

Full Quarterly CAEECC Meeting #44 Summary

Date: Wednesday November 13, 2024

Time: 10:00 am - 4:00 pm PT

On November 13, 2024, the California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee met for its forty-fourth quarterly meeting. The meeting was hosted both in-person (in San Francisco) as well as online via Zoom. There were over 79 attendees, including representatives from 22 CAEECC Member organizations and 3 CAEECC Ex-Officio agencies as well as over 50 Members of the Public (see [Appendix A](#) for a full list of meeting attendees). This meeting was facilitated by Katie Abrams (Birch Road Consulting), Michelle Vigen Ralston (Ralston), Suhaila Sikand (Sikand), and Mahal Miles (Miles) of Common Spark Consulting, and supported by Susan Rivo (Rivo) of Raab Associates. Additional presenters included Nancy Barba (Frontier Energy); Trevor Keith (CCRREN); Patricia Terry (RuralREN North); Coby Rudolph and Chris Westling (CPUC Energy Division); Annette Beitel (CalTF); Sebastien Csapo and Angela McDonald (PG&E); and Nils Strindberg (CalMTA).

Supporting meeting materials are available at:

<https://www.caeec.org/11-13-2024-full-caeccc-mtg>. Relevant materials include the Agenda, the Slide Deck, CalTF Presentation on Priority Solutions for EE and Decarbonization, and the PG&E Presentation on Lighting Controls Certification.

Overview

Key Meeting Takeaways:

- Newsom released an [Executive Order](#) requiring the CPUC to review all electric programs and modify or sunset programs that don't meet cost-effectiveness in an effort to reduce utility bill costs.
- Members discussed six priority solutions for EE/decarbonization based on a recent set of recommendations from the California Technical Forum's (CalTF)
- PG&E presented an update on the Equity and Market Support Goal Setting process.
- CAEECC Members reached consensus to host an Environmental and Social Justice (ESJ) Panel to help provide input on Community Engagement Indicators.
- CAEECC Members did not reach consensus on equity recommendations to implement in the near term; the Facilitation Team will send out a survey to finalize next steps.
- CAEECC Members approved the 2025 Workplan.

- Laurel Rothschild (TEC) and Stacie Risley (SDGE) were approved as the new CAEECC Co-chairs effective January 1, 2025 - taking over for Lara Ettenson (NRDC) and Lujana Medina (SoCalREN).
- The current Facilitation contract expires July 31, 2025. ED and PG&E (the current contract holder) are exploring next steps.
- During the optional assembly, PG&E presented its plans for NALMCO certification for lighting-related Workforce Standards. Input is requested by 11/25/2024
- The next CAEECC meeting will be held on February 11, 2025.

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

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

Session 0: Welcome and Background

Slides 4 - 14

Abrams presented the meeting objectives, which included:

1. Discuss priority solutions for energy efficiency/electrification
2. Discuss updates on the Equity and Market Support goal setting process
3. Discuss and decide on Community Engagement Indicators next steps
4. Revisit and decide on Equity Recommendations for the near term
5. Discuss and decide on the 2025 Work Plan
6. Hear relevant presentations on topics during Optional Assembly

To achieve meeting objectives, the facilitation team, in consultation with Co-Chairs and Energy Division, and based on CAEECC Member feedback, developed the following agenda:

- [Session 1](#): Discussion Topics
- [Session 2](#): Presentation + Action Items
- [Session 3](#): 2025 CAEECC Workplan

- [Session 4](#): CAEECC Business Items
- [Session 5](#): Main Assembly Wrap Up
- [Session 6](#): Optional Assembly

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

New Member Introduction: Frontier Energy, RuralREN, and CCR-REN

Slides 15 - 27

Patricia Terry, Senior Project Manager of Northern California Rural Regional Energy Network (RuralREN North)¹, provided an introduction to RuralREN North’s offerings. Terry presented on the new RuralREN, covering the main partners in the REN, menu of programs, and strategic plan. RuralREN will be serving seventeen rural counties throughout the North Coast and Sierra Nevada regions.

