



WHPA Streamlining* Committee Teleconference Summary Notes
Friday, September 15, 2017
Scheduled for 12:00pm – 1:00pm PDT

Call to Order

WHPA Streamlining* Committee Chair, Paul Thomas (SDG&E), called the meeting to order at 12:04 p.m. PDT. The meeting was recorded for note purposes.

** This Committee was initially referenced as the “Streamlining” Committee but exact nomenclature is yet to be determined. The Committee will focus on exploring what stakeholder engagement looks like beyond 2017 and without Investor Owned Utility (IOU)-compensated Staff support of WHPA Committees and Working Groups.*

Roll Call

WHPA Staff (Wendy Worrell) conducted roll call based on the current roster. As no voting panel has been assigned in favor of consensus voting, members are organized by voting eligibility status. 16 participants (or proxies) attended the meeting with a quorum (8+) of eligible members as indicated below:

P = Present at meeting A = Absent from meeting; if proxy has been assigned it will be noted below.				
Organization	First Name	Last Name	WHPA Category	Attendance
Voting Eligible				
ACCA (Air Conditioning Contractors of America)	Don	Langston	Contractor Association	P
CALBO (California Building Officials)	Bob	Barks	Codes & Standards Official (Association or Jurisdiction)	P
CEC (California Energy Commission)	Lea	Haro	Government (Other than CPUC)	P
Galawish Consulting Associates	Elsia	Galawish	Energy Efficiency Program Consultant	P
HVAC Excellence	Eugene	Silberstein	Certifying Body	P
IHACI (Institute of Heating and Air Conditioning Industries)	Bob	Wiseman	Contractor Association	P
NCI (National Comfort Institute)	Mel	Johnson	Educator, Trainer	P
PG&E (Pacific Gas and Electric Company)	Mark	Salavitch	California IOU	P
	Christian	Weber	California IOU	P
SCE (Southern California Edison)	Scott	Higa	California IOU	P
SDG&E (San Diego Gas & Electric Company)	Paul	Thomas	California IOU	P (Chair)
SoCalGas (Southern California Gas Company)	Harvey	Bringas	California IOU	P
SynergyNexGen	Barbara	Hernesman	Energy Efficiency Program Consultant	P
Transformative Wave	Joe	Schmutzler	Controls (Manufacturer or Distributor)	P
Tre'Laine Associates	Pepper	Hunziker	Energy Efficiency Program Consultant	P
Voting Eligible (upon meeting attendance)				
AHRI (Air-Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration Institute)	Garrett	McGuire	Director, Government Relations	A
CPUC (California Public Utilities Commission) Energy Division	Peter	Biermayer	California PUC	A
HARDI (Heating, Air Conditioning & Refrigeration Distributors International)	Talbot	Gee	Distributor Association	A
ICSC (International Council of Shopping Centers)	Keith	Walker	Owner/Facility/Property Management Association	A
JCEEP (Joint Committee on Energy and Environmental Policy)	David	Dias	Organized Labor	A
SMUD (Sacramento Municipal Utility District)	Ravi	Patel	Public Owned Utility	A
Guests				
CPUC (California Public Utilities Commission (Energy Division)	Jeorge	Tagnipes	California PUC	A
WHPA Staff				
InfoPlast	Wendy	Worrell	Other Stakeholder	P (Host/Scribe)

*** 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 WHPA Compliance Committee roster by WHPA Staff prior to the meeting:



WHPA Streamlining* Committee Teleconference Summary Notes
Friday, September 15, 2017
Scheduled for 12:00pm – 1:00pm PDT

PDT TIME	TOPIC	FACILITATOR
5 min. 12:00-12:05	Roll Call	Wendy Worrell
5 min. 12:05-12:10	Chair's Opening Comments (Goals, Expectations, Introductions)	Paul Thomas
10 min. 12:10-12:20	IOU Perspective Overview: "Programmatic" and "Technical" Needs	Scott Higa & Christian Weber
25 min. 12:20-12:45	Facilitated Discussion: Stakeholder Identified Needs	Paul Thomas
5 min. 12:45-12:50	Committee Nomenclature	Paul Thomas
10 min. 12:50-1:00	Future Meeting Scheduling and Next Steps	Paul Thomas / Wendy Worrell
by 1:00pm	Adjournment	Paul Thomas

The Chair overviewed the agenda and thanked all for their participation in this important effort. He reported that the agenda provides some structure, but will be flexible on time as needed.

