

Responses from Homework B: Evolving CAEECC HW Before Meeting #2

Responses were gathered by: 7/14/2023 Close of Business (COB)

Meeting #2 is August 3 from 9:30am PT - 1:30pm PT via Zoom.

Instructions for Evolving CAEECC Working Group (ECWG)

Members:

- A. Answer the four questions under [Meeting #1 Follow-up Questions](#) below (straight into this document)
- B. Read the two documents and complete the [Prospectus Activity](#) below
 - a. [ECWG Draft Prospectus](#) (PDF)
 - b. *Section 6: Restructuring CAEECC Recommendations* of the [Composition, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Final Report](#) (PDF)
- C. View the Shared Contact Information Doc (link not provided to the public to protect contact information; only ECWG Members that requested their info be shared will be shared only to other ECWG Members)
- D. [Optional: Read Ahead for Meeting #2](#)

Facilitator Notes about the Homework

This Work Between Meetings Homework B will be used to help inform the following:

- A. The agenda for Meeting #2
- B. An onboarding walkthrough by Suhaila via on-demand video
- C. Opportunities to meet each other in “ice-breakouts” (small groups at ECWG Meetings)
- D. Ways the working group can conduct itself
- E. An amended Prospectus Proposal compiled by the Facilitation Team based upon your direct insight through the Prospectus Activity
 - a. *Alice Sung, Individual: I'm not sure that this is the process that we, as the ECWG (not the Facilitation Team?) are given charge to perform. Doesn't the CDEI recommendation state that this new group (the ECWG itself) should create its own process for developing its own version of its Prospectus? Some of us might take exception to some of the interpretations of the current "Draft Prospectus Proposal" we have been given. I'd like the ECWG to have the time [and compensation as appropriate] to discuss each item comprehensively as stated in the approved CDEI WG final recommendations.*

Homework B - Meeting #1 Follow-up Questions

Instructions: Respond to the questions below. Add your name/affiliation by a bullet (or make a sub bullet) and add your thoughts. Thank you!

If you have any questions about how to participate or engage in this homework, or prefer an alternative way (e.g., survey, phone call) to share your thoughts, please contact Suhaila (suhaila@common-spark.com)

1. What questions do you have after our first meeting?

- Kate Woodford, C4AT: No questions yet. I thought the 1st meeting was informative and positive.
- Aislyn Colgan, Independent: I think the answer will be made more clear as I go, but is our primary objective to figure out how to make the CAEECC membership more diverse? Is recruiting more diverse CAEECC members part of our goal?
- Lucy Morris, PG&E; no questions yet, I am looking forward to the discussion around finalizing the prospectus and think that will help us get clear on our goals and identify some key questions.
- Kelsey Jones, SJVCEO. Unable to attend the first meeting due to travel schedule, will provide more questions during later meetings if they arise.
 - Mr. Charles, Independent: I am deeply interested in knowing if our work in the end would create more affordable energy for poor and disenfranchised BIPOC?
 - Mr. Charles, Independent: Another thought of mine is will this process allow us to look at the Marijuana cultivators strain on the power grid and the subsequent costs being passed on to ALL consumers; as opposed to the costs being relegated to the most egregious power consumers?
- Jenifer Lomeli, ECC: Maybe this will be answer in later sessions but I would like to get more clarity on what our overall purpose is, I understand it's to align the CAEECC purpose, objectives, etc., to justice and inclusion but is it possible to get more specific?
- Sarah Xu, Brightline: I would love to learn more on purpose and primary objectives as Aislyn, Lucy, and Jennifer have raised. I would also like some clarity on, if our objective is to provide recommendations, what are the steps and pathways for CAEECC to incorporate and actualize the recommendations? What are the "mechanisms" or "leverages" for CAEECC?
- Amaury Berteaud, AMBAG: no questions yet, I am also looking forward to the discussion around the prospectus
- Jan Maes: how can we make sure that all ECWG members work from a level playing field? I am not suggesting we all become experts in the technical aspects and/or JEDI aspects of EE programs and policies and the

purpose/objectives/processes of the CAEECC WG, but can we jointly determine what it would take to bring newcomers without EE program backgrounds to a level of understanding and access to information, to ensure that knowledge differences won't result in power differences?

- Mr. Charles, Independent: I would hope that we are able to meet people on their level without having to slow down to catch newcomers up, but that is why this initial group has to develop a cohesive team oriented approach as to working together. It is also my hope that PHD's and college degree's don't determine our leadership, but the ability to work with people and share leadership takes precedence.
- Jason Minsky, ACCES: No questions as I feel meeting 1 was more of an introduction/overview and further meetings will define our role a bit more.
- Melanie Gillette, MCR: I felt the first meeting provided good information as a foundation for this working group and allowed everyone to share their background and interest in the project. I do look forward to better understanding what success looks like for this project as that is still unclear to me. Is success a clearer prospectus that requires more balance or is it achieving more balance among the CAEECC membership? Or is it something else entirely?
- Alice Sung, Independent: What DEI or Racial Equity training, environmental justice, energy equity related workshops, or self-learning/readings have CAEECC members, CPUC commissioners and staff participated in and what was learned that they want to try to put into practice? What is the charge or duties of the Leadership Group, where does this power structure (4 people) arise from, and what was the process by which they were selected? Ultimately, are there any topics/recommendations we might want to make regarding the CAEECC that are legally not in our scope or off-limits, and why? Can we clarify/define the outcome/Deliverables of this ECWG—is it first a Prospectus for ourselves, and then the Recommendations pertaining to the CAEECC, fulfilling the Prospectus?
- Lou Jacobson, Willdan: No additional questions.
- Laurel Rothschild, The Energy Coalition: Will the recent EE Decision impact group discussions/prospectus?
- Jordyn Bishop, The Greenlining Institute: I echo Jan's questions. I'm also curious about the relevance of the recent [EE decision](#) that Laurel references, and wondering about the future scope of the EE proceeding since that is where the CAEECC engages. Finally, will we be going over the CPUC ESJ Action Plan in more detail as a group? Is that the document that we are limited to in terms of the "justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion" principles we are aiming to align the CAEECC with?
- Tanisha-Jean Martin, I asked many questions during the meeting
- Angelique Lopez, Day One (DO): No questions, I was unable to attend the the first meeting.

