

# CALIFORNIA ENERGY ALLIANCE MEETING NOTES (6/19/2018)

*Meeting start time: 9:28 A.M.*

## REGISTRATION/CHECK-IN

## WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND OVERVIEW

- Antitrust statement (read by Cori).

## 2022 ENERGY STANDARDS: TOP MEASURES—MECHANICAL

**Subcommittee Co-Chairs: Eric Taylor, David Dias**

- John: Separate discussion of 2022 standards by technology. May be bringing things back together where there are opportunities to combine ideas. Discussion is all part of big picture we are trying to assemble.
- Doug: Trying to whittle down on what CEA wants to focus on for 2022. Need as much of membership as possible to contribute to the efforts.
- Eric: Last two months ago, at meeting at the Lutron center, the mechanical division came up with four top initiatives that they recommend to CEA and a path to achieve these initiatives:
  - Regulatory issues. Currently in the energy code, where equipment is used in the field.
  - A statewide online permitting of HVAC system that streamlines commissioning and HERS raters and building departments.
  - Is serial number tracking feasible? Going to bring a viable option of requiring HVAC operation, much like the DMV, putting stickers on HVAC systems, but there was much resistance from manufacturers. Insure mobile and fixed asset open protocol and security, open APIs and protocols. Want to prove in this pilot that there is enough room for these open protocols in the market.
  - Utility compliance advocacy (addressed to CEC). Guideline for POUs; without educating the public utilities, it is difficult for utilities to understand why they are advocating compliance.
  - Pilot will focus on rewarding distributors. Building departments, HERS raters need to be a part of the process and are not currently incentivized to accelerate the market. Working with the right people to accelerate the market to full compliance. Goal: raise compliance.
- Eric: pilot will start in Imperial Valley and Coachella Valley. Later want to be able to take hold on a statewide basis.
- HVAC Committee Initiatives (*refer to slides for more info*)
  - Legislative and Regulatory:
    - Change “may” and “shall”
    - Enable Statewide Online Permitting of HVAC Systems
    - Require California HVAC
- Charles: Question about wording of “protocols”.
  - Eric: This is more about the diagnostic tools that are specified by the CEC. They do not specify tools, they specify a diagnostic protocol that has to meet their specification. The Mobile and Fixed Asset Open Protocols manufacturers want their tools to be used. Let

the CEC drive the industry at large, not just the programmatic for using tools, but also the guidelines.

- John Busch: A similar situation: demand response. Ultimately, what is that going to accomplish? A good way to compare what was done correctly: electrical metering requirements, it delineated what the metering had to do. Is it possible to present it in a way of 'what do we get out of it'? If you have an open protocol, you need to delineate what it will do.
- Charles: We, as CEA, recommended using OpenADR 2.0. In talking about protocols, I'm thinking of communications, but it seems like this is talking about methodologies.
- Eric: WCEC program. Also did study on diagnostic sensors, not specific equipment or manufacturers, but sensors (needs to be this accurate, need to apply it this way, to get answer of proper air conditioning). In a perfect world, everyone follows those rules, but in a cutthroat world, they follow their own rules, keep their own modules out,
- Jeanne: A HERS rater, has never had to use a specific type of equipment. If you look into the Appendices, the way you do testing for HERS is outlined and is there for a reason.
- Eric: The particular program, LADWP, has their own set of ideas, not allowing other contractors to use the tools that are available out there. Has a problem with that.
- Dave: Energy Code is different from Utility Program, a whole different thing from Title 24.
- Doug: Not sure if issues are of communications or philosophies. As a community, we will have difference of opinion, but we compromise and find a middle ground. As a group, we will figure out what the issues are. If there is value here, we need to pursue it. Keeping discussion at a higher level.
- Cori: Keeping the distinction between the utility programs and the actual energy code: if we keep this distinction in mind, it might help us understand the topic.
- Tanya: With understanding that there is a distinction between energy code and utility programs, is utility programs in our purview?
- Doug: Not going to focus, but will touch upon them, since they deal with energy codes. Mainly focusing on compliance. They are a stakeholder.
- Eric: Mainly as our top four initiatives, the pilot is very different. As we're working on our initiatives, we need to start piloting what we're trying to accomplish since there are dollars out there in the hands of utilities and we need to get those dollars in the right hands, right now, rather than in three years when the dollars are gone.
- Doug: Maybe instead of a pilot, do a demonstration project. Trying to prove a point, like performance base. A proof, rather than a pilot?
- Eric: Not a proof, since it is already being done now. We are trying to raise compliance, and we can measure that. We involve some of the stakeholders in working with us to direct the rebate dollars to the right market players to pilot this and show that it keeps going. The pilot looks like working with utility companies; other program is quality install program. Let's use this program to incentivize the building department, HERS rater, HVAC contractor, and homeowner. All of the parts and pieces are here, we just need to orchestrate it.
- John Martin: We have pretty limited resources, and as we chart the future, we want to make sure that in every activity we engage in, we plan ahead how much of our

