

# Full Quarterly CAEECC Meeting #46 Summary

Date: Thursday May 8, 2025

Time: 11:30am - 3:45pm PT

On May 8, 2025, the California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee met for its forty-sixth quarterly meeting. The meeting was hosted both in-person (in San Francisco and Los Angeles) as well as online via Zoom. There were 92 attendees, including representatives from 22 CAEECC Member organizations and from three CAEECC Ex-Officio agencies as well as 59 Members of the Public (see [Appendix A](#) for a full list of meeting attendees). This meeting was facilitated by Katie Abrams (Birch Road Consulting), Michelle Vigen Ralston (Ralston) and Mahal Miles (Miles) of Common Spark Consulting, and supported by Susan Rivo (Rivo) of Raab Associates. Additional presenters included Coby Rudolph (Rudolph) and Pam Rittelmeyer (Rittelmeyer) of CPUC Energy Division; Stephanie Gutierrez (Gutierrez) of SDG&E; Jacqueline Gilyard Jones (Jones) of California Energy Commission; and Shelley N. Osborn (Osborn) of SoCalREN.

Supporting meeting materials are available at: <https://www.caeecc.org/5-8-2025>. Relevant materials include the Agenda, Slide Deck, OIR 25-04-010, and 2024 Annual Portfolio Performance Report Review Draft Agenda.

## Overview

### Key Meeting Takeaways:

- CAEECC Members and stakeholders engaged on policy and regulatory updates
- CAEECC Members completed Business Items including a recap of the Community Engagement Panel, prep for the Annual Performance Report Review, and deliberation of the Equity Advisory Committee (EAC) Scope of Work. EAC discussions centered on intentional design and development to support CAEECC, make appropriate use of ratepayer funds, and respect EAC member capacity.

### High-Level Summary of Next Steps:

- Co-Chairs and the CAEECC Facilitation Team will reflect on CAEECC Member feedback on the Equity Advisory Committee Scope of Work and Timeline to determine next steps.
- PAs will prepare for the Annual Performance Report Review Scheduled for August 5, 2025.

*This meeting summary is intended to capture the overarching discussion of ideas, concerns, alternative options for proposals and consensus; it is a high-level summary and not a transcript. For more detailed discussion, please reach out to the [Facilitation Team](#).*

Key acronyms used in this document include California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee (CAEECC), California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), Energy Division (ED), California Energy Commission (CEC), California Air Resources Board (CARB), energy efficiency (EE), working group (WG), disadvantaged communities (DAC) and hard-to-reach (HTR) communities, justice equity diversity and inclusion (JEDI), CPUC's Environmental and Social Justice Action Plan (ESJ Action Plan), Portfolio Administrator (PA), Investor-owned utilities (IOU), Regional Energy Network (REN), community-based organization (CBO), market transformation (MT), Equity Metrics Working Group (EMWG), Market Support Metrics Working Group (MSMWG), evaluation measurement and verification (EM&V), Ordering Paragraph (OP), Disadvantaged Communities Advisory Group (DACAG), Low-Income Oversight Board (LIOB), Evolving CAEECC Working Group (ECWG), Compensation Task Force (Compensation TF), and Mid-Cycle Advice Letters (MCALs).

## **Welcome and Background**

*Slides 1-14*

Ralston presented the meeting objectives, which included: (1) Engage on policy and regulatory updates and (2) Complete CAEECC Business items.

Miles provided general reminders, Zoom etiquette, and meeting logistics. To encourage a space of inclusion, Miles also reviewed Groundrules and Proposed Meeting Norms.

Abrams shared a CAEECC Membership Update: Ely Jacobsohn, a long-time CPUC Ex Officio CAEECC representative, is moving to Commissioner Houck's office as an advisor for the next 7-24 months in total.

## **Policy, Regulatory & Legislative Updates**

*Slides 15 - 25*

### **CPUC Energy Division Staff Updates**

*Slide 18*

Pamela Rittelmeyer and Coby Rudolph (CPUC Energy Division) provided updates on Application templates for the 2028-31 EE Business Plan Cycle, Indicators and Common Metrics Draft Resolution, the California State Audit, and evaluations currently out for comment. Rudolph shared an update on the EE Rulemaking next steps.

