

Energy Data Access Committee Meeting

4/6/2015

Minutes

Attendees

Member Organization	Member Representative
Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E)	Jeremy Donnell
Southern California Edison (SCE)	Mark Podorsky
Southern California Gas (SCG)	Jody Lawler
San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E)	Chris Vera
California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)	Amy Reardon
California Energy Commission (CEC)	Andrea Gough
Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA)	Chris Meyer
Electronic Frontier Foundation (EFF)	Lee Tien
The Utility Reform Network (TURN)	Mark Toney
Center for Sustainable Energy (CSE)	Timothy Treadwell
San Francisco Department of the Environment	Barry Hooper
Mission:data	Michael Murray
Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)	Maria Stamas
University of California, Berkeley (UCB) Energy Institute at Haas	Karen Notsund
University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Institute of the Environment and Sustainability	Stephanie Pincetl
Center for Sustainable Energy (CSE)	Sach Constantine
Southern California Gas (SCG)	Bill Kim
California Energy Commission (CEC)	Hazel Meronda
California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)	Mary Claire Evans
Southern California Edison (SCE)	David Fanous

I. Opening Remarks

Tim Sullivan, Executive Director of Public Utilities Commission, who wrote the decision:

Motivation of setting up Committee was to create place where parties can discuss data access in order to prevent expensive litigation that might otherwise result from misunderstanding. Intent is not for Committee to decide things, but to open communications.

This data is important, but can be used the wrong way, and requires privacy protection. Decision kept close to state and national law, which provide access to university and agencies, and statutory means. I don't think would be good use of this forum talk about that.

Scheduled meetings quarterly but maybe cut back to half yearly.

II. Review of Agenda

New business:

1. Karen Notsund: Can we discuss our experiences with request process to date?
2. Michael Murray: Would like to discuss travel compensation

III. Review of EDAC Charter

A. Frequency Of Meeting – once per quarter in person

B. Travel Compensation

1. Amy Reardon – Executive Director's office does not have an account for this, and no mechanism exists at state level. Decision says EDAC members will serve without compensation. Best can do is have functioning webinars and/or host some in SoCal where most members live.
2. Sach Constantine – Are we as efficacious if half remote? Preferable to find funding.
3. Mark Toney – Compensation is something reported on income. There is no prohibition for non-profit board members against receiving reimbursement for travel. Maybe this could be discussed by Commissioners.
4. Tim Treadwell (phone) – Agree it's great to be in one room, but propose hybrid solution – So Cal in one room, Nor Cal in another with video link.
5. Chris Vera – love that idea.
6. Maria Stamas – great near term solution. Perhaps also modify decision for reimbursement.
7. Lee Tien – Other group doesn't have trouble reimbursing travel for CEC advisory.
8. Michael Murray – have concern about massive barriers to participation. Time and resources to show up and have the time and pace to participate is resource intensive. For me to hear that minor travel expense couldn't be compensated, sign that is biased to entities who have the resources, namely the utilities.
9. Amy Reardon – Commission doesn't have budget to cover expenses for everyone who wants to participate. We as staff barely have travel budget. I have been asking around, are you aware of travel account? There would be issues if a travel budget were set up, would involve submitting claims, are you using the preferred provider?
10. Stephanie Pincetl – web access to this meeting no longer available. Concurrent video meeting is first step. Perhaps parallel path ask Commission for funding.
11. Amy Reardon – would have to be more meetings.

