California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee

Full Quarterly CAEECC Meeting #33

April 12, 2022, 9:00am – 12:30pm

Teleconference

Draft Meeting Summary

Facilitators: Katie Abrams and Michelle Vigen Ralston

On April 12, 2022, the California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee (CAEECC) convened part two of its first quarterly meeting of the full CAEECC via WebEx. Over 76 individuals participated, including representatives from 22 CAEECC Member organizations plus 9 Ex-Officio and 30 members of the public. A full list of meeting registrants is provided in Appendix A.

Meeting facilitation was provided by Katie Abrams (SESC) and Michelle Vigen Ralston (Dr. Jonathan Raab of Raab Associates, was scheduled to facilitate but unable to attend). Meeting materials, including presentations, are provided on the CAEECC website here: <https://www.caeecc.org/4-12-22-full-caeecc-mtg>

The PowerPoint presentation used throughout the meeting is available on the CAEECC website (see link above to Meeting Materials, *Final* *Combined 4.12.22 CAEECC Mtg Slides v3,* under “Documents Posted Before the Meeting”).

Following the presentations, key clarifying questions or comments are listed and relevant *responses to questions* are noted in *italics*. Where multiple responses were given, these responses are listed as sub-bullets. Next Steps, at the end of this document, list all next steps discussed at the meeting.

**Remarks From Commissioners Shiroma And Houck**

Commissioner Shiroma gave the following remarks:

* Wished Jonathan a speedy recovery; thanked CAEECC Facilitation team, Co-Chairs, and Composition, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (CDEI) Working Group members; and mentioned we’re honored to have her colleague Commissioner Darcie Houck from the California Public Utilities Commission join.
* Noted that last Thursday the Commissioned approved version 2.0 of its Environmental and Social Justice (ESJ) Action Plan, which further serves as the Commission’s commitment to the principles of environmental and social justice and an operating framework to integrate equity and access throughout its regulatory proceedings.
* The goals of the ESJ Action Plan strive to improve access to programs and services in ESJ communities and engagement with ESJ communities for public participation in the Commission’s decision-making process.
* She expressed her excitement to learn about the recommendations developed by CAEECC’s CDEI Working Group to expand its membership to represent the broader diversity of Californians targeted for access to energy efficiency programs and to adopt practices that align with the Commission’s ESJ Action Plan.
* She thanked the CDEI WG for their hard work to initiate change to support the Commission’s goals, then asked Commissioner Houck if she’d like to make any remarks.

Commissioner Houck gave the following remarks:

* Thanked CAEECC for their effort promoting Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion.
* Noted that this important work will provide insight and recommendations for energy efficiency to better serve all communities in California: disadvantaged, communities of color, disabled, LGBTQ, and tribal communities.
* Expressed that this work does not occur in a vacuum; need to be thoughtful and creative to engage all CA communities.
* Reiterated Commissioner Shiroma’s comments that the ESJ Action Plan is in line with the work that will be presented today.

**SESSIONS 1A and 1B: Composition, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (CDEI) Working Group**

***Composition, Diversity, Equity & Inclusion Working Group (CDEI WG) Introduction/Overview of Process***

Katie Abrams provided an introduction of the CDEI WG and an overview on the approach to recommendation review. See *Final* *Combined 4.12.22 CAEECC Mtg Slides v3, slides 9-14,* posted to the meeting page. There were no questions or feedback.

***Presentation of Overarching Recommendation (to form a Restructuring WG proceeded by Compensation Task Force)***

Lara Ettenson, NRDC presented a series of slides on the CDEI WG’s overarching recommendation to form a Restructuring WG proceeded by a Compensation Task Force. See *Combined 3.10.22 Slide Deck, slides 15-21,* posted to the meeting page. Questions and feedback are summarized below.

