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# Executive Summary

The following document proposes recommendations to establish a pilot compensation program for historically underrepresented stakeholders to engage and participate in the upcoming Justice-, Equity-, Diversity-, and Inclusion-focused (JEDI-focused) Working Group (WG) of the California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee (CAEECC). The Compensation Task Force (Compensation TF, Task Force), a committee of CAEECC, was tasked to develop these recommendations for the Compensation Pilot (Pilot). The purpose of this Task Force is based upon the work of the Composition, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (CDEI) WG and the vision within the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) Environmental and Social Justice (ESJ) Action Plan to create an accessible, accepting environment that better includes and considers the perspectives of underrepresented communities in the work of CAEECC.

Through a series of four meetings over five months, the Task Force developed these consensus-based recommendations to shape and launch the Compensation Pilot:

**Guiding Principles:** The Task Force proposes a set of Principles, Intentions and Eligibility Criteria that identifies why, how, and for whom this Pilot is intended for.

**Funding Source, Amount, and Allowable Costs:** The Task Force recommends the use of Energy Efficiency Budget Funds for the Compensation Pilot. It will be requesting, through a related motion, that IOU Program Administrators may collectively allocate $175,000 of Energy Efficiency Budget Funds to the CAEECC budget for the Compensation Pilot.

**Administration:** The Task Force recommends that administration, distribution, and oversight of the Pilot would be entrusted to the CAEECC Facilitation Team as part of the facilitation contract (facilitation contract currently held by PG&E).

**Recruitment:** In order to raise awareness of the Pilot, the Task Force recommends implementation of a recruitment strategy once the funds are authorized for the Pilot, and that recruitment for the JEDI-focused WG be done in conjunction.

**Application for Compensation:** The Task Force recommends that the application for compensation through the Pilot be integrated into the JEDI-focused WG Member Application to provide ease of use and simplicity. The Task Force offers a standalone example of an application and recommends it be integrated into the eventual JEDI-focused WG Member Application. The Task Force also recommends an ongoing first-come, first-serve basis for application review and acceptance.

**Pilot Evaluation:** The Task Force recognizes that evaluation of the Pilot will be necessary to measure success and determine if the Pilot can and should be replicated in other CAEECC and/or CPUC settings. This report outlines recommended evaluation criteria, additional data, and data-not-to-be-measured to evaluate the objectives of the Pilot.

*This Task Force encourages CAEECC to adopt the recommendations as presented herein and support the filing of a Motion by SoCalREN (who volunteered to file the motion) to request the CPUC to authorize use of funds for the purposes of this Compensation Pilot. The Motion will also ask that subsequent requests for funds to be used for similar compensation purposes be made via an Advice Letter.*

# Introduction

This report summarizes the discussions and outcomes of the Compensation Task Force, a sub-committee within the California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee (CAEECC). The recommendations described herein are presented for Member review by CAEECC and will be the basis for a Motion for funding authorization by the CPUC.

**Key definitions**

* **Administrator**: the entity that will implement the Pilot and its funding distribution process (distinct from EE Program Administrator)
* **California Public Utilities Commission’s (CPUC)**: The state agency regulating privately owned electric, natural gas, telecommunications, water, railroad, rail transit, and passenger transportation companies
* **California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee (CAEECC)**: a CPUC-formed stakeholder group for the proceeding R.13-11-005.
* **Compensation Task Force (Compensation TF, Task Force)**: the subcommittee of CAEECC that developed this report.
* **Compensation Pilot (Pilot)**: a pilot to compensate future members of the JEDI-focused WG who identify as historically underrepresented in CAEECC.
* **Composition, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Working Group** (CDEI WG): a previous subcommittee of CAEECC that initially proposed a compensation model be available for all applicable CAEECC activities.
* **Energy Efficiency (EE) Budget Funds**: funds from Public Purpose Programs Charge (PPPC) Public Benefits Charge allocated for energy efficiency (EE) programs administered by IOU, REN and CCA Program Administrators.
* **ESJ Community**: a California Public Utilities Commission’s (CPUC) defined term through the Environmental and Social Justice Action Plan (ESJ Action Plan).[[1]](#footnote-0) It is the intent of the Compensation Task Force to use the most up-to-date and inclusive definition.
* **JEDI-focused WG**[[2]](#footnote-1) (Justice-, Equity-, Diversity-, and Inclusion-focused): a future subcommittee of CAEECC that will focus on ways to bring justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion to all CAEECC systems and activities.
* **Pilot applicant**: an individual/organization who applies for the Compensation Pilot
* **Pilot recipient**: an individual/organization who is granted and awarded compensation through the Pilot

| **“Environmental and Social Justice Communities” or “ESJ Communities”** are identified as those where residents are:* Predominantly communities of color or low-income;
* Underrepresented in the policy setting or decision-making process;
* Subject to a disproportionate impact from one or more environmental hazards; and
* Likely to experience disparate implementation of environmental regulations and socio-economic investments in their communities.

These communities also include, but are not limited to:* Disadvantaged Communities (Defined as census tracts that score in the top 25% of CalEnviroScreen 3.0, along with those that score within the highest 5% of CalEnviroScreen 3.0's Pollution Burden but do not receive an overall CalEnviroScreen score);
* All Tribal lands;
* Low-income households (Defined as household incomes below 80 percent of the area median income); and
* Low-income census tracts (Defined as census tracts where aggregated household incomes are less than 80 percent of area or state median income).

Note: the new version of CalEnviroScreen (4.0) will result in an updated definition of Disadvantaged Communities which will further expand the definition of ESJ Communities. The Compensation Task Force intends to use the most up-to-date and inclusive definition, and to the extent possible, consider all forms of underrepresentation, such as individuals with special Access and Functional Needs and other medical vulnerabilities.  |
| --- |

# Background

The Compensation Task Force (Compensation TF, Task Force) was created within an effort to diversify and create an inclusive community in the California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee (CAEECC). In April 2022, through the recommendation of the [Composition, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Working Group (CDEI WG)](https://www.caeecc.org/cdei-working-group), CAEECC Members approved the establishment of a Task Force to further explore a compensation process, and pilot, for the future JEDI-focused Working Group.

In order to align with the California Public Utilities Commission’s (CPUC) Environmental and Social Justice Action Plan (ESJ Action Plan)[[3]](#footnote-2), CAEECC is seeking mechanisms to establish a more diverse, inclusive, and welcoming stakeholder group and process. Members of the previous CDEI WG identified the challenges to invite groups and individuals to participate who have historically been an underrepresented[[4]](#footnote-3) part of CAEECC. These challenges include the time-intensive nature of CAEECC’s activities and the lack of available staff capacity to engage. While the CDEI WG proposed in the CDEI WG Final Report *(see* [*CDEI WG Webpage*](https://www.caeecc.org/cdei-working-group)*)* a model to compensate organizations or individuals who have been historically underrepresented throughout all CAEECC activities, CAEECC voted to pursue a Compensation Pilot for the to-be-established JEDI-focused WG to test out the process. The Compensation TF is tasked with developing the scope of the Compensation Pilot. Moreover, the Task Force recognizes that compensation may be needed for key prospective stakeholders of the JEDI-focused WG to participate and engage in its activities. **The Compensation TF outlines below a process to launch, administer, and evaluate a Compensation Pilot.**

The Compensation Pilot envisioned herein is focused on compensation solely for the JEDI-focused WG, however, its framework and certain aspects may be applicable to future or parallel compensation programs.