resources it will take and its significance. A small-scale proof or test may make sense, but we need to understand the details and the big implications.

- Charles: Have to demonstrate need and problem to be solved.
- Dave: CEC has been wanting serial numbers, but distributor groups stopped progress on mandating it into the code.
- Theresa: CEC bidded out the jobs of the permitting database.
  - Multiple: It was ultimately rescinded, twice.
- Doug: This sounds like something in our wheelhouse, is picking up the measure something that appeals to CEA?
  - John Busch: If we can line up with what the CEC is trying to accomplish.
  - John Martin: We've said in the past that we've wanted to be a vertically-implemented organization. Want to be able to define the problem very clearly so that when we have a solution to propose, people understand the problem we're trying to solve.
- Tanya: It sounds like something that others have been working on but has been tabled. If it's something we all want to get behind, we need to understand the issues.
  - Dave: Refers to 2008 Strategic Plan.
- Charles: Not a mechanical person, but a lighting person. In hearing serial numbers, not sure what the problem is behind serial numbers of HVAC. Understands why cars have serial numbers. It seems like there is more regulation.
  - Dave: 270 to 300 thousand HVAC equipment that come into California, only 5% get permit pull to get installed. Most of that is done by ratepayer funded utility funds.
  - Charles: Issue is that permit pools are not being issued, how does serial numbers fix the problem?
  - Dave: Can be tracked to address, etc.
- Jim: What you're pointing to is a failure in the system to control code. The big question is: should this organization undertake or promote better inspection and all the other things that come with it?
  - Doug: From experience in doing the lighting code in 2013, not everyone was on the same page, but if this is something that CEA wants to engage in, we can bring diverse stakeholders together and bring compromise. That is something that CEA knows how to do.
  - Eric: The money is already there, and from the mechanical side, we understand this. My job as the chair is to bring in the right market actors. Not just put people together, but here to get CEA support from the mechanical side of things. A matter of the direction and guiding the direction.
- Thao: How long are you running pilot program for?
- Eric: Want to start next month. Have technology and groundwork. Western HVAC worked on these issues for five years and got all the way to the point that it's time on pilot. SDG&E pulled the plug on Western HVAC alliance. Here at CEC, just picking up what the industry wants and move it forward.
- Cori: What do you need from CEA?