- Lara Ettenson, Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) , also unable to join the first meeting but look forward to the next one.
- Spencer Lipp, Independent: No questions on the content after the first meeting. I do agree with Melanie and others on defining success. I think that is really important to lay the foundation for productive discussions and outcomes.
- Nicole Milner, Individual- No questions.
- Leo Steinmetz, Acterra: No questions on content.
- Fabi Lao, Center for Sustainable Energy: I echo Laurel and Jordyn’s question about the impact of the recent CPUC Decision on the ECWG’s deliberations. Other than this, no other questions since the first meeting was meant to provide an introduction/overview. I look forward to the next meeting to start finalizing the prospectus.
- Sumi Gant, Gateway Cities COG: Appreciate the content - no questions yet
- Evan Kamei, Energy Solutions: None, since I was unable to attend this meeting, but like others, I also agree with Jan’s comment.
- AJ Perkins, Individual: No questions yet. Due to my travel schedule, I wasn't able to attend.

2. What more information would you like?

- Kate Woodford, C4AT: No thoughts yet.
- Aislyn Colgan, Independent: Where is Appendix 6 with the full CAEECC restructuring recommendations mentioned in the CDEI partial report?
 - Suhaila Sikand, Facilitator: the full CDEI report is available at: https://www.caeec.org/_files/ugd/849f65_d6d06e464a7d44399d47dee13e7b05d6.pdf
- Lucy Morris, PG&E; nothing yet.
- Kelsey Jones, SJVCEO. None
- Jenifer Lomeli, ECC: Additional information on past recommendations and how they’ve affected the populations we’re trying to target.
 - Jan Maes: ditto
- Sarah Xu, Brightline: An understanding of navigating the CAEECC website.
- Amaury Berteaud: none
- Jan Maes: more detailed information on (rate payer) EE programs, including their goals and objectives, how they are designed, how cost-effectiveness is evaluated and measured, how they are funded by rate payers, how utility bills are structured. Also, besides cost-effectiveness, what other types of criteria are used to evaluate EE programs. I would also like to see some actual numbers of EE program achievements in terms of energy savings, outreach, dollars spent, etc. IN SHORT,

for the non-technical newcomers among us, can we get some more details on the technical aspects of EE programs? Since the first two goals of the CAEECC are supporting the development of EE programs and providing feedback to PA's business plans, it would be great to gain a deeper knowledge about these programs and business plans.

- Melanie Gillette, MCR: Nothing additional at this time.
- Alice Sung, independent: I'd like an overview of the salient points of the latest CPUC Racial Equity Plan, and a review of the CDEI recommendations or other documents that are foundational to our "continuation" of development of our work, so that past efforts are built upon, not lost, but advanced with more diverse input and include community-led priorities and voices not only heard, but adopted. I might also like to suggest we first, as a group, define our own set of Community Agreements and review the Jemez Principles for Democratic Organizing to ground our operational working relations. After this, I do think many of us would benefit by a briefing on (1) what the "EE Portfolio" is, ("who" Program Administrators have historically been, what amounts of Monies are involved, etc. and more recent recent developments, and (2) what the CAEECC does in practice.
- Alice Sung, Independent: I'd like an honest Power Mapping of the CA energy system showing the various stakeholders, such as the CPUC, IOUs/PAs, CEC, CAEECC, CAISO, other state regulators/agencies, DACAGs/DCAGs, ECWG...
- Lou Jacobson, Willdan: No additional information needed.
- Jason Minsky, ACCES: nothing at this time.
- Mr. Charles Independent: Succinctly; Are we defining what Equity and Inclusion looks like and feels like from a Community perspective or are we being handed down a script from above that dictates what Equity and Inclusion looks like from an agency/industry perspective? It is also a question of the weight of our words as Concerned Community Members, are we only an "advisory body", or will our participation lead to significant and legally binding policy changes?
- Laurel Rothschild, The Energy Coalition: nothing needed at this time
- Jordyn Bishop, The Greenlining Institute: I echo Jan's and Mr. Charles' comments. Meeting 1 discussed the "evolving EE portfolio" and more specifics would be helpful. I'm particularly interested in more information regarding the Equity Segment overviewed in meeting 1. Also, concrete examples of how the CAEECC has previously weighed in on or influenced the EE proceeding would help me contextualize the existing CAEECC.
- Tanisha-Jean Martin, It is clear that the CAEECC is working to evolve the structure to follow the "CPUC ESJ Action Plan", but who are the individuals that created that ESJ plan, was it a diverse group? I saw pictures of liasions when I was reading the Plan, but that did not clarify they had participation in the final draft.