Trevor Keith, Planning and Building Director at San Luis Obispo, and Jordan Garbayo, Energy Programs Manager of Central California Rural Regional Energy Network (CCR-REN), provided an introduction to CCR-REN’s offerings. Keith presented on the new CCR-REN, covering its organization, vision, and menu of programs. CCR-REN will be serving three regions of California: The Central Coast, the Eastern Sierra, and the San Joaquin Valley.

Session 1: Discussion Topics

Slides 28 - 33

Governor’s Executive Order N-5-24

Slides 28-30

Ralston and Coby Rudolph (CPUC Energy Division) provided an overview of the [Governor’s Executive Order \(EO\) N-5-24](#), in reference to the affordability of customer energy bills.

CAEECC Member Discussion on Governor’s Executive Order N-5-24

- A Member of Energy Division confirmed that definitions for underutilized and underperforming programs have not been created, but they are receptive to informal discussions surrounding the EO.
- Members questioned administrative aspects of the EO process, such as timeline, data needed from PAs, work volume, and outreach. A Member of Energy Division shared that they have not received clarity on these administrative components, but will update CAEECC as more information is made available.

¹ RuralREN North may also be referred to as NCCREN (Northern California Rural Regional Energy Network)

- A Member inquired about the pressure the EO may place on market support and equity programs since they are not considered as cost effective as other types of programs. Members of Energy Divisions stated that it is Energy Division's role to look across all of the EE programs to interpret a good use of ratepayer funds and that other requirements request detail on additional program impacts.

Public Input on Governor's Executive Order N-5-24

- A Member of the Public asked about the administrative process. A Member of Energy Division could not provide an answer at the time, clarifying that timing is tight for a Commissioner vote on something before the deadline.

CalTF “Priority Solutions” for EE/Decarbonization

“11-13-2024 CalTF Presentation on Priority Solutions for EE and Electrification (posted 11-6-2024) (rev. 11-12-2024)”

Annette Beitel with the support of Spencer Lipp, Michael Daukoru, and Tim Melloch, from [California Technical Forum \(CalTF\)](#) shared background on CalTF, as well as the existing EE and decarbonization oversight frameworks and how they were developed under a different paradigm. Beitel highlighted how continued funding is at risk.

CAEECC Member Discussion on CalTF “Priority Solutions” for EE/Decarbonization

CalTF stated that California should maintain its EE leadership position, as EE and decarbonization savings are essential to affordably achieving GHG reductions and modernizing the grid. CalTF shared six priority solutions for EE and decarbonization.

After presenting each priority solution, the presenters paused for CAEECC Discussion. The discussion below is separated by the discussion of each priority.

Solution #1: Clear Rules, Reasonably Applied

- Members discussed what processes and Commission action would be needed to implement this solution. *[this meeting summary will be updated if additional comments are provided by Beitel, who offered to follow up after the meeting]*
- Beitel clarified, upon Member questions, the definitions of rules and the process for research on these rules (a member of CalTF pulled together Commission decisions, records, opinions, guidance from PAs, etc. and identified every single rule that was a rule and organized them into measure specific categories, totalling in about 1000 rules). Beitel additionally shared that CalTF plans to seek stakeholder review of the rulebook—stakeholders include customers, implements, PAs, trade allies, and more— and is exploring how to obtain CPUC approval to confirm that the rulebook may be used as a resource.
- Beitel clarified, upon Member questions, that the CalTF team working on the rulebook is composed of engineers and evaluators (not attorneys, except Beitel herself). Members engaged in a robust discussion about how rules are

interpreted, and the subjectivity of “reasonable” applications of law. Beitel outlined scenarios of current rules resulting in differing interpretations, stating that in the spirit of arbitrary and capricious rules, comprehensive rules ought to be accessible and centralized. Beitel argued that the rule should be prospectively updated in lieu of punishing the person for misinterpretation of the rule if the goal of the rule is to increase energy savings.