The Compensation TF met four times over the course of five months (June 2022 - October 2022). Task Force members were expected to attend all meetings and complete all homework assignments. A breakdown of each meeting objective and homework assignment is outlined below (*see the Compensation TF Webpage for more information on the Task Force and its members and full Meeting Summaries)*:

* **Pre-Work**: Review Task Force Scope of Work and Charge; and review CDEI WG Final Report
* **Meeting #1:** Review Task Force Scope of Work and Charge; review compensation context from CDEI WG; and brainstorm initial recommendations
	+ **Key Outcome(s):** A modified scope to focus solely on the JEDI-focused WG.
* **Homework #1:** Ideate Principles, Intentions, and Eligibility Criteria (PIE)
* **Meeting #2:** Adopt a set of PIE for compensation; prioritize possible funding sources; determine critical questions for compensation funding implementation processes
	+ **Key Outcome(s):** An initial set of PIE; agreement to use Energy Efficiency (EE) Budget Funds
* **Homework #2:** Review Draft Application Sample, Application Review Process, Recruitment Strategies, Evaluation and Metrics; review PIE; and discuss pathways to unlock authorization for EE Budget Funds
* **Meeting #3:** Present pathway to unlock EE Budget Funds; adopt finalized PIE; and discuss Draft Recommendations
	+ **Key Outcome(s):** Facilitators to draft the Final Report for review by the Task Force; PIE adopted
* **Homework #3:** Review Draft Final Report
* **Meeting #4:** Finalize Final Report
	+ **Key Outcome(s):** Finalized Final Report

# Next Steps

Upon the formal adoption by CAEECC of the recommendations of the Compensation Task Force as provided in this report, a Motion to authorize the use of Energy Efficiency Budget Funds for this Compensation Pilot will be filed.

The following graphic is meant to show the sequencing of events following the granting of the Motion authorizing funding *(note, graphic is not to scale)*.



# Recommendations

Unless otherwise indicated, the following recommendations represent consensus-based outcomes from the Task Force.

## A. Principles, Intentions, and Eligibility Criteria

In an effort to ground the Pilot to its mission and purpose, the Compensation TF created a set of Principles, Intentions, and Eligibility Criteria (PIE). The Principles and Intentions are meant to be the guideposts for the Pilot, identifying why, how, and for whom this Pilot is intended to serve. They are based upon the work of the CDEI WG and the CPUC ESJ Action Plan vision to create an accessible, accepting environment that better includes and considers the perspectives of underrepresented communities regulatory policymaking and stakeholder engagement broadly speaking.

The Eligibility Criteria are meant to provide funding as a means of removing a critical barrier to participation, and at the same time, provide a flexible and accessible process to apply for and receive compensation so as to not discourage and thereby discourage prospective applicants. The Principles, Intentions, and Eligibility Criteria will be used by the Application Review Team for the review of the applications (see [Application Review Process Recommendations](#_6tml3r17qgwp) for more information).

**A.1 Principles, Intentions, and Eligibility Criteria Recommendation #1:** The Compensation TF recommends the following Principles, Intentions, and Eligibility Criteria be adopted in their entirety to guide the design and implementation of the Compensation Pilot.

| **Principles (Version 2)**1. Keep it simple to administer and operationalize.
2. Make it flexible (both in terms of access and process for reimbursement).
3. Be open to and value diverse skill sets, including lived/living experiences.
4. Strive for scalability and learning (through evaluation) for the whole of CAEECC.
5. Be empathetic to existing barriers for participation in CAEECC and identify easy-entry, accessible solutions.
6. Compensate for pre- and post-meeting work, and time that is spent on CAEECC-related activities, based on past CAEECC norms for pre and post-meeting work.
7. Both individuals and representatives of organizations may apply. It is important that it is clear whether someone is representing themselves, or whether they are a representative on behalf of an organization (e.g. Community-Based Organization). Eligibility rules might be tailored differently for individuals and organizations.
 |
| --- |

| **Intentions (Version 2)**1. Provide compensation to organizations/individuals who present financial need as a barrier to meaningful participation and contribution to CAEECC
2. Allow organizations/individuals to self-determine their financial need for compensation. Applicants will need to demonstrate financial need, but should have flexibility in how to document and demonstrate financial need.
	1. Documentation for application and upon disbursement of funds needs to be sufficient to meet fiscal reporting requirements by the PAs contributing funds from their budgets, and according to any CPUC requirements on pilot funds.\*
3. Compensate at a standardized rate for each individual/organization that considers value of time, subject matter expertise (including lived and living experience and perspective) for a specified duration of activity, e.g., for the duration of a Working Group process/defined series of meetings.
	1. Recognize that some individuals may require financial support including but not limited to lodging, travel, food, family-care.\*\*
4. Not requiring baseline knowledge of energy efficiency to participate in the JEDI-related WG compensation program; however, applying participants are encouraged to review background information EE (self-guided orientation through resources provided) and the CAEECC orientation in order to support meaningful participation.

*\* Documentation will depend on funding source requirements. Since participation may manifest in different ways (i.e., active participation, verbal comments, or silently learning and contributing via homework) documentation of contribution should be broad and flexible. Consider the use of polls, and other opportunities to document a base level of participation.**\*\* self-defined family care* |
| --- |

| **Eligibility Criteria (Version 2)**Applicants must meet all three of the following criteria:1. Individuals/organizations that can bring historically underrepresented perspectives, specifically those of DAC, ESJ Communities, LI households, LI communities/census tracts, tribal lands, HTR customers, and those with “lived experience” to inform the justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion principles of CAEECC. This intention does not require an individual be formally engaged in an organization that does this work, only that they can contribute such perspectives
2. Individuals/organizations have a demonstrated financial need in order to meaningfully participate. E.g. Participation would expose the individual/organization to financial hardship.
3. Individuals/organizations are committed to a WG or stated engagement process and make meaningful contribution(s). Standard expectations of commitment and proxy representation apply.
 |
| --- |

## B. Funding Source, Amount, and Reimbursable Costs

The Compensation TF, after deliberate conversations about funding for the Compensation Pilot (*see Meeting #2 Summary in* [*Appendix G*](#_onurw9rl2cb3)*)*, voted to pursue the use of existing EE Budget Funds already authorized by the CPUC for the IOU, REN, and CCA PA’s EE portfolios. The Task Force based this recommendation on the perceived appropriateness of the use of these funds, the timely and ease of access to these funds compared to grants or legislative allocations, and the ability to leverage the existing CAEECC facilitation contract, which is also funded through the EE budget.

While the Commission has authorized EE funds for CAEECC facilitation[[5]](#footnote-4) and provide for the “minimum needed to hire a facilitator and conduct meetings to cover the scope of work outlined,” it is the interpretation of the IOUs and Energy Division staff that that authorization will not support use of funds for compensating individuals to participate in CAEECC activities. As such, the Compensation Pilot will require specific authorization to use EE Budget Funds for the purposes of this Pilot by the Commission. Budget authorizations require a regulatory process that allows for stakeholder input, such as a Motion for a Ruling (which includes a comment period) or the development of a record ahead of a Decision.