12. Jeremy Donnell – disagree with re-opening decision. Support two meeting approach.
13. Amy Reardon – if anyone wants to do PTM, cannot stop you. Suggest ‘Unless or until travel funds, two meeting solution plus webinar.’
14. Jeremy Donnell – reading from decision ‘EDAC should meet at location of choosing and make available [electronic access?] for those unable to attend.’ That solution is very much in line with the decision.
15. Chris Vera – still having trouble accessing today’s webinar
16. Barry Hooper – agree that we should encourage Commission to resolve the issue
17. Lee Tien – we could add that we don’t know if Commission can [pay for travel expenses]
18. Michael Murray -- is about the best functioning of group. It sounds like everyone agrees people think in person is best.
19. Mark Toney -- another recommendation: I’m not a utility company, we’re going to offer to take turns hosting the meetings, whichever one of us hosts, reimburse other members on the list who aren’t utility and aren’t interveners. Turn will always pay own way.
20. Sach Constantine – I think in this early stage, productive to meet in person. Need language for charter. It is intention for public members to seek reimbursement for travel expenses. Public members may seek reimbursement from PUC if possible/available’
21. Amy Reardon -- want to say yes, but no mechanism [for reimbursement]
22. Michael Murray -- other ways we can explore. Register desire to have greatest participation to extent possible.
23. Sach Constantine -- Sach: in meantime video is workable, we can iron out glitches. Nothing that prevents us, Jeremy you pointed out the language in the decision.
24. Someone – ‘seek reasonable ways to recover travel costs’

C. Chair and Vice Chair Selection

1. Amy Reardon -- ‘Chair and Vice Chair to be elected’, was proposed, changed from ‘would be appointed and IOU’. It is not proposed to be changed that the meetings will be hosted by the IOUs or ED. Means we have to nominate each other. Don’t have a problem with election process. ‘Chair’ may be too loaded a term, is more like ‘Facilitator’; is legwork, not a political position. As far as setting agenda, running meetings Chair should not have control. Would like to replace Chair with Facilitator.
2. Sach – intention of facilitator is good. But like to have ‘Chair/Vice Chair’. Having it be ‘Facilitator’ diminishes role. That little bit of formality is good.
3. Mark Podorsky – second that opinion, it is a formality. But would like it to be for a year. Not ready to elect today, give me background info.
4. Lee Tien – might be moot point, does anyone want to be Chair? Don’t want to do administration, worry about webinar. Most of the Non PUC folks are interested in substantive.

5. Amy Reardon – Chair is slightly different than Facilitator. Facilitator would be the meeting host. Can we be prepared to vote at next meeting?
6. Lee Tien – I suspect we can't vote except in meeting. Can motion be articulated in email? Some committees lay out what can be done in email.
7. Sach Constantine – is not specified in charter whether we can or cannot vote by email. My understanding is that is permissible to vote by email under our charter.
8. [Amy Reardon?] -- If we were entertaining motions, we'll nominate candidates for chair/vice chair at this meeting, distribute bios via email, vote in email or next meeting.
9. Maria Stamas – what is responsibility of Chair?
10. [Amy Reardon?] -- receiving and aggregating agenda. Sounds like we've agreed it will be elected. And it's not a rotating role.

D. By Laws

1. Section 3 – 'Exist for 2 years until disbanded by CPUC'
 - a) Mark [Podorsky?] – 'or until EDAC committee disbands itself'
 - b) Sach Constantine -- Commission decision says minimum of 2 years, gives EDAC lots of discretion about number of meetings
 - c) Lee Tien – was Decision's intention to create sunset or not?
 - d) Chris Meyer – at end of two years, maybe evaluate the need to keep going, recommendation to Commission either disband or not.
 - e) Mark Toney – if Commission wanted a sunset would have used word maximum. When used word minimum, to me that is a floor. The next phrase is contradictory.
 - f) Jeremy Donnell -- and as necessary after 2 years. Suggesting it's a minimum of two years, if CPUC decides to end, fine, if not we decide whether to keep going.
 - g) Amy Reardon – 'determined by vote of committee thereafter'
 - h) Lee Tien – Who decides? Could leave it as is, which doesn't take a position or write something
 - i) Amy Reardon – Committee will develop a recommendation at end of two years, what is necessary.
 - j) Jeremy Donnell – Why not leave it up to ED?
 - k) Sach Constantine – agree with Jeremy. We have decision making procedures. Commission/ED can decide, despite what we vote.
 - l) Amy Reardon -- 'ad hoc basis as determined by ED'
 - m) Sach Constantine -- you could add in consultation with EDAC
 - n) Amy Reardon -- changed it EDAC. ED is on the EDAC so why not.

