California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee

Full Quarterly CAEECC Meeting #34

June 22, 2022, 9:00am – 1:00pm

Teleconference

Draft Meeting Summary

Facilitators: Dr. Jonathan Raab, Raab Associates, Ltd. & Katie Abrams, SESC

On June 22, 2022, the California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee (CAEECC) convened its second 2022 quarterly meeting of the full CAEECC via WebEx. Over 79 individuals participated, including representatives from 18 CAEECC Member organizations plus 8 Ex-Officio and 48 members of the public. A full list of meeting registrants is provided in Appendix A.

Meeting facilitation was provided by Dr. Jonathan Raab (Raab Associates) and Katie Abrams (SESC). Meeting materials, including presentations, are provided on the CAEECC website here: <https://www.caeecc.org/6-22-22-full-caeecc-mtg>

The PowerPoint presentation used throughout the meeting is available on the CAEECC website (see link above to Meeting Materials, 6.22.22 Full Quarterly CAEECC Mtg Draft Slides, 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. Each section features both a high-level summary of questions, comments, and next steps as well as a detailed list of member questions and comments.

**SESSION 1: Evolving Scope of CAEECC**

***Presentation from Facilitation Team on background and options; and initial Member discussion***

Jonathan Raab presented a brief historical context, summary of CAEECC accomplishments, overview of relevant market and regulatory changes, and summary of key changes related to CAEECC and California energy landscape. See *6.22.22 Full Quarterly CAEECC Mtg Draft Slides, slides 8-12,* posted to the meeting page.

**High-Level Summary of Member Questions & Comments – and Next Steps:**

* Members noted the successes of CAEECC to date.
* Members noted the value of using CAEECC as a venue for midcycle check-ins for 4 Year Business Plan
* Members discussed possibilities for changes in scope of CAEECC moving forward, some noting its diminished importance for their organizations’ foci while others pointed to its ongoing value.
* Members discussed the role of JEDI with regards to CAEECC’s future scope and whether/how to coordinate with other programs such as ESA, reliability, and demand response.
* Next step: Continue to discuss CAEECC’s evolving Scope and Structure at the September Meeting and pass along key takeaways and ideas to the JEDI-focused WG, prior to the CAEECC finalizing its updated Scope.

Details of Member Questions and Comments:

*What has changed since the beginning of CAEECC in addition to what is identified in slide 10?*

* Randy Young, Sheet Metal Workers Local 104 (SMW 104): The transition to Market Transformation presents an opportunity to focus on the intersection of technologies and Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (JEDI) – for example, new refrigerant technologies.
* Lucy Morris, PG&E: There’s been an increase in Program Administrators (PAs) since 2016. Also, CAEECC has been successful in reducing some tension – in the early years of CAEECC, energy efficiency issues seemed much more contentious than today.
* Jenny Berg, BayREN: We should reflect on how far we’ve come. For example, the recent CPUC Decision on Business Plans adopts many CAEECC recommendations, which lends credibility to the stakeholder body.

*What should CAEECC’s scope be going forward? What’s missing from slide 11?*

* Christopher Malotte, SCE: Consider an annual or midcycle check in on the status of the PAs’ 4-year plans
* Laurel Rothschild, The Energy Coalition: Agree with Chris’ suggestion on midcycle check-ins. Also provide a venue and an opportunity to share successes and lessons learned by comparing efforts with other California PAs

*What should CAEECC’s scope be going forward? What’s the most or least important and why (slide 11)?*