### **CAEECC Member Discussion on Policy, Regulatory & Legislative Updates**

- A Member requested more information on progress reports relating to the CPUC response to the California State Audit. Rudolph [shared a link to the State Auditor's website](#), noting that the CPUC would provide an update in 60 days, and then another in 6 months.
- Rudolph clarified that the Application templates for the 2028-31 EE Business Plan Cycle are an 8-year plan with a 4-year budget spending authorization.
- Jon Taffel (CPUC Energy Division) shared that the CPUC is working on the report under AB3264 by pulling from publicly available data from 2021-2023. The CPUC Energy Division may have small clarifying questions for PAs, such as how many Home Energy Reports were sent out, but do not anticipate large data requests of PAs at this time.
- A Member requested general feedback from CPUC Energy Division on the California State Audit, expressing interest in recommendations regarding EE programs, corrective actions, cost effectiveness or energy savings goals. Rudolph acknowledged that most specific recommendations in the Audit were responded with CPUC agreement to take remediation action. Rudolph reiterated that CPUC staff cannot guarantee specific outcomes, as decisions on certain matters are ultimately made by commissioners and judges. The Public Utilities Commission (PUC) has the authority to initiate proceedings to examine particular issues, either independently or within the scope of existing proceedings.
- Members expressed interest in including CAEECC in the EE OIR scope, with several planning to comment or provide space for discussion.

## Process Update on Equity & Market Support Goals

*Slides 22 - 24*

Stephanie Gutierrez (SDG&E) presented a process update on Equity & Market Support Goals. The update included context on the relevant Decision's Ordering Paragraphs ([D. 23-06-055](#), Ordering Paragraphs 11 and 25) and SDG&E's role in collaborating with PAs.

### CAEECC Member Discussion on Process Update on Equity & Market Support Goals

- A Member of Energy Division requested context on efforts related to OP 25, and Gutierrez clarified that most of the work, including goal-setting and study requirements, has already been completed.

## CAEECC Business Items

*Slides 28 - 44*

### Recap of Community Engagement Panel held on April 9, 2025

*Slides 28 - 31*

Miles shared a high-level summary of the [Community Engagement Panel](#), hosted by CAEECC on April 9, 2025. Panelists at the Community Engagement Panel included Julia Hatton (Hatton) of [Rising Sun Center for Opportunity](#), Brooke Wright (Wright) of

[Environmental Innovations](#), and Sarah Sharpe (Sharpe) of [Central California Asthma Collaborative](#).

## **Prep for Annual Performance Report Review Scheduled for August 5**

*Slides 32-36*

Abrams provided background on the purpose of the Annual Performance Report Review, including goals. Additionally, Abrams presented the draft agenda for the August 5, 2025 meeting.

### **CAEECC Member Discussion on August 5 Annual Performance Report Review**

- A Member questioned whether newer RENs should be on the agenda or included under performance reviews, and a CAEECC Co-Chair clarified that the plan is for the Facilitator to present 1-2 summary slides—prepared in coordination with CCREN, SDREN, and NREN—highlighting 2024 activities, with feedback welcomed on the approach.

## **Draft Equity Advisory Committee Scope of Work & Timeline**

*Slides 37 - 44*

At the meeting, Abrams summarized the Equity Advisory Committee (EAC) Scope of Work (SOW) redline feedback provided by Members a week before the meeting. Abrams introduced the following discussion prompts which loosely guided the robust conversation on EAC:

1. Given the new proceeding and the forthcoming guidance to PAs for the next EE portfolio, should we include a task to advise on what should be included in that guidance (assuming it would come out before the end of this pilot)?
2. Is 3-5 people the appropriate number of people for the EAC?
3. Should the EAC develop a best practice checklist (assuming one doesn't already exist)? Would that be helpful for CAEECC Members?