- Spencer Lipp, Independent: No additional information at this time.
- Nicole Milner, Individual- nothing at the moment
- Angelique Lopez (DO): No additional information at this time, this answer may change after the second meeting.
- Leo Steinmetz, Acterra: Nothing yet.
- Fabi Lao, Center for Sustainable Energy: Nothing at the moment.
- Sumi Gant, GCCOG: Nothing right now.
- Evan Kamei, Energy Solutions: Nothing right now.
- AJ Perkins, Individual: Nothing yet

3. What else would you like to know about your fellow ECWG members?

- Kate Woodford, C4AT: If possible, the community activities, the concerns / needs of the members of the WG to feel safe and valued.
- Aislyn Colgan, Independent: What factors help people in this group feel comfortable and energized to share their thoughts and engage in change-making dialogue? Like do breakout groups help people feel more open to share, or writing things down, etc? Also, how do people best receive critical feedback– compliment sandwich (compliment/criticism/compliment) or just straight up no chaser?
- Lucy Morris, PG&E: I’m interested in what “success” for this group looks like to everyone.
 - Mr. Charles, Independent: I would like to know the genuine interests of industry people in the workgroup. Are they paid to play and sit at the table or are they genuinely equity minded participants- So in essence are they at the table on their companies behalf or The People.
- Kelsey Jones, SJVCEO. Why does this matter for everyone? What has been your experience with these types of conversations and working groups?
- Sarah Xu, Brightline: What is the best way to share knowledge (lived experiences, academic, etc)?
- Amaury Berteaud, AMBAG: How did you get into this line of work? How do you explain what you do to the communities you serve?
- Jan Maes: getting a sense of how the topic matter of the ECWG relates to their work
- Melanie Gillette, MCR: I agree with Lucy that it’s important to understand what “success” looks like. I think that could be very different for some of us.
- Jason Minsky, ACCES: what their favorite type of fruit pie is and why it’s not cherry. 😊

- Lou Jacobson, Willdan: Agreed with Lucy and Melanie regarding defining/exploring what success looks like for everyone..
- Mr. Charles Independent: I would like to know why everyone sitting at the table is at the table. My prior work on committee's has shown to prove that we're all not here for the same reasons, so it's always a good thing to let people feel each other out before asking them to roll up their sleeves and work together. So I am echoing some of the previous desires to ensure a safe space where people feel empowered to express their freedom of thought fearlessly, but respectfully, and irrespective of how many letters they have behind their name.
- Laurel Rothschild, The Energy Coalition: Agree with others above. What does success look like?
- Jordyn Bishop, The Greenlining Institute: What are the ways we can build trust together as a working group?
- Tanisha-Jean Martin, What success means to each individual? Perspective is important and I am interested to know what perspective each member brings and how they will define success. Also, what expertise we each bring.
- Spencer Lipp, Independent: As noted by others, defining success both as a group and individuals early helps to provide context throughout this process.
- Alice Sung, independent: Tell me who you are? And, beyond "learning" what are you and your organization's interests in participating in this ECWG ? Full disclosures on potential conflicts of interest beyond the 2 questions on the current Disclosure form, i.e. Do any of us have any Contracts, business relationships or income from any CAEECC Member organizations, now or in the past 2-4 years? How can we further build trust?
- Nicole Milner, Individual- I would like to hear how each person interprets what is being asked of this working group. I think a lot of times we read orange, are told orange and still sometimes think red. If that makes sense?!
- Angelique Lopez (DO): I echo everyone's sentiment on understanding what/how "success" will be measured in this group. In addition, I echo Jordyns question.
- Leo Steinmetz, Acterra: No specific questions yet, although I'm curious in general about how best to collaborate, and how I can be most helpful to other members of the group.
- Fabi Lao, Center for Sustainable Energy: What are folks' prior experience participating in a working group/committee/advisory body? Were there any best practices in those groups/committees the ECWG would benefit from emulating/adapting? I also echo others' comments about what success means for each member of the WG. I'd also be interested in hearing folks's responses to Nicole's question.
- Sumi Gant, GCCOG: I think we'll learn more about each other as this process unfolds.

- Evan Kamei, Energy Solutions: Echoing that we should define what success looks like and better understanding what perspective they are bringing.
- AJ Perkins, Individual: Why are you doing this? What are milestones that we can celebrate as we move towards what we would view as success?

4. How do you envision reaching consensus in this working group?

- Kate Woodford, C4AT: I am hoping that our group feels valued and safe to speak their truths and needs in order to reach consensus, AND if there is a concern about these important things not being honored, that it is brought up and dealt with respectfully and with genuine care for our members.
- Aislyn Colgan, Independent: I think consensus requires a commitment to active listening and clearly reflecting back what was said to resolve misunderstandings that get in the way of sorting out actual differences of opinion. This process requires a lot of patience from everyone because it can be very long.
- Lucy Morris, PG&E; honestly, I have concerns that it could be very challenging to achieve consensus in this working group because we all may have different priorities; that's why I'm interested in discussing and hearing what success looks like to everyone because that might help us understand the breadth of priorities but also, hopefully, understand shared priorities around which we may be able to reach consensus.
- Kelsey Jones, SJVCEO. I think if we foster an environment where all participants feel comfortable and able to speak their own opinions, this will be a great foundation for us to reach consensus on ideas or topics. I do think though that we need to have specific parameters or guidelines so each person has an equal opportunity to share and there's balance.
- Sarah Xu, Brightline: I feel that building respect/trust and understanding of processes is core to moving towards some sort of consensus. Trust in that questions come from places of learning and that information is openly shared with candor.
- Amaury Berteaud, AMBAG: I think consensus is a north star we should be aiming for, while understanding that the trust might not be in place yet to get there. I have seen consent based decision making principles be used as an interim to consensus decision making, which might be an interesting concept to explore. <https://medium.com/humans-of-xero/making-better-faster-decisions-that-are-good-enough-for-now-how-to-use-consent-based-decision-eef45ed8c976>
- Jan Maes: I don't know yet, the processes and advice provided by other members are already plenty. I hope to get a better sense of what the priorities and interests are for various ECWG members
- Jason Minsky, ACCES: May be too early to answer this question.
- Lou Jacobson, Willdan: I'm hopeful and eager to reach group consensus yet agree with Amaury's comment and recommendation.

