Combined notes for the September 2013 Strategic Plan Workshops

Attendees

September 23, 2013 in San Francisco

> Simon Baker, CPUC
> Jeremy Battis, CPUC
> Jenny Berg, ABAG
> Martin Bond, Community Energy Services
> Cal Broomhead, San Francisco
> Sharlene Carlson, Santa Clara County
> Leif Christiansen, PG&E
> Jeff Condit, City of Monterey
> Rory Cox, CPUC
> Shasa Curl, Richmond
> Natalie deLeon, Santa Clara County
> Rachel DiFranco, Santa Clara County
> Richard Flood, Valley Climate Action Center
> Paul Gilbert Snyder, EBMUD
> Ann Kelly, San Francisco
> Jane Kruse, PG&E
> Jerry Lahr, ABAG
> Heather Larson, StopWaste.Org (Alameda County)
> Jody London, LGSEC
> Demetra McBride, Santa Clara County
> Beckie Menten, Marin Energy Authority
> Rita Norton, Rita Norton Consulting
> Jodi Pincus, Rising Sun Energy Center
> Alex Porteshawver, City of Benicia
> Jillian Rich, PG&E
> Nancy Richards, Local Energy
> Juan Romero, Santa Clara County
> Elisabeth Russell, AMBAG
> Kif Scheuer, Strategic Energy Innovations
> David Siddiqul, Populus
> Suzanne Smith, Sonoma County
> Pat Stoner, SLGEEBPC
> Michael Warburton, Public Trust Alliance
> Meredith Youngheim, CPUC

September 25, 2013 in Los Angeles

> Bernard Adebayo-Ige, SCE
> Duane Baker, San Bernardino Association of Governments
> Jeremy Battis, CPUC

Simone Blackwell, WRCOG
Sabrina Bornstein, South Bay Cities COG
Charlie Buck, CCSE
Joanna Chang, SCE
Howard Choy, LA County
David Cohen, The Energy Coalition
Michael DeSousa, SCE
Becky Estrella, So Cal Gas
John Fasana, SCE
Angela Hacker, Santa Barbara County
Greg Haney, SCE
Matt Henigan, Santa Monica
Ann Hewitt, Ventura County
Trevor Keith, SLO County
Aaron Klemm, Huntington Beach
Jesse Langley, SCE
Marilyn Lyon, South Bay Cities COG
Scot Mann, SCE
Tyler Masters, WRCOG
Ronald Mohr, LA County
Paulo Morais, So Cal Gas
Leslie Owashi, SCE
Lisa Parker, SCE
Pat Stoner, SLGEEBPC
Craig Tanby, LADWP
Allejandra Tellez, Ventura County
Denise Tyrell, CPUC
Alma Williamson, So Cal Gas

September 26, 2013 in Fresno

Bob Decker, SoCalGas
Jose R. Gonzalez, Fresno
Betsy McGovern-Garcia, Visalia
Steve Newvine, PG&E
Joseph Oldham, Fresno

September 26, 2013 in Palm Desert

Martin Alvarez, City of Palm Desert
Katie Barrows, CVAG
Jeremy Battis, CPUC
Becky Estrella, SoCalGas
Greg Haney, SCE
Sarah Jimenez, Aqua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians
Pong Kunakorn, SCE

Jeff Lawler, SoCalGas
Michelle Mician, City of Palm Springs
Brit Wilson, City of Rancho Mirage

September 26, 2013 in San Diego

Lorie Azar, San Diego
Nabil Chehade, San Diego
Lorie Cosio Azar, San Diego
Jon DeHart, LGC
Susan Freed, San Diego County
Amanda Jenison, SDG&E
Christy Kindig, Santa Ana
Mo Lahsaie, Oceanside
Mariann Long, Santa Ana
Margaret Mercer, Santa Ana
Linda Pratt, San Diego
Cesar Rios, San Diego County
Lianna Rios, SDG&E
Pat Stoner, SLGEEBPC
Martin Turock, CleanTech San Diego
Dave Weil, San Diego
Brenda Womack, SDG&E
Jenny Woods, LGC

September 26, 2013 in Santa Barbara

Brian Hiefield, Goleta
Erin Maker, Carpinteria
Cindy Moore, Goleta
Paulo Morais, SoCalGas
Alelia Parenteau, Santa Barbara

Meeting Notes

General Comments for CPUC:

This needs to be a document from both organizations (CEC and CPUC).

