

ANONYMOUS Full CAEECC #50 Q2 Evaluation

Date: June 9, 2026

Overview

23 respondents: 14 CAEECC Members; 1 CPUC, 2 Stakeholders.

Question		AVG	MED
Meeting objectives were accomplished	Objective 1: Learn about Energy Division's relevant updates	5.2	5
	Objective 2: Discuss updates and next steps for CAEECC Workshops and Committees	4.9	5.5
	Objective 3: Discuss and decide next steps on proposed CAEECC engagement regarding Business Application Policy Proposals	4.5	5
	Across all Objectives	4.9	5
Presentations and background documents were clear and helpful.		5.3	5
This meeting was an inclusive and trusting environment.		5.3	5
The facilitators were effective in running the meeting (e.g., fostering a constructive and efficient forum, being impartial, and making sure no one dominated discussions).		5.1	5
Overall, the hybrid format was smooth and effective.		5.2	6
Overall, this Full CAEECC meeting was successful.		4.8	5
Overall, this Full CAEECC meeting was valuable to my organization.		4.5	5

To see how this meeting compares to recent CAEECC evaluations, [see reference table](#).

Key Findings

- The voting process was hard, chaotic, and didn't provide sufficient time for discussion given how many proposals were put forth. Voting results were not clear.

- In-person participation was unable to view the virtual chat where decision language was shared.
- The meeting was inclusive, timely, and balanced in-person/virtual participation.
- Provide more context and understanding of what CAEECC is, the scope of CAEECC, and the impact CAEECC has had previously.
- Explore how CAEECC may overlap with existing workstreams/PA coordination groups and optimize to balance both PA time and stakeholder value.

Open Text Responses

Objectives

Please add any clarifying comments regarding your responses to the question above about Objectives.

- For the workshop discussion, I don't think we ever received clarity on the **full voting results**. There was one member who joined late and we were told that votes were close enough that that member's decision could impact the workshop discussion.
- The Policy items that members voted on were set **not up for comments/feedback** rather it was setup for 1. Questions, and 2. Amendments. In addition, it was shared that there was a **time limit on comments**. It would be helpful to have a **virtual clock** to see on the screen.
- The **voting process is always hard**, not sure of another way to do it. just makes it hard to all agree on topics.
- Due to the uncertainty about the upcoming ALJ Scoping Memo for the PA Business Plans, the Cost Effectiveness policy issue could not be decisively resolved in this meeting. Facilitators were **helpful in managing the concerns**, but **ultimately there was no resolution**.
- Next steps for the EAC were discussed but it was **not clear when CAEECC would revisit/vote on whether to continue the EAC** or move forward with the EAC's memo for next steps.
- I think it would have been good to **allow time for general concerns or thoughts** on the CAEECC taking up the any of the policy proposals instead of on specific ones. I had general concerns about taking up any thing before knowing the scope of the application proceeding but it didn't feel like there was an appropriate time to bring up those comments.
- Energy division updates made up a very small portion of the meeting and they were **not able to provide update on high impact upcoming policy changes such as VEA**

- **No outcome to voting during the meeting.** Updates on Energy Divisions relevant updates **went really fast and felt incomplete**

Presentations and Background Docs

Please add any clarifying comments regarding your response to the question above about presentations and background documents.

- Presentations and background documents were **clear, relevant, and useful.**
- Presentation was **clear** and provided adequate **time to read and prepare** before the meeting.

Inclusive and Trusting Environment

Please add any clarifying comments regarding your response to the question above about inclusive & trusting environment.

- Facilitators created an environment which **encouraged diverse opinions and suggestions without prejudice or judgment.**
- In person participants were not able to track public participation in chat, **which made it feel slightly less inclusive than fully virtual**

Meeting Facilitation

Please add any clarifying comments regarding your responses to the question above about meeting facilitation.

- A visual for **speaking time limits** would be helpful. We still have not received the results of the vote from the Policy items.
- thank you for accommodating all locations and ways of participating
- The facilitators orchestrated a **smoothly running meeting**, integrating the **engagement of online and in-person participants without favoring disproportionately** one person or one group.
- Great job!
- The **voting was pretty chaotic**-- I know it was the first time doing so many votes at once, and the bylaws have the consensus test thing in there which is an add'l layer of logistic complexity, so **not necessarily a facilitation issue.** Some questions/ideas for next time-- **Decide whether or not the vote is supposed to be secret.** Then, if it's supposed to be secret, is there another way to vote other than hands up? There was a mention of not looking at the spreadsheet b/c of trying to make it secret but yet the hands up is not secret. Whether or not it needs to be secret, a method other than hands-up would seem to be helpful to make sure

people are voting on the specific thing they're supposed to be voting on, and not forgetting to raise/lower hands. Also, maybe making very clear announcements about what is happening will help folks pay attention-- have just one person speaking and saying what's happening at that moment, **also putting it in chat**, also **flashing something on-screen**?

- Meeting was well **organized and run and stayed on time**

Meeting Format

Please add any clarifying comments regarding your responses to question 9 about the virtual meeting format.

