

Evolving CAEECC Working Group Meeting #3 Summary

Meeting Date and Time: September 27, 2023, 9:30am - 1:30pm PT

On September 27, 2023, the Evolving CAEECC Working Group (ECWG) met virtually via Zoom. There were twenty-five Evolving CAEECC Working Group Members in attendance and one member of the public (see [Appendix A](#) for a full list of meeting attendees). This meeting was facilitated by Michelle Vigen Ralston (Ralston), Suhaila Sikand (Sikand), and Katie Wu (Wu) of Common Spark Consulting and supported by Susan Rivo (Rivo) of Raab Associates. In addition, CAEECC's Senior Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Advisor, Dr. Anthony Kinslow II, attended this meeting in part.

Supporting meeting materials are available at:

<https://www.caeec.org/evolving-caeccc-wg-mtg-3>. Relevant materials include:

- Agenda (*Evolving CAEECC WG #3 – Agenda*),
- Meeting Slide Deck (*Evolving CAEECC WG #3 – Live Edited Slide Deck*), and
- Facilitator Synthesis and Proposals (*Evolving CAEECC Homework D Facilitator Synthesis*).

Overview

Key Meeting Takeaways:

- Members want a new way of doing work within this Working Group including more frequent and shorter engagements (through Huddle Meetings), the ability to choose topics to discuss more freely and the ability to co-develop agendas and homeworks. They seek more group-led discussion.
- Members raised that they still require more context setting about CAEECC and the energy efficiency programs, and specific CAEECC nuances and dynamics relevant to the Evolving CAEECC Working Group topics.
- Members elevated the following topics for continued discussion:
 - Shared understanding of CAEECC history and EE context;
 - Common Terms and Definitions;
 - Sharing of where folks are coming from (interests, conflicts, skillsets) and what they bring to the space;
 - What problems is the Evolving CAEECC Working Group trying to solve;
 - What are the group's common goals in the short, medium, and long term;
 - What injustices are in CAEECC now;
 - What solutions are available to change CAEECC to remove injustices;
 - What should CAEECC be moving forward; and
 - What tools should be in CAEECC's tool box to affect change.

This meeting summary is intended to capture this meeting's discussion of ideas, concerns, and alternative options for proposals.

Key acronyms used in this document include: Evolving CAEECC Working Group (ECWG), California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee (CAEECC), California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), energy efficiency (EE), justice equity diversity and inclusion (JEDI), Composition Diversity Equity and Inclusion Working Group (CDEI WG), Portfolio Administrator (PA), Investor-owned utilities (IOU), Regional Energy Network (REN), CPUC's Environmental and Social Justice Action Plan ([ESJ Action Plan](#)), and Compensation Pilot (Pilot).

Welcome and Introductions

Slides 2 - 15

Suhaila Sikand welcomed everyone to the meeting and began a brief introduction section via the chat. Members were then dispersed into breakout groups to meet other members in groups of roughly four. Members were given two prompts, but could diverge from them: *What are 3 words that describe you? What are 3 words to describe the Evolving CAEECC Working Group?*

Sikand provided general reminders, Zoom etiquette, CAEECC Ground Rules and Working Group Community Agreements. Michelle Vigen Ralston introduced the agenda below and how it was developed. Ralston provided a brief summary of the evaluations from the first meeting.

- Welcome and Introductions & Today's Meeting
- Topic 1: Debrief 9/20 CAEECC Meeting
- Topic 2: Pivot
- Topic 3: Set a new path
- Wrapping up

Ralston acknowledged that this meeting was different and that was on purpose. She recognized that the Working Group is working within the system of inequities and injustice. She addressed some of the voice concerns and talked about how this meeting has been shaped from those comments and thoughts. Ralston acknowledged that this Working Group is very unique, and that it's one of the first in this space. She outlined that the Evolving CAEECC Working Group is constrained in a lot of different ways: this is a Commission-driven initiative with all of the incumbent cultural structure and expectations and practices and that the subject matter of anything regulatory is extensively complicated. Ralston thanked everyone for engaging and for calling in exclusive language use.

The agenda for this meeting was changed after input from the 9/20 CAEECC meeting. The new purpose of this meeting was to further release the working group from the original initial working group vision and process, and to allow the Evolving CAEECC

Working Group members to re-scope their work, process, and deliverables. Moreover, the purpose was to answer the following questions: *What is needed in this working group; what do you want to work on?* Specifically, the objectives of this meeting were:

- Continue to meet and learn from members of Evolving CAEECC Working Group
- Discuss/Set a new path for this working group to sail.

Summary of Discussion during Welcome and Introductions

- A Member asked if there were alternates or members of the public in attendance. At the time, the Alternates present was Shadi Aslebagh from the CEC and eventually, a member of the public, Jim Dodenhoff, joined the call.

9/20 Full Quarterly CAEECC Meeting #39 Debrief

Slides 19 - 21

Ralston introduced the next section, to hear from folks based on the conversation of the [9/20 Full Quarterly CAEECC Meeting #39](#).

Dr. Anthony Kinslow II was invited to introduce himself as part of the facilitation team, and specifically advising the facilitation team's work with the Evolving CAEECC Working Group. Dr. Kinslow has a background with a focus on equity and technical aspects of clean energy, and then was exposed and began to intervene in the policy space. Dr. Kinslow noted that the institutional inequities we see really transcended the topic, it didn't matter if talking about solar, EE, or building housing—the same misperceptions and biases were showing up. Dr. Kinslow provided encouraging words for Evolving CAEECC Working Group Members: *do not feel the need to be an expert in both sides to have an impact and participate, this should be a partnership in order to create a better solution.*

Sikand built off Dr. Kinslow's words of encouragement by elevating that even if certain members were not in attendance at the CAEECC Meeting, the Facilitation Team believes that there is still a lot to discuss and ways to engage and add their voice in the breakouts to debrief the CAEECC meeting. She noted that the breakouts are offered as a space for those who were present to bring back some of the observations. She reiterated Dr. Kinslow's message, the Facilitation Team believes each Member has great value and perspectives. Sikand sent participants into breakouts to discuss the following prompts: *What was frustrating, hopeful, confusing, or helpful at the CAEECC meeting? What do you/does the Evolving CAEECC Working Group need from CAEECC to move forward, if anything?*

Ralston brought the group back to the main room and requested to hear from each group, ideally someone who typically the group had not heard from, to elevate what rose to the top of discussion.