**B.1 Funding Recommendation #1 | Funding Authorization:** On behalf of the Compensation TF, SoCalREN shall submit a Motion (*see* [*Appendix A: Motion Outline*](#_npsprfb2r85b)*)* to R.13-11-005 requesting authorization from the CPUC to use EE Budget Funds for the Compensation Pilot and will reference this Final Report to outline the oversight, administration, distribution, recruitment and evaluation of the Pilot. This Motion shall be submitted within 30 days of the approval of the recommendations within this report by CAEECC.

**B.2 Funding Recommendation #2 | Funding Amount:** The Task Force requests $175,000 to fund the Compensation Pilot for 2022-2023. This would allow approximately 10 recipients of compensation for a Working Group process, which includes up to 6 Working Group meetings and including attendance at up to 2 Full Quarterly CAEECC meetings and 1 ad hoc workshop or additional meeting. The full assumptions are documented in the Budget Estimation (*see* [*Appendix B: Budget Proposal*](#_7jqvsjlooeq)). Actual number of participants will depend on the final Work Group process, time required, and actual funding needed per participant.

**B.3 Funding Recommendation #3 | Reimbursable Costs:** In addition to time compensation, reimbursement of documented costs that are directly in support of participation in the Working Group shall also be considered reimbursable. The categorized costs below are meant to be *illustrative*, and actual reimbursement will require approval of the Administrator of the Compensation Pilot[[6]](#footnote-5):

* Travel costs, such as airfare, lodging, meals, mileage, parking.
* Self-determined family or childcare costs
* Medical or disability accommodation, if accommodation is unable to be provided by the Working Group
* Other direct and incremental expenses associated with in-person or virtual participation

## C. Administration

The following reflects consensus recommendations from the Task Force regarding the administration and oversight of the Pilot.

### C.1 Administration

**C.1.1 Administration Recommendation #1:** Funds shall be contributed by all IOUs to the PA holding the facilitation contract so the Facilitation Team may access those funds through the existing CAEECC Facilitation Contract.

**C.1.2 Administration Recommendation #2:** Funds shall be administered by the Facilitation Team to the Pilot. Administration includes supporting the recruitment and application process, documentation of Pilot recipient eligibility, the distribution of funds to recipients using an invoicing or other process as determined between the contract-holding PA and the CAEECC Facilitation Team, and the evaluation process.

**C.1.3 Administration Recommendation #3:** Up to 15% of Pilot funds may be allocated to the Facilitation Team for administrative and program support activities. Such funds would be tracked, accrued, and invoiced as contractually required.

### C.2 Application Sample

**C.2.1 Application Recommendation #1:** Adopt the Sample Application *(see* [*Appendix C*](#_z080gajj2hfk)*)* as a subsection of the JEDI-focused WG Member Application. Redundant questions may be integrated appropriately with the JEDI-focused WG Member Application.

The Compensation TF scope does not include creation of the JEDI-focused WG Member Application, however, the Task Force recommends that while the Compensation Pilot application process be straightforward and distinct from the JEDI-focused WG application (as not all future WG members may request compensation), it also be attached to it for ease of access.

Lastly, information about the Compensation Pilot should be provided to all applicants of the JEDI-focused WG, informing applicants about their potential eligibility and ability to participate in the Compensation Pilot. This information should include the Principles, Intentions, and Eligibility Criteria as well as CAEECC WG expectations and meeting norms.

### C.3 Application Review Process

**C.3.1 Application Review Recommendation #1 | Reviewer:** The Compensation Pilot Applications will be reviewed by a review cohort consisting of the facilitation team and volunteers from the CPUC ESJ Team, Compensation TF, and CAEECC (who will not be applying to participate in the JEDI-focused WG). The Facilitation Team will ask for volunteers from the parties above after the authorization of the Motion.

**C.3.2 Application Review Recommendation #2 | Timing:** Applications will be invited ahead of the launch of the working group and will be open on a rolling basis and reviewed/approved in the order they were submitted.[[7]](#footnote-6) Reviewers should aim to complete reviews within 14 business days of application submission. *Note: Reviewer committee may choose to meet on a predetermined frequency (similar to how other WG application review committee meets) or deliberate over ad hoc meetings or email.*

**C.3.3 Application Review Recommendation #3 | Acceptance:** Compensation will be granted on a first-come-first-serve basis to eligible applicants until the WG funding cap has been reached. Eligible applicants must meet all Eligibility Criteria such that their participation in the Pilot reflects the Pilot’s Principles and Intentions. In the case the Compensation Pilot application is reviewed ahead of the JEDI-focused Working Group Membership Application, acceptance into the Compensation Pilot may be granted, but would be contingent upon approval to participate in the JEDI-focused WG.

### C.4 Distribution of funds

**C.4.1 Funding and Distribution Recommendation #1 | Distributor:** The funds shall be distributed to Pilot recipients by the CAEECC Facilitation Team.

**C.4.2 Funding and Distribution Recommendation #2: | Structure of Compensation:** Successful applicants for the Compensation Pilot, to the extent it is legal and possible, will have two options for structuring their compensation distribution. Under both options below, reimbursements of eligible costs would be subject to approval and a regular invoice process including submission of documentation for eligible reimbursable expenses. This hybrid approach is intended to provide flexibility and options to fit the recipient’s needs:

* **Distribution Option A:** Predetermined standard amount of compensation per full Working Group process. The amount would be based on assumed time required for meeting prep, attendance, follow-up, and other expected Working Group responsibilities.
* **Distribution Option B:** The applicant submits an hourly rate proposal with supporting documentation. The applicant may invoice no more than monthly for incurred time devoted to eligible Working Group activities. Each applicant would be given a budget cap based on the maximum assumed hours expected for the Working Group process, to which the applicant would bill against.

**C.4.3 Funding Distribution Recommendation #3 | Payment:** Payment would be made depending on the Distribution Option chosen by the applicant.

* **Distribution Option A:** Applicant would receive compensation on a pre-determined schedule, and would not be dependent on the monthly invoicing cycle of the Facilitation Team. For example, compensation could be paid out at the end of each meeting attended by the applicant or in a series of payments otherwise tied to a schedule of meetings.[[8]](#footnote-7)
* **Distribution Option B:** Applicant would submit their invoice with their documented hours and hourly rate(s) plus any reimbursable costs and documentation to the Facilitation Team which would be included with the Facilitation Team’s invoice. Applicant would be paid on the same schedule as any subcontractors under the Facilitation Team’s contract (e.g., within 10 days of receipt of invoice). Applicants would not be considered subcontractors but recipients of a program administered by the Facilitation Team.

### C.5 Oversight of funds

**C.5.1 Funding Oversight Recommendation #1:** The CAEECC Facilitation team, via the PA holding their contract, will oversee the use of funds for the Pilot and ensure that the distribution of funds is in accordance with regulated requirements and the Pilot stays on budget. The CAEECC Facilitation Team will retain all documentation from the Pilot, provide updates regarding use of funds to the full CAEECC and JEDI-Focused WG as appropriate about the status of the pilot, and at the end of the pilot compile data and evaluations to provide a Pilot Report.

## D. Recruitment

**D.1 Recruitment Strategy Recommendation #1 | Recruiters:** Volunteers from the Compensation TF, CAEECC, and the CPUC ESJ Team, with the coordination support of the Facilitation Team, shall conduct outreach to raise awareness about the Compensation Pilot.