- Virtual is preferred
- Went smoothly.
- **All virtual maybe more effective.**
- Problems with integrating two main in-person locations with numerous online participants in real time are almost inevitable, but there were **no significant issues**.
- Facilitators do a great job of **balancing virtual and in-person** meeting participation/flow!
- Seemed like **much less whispered side convos** being picked up on the mics, so the facilitators calling that out as something to avoid really helped!
- I have not attended a dual in person hybrid meeting which **went as smoothly as this one**.

Overall Meeting Success

Please add any clarifying comments regarding your responses to question 11 about the overall meeting success.

- The policy voting results are still not confirmed.
- The facilitators applied **high energy, skillful organization, quick thinking, and flexibility** in achieving a very successful meeting.
- I was a bit **disappointed in the results of the voting**, but the meeting met the stated objectives
- The voting in the afternoon was **complicated**, especially has the 5 options proposed may be included in the Business Plan Applications Scoping Memo, not yet released. This created **more uncertainty** as any actions that CAEECC may take could be in scope or out of scope.
- Hard to tell **where things landed**.

Value of the Meeting

Please add any clarifying comments regarding your responses to question 13 about the overall meeting value.

- It was **good to have an opportunity to correct some misunderstandings** about the SoCalGas fuel switching proposal
- The policy issues raised and discussed were all **very relevant and important**.
- Some items were **useful for discussion for PAs specifically**. Some information was **duplicative** (ED updates) of what PAs already hear. The EAC's work has very important objectives but **appears somewhat duplicative with existing PA and CPUC efforts** to improve equity reporting and adaptively managing portfolios to improve equity outcomes. That said, PAs aren't the only stakeholders in the room but **perhaps there are opportunities to streamline or otherwise discuss how CAEECC overlaps with existing PA/CPUC/portfolio workstreams** to optimize balance of PA vs stakeholder value.
- As an implementer, we are always interested in developments in EE, compliance, policy etc... **It is hard to know exactly how we can participate and become more active and involved as a stakeholder**.
- Much of the discussion in the afternoon centered around the CAEECC engagement regarding Business Applications. Only one of the five passed. The cost-effectiveness one in particular was 3-4 different changes in one working group (TRC vs PAC/SCT, addition of NEBs, and REN cost effectiveness) which **lead to lack of clarity on what was in/out of scope** and more complexity of the task and reaching consensus.

Better Engagement

Do you have any suggestions on how to get better engagement (i.e., hearing from a broader set of participants while using Zoom)?

CAEECC Members

- The **in-person locations are still kind of hard to get to**. Locations are great for people already participating. But not for new participants. **Very big city focused**, we need to be ok with smaller participations on other locations before we measure successful engagement.
- With each successive meeting, **participants are becoming a little more confident in expressing their questions and opinions**. Ongoing encouragement from the facilitators, along with policy issues of interest to most (if not all) participants is the key.
- Facilitators do a **wonderful job of getting engagement!**

- **Great engagement** across the 3 "locations."
- I'm not sure that many implementers attend, yet they are critical stakeholders. I think the **structure of CAEECC is confusing and not very well known**. It may be beneficial to send out an email **explaining how CAEECC is organized, how to become a member, what costs are for members, who can be a member, who can participate in working groups** etc.

Suggestions for Future CAEECC Meetings

Please add any suggested improvements for future CAEECC meetings.

- It was **confusing that late voting was allowed**, especially since we can send a proxy. The other CAEECC members were present either virtually or in person.
- Continue to determine **which issues CAEECC members are most interested in**, and which CAEECC can **actually have an impact** on the CPUC EE policies.
- I do feel like **anonymous voting would make people feel more comfortable**, but I understand that there are limitations with a hybrid model.
- For newer folks, it may be good to **get an understanding of what CAEECC has made an impact on in proceedings**. It seems many don't think the topics we discussed could be impacted by CAEECC and could be a waste of time. This may be accomplished by **better understanding CAEECC's scope and what it is designed to do**.
- Maybe at the top of the meeting do a **quick review of the structure of CAEECC** for new people that are attending? Explain who CAEECC members are and what it means to just be a public attendee (who from the public attends?) Who can be part of a working group etc...

Reference: Average Evaluations

Question	Q2 2026	Q1 2026	Q4 2025	Q3 2025	Q2 2025	Q1 2025	Q4 2024	Q3 2024	Q2 2024	Q1 2024	Q4 2023
Objectives of the meeting were accomplished.	4.9	5.4	5.5	5.3	5	4.9	4.9	5.3	4.6	4.3	5.0
Presentations and background documents were clear and helpful.	5.3	5.3	5.2	5.5	5.4	5.2	5.3	5.4	4.4	4.9	4.9
This meeting was an inclusive and trusting environment	5.3	5.4	5.3	5.2	5.3	5.2	5.0	5.1	4.3	4.9	4.9
The facilitators were effective in running the meeting (e.g., fostering a constructive and efficient forum, being impartial, and making sure no one dominated discussions).	5.1	5.7	5.8	5.5	5.3	5.4	5.2	5.2	4.3	4.7	4.7
Overall, the online meeting format was smooth and effective.	5.2	5.7	5.5	5.5	5.5	4.7	4.9	5.1	4.8	4.4	5.2
Overall, this Full CAEECC meeting was successful.	4.8	5.3	5.2	5.2	5	5	4.8	5.2	4.3	4.4	4.6
Overall, this Full CAEECC meeting was valuable to my organization.	4.5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A