- Mr. Charles: After reading my teammates express their optimistic, hopeful, yet plea for patience in the trust building aspect, I would hope that WE could ALL focus on our commonalities as a way to set about working together- what do WE ALL agree are some common goals- Community defining Equity, making constant progress, using this time productively and most of all, respecting others freedom of thought to speak their truth w/out taking things as personal attacks or playing politics. So I'm hoping to establish genuine Community agreements like: " We understand that Life is hard for everybody, we ALL have problems, but please don't bring them with you, because WE got work to do!"
- Laurel Rothschild, The Energy Coalition: Recognizing complete consensus on every topic/issue is unreasonable and spending extra time and effort on the group's identified priorities to work towards consensus.
- Jordyn Bishop, The Greenlining Institute: I echo Mr. Charles' comment on establishing community agreements.
- Tanisha-Jean Martin, I want to be realistic that sometimes the entire group may not come to a full consensus. I understand the goal may be to aim for full agreements, but given true diversity in a group sometimes it just isn't reached and it needs to be more than agree to disagree...I believe we need to listen, ask questions, reflect, have respect and give feedback and accept feedback given. The consensus will then come with understanding, open-mindedness, and compromise. If everything was very easily agreed on, I would question the diversity that is in this group.
- Lara Etnson (NRDC): I think this answer will be determined by what it is we are trying to accomplish. While we can strive for consensus whenever possible and use strategies like active listening, compromise, respect, team building, etc. to get there, sometimes what we really need is clarity on options to propose to CAEECC and beyond. For those things where consensus does not add substantial benefit, it may not be worth spending time trying to get consensus as much as it is worth spending time articulating the options and identifying members' positions.
- Spencer Lipp, Independent: I think there may be a few things the group fully agrees with but most there will be some dissent. In those situations, I think we can work towards a consensus by really listening to and understanding the experiences that are driving the discussion. It's not about right or wrong it's about working toward the goals. Having said that, Tanisha's and Lara's comments together are very valuable.
- Alice Sung, independent: I'm not sure that Consensus, especially given our composition, has been a serious goal of these working groups (witness all the language in the documents that outline how "dissenting" opinions are to be treated and footnote documentation is the responsibility of the dissenter , but majority will decide any Final Recommendation, etc...); however, active listening with respect, empathy, and practice of mindful inquiry, can advance to consensus

sometimes. Having said that, see my other suggestion below (regarding 5 Gradients of Agreement).

- Nicole Milner, Individual- Being right is not as important as being heard. I believe that consensus can be reached and respected when everyone at the table is given the opportunity to voice their opinion and advocate on behalf of their experiences.
- Angelique Lopez (DO): I find it very valuable to set community norms that the group agrees upon. I do not think that this question can be answered quite yet.
- Leo Steinmetz, Acterra: I'm not sure yet. I think different groups often face very different challenges to achieving consensus, with different strategies and solutions. I think it will be very important to clearly define goals, and to make sure members are comfortable expressing their opinions and are giving other members their full respect and attention.
- Fabi Lao, Center for Sustainable Energy: If we're aiming for consensus, what exactly does this mean for us? Are we going to have different levels of consensus? For example: I can say an unqualified "yes"!; I can accept the decision; I can live with the decision; I do not fully agree with the decision, however, I will not block it and will support it. As others have stated, achieving consensus might not always be feasible. When this happens, are we going to apply what CAEECC has done in the past (i.e., developing options and indicating preference for X option)? Or should we consider other non-consensus decision-making processes?
- Sumi Gant, GCCOG: I'm not sure yet. Fairly new to this particular space so at this point I'm reading others comments and looking forward to seeing how this unfolds. Happy to dig in and participate in the process.
- Evan Kamei, Energy Solutions: We should support methods of gathering feedback, possibly using tools like Jamboards or whiteboards, to see what everyone thinks. Consensus could mean that we are avoiding the least popular options, if getting full consensus is too difficult.
- AJ Perkins, Individual: I believe that we should be able to recognize other differing views but see small steps forward toward a common goal. The road taken to the goal may be different as long as we can agree on the destination.

5. For those who joined the Full CAEECC Quarterly Meeting on 6/21 (or any previous Full CAEECC meeting), any reactions you'd like to share?

- Kate Woodford, C4AT: Unable to attend.
- Aislyn Colgan, Independent: It was very helpful to see how the group tackled a proposal by a group that was confusing to others. It was really reassuring to see that people felt open to giving and receiving feedback and challenges to their proposal, and that the conversation remained respectful. It was not clear to me

how the conflict was resolved but I think that it was but I didn't understand the process enough to see exactly how.