- Katie Wu, Facilitation Team: Noted that there was a lot of frustration with this process and a need to understand a long and complex regulatory history to understand what changes can be made. She noted positive reception by the Full CAEECC at the 9/20 Full CAEECC Meeting after Mr. Charles recommended extending a timeline for community input.
- AJ Perkins, Individual: Mr. Charles mentioned that we weren't able to be a participant in the 9/20 Full CAEECC Meeting because we weren't invited (physically). Laurel Rothschild mentioned that the 9/20 Full CAEECC meeting was a shift generally, because this meeting wasn't only CAEECC Members contributing (which is the typical process). Perkins offered that the CAEECC Family can cover the structure of CAEECC and why things were done in the past in order to assess how to bridge the gap.
 - Facilitator: Noted that Evolving CAEECC Working Group can make recommendations to CAEECC that would dramatically change the way the meetings are conducted.
- Melanie Gillette, MCR Group: Summarized that there are historical things that CAEECC has always done that is making it cumbersome for Working Group members to participate in the 9/20 Full CAEECC Meeting. Many Working Group Members had prior commitments so couldn't attend the 9/20 Full CAEECC Meeting. Requested there be a recognition for all the competing priorities, so when Working Group Members do set aside the time to participate, they feel heard and valued. Gillette highlighted that some structures of CAEECC aren't well understood and the homework feels disconnected and "plopped together" for folks to engage in. She noted that CAEECC being willing to change historical processes is a helpful suggestion.
- Tanisha-Jean Martin, San Diego Urban Sustainability Coalition: Elevated and thanked Mr. Charles for his comments at the 9/20 Full CAEECC Meeting, particularly around engaging communities, and is excited for changes coming.

Summary of Discussion during 9/20 Full CAEECC Meeting Debrief

- Members questioned how many Evolving CAEECC Working Group Members were at the 9/20 Full CAEECC Meeting and how they might participate in the Breakouts.
- Members chatted about zoom technical difficulties with the Breakout Room timer.

Pivot

Slides 38 - 46

Ralston acknowledged that there's been questions about why the process is what it is and why Homework is done the way it's conducted. She shared the process used so far has been based on best practices of past working groups but may not be the process this group needs. She invited folks to observe what the Working Group has put together

so far and invited folks to toss it out or say that this process isn't working and to develop a new one.

Ralston covered what the work Evolving CAEECC Working Group has done so far. She noted that CAEECC has an established process where:

- During the meeting, members share their ideas, feedback and input
- In between meetings is for additional thought
- After Homework, the Facilitation team takes that all into consideration and compiles it into a first draft so Working Group Members have something to work with for the next meeting.
- During the meeting, Working Group Members can pick apart the first draft, change things, move things, add things, take things out, etc. And the process continues.

Ralston reminded the Working Group that they could throw it all away if it wasn't a helpful starting point, yet she also wanted to acknowledge all the work the Working Group has already put into this process. Ralston covered an overview of the initial ideas that were from the Homework C. Sikand elaborated with a walk through of the Synthesis (available on the [Meeting Webpage](#)) draft in detail.

Ralston provided a recap of the topics that the Composition, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (CDEI) Working Group recommended, including, but not limited to: Composition/representation; Compensation; Building competency; Recruitment/retention; Facilitation; and Building accountability. She reminded Evolving CAEECC Working Group members that the CDEI put thought into naming these topics as potential areas for the Evolving CAEECC Working Group to provide recommendations around.

Ralston posed questions inviting the group to pivot: *What is the biggest need for change? What topics do you want to work on? How do you want to meet and do your work? What do you think should be included and delivered in a report?* Ralston noted that, for better or worse, this working group was originally structured based on past working group processes.

Ralston pivoted to discuss the various ways to move forward. One, to continue as it's been, where the Working Group discusses the Synthesis, edits, revises, continues to do Homework, etc. Another, to take a step back, to see if folks want to revise the process of this Working Group in order to then move forward later (perhaps with the synthesis, perhaps with other items). Sikand highlighted that if the latter is chosen, it doesn't mean that the Synthesis won't get talked about, but that it can be a future conversation.

Midway through discussion, the Working Group took a lunch break.

Summary of Discussion during Pivot

- Members raised caution, confusion, and frustration that the Synthesis was so briefly presented.
 - The Facilitators noted that they wanted to lay everything out that the Working Group has done to be able to discuss whether or not Members would like to re-examine and create a new format for the working group. They didn't want to assume this group wanted to work from the Synthesis as a starting point.
- Members raised questions about technical pieces, including clarifications on market rate versus non-market rate customers, ratepayer versus non-ratepayer, and the concept of a rolling portfolio.
- Members questioned how the Synthesis came from Homework C, feeling like the Facilitators added their own thoughts into the Synthesis.
 - The Facilitators noted that the Synthesis was developed directly from the Homework C. Facilitators sought to incorporate the ideas that seemed to resonate with the most folks, as well as include as much as they could; ideas were organized to try to convey the topline ideas. However, the Facilitators did not add additional concepts into this Synthesis.
- Members elevated that (more) context-setting was needed to be able to understand the scope of possible solutions and ideas the working group can develop. Others, however, felt that they were ready to dive in. A few Members raised that this could be because they already have the context needed, but that others in the group do not and therefore need additional time to build context in order to develop and generate recommendations. Some ideas include: naming the inequities in the system; understanding the ecosystem of market rate programs, power-mapping, conflict of interest disclosures, etc.
- Some Members elevated a need to redo the entire working group process whereas others felt they could dive into what the working group wants to recommend.
- Members suggested taking the process slowly, one topic at a time. Members elevated that the Homework as-is is daunting and that it needs to be more focused. A Member also requested that the Homeworks and Agendas be co-created by the Working Group versus Facilitators.
- Members requested that this session be more conversational and group-led, without the Facilitation Team guiding the conversation.
- Members discussed if there is consensus in this Evolving CAEECC Working Group that CAEECC is "broken". There was agreement from CAEECC Members and specific stakeholders that CAEECC isn't "broken" but very much outdated.
- A Member suggested that each member identifies why everyone is in the group (make transparent any interests) and what they bring to the table (skills and strengths) in order to begin trusting each other and leveraging the strengths and passions of each Member to develop recommendations.

