

# CAEECC EMSWG Meeting #2 Summary

Date: Tuesday, December 5, 2023

Time: 9:00 - 12:00 pm PT

On December 5, 2023, the Equity & Market Support Working Group (EMSWG) met for its second Meeting via Zoom. There were over 36 attendees, including representatives from 12 EMSWG Member organizations and 12 representatives from Ex-Officio agencies, as well as 12 Members of the Public (see [Appendix A](#) for a full list of meeting attendees). This meeting was facilitated by Katie Wu (Wu) of Common Spark Consulting and supported by Sooji Yang (Yang) and Suhaila Sikand (Sikand) of Common Spark Consulting.

Supporting meeting materials are available at:

<https://www.caeec.org/equity-market-support-wg-mtg-2>. Relevant materials include:

- Agenda (12-5-2023 EMSWG Meeting #2 - Agenda (posted 11-28-2023))
- Slide Deck (12-5-2023 EMSWG Meeting #2 - Slide Deck (posted 11-28-2023))
- Equity-related Definitions (Equity-related Definitions (posted 11-28-2023))
- EMSWG Homework #1 Compilation (EMSWG Homework #1 Compilation (posted 11-28-2023))

## Overview

Key Meeting Takeaways:

- Members discussed different ways to define “equity target participant,” “equity market participant,” and “equity segment participant.” Most, if not all, were aligned with the definition of “equity segment participant” as described in the June Decision (D.23-06-055). However, there were different opinions on whether to define “equity target participant” as the same as “equity market participant.” Ultimately, the group defined “equity target participant” as an Equity-eligible customer who is participating in an Equity, Market Support, or Resource Acquisition segment program and “equity market participant” as an Equity-eligible customer who is participating in an Equity segment program.
- Members agreed that participants across segments are the same but highlighted the varying forms of participation (e.g., receiving an email versus retrofitting a home) that may impact how participants are counted and thus interpreted by stakeholders.
- Members highlighted the need for clarification on how PAs will report Indicator data for statewide programs, especially as it relates to participant counts.
- For convenings scheduled in January, Members agreed to hold meetings instead of huddles. Meetings scheduled for January 17 and 24 are expected to address

Market Support Indicators. The January 31 meeting may address both Equity and Market Support Indicators.

*This meeting summary is intended to capture this meeting's discussion of ideas, concerns, alternative options for proposals and consensus; it is a high-level summary and not a transcript.*

Key acronyms used in this document include California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee (CAEECC), California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), Energy Division (ED), energy efficiency (EE), working group (WG), disadvantaged communities (DAC) and hard-to-reach (HTR) communities, CPUC's Environmental and Social Justice Action Plan (ESJ Action Plan), Program Administrator (PA), Investor-owned utilities (IOU), Regional Energy Network (REN), community-based organization (CBO), and Total System Benefits (TSB).

## Welcome & Introductions

Slides 1 - 9

Wu welcomed and introduced participants to the second meeting of the EMSWG, and asked participants to introduce themselves through the chat.

Wu presented the meeting objectives, which included:

1. Discuss input received in homework
2. Begin to clarify definitions and issues related to Equity Indicators
3. Confirm Work Plan moving forward

To achieve meeting objectives, the Facilitation Team developed the following agenda:

- Welcome & Housekeeping
- Summary of Homework
- [Session 1](#): Equity-related Definitions
- [Session 2](#): Statewide Programs
- [Session 3](#): Work Plan
- Wrap Up and Next Steps

Wu provided an updated roster of EMSWG Members (as of December 5, 2023) and disclosures of financial linkages.

- A Member asked for clarification on whether there is any distinction between financial linkages between parties for the purposes of the WG and any financial linkages beyond the purposes of the WG, and why only one PA is named in the left hand column while many PAs have been indicated in the right hand column.
  - Wu replied that no distinction was made as this was the practice from previous CAEECC Working Groups, and noted that the left hand column

reflects who submitted disclosures and will double check to ensure that all disclosures are captured.