- Eric: Need the resources, just let us run with it and move forward. A good thing for the mechanical industry. Collecting data on a single platform (software infrastructure slide).
- Michael Thompson: (*Refer to diagram in slides*) Transition into DER grid. Have assembled a network of software applications and programs that are both independent and interdependent and those programs that allow us to reduce the cost of energy efficiency and demand response to the point that it's feasible. This illustration on the screen right now is the current state of the networked application: a number of companies, PMAP is the core we've developed. Most of this exists currently, and this is what allows everything to be done and feasible.
- Tanya: Please include the roadblocks, would be helpful to understand the issues.
  - Eric: Will provide information if interested. Wants yea-sayers than nay-sayers.
- Doug: Nominates Jeanne and John Busch to work with Eric on recommendations. Would like Thao to go back to CEC to see how to best proceed with the initiative.
- John: Would be really helpful to restate the problem in clear language that non-mechanical members will understand. Took about 30 minutes in this discussion to "kind-of get it". If we could have a statement of the problem in a paragraph that laypeople could understand, the case for the need of this solution would be easier to make.

## CODE COMPLIANCE

### Subcommittee Chair: John Busch, Craig Ochoa

- **Refer to Code Compliance slides.**
- John: Took a couple steps back from delineating, broke it down into four items:
  - Who are the stakeholders? Picking **three or four stakeholders** to set up a meeting and have a round-table, asking them what their challenges are in enforcing the code. We are good at picking topics, but could work on getting everyone on the same page, more compliance. CEC looks like the bad guy for laying down the law, but they want the same outcomes.
    - Establish main stakeholders and what we need to provide to assist them.
      - Who is it that needs to be re-educated, and bring them along.
      - Stakeholders in play: owner, engineer of record, CX agent, contractor, system designer, rep agency, distributor, AHJ, training provider, engineering/energy consultant, acceptance testing provider, acceptance testing technician.
      - Even though we are all in the energy industry, we all speak different languages.
  - Areas of alignment—identify common goals, develop strategy, and develop tactics.
    - We need to identify what the issues are and **systematically** move through it.
  - Need to see what's been done.
    - What information is available and how is it sourced?
    - Geographic county and city heatmaps?
      - Reiterating systematic approach. Example: larger municipalities rarely looked at compliance sheets, not realizing acceptance testing went back to them. Re-educating moving forward.

- What additional data is needed?
          - Opportunity to develop unique CAE work-product.
  - Education and outreach groups believe they are doing a great deal to enable compliance
    - Who are the educational and outreach bodies?
    - Are they being effective?
    - What can CEA do to assist them in doing it better?
    - What can CEA do different to improve compliance?
      - Moving from being an organization where presenters read the slides. Not just a place to get numbers.
    - What are our resources?
      - *Committee members slide*
        - Experienced members, members in healthcare, entertainment
        - Now, there is also Title 20 compliance (in addition to Title 24 compliance) to keep in mind.
- John Busch: Wanted to give a brief overview, would like to see list grow. If we do it that way, we can break items down into smaller chunks. Doesn't want any of us to be overly taxed by what we have to accomplish. Really believes the code compliance component is only as strong as what we put out for education, compliance forms. Teaching them how to use the tools. A lot of this is going to be enabling, education process. If we're willing to come alongside CEC, we can achieve more.
  - Cori: Next step?
    - John Busch: Grow the list, then break them down into smaller items. Sitting with stakeholder groups, finding out what their challenges are.
  - John Martin: Do you have a calendar in mind for producing what needs to be done and what it will take to do it?
    - John Busch: By our next meeting, having a concise calendar of when we're meeting municipalities and stakeholders, but if people step up to the plate. Can share the calendar, but the person sharing the calendar is not the same as getting the calendar done.
  - Eric: At Lutron meeting, didn't we already specify four points to focus on (as CEA)?
    - John Busch: Then, we looked at points to focus on for code cycle. This is talking about code compliance. Code language between code compliance.
  - Dave: Need to break up points moving forward into 2022 code cycle.
  - Charles: With mechanical coming into this group, we want to understand what the process should be moving forward with CEA approvals, documents, etc. Minutia hasn't been figured out yet.
  - Michael: Do we need to differentiate between compliance and enforcement? Compliance is how you meet requirements in Title 24, Part 6, and enforcement is making sure it happens.
  - John Busch: Sees the need in doing so, but raises the issue of bandwidth and resources as a group. Would like to see them both being worked on in parallel and seeing ways to combine it. Enforcement is being pushed away. "Can have the best wording in the world, but if there's no teeth, then what's the point?"