### **Summary of CAEECC Member Discussion on Draft Equity Advisory Committee SOW**

- **Clarify and narrow EAC scope:** avoid reviewing full PA Applications; focus on defining and advising on equity best practices, potentially through checklists or consultation on equity portions only. Consider allowing EAC members to help shape specific scope within defined boundaries.
- **Consider compensation model and safeguards:** since EAC input may be funded through dratepayer dollars, include spending caps, clarify conflict-of-interest policies, and explore co-funding agreements from multiple PAs to reduce bias and increase transparency.
- **Set realistic timeline expectations:** feedback incorporation is unlikely for this Business Application cycle; shift to longer-term influence, possibly mirroring PPRR for pre-review and stakeholder preparation.

- **Ensure fair and diverse representation:** without compensation, EAC may skew toward current EE ecosystem members; to broaden reach, revisit eligibility criteria and explore external funding avenues (e.g., CPUC community grants) for equity-centered orgs.
- **Revisit group size and purpose:** scope should inform EAC size; while 3–5 members keeps the group focused, a larger group of up to 10 would better reflect diverse, place-based equity issues. Clarify overarching goals (e.g., equity program effectiveness, metrics) to guide structure.

For details, [see Appendix B](#).

Abrams summarized that the next step is for CAEECC Co-Chairs and Energy Division to make a plan for how to incorporate feedback and ultimately determine next steps.

## Main Assembly Wrap Up

*Slides 45 - 51*

Ralston provided reminders on 2025 meeting dates and shared the Q3 Full CAEECC Meeting Proposed Topics.

### CAEECC Member Discussion on Q3 Full CAEECC Meeting Proposed Topics

- A Member of Energy Division questioned whether the Q4 CAEECC meeting would include discussion on PA application formal consultation. Risley (SDG&E) cited [D.21-05-031](#), which requires PAs to conduct formal consultations: PAs present and receive feedback which may trigger a change.

For meeting participants unable to attend the 4pm tribute, Coby Rudolph (CPUC Energy Division) shared closing remarks about Nils Strindberg, who was a long-time CAEECC Ex-Officio representative at the CPUC and passed away in March, 2025.

## Optional Assembly

*Slides 55 - 92*

### CPUC NEBs and CEC NEIs

*Slides 55 - 73*

Pam Rittelmeyer (CPUC Energy Division) provided a brief overview of the non-energy benefits (NEB) study, authorized in [D. 23-06-055](#), due on October 1, 2026. The study development process included a working group including 42 members, culminating in SoCalGas' AL 6-3-3-8G to the CPUC in July 2024. The study is in its early phase, with plans to reconvene the working group quarterly throughout the duration of the study.

Jacqueline Gilyard Jones (CEC) described the landscape of non-energy impacts (NEIs) in CEC's programs, including the CEC's role, how NEIs are currently used, and the plan for NEIs.

### **CAEECC Member Discussion on CPUC NEBs and CEC NEIs**

- A Member asked for more information on the timeline for the CPUC vs. CEC on the programs side, including how NEBs and NEIs intersect. Jones clarified that the CEC's NEI Order Instituting Informational Proceeding (OIIP) is focused on CEC products with respect to implementation, while [Senate Bill 100](#) will include agency collaboration, with NEIs incorporated into that.
- A Member requested examples on how to integrate NEIs into the resource planning process. Jones shared that NEI incorporation into processes is likely to start with reliability planning, potentially moving NEIs into the Integrated Energy Policy Report (IEPR). Specifically, Jones gave an example of NEIs with land use: parameters such as screen and analysis, constrains the environmental impacts in the assessment or, climate change: weather is variable, impacts of wildfires.
- A Member raised key economic concepts such as the social discount rate in net value analysis, asking whether the CEC is taking steps to lower the discount rate to better reflect intergenerational impacts. Jones hypothesized that the CEC will probably include several discount rates, and they will likely use 2-3 different discount rates in assessment to compare what is most appropriate.

