

ANONYMOUS Full CAEECC #51 Q3 Evaluation

Date: September 23, 2026

Overview

26 respondents: 21 CAEECC Members (1 non-CAEECC Member from a CAEECC Member organization); 2 CPUC, 3 Stakeholders.

Question		AVG	MED
Meeting objectives were accomplished	Objective 1: Engage on Energy Division's relevant updates	5.2	5
	Objective 2: Discuss CAEECC planning and business items	5.2	5.5
	Objective 3: Discuss fuel-switching policy questions	5.2	5
	Across all Objectives	5.3	5
Presentations and background documents were clear and helpful.		5.2	5
This meeting was an inclusive and trusting environment.		5.2	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).		5.4	5
Overall, the zoom format was smooth and effective.		5.4	6
Overall, this Full CAEECC meeting was successful.		5.2	5
Overall, this Full CAEECC meeting was valuable to my organization.		4.9	5
Specifically for the Fuel Switching Session, how useful and valuable was the session?		4.0	4

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

Key Findings

- CAEECC Members found value in the fuel switching panel and format. However, two CAEECC Members were concerned with the panel selection/representation

and baseline knowledge of panelists. A participant from the public also noted that Tribal perspectives were not included in the panel.

- One CAEECC Member found that the first half of the meeting had limited participation from non-CAEECC Members, but the fuel switching session gathered more public interaction. Another CAEECC Member noted how this meeting had good participation overall.
- CAEECC Members and Public participants thought that the meeting seemed to balance perspectives well.
- Two CAEECC Members were confused about the re-vote of the Cost-Effectiveness Working Group.

Open Text Responses

Objectives

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

CAEECC Members

- I was a little confused on why we voted on a cost effectiveness working group two meetings in a row. **I don't know why the second vote was needed.**
- The **fuel-switching presentation** was fantastic
- The CPUC update gave a **good overview** of recent policy issues. The CAEECC planning and business items were **addressed thoroughly**. The fuel-switching discussion included several **interesting insights** and opinions.

Presentations and Background Docs

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

CAEECC Members

- Documents were **fine**
- Presentations and background documents were **helpful** and **very relevant**.

Inclusive and Trusting Environment

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

CAEECC Members

- I wasn't sure how the panel on fuel switching was decided and **why SoCalGas wasn't considered**. I did **appreciate the discussion on the SoCalGas** proposal

- The fuel switching **presentations were excellent**, and it was a very **cooperative discussion** among PAs and other stakeholders!
- The facilitators ensured that all participants felt **welcome to contribute** their perspective, **without judgment**.
- There was **obvious division** between members and the public for the first half of the meeting. The afternoon was more inclusive when all attendees were able to promote themselves to panelist for the discussion.

Public

- There is **no tribal considerations** or experience, as observed.

Meeting Facilitation

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

CAEECC Members

- I appreciate the **facilitators efforts**
- It was a **well-run** meeting. Came close to an early lunch but the **efficiency** allowed us to get our hour when we had extra questions there before the break.
- The facilitators were **open to all suggestions** and thoughts and focused on engaging each participant **without bias**.

Meeting Format

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

CAEECC Members

- Not all virtual meetings have good interaction with attendees, but **this one did**.
- Virtual meetings can have technical glitches, but this meeting had **no significant technical issues**, at least from the participants' viewpoint.

Public

- Zoom will always be **limiting**, but seems to work for this group

Overall Meeting Success

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

CAEECC Members

- Good meeting!
- Each topic was **addressed adequately** to achieve objectives, while **allowing for differing positions** and objectives of stakeholders.

Public

- Moving through **procedural items** on Zoom with that many people can be challenging, but I thought the group **handled it well** while still moving through an agenda.

Value of the Meeting

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

CAEECC Members

- **I learned a lot today**, especially on fuel-switching and the bigger debate about affordability.
- The meeting addressed **SBE/DBE, HTR, DAC, and underserved customers**, while also addressing all other customers., and all the PAs.

Public

- **Access to additional perspectives is valuable**, even on issues tribes may be in conflict with

Fuel-Switching Session Value

Please add any clarifying comments regarding your responses to the question about the Fuel Switching Session.

CAEECC Members

- See comment above about **how panelists are chosen**
- Not all of the speakers seemed informed of the limitations of Energy Efficiency funding. The speaker who discussed asthma, **did not seem to have a baseline understanding of the constraints for supporting different initiatives**. When speakers a foundation in the subject, they can unintentionally share incorrect information with an audience who may also not be aware of all of the constraints.
- I appreciated all the **different points of view**.
- **Incredibly informative**. Unfortunately I had to jump away for a little while but will look for the recording
- It was **beneficial to hear the perspectives** of other stakeholders, broadening my own perspective.
- Really liked the **format balance with presenters, Slido, and open discussion**.
- It was **useful as a starting place** and to hear different perspectives.

Public

- Tribal specific conflicts are not considered, which is not necessarily this groups focus, but **limits engagement**.

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

- The **engagement was good** on this call. I think the **topic will drive the engagement** level.
- Not sure.
- Keep delving into the particular interests of each stakeholder, **encouraging them to reveal their genuine interests**.
- **Being more careful about acronyms and jargon** – this improved over the course of this meeting, but especially on complicated topics like cost-effectiveness and fuel-switching, there's a lot of background and complexity which I think make it intimidating for people to participate. Not something completely solvable, but good to be aware.

Public

- **Tribal** specific perspectives and consideration

Suggestions for Future CAEECC Meetings

Please add any suggested improvements for future CAEECC meetings.

CAEECC Members

- We were unclear **why the fuel-switching was brought for a re-vote**, when it failed previously.
- Add in **segments regarding other non-CPUC EE programs**, especially the ones at the Energy Commission and local programs. stacking multiple programs such as a fuel-switch with a heat pump or induction stove might help overcome perceived increase in bills for making the move.
- Always be **seeking to understand what stakeholders are most interested in**.
- Thank you for the **breaks**; please continue to include them. They are really important during such a long meeting and when other work is piling up.

Public

- Panel members should remain awake for the meeting if on camera

Reference: Average Evaluations

Question	Q3 2026	Q2 2026	Q1 2026	Q4 2025	Q3 2025	Q2 2025	Q1 2025	Q4 2024	Q3 2024	Q2 2024	Q1 2024	Q4 2023
Objectives of the meeting were accomplished.	5.3	4.9	5.4	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	5.3	5.3	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	5.2	5.3	5.4	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).	5.4	5.1	5.7	5.8	5.5	5.3	5.4	5.2	5.2	4.3	4.7	4.7
Overall, the online meeting format was smooth and effective.	5.4	5.2	5.7	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	4.8	5.3	5.2	5.2	5	5	4.8	5.2	4.3	4.4	4.6
Overall, this Full CAEECC meeting was valuable to my organization.	4.9	4.5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A