- A Member proposed the development of a roadmap of what Evolving CAEECC wants to aim for and how to get there. Another member suggested identifying the tools needed at the end of the roadmap for future CAEECC Members.
- Members suggested using Huddles (shorter, non-required meetings) as a way to collaborate on Homework together and move the conversation forward. Members suggested using topic-based spaces, such as what isn't working in CAEECC, and a dream big vision for CAEECC.
- Members discussed what ways were best to collaborate. Many supported using breakout rooms, Jamboard, and/or Google Docs, however, one member raised concern about accessibility and limitations to these tactics and tools.
- A Member requested that the working group move forward from a place of trust and respect and that there be concrete next steps.

A comprehensive summary of Member discussion is available in [Appendix B](#).

Next steps

Facilitator Wu summarized the discussion and a few pieces that may be a launching point for further work, including:

- Doing work in smaller chunks
- Narrow the focus with the intention to empower folks to participate in the ways that work for them (i.e. both written and verbal; small and large groups)
- Leverage the Homework for some more narrow topics that builds from the discussion time as we move into this with trust and respect for each other
- Elevated a few broad topics for continued discussion:
 - Shared understanding of history and context, sharing of where folks are coming from and what they bring to the space
 - What problems is the Evolving CAEECC Working Group trying to solve? What injustices are in CAEECC now?
 - What solutions are available to change CAEECC to remove injustices?
 - What tools should be in CAEECC's tool box to affect change?

Summary of Discussion during Next Steps

- Members generally supported the proposed topics for continued discussion. A few Members discussed whether or not Shared Understanding of CAEECC History and Context is needed, but ultimately, it was suggested that it's necessary for specific topic areas versus a broad overview of CAEECC.
- A Member suggested adding short, mid, and long term objectives as a topic for discussion. Another Member built off this and requested to identify common goals as a means to take discussion further where there's commonality.
- Many members, including Jan, Alice, Tanisha-Jean Martin, Jennifer, and Kate echoed that Evolving CAEECC Working Group can't wait until November and that they want meetings prior to November, even if shorter. The Facilitation Team

agreed to look into meeting time possibilities for Huddles (shorter, non-required meetings) before the November 15 Evolving CAEECC Working Group #4 Meeting.

- A Member asked if in-person is feasible prior to November or for the November meeting.
 - The Facilitation Team agreed to explore the budget for this.
- The Facilitation Team, to get everyone's input, shared the topics for continued discussion (see bullet below) via the Evaluation Survey to get additional feedback on potential next topics for the Huddles. In addition, the Facilitation Team sent out a scheduling poll for a Huddle via the Evaluation Survey.
- The following topics were elevated in the Evaluation Survey which can shape what prompts will be incorporated into the Homework:
 - Shared understanding of CAEECC history and EE context;
 - Common Terms and Definitions;
 - Sharing of where folks are coming from (interests, conflicts, skillsets) and what they bring to the space;
 - What problems is the Evolving CAEECC Working Group trying to solve;
 - What are the group's common goals in the short, medium, and long term; What injustices are in CAEECC now;
 - What solutions are available to change CAEECC to remove injustices;
 - What should CAEECC be moving forward;
 - What tools should be in CAEECC's tool box to affect change.
 - Other: _____

A comprehensive summary of Member discussion is available in [Appendix B](#).

Appendix A - Attendance

Organization	Name
Evolving CAEECC Working Group Members	
NRDC	Lara Ettenson
The Energy Coalition	Laurel Rothschild
CPUC	Pamela Rittelmeyer
CEC	Shadi Aslebagh (alternate for Kristina Dulonglo)
Acterra	Leo Steinmetz
Association of California Community & Energy Services	Jason Minsky
Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG)	Amaury Berteaud
Brightline Defense Project ("Brightline")	Sarah Xu
Center for Accessible Technology	Kate Woodford
Day One	Angelique Lopez
Emerald Cities Collaborative	Jenifer Lomeli-Quintero
Energy Solutions	Evan Kamei
Gateway Cities Council of Governments	Sumire Gant
Individual	Aislyn Colgan
Individual	AJ Perkins
Individual	Alice Sung
Individual	Mr. Charles
Individual	Nicole Milner
Individual	Spencer Lipp
MAAC Project	Valerie Hash
MCR Performance Solutions	Melanie Gillette
Nevada County Energy Action Plan Committee	Jan Maes
San Diego Urban Sustainability Coalition	Tanisha-Jean Martin
The Greenlining Institute	Jordyn Bishop
Valley Clean Air Now	Tom Knox
Willdan	Lou Jacobson
Members of the Public	
Silent Running	Jim Dodenhoff

Appendix B: Discussions

Welcome and Introductions

- [Chat] Alice Sung: Do we have any "public" (not Evolving CAEECC Working Group members) in the room? other than Dr. Kinslow? Who's missing from the Evolving CAEECC Working Group?

9/20 CAEECC Debrief

- [Chat] Laurel Rothschild: Did most Evolving CAEECC Working Group members participate in last week's meeting?
 - Facilitator: About 20 Members did attend
- [Chat] Jordyn Bishop: Yes, definitely want to contribute to the discussion, but need to get up to speed on what my colleagues said
- [Chat] Aislyn Colgan: I wonder if debriefing the homework C would also be a part of this breakout?
- [Chat] Laurel Rothschild: I did not see a timer!
 - [Chat] Dr. Anthony Kinslow II: It was small in the top right.
 - [Chat] Laurel Rothschild: Thanks! I will look for it next time
 - [Chat] Pamela Rittelmeyer: It was in the upper right side of the screen. Very small

Pivot

- [Chat] Alice Sung: Could you go back and start with the first slide re CAEECC definition, and ask for feedback and questions first?
 - Facilitator: Agreed, but also noted that this was meant to be a quick overview of the ideas elevated (again a first draft) and that this meeting was asked to be a point to rethink the working group process generally.
- [Chat] Lara Ettenson: Point of clarification, CAEECC only can influence Californians receiving energy from entities (e.g., investor owned utilities or community choice aggregators) that are regulated by CPUC
- [Chat] Jan Maes: how is rate-paying different from market rate EE programs?
 - Facilitator: Market rate EE is a subset of ratepayer-funded EE
- [Chat] Pamela Rittelmeyer: Could facilitators explain ratepayer versus non-ratepayer programs?
- [Chat] Jan Maes: and market rate v non-market rate
 - [Chat] Pamela Rittelmeyer: To build on Jan: can you explain the different segments in the EE portfolios
 - Facilitator: Ratepayer funded programs are the programs implemented by IOUs and other program administrators. These are funded through the Public Purpose Charge on energy bills. Non-ratepayer programs could be programs funded by utility shareholders, the CA general fund, and/or other agencies. In the EE portfolio, the three segments include (1) Resource