- Roundtable discussion will be one by one to hear individual brainstorming perspective and thoughts on what “we need to get out of this activity” for the Committee and the future strategy of industry engagement with the Investor Owned Utilities (IOUs).
- The Committee will hopefully develop a better name for representation to the WHPA at large.
- Additionally, the Committee will determine future scheduling frequency.

The Chair asked if any agenda adjustments were needed. The agenda was accepted as is.

Chair's Opening Comments

The Chair reminded that this Committee is about developing a strategy for the future of 2018 and beyond for engagement between various stakeholders in the HVAC industry, with the IOUs being one of them for the EE program, including WE&T.

WHY IS THIS COMMITTEE SO RELEVANT RIGHT NOW?

The Chair reported that there are some administrative aspects driving this timing.

- Historically the IOUs have maintained a facilitation contract to keep WHPA going with structure, etcetera. That contract with paid Staff members ceases at the end of this year.
- The IOUs filed business plans earlier this year per CPUC requirements, but there have been some drastic changes in the EE world. One big impact is that IOUs will act more as program administrators than implementers, with design largely going to third parties. By 2020, the minimum target is for 60% of the IOU budget to go toward third-party implementation programs. The difference with historical and future third-party implementation is that rather than just handing it over to them, third parties implementers will now be designing, proposing and delivering the implementation.

Christian Weber (PG&E) noted that the IOUs will still be administrators responsible for budget and energy savings results.

The Chair clarified that the other big change is that the CPUC has “ordered” the IOUs to establish statewide program administrators for certain programs. Historically these were coordinated through statewide utilities to discuss how programs perform, what is working and not, etcetera. The statewide definition is changing to “statewide program administration” in which one utility is the administrator for a given program across the entire state and would have responsibility for service including in another service area. In the business plans the IOUs filed in January 2017, they had already defined who would do which parts and who would be the lead. SDG&E proposed being the Statewide Program Administrator for a Residential and Commercial Upstream and Midstream HVAC program and for a Downstream Pilot focused on Residential HVAC Quality Installation and Quality Maintenance.

Mel Johnson (NCI) commented that the Chair did a good job of clarifying all the change coming from “several different directions”. He also noted that the California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Council (CAEECC) comes along with that change.

- The Chair reported that CAEECC was heavily involved with the development of the IOU business plans and will be involved in review of implementation plans. CAEECC is comprised of a cross section of various stakeholders across California.



WHPA Streamlining* Committee Teleconference Summary Notes

Friday, September 15, 2017

Scheduled for 12:00pm – 1:00pm PDT

The Chair reported that this new WHPA Committee was formed to develop a strategy for the future of HVAC stakeholder engagement. “It gets tricky since the IOUs have some leadership, but they are also stakeholders.” The Committee is important to help the IOUs determine how to proceed forward. Driven by the lack of the admin contract as well as recognizing that so much is changing in EE across the state, a fresh look is needed for how to remain engaged. The Chair suggested that the visioning process is the best place to start for needs, wants, and expectations. The output of this Committee is not how to specifically fund WHPA going forward, but rather a look at the broader vision of engagement to evaluate what WHPA looks like in the future. The Chair’s role is to facilitate dialogue and to work with the Committee to pull out relevant information to develop a strategy for achieving the goal of maintained engagement.

Mel Johnson (NCI) commented that putting together a strawman vision requires looking at what it serves as the preferred outcome. In the past, WHPA was chartered with the whole strawman based on the CEESP. Now the CEESP has not been updated and Decision 15-10-28 states the CPUC anticipates adopting a revised plan, but one does not exist. The lack of a Strategic Plan, combined with “legislation that needs to take place, which also has desirable outcomes”, and CAEECC creates another predicament for thinking about a good outcome. In the past Utilities had market implementation goals and market transformation metrics. Without those, it is a very difficult task. He is interested to see the type of structure that can be built in the lack of something with an authorized structure.

The Chair has been involved with WHPA since January 2017 and is trying to understand what WHPA is. The organization chart helped provide clarity for the current structure. Absent specific clarity and guidance, evaluation is needed for determining the value desired from this effort. As a Utility, he “personally believes” they cannot do an effective job of administering and implementing energy efficiency programs without industry engagement. The Chair noted that he had done some preliminary brainstorming with IOU colleagues and others and noted that the IOUs “value the engagement, the discussion, the dialogue” so perhaps an outcome with “folks getting together quarterly, or twice a year in person to go over these topics to keep everybody informed and up to speed” is suggested. He is not predetermining, but noted that it is a potential output or strategy that might have value. “There is a little way to go before determining” the best path.