- Jim: Right now, elegant solution, but no understanding of the problem. There's issues and problems out there we share, but we don't really understand the larger problems. Building departments (and the state) don't have the resources to keep everyone on the same page.
- John Busch: If anyone wants to get involved with any particular initiative, Cori will send out the slides, (John's) email is in the slides. Need to just get things going, if anyone gets overloaded, that person will step down. These efforts are in drafting a system that have compliance and enforcement working together.
- Thao: Efforts look similar to what Energy Code Ace is already doing, are there going to be efforts in differentiating from that?
  - Doug: Need to work with them, have heard mixed reviews about Energy Code Ace, can see what would help them. Whatever is going on out there can be improved, since there is still noncompliance out there.

## **POLICY INITIATIVES**

### **Gregg Ander**

- Doug: Will be holding a convening event at CLTC; bringing commissioners, public utilities, and decision makers. They can speak their minds and speak freely. What are their issues, problems, wishes for the future, dreams, visions, etc.? A vehicle to assist them in reaching these visions and in making this happen and making it into a reality.
- John Martin: Area of visibility and effectiveness in CEA. Being able to bring policymakers together, the things we talk about are things they don't see outside of their particular agency, district, or territory; difficult in seeing bigger picture. This can bring people who don't normally talk to each other and share their views of common problems and can start talking to each other. Not expecting "world peace", but small steps.
- Doug: Small group, 25–30 people at max, invite-only.
- Rita: Are any of the members end-group?
  - Doug: Not at the convening; it is specifically for people who don't have the opportunity to speak freely, without attribution.
- John Martin: One of the issues we've seen at every level, particularly policymakers, even if they're well-staffed and supported, frequently have their assessment of reality not completely accurate, so one takeaway for this meeting is education for policymakers that includes the end-group.

## **FUNDRAISING AND PROGRAMS**

### **Cori Jackson**

- Cori: Six months ago, started having conversations with Energy Foundation. Got a \$50,000 Grant from Energy Foundation to focus 2022 measures. Will support brainstorming activities over the coming months. Starts July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019.
  - Key activities:
    - Identify potential measures for consideration
    - Host workshops, convenings, meetings to collect and vet ideas (as CEA)
    - Documentation and reporting
  - Funds will support operations, events, technical analyses, reporting.

- John Martin: Getting this grant does **not** mean we are no longer going to be a dues-paying organization. It is critical to get funding through both dues and received grants.

**HOSTED LUNCH – 11:50 P.M.**

***Meeting reconvened: 12:51 P.M.***

**2022 ENERGY STANDARDS: TOP MEASURES—ELECTRICAL**

**Subcommittee Co-Chairs: Charles Knuffke, Michael Jouaneh**

- Charles: CEA organizational structure. *Refer to slides for more information.*
  - Technical Subcommittees: So far, CAE subcommittees have been focused on specific Lighting requirements in Title 24.
    - Alterations: a Technical Group with the requirement of creating a CASE Report that could be submitted to the CEC.
    - Demand Response & Plug Load: An Ad Hoc group to provide policy feedback to the CEC.
    - Demonstrates that there is a wide range of projects to approach to the CEC.
    - Thao: Recommends using a ‘proposed code change proposal’ rather than ‘CASE Report’.
  - Moving Forward–Subcommittees
    - CEA needs to be able to bring together groups of qualified individuals to offer advice and provide documentation to interested decision makers, both inside and outside of the organization.
    - Subcommittees should assemble Technical Teams as needed, whether to produce a single defined deliverable or for a longer term initiative.
      - Subcommittees should determine membership of the team. Ideally there would be some minimum number of individuals on a technical team to ensure diverse membership opinions (5?).
      - Depending on what is needed, a Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson might be appointed to set the team’s goals and meeting schedule, and work to ensure success.
    - After Subcommittee review of content, the technical committee would check any technical team output to be shared outside the organization to ensure that all output meets overall CEA goals. Then the Technical Committee will recommend Executive Board approval so that it may be sent out as a CEA document.
    - John Martin: Two steps: (1) a presentation for general CEA members, to vet ideas brought up and get everyone on the same page. (2) A common protocol for ideas that will be undertaken (Address who/what/when/where/how/etc.).
    - Jim: The theory of the energy code is that there is an energy index for a building that is allowed. You create the index through a process, trying to meet a limit. That index is hidden by the prescriptive method, but there is the performance method.
      - Charles: To be explained in further slide. This proposal/organization structure does not necessarily apply to just the Energy Code. This