## Summary of Homework

Slides 10 - 12

Wu gave an [overview of the ten responses](#) received on the Homework, which asked EMSWG Members to prioritize Indicators and, optionally, to provide feedback on the PA Starting Proposal - Table of Adopted Indicators. Wu presented a list of suggested discussion items, derived from the Homework responses, that shaped the agendas for Meeting #2 and Meeting #3.

## Session 1: Equity-related Definitions

Slides 13 - 20

Wu provided background context to Session 1 by sharing that the goal is to clarify definitions and issues related to Equity Indicators. References for the discussion included definitions found in D.23-06-055 and D.21-05-031, Homework responses, and the Environmental and Social Justice Action Plan Version 2.0.

### Topic 1: Equity Definitions Breakouts

Wu identified that the term "equity target participants," which appears in Equity Indicators 1-4, 10, and 13, is not directly defined in any CPUC decision. Wu also shared a table from Grounded Research's Equity Indicators memo responding to the Homework that compares the definitions of DAC, Underserved, and HTR to support the discussion.

Participants were then moved into randomized breakout groups to discuss the following questions:

1. *How does an "equity target participant" differ from an "equity segment participant" or an "equity market participant" if at all?*
2. *How do overlapping definitions of "disadvantaged community," "hard-to-reach," and "underserved" affect the PAs' ability to consistently report on these populations (e.g., as "equity target participants" and in Equity Indicators #11 and #12)?*

### Summary of Discussions on Topic 1

- A Member asked for clarification on what the Commission ordered for what is classified as small business in the "hard to reach" definition.
  - Wu clarified that the June decision (D.23-06-055) says that a criteria for a "hard-to-reach" small business is that the business consists of 25 or fewer employees.

- A Member asked for clarification on whether the CPUC intended for “equity target participant” to be a different term than “equity market participant” and “equity segment participant.”
  - A Member from Energy Division noted that the term was derived from an effort to limit confusion between participants who are targeted in the Equity segment versus customers who actually participate in the Equity segment, and that the CPUC seeks to understand the differences between targeted populations and participating populations.
  - A Member noted that that reasoning speaks more to the “equity segment participant” versus “equity market participant,” so there is still confusion about the specific intent from the CPUC about the use of the “equity target participant” term.
  - A Member from Energy Division noted the terms could benefit from clarity and distinctions between all of them.
  - Wu commented that SoCalREN defined “equity target participant” as “equity market participant” in the Table of Adopted Indicators.

After spending 20 minutes back in breakouts, one participant from each breakout group reported what they discussed. Wu live-edited notes on slides as each group presented. (Images of the live-edited slides are included below.)

- A Member shared that his group discussed the differing interpretations of “equity target participant” – one interpretation is that the “equity target participant” is participating in a program whereas another interpretation is that the “equity target participant” is targeted for a program but isn’t necessarily participating in it.
  - Wu asked if PAs can track targeted but not participating customers.
  - A few Members discussed that some PAs can track touchpoints with customers and can gauge this information, but what constitutes “targeting” must be defined, whether that is an email, phone call, etc. A Member noted that they can track some “targeted” populations, but not all as they can’t track or obtain detailed information about everyone who attends a community event and stops by their table (as an example).
  - A Member added that her breakout group also discussed how a third-party implementer could use “target” as a subset of a segment (while segment refers to the entirety of individuals who are eligible for the Equity segment programs) and to use these interchangeably may raise issues. This Member asked for clarifications on applications where these terms would be synonymous and recommended that customers should have unique identifiers to reflect real performance in any evaluation.
  - A Member of the Public noted in the chat that “equity market participant” and “equity target participant” are used interchangeably in the Decision. For example, *“For the equity segment, the indicators will provide additional insight into how well the equity segment programs are reaching customers, as well as the depth of impact. The term **“equity market participants”**”*