- A Member expressed interest in being involved with the CalTF rulebook development, sharing their appreciation of the living policy manual.
- A Member of the Public acknowledged the broad scope of CalTF, opining that the work should be considered “regulatory reform”. This Member of the Public referenced the June 27 CalTF [meeting materials](#) slide deck, noting that the challenges hindering EE in CA have been present for many years. This Member of the Public noted that the challenges bring to light "underperformance" aspects of the CA EE portfolio, including budget implications which have incepted an Executive Order. Lipp clarified that the solutions have since been reformed and resulted in the six priority solutions being presented at this meeting.

Solution #3: Design for Customer and Market

- A Member noted that some programs take a concierge approach, which given costs, need to be accounted for; the Member also stated the need to design program performance measures with timelines in mind.
- A Member offered perspective on the market availability of EE contractors, noting that workers respond to demand, and need certainty before investing in a technical training program. A Member shared additional barriers to contracting, including permit noncompliance as a barrier to contracting (92% of residential projects in CA are not permitted for HVAC) and increased technical challenges and dangers of new HVAC systems which have flammable components. A Member of the CEC confirmed that the CEC is aware of noncompliance rates for residential permits and is working to address this issue.
- Beitel shared that the motivation to develop and assimilate CalTF priorities is a sense that EE is currently at risk.

Solutions #4: Reform Customer Incentive Eligibility

- A Member observed that CalTF is attempting to increase program success by prioritizing program and customer benefits, as opposed to penalizing customers by rolling back incentives. Beitel was shocked at the concept of “penalizing customers”; Beitel reiterated the need to support contracts and implementers in order to achieve state EE goals and a need to make everything clear.

Solution #6: Modernize NTG

- Presenters from CalTF clarified, upon Member questions, that the 0.85 net to gross (NTG) is for emerging technology and new programs; a NTG of 1.0 is more

reasonable for hard to reach (HTR) customers; and the 0.85 listed in the presentation was not intended to diminish HTR efforts. A Member of Energy Division added that the Energy Division is exploring how NTG is assessed and working to ensure that EE is a proper use of ratepayer funding.

General Discussion on Priority Solutions

- Beitel welcomed further conversation with CAEECC Members, requesting Members with specific questions set up a meeting with the CalTF team.
- A Member of the Public noted that EE programs have the potential to inform future code development, suggesting that program cost-effectiveness could be improved if this value were leveraged.
- Ralston concluded the discussion by asking CAEECC to reflect on its role among CalTF priorities.

Attendees did not provide any comments on Solution #2 (Streamlined and Standardized) or #5 (Correctly Measure Savings).

Session 2: Presentation + Action Items

Slides 35 - 62

Update on Equity and Market Support Goal Setting

Slides 36 - 45

Sebastien Csapo (PG&E) presented a procedural update on the Equity and Market Support Goal Construct Development process. Csapo shared key elements of the Decision ([D.23-06-055](#), Ordering Paragraph (OP) 25), progress to-date, and upcoming timeline. Abrams noted that this item was included because CAEECC Members previously indicated they wanted an update and to potentially discuss next steps for CAEECC (if any).

CAEECC Member Discussion on the Update on Equity and Market Support Goal Setting

- Members discussed the relationship between OP11 and OP25 Advice Letters. A Member of Energy Division shared that OP11 is still being processed, but that OP11's resulting clarified equity and market support indicators would relate to the rest of the portfolio and tie directly to goals.

Members of the Public did not provide any comments on Equity and Market Support Goal Setting.

Community Engagement Indicators

Slides 46-51

Ralston provided background on Community Engagement Indicators, recapping previous discussions at CAEECC, questions raised, and provided some clarifications referring to language in Decision ([D.23-06-055](#)). Ralston also presented results from a CAEECC member survey on preferred engagement for this topic, indicating a minimal preference for no or lower engagement on the issue in the form of a panel or a task force. The Facilitation Team, recognizing CAEECC members needed and wanted to make a decision, proposed and sought approval to host an ESJ Panel to share the Panel's experiences with EE programs and outreach at a CAEECC Meeting. This panel could inform the PA's development of Community Engagement Indicators. After discussion, CAEECC Members reached consensus to host the ESJ Panel (either at an offcycle meeting between Q4 2024 and Q1 2025 CAEECC meetings or at the Q1 2025 CAEECC Meeting), with potential panelists pulled from a list of organizations engaging with current equity segment programs and other CBOs that have experience with energy efficiency programs in their communities.