Barbara Hernesman (SynergyNexGen) expressed that she “liked” the Chair’s comments. She reminded that the WHPA EBEE Committee had an in-person meeting (charrette) that yielded “incredible, concrete, actionable item outcomes”. She proposed thinking about 4 sessions of annual charrettes that could cover updates on regulatory industries, etcetera as part of one of those sessions. She reported that WHPA does best by bringing stakeholders together to think about ideas and on how things will happen from “boots on the ground” through CPUC. She believes the feedback that would be gained from the charrette format would be invaluable.

Pepper Hunziker (Tre’Laine) appreciated the clarity provided earlier in the meeting. She asked if the focus will be through the HVAC lens only or if it will be expanded to the Whole Building lens. She wondered if it is a better idea to identify a specific problem and then somehow do an email campaign to get additional stakeholder views rather than the same people working on ideas.

The Chair reminded that notes are being taken and that the meeting is recorded. Trends will be developed from those. Next steps include behind the scenes analysis for presentation to the group to keep the Committee moving forward in a structured way throughout the decision-making process.

IOU Perspective Overview: “Programmatic” and “Technical” Needs

Scott Higa (SCE) provided a high-level overview of IOU “programmatic” needs, noting that they are essentially a way to stay in alignment with the intent of the WHPA. It is an industry advisory resource and a sounding board with the Commission and the IOUs. Per his WHPA experience, Scott sees the highest output when there is open sharing of information from all stakeholders, including getting feedback on how programs are being received and the challenges being observed by the “boots on the ground”, as well as feedback to inform the membership on some of the regulatory requirements and provide a balanced view to ensure ratepayer funds are being used appropriately. There will be requirements in programs for IOUs to provide savings validation and to show how well the programs are influencing market transformation, etcetera. There is also an overarching requirement to make sure it is all done cost effectively.

The Chair clarified that cost effectiveness from a programmatic lens is a fairly restrictive process that may not be what others expect. When looking through the lens of state requirements and regulatory oversight, “project goals might not shake out the same way others think”.



WHPA Streamlining* Committee Teleconference Summary Notes

Friday, September 15, 2017

Scheduled for 12:00pm – 1:00pm PDT

In terms of IOU “technical” needs, Christian Weber (PG&E) noted that there will still be a lot that remains the same for delivery of energy efficiency and HVAC market transformation with technology. There are several challenges for achieving that. “The WHPA has played an important role and the Charter of the WHPA remains as important as ever.” With the new move to statewide and third-party implementation, the third-party implementers will have specific perspective toward pay for performance. They will be short term with focus on achieving their goals and may look for the easiest options to reduce risk. The IOUs and WHPA need to consider who is focused on longer term energy efficiency strategies that may take years to achieve. “Who will be the guardian of the long-term vision and roadmap?” Christian suggested that WHPA needs to discuss focus on how to meet those needs going forward.

Facilitated Discussion: Stakeholder Identified Needs

The Chair asked for continuation of the brainstorming ideas.

Barbara Hernesman (SynergyNexGen) commented that “back in the day” contractor associations were brought to the IOU education and training centers. They were provided with non-alcoholic beverages and food for the purpose of “meeting them where they were at”. The contractor “boots on the ground” need to feel they are being heard. They need to be targeted where they are so input can be provided directly for what they can do to help and to also to share what they need. Policies and purposes can be moved into goals and actionable items by incorporating needed feedback from those implementing requirements in the field into the regulatory development process. Barbara strongly suggested that this step not be missed in the design process.

- The Chair asked if implementing policy is a key element of something that should occur?
- Barbara Hernesman (SynergyNexGen) clarified that if we expect contractors to use the processes and take the tools to apply them to what they do within the community, but do not include their input in making policy change, there will be difficulty in market transformation.

ACTION: The Chair and Barbara Hernesman (SynergyNexGen) to further discuss the topic of “meeting the boots on the ground where they are at” offline.