Summary of Member Questions and Comments:

* Chris Malotte, SCE: What delegation is being proposed?
  + *Katie Abrams: The proposal is to delegate both Prospectus-finalization and recommendation making authority to the Compensation Task Force and Restructuring Working Group; we’ll return to this discussion later in the agenda after going over the details of those proposals*
  + *Lara Ettenson, NRDC: As a reminder, other CAEECC WGs have had the authority to make recommendations that go straight to the CPUC (and PAs as appropriate), so today’s delegation proposal is in alignment with that*
* Erin Brooks, SoCal Gas: What is the vision of decision-making changes?
  + *Lara Ettenson, NRDC: There’s no proposed changes to decision-making process; focus is to bring in more voices*
* Mike Campbell, CalPA: What is the future role of CAEECC and how might the new role change this work?
* Garrett Wong, LGSEC: What types of participants (individuals and organizations) are envisioned?
  + *Lara Ettenson, NRDC: Mostly community-based organizations (CBOs). Looking to target communities not represented by the Low Income proceeding, including workforce, labor, workforce, JEDI expertise, and many other voices we’d like to engage. The CDEI WG brainstormed 20+ types of groups.*
  + *Katie Abrams: See slide 48 of today’s presentation; page 62 of the CDEI WG report for a list of* *organizations the WG suggested engaging.*
* Marc Costa, The Energy Coalition: What lessons learned do we have from the CPUC’s DAC with regards to composition and recruitment? How can their work complement our work?
  + *Lara Ettenson, NRDC: This is part of the Restructuring WG’s work - open to adding other groups’ work and best practices/lessons learned*

***Presentation, Discussion, and CAEECC approval/feedback on Individual Recommendations:***

Katie noted the presentation sequence was Compensation, Competency Building, Recruitment & Retention, Restructuring, then Facilitation.

**Compensation**

Fabiola Lao (CSE) and Jim Dodenhoff (Silent Running) presented a series of slides on Compensation. Slides are available on the CAEECC website (see link above to Meeting Materials, *Final* *Combined 4.12.22 CAEECC Mtg Slides v3, slides 23-30*).

Summary of Member Questions and Comments:

* Ted Howard, SBUA: Would compensation through CAEECC impact CPUC intervenor compensation (iComp) eligibility?
  + *Lara Ettenson, NRDC: No, CAEECC compensation would not impact iComp.*
  + *Jim Dodenhoff, Silent Running: The goal is to reach groups that cannot access iComp.*
* Erin Brooks, SoCalGas: I echo Jim’s concern of double dipping compensation through CAEECC and iComp. My question is, what is the purpose of CAEECC? Is it up to CAEECC to decide? Compensation for what? There are no other regulatory proceedings that offer compensation - How does this track with other groups that inform the Commission?
  + *Commissioner Shiroma: The Low-Income Oversight Board and Advisory Board for CARE and ESA offer compensation*
* Jenny Berg, BayREN: The issue of compensation extends beyond energy efficiency (EE). It’s not just about eligibility for iComp; iComp has many challenges such as significant payment time delays.

Michelle asked if there were any objections with the recommendations as written. In alignment with the process Katie presented in slide 14, the recommendations are considered defacto adopted by CAEECC, with the above concerns and suggestions to be shared with the future WG for consideration.

**Competency Building**

Dany Kahumoku (ICF) and Mabell Garcia Paine (Viridis Consulting) presented a series of slides on Competency Building. Slides are available on the CAEECC website (see link above to Meeting Materials, *Final* *Combined 4.12.22 CAEECC Mtg Slides v3, slides 31-37)*.

Summary of Member Questions and Comments:

* Jenny Berg, BayREN: I recommend looking at appendix 9 for organizations to reach out to and adding public defenders and criminal justice groups. Good voice for considering the Justice in JEDI [Justice, Equity, Diversity & Inclusion].
* Mike Campbell, CalPA: Need a process for ensuring that bias is minimized in the application selection process.
  + *Lara Ettenson, NRDC: This will be in scope for the Restructuring WG.*

Michelle asked if there were any objections with the recommendations as written. In alignment with the process Katie presented in slide 14, the recommendations are considered defacto adopted by CAEECC, with the above concerns and suggestions to be shared with the future WG for consideration.

**Recruitment & Retention**

Annette Beitel (Future Energy Enterprises) and Patty Neri (SCE) presented a series of slides on Recruitment & Retention. Slides are available on the CAEECC website (see link above to Meeting Materials, *Final* *Combined 4.12.22 CAEECC Mtg Slides v3, slides 38-42*).