- Kelsey Jones, SJVCEO, Unable to attend
- Jenifer Lomeli, ECC: Unable to attend
- Sarah Xu, Brightline: I was able to briefly attend but it wasn't enough to have many reactions!
- Amaury Berteaud, AMBAG: Unable to attend
- Jan Maes: was able to attend a good portion of the meeting and felt that it was conducted very efficiently and respectfully. Was interesting to get a sense of what the CAEECC is doing
- Melanie Gillette, MCR: Unable to attend.
- Laurel Rothschild, The Energy Coalition: I regularly attend as a CAEECC member. No strong reactions to share.
- Jordyn Bishop, The Greenlining Institute: Unable to attend.
- Tanisha-Jean Martin, I attended and a thought I had was, I don't feel represented in this group I am listening to.
- Angelique Lopez (DO): Unable to attend.
- Lara Ettenson (NRDC): nope.
- Spencer Lipp, Independent: Unable to attend.
- Alice Sung, independent: unfortunately unable to attend.
- Nicole Milner, Individual- I attended for about half, it seems like until this working group is able to bring some direction, everyone is at a stand still.
- Mr. Charles Independent: I attended but like most new things it was a lot of information.
- Fabi Lao, Center for Sustainable Energy: I was glad to see many ECWG members in attendance. As a CAEECC member, I know the meeting was a lot to digest, and I really appreciate your participation.
- Sumi Gant, GCCOG: Did not attend.
- Evan Kamei, Energy Solutions: Did not attend.

6. What suggestions should the group consider for productive collaboration?

- Kate Woodford, C4AT: Respect for all thoughts and ideas.
- Jason Minsky, ACCES: attentive listening and mutual respect
- Suhaila Sikand, Facilitation Team: **Would a 'Community Board' be helpful to share resources, events, ideas, and thoughts** that may not be fully aligned to the Working Group Prospectus? For example, if your organization is throwing an

event about climate justice, and you want to either share attendance registrations or ask for support from the ECWG community for the event, you could do so within this 'Community Board'? We can integrate reminders about the 'Community Board' at each WG Meeting. *Think of it as a virtual community for mutuality and resource-sharing.*

- Kate Woodford, C4AT: Yes, this is a great idea. In order to understand the realities of our WG, knowing what is happening outside of our worlds is incredibly helpful.
- Aislyn Colgan, Independent: Yes I think this would be helpful! Anything that can get people to better relate to what other member's experiences are would be helpful. This might be a good thing to extend to CAEECC members as part of the overall process.
- Kelsey Jones, SJVCEO: Definitely on board with this idea!
- Sarah Xu, Brightline: yes!
- Amaury Berteaud, AMBAG: this is a great idea!
- Jan Maes: yes, great idea! In addition, if this isn't already planned, it would also be nice to have a Resources page, with various subtopics reflecting the issues being discussed in the ECWG
- Lou Jacobson, Willdan: Yes!
- Melanie Gillette, MCR: Yes!
- Mr.Charles: I have long suggested in our AB-617 work that we breakdown the silo's that we work in and share information with the different communities fighting the same fight. Too often we end up re-creating the wheel and wasting time learning or doing something that's already been done. Shared knowledge and strategies based on shared goals are like concrete footprints that would help us ALL grow in this work, because we're ALL looking for the success of accomplishing a better Quality of Life for our disenfranchised Communities.
- Laurel Rothschild, The Energy Coalition: yes to community board that is easy to access and add to (not an additional login)
- Nicole Milner, individual- yes
- Angelique Lopez (DO): I think this is a great idea!
- Fabi Lao, Center for Sustainable Energy (CSE): I also think this is a great resource to help us learn about what others are working on. I agree with Laurel that it should be easy to access and not require an additional log-in.
- Laurel Rothschild, The Energy Coalition: breaking out into smaller groups for sharing and providing the space for contributions in smaller groups
- Tanisha-Jean Martin, Multiple small groups with rotating partners. I would also suggest creating opportunities for members to meet in person. Lunch meetings

allow collaboration and in-person meetings create familiarity to better understand the perspective people bring to the table.

- Alice Sung, independent: What about customizing and trying to use the 5 Gradients of Agreement as a consensus building tool for decision-making?
 - Alice Sung, Independent: I like the idea of a space (Community Board) for online sharing of Resources above, but agree it should be simple, and accessible, not be proprietary with a password. If well-organized, it could be a way for us also to share more publicly with our communities. We should be conscious that it is not a place to “market” services or disseminate disinformation or political opinion editorials.
 - Alice Sung, Independent: Also like the idea of some in -person meetings and more connection with CAEECC. How about providing us all with lunch meetings like CAEECC used to have?
 - Alice Sung, Independent: Inviting a key speaker or professional workshop ?
 - Alice Sung, Independent: Think about WHO is not at the table or in the room. And also think about what is NOT said, and any impacts to those NOT in the room. Be curious as to who benefits and who might be harmed?
- Nicole Milner, Individual- I definitely think that if possible in person meet ups for community building and productivity would be helpful. We are very fortunate that technology has shown us that we can still connect and do business from afar, but it also allows for things to come off as impersonal and distant.
- Angelique Lopez (DO): I echo what others mentioned above regarding smaller discussion groups. I think this would be a great first step to create space for everyone to share their thoughts and to be heard. I personally feel more comfortable in smaller groups, especially, in new spaces with new people. If there is opportunity to potentially meet in person, I would like that as well. Sometimes we don't always get to convey ourselves they way we intent to through Zoom, and discussion can sometimes get lost in translation.
- Fabi Lao, Center for Sustainable Energy (CSE): Visual aids/tools/platforms (e.g., Google Jamboard, Mural boards) during small group breakout would be helpful to help take in and process information and to engage in a more interactive manner.
- Evan Kamei, Energy Solutions: I agree with small breakout sessions and using visual aids/tools. In-person meetings may be difficult/harder to attend for some members, so we should leverage creative ways of fostering a culture of collaboration among the group.
- AJ Perkins, Individual: Smaller group discussions