*means an equity program participant that is identified by at least one of the equity segment flags in CEDARS (e.g., hard-to-reach, disadvantaged, or underserved). The term “**all equity segment participants**” means all of the participants that participated in an equity segment program, regardless of whether they are an **equity target participant** or not.” (emphases added)*

- A Member shared that his group agreed with SoCalREN’s understanding that “equity target participant” is the same as “equity market participant,” and defined “equity segment participant” as a person or business that is participating in an Equity program **and** has to either be HTR, DAC, or underserved to participate in the program (facilitators' note: *this conflicts with the CPUC's adopted definition of "equity segment participant" which explicitly states that an equity segment participant is not required to qualify as HTR, DAC, or underserved to participate in an equity segment program*). This Member noted that there is an HTR flag in CEDARS but currently does not see any DAC or underserved flags, and noted that the participant can be defined as a service account and the WG is tasked with coming up with ways to count who is participating in the program, not who is eligible.
- A Member shared that his group discussed that the definition of “equity segment participant” was made clear in the Decision, and noted that the group agreed that (1) there are no differences between “equity target participant” and “equity market participant,” (2) the definitions of HTR, DAC, and underserved should not be additive because of the overlapping participants in each category, and (3) there may be customer privacy concerns with PAs collecting information about eligibility.
- A few Members discussed in the chat whether someone who is not HTR, DAC, underserved, or a resident on tribal land can still participate in an Equity program, and whether this raises an issue of being counted as contributing to “equity.” A Member from Energy Division noted that it is possible for someone who is not HTR, DAC, or underserved to participate as it is more administratively efficient if an implementer determines an entire neighborhood, multifamily building, or institution as eligible if the majority of customers are eligible versus verifying all individuals. A Member noted that non-Equity-eligible customers should not be targeted for Equity programs but also should not be completely excluded.
- A Member shared that her group agreed with “equity market participant” as being the same as “equity target participant,” and noted that it would be helpful to PAs to have a definition and term for the customers PAs are promoting a program to and to have clear guidance on what data needs to be collected to report on all three definitions of HTR, DAC, and underserved.
- A Member shared that her group disagreed with treating “equity market participant” and “equity target participant” as the same by stating that the Decision defines “equity market participant” as a customer who is in an Equity segment program and has been identified by at least one of the three Equity flags in CEDARS. CEDARS, however, is only used to report data for programs that directly result in energy savings, which applies to only fifteen out of fifty Equity

Segment programs. Therefore, CEDARS cannot be the only platform to report on the Equity Indicators across the Equity segment programs and another reporting pathway must be identified. This Member shared that her group defined “equity segment participant” as a customer that is not necessarily HTR, DAC, or underserved but participates in an Equity segment program while an “equity target participant” is either HTR, DAC, or underserved who is not necessarily in an Equity segment program. This Member further noted that to be considered “equity market participant” or “equity target participant,” the customer needs to be identified by only one of the three Equity flags, but it is important to acknowledge that data isn’t currently collected about some of the non-geographic-based requirements for hard-to-reach like primary language other than English.