Summary of Member Questions and Comments:

* Erin Brooks, SoCal Gas: Concerned about CAEECC informing the design/delivery of programs since third parties design and delivery programs – CAEECC could have an undue influence/conflict of interest.
  + *Lara Ettenson, NRDC: This is a concern we’ll need to keep an eye on.*
* Benjamin Druyon, I-REN/WRCOG: As a new member to CAEECC, the onboarding hosted by the Facilitation team (Katie Abrams, Susan Rivo) and Co-Chair Jenny Berg was beneficial. I suggest providing an intro package to hand to potential members, including a 1-page marketing piece to interest prospective members in CAEECC and then provide a bigger package later about what CAEECC does. A good list to start with: Every year, program administrators (PAs) provide CPUC an annual report on CARE/FERA efforts. Along with that report are list of contractors. That list is a helpful list to target disadvantaged communities (DACs) we want participation from. I suggest including in the list of participants: education and instructional institutions, teachers, and admin facilitators in the education industry.
* Garrett Wong, LGSEC. What are the goals and targets/metrics associated with these recommendations? What does it achieving JEDI in any of these mini WG topics look like? What does balanced composition across PAs and Community Based Organizations (CBOs) look like? What does shifting decision making and power dynamics look like?
  + *Lara Ettenson, NRDC: The Working Group added placeholders globally and in each section of the report to answer these sorts of metrics and accountability questions but did not have time to fully flesh them out due to the WG’s accelerated timeline. In short, the future WG will need to follow up on these questions/report placeholders to ensure we’re matching success to the problem statement.*
  + *Annette Beitel, Future Energy Enterprises: A few suggested metric ideas include: the number of new CBOs participating, number of suggestions made (likely tactical level), and number of suggestions made that get adopted into programs/portfolios.*
* Robert Castaneda, La Cooperativa Campesina [public comment from CDEI WG member, made in the chat then verbally elevated]: I agree that the suggestion to investigate CARE & FERA for recruitment is a worthy idea. Secondly, for most CBOs the energy regulated environment] (CPUC) is mind boggling. However, there is an opportunity here. Utility costs are rising and the negative impact to low income is exponential. CBOs are functioning as service providers and advocates for their respective communities. As such, learning the processes of the CPUC and their regulation of IOUs would be of interest to the enterprises.

Michelle asked if there were any objections with the recommendations as written. In alignment with the process Katie presented in slide 14, the recommendations are considered defacto adopted by CAEECC, with the above concerns and suggestions to be shared with the future WG for consideration.

**Restructuring**

Lara Ettenson (NRDC) presented a series of slides on Restructuring CAEECC. Slides are available on the CAEECC website (see link above to Meeting Materials, *Final* *Combined 4.12.22 CAEECC Mtg Slides v3, slides 43-49*).

Summary of Member Questions and Comments:

* Erin Brooks, SoCal Gas: Request that it be made clear that the CDEI proposal (including potential increased CAEECC scope for JEDI and to align with income-qualified) would go to the CPUC for approval. Does CAEECC truly need a formal expansion of scope?
  + *Lara Ettenson, NRDC: There is no authorization for CAEECC for JEDI, although the CPUC can determine what’s in scope for CAEECC. There is no authorization to align with income qualified. CAEECC can do certain things without a CPUC Decision, but things like updating CAEECC’s authorizing language to do more than vetting business plans, will require CPUC action.*
* Erin Brooks, SoCal Gas: How would CAEECC align with income qualified programs?
  + *Lara Ettenson, NRDC: There is no current authorization to align with income qualified.*
* Erin Brooks, SoCal Gas: What is meant by balancing power dynamics? It seems that an unwritten subtext is that PAs somehow have more power than other members on CAEECC. But PAs are regulated by CPUC.
  + *Lara Ettenson, NRDC: A future WG might recommend a structural change to address power dynamics, or maybe simply acknowledging and naming dynamics.*
* Marc Costa, The Energy Coalition: What insights are we looking for from new members? What are the blind spots? What will the ability be for new members to influence our activities? What kind of topics would we put in for a call for participants? Based on the BBAL timing, the window will be closed by the time we get members onboarded for the new WG, so how can new members/voices influence CAEECC’s long term planning?
  + *Lara Ettenson, NRDC: The recruitment process won’t be tied to the Business Plan timeline. For context, the CAEECC recommendation related to Rolling Portfolios was to identify barriers to success and policies or issues to address quarterly – to identify barriers to success, what’s working well, and any proposed policy recommendations. We could reopen topics like the Equity segment. The CPUC is involved in setting the CAEECC agenda, too.*
* Vanessa Garcia, SDG&E: Support making CAEECC more diverse and inclusive. Leadership plays a role in breaking down silos and setting the decision-making process. At the end of the day, power is defined by the regulator. CAEECC can help influence other entities to be part of that, despite barriers. Concerned about SDG&E’s affordability and rates, which are impacted by additional funding requests. Want to think through PRGs.
* Alice Havenar-Daughton, MCE: Support thinking about these issues. Echo the importance of redefining the purpose of CAEECC. Suggest adding the space to think through the mechanism CAEECC has influence over aspects of EE decision-making. Erin Brooks’ point about 3P implementation and CAEECC providing recommendation back to CPUC around regulatory decisions is important to consider: think through how the CAEECC process creates recommendations, and how are those recommendations brought to decision makers at CPUC. Thus, I recommend doing some pre-work prior to launching the Restructuring WG and its recruitment process so that prospective WG members understand the role and purpose of CAEECC in the restructuring WG. Also, I second the sentiment others have shared about the challenge of recruiting into CAEECC; hence the importance of clearly defining CAEECC influence and impact – before launching recruitment.
* Ted Howard, SBUA: Suggest explicitly adding hard-to-reach (HTR) customers under D.18-05-041 [which is currently mentioned in the report’s introduction and JEDI glossary, but not in specific recommendations or more globally]
  + Lara Ettenson, NRDC: Report intent was to be inclusive; will followup to make sure HTR is explicitly in the report.

Michelle asked if there were any objections with the recommendations as written. In alignment with the process Katie presented in slide 14, the recommendations are considered defacto adopted by CAEECC, with the above concerns and suggestions to be shared with the future WG for consideration.

**Facilitation & Additional Considerations**

Katie Abrams presented a series of slides on Facilitation and additional considerations. Slides are available on the CAEECC website (see link above to Meeting Materials, *Final* *Combined 4.12.22 CAEECC Mtg Slides v3, slides 54-57).*

Summary of Member Questions and Comments:

* Erin Brooks, SoCal Gas: Support these types of recommendations and making CAEECC more equitable and inclusive. The info here goes a long way toward that.

Katie noted that there were no formal Facilitation recommendations for CAEECC’s consideration, but that the list she presented, brainstormed by the CDEI WG, would be forwarded to the Restructuring WG for consideration.

***Prioritizing certain recommendations for early in Restructuring WG or by other means if WG delayed***

Katie Abrams presented candidate recommendations and a couple process options for prioritizing certain recommendations. See *Final* *Combined 4.12.22 CAEECC Mtg Slides v3, slide 56,* posted to the meeting page. The meeting sequence was designed to first seek public input (there was none), then return to CAEECC members for input after approving the Overarching recommendation. However, due to time constraints and concerns with the overarching recommendation, this topic will be added to the June meeting agenda.

***Public Input***

There were no questions or comments from the Public.

***Approve Overarching Recommendation (to form a Restructuring WG proceeded by Compensation Task Force); plus, delegation of respective prospectus finalization and recommendation making to WG/TF***

Katie Abrams represented the overarching recommendation presented at the beginning of the meeting. See *Final* *Combined 4.12.22 CAEECC Mtg Slides v3, slides 60-66,* posted to the meeting page. Questions and feedback are summarized below.