- Acquisition (programs that achieve energy efficiency savings), (2) Market Support (programs that support the energy efficiency market like workforce development and codes and standards advocacy), and (3) Equity (programs that help to increase access to energy efficiency)
- [Chat] Kate Woodford: This synthesis is odd. It is NOT what you prepared as the Homework C synthesis. Now it looks like you have recreated a synthesis from those of us who have expressed extreme dissatisfaction with the current process.
 - Facilitator: Kate, as we said at the beginning, this is a very very first draft. We're open if y'all want to toss this out! We're asking about that in a few slides
- [Chat] Alice Sung: I had thought this is our opportunity to discuss this all together....?
 - Facilitator: We're doing a fly-by right now, and we can discuss this, toss it out, and/or step back about Evolving CAEECC Working Group processes generally (how Evolving CAEECC Working Group wants to work moving forward)
 - [Chat] Alice Sung: How much time do we all get to answer these questions posed and discuss?
 - Facilitator: About half the meeting.
- Amaury Berteaud: Loved the synthesis prepared as it seems to address the scope of work (deliverables). Asked if we have a synthesis about the existing processes. Asked if the group needs to take time and discuss CAEECC.
 - Facilitator: Noted a few things. 1) perhaps more time is needed to set the context of CAEECC in order to create a process. 2) the discussion on recreating a process is for the Working Group Process and how it wants to move forward to discuss, converse, and recommend.
- Tom Knox: When I read this, I'm seeing a lot of process rather than outcomes. Struggling to understand what the outcomes of this will be and believes the process and structure is less important. The outcome, presumably creating a more equitable system for energy efficiency to be available to the most impacted communities. That then feeds into what is possible to change the existing system and developing the tangible outcomes.
 - Facilitator: Noted there's frustration with the Working Group process, how we are doing meetings and homework. Then there's frustration with CAEECC and how its structured. Noted the FACilitators have been focusing on the latter, but Working Group Members have been frustrated on the former and that's what this meeting is about. Noted she's hearing mixed messages about redoing this working group versus moving forward on the orientation, what's possible for change, etc.
 - [Chat] Alice Sung: In order to address part of what Tom is raising--here's a suggestion-- that what is needed is Targeted Universalism, per John A. Powell

- Aislyn Colgan: Felt that the working group needs to acknowledge the mountain of inequity that's built into the system. Raised the inherent conflict of interests for folks who are using public money to build programs but are paid through those programs to do that work. Noted the things that need to change are obvious, such as having different people need to be in the room and the barriers that exist there. Then there's the constraints of this group and the levers that this group can push on. Would like to look at the larger system, name inequities built into the institution, and then work from there.
 - Facilitator: Perhaps Dr. Kinslow and Ralston can do a meeting to name the inequities.
- [Chat] Kate Woodford: Redo the entire Evolving CAEECC Working Group process.
- [Chat] Amaury Berteaud: Another question I had was whether the current full CAEECC structure, objectives, and scope is determined by D15-10-028? Would a CPUC decision be needed to change what CAEECC does?
 - Facilitator: Yes, and this Evolving CAEECC Working Group can develop the motion and recommendations for the change
 - [Chat] Amaury Berteaud: So the vision/deliverable for the working group would be to provide recommended language to CAEECC, for a motion to be made to transform CAEECC?
- Nicole Milner: Noted in office hours, a suggestion was for the meetings to be bite-size with more group discussion. Elevated that if Evolving CAEECC Working Group can submit a solid "Task 1", that's better than a partial non-consensus nothing. Suggested to slow it down and focus down with group discussion. Noted that she was on the Compensation Task Force that was designed like this Evolving CAEECC Working Group process, and it worked for that group, but clearly isn't for this group.
 - +1 Jan Maes
 - Facilitator: Heard that perhaps Huddles around specific tasks would be helpful.
 - [Chat] Tanisha-Jean Martin: Great suggestion Nicole! let's fully accomplish a task rather than touching on many.
- [Chat] Alice Sung: Maybe what we need is for each of us to re-write the last few slides in our own words and we put them all up to discuss - as opposed to having facilitators synthesize through their bias?
- [Chat] Kate Woodford: It seems we are being to at. That seems not a collaborative way. It seems our voices are still being slowed down. Lots of talking from the facilitators, but almost no talking about the real issues here from the group.
 - [Chat] Aislyn Colgan: I can relate to a feeling that this agenda section was presented as a chance for us to talk but the first chunk was us being presented more slides. And I also can relate to a feeling that the synthesis presented (badass as it is) was not something that felt like it came directly from our homework but had an added component of facilitator input.

badass in this context is defined as "a thorough, on-point introductory rendering of the necessary scope to infuse more ESJ into this process."

- Spencer Lipp: Noted it seems like a lot is happening in Homework and that's not working for this process. Felt that the Homework is very independent. Raised a proposal to break into smaller groups to do a mini meeting with a range of program folks and community folks working on the Homework together. Noted that the issues we are talking about are conversational. Raised that the proposal is perhaps a way to work within the budget constraints.
 - +1: Lara Ettenson, Tanisha-Jean Martin
- Pamela Rittelmeyer, CPUC: Covered the decision-making authority of CAEECC. Noted that CAEECC is a policy forum, and usually they don't have decision-making authority because that really adds a lot of restrictions and complications. Noted that as an advisory group, there can be networking, recommendations, conversing of ideas. Highlighted the power CAEECC currently has is the ear of one of the Commissioners. Emphasized the paper trail is important as a deliverable. Noted that Evolving CAEECC Working Group is not the only one in the world, but the connection to CPUC is unique. Acknowledged that it often does take knowledge for making those recommendations coming to life, and it doesn't have to be the same folks writing recommendations. Proposed a topic on "how to write a motion and what that means".
 - Facilitator: Noted that some in this group can make bold recommendations and some know how to make those recommendations formalized and public.
 - [Chat] Pamela Rittelmeyer: I wasn't suggesting that everyone needs to be able to write a motion, etc, but rather just to understand what the process is. Some orgs here, like NRDC, are very experienced with this process.
- Jordyn Bishop: Felt a lot of tension in this room, and it's distracting. Echoed that there's not a level of understanding of agreement of how or what we're doing as a working group. Sensed confusion and non-consensus about the process itself and what we're doing. Raised concern the desire to slow down and continue the level set and agreement before moving forward. Noted that building equity within an existing committee space is a difficult space, and you can't do that without meaningful community engagement with adequate level setting. Recognized that not everyone needs to be an energy efficiency expert, but needs to be informed enough to be included in a process. Noted that we aren't there yet. Highlighted she can't think about recommendations when there's inequity in this process with this knowledge barrier.
- Lara Ettenson: Overviewed the process of CAEECC—it brought interested people into CAEECC to discuss. Emphasized she'd love to toss out CAEECC as it is and come up with a new vision entirely. Noted if there are commission barriers, then proposed to recommend that the CPUC do something about it. Let's think about CAEECC two years from now as a recommendation to the CPUC. Asked what does Evolving CAEECC Working Group think would be a successful situation for CAEECC to influence to the vision, and then use that as the foundation for

