback loop back to the WHPA for each Work Product.

COMMENT by Jeremy Reeve (SDG&E) – A lot of times, the WHPA creates Work Products and the people (who developed them) don't know where the Work Product goes. The Work Products that are coming out soon will affect so many things directly and indirectly. They are a big deal (to the IOUs). Thank you for your time.

COMMENTS by Jeanne Duvall (PG&E)

- When I worked with Barbara Hernesman (SynergyNexGen) on the Existing Buildings Committee, we identified the need for some EBEE Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) that were not in the WHPA, and we went out and got them for that one purpose. We need certain SMEs sometime but not all the time, like climate experts. I think it could be critical moving forward—the most economic use of resources—to bring in specific SMEs for specific issues.
- The 2016 SMART Goals will roll over and continue into 2017. It was a better decision to let them develop and mature (for a second year) so we are not constantly remaking them. We will start to look at the rapid response model with input from BBI. Maybe a couple pilots on some of the projects and then see the best way to get the resources identified and go from there.

CLOSING COMMENTS were made by EC Co-Chair Jeanne Duvall (PG&E), EC Co-Chair Ron Jarnagin (ASHRAE), and COA Chair Dominick Guarino, NCI.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m. PST.

Notes by Judy Key Johnson
judy@performancealliance.org
www.performancealliance.org