system is to be in place so that it is malleable for different issues. A process that allows for explorations in other areas, even though we initially came together for the Energy Code.

- Charles: Instead of having people automatically being placed into specific subcommittees, system where individuals are pulled based on their interest, enthusiasm, skillset, etc.
- Rita: Kind of like a peer review process, provides us more rigor and legitimacy.
- John Martin: Does not think that he would want the task teams to find funding themselves, running the risk of being a group that has the reputation of doing projects based off of who's funding project.
- Jim: Does not see any public reviews. ANSI standards—you send them out to specific, selected people. Surveys come back and are responded to. Should we do that?
  - Charles: As a technical committee, we determine projects that are advisable on. We should be dealing with it based on the projects that CEA is involved in. Different levels/spectrum of things we're involved in, probably shouldn't use a "one-size-fits-all" approach.
  - Jim: For certain documents, we might want to follow ANSI canvas method.
  - John Martin: Quite a resource commitment (to follow ANSI method). Right now, our issues are directed towards issues in California for CEC/CPUC.
  - Michael: Action item: expand items in flowcharts: after subcommittees, vetting process to greater CEA, etc.
- Kosta: Titles under subcommittee box, are these examples?
  - Charles: These are some already existing subcommittees. Subcommittees are not static.
  - Doug: Subcommittees will essentially be formed by projects (*such as proposals on screen/below*).
- Proposals
  - Commercial Building Outcome Path
  - Receptacle Controls. Receptacle control for alteration.
  - Improved DR.
  - Simplify and Reformat Section 130.1
  - Commissioning
  - Others?
- Proposal 1 (Electrical)
  - **Commercial Building Outcome Path** (Double wild card – may pursue outside the Energy Standards) Outcome based compliance path (use a lighting control system that can monitor and report its connected load and when turned on if lighting is less than X watts building complies). Must keep all control requirements. The light fixtures must be tunable to set high-end trim to ensure compliance.
  - What needs to be done?

- Who?
      - Michael/Charles: need people to take part for progress to happen.
      - **Interested: Peter Schwartz (LBNL), Jim Benya, Tanya Hernandez (Acuity), Doug Avery, John Martin (IALD), Kosta (CLTC), Kelly Seeger (Philips), Michael Jouaneh (Lutron)**
      - Will be lead helper: Craig Baum
- Doug: 'What needs to be done?' for each proposal should be done by next meeting in San Diego (hosted by CSE).
- Proposal 2 (Electrical)
  - Receptacle Controls. Receptacle controls for alterations.
    - CEA has already written a letter to change this process.
  - What needs to be done?
  - Who?
    - **Interested: Charles Knuffke (WattStopper), Cori Jackson (CLTC), Michael Jouaneh**
    - **Will be led by: Charles**
- Doug: Suggests doing a brief write-up to send out to other members to see if anyone wants to be a part of these proposals. Will mail to not only membership but interested parties as well.
- Proposal 3 (Electrical)
  - Improved DR. Overall improvement to demand management requirements to ensure DR-ready buildings.
  - What needs to be done?
  - Who?
    - **Interested: Michael Jouaneh, Charles Knuffke, Jim Benya, Eric Martin**
    - **Will be led by: Michael**
- Proposal 4 (Electrical)
  - Simplify and reformat Section 130.1 as a whole. Refer to slides for more information.
  - What needs to be done?
  - Who?
    - **Interested: Cori Jackson, Michael Jouaneh, Lawrence Lamontagne, Jim Benya, Charles Knuffke**
    - **Will be led by: Cori**
  - Jim: One of the things we haven't done is look at past language from a cost-effective point of view. Example: automatic daylighting controls. Will adequate energy be saved when your power density is that low doing these things?
    - Peter: How do you define 'cost-effectiveness'? Which perspective do we follow? Historic, myopic view, or open up how we calculate the financial variables?
    - Charles: Is there a bigger path to take to put these plans into place?
    - Peter: Do we use the old framework of the building owner as the owner of the lighting system?
    - Jim: References Warren-Alquist Act.