- A Member from Energy Division added that the distinction between the three terms is helpful to understanding how equity-eligible customers are participating in the portfolio and how “equity target participants” may be served in other segments.
- A Member noted that a few years ago, an analysis showed that 20% of Resource Acquisition residential savings were in DAC.
- Wu highlighted that Equity Indicators 1, 3, and 4 are all a count of “equity target participants” by segment – Equity Indicator 1 pertains to the Equity segment, Equity Indicator 2 pertains to Market Support, and Equity Indicator 4 pertains to Resource Acquisition. A Member in the chat noted that the Indicators are meant to report on “equity target participants” that are not broken down between the sub-definitions. Another Member questioned in the chat that if the Indicators that use “equity target participant” are all specific to the equity segment only, then that would imply the same definition as “equity market participant.”
- A Member in the chat agreed that the definitions of the three terms should not be blurred or made synonymous with each other.
- A Member shared that his group focused on the challenges of ensuring participation is properly tracked and targeted and how definitions may leverage a scale (e.g., census tract) that differs from how the Equity programs are actually applied (e.g., by city). This Member noted that the overlapping definitions of HTR, DAC, and underserved may be resolved with a pragmatic approach of moving customers from the broader definitions into more specific categories.
- A Member asked whether there is a separate effort to parse out demographic tracking issues and whether this WG’s recommendations will inform those separate discussions.
  - Wu and a Member from Energy Division replied that reporting on demographic data will be taken up early next year through a CAEECC process, with a deliverable report due with the mid-cycle Advice Letter in September 2025, and the results of that report may inform potential changes to the Metrics or Indicators.

- A few Members discussed in the chat the need to clarify the term “target.” A Member suggested differentiating between a “potential” participant versus an “engaged” participant who receives services and products. Another Member noted the need to clarify if “target” means meeting one of the three Equity criteria or if all customers meet the eligibility for an Equity program even though eligibility for the programs is not tracked (other than in filed Implementation Plans).
- Wu asked for clarification on whether there are program rules applicable to the Equity segment that might limit eligibility to those who are HTR, DAC, or underserved.
  - A Member from Energy Division clarified that while it is not required for a customer to be HTR, DAC, or underserved to be in an Equity segment program. The CPUC intends to understand if and how PAs are targeting the right customers and balancing administrative efficiency with ensuring most of the customers participating in the Equity segment programs are eligible in one of the three Equity categories.
- Wu highlighted that a few groups agreed that an “equity target participant” is the same as an “equity market participant” but the Equity flags in CEDARS may not apply to Equity or Market Support segments, and asked whether the process to report the Indicators is exclusively through CEDARS.
  - A Member from Energy Division clarified that the flags are independent of the segments but can classify who is eligible to be considered in the Equity segment. This Member noted that the current process in the claims database includes an HTR (and possibly DAC) flag and the goal is to have all three Equity checkboxes and to understand the volume of Equity-eligible and non-eligible customers to prevent Equity programs from overserving non-eligible customers. Another Member suggested tracking and differentiating between Equity-eligible participants who have received benefits from non-Equity segment programs and non-eligible participants who have received benefits from these programs.
  - A Member noted that since the CEDARS claims data relates primarily to energy savings, only fifteen of fifty Equity segment programs will have data reported via the platform, which means there’s currently no place to track the other Equity Segment programs. Another Member agreed with this statement and added that the Annual EM&V Report could capture some of the Equity Indicator data (e.g., HTR customers who participate in other types of programs), and that SDG&E is planning to work on new reporting mechanisms that can capture more of this data on a quarterly basis. Another Member asked if non-resource programs (including Equity segment programs) will ever be reported through CEDARS, to which a Member replied that the budgets for non-resource activities are reported in CEDARS but since there are no claimed energy savings or total system benefits (by definition of non-resource), there are no measure details.
  - A Member noted in the chat that even if energy savings are not claimed, measure costs (if there are any) would still be reported so these projects

could conceivably still be reported in CEDARS; however, this would require that an energy efficiency measure is provided, incentivized, or installed in the program.

- A Member of the Public noted gaining more clarity with the distinction that “equity market participants” are participants in the Equity programs, “equity target participants” include anyone who meets the Equity eligibility and are participants in any EE programs, and “equity segment participant” is anyone who is participating in an Equity program whether they are eligible or not. Another Member agreed.
- A Member noted that the definitions are not perfect, given the example of rural customers who may not meet all of the eligibility criteria but are still considered underserved and targeted to participate in an EE program. Another Member suggested that RENs can perhaps define “underserved” or add another definition and include it in an annual report or as a unique metric outside of these Indicators.