Define 'energy' not as just electricity and natural gas, but also transportation fuels.
Also include water as much as possible. (Pat's response – probably can't include
transportation fuels, they are not under CPUC oversight)

EE is often focused on usage. On gas side, we need to think about leakage. Leakage
often has greater GHG impact than usage. Leakage is not in GHG inventory because

it's unknown. Responsibility often on IOUs, but behind the meter, LG's can do something.

COG focuses a lot on reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and they are wondering if plan can address VMT? (Probably not….probably won't be able to have VMT in the menu.) Are there other areas in strategic plan that can address vehicle use? (Probably not)

Include open space districts, water districts, and other non-city and non-county government. (Current Strategic Plan just looks at cities and counties).

Hope when this planning is all done it would be helpful for someone to come down and walk all city managers through the plan.

Global Warming v. GHG Emissions:

We used to call it global warming and now we say climate change but ordinary people have difficulty with greenhouse terminology. It would be nice to have a different terminology – general citizens don't understand it very well.

Harmful environmental emissions versus greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. No one can disagree with harmful environmental emissions.

Local governments have spent a lot of time educating the public on GHG – I feel like it is fine to stick with the standard. At the local government level, alter the language as needed. Wording is fine.

By including reference to GHG, you are adding another level of analysis beyond just energy reduction. It creates more work because it is more in depth. CAP is part of it but not everyone has a CAP.

Try to keep language and goals consistent with other state goals (AB 32).

In rolling cycle discussions now, hoping that programs will continue to operate. How to evaluate when you need an onramp or off ramp for a program. Not clear in other process, that there will be a formal application for 2015.

<u>*General Comments on Chapter:*</u>

Energy Savings Targets:

Energy savings figure – have as a chapter goal instead of energy savings per goal. If energy reductions will be used as a basis for funding, it should be transparent because it will have a huge impact. There should be a special category with different way of measuring for emphasis on low-income with different set of metrics for innovative or hard-to-reach populations.

Caution around the language. Cost effectiveness and energy impact bigger than this. Maybe care less about which program made a specific contribution and taking credit because it's a time suck.

Credit for activities that don't get IOU incentives:

Concerned about tracking and controlling energy use – doing activities that are not eligible to be tracked. Is that something that can be changed in this chapter? Things that don't qualify for rebate or incentive or timeline don't allow us to follow utility process. How can a local government report on an activity that may have a positive impact but is not necessarily being funded or tracked through strategic planning item? (This is a PUC question.) It would be great to have language in the chapter to acknowledge this challenge.

Strategies that fit under more than One Goal:

Cross-cutting issues (strategies) should be restated under more than one goal.

Not sure if we should restate, perhaps preface that the cutoff is gray between the strategies.

Include more than Energy Efficiency:

Go beyond the EE proceedings and include demand response, as a long-term strategy. There are so many overlapping proceedings. (CPUC response: working on how to handle that in a manageable way, keep DR on the table.)

Underscore that this is a long-term plan. Don't see long-term thinking in the language. Projects sometimes take 5- 10-yrs. Needs to be part of language and understanding. Any entity depending on public funding develops into best practice a master plan like a facilities master plan. Identifies 10 yr. need for funding. As we obtain funds from different resources, we can address parts of the plan. Constraints on when we can use funding (construction cycle). When we have access to grants, bonds, etc., we have to be ready to move, and we want to keep moving when don't have access to funds. At micro, local level, lots of different planning efforts going on.

Look at how the Strategic Plan can also address energy assuredness and disaster preparedness. (need language for this)

Use energy efficiency a lot – strategy 3.3 – how broad is this – does this focus on water? Natural gas? What is meant by energy efficiency? (Natural gas is definitely part of it, water/energy is definitely a large interest – we can make this more explicit in the plan, propane is not overseen by PUC)

Local Government Expertise:

Missing a really clear acknowledgement that local governments design and implement energy efficiency programs.

Local governments have 4 tools: Four tools:
    1) Education & Outreach
    2) Tech assistance and financing, permit barriers
    3) Incentives like permit processing
    4) Law

Connection with other Strategic Plan Chapters:

LG chapter isn't isolated – it encompasses work within the other chapters because the LG chapter represents the community.