- Proposal 5 (Commissioning)
  - Commissioning Section 120.8 Commissioning: reduce square footage requirement from 10,000 to 5,000 square feet. Add Sequence of Operations and add outdoor lighting systems and controls.
  - What needs to be done?
  - Who?
  - Charles: Can reach out to other parties to help out (CBA). Commissioning is for the whole building, not just lighting.
  - Thao: Brings up that you may still need to do a proposal, even though the only change is from 10,000 to 5,000.
  - Jim: When you have a project in an outer lying place, there aren't enough CALCTP-certified people. You have to factor in fixed cost over the square footage. Does not think that this was included in the original math.
- Proposal 6 (Other)
  - Other(s)?
  - What needs to get done?
  - Who?
  - Jim: By 2022, lighting will be powered by DC. Cost of transporting and installation of lighting wires. We should start planning around this. My proposal 6 is foreseeing the future where we see more for less.
  - Doug: Discussions with CEC after a draft up proposals.
  - Idea of sensor network backbone in buildings. If we were thinking about where standards need to move, technology is moving towards this fundamental backbone buildings can get information from about energy consumption in buildings.
    - Cori: One of the projects CLTC was funded to was sensory networks that become part of the building itself. This is just a repository of information that is available, and the end-use systems decides how it's used. It's not managed by the automation system. It's just the sensor information.
  - Michael: Outside of Title 24, New York Local Law 88. Requires existing buildings to upgrade their existing lighting levels by 2025. Could CEA host something similar to that in California? The problem is existing buildings.
  - Charles: If you start dropping prices of installation, paces could be made.
  - Michael: Not just lighting, also enforcement.
  - Jim: Did this in San Francisco in 1987. Lasted six months, but it was dropped because it got pushback from the real estate industry.
  - Rita: Building Energy Disclosure Requirements. Another way to move towards LL88: disclosure.

## **WEBSITE, OUTREACH AND SOCIAL MEDIA**

### **(Outreach & Education Subcommittee: Jeanne Fricot, Rita Renner)**

- Doug: Talked at UC Davis, part of Energy Summit. Talked about CEA and CALCTP.
- Rita: Brought lapel pins.
- Rita: Upcoming Outreach Opportunities