Summary of Member Questions and Comments:

* Jim Dodenhoff, Silent Running: To clarify some questions in the chat, the primary goal [recommended by the CDEI WG] for the Compensation TF is to develop a compensation pilot that provides a source and rule set for funding for eligible participants in the Restructuring WG. As the Restructuring WG ramps up, they may choose to continue the pilot or change course.
* Christopher Malotte, SCE: SCE plans to participate in this effort. Don’t support delegating recommendations if it involves EE budgets; that needs to come back to CAEECC in case IOU/PA budgets are impacted.
* Erin Brooks, SoCal Gas: I don’t support delegating recommendations. At this time, SoCal Gas doesn’t support moving forward with the Compensation TF – need to first understand the fundamental question what are we trying to achieve that isn’t possible with the existing structure of CAEECC? Support making CAEECC more diverse and inclusive, but unclear why we need to launch separate working groups where the benefit is not clear to me.
  + *Lara Ettenson, NRDC: The purpose of CAEECC and the objective of the WG is the first question the WG would address: what can CAEECC do now within its current authorizing language, and what would need to change to bridge any gaps on what we want CAEECC to do. In short, the proposed WG evolved from equity and inclusivity to a broader scope on the scope and charge of CAEECC. All that said, Restructuring may not be the right word.*
* Fabiola Lao, CSE: If CAEECC’s JEDI efforts [including seeking compensation for eligible members and activities] are left solely to quarterly meetings, we won’t make adequate progress.
* Mike Campbell, CalPA: It’s hard to evaluate the value of the overarching recommendation unless we can agree on what CAEECC can and should be doing. Given where things are currently, I’m not sure CAEECC is necessary. How do we authentically answer “where should we go” and which voices to include?
* Alison LaBonte, CPUC: Even if the scope is unknown, the how we show up (recruitment, how voices are heard, governance, and how CAEECC is structured), is still important and needs to be worked on – to align with the ESJ Action Plan.
* Erin Brooks, SoCal Gas: Seems like the CDEI WG was focused on bringing in missing voices; how do we focus on access and composition issues? That feels like different questions than the purpose and value of CAEECC? My understanding is that the WG was going to focus on equity and access, not the purpose and scope of CAEECC.
* *Lara Ettenson, NRDC:* Considering members’ requests for more check-ins and approvals, suggest the following revised proposal:
  1. Approve a Compensation Task Force
  2. Launch an effort (including individuals/organizations eligible for compensation) looks at the purpose of CAEECC
  3. Launch the full “Restructuring” WG as proposed by the CDEI WG
  4. Throughout, continue to look at recommendations that can be implemented earlier/through other means
* Marc Costa, The Energy Coalition: Support the overarching recommendation and suggest we move forward.
* Jim Dodenhoff: The CDEI WG didn’t set out to form a Restructuring WG. There are broad questions about the meaning of CAEECC that prompt a broader lens.
* Jenny Berg, BayREN: CAEECC and the regulatory EE framework it operates has different priorities than when CAEECC was established, so I suggest CAEECC evolves with it, and support Lara’s revised proposal
* Stephen Kullman: What are the specific concerns [from Erin and Mike]? Can we adopt or modify the overarching recommendation (slide 62)?
* Erin Brooks, SoCal Gas: Concerned about estimated budget of $300k and impacts to PA budgets. Also concerned about whether the Compensation TF would be approved by CPUC, and about moving forward without knowing the purpose of CAEECC. Don’t currently feel comfortable signing on to the Overarching recommendation.
  + *Lara Ettenson, NRDC: Would you [Erin] agree to the Compensation Task Force if the proposal today was modified such that its recommendations were to come back to CAEECC and to CPUC for approval if needed?*
    - *Erin Brooks, SoCal Gas: yes*
  + *Lara Ettenson, NRDC: Would you [Erin] agree to the New WG element of this overarching proposal if the today’s proposal was modified such that at the June meeting, a proposal is presented to full CAEECC for approval that includes sequencing proposal for CAEECC purpose, WG Prospectus, and update on the Compensation TF.*
* Lucy Morris, PG&E: Appreciate Erin raising concerns, and echo many sentiments raised today on silos and the importance of this topic.