Data:

Improving access to data for local governments is essential to making good plans and knowing whom to target. More refinement because language relies on aggregated data. Sometimes need more than aggregated. LG's align with CEC on data issues.

Data sharing between the IOUs and LGs should bidirectional. In the case of multifamily, commercial, small business, industrial and agricultural customer collected data, local entities are privy to data that may signify very specific "trigger points" for these market actors. For example, when a multifamily building applies locally for building permits for a significant renovation, this trigger point could be easily shared by the local municipality to the IOU. With this knowledge in hand, IOU account representatives could use this information as an intervention point to identify and explain rebate and other energy efficiency programs available to the permit applicant and or account holder.

Criteria for adding additional strategies:

Possible additions to criteria for adding new strategies
    ▪ Things that don't duplicate others resources
    ▪ Things that leverage other resources

Ordering the Goals:

Permitting Authority should be goal number 1.

We rated the codes from easiest to achieve to hardest to achieve, but capacity is easy to proceed from 1, 2, 3.

Suggest that the order you have placed these approaches in….order of approaches is not important. Certain goals will be more important than others depending on the LG. De-emphasize order and focus more on the content.

Miscellaneous:

List a number of statewide organizations and LGSEC would like to be added.

Have to be creative to fund activities through partnership. If there is a way to include more of a long-term vision and use this document to facilitate funding streams to local governments. Support things like PACE and other avenues.

Goal 1: Lead by example

Take general category as internal capacity building. (Goal 4) Have strategic energy management goal and implementation here.

Goal Wording:

Reword to say something like LGs lead by example by designing programs that reduce their own energy use and GHG emissions. Important to acknowledge that LG's are already implementing programs with leveraged funding. Way to recognize process.

Expect us to set an example and be an energy leader. But this is often challenging. If we can set in our goals as being a resource, education center, showcase – it is ideal. Understand concern about risk but there is expectation as well. Great for citizens to see example in real life of something we are trying to promote at the residential level.

Recognize the low hanging fruit first, but don't want to de-emphasize where LG's have significant reach and leverage. Maybe another way to characterize it is 'leading by example' instead of 'municipal energy use.'

Appreciate 2013 goals and strategies not using the word 'buildings' as much and water/sanitation doesn't qualify as a building.

Energy Outcomes:

On moving goal 1 compliance to 2025: some prefer to keep it at 2020, which encourages all local governments to get to their goals sooner rather than later.

LG energy use is reduced by X% by 2020 and by Y% by 2025. How will this goal be evaluated, if the goal is being met or not? There is never any accuracy on the measurement, and who is measuring? Absolute measure and energy use measure are not the same, there's always a community fighting for a new community center. I

think the LG will need a lot of guidance in this area of program planning and design. We really need strong guidance. If the LG is tracking the measurement and process, we need to have the data. It's been a problem to get the data for years. The process of getting data from LG needs to be resolved and improved, find a better strategy.

One suggestion for the benchmarking goal setting could be a series of choices that a government can choose from depending on their personal needs, declare what that is, and then achieve 20% energy savings from that. The types of starting points can be 1990 energy use, some mix of T24 2002 plus 1990 energy use for agencies that have equal growth and retrofit opportunity, as an example. I understand the big picture is to establish a baseline, and then improve 20% from that baseline, which is great. I just don't think any one single baseline will apply to all municipalities.

Assistance needed:

Needs to be some level of analysis up front to determine where biggest bang for the buck lies. Knowing what impact/numbers are will be good. Perhaps a goal/strategy around determining needs.

Facilities and Infrastructure:

A lot of policies talk about 'their own' buildings, but LG's often lease buildings. Perhaps add policy about lease terms including EE and Green Building.

LG's have other capital processes and EE should be included in those.

Additional strategy recognizing the LG's spend most on infrastructure, and a lot of it is in need of updating. Possibly a strategy about infrastructure improvements and that LG's proactively think about energy efficiency. Most water utilities will replace pipe in near future. We hope that they also think about their pumps. A broad statement about EE while making existing infrastructure improvements.

Employee Education:

~~Behavior modification should be stricken~~. Use behavior change instead. Alameda County incentivizes behavior with employees. Perhaps a goal around employees leading by example outside of work.

Financing:

Can we add grant opportunities to financing options?

Beta-testing language:

Cautious about serving as a venue for new practices. Where is the highest and best use of funding? Public funding for experiments where we don't know what will

happen - let's be cautious. Local code would be a barrier to finding where to experiment with new technologies.