- IES San Francisco Light! Design Expo
  - Thursday, June 28, 2018, 12–8 PM
  - Pier 27
    - Curated expo of 120+ exhibitors of architectural lighting products
    - Four free AIA & IES accredited educational seminars
    - Top shelf bar 4:00 PM to 8:00 PM.
    - Complimentary cuisine from San Francisco food trucks.
  - CEA has complementary table and seeking staffing!
- Net Zero 2018 Conference
  - September 12–14, 2018
  - IBEW-NECA Net Zero Plus Training Center, Commerce, CA
    - Net Zero 2018 is nation’s largest net zero building conference
    - 1,000+ green building pioneers from across the United States and worldwide to inspire, educate, and ultimately evolve built environment into the net zero future.
    - 9 workshops, 70+ speakers, and expo hall with 75 exhibitor tables
  - CEA is negotiating booth.
  - Interested: Lawrence, Jeanne
- Energy Efficiency Fair
  - Collaboration between CEA & Graybar
  - Vision:
    - 10day forum
    - CA Title 24 presentations by CAE and other presenters
    - Tabletop displays by participants in EE marketplace (product vendors, inspectors, contractors)
  - Location: Graybar Distribution Center in Pomona, CA
  - Date: Fall 2018
    - October 17 or 19 (CEA in-person is 10/18 at Lutron EC in Irvine)
    - November 7 or 8
    - November 14 or 15
  - Program:
    - 10 AM–4 PM
    - CA Title 24-2019 update (30–60 minutes) in 2–3 sessions across the morning and afternoon
    - Catered lunch
    - Tabletop sponsorships? (modest fee to cover costs of event or as contribution to CEA?)
  - Audience: primarily electrical customers, occasionally users as well.
    - Rita: probably not able to offer CEU-affiliated courses and may be more cost-prohibitive for us as an organization, but it is a big draw and can look into making the presentation CEU-certified if we are interested.
    - October 17 or 19 date might be affected by Lightfair West happening around the same time. Convening event might also be around the same time as well.

- Delaying it to November runs the risk of happening near the holidays.
    - Need to start percolating ideas by July/August if this is happening.
  - Rita: Generally speaking, is this the type of activity that CEA wants to develop? Is this what we want our education and outreach to look like?
- Assets Under Development
  - Event properties
    - Banner stand
    - Branded tablecloth
  - Advocacy toolkit
    - Can be useful for situations, e.g. being asked a Mechanical question as an Electrical specialist. Cheat-sheets/reference sheets to provide.
- Speaker proposals: CEA can provide speaking augments.

**WRAP-UP AND ADJOURN  
(Doug Avery)**

- John Martin: Many states are proposing an outlaw of certifications not offered by the state. American Legislative Exchange Council. Already passed in Missouri, was stopped in Louisiana. US House of Representatives is having a hearing tomorrow on this topic. If you are interested, you can stream it live. Google 'US House of Representatives Licensing Hearing'. If you have a certification, you cannot use it in a state that passes this.
  - Craig: What is the purpose behind doing this?
    - John Martin: In Louisiana, an effort to curtail the licensing power of state governments, but the wording prevents certification from other entities as well. Does not extend to degrees (yet).
  - Rita: What are the enforcement mechanisms?
    - John Martin: Draft does not address enforcement so far, but it is problematic that this is out and has been approved in one state.
  - John Martin: If you have a certification of any sort (like LEED), alert your associations and notify them.
- Doug: Wrap-up, going around the room.
  - Rita: Likes the fact that there is attention to process and methodologies, gives us credibility.
  - Lawrence: Glad to have come in person.
  - Charles: Appreciated feedback during his session, the time and thought everyone gave.
  - Eric: Appreciated Charles's presentation, organization starting to gain structure
  - Cori: Excited to get technical projects for 2022.
  - Dave: Thankful for Doug to get Eric excited.
  - John Martin: Great discussion.
  - Craig: Excited to see what's going on.
  - Jim: Thrilled at this organization and what it will be taking. Commends everyone, as a subject matter expert, working with CEC staff. Reminds him of Title 24 in the good old day, from lighting community.
  - Thao: Learned a lot from the meeting, will take back to team and get back to CEA on discussed topics.

- Tanya: Exciting to see movement and things developing. Not just talking about this, moving things forward as well.
- Jeanne: Liked being able to figure out where she could plug-in more. Hoping to do a lot more outreach to bring in people that are more on the mechanical, building envelope side and make the group more diverse.
- Doug: Appreciates everyone being here to begin with. Getting structure, but also becoming a family in the process, getting to the same place. Need more resource: people and organizations.
- Thao: Putting out Compliance Review in July, public review for 30-days afterward.

***Meeting adjourned: 2:51 P.M.***