Lara Ettenson, NRDC and Michelle Vigen Ralston presented the following revised Overarching proposal, as captured on slide 64 during the meeting:

*New Working Group... Need to know 1) CAEECC Purpose and changing context (June meeting) and 2) Prospectus, scope and phasing for Restructuring WG*

1. *Compensation Task Force – will come back to full CAEECC, determine if it needs CPUC approval*
2. *Come back in June with sequencing for CAEECC Purpose + WG prospectus + update on Compensation TF*
3. *Launch RFI for Compensation Task Force, New WG interest, and to assess any financial need*

Michelle tested for consensus on this revised proposal and there were no objections.

Due to scheduling issues, the meeting ended 15 minutes before planning. Considering the abrupt end, the Facilitation team emailed CAEECC members and meeting participants the following “Key Outcomes” summary and requested replies on any significant concerns or areas that didn’t align with their understanding. They did not receive any replies by the deadline 4/19.

**Key Outcomes:**

**1. CAEECC members discussed and de facto approved all 15 CDEI WG recommendations**; incorporating recommended additions and modifications to be considered during implementation

**2. CAEECC members discussed and agreed to move forward with the Compensation Task Force (with modifications noted below) and to launch a request for information (RFI)** survey to assess interest and compensation needs for prospective participants in the New Working Group (name TBD but will be referred to as “New Working Group” until a name is determined; formerly “Restructuring WG”).

**3. Two modifications were made to the Overarching proposal to form a Compensation Task Force followed by a New Working Group:**

* The New Working Group’s Prospectus and recommendations will be vetted by the full CAEECC (no delegation), with regular check-ins (e.g., each quarterly meeting)
* The Compensation Task Force’s charge will be guided by the approved Compensation recommendation #5; the TF’s recommendations will be vetted by the full CAEECC, and Commission approval may be sought, if this need is determined to be necessary

4. In light of member requests to better understand what the potential updated purpose of CAEECC is prior to launching the New Working Group, the facilitation team and co-chairs will **present a sequencing proposal at the June CAEECC meeting**to address these concerns

**Updated TF & WG Implementation Schedule**

* **Late April/Early May**—Request for Information (RFI) for New WG and Compensation TF
* **Late May/Early June**—Launch Compensation TF
* **June CAEECC mtg topics related to CDEI**
  + Discuss and approve/modify sequencing/phased proposal for New WG and CAEECC purpose re-envisioning process
  + Review/approve New WG Prospectus Outline & discuss process for how the New WG will finalize the prospectus once the WG is launched
  + Update on Compensation TF
  + Discuss prioritizing certain recommendations
* **September CAEECC mtg**—Wrap up Compensation TF or determine if more time is needed
* **October**—Recruit and select New WG Members; schedule initial meetings
* **November 2022-April/July 2023**—New Working Group meets (6–9-month process)

**Wrap Up/ Next Steps**

***Topics for June Full CAEECC Meeting***

Katie Abrams presented proposed topics for the June 22, 2022, Full CAEECC meeting (see slide 70, at link above to Meeting Materials, *Final* *Combined 4.12.22 CAEECC Mtg Slides v3).* There were no questions or suggestions/comments.

***3.10.22 Meeting Evaluation***

Katie summarized the results from the 3/10 full CAEECC evaluation (see *Final* *Combined 4.12.22 CAEECC Mtg Slides v3, slide 71,* posted to the meeting page). She instructed all Members to fill out the CAEECC Evaluation for today’s meeting and encouraged other participants to do so as well.

***Next steps are as follows:***

**CAEECC Members:**

* Fill out the CAEECC Evaluation of the meeting (as required by our CAEECC groundrules) no later than April 19, 2022, COB
* Confirm the meeting key outcomes (emailed 4/13; responses due 4/19; summarized above)

**Facilitation Team:**

* **Post revised meeting** slides that show revised Overarching proposal as revised and approved by CAEECC members (slide 64)
* **Post revised CDEI WG report** to explicitly name hard-to-reach (HTR) customers
* **Launch RFI** for Compensation Task Force, New WG, and to assess financial need
* **Ensure New WG Prospectus incorporates feedback** from today’s meeting
* **Meeting Facilitation:**
  + Develop, post and notice draft meeting summary (this document) to the meeting webpages by April 20, 2022
  + Review and analyze survey evaluations of today’s Full CAEECC meeting for continuous improvement opportunities
  + Prepare for next Full CAEECC meeting on June 22nd– including adding agenda topics based on feedback from today’s meeting