2. Footnote 3
 - a) Andrea Gough – don't know if this is necessary
 - b) Michael Murray – agree
 - c) Garen Grigoryan – there may be a discrepancy in the Decision – the ordering paragraph does not mention CEC as part of that group, but does mention CEC as party to help with the formation of EDAC in the body of the decision.

- d) Jeremy Donnell – was trying to clarify the record, but have no objection to getting rid of footnote
- e) Sach Constantine -- clarifying a discrepancy would be an appropriate footnote. Don't think this is necessary but is that what you're aiming for?
- f) Jeremy Donnell -- think how it's written is fine

3. Changing Committee Makeup

- a) Amy Reardon – went from Consensus to Majority to Super Majority
- b) Jeremy Donnell – Was super majority. Super majority means 2/3.
- c) Mark Toney – can also mean 60%
- d) Jeremy Donnell -- This is one of the biggest changes we could make, having it decided by an 8/7 vote doesn't seem right.
- e) Amy Reardon – I put 2/3, correct? (Yes).
- f) Lee Tien – by change, do you mean individual organizations or composition like more slots for this type (not particular to a specific group)?
- g) Amy Reardon – Structural composition of EDAC representative seats may change upon 2/3 vote. If you want to send staffer that is not what we're talking about.
- h) Jeremy Donnell – if composition were to be made fewer, which would entail kicking off?
- i) Amy Reardon – changes to structural composition.
- j) Karen Notsund – doesn't Decision lay out?
- k) Garen Grigoryan – other than permanent members, does not, leaves it up to the group.
- l) Sach Constantine – what is interaction of quorum rules and this rule?
- m) Garen Grigoryan – 2/3 majority of full membership, not just quorum.
- n) Amy Reardon – are we able to mail in votes?
- o) Jeremy Donnell – yes

4. Section 5

- a) Alternative members may be selected

5. Section 6

- a) Chris Vera – let's remove part about 'pool of candidates from the original invitee list'. I'm guessing original invitee list is not what we're talking about
- b) Andrea Gough – article 3 section 6 and article 5 section 1 conflict about minutes.
- c) Jeremy Donnell – we had previously thought of rotating host, was interchangeable. Chair was the host, but that's gone now, so need to clean up language.
- d) Amy Reardon – IOU responsible for hosting, will provide staff to record votes etc.
- e) Chris Vera – does it make sense to post minutes on utilities' data access sites or is there someplace that makes more sense?
- f) Maria Stamas – Google group?
- g) Amy Reardon – put it on CPUC website?

- h) Lee Tien – makes no sense to have to go to 4 utilities sites.
 - i) Karen Notsund – agree with Lee.
 - j) Chris Meyer – we have two pages where might make sense
 - k) Amy Reardon – Can think of 5 places might put it. ‘minutes and other relevant documents in one place’
6. Section 2 under decision making procedures
- a) Jeremy – regarding hours of 9-1, 1-5, if it were midday might avoid hotel stays.
 - b) Amy Reardon – why so particular about hours? Why not kill?
 - c) Chris Vera – no issue with killing it
 - d) Jeremy Donnell – we wrote first draft, tried to think of everything.
 - e) Chris Meyer – we might find it easier to do by teleconference
 - f) Andrea Gough – if full day meeting, IOU pays for lunch.
7. Section 5
- a) Garen Grigoryan – could we clarify if there will be a group email?
 - b) (Discussion around email has to be maintained and possibly using external email service for group email.)
 - c) Lee Tien – are emails among us public records, subject to sunshine rules?
 - d) Amy Reardon – edac@cpuc.gov. I volunteer to maintain the email list since seems like most appropriate source to do this is CPUC.
 - e) Sach Constantine – what if someone says we’d like discussion to be confidential?
 - f) Jeremy Donnell – some discussion may deal with customer privacy. If it’s to the point where you need an NDA, should not go over email. If we need to talk about why we denied a request, it may require closed door discussion.
 - g) Mark Toney – when discussion is confidential, minutes can reflect that confidential discussion happened without getting into details. But record decision in minutes.
 - h) Michael Murray: seems like there does need to be some NDAs at some point, so utilities get some security, but the list serve itself doesn’t raise these issues, the issue is email in general.
 - i) Bill Kim: if anything is confidential that requires NDA, can’t discuss it in meeting, because open phone lines too. If we get to that point, we might have to hold that in place. Regulations utilities bound to. Have to be cognizant of what level of detail can release.
 - j) Chris Vera: kind of agree with Amy, I can’t imagine we’re going to be sharing customer info in meetings. My biggest concern is customer data. My legal team would be concerned about intellectual property. Can’t imagine we’d be getting to these two. Here’s the request, here’s why we denied it. Third parties may be more concerned.
 - k) Sach Constantine – ‘confidentiality rules for CPUC settlement’. Think folks have reasonably addressed.
 - l) Michael Murray: don’t think we have to address in the charter. If we really had to discuss, utilities would not discuss. If we really need to discuss, need NDAs, get attorneys involved.