thinking through this. Proposed that then we can strategize about how to move the recommendations through the commission, rather than being constrained by the levers that can be pulled.

- +1: Alice Sung, Nicole Milner
- [Chat] Kate Woodford: What does level setting mean? Not in this space, but what is level setting?
 - [Chat] Jordyn Bishop: I would define level setting as taking the time to bring everyone up to speed and enough understanding that is needed to meaningful participate in a process.
 - [Chat] Kate Woodford: Thank you. THAT is an example of exclusionary language.
- Alice Sung: Noted that self determination, seems very confinely constrained. Highlighted that the questions proposed to guide this discussion or meetings generally are not coming from us. Suggested to have a shared purpose, because there's not. Highlighted that conflict of interest within our own body as well as in CAEECC as a body. Suggested to break ourselves free from having to respond to the slides and to have everyone speak. Asked what is our shared purpose as Evolving CAEECC Working Group? Asked if Evolving CAEECC Working Group can actually manifest the words "Dream Big" by creating a new model for the use of our ratepayer money in order to utilize Targeted Universalism and address or shift investments of public goods money to the Communities of Concern. Suggested to hold the CPUC accountable to not continuing in the business as usual. Suggested to research how to create a CA Energy Trust that's independent to direct ratepayer funds.
 - [Chat] Alice Sung: in addition to creation of agenda, co-creation of any process and "homework" with huddles,,,
- [Chat] Tanisha-Jean Martin: Despite the groups overall tension, I just want to comment I think Suhaila and Michelle are doing a great job of working to try and genuinely hear the groups concerns and I appreciate it. This is not easy work and I appreciate everyone in the room offering sincere suggestions for the betterment of improving CAEECC and the communities we serve.
 - +1: Jordyn
- [Chat] Nicole Milner: Regardless of how much we get accomplished, the vision and our suggestions will be documented, so it will help contribute to progress!
- [Chat] Aislyn Colgan: I agree with Lara and would add the piece that ultimately the Communities of Concern would need to be equipped to write the motion and not have the system designed in a way that Communities of Concern always need a gatekeeper/translator in order to communicate with the CPUC
 - +1: Pamela Rittelmeyer, Sarah Xu
- Nicole Milner: Suggested to take part one of task one and lets put it out there and ask questions. Suggested to not move on until we're good and have consensus. Suggested to move to recommendations to CAEECC. Suggested to start with what is the purpose of CAEECC, and then move on from there.
 - +1: Leo Steinmetz

- [Chat] Tanisha-Jean Martin: I agree Alice, I am interested in everyone's opinions, so those that I have never heard, not just today, but at any meeting we have had, I just want to encourage them and say I/we are very open to hearing you.
- [Chat] Pamela Rittelmeyer: Would it be useful to discuss how ratepayer funds are being used?
 - [Chat] Alice Sung: @ Pam's comment- yes, partially - that gets at what CAEECC does now.
- Aislyn Colgan: Supported a naming inequities piece agenda item and invited it to be a discussion in a huddle with more voices than just Kinslow and Ralston. Suggested to look at outcomes and where we want to be in order to ground ourselves. Supported the synthesis as a baseline with the proper language for the levers to be pushed on. Questioned how to have the conversation about the synthesis.
- Facilitator: Summarized that people are asking for Huddles, perhaps without an agenda and only a question to discuss.
- [Chat] Leo Steinmetz: I think diving into something very specific and narrow for a while would be useful.
- [Chat] Spencer Lipp: Suggestion to focus on future as Lara said. So, perhaps it's "What should the purpose of CAEECC be?"
 - [Chat] Jan Maes: "and what is the problem it is trying to address in the first place"
- Facilitator: Maybe we don't have an agenda, but just a question. Maybe my job is to notetake in front of y'all.
- [Chat] Alice Sung: I actually felt much of the original Evolving CAEECC Working Group prospectus was relevant as a starting point, .. just thought the "summary" prospectus was not inclusive enough
- [Chat] Lara Ettenson: Also, Michelle could you add specificity to the inequity piece?
- Mr. Charles: Thought about the last session ending. Suggested to have a group-led discussion and for Facilitators to keep conversation going and would like to hear from fellow group members in discussion. Called Evolving CAEECC Working Group into a Huddle right now. Wanted to see the group coming up with ideas.
- [Chat] Alice Sung: what is our Evolving CAEECC Working Group shared purpose? A. to make recommendations to "incrementally fix CAEECC" or B. co-create a new model to replace CAEECC?" or C. " Others?" D. " ?"
- Sumi Grant: Suggested that rather than going backwards, love the "think big" idea and what CAEECC should be going forward versus going back on what it already is.
 - +1: Lara Ettenson
- Nicole Milner: Asked if we could get going right now and think big. Suggested to do breakout groups and report back.
- [Chat] Pamela Rittelmeyer: What is the main goal Evolving CAEECC Working Group sees for CAEECC?