**D.2 Recruitment Strategy Recommendation #2 | Outreach Process:** Outreach (e.g. emails and meetings) shall begin with groups identified below. The Facilitation team will provide a template for outreach. Additional work to identify individuals and their contact information will be needed to facilitate outreach.

| From the *Pre-identified List of Prospective JEDI-focused WG Participants* included in the CDEI WG Final Report* Trade allies
* Unions (work/work implementation groups)
* Authorized Agents of IOU's and Implementers
* Youth, universities, and emerging professionals (including respective diversity groups)
* Consumer advocates like CalPA and TURN
* Environmental, Racial, and Social Justice groups like Greenlining, Rising Sun, and California Environmental Justice Alliance (CEJA)
* Other experts (e.g., other agencies)
* Advocacy groups whose mission is to promote and establish diversity in EE (similar to E2, ACEEE, etc.)
* A representative sample of customers
* Local Government Coalitions
* Community Based Organizations and/or aggregations of Community Based Organizations
* Local Government Climate Action Organizations
* Tenant right groups
* BIPOC specific groups
* Community Service District Latino Service Providers

Additional outreach ideas (beyond the *Pre-Identified List* above) may also come from Compensation TF contacts and suggestions (*see* [*Appendix D*](#_j7rki8ew9mtg)*).* |
| --- |

**D.3 Recruitment Strategy Recommendation #3 | Timeline:** Begin outreach efforts upon CPUC authorization of Pilot funds and CAEECC adoption of these recommendations as well as the release of the JEDI-Focused WG Prospectus. Outreach will continue until all of the Compensation Pilot funds have been allocated or, for existing members of the JEDI-focused WG, when the JEDI-focused WG is beyond the halfway point of its charge.

**D.4 Recruitment Strategy Recommendation #4 | Facilitator Budget:** Recruitment strategies shall require the support of the CAEECC Facilitation Team in the form of coordinating communications, scheduling any informational meetings, and developing any support materials, which is beyond the established and budgeted scope of the Facilitation contract. These additional tasks would be compensated through the Facilitation Contract with a budget equating up to a 15% cap on Facilitation Team support and administration costs for the Compensation Pilot.

## E. Pilot Evaluation

**E.1 Evaluation Criteria Recommendation #1:** Adopt the following structure of three evaluation criteria to determine the success of the pilot:

1. Criterion 1: Diversity of perspectives included in JEDI-focused WG
	1. Percentage (and absolute #) of JEDI-focused WG overall that is/represents a new stakeholder to CAEECC
	2. Percentage of JEDI-focused WG overall that is/represents a CPUC ESJ Community
	3. Percentage (and absolute #) of members of JEDI-focused WG from a CPUC ESJ Community that is receiving Compensation Pilot funds
	4. Percentage (and absolute #) of members of JEDI-focused WG that is new/represents a new stakeholder that is receiving Compensation Pilot funds
2. Criterion 2: Accessibility and ease of application process
	1. Number of applicants for the Compensation Pilot
	2. Rate of acceptance for Compensation Pilot
3. Criterion 3: Effectiveness of Outreach and Recruitment
	1. Percentage of Compensation Pilot recipients from direct outreach efforts
	2. Number of Compensation Pilot recipients from direct outreach efforts

**E.2 Evaluation Criteria Recommendation #2 | Additional Data:** In addition to the indicators and metrics proposed above, the Compensation TF recommends the collection of data to help inform and potentially improve the effectiveness of the Pilot.

| * By Pilot participants:
	+ How funds were used
	+ If any expenses were uncompensated
* Number of declined offers from recruitment and reason why (if available)
 |
| --- |

**E.3 Evaluation Criteria Recommendation #3 | Not for Measurement:** The Task Force also discussed two criteria that they strongly recommend not be used to measure the success of the pilot.

| * The outcome of a Working Group
* A set of predefined *productive contributions*
 |
| --- |

The Task Force believes these two criteria are factors that can contribute to the overall outcomes of a Working Group, but that the Pilot itself cannot impact. Secondly, productive contributions may take many forms, especially with members new to CAEECC Working Groups, possibly new to energy efficiency, and members that may engage in more passive or indirect ways as may be supported by their culture, personality, capabilities, or other factors.

# Conclusion

The Compensation Task Force requests CAEECC’s review and adoption of the recommendations within this report in their entirety. Through the implementation of this Pilot, the Task Force believes that CAEECC will demonstrate acts of inclusion that can lead to the increased diversity in CAEECC and the CPUC policymaking processes, leading to more equitable outcomes in the community’s collective energy efficiency efforts.

# Appendices

1. Motion Outline
2. Budget Proposal
3. Application Sample
4. Compensation TF Prospective Applicant Contact List

##

## Appendix A: Motion Outline

* Introduction
* Summary of Comp TF recommendations and CAEECC request for funds for Compensation Pilot for JEDI-focused WG
	+ Purpose and benefits of compensation pilot
	+ Why EE funding source
	+ Recommended administration
* Background on EE funding authorization
	+ D.15 XX XXX what it orders and allows, interpretation that funds cannot be used for the purposes
	+ Seeking budget authorization for defined use of XYZ
* About the Compensation Pilot
	+ Administration and process, criteria and oversight to ensure proper use of ratepayer funds
		- Application process + eligibility
		- Approval process
		- Distribution of funds process
		- Evaluation
* Request for authorization
	+ Pilot budget amount
	+ Authorization of future funds via Tier 2 Advice Letter
		- Annual cap of $XXX
	+ Allocation ratios to parallel that of the facilitation budget
* Conclusion

## Appendix B: Budget Proposal

*Note, this table was revised by the Task Force from a summary table incorporated into the CDEI Final Report.*

| **SAMPLE Annual Compensation Budget for CBOs and Under-resourced Groups:** **ONE WG PROCESS of 6 WG meetings + 2 Quarterly Full CAEECC meetings + 1 Ad Hoc Meeting** |
| --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **CAEECC Onboarding** | **Hours per event** | **$/hr** | **Total $/event** | **Total $/year** |  |
| Onboarding and Training | 10 | $150.00 | $1,500.00 |  |  |
| Other Expenses and Per Diem | N/A | N/A | $200.00 |  |  |
|  |  | **Subtotal** | **$1,700.00** | **$1,700** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **CAEECC Quarterly meetings (2 per year)** | **Hours per event** | **$/hr** | **Total $/event** | **Total $/year** |  |
| CAEECC Meeting Attendance | 6 | $150.00 | $900.00 |  |  |
| CAEECC Meeting Preparation | 2 | $150.00 | $300.00 |  |  |
| CAEECC Meeting Follow-up | 2 | $150.00 | $300.00 |  |  |
| -Per Diem Expenses | N/A |  | $200.00 |  |  |
|  |  | **Subtotal** | **$1,700.00** | **$3,400.00** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Participation in one (1) Working Group (Assume 6 Working Goup meetings per year)** | **Hours per event** | **$/hr** | **Total $/event** |  |  |
| Working Group Meeting Attendance | 4 | $150.00 | $600.00 |  |  |
| Working Group Meeting Preparation | 2 | $150.00 | $300.00 |  |  |
| Working Group Meeting Follow-Up | 2 | $150.00 | $300.00 |  |  |
| Working Group Meeting Homework | 2 | $150.00 | $300.00 |  |  |
| -Per Diem Expenses | N/A |  | $200.00 |  |  |
|  |  | **Subtotal** | **$1,700.00** | **$10,200.00** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Ad-Hoc Workshops (Assume 1 workshops per WG process)** | **Hours per event** | **$/hr** |  |  |  |
| Stakeholder Workshops | 4 | $150.00 | $600.00 |  |  |
| - Per Diem Expenses | N/A |  | $200.00 |  |  |
|  |  | Subtotal | **$800.00** | **$800.00** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL PER PARTICIPANT PER WG PROCESS** | **$16,100** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| This estimate represents the high end. Assumptions include higher rate + assume some travel for each meeting (as of 2022, not anticipated) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Estimated budget for a single 6-meeting WG process per compensation recipient** |
|  |
| ***Budget can change depending on how many recipients to be able to be supported*** |
| ***Baseline is the assumptions above. High Cost is 10% higher, Low cost is 10% discount.*** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Participants** | **5** | **10** | **15** | **25** |
|  | *Total Annual Compensation to CBOs* | $ 80,500 | $ 161,000 | $ 241,500 | $ 402,500 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Program Budget** | Includes 10% for admin | $ 88,550 | $ 177,100 | $ 265,650 | $ 442,750 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High-Cost Scenario | Annual Total | $ 101,833 | $ 203,665 | $ 305,498 | $ 509,163 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low-Cost Scenario | Annual Total | $ 79,695 | $ 159,390 | $ 239,085 | $ 398,475 |