- m) Amy Reardon: won't discuss content of fields. Fields are out there. Don't see why we'd be discussing confidential content.
- n) Michael Murray -- could be discussion about deanonymizing. Think we should be silent, because if need to discuss, then can go to NDA.
- o) Chris Vera -- can't see actual info being discussed, but if discussion about utility process. If want to go over query, that query could be intellectual property.
- p) Amy Reardon -- anything I need to change about language? (No.)
- q) Lee Tien -- likes language in preamble, it doesn't determine anything but acknowledges possibility. If we leave charter silent, do we feel like paragraph in non-charter, suffices to establish a ground understanding?
- r) Garen Grigoryan -- whole document is charter
- s) Amy Reardon -- I'm repeating the language in the bylaws section
- t) Jeremy Donnell -- while utilities will host meetings, should not be responsible for coming up with dissenting opinion. If you give it to us we'll put it somewhere but don't want to have to craft it from verbal comments on a conference call.
- u) Amy Reardon -- discussing postponements, I can live with that
- v) Jeremy Donnell -- obvious solution is to get the agenda out early?
- w) Amy Reardon -- 'agenda circulated 2 weeks prior to meeting'
- x) Amy Reardon -- what about people from outside who want to put something on agenda? How do we know if firm ABC has a dispute?
- y) Michael Muarry -- don't they go to CPUC?
- z) Lee Tien -- items could come from variety of places, sophisticated one might know to come.
- aa) Amy Reardon -- this belongs in another part of our agenda.

Amy Reardon: think we've accomplished reviewing Charter. It will be sent around for one last look.

IV. Updates from IOUs on Energy Data Requests

PG&E

Jeremy Donnell -- we've received eight requests, denied none. Sometimes the request has come through the wrong portal, for example through Green Communities. Or sometimes they are not asking for data that is under this decision. We pride ourselves on not saying no. Maybe we can't give you exactly that, we can probably give you something that will answer the question. Sometimes we do the analysis.

Garen Grigoryan -- we've had 8 requests, all of them from local governments. We haven't had others thus far. We have a program called Green Communities, launched a while ago (for example: GHG inventories are available through that program). Some requests were withdrawn, because we had met the request by providing the information through different means. The Suspended requests, we're working on those to see if we can provide the data in

some other way since the requests as requested do not conform to the aggregation rules. For example we're looking into Tableau dashboard that we use for the Green Communities program, if not, we will revisit and see if we could provide the information in some other way.

Amy Reardon -- when did you start accepting requests?

Garen Grigoryan -- Dec 1 2014 was the launch date of the IOU's portals. A request has to be submitted through that portal. PG&E site allows one to create an account, though users sometimes do not submit a request even after having created an account. There were eight requests that were submitted since Dec 1.

Amy Reardon -- what is the URL?

Garen Grigoryan -- pge.com/energydatarequest

Sach Constantine -- City of Berkeley has been working with you to get disaggregated info, gotten to agreement about what you can and cannot disclose. They are looking for building level data to comply with city ordinances. Is it your sense, we want building level info, for newly passed ordinance. You can't disclose, would they be rejected, withdrawn or moved to new process?

