

Full CAEECC #48 Q4 Evaluation

Date: December 9, 2025

Overview

18 respondents: 16 CAEECC Members; 2 CPUC. One CAEECC Member organization had both their Primary and Proxy members respond.

Question		AVG	MED
Meeting objectives were accomplished	Objective 1: Conduct Portfolio Administrator Formal Consultations and finalize CAEECC next steps (if any)	5.5	6
	Objective 2: Elect 2026 CAEECC Co-Chairs and discuss/finalize 2026 Workplan	5.7	6
	Objective 3: Learn about the Equity Advisory Committee's draft recommendations	5.5	6
	Objective 4: Learn about Energy Division's relevant updates	5.4	6
	Across all Objectives	5.5	6
Presentations and background documents were clear and helpful.		5.2	5
This meeting was an inclusive and trusting environment.		5.3	5
The facilitators were effective in running the meeting (e.g., fostering a constructive and efficient forum, being impartial, and making sure no one dominated discussions).		5.8	6
Overall, the virtual meeting format (Zoom and Slido) was smooth and effective.		5.5	6
Overall, this Full CAEECC meeting was successful.		5.2	5

To see how this meeting compares to recent CAEECC evaluations, [see reference table](#).

Key Findings

- Many found the presentations to be helpful, useful, and informative.
- The meeting objectives were met, and the meeting was generally productive.
- Two Members applauded the engagement and two also questioned why there were few questions. Another member suggested using the 1:1s for follow up.
- Members appreciated in-person and virtual meetings. One requested a virtual participant list for those attending in person.
- Facilitation was generally praised for encouraging dialogue. A few members had mixed feelings about the time for discussion. One noted that time stamps were not used for ED's presentation, causing delays for the day.
- Two PA members noted that the Consults were not informative due to confidentiality and inability to provide more information.
- **There were two unique comments about the comprehension and appropriateness of content. One was in regards to the EAC and their seemingly limited awareness of SDG&E/SoCalREN's Policy and Program restraints. Another was in regards to fostering better engagement by covering topics in which "less experienced participants have a strong interest and expertise."**

Open Text Responses

Objectives

Please add any clarifying comments regarding your responses to the question above about Objectives.

CAEECC Members

- A ton was covered, making this a very **productive** CAEECC meeting. A couple of the topics would have benefited from being **allocated more time to facilitate more discussion**, but that was not possible due to the schedule.
- Well-managed with **appropriate amount of time** allocated to each topic.
- The Equity Advisory Committee did not seem to be aware of Policy and Program constraints that both SDG&E and SoCalRen addressed. This was concerning because it **seemed like the committee did not have the correct background/expertise to be making recommendations.**

Presentations and Background Docs

Please add any clarifying comments regarding your response to the question above about presentations and background documents.

CAEECC Members

- **Level of detail** and information provided across PAs was **inconsistent** for the consultation and all weren't provided with enough time to review before the meeting.
- Presentations and documents were **relevant and informative**.
- There is so much content that is confidential or subject to change prior to filing the application, that the **presentations were not meaningful and it was not a good use of time**.
- PAs followed the **template** that was provided to them.
- such thorough materials!

Inclusive and Trusting Environment

Please add any clarifying comments regarding your response to the question above about inclusive & trusting environment.

CAEECC Members

- Despite all the locations the team was great about making sure **everyone got a turn**.
- **Limited public comments or feedback raise questions** about whether participants are **comfortable** offering feedback or posing questions.
- Facilitators **encouraged participation and collaboration** among participants.
- Still, **only a few people** asked questions/ provided feedback.

Meeting Facilitation

Please add any clarifying comments regarding your responses to the question above about meeting facilitation.

CAEECC Members

- **Good readout** of comments and notes at end of regular meeting. Good time keeping.
- **Great facilitation** throughout the day.
- Facilitators **genuinely** sought to impartially **foster a constructive and efficient** forum.
- In the morning, the meeting got behind schedule. I appreciate that there were prompts to remind presenters on their **time limits**, however the prompts were not given to ED staff.
- For the BP consult, are there **other ways the presentations could be organized**. Maybe if there is some way to **group by similar program types** so that stakeholders with a particular interest (i.e. WE&T) can be more engage?

Meeting Format

Please add any clarifying comments regarding your responses to question 9 about the virtual meeting format.

CAEECC Members

- Would be nice to be **able to view who is participating online** when you are in-person.
- Zoom and Slido enabled an interactive forum which **engaged all participants**.
- Agree. I **appreciate** the clarification that Zoom questions are only for technical issues.
- **Smooth** hybrid meeting!
- **Successful** virtual meeting!

Overall Meeting Success

Please add any clarifying comments regarding your responses to question 11 about the overall meeting success.

CAEECC Members

- thank you for making it all work.
- The meeting was **successful** in that it met its objectives, but I did **not find it incredibly useful as a PA representative**.
- Very **useful** and **productive** meeting.
- For such a long meeting with so much information, there is a risk that people zone-out occasionally. However, the **facilitators frequently encouraged interaction**, lessening that risk.
- The **Consult is not needed**. There is so much content that is confidential or subject to change prior to filing the application, that the presentations were not meaningful and it was not a good use of time.
- I felt this was one of the **most beneficial CAEECC meetings** I've attended (noting it is one of few I've attended in person).

Better Engagement

Do you have any suggestions on how to get better engagement (i.e., hearing from a broader set of participants while using Zoom)?

CAEECC Members

- Allocate more time in the agenda for **discussion and questions**.
- **Cover topics for which the less experienced participants have a strong interest and expertise.**
- I appreciated the option of **virtual along with other in-person** locations to choose.
- (2nd CAEECC Member Respondent per an organization): Utilizing tools like Lucid's **whiteboard** (or a similar tool) and **break-out groups** could be a good way to increase virtual engagement for future meetings (depending on the topic of discussion).

Suggestions for Future CAEECC Meetings

Please add any suggested improvements for future CAEECC meetings.

CAEECC Members

- The **one-to-one follow-up calls** between facilitators and participants are a good opportunity to determine why some participants may not be completely engaged in the meeting.
- None at this time. Really great job with the facilitation team. I appreciate all the work that goes into these meetings and the challenges that come with multiple locations and participants. Well done team!
- **More but shorter meetings**

Reference: Average Evaluations

Question	Q4 2025	Q3 2025	Q2 2025	Q1 2025	Q4 2024	Q3 2024	Q2 2024	Q1 2024	Q4 2023
Objectives of the meeting were accomplished.	5.5	5.3	5	4.9	4.9	5.3	4.6	4.3	5.0
Presentations and background documents were clear and helpful.	5.2	5.5	5.4	5.2	5.3	5.4	4.4	4.9	4.9
This meeting was an inclusive and trusting environment	5.3	5.2	5.3	5.2	5.0	5.1	4.3	4.9	4.9
The facilitators were effective in running the meeting (e.g., fostering a constructive and efficient forum, being impartial, and making sure no one dominated discussions).	5.8	5.5	5.3		5.4	5.2	5.2	4.3	4.7
Overall, the online meeting format (WebEx or Zoom) was smooth and effective.	5.5	5.5	5.5	4.7	4.9	5.1	4.8	4.4	5.2
Overall, this Full CAEECC meeting was successful.	5.2	5.2	5	5	4.8	5.2	4.3	4.4	4.6