DOCKETED

Docket Number:	17-BSTD-01
Project Title:	2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards PreRulemaking
TN #:	220476
Document Title:	Comments for Docket Number 2017-BSTD-01
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Brownson Technical School
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	8/1/2017 8:53:57 AM
Docketed Date:	8/1/2017

Comments for Docket Number 2017-BSTD-01

Comments for Docket Number 2017-BSTD-01

Mark Alatorre, PE

I listened to the discussion â€" especially the Q&A portion of the meeting with regard to the Quality Assurance side of the Mechanical Acceptance Test Technician program with great interest.

I am with Brownson Technical School. We are doing the hands-on training and evaluation for the ATTCP, NEBB. I am very familiar with the QA plan that NEBB submitted. While nothing will ever be perfect, I thought that it struck a great balance between what was realistic and what should be done to hold the Mechanical Acceptance Test Technician accountable. This approach is sadly not to be.

I feel that doing a paper (desk) audit alone is insufficient. At the same time, going into the building after the test has been completed just (in my opinion) isnâ€™t feasible. While I would like the plan to send the ATT back for someone like us to â€œrecertifyâ€ every so often would be great for our revenues, I think that it would fall short of the kind quality assurance that I feel would be required. I guess that Iâ€™m just not seeing what the problem is with â€œshadowingâ€ the ATT on a job and taking careful notes to report back to the ATTCP for them to evaluate whether or not it was being done properly. If the ATTCP felt that the work wasnâ€™t being done properly then they could take whatever steps they deemed appropriate.

So, if a simple paper or desk audit isnâ€™t enough and shadowing the ATT at the worksite isnâ€™t acceptable, but going back to the building at some point after the ATT has left and attempting to recreate the test seems problematic, Iâ€™m not sure where we go from here.

Iâ€™m unclear why the shadowing idea got thrown out. Is it the entire concept or was there something in particular about that was problematic? Is there a way to salvage this concept but modify it in such a manner as to be acceptable to the CEC?

Bill Brown
Director
Brownson Technical School
1110 Technology Circle
Anaheim, CA 92886
(714) 774-9443 Voice
bill@brownson.edu