ATTACHMENT 1

California State Senate

ALEX PADILLA SENATOR, 20TH DISTRICT



March 19, 2010

Ms. Karen Douglas Chairwoman California Energy Commission 1516 Ninth Street, MS-33 Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Chairwoman Douglas:

This letter serves as a follow-up to the Senate Energy, Utilities and Communications Committee hearing on Tuesday, March 16, 2010 to re-state my requests for information from the Commission. Please respond to the following:

- 1. Please provide a summary of all applications for the State Energy ARRA Program including criteria by which they were rated and a copy of each applicant's score card. Please include the number of jobs to be created by job type/classification for each applicant along with wage rates, benefits, and job training for each.
- 2. Please provide a list of CEC staff that was involved with crafting the SEP ARRA Program grant guidelines.
- 3. Please provide a list of CEC staff that was involved with scoring and ranking the applications.
- 4. As was raised during the hearing, are you or any of the CEC Commissioners concerned about the roles and relationships between CEC staff and grant applicants? Do you believe that these roles or relationships provide any applicant with an unfair advantage in the process? Were any Portland Energy Conservation Inc. officials involved in the development of any aspect of the SEP ARRA program guidelines?
- 5. How does the CEC justify the salary schedule of Portland Energy Conservation Inc. staff that will work in Portland when ARRA funds awarded to California are intended to address California unemployment?



CAPITOL OFFICE: STATE CAPITOL, ROOM 4038 • SACRAMENTO, CA 95814 • TEL (916) 651-4020 • FAX (916) 324-6645 DISTRICT OFFICE: 6150 VAN NUYS BLVD. SUITE 400 • VAN NUYS. CA 91401 • TEL (818) 901-5588 • FAX (818) 901-5562 Ms. Karen Douglas March 19, 2010 Page 2

- 6. As quoted in the Los Angeles Times, a CEC spokesperson stated that the hourly pay rates of the project managers include fringe benefits and overhead, yet the Portland Energy Conservation, Inc. proposal clearly states that the rates are unloaded (that is, before fringe benefits or any other overhead). Are they loaded or unloaded?
- 7. How is it that the Portland Energy Conservation Inc. proposal includes CCC workers making minimum wage when projects funded by SEP ARRA must comply with the Davis-Bacon Act?
- 8. Why did the CEC exclude geographic distribution criteria or regional unemployment levels in scoring criteria to ensure equitable distribution of SEP ARRA funds throughout the state?
- 9. What options does the CEC have to modify the SEP ARRA awards to reflect and address unemployment throughout the state?

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I would appreciate your response by March 30, 2010, so that members of the Senate Energy, Utilities, and Communications Committee may have ample time to review before our next hearing.

Sincerely,

Flex Padela

ALEX PADILLA Chair, Senate Energy, Utilities and Communication Committee