- Kate Woodford: Opposed breakout groups as it comes off as a divide and conquer technique. Noted that non-facilitators have heard from Facilitators for some time. Rather than seeing hands up, wanted to see a respectful conversation. Suggested to have a basic conversation about the Evolving CAEECC Working Group function.
- [Chat] Amaury Berteaud: Is there a polling function we could use to make sure everyone's opinion is represented?
 - [Chat] Lara Ettenson: or add a Jamboard, that way we can get the folks who are less inclined to speak in big groups and we'll have more time to brainstorm vs. report out.
 - [Chat] Laurel Rothschild: Jamboard is always a great way to hear from everyone at once
- Aislyn Colgan: Supported the idea to think big. Assumed that everyone here is for the good of environmental efficiency. Noted there's a power imbalance in the system and some people have more say inherently in the system than others. Asked where everyone's potential conflict of interest is. Questioned how CAEECC will look in the future may impact their bottom lines and paychecks. Supported a power map activity.
 - Nicole Milner: Reminded that disclosed conflict of interests are on the CAEECC Website.
 - Facilitator: Expanded that perhaps it's more than a contractual conflict of interest and rather how they may contribute or participate.
 - Aislyn Colgan: Raised that there's explicit bias around programing.
- [Chat] Leo Steinmetz: Personally, I find it a lot easier to speak up and have a focused discussion in smaller groups, and would prefer some breakout rooms, even though I understand that makes it harder to really clearly understand our group thoughts afterward.
- [Chat] Alice Sung: I see some participants names I don't recognize--in the spirit of transparency and building trust in the room, could they introduce themselves?
- Laurel Rothschild: Heard that folks want to establish trust. Noted she represents The Energy Coalition and disclosed contracts. Noted that for us as an organization, we'd be thinking about how to adapt and evolve to Evolving CAEECC Working Group's recommendations. Noted she's looking at this as an opportunity to listen and learn and provide input where valuable. Interested in how we can start trusting each other.
- Alice Sung: Asked if Evolving CAEECC Working Group all shares the sentiment that CAEECC is broken and we need something new, especially to address the inequity in the world and who has access to opportunities to level the playing field. Noted there are some CAEECC Members here and asked if this sentiment is shared.
 - Lara Ettenson: Noted that the Full CAEECC Members believes that CAEECC is out of date and irrelevant, not necessarily broken. Summarized that's why we're here today and why Full CAEECC and CPUC ED agreed

- this is what we all need. Noted that CAEECC had to vote to let this group happen, and no one disagreed.
- [Chat] Laurel Rothschild: As a full CAEECC member, I am supportive of change!
 - Facilitator: Noted that CAEECC Members knew what would be in that group through the CDEI Final Report.
 - Alice Sung: Asked if CAEECC is willing to entertain the idea of “blow it all up and start over.”
 - Lara Ettenson: Noted they may disagree but we have a process for that and it would go to the Commission for a final say no matter what.
 - Alice Sung: Highlighted that no matter our recommendations, even if there isn’t consensus on these recommendations, it’s up the CPUC to act or not act on our recommendations.
 - [Chat] Lara Ettenson: I'd love to hear what this group would see as an ideal set-up of an inclusive collaborative moving forward. Who would be in the group, what would this group be charged with, how would we be inclusive, etc? And after we build that ideal, then we could come up with the recommendations.
 - Amaury Berteaud: Noted that there seems that there is a consensus that CAEECC is broken. Asked if there is a consensus on how CAEECC is broken. Asked if our evaluation of CAEECC’s current scope needed or is it important to move forward and dream big.
 - +1 Pamela Rittelmeyer
 - [Chat] Lara Ettenson: I propose we go straight to what could be
 - Amaury Berteaud: Suggested to provide multiple ways to provide input, perhaps a poll, Jamboard, or a way to document to see if there is a true consensus across all members versus just the people speaking.
 - Jan Maes: Echoed why CAEECC is broken is important. Noted he’d love to get started and think big on a vision for what CAEECC could look like. Disagreed that breakouts aren’t dividing and conquering in smaller groups, support whatever format. Suggested to end today’s session with a vision and optimism of where we’re going.
 - Pamela Rittelmeyer: Noted she’s speaking as a new staff to the CPUC. Spent a lot of time figuring all this out. Noted that CAEECC was formed back in 2013 because the system was already broken. At the time, those were being implemented by the IOUs. Noted the whole scenario has changed since 2013 and there’s a lot of different players implementing and managing programs. Highlighted it’s important to understand where it started, how its changed, and how the industry has changed. Questions how CAEECC can best make these programs accessible to those historically not served.
 - [Chat] Lara Ettenson: +1 Pamela and we also have COVID and the murder of George Floyd and so many other things...
 - [Chat] Lara Ettenson: I’m happy to discuss what isn't working, but I am not sure that's necessary to create the world we want to see moving forward...

- Alice Sung: Asked if folks could respond to these questions: 1) What has historically been CAEECC's activities and outcomes and what's not working? 2) what do you feel is broken and needs change in CAEECC? Would like to know this and felt that these questions were ignored in the past.
- [Chat] Evan Kamei: I think it's helpful to understand why CAEECC is broken, so it can inform what we expect CAEECC to do. There is a need to understand what is in scope for CAEECC to do. For people newer to CAEECC, taking time to develop that understanding will help members contribute meaningfully.
- Lou Jacobson: Challenged the idea that CAEECC is broken, rather it's out of date to meet the need of today. Asked the question, what's limiting market actors from serving equitably? Posed how can CAEECC engage in this proceeding and maybe others to figure out how programs can change. Noted Evolving CAEECC Working Group was talking about of equitable service to all people. Noted the assumption that programs are about the individual person versus the ratepayer—that small detail penetrates everything. Highlighted that in some cases it's about the individual versus the ratepayer. Noted that CAEECC needs to evolve to the needs of today as it relates to the policy and regulation that are driving programs forward.
 - [Chat] Jan Maes: I agree with Lou that is where we need to start, policies and regulations are broken
 - [Chat] Sarah Xu: Thanks Lou, that's a good framing to think about.
 - [Chat] Pamela Rittelmeyer: Agree with Lou. CAEECC can recommend changes to make policies equitable. Is Evolving CAEECC Working Group recommending who needs to be in the CAEECC room to draft those policy recommendations or is Evolving CAEECC Working Group recommending the policies? I think either would be fine, but which one does Evolving CAEECC Working Group want to do? Both are fine, recognizing the time/energy to do each.
 - [Chat] Alice Sung: To Lou's comments, I respectfully disagree with the assumption that "what is needed is to identify what limits market actors from implementing the energy efficiency work more equitably?" because, the MARKET innately operates for the capitalist purpose of maximizing profits for the org/firm/shareholder/executives. this is opposition of what I believe is needed, which is to direct the investments/public funds to benefit those most impacted, in communities of concern as a priority at which point equity is better achieved and do this through Just Transition, where the majority of the monies do not necessarily flow to the already powerful and or wealthy stakeholder/implementers but lift up and partner with community folks and small BIPOC businesses that should be resourced to do this work for their communities and then some.
 - [Chat] Lara Ettenson: Bottom line is CAEECC was set up to do something different than what we need in a collaborative body today and moving forward