**Appendix A: Meeting Attendees**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Attendance at 4.12.22 Full CAEECC Meeting** | | |
| **CAEECC Members/Alternates** | | |
| 3C-REN | Alejandra | Tellez |
| 3C-REN | Erica | Helson |
| BayREN | Jennifer | Berg |
| Cal Advocates | Mike | Campbell |
| CEC | Brian | Samuelson |
| CEDMC | Greg | Wikler |
| CEE | Alex | Lantsberg |
| CEE | Bernie | Kotlier |
| CSE | Fabiola | Lao |
| Code Cycle | Dan | Suyeyasu |
| I-REN-WRCOG | Tyler | Masters |
| LGSEC | Demian | Hardman-Saldana |
| LGSEC | Garrett | Wong |
| MCE | Alice | Havenar-Daughton |
| NRDC | Lara | Ettenson |
| PG&E | Lucy | Morris |
| RCEA | Stephen | Kullman |
| RCEA | Aisha | Cissna |
| SBUA | Ted | Howard |
| SCE | Christopher | Malotte |
| SCE | Patricia | Neri |
| SDG&E | Vanessa | Garcia |
| SJVCEO | Kelsey | Jones |
| SMW Local 104 | David | Vincent |
| SoCalGas | Erin | Brooks |
| SoCalGas | Sebastian | Garza |
| SoCalREN | Lujuana | Medina |
| SoCalREN | Sheena | Tran |
| The Energy Coalition | Marc | Costa |
| **Ex-Officio** | | |
| CPUC | Nicole | Cropper |
| CPUC | Commissioner Darcie | Houck |
| CPUC | Jen | Kalafut |
| CPUC | Alison | LaBonte |
| CPUC | Yeshi | Lemma |
| CPUC | Commissioner Genevieve | Shiroma |
| CPUC | Nils | Strindberg |
| CPUC | Leuwam | Tesfai |
| CPUC | Christie | Torok |
| **CDEI Presenters** | | |
| Future Energy Enterprises | Annette | Beitel |
| ICF | Dany | Kahumoku |
| La Cooperativa Campesina | Robert | Castaneda |
| Silent Running | James | Dodenhoff |
| Viridis Consulting | Mabell | Garcia Paine |
| **Other Interested Stakeholders** | | |
| American Eco Services | Nicole | Milner |
| CHOC Housing | Anna | Solorio |
| CPUC | Kristy | Chew |
| CPUC | Peter | Franzese |
| CPUC | Jason | Symonds |
| CPUC | Jeorge | Tagnipes |
| CPUC | Sarah | Thomas |
| CPUC | Cheryl | Wynn |
| Don Arambula Consulting | Don | Arambula |
| Emerald Cities | Carli | Yoro |
| Enervee | Chris | Healey |
| FS Consulting | Frank | Spasaro |
| Google Nest | Chad | Ihrig |
| Greenbank Associates | Alice | Sung |
| High Sierra | Pam | Bold |
| Lincus | Patrick | Ngo |
| Lincus | Hob | Issa |
| MWC | Mark | Wallenrod |
| NAESCO | Donald | Gilligan |
| Opinion Dynamics | Sharyn | Barata |
| Opinion Dynamics | Bob | Ramirez |
| Pacific Corps | Jackie | Wetzsteon |
| Resource Innovations | Margie | Gardner |
| Roth Capital Partners | Craig | Irwin |
| SCE | Kellvin | Anaya |
| SCE | Jameel | Pueblos |
| SDG&E | Stacie | Atkinson |
| SEI | Stephanie | Doi |
| SoCalGas | Emma | Ponco |
| SoCalGas | Kevin | Ehsani |
| SoCalREN | Frederick | Chung |
| Willdan | Liz | Fitzpatrick |