LG's can serve as a breeding ground but potential backlash. Perhaps some more vetted technologies like a demo ZNE building.

Considering concept of beta testing – replace with tested incubators. This phrase is commonly used.

I think the language to R&D should be changed.

Another idea for strategy 1-4 which deals with the innovation incubator could be demonstration projects. LG's are perfectly positioned to engage community awareness by using innovative technologies in their development.

Learn with peers to test and pilot ZNE bldg. Perhaps say pilot ZNE buildings, it doesn't need to be new technology because a lot of them are already understood.

Street Lighting in San Diego area could be used as an example of new Technology and development of procurement.

I think market transformation is critical to this plan being able to advance and for title 24 to advance. Current situation with available technologies and products to make title 24 projects feasible has lacked. Piloting and beta testing is important to aid market transformation. However, our jursidiction will not beta test because politically speaking it is a landmine. (We are changing the language to emerging technologies.) Even that, is too progressive. Can we construct this objective so that even our jurisdiction can take part in it and help market transformation? Problem is- everything we do with general services has political impact on the elected officials. What we do has to be solid. If you can reconstruct to discuss aiding market transformation rather than beta testing – so we can participate in projects that put us at risk. More specific examples can fall under this. (Suggest that they send language to make this change.)

Comprehensive Programs:

To go one step further, I'm thinking one of the Goals for this section of the Strategic Plan could be to integrate carbon, water, waste, renewables, and other resources into comprehensive whole building retrofits. Right now, the CPUC only allows coverage of electric and gas savings ignoring the rest. However, since local governments are permanent fixtures within a community, they can really be given the opportunity to comprehensively work towards resource responsibility. That would include audits that called out water saving opportunities as well as carbon reduction strategies in addition to demand response and energy efficiency. We can never get to a net-zero marketplace without tying it all together and the revision to the strategic plan is where it should occur. Furthermore, the private sector won't be

the ones to set an example because some of these paybacks aren't cost effective enough if you aren't staying in the building for a long period of time.

Water/Energy Nexus:

Maybe LG would like to increase EE with Water and help the community save water. Water usage is increasing.

The water/energy nexus is becoming a much more important issue in CA than in previous years. I'm talking about quantifying the embedded energy savings, which would result from end-use water reduction. The CPUC is working on a metric of which to discuss providing energy incentives for water reduction strategies. This should be as important for LGs as energy savings. LGs can change out landscaping, adopt greywater strategies and permitting processes, and require or retrofit low flow fixtures into their facilities as part of the energy package deep retrofit possibilities. I believe that water reduction should be included in Goal 1, as well as Goal 4, where you have it. However, your use of it in Goal 4 is more of cross-promoting energy rebates from electric utilities with water rebates through water agencies. That is more of co-op marketing than water/energy nexus, and is still important.

Natural Systems:

Suggest taking a look at ZNE elements that rely on natural system advantages (sun, wind, natural shade canopy, hydrology) – to include as an example for strategy 4 . Also open up to school buildings, not just municipal buildings, harnessing natural "technology". Don't just stop at electronics, computer – include natural options.

Goal 2: Community Leadership

Goal Language:

Good goal, like the fact the broader sustainability language is included – but it can be problematic when dealing with EE funds.

Old goal has tracking and implementation. Please keep.

General Comments:

Support in the goals the need for implementation of climate plans. Good it's called out. Jurisdictions have plans, but not a lot of implementation.

I think the greatest concern for the municipalities is how to collaborate and increase Energy efficiency. We should be tracking, and we need to help the cities in the regional level. But how much is this going to cost us? How can we help these cities?

This is where the community roles come in. The LG role, Green building promotion, Financing, Marketing and outreach, Outreach with realtors, water energy, etc. But they need to be listed as a blue print, we should be comprehensive in listing and included.

LGs engaged in resiliency and emergency plans. Don't want them to be excluded by omission. Cross-cutting with data sharing.

Never know what's going to come next. Having a strategy that allows for broad activities to address the unknown. Financing is a start.

Community Outreach:

Our county is energy advising, and visiting homeowners. This is helping with our action plans and with energy savings.

Local governments will be doing outreach. Encourage you to include some broad statement with the public.

Permit counter displays – get more specific – promotional materials and perhaps software (remotely and point of sale) – help educate about different possibilities that could be incorporated into projects.