* Mike Campbell, California Public Advocates (CalPA): For CalPA, the goal of our engagement with CAEECC was to work with stakeholders on contentious topics (bullet #1). Initially it was important to have a venue to vet Business Plans (and CAEECC served as a venue to look “under the hood” to evaluate programs), but that’s no longer as valuable considering the new way they’re vetted and approved through the Commission. CalPA supports the other bullets even though they may be less important to our organization specifically.
* Sebastian Garza, SoCal Gas: Question if CAEECC is needed moving forward and who should/needs to be involved.
* NRDC conveyed by Jenny Berg on NRDC’s behalf: Supports changing the charge to center justice and equity. Would like to recenter to align to the CPUC’s Environmental Social Justice (ESJ) Action Plan as a guide. Supports maintaining energy efficiency (EE) as the topic and bridging to other proceedings as relevant.
* Demian Hardman-Saldana, The Local Government Sustainable Energy Coalition (LGSEC): Doesn’t support decommissioning CAEECC. CAEECC serves a key role to get stakeholders together and understand the big picture of what is happening statewide. This plays a vital role for local government entities and others who don’t have time to sift through tons of proceedings.
* Lucy Morris, PG&E: The list seems to generally represent CAEECC’s focus with the exception of #2 (vehicle for equity). If the focus is on JEDI, why aren’t we talking about the Energy Savings Assistance (ESA), reliability, and demand response and other programs critical and related to equity in the EE space. The degree of change and focus on JEDI impacts how holistically we rethink the topical focus generally.
* Dan Suyeyasu, Code Cycle: Echoing Demian Hardman-Saldana, specifically the unmatched power to engage with PAs
* Vanessa Garcia, SDG&E: Interested in what the Energy Division’s goals are and mapping those goals to what CAEECC can and should tackle and which proceedings align with those goals. Also support comments about aligning to an equity focus.

*Input on proposed next steps (slide 12)*

* Sebastian Garza, SoCal Gas: Do the structural changes require a Commission Decision?
  + *Nils Strindberg, California Public Utilities Commission Energy Division (CPUC ED): If there are holistic changes or changes to the purpose of CAEECC, then yes, it likely requires a Commission Decision. If it’s implementing recommendations from the CDEI WG, likely not. This has been teed up on the record via the Application proceeding.*
  + *Mike Campbell, CalPA: Today’s discussion on the evolving scope of CAEECC does not constitute a record or basis so there will need to be a process for formally changing the scope, which will need record evidence and be changed through a Decision.*

***Presentation from Energy Division***

Nils Strindberg, CPUC ED, presented a series of slides about the CPUC’s vision for the evolving role of CAEECC. Nils Strindberg noted that the intent of the slides is to present a proposal to solicit feedback, and that ED’s intent is not to narrow CAEECC’s scope but rather to add greater emphasis on JEDI. See *Energy Division - Future of CAEECC Presentation (6.21.22),* posted to the meeting page.

**High-Level Summary of Member Questions & Comments – and Next Steps**:

* Members were in general agreement with CPUC ED’s proposal for increased focus on equity, while still maintaining CAEECC’s pre-existing scope
* Some members asked ED for specifics such as how they’re defining equity (e.g., hard to reach and disadvantaged communities) and what its proposal would mean for the CAEECC framework
* The CPUC ED noted that finalizing the details of CAEECC’s scope will be an iterative process involving the JEDI-focused WG.
* Next step: Members will continue this discussion at the September Full CAEECC meeting and then provide the takeaways and ideas to the JEDI-focused WG for their input, prior to the CAEECC finalizing its updated Scope.

Details of Member Clarifying Questions and Feedback:

* Lucy Morris, PG&E: Is CPUC ED envisioning that hard-to-reach (HTR) or Disadvantaged Communities (DAC) or JEDI-related issues will be fully integrated CAEECC’s activities moving forward? In other words is the proposal to shift focus entirely or adjust how CAEECC addresses JEDI to ensure we are respecting these issues when they come up in CAEECC?
  + *Nils Strindberg, CPUC ED: Both. CPUC ED envisions more focus on JEDI as well as to respect how we address JEDI. Adding as well the need and value of getting the right representatives at the table to discuss and address JEDI issues in a meaningful and appropriate way.*
* Jenny Berg, BayREN: Raising that the CPUC ESJ Action Plan defines communities more broadly than HTR and DACs.
  + *Nils Strindberg, CPUC ED: Use the ESJ Action Plan definition*
* Fabi Lao, Community for Sustainable Energy (CSE): The goal should be to operationalize equity throughout CAEECC’s work. CAEECC should not address JEDI separately, but instead, embed JEDI into every discussion and shift the perspective to be inclusive of equity and justice. CAEECC provides a great venue to begin doing that work.
* Christopher Malotte, SCE: Strongly support incorporating the CPUC ED’s proposal. Suggest keeping CAEECC focused on energy efficiency to minimize duplicate efforts.
  + *Nils Strindberg, CPUC ED: Currently operating under the framework of 15-10-028 (which calls for an EE focus), and acknowledge that other groups/proceedings cover related topics such as ESA*
* Dan Suyeyasu, Code Cycle: Can CAEECC adopt the CPUC ED’s proposal now?
  + *Jonathan Raab, Raab Associates: The process proposal is to have the JEDI related WG engage in the ongoing discussions as well as continue to revisit this topic at future CAEECC meetings (so adopting it now is premature).*
* Lucy Morris, PG&E: Want to acknowledge the notion of keeping a focus on EE (to minimize duplication) but need to coordinate with other efforts and be mindful not to silo CAEECC because these issues are so interrelated to other proceedings.
* Damien Hardmans-Saldana, LGSEC: Appreciate the CPUC ED’s proposal. It’s essentially status-quo except for the equity components, is that correct? What is the thought process of what the CPUC thinks CAEECC should be and its framework?
  + *Nils Strindberg, CPUC ED: Yes that’s correct regarding your first question, no response as of yet on your 2nd question.*
* Laurel Rothschild, The Energy Coalition: CAEECC is looking back as well as looking forward in these conversations. Suggest also looking at accomplishments, challenges, and lessons learned. For example, I’d like to discuss challenges such as those faced by the Underserved Working Group, which was challenged by data access – because those lessons learned may help inform future conversations
* Jonathan Raab, Raab Associates: To accomplish the greater JEDI-focus regarding CAEECC composition, is the idea to expand the membership, shift membership, or more of a consultative process that CAEECC members would have with DACs?
  + *Nils Strindberg, CPUC ED: The JEDI-focused WG would likely address this.*
* Jonathan Raab: CAEECC hasn’t gotten into program design in the equity segment, should that be a focus?
  + *Nils Strindberg, CPUC ED: Would like to make space for the JEDI-focused WG to address this.*