Jeremy Donnell: need more granular statuses, withdrawn -- fulfilled elsewhere.

Garen Grigoryan: it's been a bit of a learning experience. Every request has been unique and very different. We hadn't really anticipated a canceled status, or suspended. What we're now calling canceled could also be defined as withdrawn.

Mark Podorsky -- all these posted on your site?

Garen Grigoryan: not the withdrawn or suspended ones. When we report on our quarterly report we'll provide more details on all the requests received. Since the Decision stipulated that the IOUs processes be consistent, IOUs had to work out what statuses needed to be displayed publicly. However, we may have some granular statuses, in between, that are designed for project management. Or statuses that weren't originally considered now need to be integrated, such as cancelled, or suspended.

Michael Murray: could you provide color what they're trying to do with first one?

Garen Grigoryan -- They have a website they've developed, where they were looking to publish per capita emissions data. Part of the request, that was the emissions, we provided through other means. Usage was provided by zip, which they would then combine with emissions data that they can then publish.

Sach Constantine -- you've had data requests in past. Faster or better now?

Garen -- it's hard to say since new rules have to be followed, such as how to apply new algorithms. For example the local government rules are different than the public rules.

Sometimes we have to revisit the data several times. For example, for the San Francisco request, does it include Presidio, does it include the County, SFO? As we get more requests we'll get better and better at refining the process.

Amy Reardon: we suffer same issues.

Jeremy Donnell: for us it's nice to have a process and portal through which request comes. But once it's agreed upon what the data is, there is a lot of work, and that work has been complicated. They are incredibly resource intensive. When it looks like we're dragging feet, we're running around like crazy.

Lee Tien -- whether or not since December, have you received requests by other means? I'm assuming your protocol is to tell them we have a website.

Garen Grigoryan -- PG&E was on the forefront of working with research institutions, and now has existing relationships with a number of them on data sharing. Research institutions know that a new, EDRP, portal exists as an alternative option. We are not going to sever existing relationships -- they may choose to remain under existing data sharing (MSA); or they may choose to go through the EDRP portal. We've had inquiries from some parties but they haven't wanted to go through portal.

Lee Tien -- you can have request for data that is in existence. Or one that extends into future, every month, ever and ever? [Pots] of data have established.

Garen Grigoryan -- mostly the latter. For Haas, Dr. Severin, may have a particular research question he'd like answered, he would then come to us for a particular project, but the data is not packaged and is not off the shelf, all of them are unique, requiring back and forth conversations. The process is iterative, based on what the needs are.

Jeremy Donnell-- or perhaps say no. These entities are doing good work, can move policy forward. We'll review that and say yes, that makes sense. Was our attempt to have a process before this project. Now, we'll follow the Decision. Our goal is to not have the Decision to pull back. Now have to go through other process, might take longer now because of decision timelines. Goal is to continue working [with partners].

Michael Murray -- prior university partners, they have a lot of data. Scope of this committee, are those data sets coming under the purview of this Commission decision, no? Will that continue in parallel?

Jeremy Donnell: mutually beneficial arrangements with these entities. There is nothing in decision that prevents us from doing primary purpose research.

Mark Podorsky: they're acting on your behalf they have to follow same rules we do.

SDG&E

Chris Vera -- So far have received only 2 formal requests through Energy Data Access program. City of Ocean Side—they canceled, got it from publically available data. Second one is completed. Have one new one in pipeline from Berkeley. They don't have approved IRB yet. They have 30 days to complete all that. If they opt not to proceed, then we'd show as canceled/withdrawn.

Amy Reardon -- when you agree on terms [for statuses], can you provide data dictionary for us, will put it on the website.

Karen Notsund -- Couple things, working with large university, couple things about form is incompatible. Person completing form has to be person with authority, I accept the terms of NDA, there's a Contracts and Grants office that has to review the NDA. I clicked it because I can't submit otherwise.

Chris Vera -- we distinguished Requestor role, should be a way to do that. No way to accept NDA on the website, have to print it and sign it return it to us manually. There is of course of Terms of Service and that is for Requestors. We don't want random third parties, filling out form to see what happens. Our expectation would be whoever is filling out would check that out.