CAEECC Member Discussion on Community Engagement Indicators

- Ralston clarified, upon Member discussion, that the ESJ Panel is intended as an informational opportunity for PAs. Ralston shared that the next step after the ESJ Panel is for PAs to incorporate lessons learned into their own programs and the OP24 portion of midcycle filings. A Member referenced [D.23-06-055](#), noting that the ESJ Panel would not solely fulfill PA requirements, and shared their interpretation that PAs need to reach some form of consensus on Community Engagement Indicators—indicating that the PAs should hold an off-cycle CAEECC meeting with the ESJ Panel to budget time to collaborate and workshop content to inform the PA Advice Letters.
- Members discussed the potential ESJ Panel presenter qualifications, expressing concerns over potential difficulties finding participants. Ralston noted that the ESJ Panel would allow for presenters that interact with EE implementation broadly. A Member of Energy Division clarified that the vision for the ESJ Panel was to hear best practices from organizations' experiences with EE programs, as PAs are not expected to have all ideas around Community Engagement Indicators already fully formed.
- Members discussed the framing of Community Engagement and the need to contextualize the conversation ahead of the ESJ Panel so ESJ Panel attendees can readily contribute to the conversation.
- A Member suggested collaboration efforts between Community Engagement Indicators and SoCalREN's Community-Based Design Collaborative.
- Members pondered on whether the current efforts to gather input from CBOs are intended to shape a principle-based or prescriptive approach as referenced in the [EMWG's final report](#); specifically, if the principle-based approach was a way of creating indicators. Ralston clarified that the Decision ([D.23-06-055](#)) requested

indicators, hypothesizing that the efforts might be more aligned with the principle-based approach, but this interpretation is up to PA discretion for their midcycle Advice Letters due in September 2025.

Public Input on the Update on Community Engagement Indicators

- A Member of the Public asked about the outcome of an ESJ Panel and potential deliverables from a task force. As discussed by CAEECC Members, the ESJ Panel would inform the PA process of coordinating the development for the submission of the midcycle Advice Letter due in September 2025.

Equity Recommendations for the Near Term

Slides 52-62

Sikand shared that the Facilitation Team reviewed all the Evolving CAEECC Working Group near-term recommendations and combined them with NRDC's 5-15-24 evaluation² (vetted by CAEECC Members and ED) of what measures are within CAEECC's purview. Sikand presented 5 recommendations at a high level.

Sikand welcomed CAEECC Member discussion for the implementation strategies of Recommendations 1-4 then presented the Equity Recommendation Implementation Proposal, with a focus on Recommendation 5: Create a CAEECC Equity Advisory Committee (EAC) to provide guidance and recommendations on EE Portfolio policies, programs, and implementation and invited Discussion.

Consensus on these recommendations was not reached. As a next step, the Facilitation Team noted it would send out a survey to CAEECC Members to gauge which recommendations CAEECC would like to prioritize in the near term.

Discussion on Equity Recommendations for the Near Term

Recommendation #1: Invite CPUC ESJ staff, DACAG, and LIOB as ex-officio members

- A Member of Energy Division recommended specifying the number of ex-officio members to invite from each organization.
- A Member recommended establishing evaluation methods to ensure that ex-officio members provide value to CAEECC.
- A Member of the Public noted that they would like the ex-officio invitation to extend to groups outside of DACAG and LIOB, as these groups are already burdened and suggested CAEECC leverage existing relationships with CBOs to diversify.

² Located in the [5/15/24 Full CAEECC Quarterly Meeting](#) Slides Appendix: *Categorizing CAEECC Authority For ECWG ReflectionRecommendations*.