Homework B - Prospectus Activity

Instructions:

1. Read the [ECWG Draft Prospectus \(PDF\)](#) and Section 6: Restructuring CAEECC Recommendations of the [Composition, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Final Report \(PDF\)](#)
2. Respond to the questions below
 - a. Add your name/affiliation by a bullet (or make a sub bullet) and add your thoughts. Thank you!
 - b. If you have any questions about how to participate or engage in this homework, or prefer an alternative way (e.g., survey, phone call) to share your thoughts, please contact Suhaila (suhaila@common-spark.com)

1. Any comments, suggestions, thoughts about/for the Draft Prospectus?

- AJ Perkins, Individual: I agree with many of the thoughts already shared. As someone who has watched CAEECC for quite some time and worked in the industry, I understand the language, but I think it would benefit everyone to have everyone be on the same page with a better understanding of everything by using more appropriate language.
- Kate Woodford, Center for Accessible Technology, While our group does work in the energy space at the CPUC, similarly to Aislyn, I am also concerned with the complexity of these documents. They seem excessively heavy with jargon and complicated, inter-woven processes and goals. This makes the ideas of reviewing and possibly updating the Prospectus particularly difficult.
- Aislyn Colgan, Independent: As a complete newcomer I am somewhat daunted by the task at hand! It seems like it involves fully comprehending the entire complex CAEECC structure before we can even consider recommendations for making it align more with CPUC Environmental and Social Justice principles... I just wanted to get that off my chest. 😊 That being said, I do wonder if there is an opportunity for a candid conversation with someone from the CDEI working group who can share in more digestible terms what they see as the primary structural concerns with the CAEECC and what generally this group was hoping might happen through this EWG process. Like, in three years, if the CDEI group had their way, CAEECC would look like XYZ. I think having at least an outline of maybe one or two CDEI people's dream come true for this would help me better grasp the task at hand.
- Lucy Morris, PG&E; I really like Aislyn's suggestion above for a more candid (less jargony) conversation about what the CDEI WG envisioned; I personally really struggle to feel clear about what future CAEECC might be; we all recognize that CAEECC was very specific and limiting (in terms of new voices being able to engage) and I think everyone agrees that that needs to change; but I still struggle to imagining what an "evolved" CAEECC looks like and what it does does. Again, I

think we all agree that it needs to be more inclusive and represent much broader perspectives and lived experiences, but what will future CAEECC actually DO? I'm better with actual examples so I imagine a wide range of possibilities for future CAEECC; at one end is of the possibility spectrum is a new CAEECC that includes new diverse members but mostly does the same kind of work that CAEECC used to do (forms working groups on specific topics, receives PA presentations and offers suggestions to PAs, etc.); and all the way at the other end is a new diverse CAEECC that does new work that is only focused on programs and policies that address EE for traditionally underserved communities/groups/etc. And then there's anything in between those two ends of the range. Right?

- Jan Maes: I like the description of the possibility spectrum, and I foresee that the new CAEECC would do more or less the same, but with a JEDI lens informed by the ECWG recommendations. I do wonder whether that applies only to the working of the transformed CAEECC or also to the type of programs it would review and make recommendations for. If that's the case, this would be potentially groundbreaking.
- Fabi Lao, Center for Sustainable Energy (CSE): I'm also better at grasping concepts by using tangible examples. I like Lucy's suggestion to think of it as a possibility spectrum. I think this approach would be a good launching pad for discussion.
- Sarah Xu, Brightline: I concur with the other comments already added. As I also put in response to the first question, I would be interested in learning about the mechanisms and leverages that CAEECC has and discuss with ECWG on thinking creatively about opportunities.
- Kelsey Jones, SJVCEO: As someone who has beginning/moderate experience with CAEECC, I do understand most of the content from the prospectus. However, I do agree with the comments from those above that it can be extremely daunting and difficult to understand if you have limited experience in the regulatory space. I think that the language moving forward needs to be less technical and more approachable so other organizations can understand what it means to be involved in CAEECC and the goals associated.
- Jan Maes: I concur with most of the comments already made, and I suppose that changing the dominant use of such technical language is something that will be addressed by the ECWG. More inclusive language to explain the technical AND JEDI aspects of EE programs and the ECWG itself, and how that relates to the lived experiences of members of a future, more diverse and inclusive CAEECC membership
- Jenifer Lomeli, ECC: Ditto Aislyn's comment, I'm also new to this space and find all the information overly complex. I agree that the jargon used makes the information harder to understand. Going forward, we should definitely think about the language. Furthermore, I'm also having trouble understanding what an

“evolved” CAEECC looks like. What are the goals? How are disadvantaged groups being addressed?