***Public input on evolving scope of CAEECC***

Public Questions and Comments:

* Halley Fitzpatrick (SoCal Gas contractor): On slide 4 of the *Energy Division - Future of CAEECC Presentation (6.21.22)*, the use of “CPUC” instead of “Energy Division” seems to broaden impact within the CPUC beyond Energy Division. Is that the intent?
  + Original Chat Message from Halley: @Nils, As Mike said, CAEECC meetings and correspondence are not "on the record" in the proceeding. ED participates in CAEECC, not the full CPUC such as Commissioners or ALJs (unless occasionally invited as guests). in the left column of the current/future slide, it said the purpose of CAEECC is to reduce the number of matters that need to litigated before the CPUC, but the right column talks about more involvement of the CPUC. should "CPUC" be changed to "ED" in some of these cells for clarification?
  + *Jennifer Kalafut, CPUC ED: As Nils Strindberg explained upfront, this presentation represents our preliminary thinking. On the last point, CAEECC was meant to dispute matters before it came to the Commission. ED can’t speak for the Commission. When you see “CPUC” written here, you can consider it “CPUC ED”. We will try to be more explicit in the future.*

**SESSION 2: Composition, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (CDEI) Working Group--Followup**

***Compensation Task Force Update***

Katie Abrams presented on the Compensation Task Force, what its charge is, and an overview of discussion from the first meeting on June 8, 2022. See *6.22.22 Full Quarterly CAEECC Mtg Draft Slides, slides 18 - 27,* posted to the meeting page.

**High-Level Summary of Member Questions & Comments - and Next Steps:**

* Members suggested considering using the EE Equity Segment budget for compensation, as well as consider whether this should be in budget of one PA or all the PAs collectively as well as whether this should allow for raising the combined budget cap for the Market Support/Equity Segments
* Members underscored the issues challenges using I-COMP to fund the JEDI-focused WG
* Members suggested a few questions and considerations for the Task Force
* Next step: The facilitation team will reflect Member questions and input back to the Task Force

Details of Member Clarifying Questions and Comments:

*Any questions or comments on the Charge or Key Questions for the Task Force?*

* None.

*What questions or comments do you have for the possible leading contender for a funding source discussed by the TF (using EE funding via CAEECC)?*

* Fabi Lao, CSE: Happy to see that I-COMP is not a main contender for funding because I-COMP is not user-friendly or easy to navigate.
* Mike Campbell, CalPA: Suggest the TF consider energy efficiency equity segment funds as a possible source, and agree that I-COMP wouldn’t be a good source for this use case
  + *Katie Abrams, SESC: we will take that back to Compensation TF*
* Sebastian Garza, SoCal Gas: If funds came from the equity segment budget, would the Equity/Market Support cap be increased? #3 says a supplemental contract by a PA, is that a single PA holding it, a single PA per organization, or something else?
  + *Katie Abrams, SESC: Compensation TF has not yet discussed the details, but we will bring these questions back to the TF.*

***JEDI-related Working Group: scope, charge, and Prospectus finalization process***

Katie Abrams presented the proposed objectives, scope, implementation schedule, and Prospectus finalization process for the future JEDI-focused WG. See *6.22.22 Full Quarterly CAEECC Mtg Draft Slides, slides 28 - 32,* posted to the meeting page.