Recommendation #2: Include in the quarterly meeting structure more opportunities for CAEECC member dialogue with non-CAEECC members, such as inviting more public comment, inviting the public to make announcements, and other changes to support more meaningful public engagement

- A Member acknowledged the importance of non-CAEECC member contributions, but pointed to meeting length constraints and potential issues achieving meeting objectives. The Member suggested creating set periods of time for public comment. A Member of the Energy Division advised against public comment periods at meetings, encouraging reflection on ways for more involved engagement and discourse.
- A Member expressed interest in how the Facilitation Team plans to create a public engagement proposal that incorporates CAEECC feedback, such as potential dedicated conversation times as opposed to just a slide in CAEECC meetings.

Recommendation #3: Update groundrules to evaluate and diversify (biennially) CAEECC's composition to include: PAs, Implementers, Equity-centered stakeholders representing Communities of Concern, Public Sector & Nonprofit Organizations

- Members noted the difficulty of inviting ex-officio members as CAEECC deliberates its own composition and purpose. A Member requested differentiation between IOU and REN PAs, as they offer different perspectives.

Recommendation #4: Include at upcoming meetings presentations and sharing from PAs on their equity-focused programming practices and standards

- Members discussed if this should be incorporated into the Portfolio Performance Report Reviews as a slide. A CAEECC Co-Chair noted that they would like presentations to be iterative, with discussions around ideas for improvement.
- A Member elaborated upon the intent of the ECWG authors that the recommendation included not only PA to PA presentations, but also presentations from additional stakeholders who might share lessons learned on equity-focused best practices and standards

Recommendation #5: Create a CAEECC Equity Advisory Committee (EAC) to provide guidance and recommendations on EE Portfolio policies, programs, and implementation and invited Discussion

- Members discussed reservations around ad-hoc panels or working groups, sharing that an EAC could help streamline efforts and integrate recommendations. Members recommended starting with a narrow scope of the EAC that focuses on specific items from the 2025 CAEECC workplan to pace efforts.
- A Member of the Public questioned the proposed outreach methodology for the EAC as compared to the ECWG. The Facilitation Team noted that this has yet to

be determined and there's room for CAEECC Members and ECWG Members to chime into the proposed approach.

General

- A Member noted general controversy surrounding concepts “diversity, equity, and inclusion” (DEI); the Member pointed to the increasing prevalence of terms such as “pluralism” and belonging. The Member encouraged future CAEECC reflection on the use of DEI.
 - A Member of the Public acknowledged the controversy around DEI and redundancy of CAEECC conversations on the topic and referenced Illinois’s CBO relationship efforts where committees met CBOs where they were versus introducing them to the committee space.

Session 3: 2025 CAEECC Workplan

Slides 63 - 67

Abrams presented the high-level 2025 Work Plan as presented at the Quarter 3 (Q3) 2024 CAEECC meeting. Abrams presented the ranked CAEECC member survey results that identified 2025 substantive priorities as well as other substantive topic ideas.

CAEECC Member Discussion on 2025 CAEECC Workplan

View the Live Edited Slide Deck for a summary of the changes made to the workplan.

- Members discussed prioritization of workplan content, particularly in light of the EO regarding cost effectiveness and affordability. A Member pointed to the 2026 Filing, suggesting that the workplan uplift content that would be most helpful for PAs as they go into the next application cycle. A Member referenced [D.21-05-031](#), inquiring if its requirements might connect to 2026 Filing efforts; Members decided that the midcycle Advice Letter due in September 2025 needs a formal consultation for the decision, noting that this discussion points to the need for review of outdated compliance requirements.

Session 4: CAEECC Business Items

Slides 68 - 71

Co-Chair Nominations and Election

Slide 69

Abrams thanked Lujana Medina and Lara Ettenson for their year and ten-years of service respectively. Abrams shared that Laurel Rothschild (The Energy Coalition) and Stacie Risely (SDG&E) were nominated for co-chair in 2025 and they were confirmed by CAEECC Members. The new Co-Chairs will start in January, but may attend some meetings in December for a seamless transition.