Karen Notsund -- Often when we request, we don't know what data they have. Here our research questions, here are types of data, then we get into conversation, how far it goes, there's a lot of back and forth, until we have that framed up, can't submit our CPHS protocol approval. 30 day limit makes it impossible because don't respond that quickly. On the forms, is asking, have you received approval when I'm just making the request. Historically the way it's worked, all of these processes have worked in parallel. Is very much iterative, going on in parallel. We're trying to limit the accounts we're asking for. Also applies to Edison form as well.

Chris Vera -- Process would absolutely accommodate that. We want to collect whatever info you have. We assign a data custodian for iterative part, can consult with you, help you formulate the best solution to accomplish your goals. You've put yourself in queue.

Karen Notsund: you said there's 30 days to get it all in place.

Chris Vera: my understanding Berkeley asked for those 30 days.

Karen Notsund -- No.

Chris Vera: completely understand it may take some time to get all the right answers. Utilities want to avoid having a stale request because a third party is not responsive. But that is not the case in your case

Karen Notsund -- last comment on form: how will you transmit data

Chris Vera -- We also view that as a conversation. Some has secure servers, or overnighted on secure sticks.

Karen Notsund -- We can answer those questions but I expect those to change.

Chris Vera: questions may be to tease out what is available to you, maybe not have secure web browser. Intended to help us understand how well security team understands security and privacy of third party.

Karen Notsund -- what about subsequent requests? Does another NDA need to be signed? Clearly we have to go thru another research description but do we have to start from scratch on each request? Can we use the existing NDA and how we handle confidential data?

Chris Vera -- good question. Our interpretation is separate requests, NDAs for specific transaction.

Karen Notsund -- for Berkeley, the organization signs, not a professor. Can have certificates who name, but the actual NDA has to signed by university.

Amy Reardon -- Decision does provide for certain standing data requests. Same requestor, same project, maybe longitudinal study, nothing else has changed, is legitimate data request.

Garen Grigoryan -- yes, that's different

Karen Notsund -- although the university has signed, is Energy Institute at Haas and utility. Maybe helpful to have separate exhibit A. I, professor so and so, abide by the terms of the NDA.

Garen Grigoryan -- the Decision provides language for recurring requests -- for example we have a local government request that is for 2 years, quarterly recurring, which is concurrent with Georgetown prize they're competing for. For research institutions it is different. Each NDA needs to have a project associated with it and the details of the data requested will be embedded in the NDA, signed by the research institution. However grad students who may be working on the project and have access to this data will need to sign separate NDA certificates. There are no canned reports available. It is important to point out that if a report was created for one party it does not mean that another party is qualified to receive the same report.

To clarify for Berkeley -- the way PG&E designed its EDRP portal user interface was to allow parties to revisit the site, sign on, update and resubmit their requests. Third parties may also copy an existing request, to be used to start a new request, with all the basic information already populated. Not sure Chris if you were able to accept another form.

Chris Vera: Once it's finished, then becomes closed thing. If later need [SSNs], IT may need to reevaluate the risk.

Maria Stamas – Have a question about requests from building owners, when they have consent from tenants.

Garen Grigoryan -- if you have customer consent forms signed, that would not come to this program. Customer consent forms have an address on them for where to send the forms. Typically they go to PG&E's Sacramento office (or Fresno office, depending on who is requesting the data), and that office will fulfill them. Not sure if customer consent topic is appropriate for this forum. This program is for third parties requesting data without customer consent.

Maria Stamas: was told by CPUC this is right forum.

Barry Hooper -- are individual buildings where there are enough customers that exceed threshold. If building owner has issues with timeframe, format...

Garen Grigoryan – still not sure if this is the right forum, but we'd be happy to talk about that offline.

Sach Constantine -- benchmarking law for Berkeley, they're going to be asking for energy consumption and energy data, is that a situation where city of Berkeley has to get consent, or is this a way to get hold of that data.

Jeremy Donnell -- Berkeley can't pass ordinance that supersedes state law, because we can't provide that without consent.