### **Community Based Design Collaborative**

*Slides 74- 92*

Shelley Osborn (SoCalREN) discussed the Community Based Design Collaborative, its collaborative roles and responsibilities, regions represented and their environmental concerns, collaborative engagement and process, program milestones and timelines, collaborative to-date, and next steps.

### **CAEECC Member Discussion on Community Based Design Collaborative**

- *A Member of CAEECC, Lara Ettenson, asked the following via Zoom Chat: Question (I don't need to come off mute) - wondering if these CBOs overlap with ESAP CBOs?*
  - *After the meeting, Shelley Osborn provided the following reply via Email: The best we can tell there is no overlap between the working group we believe Lara is referring to and the CBDC.*

### **Gathering in Honor of Nils Strindberg**

Dozens of friends and colleagues gathered in person and remotely to honor the life and legacy of Nils Strindberg, who died in March 2025. Nils spent many years at the CPUC and most recently worked at Resource Innovations. He served as the CAEECC Ex-Officio

representative for several years. He was a dedicated, well-respected, and model public servant, and has left an enduring mark on energy efficiency. Rest in peace, Nils.

## Appendix A: Attendees

Organization	Name
<b>CAEECC Members</b>	
3C-REN	Alejandra Tellez
BayREN	Jane Elias
CodeCycle	Dan Suyeyasu
CCRREN	Jordan Garbayo
CSE	Rocky Fernandez
Frontier Energy	Nancy Barba
I-REN	Benjamin Druyon
LGSEC	Amaury Berteaud
MCE	Alice Havenar-Daughton
NRDC	Lara Ettenson
Northern Rural Energy Network (NREN)	Stephen Kullmann
PG&E	Lisa Hunter
SBUA	Ted Howard
SCE	Jessica Lau
SDG&E	Stacie Risley
SDREN	Aisha Cervantes-Cissna
SF Dept of the Environment	Lowell Chu
SJVCEO	Courtney Blore
SMW Local 104	David Vincent
SoCalGas	Roy Christian
SoCalREN	Shelly Osborn/Fernanda Craig
The Energy Coalition	Laurel Rothschild
<b>Ex-Officio</b>	
CARB	Emma Tome
CEC	Kristina Duloglo
CEC	Jacqueline Jones
CPUC	Coby Rudoph
CPUC	Pam Rittelmeyer
CPUC	Jessie Levine

CPUC	Gillian Weaver
CPUC	Jon Taffel
CPUC	George Tagnipe
CPUC	Ely Jacobsohn
<b>Other Interested Stakeholders</b>	
3C-REN	Erica Helson
A LaBonte (Alba)	Alison LaBonte
Brandt Energy Strategies (for CCRREN)	Melissa Brandt
CalMTA	Stacey Hobart
CalMTA/Resource Innovations	Rachel Good
Cascade Energy	Emily Lange
City of Berkeley	Alice LaPierre
CLEAResult	Matt Clark
CPUC	Peter Franzese
CPUC	Emily Pelstring
CPUC	Kapil Kulkarni
CPUC	Valerie Kao
DAC	Don Arambula
DNV	Nick Brod
Ecology Action	Andrew Guerra
Ecology Action	Lore James
Energy Solutions	Chris Burmester
Frontier Energy	Margaret Marchant
FS Consulting	Frank Spasaro
Future Energy Enterprises	Arlis Reynolds
GoGreen Financing	Bill Heberger
Grounded Research	Jenn Mitchell-Jackson
Grounded Research	Mary Sutter
Guidehouse	Gabriel Stelmack
IEc	Cynthia Manson
Illume	Emily Morris
LEI	Susan Davison
Lincus	Patrick Ngo
MCE	Wade Stano
MCE	Quashaun Vallery
MW Consulting	Mark Wallenrod
NREN	Patricia Terry
NREN/RCEA	Sam Smith