## Notes from Breakout Discussion Report Back

- Distinction/interpretation/emphasis - is it "participant" or "target"? - are folks who are already participants the focus to report or is it those who are targeted but not necessarily a participant who are the focus of the Indicators? Need to clarify before determining who/what to measure
  - "Target" could be a subset of a "segment" within a definition
  - May need unique identifiers in tracking data (by address or meter) to distinguish
- Equity target participant = equity market participant
  - Equity segment participants are not required to be HTR, located in a DAC, or underserved to participate in an equity segment program
  - CEDARS includes an HTR flag, identifies DAC via census tract, but lacks a flag for underserved
  - Who is eligible for participation is beyond the scope of the group
  - "Participants" are in a program
- Acknowledge that even though there are three definitions (HTR, DAC, and underserved) they may not be additive because of overlapping participants in each category; obtaining some information relating to HTR and underserved definitions may come up against customer privacy issues
- "Targeted" customers may be different than participants as they are folks who are promoted a program
- For each term (HTR, DAC, underserved) there is specific data to collection, which PAs need very clear guidance on what to collect - be aware of what is feasible to collect, what is comfortable for a customer to share
  - Some terms can be very restrictive so it's nice to have several terms, but when they overlap, there can be confusion about who falls into which bucket

18

Figure 1. Slide 1 of live-edited notes from Topic 1 breakout report-backs



## Notes from Breakout Discussion Report Back

- Disagreement that an equity market participants = equity target participant
  - Equity market participant is dependent on CEDARS, which only applies to resource acquisition programs so those flags do not apply to Equity and Market Support segments
- Equity target participant is DAC, HTR, or underserved but don't have to be in an equity program (could be in market support or resource acquisition)
  - However, some targeted participants may not fully meet HTR, underserved, or DAC definitions
- Equity segment participant doesn't have to be DAC, HTR, or underserved but must be in an equity segment program
- Equity market participant is DAC, HTR, or underserved and in an equity program
- Challenge in tracking participation and possible confusion from "spillover" - intent vs outcome; who is targeted vs who is participating
  - Some programs are framed at a more macro scale than how the criteria are applied (e.g., census tract vs city-wide)
- To address the overlap in definitions (DAC, HTR, and underserved), roll up to a broader definition first

19

Figure 2. Slide 2 of live-edited notes from Topic 1 breakout report-backs

## Topic 2: Defining and Identifying "Participants"

Using [Grounded Research's Memo](#), Wu opened up discussion on defining who or what constitutes a "participant" as it varies by sector, program, and segment. She provided the following questions for the discussion:

1. *What types of "participants" are expected to engage in Equity and Market Support Segment programs across the PAs? Do these differ from participants expected in Resource Acquisition programs?*
2. *Are there any missing types of "participants" from Table 2 of Grounded Research's memo on Equity Indicators?*
3. *How do variations among "participants" affect a reader's ability to understand information reported in Equity Indicators? Are there edits to the Indicators (or elsewhere) that can support clearer interpretation (if needed)?*

### Summary of Discussion on Topic 2

The following summarizes the responses to the first discussion question: *What types of "participants" are expected to engage in Equity and Market Support Segment programs across the PAs? Do these differ from participants expected in Resource Acquisition programs?*

- A Member noted there is no difference between participants in the Equity, Market Support, and Resource Acquisition segment programs. Another Member agreed.