- Jason Minsky, ACCES: Have to agree with the sentiments above..I agree that “daunting” is a good way to explain things.
- As Co-chair of our East Oakland Community Emissions Reduction Plan (CERP) I have long suggested to agency that they breakdown their learned language to laymen terms. The overall effectiveness of any Community/Agency Partnership/Committee is based on clear communication and understanding of the issues, the mission, and the tools at our disposal to accomplish our goals. If Community members/laymen don’t understand the language and the acronyms we may as well be speaking different languages to each other whether we’re saying the same thing or not. I would suggest that your excellent staff not err on the side of assuming we ALL already know stuff (I personally think this has been one of the best initial committee roll-outs I’ve been a part of) remember that we didn’t go to school to know the technical terminology, associated with the issues and mission (for instance; send by COD- is that Cash on Delivery for most non-workplace Community Members or Close of Day for professionals?). I would also like to suggest that Acronym cheatsheets of associated and frequently used terms, agencies, policies, etc be developed in order to introduce each other to a new language and understanding of how to communicate with each other. It’s understandable that this would signify a completely different approach than you probably planned for the education and teaching component of this process, but I hope the word ‘DAUNTING!’ resoundingly resonates with staff when it comes down to the shared information that you’re asking us to consume without a thesaurus, dictionary, and knowledge of operational procedures. How about going old school and breaking it down to pictures, charts, and remedial materials until you bring people up to speed? Let’s recognize that Social Justice isn’t just about offering or providing The Community Quality of Life solutions, but to offer Quality of Life opportunities to the Community in a way that leaves them more knowledgeable and empowered after participating in the process.
- Tanisha-Jean Martin, “CAEECC’s formal structure and approach to engagement needs to evolve to advance the Commission’s commitment to Environmental and Social Justice as articulated through their “CPUC’s Environmental and Social Justice Action Plan”(“Action Plan”),” This is a very important goal, I would like to know who was included in the discussion in the development of the Action Plan? To lead in a direction about diversity, I have seen many times where there was a lack of diversity in formulating standards many strive for, and ultimately there still is a void and/or lack of representation.
- Spencer Lipp, Independent: I’m unclear what the prospectus is trying to accomplish. A business prospectus purpose is to show a positive financial outlook and attract investors. In academia, a prospectus lays out the plan of a research project to garner support and attract grants and other funders on research. Depending on the goals, a charter might be a better term for this

document. I think the document does a good job of illustrating the process that has taken place to establish the evolving CAEECC Committee and the Committee's ground rules but I think it needs more substance on the vision. I think this document should include an understanding of the goals. Perhaps it could be taking a step back and clearly articulate some the very high level goals and then sub goals can be determined on how we might get there. An example could be to evolve CAEECC such that representation exists to electrify through program participation communities of concern faster than other communities without impacting the communities of concern net energy cost over the next 15 years. Then, one could develop sub goals to get there by identifying the challenges.

- Alice Sung, Independent: There have been some good comments above by many folks that I agree with. I find that it is difficult for me to make comments here in a couple of bullets on the Prospectus. In order to make any meaningful evaluation of the current Draft Prospectus, I would need to go back to the Draft, and the source CDEI Final document that called for its creation, as well as the "November 2022 CAEECC meeting feedback" as stated, and start there, comparing section by section, line for line. So that is a perhaps a 2-3 day task right there. Since I am of the understanding that the original Recommendations called for this ECWG body to develop its own charge more comprehensively, and it now appears the charge is to be embodied in this "Prospectus," this requires more deep consideration and discussion as a collaborative group (not merely re-summarized in a list.)
- Alice Sung, Independent: I find some of the Appendix items, such as the "Disclosure & Conflict of Interest Policies" as written in the Draft Prospectus to be performative and completely ineffectual in addressing the actual issues raised in the CDEI Recommendations regarding this issue. This is a critical issue of "composition" and restructuring that we, the ECWG need to delve into.
- Angelique Lopez (DO): Personally, I have to read/review the document multiple times to ensure I was comprehending the depth information that was in the document. I echo Aislyn's comments, as a newcomer, I too wonder if there is opportunity to make it more digestible and not so dense.
- Nicole Milner, Individual- I agree with a lot that has been said. I feel as if a lot has been thrown onto this working group because of so many uncertainties. Instead of breaking things up and figuring out what the future of CAEECC is and how to incorporate JEDI efforts separately, it was thrown together which in an attempt to kill two birds with one stone, seems like it has caused some confusion and a mighty task to be done in a short amount of time. We can bring JEDI efforts to CAEECC, but if we still don't have a plan for what is next then where do we go?
- Leo Steinmetz, Acterra: I agree with many of the above comments, about the sort of daunting and difficult-to-evaluate scope of the prospectus, and not necessarily coming away from it feeling super secure in understanding our goals, especially

as someone not involved with CAEECC before. I hope more conversation will bring additional clarity.

- Laurel Rothschild, The Energy Coalition: The materials are familiar to me since I have been involved with CAEECC for several years. Reading the comments above, it seems that it is important to spend the time to make the information more digestible so everyone can provide thoughtful feedback.
 - Fabi Lao, Center for Sustainable Energy: I echo Laurel's comments, as I too have been involved with CAEECC for the past few years.
- Sumi Gant, GCCOG: Yes, I agree with almost all of the previous comments being new to this regulatory space.
- Evan Kamei, Energy Solutions: I agree with the other comments regarding the depth/level of understanding needed of the prospectus and room for better defined goals. It could be helpful to include the CPUC's goals from the ESJ Action Plan to make sure we have a sense of what we are trying to align with.

1. Any comments, suggestions, thoughts about/for the Composition, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Final Report Section 6: Restructuring CAEECC Recommendations?