Member Questions and Comments:

* Vanessa Garcia, SDG&E: As CAEECC recruits for the JEDI-focused WG, provide WG members with a clear scope of work for CAEECC so the scope doesn't change after engaging them.
  + *Katie Abrams, SESC: The reason we’ve been discussing the evolving scope of CAEECC topic as iterative is because we want to hear from stakeholders, including those in the WG, what they think about the scope of CAEECC. If we tell them the finalized scope we miss out on hearing from key stakeholders. We’ll continue this discussion at the September Full CAEECC meeting and beyond.*

Jonathan Raab and Katie Abrams summarized next steps, which is for the facilitation team to draft a Prospectus for the JEDI-focused WG in consultation with CAEECC Co-Chairs and CPUC staff, and based on the recommendations from the CDEI WG.

***Public input on Compensation TF Update and JEDI-related Working Group scope, charge, and Prospectus finalization process***

Public Questions and Comments:

There were no questions or comments from the Public.

***CDEI WG recommendations-implementing 1-2 before new WG launches***

Katie Abrams and Jonathan Raab presented a few CDEI Recommendations that the Facilitation Team, CAECC Co-Chairs, and CPUC ED flagged for potential implementation prior to the formation of the JEDI-focused WG. See *6.22.22 Full Quarterly CAEECC Mtg Draft Slides, slides 34 - 38,* posted to the meeting page.

**Recommendation 1 (part 1 of 2): Include a demonstration of and commitment to JEDI in the JEDI-focused Working Group Application (slide 36) – approved by consensus**

**Summary**: Following Member discussion (detailed below), CAEECC members agreed to add the following language (from slide 37) to the JEDI-focused WG application:

|  |
| --- |
| As a representative of X organization, I will actively 1) demonstrate and 2) commit to an ongoing education and personal commitment to Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion in my participation as a CAEECC Working Group member. |

Details of Member Discussion:

* Randy Young, SMW Local 104: What does “actively demonstrate” mean?
  + *Katie Abrams, SESC: There is no formal requirement to “actively demonstrate” a commitment; but rather, that clause is included to strengthen the language around commitment*
* Ted Howard, Small Business Utility Association (SBUA): The recommendation drops “at an organizational level” from the original recommendation from the CDEI WG. Was that on purpose and if so why?
  + *Katie Abrams, SESC: The original CDEI WG recommendation was intended to apply to full CAEECC membership application; the facilitation team adapted that recommendation to the JEDI-focused Working Group application. Since the WG scope and focus is much narrower and shorter than full CAEECC membership, the clause about “at an organizational level” was removed. Welcome input from members, CDEI WG participants, and the public if this raises a concern.*
  + *Fabi Lao, CSE: It makes sense to exclude this for the JEDI-focused Working Group. For organizational change, 6-9 months might be too much of a lift.*

**Recommendation 1 (part 2 of 2, slide 37): Proposal for the JEDI-focused WG Membership Application to add questions related to the experience of both EE and JEDI – revised language approved by consensus**

**Summary**: Following Member discussion (detailed below), CAEECC Members agreed to the following revisions (in redline) to the JEDI-focused WG application. See slide 37 for original proposal, and see revised/new application questions in redline below.

|  |
| --- |
| Note to applicants: experience or expertise in DEI and/or EE is required for this Working Group,  or other relevant experience or expertise.   1. Do your representative and alternate have experience (including lived experience) ~~with and/~~or expertise related to issues of Justice, Equity, Diversity, ~~Equity~~, and Inclusion (~~DEI~~JEDI)? *Yes/no* 2. Do your representative and alternate have experience or ~~with and~~ expertise related to energy efficiency (EE)? *Yes/no* 3. If you answered yes to either question above, please briefly elaborate on your experience with and expertise in issues of Justice, Equity, Diversity, ~~Equity~~, and Inclusion (~~DEI~~JEDI) and/or energy efficiency (EE). *Required if answered yes to either question above* 4. If you do not have EE or JEDI experience, what relevant experience or expertise would you bring to the Working Group? *Required if answered no to questions 1 and 2, above.* |