Peninsula Clean Energy	Jana Kopyciok-Lande
Peninsula Clean Energy	Shelby Bush
Peninsula Clean Energy	Matthew Rutherford
PG&E	Lindsey Tillisch
PG&E	Sebastien Csapo
Public Advocate's Office	Andy Zhang
Resource Innovations	Nick Fiore
Resource Innovations	Kimberly Rodriguez
Rising Sun Opportunities	Julia Hatton
SCE	Christopher Malotte
SCE	Becky Mandich
SCE	Larry Tabizon
Schneider Electric	Kevin Lugo
SDG&E	Stephanie Gutierrez
SDG&E	DeDe Henry
SEI	Jake Pollack
Silent Running LLC	James Dodenhoff
SoCalGas	Laura Verduzco
SoCalREN	Tessa Cherofsky
SVCE	Joey Lande
The Energy Coalition	Marc Costa
The Energy Coalition	Natalie Espinoza
The Energy Coalition	Rebecca Hausheer
The Energy Coalition	Craig Perkins
Tierra Resource Consultants	Matthew Joyce
Tierra Resource Consultants	Nicholas Snyder
Tierra Resource Consultants	Shannon White
Willdan	Rosalie Deliz
Willdan	Jeanne Huntsman
Willdan	Rosie Kang
Yinsight	Carol Yin

## Appendix B: Detailed Discussion on Draft Equity Advisory Committee Scope of Work & Timeline

### Timing

- A Member asked if it would be useful to discuss potential guidance for PAs in the next EE portfolio. A Member of Energy Division noted the EE OIR may lead to a formal or informal direction, similar to the 2021 decision. Abrams questioned if this timing aligned for the EAC proposed timeline. A Member noted that with the first meeting not until Q3 and PA Applications due in February, the timeline may be too tight for meaningful feedback. Another Member noted that while using EAC to advise on portfolio proposals was possible, expecting incorporation into proposals would be ambitious, especially regarding portfolio and program strategy.
- A Member suggested that EAC members provide input to equity-related portions of portfolio plans, such as through 1:1 tailored meetings.
- A Member questioned whether there was a Joint Business Plan presentation at CAEECC during the last cycle and how that might be handled this year, including the overall consultation and public input process. Members could not recall the exact format, but noted that PAs did not need to coordinate proposals and typically aligned on presentation content, similar to the Annual Performance Plan process. A Member suggested a shift toward sharing information in advance—mirroring the PPRR process—to allow stakeholders to prepare questions and avoid lengthy presentations, balancing transparency with not overburdening the PAs.

### Compensation

- A Member recommended funding for EAC Members, emphasizing that EAC Members will likely be paid through ratepayer funds, and 1:1 consultations would accrue many hours of time and thus ratepayer dollars. Abrams clarified that while the SOW states that EAC members will not be compensated by CAEECC, it is important to consider that the individuals who volunteer for this role, such as consultants to PAs, may require compensation through other means, potentially funded by ratepayer dollars. Abrams affirmed that the SOW should be mindful of these considerations when outlining expectations.
- A Member of the Energy Division asked if there is any sense of how much EAC compensation might cost, as this would likely influence discussions on potential funding sources. Abrams pointed to SOW determining compensation.
- A Member of Energy Division referenced a section in the SOW that states “No compensation is available through CAEECC at this time, although there may be compensation through other sources such as CPUC community grants”, noting that the compensation mechanism is not definitive in the SOW.

### Composition

- A Member stated that if EAC is not being compensated, scope needs to be reasonable. Another Member acknowledged that without offering compensation, the EAC would likely comprise individuals from the current EE network, as opposed to a broader group of Equity representatives.
- A Member noted that the Compensation Pilot funding required a decision from an Administrative Law Judge to access ratepayer funds, suggesting that CAEECC may face a similar process, potentially raising optics issues given that affordability is a priority.
- A Member of the Public provided input on cost of the EAC, noting that if the number of members is capped at 3-5 people, this could translate to a more significant workload as opposed to if the EAC is larger and the workload is diffuse.
- A Member echoed that the scope of the EAC would determine the appropriate number of EAC members. Another Member supports the 3-5 number of participants during the pilot to keep the group focused, noting that when groups get too big, it is harder to hear different view points.
- A Member of the Public stated that 3 EAC members may be insufficient, but 5 could be adequate depending on the scope. The Member of the Public clarified that 5-10 members would be sufficient, regardless of the scope's intensity, emphasizing that equity work is place-based and involves various dimensions, including the lived experiences of individuals from diverse areas such as Oakland or rural communities.