- A Member asked for clarification on what is meant by “participant” – if it means that a customer received benefits or services or received an unrequested mail or email.
  - Wu clarified that participants are those who actually participated in the program and received service **or** information.
- A few Members agreed with the clarification with the exception of educational programs such as the Home Energy Reports (HERs) Program, in which PAs count customers who receive information about their energy usage as participants (facilitators' note: *not all of the PAs offer this program*). A Member noted that SDG&E is building an Equity segment program that provides information to customers and will track whether the program’s marketing tactics drive customer participation in other programs; customers who take action in other programs are counted as participants in the marketing program. Another Member noted that it is important to consider these nuances of why the participant count may be high in some programs versus others (e.g., high participant count in HERs versus direct install programs), and how these data points may be perceived by readers.
  - A Member raised that the question of measuring the depth of intervention (handing out an energy efficiency kit versus a deep retrofit) and classifying all levels as participation has been ongoing.
  - A few Members made some suggestions, including reporting HERs separately since it could create stark contrasts in participants reported; reporting with greater detail about the level and nature of participation; and creating a distinction between behavior programs and programs with known installations. A Member noted that this distinction can be made but it may not address the depth of intervention. Another Member noted that some programs can be a blend of both behavior and installation. Another Member noted that including both participation counts and energy savings, GHG reductions, TSB, etc. are important so that the Indicators reflect both the depth and breadth of Equity-targeted services.
- A Member suggested CPUC considers additional definitions for equity target participants, as outlined in ESJ 2.0: *“..communities with AFN [access and functional needs] and those with other medical vulnerabilities are not specifically captured, nor are communities that experience disproportionate challenges with affording utility service, unhoused individuals, or indigenous populations living off tribal lands. Version 2.0 of the ESJ Action Plan does not propose a revised definition of “ESJ communities,” as we recognize there is not a one-size-fits-all definition of what encompasses a potential ESJ community. Rather, we encourage CPUC initiatives to critically consider all the various kinds of populations that warrant prioritization in policies and programs”* (ESJ Action Plan at pages 21-22).
- Wu shared her takeaways from the discussion thus far, including how the Indicators are reported and interpreted, which is still in need of discussion, and the context around the programs is important to interpret Indicator data.
- A Member suggested adding "contractors" to the WE&T participant list in the table on Slide 20.

- A Member added that it is also important to understand how each IOU classifies its programs, e.g. SDG&E classifies HERS as a Resource Acquisition program, which funnels through CEDARS. Another Member commented that PG&E also classifies HERS as a Resource Acquisition program but noted that given the Equity Indicators apply outside of the Equity segment, Equity customers need to be reported on and it raises the challenge of needing to parse out energy savings from Equity customers served from all customers served.

## Session 2: Statewide Programs

Slides 22 - 37

Wu provided background context to Session 2, noting that for statewide programs, IOUs receive credit for program benefits in proportion to their share of the budget. As some Indicators count participants in statewide programs, this raises an issue of IOUs claiming a proportion of participants, regardless of whether they are located within the IOU service territory. Wu provided the following questions for the discussion:

1. *What proportion of the EE portfolio is affected by this issue? i.e., how many statewide programs are there?*
2. *How many Equity and Market Support segment programs are impacted by this issue?*
3. *How can the Indicators be clarified to address this issue?*

## Summary of Discussion on Statewide Programs

- A Member raised concern that counting participants is not as straightforward as claiming portions of GHG and energy savings in the Equity segment (e.g. PG&E counting 0.3% of a customer who lives in another IOU territory), and that there's a need to understand how to calculate and determine the appropriate denominator for the eligible population. A Member from Energy Division noted that knowing the number of customers served in a given service territory would be pertinent in the Equity segment. Another Member agreed that detailed characterization of reporting and accounting is needed across the Indicators.
  - A few Members discussed how this issue also impacts Common Metrics, which will also be addressed in the May 2024 Advice Letter along with the Equity and Market Support Indicators.
- Wu asked what proportion of the current Energy Efficiency portfolio consists of statewide programs. A Member replied that there appear to be 15 statewide programs out of 200 – one in Equity, six in Market Support, and eight in Resource Acquisition – and they will spend about \$530 million from 2024-27.
- A few Members asked whether PAs are currently counting participants by service territory for statewide programs. A Member replied that he is not sure how this information is tracked, and discussed the example of the one statewide Equity segment program, a career and workforce readiness program where participants are not straightforward to track.