Details of Member Discussion:

* Christopher Malotte, SCE: Should we add examples of what “experience” means? What level of experience or expertise are we asking for?
  + *Jonathan Raab, Raab Associates: That’s the intended point of the third question, to allow applicants to self-describe “experience” and “expertise” themselves. But if a baseline knowledge is required, then yes, we probably should be explicit.*
* Randy Young, SMW Local 104: I believe both questions should be required.
* Sebastian Garza, SoCal Gas: I don’t think experience and expertise related to DEI should be required to join nor do I think that EE experience or expertise should be required to join because this will exclude a lot of people without expertise in both. I think you’ll also be excluding people with a desire to learn about either of these topics. Don’t make either of these questions requirements.
* Laurel Rothschild, The Energy Coalition: What would CAEECC do with this information and how that will be used should be explicit.
  + *Jonathan Raab, Raab Associates: [provided details on the selection committee and process]*
* Ted Howard, SBUA: Struggling with this question of both or one being required and the extreme either way. If the WG becomes too diverse, would that affect effectiveness? Would an additional WG be necessary to accommodate some nuances?
* Fabi Lao, CSE: CAEECC needs to include these questions, though undecided on whether they need to be required. CAEECC needs to balance who is a member. I do not agree with multiple working groups because it goes against the integration of JEDI.
* Stephen Kullmann, Redwood Coast Energy Authority: Agree both questions should be asked, but “expertise” is an exclusive term and may cause folks to disqualify themselves based on that. Recommend removing “and” or keep it as solely as “experience” If CAEECC isn’t requiring it, the application should be explicit ahead of time as to the criteria for selection of applications.
  + *Nils: CAEECC could also say experience and a commitment to DEI.*
* Caroline Massad Francis, PG&E: We think it’s a good idea to include these questions. Supports switching to “experience and/or expertise”. Supports clarifying the selection criteria prior to opening applications. Supports the need for balance in the committee. Proposal to require experience in one of the two areas (EE or JEDI). Proposal to add a fourth question “If you don’t have experience and/or expertise in either topic, please describe why you think you’d be a good candidate”.
* Ted Howard, SBUA: Clarifying that the amendment is to allow anyone to join the JEDI-focused WG as its a sub-group. Also want to note that Washington State is accommodating experience as inclusive of “lived experience”
* Fabi Lao, CSE: The reason behind these questions is to be open to experience with lived experience and expertise from a job. The idea is to address the lived experience of community members. Supports modifying to “experience and/or expertise” or “experience or expertise”.

**Recommendation 2: Conflict of Interest Process and Disclosure Requirements for JEDI-focused WG. 1) Remove requirement for non-CAEECC members to provide an exhaustive client list. 2) Add attestation statement for conflict of interest (COI).** See slide 38 for proposal.

**Summary of Member Discussion and Next Steps**:

* Members agreed to replace full listing of past and present clients for non-CAEECC WG Member applications with attestation statement of not having a conflict of interest (COI)
* Members discussed the need for a new CAEECC COI definition and suggested alignment with COI statements from other CPUC ED groups. Members also discussed the desire for IOU involvement in the development of said attestation.
* Next step: CAEECC Facilitation team with assistance from some Members to draft an attestation statement, including a Conflict of Interest definition, and present to Full CAEECC for review at the September Full CAEECC meeting.
  + Mike Campbell agreed to work with the CAEECC Facilitation team to draft a proposal. After the meeting, Dan Suyeyasu also volunteered to join the effort.

Details of Member Discussion:

* Mike Campbell: What is presented is okay if “conflict of interest” is defined.
* Vanessa Garcia, SDG&E: Is this proposal aligned to other CPUC ED groups' COI policy statements?
  + *Mike Campbell, CalPA: Participants of the Low-Income Oversight Board are invited based on their affiliation. Unsure what their COI statements might be.*
  + *Jonathan Raab, Raab Associates: Clarifying that this attestation is for non-CAEECC members to attest that they do not have a conflict of interest when joining the JEDI-focused WG.*
* Jenny Berg, BayREN: The last time the COI issue came up, there were roadblocks from IOUs, so participation from IOU organizations would be helpful in the development of this statement.
  + *Vanessa Garcia, SDG&E: Starting with a template would be helpful. Want to make sure CAEECC is evaluating possible third-party conflicts.*

***Public input on CDEI WG recommendations-implementing 1-2 before new WG launches***

Public Questions and Comments:

There were no questions or comments from the Public.