Add websites.

Natural Systems:

A thought about natural heating and cooling of buildings. Please write it in.

Ecosystem services / Natural Capital
- Looking at ecosystem as part of regional and local planning. Economic services that arise from the environment.
- Propose that ecosystem services concept be included in strategy to include for instance OS planning (cooling, reduce VMT, etc)
- Methodologies from WRI, Stanford, Nature Conservancy

Neighborhood Sustainability Planning:

Integrate water, storm water, pedestrian plans, etc. Way to integrate EE.

Hard to Reach:

Include language to address hard to reach populations – local governments have a comparative advantage and could come up with tools and methodologies to reach hard to reach populations.

Financing:

Something related to shared savings. If money can get back to LG's to support ongoing efforts. Embed that in structure of funding. Shared savings with whom? Revolving load fund w/built-in kick back for LG's. With one facility manager, try to develop shared savings with depts. Or schools. Gets taken away with budgeting. In order to get money to fund activity, required to return some portion to department or school. If required, then need to track savings and return savings. (Pat response: that can be an example but can't be the only way to do this statewide)

Goleta: Empower Financing program – can this be mentioned? It is a financing program for residential upgrades that is being done with local banks.

Goal 3: Permitting Authority

Goal Language:

"Permitting authority" is limited. Include ordinances? "permitting and other authority" better.

Maybe we should say "Credibility, Local Trust", instead of Permitting Authority. Perhaps we should use a friendlier language.

Take out reference to permitting authority, goal should be broader. Seems to emphasize permitting and that is just one strategy. (Will change title to permitting and other authority, does that capture?) Maybe, but still too much emphasis. Change to regulatory authority instead? Not quite there yet. Think about other title options. Permitting Jurisdiction?

Permitting authority – taking it out wouldn't hurt it Top part is what we are trying to achieve- implementation. Permitting doesn't add to discussion, accelerating implementation in their communities, it doesn't matter as much to mention permitting authority.

Including zoning codes for long-term planning documents.

Assistance Needed:

Reiterate importance of compliance research. Not a good, quantified example of permitting and enforcement. Support for this type of study.

Strategy 3-3: develop document and implement model policies. Does this goal of including permit template? Nice to not have to reinvent the wheel, helpful to have templates to utilize. (Goal 4 addresses sharing of information.)

Data:

Data collection that aligns with state needs. Not only asking for data, but giving it.

Building codes, all LG's have non-disclosure agreements (NDA) with IOUs to have data sharing on a variety of issues. Some counties and cities have digital permit records. If data could be shared with utility to identify buildings at trigger point for residential or commercial permits, that would be of benefit. Permit-holding entities have data that could be of use to IOUs.

Title 24:

Improve T24 and improve EE in existing building: current and future codes address retrofitting existing buildings in more comprehensive way. So these two sort of merge in the new title 24 codes.

Perhaps add a compliance baseline strategy.

Have funding for regional inspectors. More resources for processing permits so it's not such a burden. Funding that allows permitting software. Trainings on upcoming building energy codes, but also need trainings on permitting process, how to do it quickly, etc.

Compliance – How much sharing by contractors or implementers could happen so that LG's know who to watch out for. Where are the losses in code compliance more significant and should we focus on those / share info on those?

Noticed at our permit desk – staff struggles to keep up. Does this include help with staff? Need help so they can be proactive with T24 better and have time to take a strategic look into future and understand their requirements will be and bring in market transformation – what is their role, how does it help them? Have staff be more helpful to move toward these goals

Should community education be a strategy here as well? When folks come in to pull permits, allow opportunity for dialogue and education

Need training for local contractors for municipal, residential, etc. Suggest adding training so contractors can meet requirements.

Reach Codes:

Reach codes should be tied explicitly to ZNE action plan. Tie them to existing buildings as well.

Under 2008 version, 1-6, CEQA wasn't carried over. Make it's sure not lost.

Green Building:

Green business certification program should be funded and supported. Can we add another category for this?

Green or energy labeling: require or voluntary. Two need to work together. Permitting: Rules vs. enforcement.

Green labeling. Under 3-3, POS programs. Another might be date certain. Move away from just adoption. Lots of setup work, including data.

3-3: broaden – develop recognition program, this may be easier for tracking. Strong agreement among group to make this change. Then possibly still use as an example.