### EAC Eligibility

- A Member of the Public noted that with the criteria of knowledge of CAEECC and the California EE industry as eligibility requirements, many folks applying to the EAC would already be implementing or part of the CAEECC ecosystem. The Member of the Public expressed that if the EAC eligibility were open, a number of climate and Environmental Justice collaboratives that have access to external funding sources might be interested in engaging these topics, especially given the focus of affordability.
- A Member stated that it would be challenging to identify EAC members who could represent the full range of equity concerns across the state, expressing concern that certain segments or issues might be overlooked, giving a false impression of fully addressing equity.
- A Member raised concerns about the EAC's potential association with a single PA, emphasizing that the EAC should ideally function as an independent equity expert. Additionally, the Member highlighted the high cost of experts and inquired whether the SOW includes any provisions on conflicts of interest, spending limits, or other boundaries. On the note of Conflict of Interest, another Member opined that it makes more sense for PAs to contribute to a fund that would pay for EAC participation, rather than individual PAs hiring folks to represent them in the EAC.

### Scope

- A Member of the Energy Division stated that given workload and number of PAs, it would be difficult to justify the EAC reviewing applications or complete sets of applications, including those for equity segment programs; the Energy Division has authorized funding already to contract for consulting services to support Energy Division analysis of applications. Abrams validated this comment, raising that another idea was to have the EAC create best practice checklists.
- A Member asked what specific issue the EAC is trying to address, such as whether the various definitions of equity need to be unified, or evaluation/metrics of PA equity programs.
- A Member of Energy Division inquired whether Energy Division staff or PAs could assist by providing legwork, such as summarizing the contents of applications and equity segment content, to serve as a resource for the EAC.
- A CAEECC Co-Chair clarified that reviewing and providing feedback on PA Applications is intentionally not included in the SOW in order to focus the scope (especially recognizing the lack of compensation).
- A Member shared that people on committees such as the EAC often prefer to have a say on what they should be doing, questioning if there needs to be space left in the SOW for the committee to make decisions on scope, within reason.
- Members stated that the EAC feels nebulous, questioning the problem the EAC is trying to solve. A Member observed that CAEECC may have approved the EAC without fully considering its purpose and suggested a revote, noting the discussion lacks clear direction and questioning its overall usefulness. A Member noted that EAC discussion began before CAEECC knew about the State Audit, EE proceeding closing, and more.
- A Member observed a lot of confusion and different perspectives across CAEECC, recommending that it would be good to reflect on the clear overarching goal of the EAC, such as “Are equity programs successful, and how do you measure that? How much follow-up is there? Can we quantify that? Are these programs effective and how do you improve them? Which ones do you drop? Which ones do you grow?”.
  - *A Member of CAEECC, Stacie Risley, shared the following via Zoom Chat in response to this comment: There is work being done on MS&E goals which is looking into what you're describing Ted. OP 25 Advice Letter :)*
- A Member of the Public emphasized that delays since the Evolving CAEECC Working Group’s recommendations are difficult for communities needing urgent support, and suggested the EAC begin by defining its role and establishing best practices for equity program design and engagement.
- A CAEECC Co-Chair acknowledged the lengthy process and noted that returning to the drawing board would cause further delays, expressing concern that with so many competing perspectives, the EAC may not deliver the intended outcome, and asked whether the group should move forward using today’s feedback or revisit the decision with a vote.
- A Member referenced the comments on EAC scope narrowing to best practices. A CAEECC Co-Chair referenced the first line of the draft SOW, “During the

2025-2026 pilot, the EAC will focus on advising Portfolio Administrators and Energy Division on Equity Best Practices”.