Benchmarking Work Group – Meeting Notes

Teleconference – 9:30-10:30 am, Tuesday, April 14, 2009

Attending:

  EPA – Tracy Narel, Stephen Miller (SRA), Peter Flippen (ICF)
  HMG – Amy Barr, Josh Rasin
  LBNL – Paul Mathew
  PG&E – Theda Silver-Pell, Sukhwant Singh
  SCE – Michael Wadler, Matt Evans
  Sempra – John Cullum
  SMUD – Sherri Hengel, Scott Saunders

1) Tenant Authorization Issue
   a) IOU Advice Filing
      i) No new info from SCE
      ii) Sempra hasn’t met as a team, but have created own release form with release agreement included
         (1) Proceeding down road even though commission hasn’t approved
      iii) SMUD looking into how to use 531 to resolve
         (1) Meeting with legal this afternoon to discuss options

2) AB 1103 Working Group
   a) Had 2nd meeting about 3 weeks ago
   b) Does look like will be phasing in commercial building types
   c) Have adjusted AB531 to specify that schedule will be developed by commission and that is commission’s responsibility to establish schedule
   d) Sempra concerned about searching by address
   e) Burden on customer, not utility to provide data

3) Utility updates
   a) PG&E
i) Everything ok for time being
ii) No formal notification of deauthorization
   (1) SRA can talk to EPA to see if is simple solution
iii) Outreach going well.
   (1) A lot of interest: people signing up for workshops
   (2) Concerned about consistency in program functionality
   (3) Working on tutorials for website
b) SCE
   i) Semi-automatic system
   ii) Deauthorization: have to wait for error message
   iii) Outstanding incident reports: customer org name in pending authorization
       response & drop down
       (1) Name issue slated for ABS2.2
   iv) Not doing any outreach
   v) Getting all metrics in one place – SRA will look into for 2.2
c) Sempra
   i) In full testing – will go live May 15, but no way to update data until then
   ii) Had authorization issues
   iii) Have webpages highlighting PM
d) SMUD
   i) Not aware of any issues with process.
   ii) Not doing any outreach

4) California Automated Benchmarking Cost Summary (Peter Flippen)
   a) Utilities provided costs associated with establishing their systems
   b) Would like to use to help other states and utilities assess providing automated
      BM systems
      i) Need email from each of utilities saying have looked at and is ok to share
   c) Concern over accuracy and completeness of cost estimates – ability to
      translate to other companies
   d) EPA/ICF to take another pass at piece to see if can come up with something
      that’s responsive to concerns