Facilitation Team Solicitation

Slide 70

The Facilitation Team shared that the solicitation for the next cycle of Facilitation would be shared soon as it is in development by PAs. Abrams noted this announcement as a courtesy to all who may be interested.

- Members discussed if the PAs need anything to launch the solicitation as well as the anticipated timeframe and whether it would warrant an extension of the current Facilitation Team contract. PG&E noted that they currently hold the contract and raised clarifying questions about who should lead the next one (if it should be PG&E or another PA) and whether the contract should be put out to bid. The Facilitators noted that it only sounds fair if the contract is put out to bid to the public since it's a three year contract. Members discussed whether CAEECC should wait to see if another proceeding would be established and have the solicitation go out after this, to which Energy Division remarked about the long regulatory processes. The Facilitators noted that if a REN took on the contract, the solicitation period could be executed before August 1, 2025 (the current Facilitation Team's contract deadline).

Discussion on Proposed Q1 2025 Full CAEECC Meeting Topics

Slide 71

Abrams shared the proposed Q1 2025 Full CAEECC Meeting topics, including discussion topics, presentations, business items, and optional assembly topics.

CAEECC Member Discussion on Q1 2025 Full CAEECC Meeting Topics

View the Live Edited Slide Deck for a summary of the changes made to the Q1 topics.

- Members raised concerns and questions about the current CAEECC voting structure and processes. Abrams clarified that the CAEECC groundrules suggest that CAEECC seek consensus, but offer certain voting thresholds for different topics to account for diverse perspectives. Abrams noted that the groundrules do not mandate transparency around voting results.

Session 5: Main Assembly Wrap Up

Slides 73 - 78

Reminders and Evaluations

Abrams provided reminders on PA solicitations and 2025 meeting dates: February 11, May 8, August 13, and December 9 for Full CAEECC Quarterly Meetings as well as the Portfolio Performance Report Reviews (June 24 and November 6) and the DEI Phase 3 Session 3 dates are being polled for January 2025.

Sikand provided a summary of the Evaluation Survey from the 9/17/24 Full Quarterly CAEECC Meeting. In general, participants felt the 9/17/24 meeting was overall successful, with most agreeing that the objectives of the meeting were accomplished, presentations and background documents were clear and helpful, and the meeting facilitators were effective in running the meeting.

Sikand then reiterated the CAEECC Members groundrules' requirement of completing a meeting evaluation after each meeting, with a note for Members to complete evaluations by November 20, 2024. Lastly, Sikand reviewed the meeting goals of the Q4 meeting.

CAEECC Member Discussion

- Members noted conflicts with the meeting dates and two codes and standards conferences: ASHRAE and IATMO.

Session 6: Optional Assembly

Slides 79 - 100

Lighting Controls Certification

"11-13-2024 PG&E Presentation on Lighting Controls Certification (posted 11-6-2024)"

Angela McDonald (PG&E), provided an overview of PG&E's International Association of Lighting Management Companies (NALMCO) certification for lighting-related Workforce Standards.

CAEECC Member Discussion on Lighting Controls Certification

- A Member commented on the fluorescent lighting market opportunity within California. McDonald noted from the workforce development perspective that NALMCO is a national certification, meaning its skills are portable to states outside of California.

CalMTA Update

Slides 81 - 91

Nils Strindberg (CalMTA), provided an overview of CalMTA and presented updates to the Room Heat Pump MTI plan and the Induction Cooking MTI plan, noting these plans are complimentary to EE PA programs and not a substitute. Strindberg highlighted the target date for a filing is December 30, 2024 and a decision hopefully in Q3 2025 as well as the Equity Sounding Board being formed concurrently.

CAEECC Member Discussion on CalMTA Update

- A Member asked for further clarification on how CalMTA evaluates the effectiveness of its market interventions and how it determines when no

additional intervention is needed in the future. CalMTA referenced its [MTI plans](#) for additional detail, and noted that if a measure has been included in Codes and Standards, that is often indicative that CalMTA's role in market transformation is complete.