**SESSION 3: New Business Plan Dashboard Compensation Task Force Update**

Ely Jacobsohn, CPUC provided an Orientation to Energy Division’s Business Plan Tableau Dashboard. See *6.22.22 Full Quarterly CAEECC Mtg Draft Slides, slide 42,* posted to the meeting page as well as the more holistic full data set on *Energy Division Email Regarding Business Plan Tableau Dashboard (6.1.22)*.

**Summary of Member Questions and Comments:**

* Members discussed possible improvements and expansions to the dashboard with the CPUC

Member Questions and Comments:

* Sebastian Garza, SoCal Gas: Who should CAEECC Members contact if they notice a discrepancy?
  + *Ely Jacobsohn, CPUC: Not sure why there might be a discrepancy and that they should be minor if they exist. Please email Amy Reardon or Ely Jacobsohn, with questions or corrections.*
* Jenny Berg, BayREN: Will there be any overlay with the business plans once they are approved?
  + *Ely Jacobsohn, CPUC: Depends on CPUC resources and stakeholder needs.*

**CAEECC Planning and Next Steps**

***Co-Chair Transition***

Jonathan Raab presented a series of slides about the Co-Chair Transition. Lucy Morris, PG&E will take over the PA seat. Lara Ettenson, NRDC, wishes to continue but is on medical leave and requests Jenny Berg, BayREN, to be Lara’s proxy in the interim. See *6.22.22 Full Quarterly CAEECC Mtg Draft Slides, slides 45,* posted to the meeting page.

Members had no questions or concerns and the proposal was adopted.

***Facilitation Team Transition***

Katie Abrams presented a series of slides about the transition of the Facilitation Team and welcomed Michelle Vigen Ralston and Suhaila Sikand to introduce themselves. See *6.22.22 Full Quarterly CAEECC Mtg Draft Slides, slides 46-47,* posted to the meeting page. There were no questions or suggestions/comments.

***Updated Workplan***

Jonathan Raab presented the workplan for the remainder of 2022 plus 2023. Full CAEECC meeting (see slide 48 in *6.22.22 Full Quarterly CAEECC Mtg Draft Slides).*

* Ted Howard, SBUA: Want to acknowledge the work by the Underserved WG and the data gaps presented therein. Request for PAs to help close the gap.
  + *Nils Strindberg, CPUC ED: Another proceeding is addressing this*

***Topics for September Full CAEECC Meeting***

Jonathan Raab presented proposed topics for the September 15, 2022, Full CAEECC meeting. See *6.22.22 Full Quarterly CAEECC Mtg Draft Slides, slides 49,* posted to the meeting page*.*

* Christopher Malotte, SCE: Additional topics may arise based on the CPUC Scoping Memo on the Business Plans/4-Year Applications

***Meeting Evaluations***

Katie summarized the results from the 4/12 full CAEECC. See *6.22.22 Full Quarterly CAEECC Mtg Draft Slides, slides 50-51,* posted to the meeting page*.* She instructed all Members to fill out the CAEECC Evaluation for the June 22, 2022 meeting and encouraged other participants to do so as well. Evaluations are due within a week.

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

**CAEECC Members:**

* Fill out the CAEECC Evaluation of the meeting (as required by our CAEECC groundrules) no later than June 28, 2022, COB.
* CalPA and Code Cycle to work with CAEECC Facilitation staff to draft the revised COI attestation statement. If other CAEECC Members are interested in participating, please notify the Katie by July 7th.