##

## Appendix C: Application Sample

The following sample is associated with Application Recommendation #1.

| **Sample application for the Compensation Pilot.** This application is for the Compensation Pilot specifically for prospective members of the JEDI-focused Working Group of the California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee (CAEECC). The Compensation Pilot is a funding mechanism to welcome burdened individuals or organizations and alleviate the barrier of ‘participation without compensation’. The intent, principles, and eligibility criteria of Compensation Pilot are located in the Application Appendix. The Compensation Pilot (and JEDI-focused WG) will adhere to the CAEECC Ground Rules and Meeting Norms (see Appendix). **The deadline to apply for the Compensation Pilot is rolling, pending available funds.** Applications will be reviewed in the order they are submitted and granted compensation until funding is maxed out. Interviews *may* be requested with compensation applicants. Please fill out the following application form.*\* Connotes a required field below.*\*Would you like to apply for the Compensation Pilot? Yes**Contact Information**\*Primary Contact Name (First and Last); Primary Contact Pronouns; Primary Contact Email; Primary Contact PhoneProxy Contact Name (First and Last); Proxy Contact Pronouns; Proxy Contact Email; Proxy Contact Phone\*Will you be representing: Yourself*\*If responded ‘An Organization’ above, required |* Name of Organization: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_What mission and values does your participation represent (as an individual or organization)? \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\*Please describe what perspective(s), representation(s), or community/ies with which you identify. Yes**Compensation Pilot Eligibility**\*Would participating in the WG create a financial hardship for you or your organization YesPlease explain why you would not be able to participate in the JEDI-focused WG without financial compensation. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**CAEECC Policies and Interest**\*Do you agree to abide by the Ground Rules and Meeting Norms for CAEECC and CAEECC working groups?[[9]](#footnote-8) YesDescribe specific prior experience (if any) working collaboratively in other stakeholder processes. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_5 See JEDI-focused WG Scope of Work Appendix \*Are you committed to make meaningful contributions to this working group by participating in the pre-work, meeting attendance and active engagement, and meeting follow-up or homework?[[10]](#footnote-9) Yes |
| --- |

###

## Appendix D: Compensation TF Prospective Applicant Contact List

**Organizations**

Asian Pacific Partners for Empowerment, Advocacy and Leadership (APPEAL)

Abrazar, Inc.

Access Reproductive Justice

African American Chamber of Commerce

Albie Aware Breast Cancer Foundation

Alcohol Justice

Alhambra Chamber of Commerce

Alliance for a Better Community

AltaMed Health Services

American Council for EE Economy (ACEEE)

American Heart Association

Antelope Valley Hispanic Chamber of Commerce

API Equality-LA

APLA Health

APTP SAC

Asian Business Association Inland Empire

Asian Resources, Inc.

Asian Youth Center

Association of California Community and Energy Services (ACCES)

BANJ Health Center Inc.

Bay Area Central American Chamber of Commerce

Bay Area Regional Health Inequities Initiative (BARHII)

Be Smooth, Inc.

Bell Gardens Chamber of Commerce

Berkeley Food Institute

Black Chamber of Commerce of Inland Empire

Black Leadership Council

Black Women for Wellness Action Project

Blue Shield of California

Brea Chamber of Commerce

BreastfeedLA

CA4Health

California Access Coalition

California Asian American Professional Society

California Association of Nonprofits (CalNonprofits)

California Black Chamber of Commerce

California Black Health Network

California Black Women's Collective

California Black Women's Health Project

California Chronic Care

California Clean Energy Association

California Department of Community Services & Development

California Energy Alliance

California Environmental Justice Alliance

California Green Business Network

California Food and Farming Network

California Health Collaborative

California Healthy Nail Salon Collaborative

California Immigrant Policy Center

California Latinas for Reproductive Justice

California Latino Business Institute

California Pan-Ethnic Health Network

California Primary Care Association

California Reinvestment Coalition

California School Nurses Organization

California School-Based Health Alliance

California State University Channel Islands, Department of Health Science

California Urban Partnership

CaliforniaHealth+ Advocates

Californians for Safety and Justice

Camara de Comercio Agrupación de Comerciantes del Norte de California

Camarillo Chamber of Commerce

Capitol City Black Nurses Association

Central California Hispanic Chamber of Commerce

Central California LGBTQIA+/2S Collaborative

Central Valley Asian American Chamber of Commerce

Central Valley Hispanic Chamber of Commerce

Central Valley Immigrant Integration Collaborative (CVIIC)

Central Valley Pacific Islander Alliance

Centro Binacional para el Desarrollo Indígena Oaxaqueño

Centro Del Inmigrante

Ceres Community Project

Cerritos Chamber of Commerce

ChangeLab Solutions

Changing Tides Family Services

Children's Cause Orange County

Children’s Defense Fund-California

Christie's Place

Chula Vista Elementary School District

Clean Up Green Up

Climate Justice Alliance

CleanEnergy States Alliance (CESA)

Collaborative in San Diego County

Colton Chamber of Commerce

Comerciantes Unidos Stockton

Comité Cívico Del Valle

Common Threads

Communities for a Better Environment

Communities United

Community Action Partnership of San Luis Obispo

Community Alliance with Family Farmers (CAFF)

Community Clinic Association of Los Angeles County

Community Health Councils

Community Health Partnership, Inc.

Cooperation Humboldt

COR Community Development Corporation

CPUC Listservs

CRLA Foundation

Cultiva La Salud

Detour Empowers FANCY Teen Girls

Dignity Health

Diversity Business Forum of SABAN

DOCS4POC

Don’t Waste LA

Dovetail Learning, Inc.

East Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce

East Oakland Building Healthy Communities Initiative

Ecology Center

Elk Grove Chamber of Commerce

Empowering Pacific Islander Communities (EPIC)

Empowerment Association

End Hep C SF

Environmental Justice Air Quality Coalition

Esperanza Community Housing Corporation

Essential Access Health

Face to Face, Ending HIV in

Sonoma County

Faith in the Valley

First 5 Alameda County

Fresno Barrios Unidos

Fresno Community Health

Improvement Partnership (FCHIP)

Fresno Interdenominational

Refugee Ministries (FIRM)

Fresno Metro Black Chamber of Commerce

Gilroy Chamber of Commerce

Gods' Grace Outreach Ministries, International

Grassroots Global Justice

Greater Coachella Valley Chamber of Commerce

Greater Corona Hispanic Chamber of Commerce

Greater Sacramento Vietnamese American Chamber of Commerce

Greater Riverside Hispanic Chamber of Commerce

Green LA Coalition

Guatemalan American Chamber of Commerce

Health Access California

Healthy African American Families

Healthy Hearts Institute

HEART of Davis

Helpline Youth Counseling

Hemophilia Council of California

Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Contra Costa County

Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Marin County

Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Northern California

Hispanic Chambers of Commerce of San Francisco

Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Silicon Valley

Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Sonoma County

Hmong Cultural Center

Human Impact Partners (HIP)

Humanidad Therapy & Education Services

Huntington Beach Chamber of Commerce

I Am Love

Impact Southern California

Inland Empire Immigrant Youth Collective

Inland Empire Regional Chamber of Commerce

Institute for Public Strategies

International Foundation for Autoimmune & Autoinflammatory Arthritis (AiArthritis)

Jakara Movement

Justice in Aging

JW Healthcare Insights

Kern County Hispanic Chamber of Commerce

KIXE PBS

Korean Community Center of the East Bay

Korean Community Services

Latin American Caribbean Chamber of Commerce

Latin Business Association

Latin Business Foundation of Silicon Valley

Latin Chamber of Commerce Las Vegas

Latino Coalition for a Healthy California

Latino Tax Professionals

LC Disability Consulting

Leah's Pantry

Let's Kick ASS AIDS Survivor Syndrome

LifeLong Medical Care

Little Manila Rising

Liver Coalition of San Diego

Local Clean Energy Alliance

Local Government Sustainable Energy Coalition

Loma Linda University School of Public Health

Los Angeles Christian Health Centers

Los Angeles County Department of Public Health

Los Angeles Latino Chamber of Commerce

Los Angeles Metropolitan Churches

Mark Horton LLC

Maternal and Child Health Access

Mental Health Advocacy Services

Mental Health America of Los Angeles

Merced County Department of Public Health

Merced County Hispanic Chamber of Commerce

Merced County Indian Chamber of Commerce

Mi Familia Vota

Mid-City Community Advocacy Network

Miracles and Dreams Foundation

Mixteco Indigena Community Organizing Project (MICOP)

Modesto Chamber of Commerce

Multi-Ethnic Collaborative of Community Agencies

Multicultural Health Foundation

Mulvaneys B&L

Napa County Hispanic Chamber of Commerce

NARAL Pro-Choice California

National Asian American Coalition

National Diversity Coalition

National Harm Reduction Coalition

National Health Law Program

National Hispanic Business Women Association

National Union of Health Care Workers

NextGen California

Nicaraguan American Chamber of Commerce Northern California

NICOS Chinese Health Coalition

NLBWA - Inland Empire

NLBWA - Los Angeles

NLBWA - San Diego

North Coast Clinics Network

North State Hispanic Chamber of Commerce

Northern California Center for Well-Being

Northern California Peruvian Chamber of Commerce

Nourish California

Nutrition and Fitness Collaborative of the Central Coast (NFCCC)

Oakland African American Chamber of Commerce

Oakland Climate Action Coalition

Oakland Latino Chamber of Commerce

Oceanside Chamber of Commerce

Ontrack Program Resources

Ontario Hispanic Chamber of Commerce

Open Door Community Health Centers

Orange County Hispanic Chamber of Commerce

Orange County Hispanic Youth Chamber of Commerce

Oxnard Chamber of Commerce

Pacific Asian Counseling Services

Painted Brain

Partners in Care Foundation

Pesticide Action Network

Physicians for a Healthy California

Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California

Pomona Chamber of Commerce

PRC

Prevention Institute

Public Health Advocates

Public Health Institute

Public Health Strategies

Racial and Ethnic Mental Health

Disparities Coalition

Reach Out

Regional Asthma Management and Prevention

Regional Pacific Islander Taskforce - Bay Area

Ripon Chamber of Commerce

River Oak Center for Children

Riverside County Black Chamber

Roberts Family Development Center

Roots Community Health Center

Roots of Change

Rural County Representatives of California

RYSE

Sacramento Black Chamber of Commerce

Sacramento Hispanic Chamber of Commerce

Sacramento Maternal, Child and Adolescent Health Advisory Board

Salud Para La Gente

San Diego County Hispanic Chamber of Commerce

San Francisco AIDS Foundation

San Francisco African American Chamber of Commerce

San Francisco Filipino American Chamber of Commerce

San Francisco Senior and Disability Action

San Juan Capistrano Chamber of Commerce

San Joaquin County Hispanic Chamber of Commerce

San Mateo Hispanic Chamber of Commerce

Sanctuary of Hope

Santa Ana Chamber of Commerce

Scripps Health

Second Baptist Church

Seeds of Hope

SEIU2015

Sepsis Alliance

Silicon Valley Black Chamber of Commerce

SISTAHFRIENDS Women's Counseling Services

Slavic American Chamber of Commerce

Solano Hispanic Chamber of Commerce

South Bay Community Services

South Gate Chamber of Commerce

South Modesto Businesses United

Southern California Hispanic Chamber of Commerce

Southside Coalition of Community Health Centers

SSG/Asian Pacific Islander Forward Movement

SSG/PALS for Health

St. James Infirmary

Street Level Health Project

Substratum Systems LLC

Tarzana Treatment Centers Inc.

Temecula Valley Chamber of Commerce

Thai Community Development Center

The Central Valley Urban Institute

The Children's Partnership

The Coalition of Orange County Community Health Centers

The Fresno Center

The G.R.E.E.N Foundation

The Health Trust

The Índigo Project

The Latino Coalition Against COVID-19

The Los Angeles Trust for Children's Health

The Unity Council

The Urban Collaborative Project

Think Dignity (formerly Girls Think Tank)

Toberman Neighborhood Center

Tracy Chamber of Commerce

Transformational Health and Wellness

Trinity Lutheran Church

Tulare Kings Hispanic Chamber of Commerce

United Parents and Students

United Way Bay Area

United Ways of California

United Women of East Africa Support Team

University of California Berkeley School of Public Health

U.S. Green Chamber of Commerce

US Latino American Chamber of Commerce

US-Mexico Chamber of Commerce

Urban Strategies Council

Ventura Chamber of Commerce

Veritable Vegetable

Village Movement California

WALKSacramento

Watsonville Law Center

Wellspring Women’s Center

Western Center on Law and Poverty

Wholesome Wave

Wintu Education and Cultural Council

Women Organized to Respond to Life-threatening Diseases (WORLD)