Can we add on Green Elements? We have a lot of buildings with holes, need a lot of renovation with our low income apartments.

What about rebates and incentives from local governments that are given to residents?

Green building codes- under LEED, green building is defined broadly - so this creates confusion when they seek funding from CPUC – use codes that support state efficiency goals instead. Expedited and streamlining - open up to muni codes in general – to cover a sustainability code.

Energy Upgrade CA:

Strategy 3-3: Was this written when EUC was considered a whole house program? I think we should strengthen and improve the language. (Will provided a written memo of his suggestions.)

Desire to facilitate and do more with promoting goals such as energy audits for the community. Would it be its own strategy under 3? Just open to consideration for local governments to take on. Utilities have energy audits for residential customers. Moved to EUC and away from residential energy audits from guidance from Commission.

Commercial sector audits would be helpful. Not aware of past precedent re past EUC pushes surrounding residential energy audits, but LGs want to do more with EUC for residents. Need to resolve this issue still

AB 758/ AB 1103:

Looking at intro language on bottom of page 8, have blurb about recent legislation. Modify to show that LG's have responsibility under AB 758 to become involved. Bigger responsibility than just what's described in the document intro. (Suggestions for language?)

I know AB758 is acknowledged within the document, but I couldn't help but think that some sections may not completely coordinate with that scoping and action plan. The benchmarking section, in particular, is aimed to find a statewide benchmarking tool for everyone to use. I feel that the plan should complement those activities and goals instead of, for example, using portfolio manager as a goal solely. That is merely an example to illustrate a point. However, I just want to point out that this should work in concert with AB 758. I can research some of the language in the AB 758 Action plan and include that in my red-lined comments of your next version of the document.

Extending AB 1103 to include multi-family buildings could be in there.

Income Eligible:

Define low income. Suggest that income-eligible is defined for those that are new to the term. Expression could mean different things to different people.

Without redevelopment funds, housing offices and community development authorities are noticing funding availability, ability to include EE in housing NOFAs for low-income housing.

Not sure why income eligible services are at the bottom – doesn't seem to fit under permitting authority. (We are trying to broaden to other types of authority as well.) If the title changes – then income eligible makes more sense. If you keep this here – you should add something about disadvantaged populations and link in the comment about hard to reach populations – have as a theme, then also include something about outreach.

Under new 3.5, under low income, align workforce requirements of those programs with IOU/Ratepayer programs.

Goal 4: Competency Building

Goal Language:

Option for local governments to build their own capacity. LGPs are one option, but if LG understands needs and capacity, if there is a way to receive funds without the restrictions of the partnerships model, that would be ideal.

Assistance Needed:

Do we have a standard package for capacity, job descriptions, permit templates, RFP language? In case a Department wants to create a position. (suggestion for SEEC partnership or Pat's replacement?)

Elected Officials:

Bringing local elected officials on board – lack of comprehensive data is important here. Most elected are working with lots of info. Need something concrete. Use data to sway local elected.

I don't see an example of engaging city officials. If EE is seen by the people running the city, it will make EE promoting much easier and increase followers.

4-1 – engaging elected officials could be its own category. Great to get the BOS more engaged in energy work that we do so they can own the projects and it doesn't have to be middle up – more top down. (Send language about this to include here.)

Recognition when you have empowered elected officials – recognition of elected officials – expand on the beacon program? If you want to do additional efforts beyond Beacon – (send Pat language.)

Peer-to-Peer Sharing/Assistance:

One thing with talking to other Public sectors, they don't have any sales management experience like I do. We should add sales management training to help the City officials with Energy champion goals for LG.

Public/Public Partnerships:

4-4- add transportation districts, lighting districts

Legislative Expertise/Resources:

I would propose to put a category for "Local Government development of legislative expertise and resources"

Data:

Stress support of 4-1 that discusses empowering local jurisdiction staff with data. Access to aggregated data would be very helpful for us, to support community outreach, etc.

Miscellaneous:

I like this slide a lot. Do word smithing on pt 1- make it more broad: promote regional energy efficiency coordination and alignment for 4-3. Sense that with some larger partnerships there is difference of opinion, capability, willpower between governments – some larger partnerships could benefit from having to sit down and where they are as an entire partnership – feel comfortable going…have leading partners step up and help other partnerships… help get everyone on same page and in same boat.