- [Chat] Lara Ettenson: I am happy to discuss what isn't working, but I am not sure that's necessary to create the world we want to see moving forward...
 - [Chat] Aislyn Colgan: Lara I am totally open to talking more about the way information is conveyed
- Lara Ettenson: Suggested that this group knows what's outdated without understanding the full history of CAEECC. Suggested to start thinking about what would be a good forum. Noted we can bring in history when it's appropriate. Believed we've evaluated a lot of this already, want to move forward. Asked what it is this group wants to see and she can pull from her 16 years of regulatory experience to help that get done.
- Tanisha-Jean Martin: Noted she's trying to be supportive. Asked to see completion and a task for today. Highlighted that discussion groups are helpful, and I know who has spoken and who hasn't. Noted that she doesn't want to silence each other out. Highlighted that in discussion groups, it allows us to get to speak. Raised that we are not utilizing the skillsets in the room: why are we all here, we all have something to offer; what passion do you want to bring into this? Noted we have progress, but we're not being productive in our conversation here.
 - [Chat] Leo Steinmetz: +1 Tanisha, agree with and appreciate all your points and suggestions.
- Kate Woodford: Noted she has a really hard time with the breakout format. Noted in a breakout may be 5-6 people. Raised concern that the group's content, when presented back, is filtered through the person speaking and recapping a group's discussion. Acknowledged that diverging from the one-person recapping is slow. Suggested that to bring justice, diversity, equity, and inclusion to energy efficiency, Evolving CAEECC Working Group needs to get to the basic words—what is justice, diversity, equity, and inclusion—and then add a component: how to get these ideas and a format to get this structure to then figure out what's helpful. Considered that perhaps many years of experience in technical expertise may be an impediment. Noted here's a lot of conflicting things all at once. Summarized that CAEECC was made to bring market rate energy efficiency oversight. The Evolving CAEECC Working Group purpose is to give CAEECC a justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion frame. Noted Evolving CAEECC Working Group can't help them unless we identify what the diversity problems are. Acknowledged that dreaming big might be non-functional and it's not a good idea. Noted she can't use jamboards due to vision impairments and so she's excluded from various technical tools. Suggested that for herself, a conversation is better.
 - [Chat] Lara Ettenson: What is it we want to change? then how can we do that?
- Melanie Gillette: Suggested for the process to look something like a roadmap and that type of an idea and what Evolving CAEECC Working Group wants for CAEECC and brainstorm what Evolving CAEECC Working Group wants to do to get there. Noted Evolving CAEECC Working Group can spend years breaking

down the history of CAEECC. Supported spending focused time on what we want out of this discussion and brainstorming on a roadmap to get there.

- [Chat] Evan Kamei: I think we can use Jamboards + breakout groups to document what people are saying within groups and make sure no input is left out.
- Lou Jacobson: Asked what tools Evolving CAEECC Working Group wants to put in CAEECC's toolbox to make positive change. Highlighted that Evolving CAEECC Working Group can shape composition, but also the tools are Evolving CAEECC Working Group is giving future membership to affect real policy change. Noted this roadmap Melanie Gillette proposed can lead us to tools to recommend to make policy change.
 - [Chat] Alice Sung: Outcomes from and through Tools are dependent on who wields those tools., and for what purposes.
- Aislyn Colgan: Proposed to be inclusive of everyone and to make sure people are operating outside of their biases. Acknowledged that people are all coming from different places with varying worldviews that may shape their own goals, but that there may not be time to align everyone's worldview or goals. Proposed a next step as a discussion in a huddle or small group discussion about specific topics like how CAEECC isn't working, structural inequities, etc. for anyone who wants to participate in these specific conversations. Suggested a group to work on why CAEECC is not working and then another group for dreaming forward. Suggested that once Evolving CAEECC Working Group gets the dream, then we can get to the real things we can do for implementable solutions.
- Sarah Xu: Noted the conversation has been interesting and that the Facilitators have a lot to consider and balance in terms of the barriers. Supported Aislyn Colgan's proposal about discrete parts to work through. Highlighted there's different depths to tackle and suggested to have directed focused time on them.
 - +1 Evan Kamei
- Jenifer Lomeli-Quintero: Felt similar to everyone. Disclosed she is new to the energy space; a lot of concepts have been tricky to follow. Supported the proposal to start with basics, and to define terms. Supported grouping topics. Acknowledged these proposals likely throw off the original organization of Evolving CAEECC Working Group. Asked for clarification of what we're going to do.
- [Chat] Alice Sung: what is the value of the "rolling portfolio?" annually moving forward, approximately and what has it been historically ? I.e. what is the dollar value of monies CAEECC has influence over administration/programmatic use of that we are talking about?
- [Chat] Sarah Xu: Perhaps a homework/between meeting question is: what are some topics we need to discuss further? And Jamboard/organize on the docs overarching themes/sub themes to tackle.
- Evan Kamei: Noted Evolving CAEECC Working Group has such a diverse range of people on this group: the folks who want to move forward and folks who want to know what ECWG stands for. Noted Evolving CAEECC Working Group is trying to balance giving context and moving forward. Echoed Mr. Charles that we can't

expect folk to meet us where we're at versus we're they're at. Noted that some people want might want to voice their opinion, but they don't even feel like they have the context even chime into this discussion. Questioned if the concepts of ratepayer vs individual is comprehensible. Proposed to stage the homework via segmented topics by weeks, and use the homework as a vehicle to provide context. Requested to use this meeting as a way to answer questions and discuss.