Worksite Wellness LA

YES Nature to Neighborhoods

Youth Forward

Youth UpRising

**Individuals**

Aaron Thompson, Los Angeles

Abby Jaramillo, San Francisco

Adele Amodeo, Albany

Adriana Botic, Denver

Adriana Ramos-Yamamoto, MPH

Adrienne Markworth, La Jolla

Alexandra Libro, Los Angeles

Ali Goodyear, Pasadena

Alison Negrin, Alamo

Alison Wohlgemuth, Brentwood

Allison Coleman

Alvaro Garza, Modesto

Amaranta Marcelos, Sacramento

Amelyne Major

Amy Shuba, San Francisco

Anastasia Coutinho, Concord

Andrea Chirino, Downey

Andrea Dumas

Andrea LaCampagne, Guerneville

Andrea Mackey, Sacramento

Andrea Picones Castro, El Cerrito

Andrea Rayas, Maywood

Andrew Deckert, MD, MPH

Andrew Feil, Fresno

Andrew Naja-Riese, San Rafael

Angel Valdez, San Pablo

Angela Gardner, Whittier

Ann Finkelstein, Vallejo

Anna Steiner, San Francisco

Anne-Lise Francois, Berkeley

Annie Pennell, Richmond

Ariadne Villegas, Merced

Ariana Thompson-Lastad, PhD

Arissa Palmer, Orange

Arpine Shakhbandaryan, Glendale

Art Hanson, Lansing

Astrid Campos, Glendale

Baolia Xiong, Fresno

Barbara Rojas-Baez, Oakland

Barbara Towle, Greenbrae

Bert Greenberg

Beth Spitler, Sacramento

Beth Thayer, Ventura

Beth Wyatt, Santa Rosa

Birgit Hermann, San Francisco

BobbieFlowers, New York

Bobby Dalton Roy, Sacramento

Boris Ricks, Northridge

Brenda Villanueva, Canoga Park

Brianna Holmes,

Bridget McCann, Long Beach

Brie Gelinas, Charlotte

Brooke Frost, Fresno

Bruce Mentzer, Healdsburg

Caitlin Esparza,

Caitlin McGrath, Oakland

Callia Hansen, Oakland

Camille Anacabe, San Francisco

Candace Campbell, Valley Glen

Carla Cassani, Menlo Park

Carla Compton, Placerville

Carla Davis, Corte Madera

Carla Rosin, Santa Barbara

Carmen Rosales Solorzano, Glendora

Carolina Goodman

Charlie Nelson, Shasta Lake City

Charlie Shearer, Bakersfield

Cheri Langlois, Mendocino

Christi Ketchum

Christianne Schurman

Christina Babst, West Hollywood

Christina Stephenitch

Christine Moss, Clovis

Cindy Young

Clarissa Vivian, Fresno

Claudia G. Corchado, Merced

Constance Best, Boonville

Corinna Tempelis, Berkeley

Craig McNamara, Winters

Dana Stephens, Ojai

Dana Walden, Vista

Daniel Companeetz, Oakland

Daniel S. Madrigal, MPH

Daniel Wilkinson,

Danuta Filipowski, San Francisco

David Shatkin, Occidental

Dawn Emery Ballantine, Boonville

DeAngelo Mack, Sacramento

Deanna Knickerbocker

Deanna Lewis, Oakland

Debbie Tenenbaum, Berkeley

Deborah McIntosh, Temecula

Deborah Yashar, Grass Valley

Dennis Pocekay, MD, MPH, Petaluma

Diana Cassady, Sacramento

Diana Cole, Oceanside

Doris Meier, San Francisco

Dorrine Marshall, Irvine

Dr. Donielle Prince, MS.Ed., Ph.D.

Dr. John F. Simmons, Jr.