- AJ Perkins: I like this as a beginning of how we shape things. The call for collaboration and making it accessible to get feedback is helpful. I like what Tanisha-Jean Martin said about putting profile pictures of all the members and their reasoning as to their support and participation which could attract others who have a similar viewpoint to share their thoughts knowing they have an advocate on the team.
- Kate Woodford, Center for Accessible Technology. This document was hard to understand. Lots of jargon, AND it seemed disconnected to our stated project of this group. It was hard for me to find a purpose in this document and the Prospectus. They seemed to be stand alone documents and difficult to understand how they fit into the group goals.
- Aislyn Colgan, Independent: This was a helpful document to read. It was pretty dense and I think I might need to read it a few more times to understand the place that it holds. A few questions I had are:
 - Aislyn Colgan, Independent: Is the Evolving Working Group the " Post-CDEI Restructuring Working Group?"
 - Suhaila Sikand, Facilitator: Aislyn, yes! So the Evolving CAEECC Working Group Name was actually set in early 2023. In all these documents, this WG may have been referred to as the Post-CDEI Restructuring WG, JEDI-focused WG, etc. Thank you for your question, I forgot to name this context!

- Aislyn Colgan, Independent: What is the EE Application and Business Plan proceeding? And what is its' timeline(s).
- Sarah Xu, Brightline: With the Draft Prospectus, the CDEI Final Report feels more understandable. I would also like to learn more about the other organizations represented in ECWG as I am fairly new to this space and starting to recognize some organizations/names but still learning!
- Jan Maes: I am interested to learn more about the 'brainstorming potential innovations for CAEECC make-up and scope of work evolution to accelerate State climate and equity goals and bring new, more democratic access to real community engagement' (3e iv)
- Jan Maes: I suggest we also clearly understand and determine to what extent a truly 'JEDI enhanced' CAEECC would stray from market-rate EE programs and policies towards non-market-rate programs that serve under-resources, hard to reach, disadvantaged communities. Currently, it seems that CAEECC already links to for instance the Energy Savings Assistance Program. The market-rate nature of EE programs may turn out to be a major obstacle to a JEDI practicing CAEECC and CPUC's own ESJ action plan.
- Tanisha-Jean Martin, SDUSC: I really like the push for collaborations. Make it accessible to have profile pictures of all the members available with a few bullet points why they are being brought into the discussion. Putting a face to a name is helpful to get a feel of who may still be missing at the table. Also be more clear who the "stakeholders" are.
- Alice Sung, Independent: There was over a year's worth of deep work by the CDEI, full disclosure, of which I was a part, that resulted in some excellent Recommendations that were approved. I think we need to take each of the Recommendations seriously and consider in discussion, their intent, and to the extent we agree, co-create how to implement them. Then advance and integrate the Racial Equity Plan and any other new State directions/climate and DEI goals, and considerations that have happened after these were published, into our work.
- Nicole Milner, Individual- I agree with what has been mentioned above. I think more digging, collaborating and understanding is needed.
- Leo Steinmetz, Acterra: Nothing specific yet, but I think I may have more thoughts in active discussion.
- Mr. Charles Independent: There was obviously alot of work done and I appreciate the formation of our group as a result.
- Laurel Rothschild, The Energy Coalition: The draft prospectus looks to align well with the recommendations in this final report. I could see how this would be challenging for someone new to the space to read through.
- Sumi Gant, GCCOG: The final report provides better clarity of the proposed outcomes for this WG, but I agree that simplifying the language would be helpful

for this group, and would be essential if the purpose is to be more inclusive and equitable to underserved and underrepresented communities.

- Evan Kamei, Energy Solutions: Nothing yet, but I will have more input as I become familiarized with this process.

Optional: Reading Ahead, CAEECC Scope, Purpose and Objectives

At Meeting #2, the Facilitators will spend some time introducing the CAEECC Scope, Purpose, and Objectives and Members will be asked to begin generative thinking of how to amend these three items. If you'd like to be prepared for this discussion, you may pre-read the three elements.

Current CAEECC Scope

- A. Provide input into development of Business Plans prior to and throughout the drafting process (see notes below re scope of input and timing);
- B. Provide input into development of implementation plans, again, prior to and throughout the drafting process;
- C. Provide input into development of annual budget advice letters, again, prior to and throughout the drafting process;
- D. Provide input into development and revision of metrics for inclusion in business plans and implementation plans as part of i and ii; and
- E. Provide a clearinghouse for discussion of the scope and schedule of other stakeholder processes.

From [NRDC Summary of Coordinating Committee Requirements per D.15-10-028 \(PDF\)](#)
[click on this text to access this link](#)

Current CAEECC Purpose

- A. Provide an ongoing forum for stakeholders to bring ideas for consideration (e.g., new ideas) that could be referred to the appropriate topic specific subgroup;
- B. Leverage what is working;
- C. Identify and aim for resolution and/or propose recommendations for CPUC consideration on timely and critical issues;
- D. Seek to find efficiencies in the process (e.g., review opportunities for combining meetings, prioritize key issues for stakeholders to discuss, etc.); and
- E. Coordinate activities important to implementing a "rolling portfolio."

From [NRDC Summary of Coordinating Committee Requirements per D.15-10-028 \(PDF\)](#)
[click on this text to access this link](#)

Current CAEECC Objectives

- A. Support the development and expansion of high-quality energy-efficiency programs that reduce greenhouse-gas emissions in line with state climate and energy goals while responding to customer needs and market dynamics
- B. Provide meaningful and useful input to the Program Administrators (PAs) in the development and implementation of their energy-efficiency business plans

- C. Improve collaboration and communication among parties and with the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) on energy-efficiency matters
- D. Resolve disagreements among stakeholders whenever possible to reduce the number of matters that need to be litigated before the CPUC

From [CAEECC Goals, Roles & Responsibilities, and Ground-rules \(DOC\)](#) click on this text to [download this document](#)