**Facilitation Team:**

* **Compensation Task Force:**
  + Share relevant Member questions and feedback with Compensation Task Force
* **JEDI-Focused Working Group:**
  + Draft JEDI-focused WG Prospectus
* Implement CDEI WG Recommendation 1 (parts 1 and 2) in the JEDI-focused WG application (if/when Prospectus is approved)
* Work with Member volunteers to revise proposal for Conflict of Interest attestation for JEDI-focused WG (and future CAEEC WGs)
* **Meeting Facilitation:**
  + Develop, post and notice draft meeting summary (this document) to the meeting webpages by June 28, 2022, COB
  + Review and analyze survey evaluations of today’s Full CAEECC meeting for continuous improvement opportunities
  + Prepare for next Full CAEECC meeting on September 15– including adding agenda topics based on feedback from today’s meeting (slide 49 plus evolving scope of CAEECC, COI attestation proposal, and possibly topics stemming from the CPUC Scoping Memo on the Business Plans/4-year Applications)

**Appendix A: Meeting Attendees**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Attendance at 6.22.22 Full Quarterly CAEECC Meeting** | | |
| **CAEECC Members/Alternates** | | |
| **Organization** | **First Name** | **Last Name** |
| 3C-REN | Alejandra | Tellez |
| 3C-REN | Erica | Helson |
| BayREN | Jennifer | Berg |
| Cal Advocates | Mike | Campbell |
| CEDMC | Greg | Wikler |
| CEE | Alex | Lantsberg |
| CSE | Fabiola | Lao |
| Code Cycle | Dan | Suyeyasu |
| LGSEC | Demian | Hardman-Saldana |
| MCE | Alice | Havenar-Daughton |
| PG&E | Lucy | Morris |
| PG&E | Caroline | Massad Francis |
| RCEA | Stephen | Kullmann |
| SBUA | Ted | Howard |
| SCE | Christopher | Malotte |
| SDGE | Vanessa | Mapula Garcia |
| SMW Local 104 | Randy | Young |
| SMW Local 104 | David | Vincent |
| SoCalGas | Sebastian | Garza |
| SoCalREN | Lujuana | Medina |
| SoCalREN | Sheena | Tran |
| The Energy Coalition | Laurel | Rothschild |
| I-REN WRCOG | Benjamin | Druyon |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ex-Officio** | | |
| CPUC Energy Division | Ely | Jacobsohn |
| CPUC Energy Division | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Nils | Strindberg | | Strindberg |
| CPUC | Jen | Kalafut |
| CPUC | Yeshi | Lemma |
| CPUC | Jason | Symonds |
| CPUC | Christina | Torok |
| CPUC | Jesus | Torres |
| CPUC | Cheryl | Wynn |
| **Other Interested Stakeholders** | | |
| AMBAG | Amaury | Berteaud |
| Building Scientist | Alice | La Pierre |
| CAEATFA | Kaylee | D'Amico |
| Cadmus Group | Priya | Sathe |
| Common Spark | Suhaila | Sikand |
| Common Spark | Michelle | Vigen Ralston |
| CPUC | Elijah | Cohen |
| CPUC | Peter | Franzese |
| CPUC | Justin | Galle |
| CPUC | Mia | Hart |
| DNV | Cameron | Tuttle |
| Don Arambula Consulting | Don | Arambula |
| Energy Resources Integration | Eric | Noller |
| ESPLabs | Mike | Myser |
| Franklin Energy | Sabrina | Oudin |
| Franklin Energy | Michael | Romeo |
| Google Nest | Chad | Ihrig |
| High Sierra | Pam | Bold |
| ICF | Cody | Coeckelenbergh |
| Independent Consultant | Jennifer | Holmes |
| Lincus | Hob | Issa |
| Lincus | Patrick | Ngo |
| Mendota Group | Grey | Staples |
| MCE | Mad | Stano |
| MW Consulting | Mark | Wallenrod |
| Okapia Architecture | Jessica | Mack |
| Okapia Architecture | Ying | Wang |
| Opinion Dynamics | Sharyn | Barata |
| Opinion Dynamics | Bob | Ramirez |
| Pacific Corp | Nancy | Goddard |
| PG&E | Rachel | Allen |
| PG&E | Mananya | Chansanchai |
| PG&E | Robert | Marcial |
| PG&E | Angela | McDonald |
| SCE | Kellvin | Anaya |
| SCE | Jameel | Pueblos |
| SDGE | Merry | Sweeney |
| SEI | Stephanie | Doi |
| Silent Running | James | Dodenhoff |
| SoCalGas | Ali | Ahmad |
| SoCalGas | Kevin | Ehsani |
| SoCalGas | Halley | Fitzpatrick |
| SoCalREN | F | Chung |
| SoCalREN | Fernanda | Craig |
| Stop Waste | Jenny | Kauffman |
| The Energy Alliance Association | Ross | Colley |
| The Energy Coalition | Craig | Perkins |
| TRC Companies | Rosie | Kang |