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**Attachment B**

**Approved Meet & Confer Document by Program Administrators, Office of Ratepayers and The Utility Reform Network**

# Background:

Decision (D.) 18-05-041 Ordering Paragraph 44 states:

Beginning with the annual budget advice letters due on September 3, 2019, the program administrators must include updated budget estimates in the same format as the supplemental budget information filed in this proceeding on June 12, 2017.

Therefore, consistent with this Commission direction, this narrative and the accompanying Attachment A Tables 9 through 16, PA provides the following information in Attachment B.

# I. DESCRIPTION OF IN-HOUSE EE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE & ASSOCIATED COSTS

## A. Narrative description of in-house departments/organizations supporting the PA’s EE portfolio

1. Functions conducted by each department/organization

**PA Response:**

2. Energy Efficiency Management Structure and Org Chart

**PA Response:**

3. Staffing needs by department/organization, including current and forecast for ~~2018~~ 2022-2023, as well as a description of what changes are expected ~~in the near term (2022-2023)~~ between 2024-2027 or why it’s impossible to predict beyond ~~2022~~ 2024, if that’s the PA’s position.

**PA Response :**

4. Non-program functions currently performed by contractors (e.g. advisory consultants), as well as a description of what changes are expected ~~in the near term (2022-2023)~~ between 2024-2027 or why it’s impossible to predict beyond ~~2022~~ 2024, if that’s the PA’s position.

PA Response :

5. Anticipated drivers of in-house cost changes by department/organization

**PA Response :**

6. Explanation of method for forecasting costs

**PA Response :**

## B. Table showing PA EE “Full Time Equivalent” headcount by department/organization

7. TURN and CAL PA like this example, taken from testimony PG&E’s 2017 GRC addressing its Energy Procurement department. We would be looking for ~~2016 or 2017~~ 2019, 2020, or 2021 “recorded” positions, depending on what’s most appropriate for the PA, or both, if that provides the most clarity. For forecast years, we’d want at least ~~2018~~ 2024.

* Note, if PAs’ FTE needs change, these changes can be made without reporting or seeking CPUC approval

****

**PA Response :**

[*Response provide in Attachment A – Table 10 Portfolio FTE]*

## C. Table showing costs by functional area of management structure

8. Expenses broken out into labor, non-labor O&M (with contract labor identified) (\* Note, in case of conflict, excel budget template will control.)

**PA Response :**

[*Response provide in Attachment A – Tables 9 Portfolio Summary, Tables 11 through 16 Sector Budget details]*

9. Identify any capital costs

**PA Response :**

## D. Table showing cost drivers across the EE organization

10. TURN and CAL PA like this example, taken from testimony PG&E’s 2017 GRC addressing its Energy Procurement department.

* While this example pertains to departmental cost increases, in our case, cost increases or decreases would be attributed to major cost drivers.

****

**PA Response :**

## E. Explanation of allocation of labor and O&M costs between EE-functions and GRC-functions or other non-EE functions

11. When an employee spends less than 100% of her/his time on EE, how are costs tracked and recovered (e.g., on a pro rata basis between EE rates and GRC rates; when time exceeds a certain threshold, all to EE; etc.).

**PA Response :**

12. Describe the method used to determine the proportion charged to EE balancing accounts for all employees who also do non-EE work.

**PA Response :**

13. Identify the EE functions that are most likely to be performed by employees who also do non-EE work (e.g. Customer Account Representatives?)

**PA Response :**

15. How are burden benefit-related administrative and general (A&G) expenses for employees who work on EE programs recovered (EE rates or GRC rates)? \*\*PG&E allocates these costs to EE pursuant to a settlement agreement with MCE and TURN, which was adopted in D.14-08-032.

**PA Response :**

16. When EE and non-EE activities are supported by the same non-labor resources, how are the costs of those resources or systems allocated to EE and non-EE activities?

**PA Response :**

17. Identify the EE O&M costs that are most likely to be spread to non-EE functions as well as EE, if any

**PA Response :**

# II. BUDGET TABLES INCLUDING INFORMATION IDENTIFIED IN THE SCOPING MEMO

This section refers to the April 14, 2017 Scoping Memo and Ruling of Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judges in A.17-01-003 et. al.

## A. Attachment-A, Question C.8

“Present a single table summarizing energy savings targets, and expenditures by sector (for the six specified sectors). This table should enable / facilitate assessment of relative contributions of the sectors to savings targets, and relative cost-effectiveness.”

18. TURN and CAL PA invite the PAs to propose a common table format for this information. We don’t have anything specific in mind. Additionally, include a brief description of the method used by the PA to estimate the costs presented in the C.8 Table.

**PA Response :**

[*Response provide in Attachment A – Table 7]*

## B. Attachment-A, Question C.9

“Using a common budget template developed in consultation with interested stakeholders (hopefully agreed upon at a “meet and confer” session), display how much of each year’s budget each PA anticipates spending “in-house” (e.g., for administration, non-outsourced direct implementation, other non-incentive costs, marketing), by sector and by cross-cutting program.”

19. TURN and CAL PA invite the PAs to propose a common table format for this information. We don’t have anything specific in mind.

**PA Response :**

[*Response provide in Attachment A – Tables 11 through 16]*

20. Additionally, include a brief description of the method used by the PA to estimate the costs presented in the C.9 Table.

**PA Response :**

## C. Attachment-A, Question C.10

“Present a table akin to PG&E’s Figure 1.9 (Portfolio Overview, p 37) or SDG&E’s Figure 1.10 (p. 23) that not only shows anticipated solicitation schedule of “statewide programs” by calendar year and quarter, but also expected solicitation schedule of local third-party solicitations, by sector, and program area (latter to extent known, and/or by intervention strategy if that is more applicable). For both tables, and for each program entry on the calendar, give an approximate size of budget likely to be available for each solicitation (can be a range).”

21. TURN and CAL PA invite the PAs to propose a common table format for this information. We don’t have anything specific in mind. Additionally, include a brief description of the method used by the PA to estimate the costs presented in the C.10 Table.

**PA Response :**

[*Response provide in Attachment A – Table 6 Statewide Programs. Current Solicitation schedule is available at (provide website)]*