Bob Barks (CALBO) commented about fundamentals. His understanding is that the Committee is trying to determine a future path for WHPA and its place in the world. Before that can be done, review of “what we have already for what WHPA is and what there is to work with” is needed. WHPA is a unique group of divergent market players from across the country who normally do not talk with each other. Going forward it is important to preserve the uniqueness of it being a place where “all come together in one place to talk about pertinent subject matter affecting the HVAC” and where “people are active in this organization” with their “efforts voluntary” because they can have conversations on neutral territory and “perhaps impact the path of the State in the future”,

Mel Johnson (NCI) noted that coordination between CAEECC and WHPA is needed to lessen confusion. He agreed that a lot of the prior comments make sense, but noted that he wants to make sure there is clarity in the objectives from both entities.

Bob Wiseman (IHACI) commented that there are so many valuable things that have come out of WHPA. “It is where the entire industry gets together.” He reported that there was a much larger disconnect between the IOUs and Industry in the past. It is much easier to learn and speak each other’s language now because of WHPA. He noted that the diversity of the WHPA is its biggest value. Most of the beneficial work product has come out of focused, smaller groups. The work has led to changes in ASHRAE standards, policy, etcetera. The quality of input needs to be maintained. “How will the utilities know what is of interest and applicable for industry, homeowners, and the like?” The diversity of thought and the ability to provide feedback both ways are key.

Elsia Galawish (Galawish Consulting) echoed Bob’s Wiseman comments. She reported that she “liked that WHPA allowed industry to start to understand and participate in regulatory processes and provide feedback”. She noted that information about coming legislation and EE programs is still needed for continued encouraged input.

Don Langston (ACCA) echoed all that has been said. He suggested that if things do get too big, some of the connections made over the last decade do get lost. Utilities are doing a better job of reaching out, but having “watering holes” where contractors gather is a good approach. He would further encourage getting the CEC and CPUC to be present as well. He has found that there is a lot of good intention, but that it is disconnected and that sometimes CEC and CPUC have competing priorities. Alignment is needed. Industry cannot bring the total impact they really could bring if the players cannot get access to the process. Don has relayed this same information to Commissioner McAllister multiple times in person as well. All are trying to do what is right from their perspective, but the contractor, building owner, and others at the base of the conversation are left out of the process. There is nothing wrong with using computer testing as a model, but not as the sole process. Under the current process, “it is a camel, which is a horse created by committee”.



WHPA Streamlining* Committee Teleconference Summary Notes
Friday, September 15, 2017
Scheduled for 12:00pm – 1:00pm PDT

- The Chair confirmed that “we are also working to have the CEC and CPUC involved in this process.”

Committee Nomenclature

The Chair pushed decision on the Committee nomenclature to email communication to enable further brainstorming input.

Future Meeting Scheduling and Next Steps

The Chair proposed a Doodle Poll for end of next week or early the week after. He will be prepared working with IOU counterparts and WHPA Staff to present beginning themes for continued conversation. He directed that the Committee nomenclature or meeting frequency should be pushed back at this point.

ACTION: WHPA Staff to send a Doodle Poll for next meeting scheduling.

The Chair agreed with Pepper Hunziker’s (Tre’Laine) suggestion to survey the roster to capture initial thoughts, “even if it is just one question.”

ACTION: WHPA Staff to send out a simple feedback survey question for input following content agreement with the Chair.

DECISION: There was affirmative agreement that an Industry Co-Chair is appropriate and needed.
The Chair confirmed that a candidate has been identified so the approval process will be enacted.

ACTION: WHPA Staff to ensure Industry Co-Chair approval is on the next Executive Committee meeting agenda.

Adjournment

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 1:04 p.m. PDT.

* * * * *

Summary of Action Items and Key Decisions (from above)

ACTION ITEMS

1. **ACTION:** The Chair and Barbara Hernesman (SynergyNexGen) to further discuss the topic of “meeting the boots on the ground where they are at” offline.
2. **ACTION:** WHPA Staff to send a Doodle Poll for next meeting scheduling. (DONE)
3. **ACTION:** WHPA Staff to send out a simple feedback survey question for input following content agreement with the Chair. (DONE)
4. **ACTION:** WHPA Staff to ensure Industry Co-Chair approval is on the next Executive Committee meeting agenda. (DONE)

KEY DECISIONS

1. **DECISION:** There was affirmative agreement that an Industry Co-Chair is appropriate and needed. (DONE)