DOCKETED

DOCKLIED	
Docket Number:	17-IEPR-06
Project Title:	Doubling Energy Efficiency Savings
TN #:	215520
Document Title:	Claire Ann Warshaw Comments: SuggestIon: putting baseline spreadsheet example "out there"
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Claire Ann Warshaw
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	1/23/2017 1:12:43 PM
Docketed Date:	1/23/2017

Comment Received From: Claire Ann Warshaw Submitted On: 1/23/2017 Docket Number: 17-IEPR-06

SuggestIon: putting baseline spreadsheet example "out there"

CEC, CPUC, Utilities, and other stakeholders:

I listened to much talk about the doubling data tracking today via WebEX. A PG&E representative (forgive me for not catching his name) asked if spreadsheets would be available to work off of. Martha Brooks, CEC, and Chairman Robert Weisenmiller, CEC, responded positively in some words reinforcing that they hoped to make this as transparent as possible. Here I am attempting to share my applauding for that particular suggestion. I understand the CEC spreadsheet may not be ready yet $\hat{a} \in \varpi$ for consumption $\hat{a} \in$ and maybe is not an accurate idea though I am guessing it might be better to share the spreadsheet information. The chart that was generated seemed fairly clear. Also Brian Cope of the Southern California Power Authority commented on ideal baseline creation. I think that is somewhat part of the $\hat{a} \in \varpi$ crux $\hat{a} \in$ of today $\hat{a} \in \mathbb{T}^{Ms}$ meeting.

I do find it a bit challenging to think of a uniform baseline that fits across the diversity of the California utility system - especially privately invested vs. municipal types. Thinking about the range of data that could possibly be generated alone is a challenge. I personally, in my tiny opinion, would suggest that the CEC and CPUC put a spreadsheet baseline example into this program's document section online and/or let a utility/utilities send their example of what they think is reasonable, as soon as possible. It seems that would help progress be made more quickly on refining ideal baselines/data/spreadsheets for your next meeting on this subject and make it easier on everyone. Some workers might benefit from not "re-inventing" too many wheels. In that way I think the CEC/CPUC and/or the other stakeholders can solidify their expectations in ways to make somewhat easier to discuss, debate and accomplish for the next meetings.

I know it can be hurtful and embarrassing to expose items that are not perfect examples. Perhaps stamping $\hat{a} \in \alpha$ draft $\hat{a} \in \alpha$ and/or $\hat{a} \in \alpha$ reject-able $\hat{a} \in \alpha$ (even by one $\hat{a} \in T^M$ s own entity including the CEC) all over these items might be helpful. I think most that do this kind of work might understand why having something to start with versus starting from scratch by oneself is easier to work with. Maybe the utilities want to do the spreadsheet suggesting simultaneously. Perhaps this can be done similarly as commenting is on the CEC website.

I understand that a separate $\hat{a} \in \mathfrak{C}$ staff meeting $\hat{a} \in \mathbb{C}$ (I gather without as many representatives) was suggested for such purposes, but I do see it as helpful to have something to work with. I am not actually involved in this work right now except for attempting to understand what is going on and learn. Please take my suggestions with a $\hat{a} \in \mathfrak{C}$ grain of salt $\hat{a} \in \mathbb{C}$.

Thanks for putting your discussion "out there". This to me seemed more like a meeting of ideals.

Sincerely, Claire Warshaw