- A Member identified that midstream and upstream programs (which can be statewide programs in the Resource Acquisition segment) may be easier to figure out. Another Member identified that detailed customer information may not be tracked for midstream and upstream programs since they are directed toward distributors, retailers, and manufacturers.
- A Member suggested a single spreadsheet where each PA includes a list of their programs, dollar budgets, and how they count or report on all of them.
- A Member suggested adding a statewide value or count that is not separated by PA to address the issue of PAs not being held accountable to statewide programs despite funding them. A few Members provided some additions and caveats, including using annual reports and impact evaluations to address the issue of ensuring benefits are distributed across the state, considering how this would impact goal development on who is being accountable to the goals, considering the need to still address distributional equity, and applying the Indicators in addition to the statewide count.

## Session 3: Work Plan

*Slides 25 - 27*

Wu presented a potential outline for the upcoming WG meetings, noting that the December meetings will focus on Equity Indicators, January meetings will focus on Market Support Indicators, and February through mid-March will focus on the Report Recommendations. She asked for feedback on whether the Work Plan should be modified to have further discussion on Equity Indicators and if any convenings should be designated as a "huddle" rather than a "meeting."

### Summary of Discussion on Work Plan

- A Member asked when the Indicators are expected to be reported to the Commission.
  - Wu and a Member from Energy Division clarified that the Advice Letter is due in May 2024, and the expectation is that the Indicators will be reported with Q1 and Q2 claims, due in August 2024. A Member raised concern that the reporting may not include a lot of claims given the timeline, e.g., TSB (total systems benefits) and energy savings.
- Several Members supported using the January meetings to discuss Market Support Indicators, leaving the meeting on January 31 to address any remaining questions for both Equity and Market Support Indicators. Members also supported convening meetings rather than huddles and being sent calendar invites for each meeting.
- A Member asked about saving the chat log.
  - Wu replied that the contents from the chat will be captured in the meeting summary notes.

- A Member asked in the chat about holding a statewide huddle, to which another Member supported the idea.
- A Member asked about the WG process for making decisions when differences of opinion arise.
  - Wu replied that the Facilitation team will be sending out meeting summaries for WG Members to review as they will be leveraged to inform the report, and will be proposing recommendations to the WG based on what was heard before the report is written.

## Wrap Up and Next Steps

Slides 28 - 31

Wu provided a recap of the day, reminded participants of the meeting objectives, and shared next steps, including:

- EMSWG Meeting #3 will be held on December 6, 2023 at 1 - 4pm PT.

## Appendix A: Attendees

Organization	Name
<b>CAEECC Members</b>	
3C-REN	Erica Helson
BayREN	Mary Sutter
Mendota Group	Grey Staples
PG&E	Moses Gastelum
RCEA/RuralREN	Patricia Terry
SBUA	Ted Howard
SCE	Gary Golden
SDG&E	Stephanie Guterrez
Silent Running LLC	James Dodenhoff
SoCalREN	Patrick Ngo
The Energy Coalition	Rebecca Hausheer
William Worthen Foundation	Alice Sung
<b>Ex-Officio</b>	
CPUC	Pam Rittelmeyer
CPUC, Energy Division	Ely Jacobsohn
<b>Other Interested Stakeholders</b>	
SDCP	Aisha Cissna

Energy Solutions	Britney Blankenship
Frontier Energy	Conor Moar
SDG&E	DeDe Henry
SoCalREN	Fernanda Craig
SDG&E	Jen Palombo
BayREN	Jenn Mitchell-Jackson
Frontier Energy	Jesse Farber-Eger
ICF	Jesse Feinberg
Frontier Energy	Margaret Marchant
Resource Innovations	Nils Strindberg
PG&E	Rob Bohn
<b>Facilitators</b>	
Katie Wu	Common Spark Consulting
Sooji Yang	Common Spark Consulting
Suhaila Sikand	Common Spark Consulting