Dr. Mha Atma S. Khalsa, Los Angeles

Dr. Paul Masotti

Dr. R. Watson

Dr. Rhea Boyd, MD, MPH

Dudley Campbell, Valley Glen

Edith Ogella

Edye Kuyper

Eileen Donnelly, Santa Cruz

El Pe, Talmage

Elaine Benjamin, Alpine

Elena Pereira, Walnut Creek

Eli Tizcareno, North Hollywood

Elizabeth Saft, Davis

Elizabeth Tumbas, Plymouth

Ellen Kolarik, MD, Davis

Ellie Gladstone, Alameda

Emily Galpern

Emily Saeger, Saratoga

Emily Webb, Concord

Erin Herman, Oakland

Erin Manalo-Pedro

Forrest Hopping,

Gabby Tilley, Los Angeles

Gail Caswell, San Francisco

Gail Kennedy

Gail Roberts, Tecate

Gary Peterson, Pacific Grove

Genevieve LeBlanc, Salinas

Genoveva Islas, Fresno

George F. Klipfel II

Gertrude A. Butler, Antioch

Gigi King, Woodland

Gladwyn d'Souza, Belmont

Glenda Corning, Corte Madera

Greg Ostroff, Belvedere

Hannah Peters, Oakland

Haoming Zhang

Haydee Romero

Hazel Lambert, Moreno Valley

Heather Seto, Burlingame

Hieu Nguyen

Holly Scheider, Berkeley

Irene Hjelmervik, Riverside

Irene Yen, Merced

Ivette Diaz-Quintero

Ivy Panlilio, Los Angeles

J. Miakoda Taylor, Berkeley

Jacquolyn Duerr, Sacramento

James Nolan

Janedra Sykes, El Cajon

Janet Jacobs, San Francisco

Janet Perlman, Berkeley

Janine Moniot

Javier Melendez, Oakland

Jean Kaplan, Willits

Jeffrey Ring, Glendale

Jenny Kattlove, Claremont

Jeremy Baril, Santa Rosa

Jeremy Cantor, Berkeley

Jerry Beale

Jerry Oliver, Sylmar

Jessamine Anderson

Jessica Hirsch, Santa Monica

Jessie Liu, Berkeley

Joanne Gamble, Gualala

Joelle Signorelli, Elk

John G. Bergen

John Kotick, Los Angeles

Jolene Beiser, Los Angeles

Jon Anderholm, Cazadero

Jonathan Bash, Martinez

Jonathan Lepule, Chula Vista

Jonathan Weinstock,

Jose Torres Casillas, Sacramento

Joseph Perl, Oakland

Judy Rich, Los Angeles

Julia Lund, Sacramento

Julian Venegas

Julie Freestone, Richmond

Julie Good, Palo Alto

Julie Makrai, Morgan Hill

Julie Maybe Lins

Jullie Calkins

Kae Gifford, Sebastopol

Kaleia Wilkinson, Long Beach

Karen Berger

Karen Metcalf,

Karen Ratzlaff, Santa Rosa

Kari Hamerschlag, Oakland

Karina Saucedo

Karissa Zingula, El Monte

Karla Guerra, Oakland

Kat Wortham

Kate Cheyne

Kate Sachnoff

Kate Walrath, Oakland

Kathy Les, Sacramento

Kawika Liu, West Covina

Kayla Williams, Elk Grove

Kayla Williams, Santa Clara

Keely Rider, San Francisco

Keith Baker

Kevin Norton

Kiara Gonzalez, Richmond

Kimberly Gray, Los Angeles

Krista Martinez-Trimlett, La Mesa

Kristen S. Marchi, San Francisco

Kristina Gelardi

L. Lane

Laila Solaris, San Francisco

Larry Martin, Forestville

Laura Guzman, San Leandro

Laura Kelly, Oakland

Laura Ramirez, Oakland

Lauren Bouyea, Carmel Valley

Lauren Hill, Los Angeles

Lauren Linda, Laguna Woods

Lauren Murdock, Santa Barbara

Leila Romero, Kelseyville

Leslie Toy, Los Angeles

Lily Dorn, Los Angeles

Lilyane Glamben

Linda Baggio, Visalia

Linda Guffin

Linda Weiner

Lindsey Wade, San Diego

Lisa Chipkin, North San Juan

Lisa Miller, Santa Rosa

Lisa Segnitz, Santa Cruz

Lisa Selby

Lisette Muñoz, San Diego

Lora Logan, San Diego

Lori Johnson, Novato

Lorna Hardin, Chula Vista

Lynn Silver, MD, Berkeley

Lynna Harris, Oakland

M. Virginia Leslie, Milpitas

Mackare Jones

Maddie Ribble, Long Beach

Marcie Parisi

Mario Ortega, Anaheim

Marisha Zeffer, Oakland

Mark Bradley Cappetta

Mark Reback, Los Angeles

Mark Wyatt, Santa Rosa

Mary Kate Morris, Berkeley

Mary Nicholson, French Camp

Mary Ott

Mary Ponder, Sacramento

Mary-Beth Meyer, LCSW

Maryellen Redish, Palm Springs

Mason Taylor, Sacramento

Matthew Lange, Davis

Matthew Page, Newbury Park

Mayra Jimenez, San Rafael

Mayra Satterlee

Megan Key, Anaheim

Michael Cahn, Santa Monica

Michael Dimock, Santa Rosa

Michael Scippa, Tiburon

Michael Tomczyszyn, San Francisco

Michelle Freridge, San Gabriel

Michelle Maddex, Oakland

Micki Besancon, Nevada City

Miriam Ada

Monika Lee, Sacramento

Nai Kasick

Nakia Woods, Richmond

Nancy Hiestand, Davis

Nancy Schimmel, Berkeley

Navneet Virk, Los Angeles

Nellie Thorngate, Santa Cruz

Nick Gaetano, Laguna Beach

Nicole Lordi, Aptos

Oscar Sandoval, Fresno

Paige Tengeluk

Pam Letourneau, Rohnert Park

Paola Ilescas, Vista

Pat Swan, San Francisco

Patricia Alcocer, Salinas

Patricia Carlson

Patricia Gutierrez, San Leandro

Patty Kestin, Los Angeles

Paula Shatkin, Occidental

Pavitee Peumsang, Compton

Peg Champion, Windsor

Peggy Rebol

Peter Kuhn, San Diego

Quetzalli Rocha, Oakland

Rachel Wesen, Berkeley

Rachelle Schulken, Folsom

Rajesh Desai, Sebastopol

Rajiv Narayan

Rena Kaminsky, Palo Alto

Rhonda Smith, Sacramento

Richard Theis, Sebastopol

Robert Nunez, Sacramento

Robert Saunders, Sacramento

Roberta Stern, Oakland

Ronald Bogin, El Cerrito

Rosa Flores, Sacramento

Sabina Gonzalez, Fresno

Sacramento

Salena Meade, Victorville

Samuel Durkin, Fairfield

Sara Bernal, Woodland

Sarah Carter, Newbury Park

Sarah Postma, Oakland

Sarah Ross, Bayside

Sengrithey Pich, Brunswick

Serena Clayton, Oakland

Shani Buggs, PhD, MPH, Davis

Shannon Huddleston, Psy.D.

Shannon Morgan, Newport Beach

Shelly Collins, Davis

Sherrill Futrell, Davis

Sonia Flowers, Richmond

Soundhari Balaguru, Lafayette

Stacie Hiramoto, Sacramento

Stacy Shwartz Olagundoye,

Steven Guilliams, San Francisco

Susan Campbell, Santa Rosa

Susan Horne, Santa Barbara

Susan Lopez-Payan

Susan McCorry, Santa Monica

Susan Porter, Pasadena

Susan Stuart, Santa Cruz

Susie Hagemeister, Sebastopol

Tamara Goldsmith, San Rafael

Terrie Green, Marin City

Thomas Greenfield, Oakland

Toni Mayer, El Cerrito

Toni Rango, Elk Grove

Tracey Rattray, Oakland

Vanessa Spagnoli, Sacramento

Vasu Murti, Oakland

Verhan Henderson, Los Angeles

Veronica Shepard, San Francisco

Vic Bostock, Altadena

Vikki Paulus, Long Beach

Virginia Stewart-Carton,

Warren M. Gold, MD

Wendel Brunner, Berkeley

Wendy Krupnick, Santa Rosa

Whitney Greswold, Richmond

Whitney Hall, Walnut Creek

Yanni Rho, MD, MPH, Concord

Zack Kaldveer, Oakland

1. About the [CPUC ESJ Action Plan](https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/esjactionplan): In accordance with the CPUC’s institutional values of accountability, excellence, integrity, open communication, and stewardship, the CPUC has created the ESJ Action Plan to serve as both a commitment to furthering ESJ principles, as well as an operating framework with which to integrate ESJ considerations throughout the agency’s work. “Environmental justice” means the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, adoption, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. Because the CPUC regulates utility services beyond those tied to the environment, the term “environmental and social justice” or “ESJ” has been adopted to capture a broader effort and potential population. [↑](#footnote-ref-0)
2. The name of this Working Group is subject to change. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
3. About the [CPUC ESJ Action Plan](https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/esjactionplan): In accordance with the CPUC’s institutional values of accountability, excellence, integrity, open communication, and stewardship, the CPUC has created the ESJ Action Plan to serve as both a commitment to furthering ESJ principles, as well as an operating framework with which to integrate ESJ considerations throughout the agency’s work. “Environmental justice” means the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, adoption, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. Because the CPUC regulates utility services beyond those tied to the environment, the term “environmental and social justice” or “ESJ” has been adopted to capture a broader effort and potential population. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
4. ‘Historically underrepresented’ includes, but is not limited to, representatives of the following communities:

	* CPUC ESJ Communities definition
	* Disabled populations and those living with access and functional needs
	* LGBTQIA+
	* Immigrant and undocumented
	* Receiving bill assistance like California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE) or Family Electric Rate Assistance Program (FERA)
	* Medical vulnerabilities
	* Unhoused individuals
	* Indigenous populations living in non-federally designated communities. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
5. See D.15-10-028, Ordering Paragraph 11, pages 125 - 126 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
6. The Task Force referenced the EE Manual of Allowable Costs and Intervenor Compensation (I-Comp) Disallowable Costs, as well as considered other potential cost barriers to participation in the Working Group, to develop this list, but does not endorse use of either document to govern eligibility of costs. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
7. The Task Force recognizes that the JEDI-focused Working Group Applications may close, but recommends that the Compensation Pilot remain open (pending fund availability) for any Working Group members that determine mid-process that compensation is needed to fully participate and remain involved. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
8. This would allow for possibly more timely payments (addressing the barrier in I-Comp of delayed payments), and would require compensation funds to be provided like an “upfront” payment not tied to an invoice. It would be up to the PA holding the facilitation contract to determine if and what type of mechanism would be possible to support this. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
9. See JEDI-focused WG Scope of Work Appendix [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
10. Meaningful contributions include: participation in meetings, participation in interactive meeting elements, completion of homework/pre-work. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)