Garen Grigoryan -- good topic for another meeting, but what Jeremy said is current state of affairs.

Barry Hooper – Suggest to move it to another meeting

Jeremy Donnell -- separate proceedings dealing with these issues. Not clear that this proceeding has any bearing on others.

Mark Podorsky: separate site for which process I follow. It can be confusing.

Southern California Edison

Mark Podorsky -- We implemented portal same time as energy service provider interface (green button connect). Have received 21 requests. Fourteen should have used EDRP, seven should have used Scissor process or ESPI, or used public information. Of 14, one was canceled, because info found elsewhere. Six we completed. Very manual process. Think there should be standardization of drop downs. If utility gets 21 a month from just this process, also considering other ways to make requests, have to have more automated. Two are pending fulfillment, three are in review, one is waiting for 3rd party feedback. Then we actually denied

one. I don't want to say, game system, but was give me it by zip code, which they know overlaps with this zip code, can put together the cube.

Amy Reardon -- PUC sees letters when you approve, but what about what we're not seeing? Think not reported. Kind of asks the question - are there people who are beign denied?

Jeremy Donnell -- you will know about every request.

Chris Vera -- pretty sure we do same thing. Think it's already yay or nay. You can look at resquest log. We have to file quarterly advice letter.

Sach Constantine -- can I request that we not make statements that are pejorative, we may decide later that you do need to say why denied

Garen Grigoryan -- IOUs have tariffed, as is, the attachments that were in the Decision. For example some of the timelines are clearly outlined in the decision - 7 days for review for completeness; 15 days to determine whether to fulfil; then a notification letter goes out to the Executive Director of the CPUC, and the requesting party, with information regarding the fulfillment or denial of the request. Explanation will be provided at that time.

Sach Constantine -- everything being done in good faith, but the purpose of this committee is to look at how well things are going. Our job is to keep tabs on this process, want to preserve ability in this body, if we think things are awry, if we need more or less transparency.

Chris Vera -- agree, thought we're in process of doing that. We're mandated to do certain things, if we disagree can bring to commission.

Sach Constantine: good so far.

Chris Vera: probably a lot of changes we can do that won't affect mandate.

Karen Notsund: think I heard you say this [form] is just to start off the process, would be great if is same as SDGE. Was additional NDA language that wasn't in CPUC, know what was added will be troublesome to university.

Lee Tien -- do we want to put on agenda?

Amy Reardon -- 'Reivew IOU forms and how IOUS approve or deny'. Forms was point of joint meetings. NDAs for SoCal Gas and SDGE identical, different.

Southern California Gas

Bill Kim -- Have twelve requests, seven from local governments, one from academic researcher. Three completed, provided data to local government. Three were withdrawn (from local government). Got one additional last Friday, believe will be out of scope of decision, but not sure.

www.socalgas.com/energydatarequest

V. Future Meeting Planning

Handled by email.

VI. New Business

Handled already

VII. Public Comments

Don't have public stakeholders today, will have to handle in some way.

VIII. Recap

Amy Reardon -- Ideas for next meeting – nominations for Chair, ok to nominate self. Send using email I will set up, will vote at next meeting.

Jeremy Donnell – if self-nominate, include Bio.

Amy Reardon – user feedback, did we want to talk more about forms, how to approve/deny, NDA?

Karen Notsund– yes, is one of the three areas for this meeting.

Sach Constantine – propose as standing item for agenda.

Jeremy Donnell – if issues with Portal just call us, don't wait for quarterly meeting.

Garen Grigoryan – the idea with the EDAC membership was for the members to represent their communities. In between meetings, hopefully communicate with each other. Not specific to one experience.

Other items for next meeting:

- Final Charter Adoption
- Use Case 7 – Clarify Maria's item
- Data Dictionary standardization
- Chris Meyer – if you do tweaks to program, can you report on at following meeting?

Amy Reardon – my action items – email address, webpage

Garen Grigoryan -- Would end of June work for next quarter's meeting? How about mid-June, or second full week of June.

Bill Kim -- So Cal Gas would like to host

End of Meeting