- [Chat] Jan Maes: I like Evan's suggestion to use homework for providing more context to those who need it
- [Chat] Alice Sung: but we need to be allowed to ask the questions /design the Homework-- not just be in reacting mode.
- [Chat] Aislyn Colgan: Thumbs up
- [Chat] Jordyn Bishop: Agree with Evan. I see our task as "how to evolve CAEECC" towards JEDI, but I don't feel we are ready to answer that. I feel that first we need to establish how this working group itself can have JEDI in the process of executing our task. This might be controversial but our final report to CAEECC might end up looking like our recommendations for creating an equitable working group to complete the task.
- Mr. Charles: Noted we've never had this many folks speaking in one session. Noted we already have the fire, now we gotta keep it burning in the right place. Summarized that he heard that the facilitators and staff are trying to find a new way to work with us, but if we don't have concrete ideas to work with, then we don't have a starting point. Suggested to take it in bits and pieces moving forward to start to see success. Noted the main thing creating mistrust is past actions/inactions. Suggested that Evolving CAEECC Working Group approach this from now on, let's trust each other, let's trust the process is changing, and practice patience. Requested to create concrete steps moving forward so there's something to work towards for the next meeting with the goal that we're all moving into this with trust and respect for each other. Noted no one wants to invest too much time if they are worried they'll get burned or wasted. Hoped we can move forward right now with a consensus to work together as a team and that frustration will keep us stagnated.
 - +1: Alice Sung, Lara Ettenson, Laurel Rothschild, Tanisha-Jean Martin
 - [Chat] Evan Kamei: I don't know about everyone else, but Mr. Charles has got me feeling hopeful and inspired 🙌

Next Steps

- [Chat] Alice Sung: Please allow members themselves to co-create the agenda, and any "slides" if they want to raise, and the homework questions themselves.
 - Facilitator: Of course! Ideas on how to do this between meetings?
 - [Chat] Alice: Ask folks to write them into a shared google doc immediately following as possible and leave it up for suggestion mode inputs to a designated date that gives plenty of time...
- Aislyn Colgan: Raised that she didn't resonate with context and history.

- Evan Kamei: Instead, proposed that as we break it down, additional context for a specific topic could be helpful (i.e. what's a concrete example so folks can think generatively).
- Facilitator Wu: Summarized that the group may not need as much time on broad history of CAEECC, but the problems of what CAEECC wants to solve in specific conversation.
 - [Chat] Jordyn Bishop: Agree. Providing necessary context in real time as we work through a task
 - [Chat] Lara Ettenson: I am happy to repackage the training we did...I understand that people learn differently and have capacity (before 10/27)
- Pamela Rittelmeyer: Raised that history is important when discussing segmentation of how energy efficiency programs fit into the different buckets. Elevated that CAEECC can recommend how to change the segmentation buckets for programs and where money can be allocated for these programs.
 - Facilitator: Began thinking through the points for which these regulatory conversations would make sense given previous conversations about the constraints CAEECC is experiencing.
 - [Chat] Alice Sung: Yes @ Pam, Perhaps funds should not be divided in 3 buckets? Can Pam's comment be documented? --so we can just name what we want changed that is inequitable/broken. Please? AND is the goals of those regulatory "mandates" equitable in the first place?
- Amaury Berteaud: Suggested that Evolving CAEECC Working Group can do both, to not be constrained by the limitations of CAEECC and to acknowledge that the portfolio of programs the CPUC approves has a very specific goal to achieve and the Evolving CAEECC Working Group needs to understand that to make recommendations to ensure equity becomes a part of the recommendations without challenging or lowering the ability of these programs to meet what they're mandated to meet from a regulatory standpoint. Noted it boils down to the current scope of CAEECC—to review business/implementation plans. Elaborated there are ways to modify these things to ensure equity is embedded and to acknowledge that these programs have a specific objective already and perhaps there's a layering objectives for short term (things CAEECC can do) and long term (policy platform) objectives.
 - +1: Alice Sung
 - [Chat] Jordyn Bishop: Yes, agree with Amaury. We need recognize existing inequities, both in spirit of recognition justice principles, and in order to develop solutions to address inequities. We can dream big and acknowledge prior harms to community
 - [Chat] Aislyn Colgan: I think a piece that Amaury said that was not captured was short term goals being CAEECC composition etc. but long term being larger policy... unless I am getting that wrong
- Mr. Charles: Supported the framing Amaury Berteaud proposed: what are short, mid, and long term goals and which of our goals are common and shared. Supported to build on our commonalities as opposed to always discussing the

different mindsets that we have. Suggested if we start from there, then, we'll be starting from a place of better understanding and lessen the lack of knowledge present on the technical side. Noted the main thing is that we want to invest equity in this, this is what equity means to us, and this is how we can start working together to achieve..

- +1: Jordyn Bishop, Alice Sung
- Jan Maes: Supported the next steps. Appreciated what Evan Kamei was suggesting as understanding the history and context is important. Suggested to do this through an example of an actual program.
- [Chat] Alice: It would be great for us to have access to this Next steps slide... for example., to direct let our voices be heard...?
 - Facilitator: I can put this in the shared doc
 - [Chat] Alice Sung: yes, and please send link around with notice of what has been added and any instructions/timing when changes will be accepted up to, etc.? thanks
 - [Chat] Kate Woodford: Please no Google docs.
 - [Chat] Lara Ettenson: What would work instead, Kate?
 - [Chat] Kate: Talking in person. Google do's don't allow for fluid thought
- Facilitator: Noted there's an option for up to 3 Huddles. For the next meeting, it would be helpful to talk about common goals, what each person contributes moving forward, and what problems the Evolving CAEECC Working Group is trying to solve. Asked if anyone is opposed to a Huddle as a next step.
- [Chat] Jordyn Bishop: What do we mean by huddle? Smaller meeting time, smaller meeting group, or both?
- Facilitator: Clarified that Huddles are optional, that everyone is invited but it's not required. Noted there are no big decisions made at huddles because not everyone is expected to be there. Summarized in the past, we've done them non-facilitated, with notes, or without notes. Noted they can be really flexible. Suggested to have no notes or let folks do their own note taking and that there's a topic like co-developing agenda, developing homework questions, some of the other topics here that the group identified, or to make space and folks decide on the spot what they want to focus on. Asked if folks would join another meeting.
 - [Chat] Kate Woodford: November is too far away
 - [Chat] Jenifer Lomeli-Quintero: Would it be possible to meet before then? At least a shorter meeting
 - [Chat] Alice Sung: Agreed we can't wait til Nov. We need at least another meeting or 1-2 huddles...in October.
 - [Chat] Tanisha-Jean Martin: November is too far away
 - [Chat] Jan Maes: Before November please
- Lara Ettenson: Asked about the feasibility for an in-person meeting before November 15. Noted Google Docs work for some, but it doesn't work for making connections. Suggested to have more connection sooner.
- [Chat] Tanisha-Jean Martin: thank you facilitators! not the easiest day but you were all great at trying to move forward