- Strindberg shared, based on Member questions, that CalMTA is involved in ongoing discussions with manufacturers, pointing to the efforts of the MTI Development team.
- Strindberg provided additional information on CalMTA's implementation process, in response to Member inquiries, sharing that CalMTA is waiting for Commission approval to approve plans. Strindberg noted startup and deployment budgets. Strindberg shared CalMTA coordinates with PAs in areas such as Codes and Standards through biweekly meetings.
- A Member asked about the timeline for an implementer interested in leveraging a CalMTA program. Strindberg pointed to the need for proactive discussions. Beitel offered CalTF's perspective, noting that implementers can only offer approved measures. Beitel shared that CalTF recognizes that both measure and installation costs are barriers to implementation. Strindberg mentioned that CalMTA works to lower costs so that measures have better cost effectiveness.
- Strindberg clarified, in response to a Member question, that CalMTA determines whether its proposals are competing with other PAs by assessing what is already being offered in the marketplace, such as specific programs and their source of funding.
- BayREN noted that CalMTA has reached out to BayREN to discuss potential duplication efforts.

Public Input on CalMTA Update

- A Member of the Public asked if the MTI Plans would be in conflict with the Governor's EO N-5-24. Strindberg noted that CalMTA expects that its portfolio of MTIs will be cost effective over time and thus would not be in conflict with the Governor's EO N-5-24 for cost effectiveness.
- A Member of the Public asked about the impact evaluator bid process. Strindberg cited the MTA Decision ([D. 19-12-021](#)), noting that CalMTA is not required to follow the same processes as those who are subject to EE proceeding regulations. Strindberg provided information on CalMTA's evaluation processes. While Energy Division contracts for IOUs' impact evaluations, the same is not required for CalMTA. CalMTA has an Evaluation Advisory Group, but evaluations focus more on market progress and less on impact. A Member of Energy Division specified that some programs have "embedded evaluations", which are handled differently than impact evaluations.
- A Member of the Public asked for clarification on CalMTA's plans to create a program off an approved measure package, which once approved, any implementer could use. Strindberg clarified that if a measure package is approved and introduced to the market prior to 2026, CalMTA would use different delivery channels and strategies for CalMTA market interactions. Though CalMTA

would be serving the same market, CalMTA would not want to offer the same kind of delivery mechanism.

Avoided Cost Calculator Updates

Slides 92 - 100

Chris Westling (CPUC), provided changes from the 2022 to 2024 Avoided Cost Calculator (ACC), Societal Cost Test (SCT) and its implementation, and information on how to navigate the [DER Cost-Effectiveness Webpage](#).

CAEECC Member Discussion on Avoided Cost Calculator Updates

- A Member of Energy Division asked if the GHG adder is greater than the social cost of carbon and how the graphs on s100 show differences in the discount rates between the TRC and SCT.
 - **CPUC Response:** In general, the marginal avoided compliance cost of GHGs in the traditional ACC (TRC ACC) is roughly equivalent to the Base Social Cost of Carbon in the SCT ACC. The High SCC is higher. Each SCT result (base SCC and high SCC) chooses higher of the compliance GHGs vs social cost of carbon. Discount rates are included in both graphs.

Members of the Public did not provide any comments on the ACC.

Meeting Wrap Up

Abrams concluded the meeting with words of gratitude for Member and Public participation.

Appendix A: Attendees

Organization	Name
CAEECC Members	
3C-REN	Alejandra Tellez
BayREN	Jane Elias
CEDMC	Joe Desmond
CCRREN	Jordan Garbayo
Code Cycle	Dan Suyeyasu
CSE	Rocky Fernandez
Frontier Energy	Nancy Barba
IREN/WRCOG	Benjamin Druyon
LGSEC	Amaury Berteaud
MCE	Alice Havenar-Daughton
NRDC	Lara Ettenson
PG&E	Sebastien Csapo
RuralREN North	Stephen Kullmann
SCE	Jessica Lau
SDG&E	Stacie Risley
SDREN	Sheena Tran
SJVCEO	Courtney Kalashian
Small Business Utility Advocates	Ted Howard
SMW Local 104	Chris Ruch
SoCalGas	Roy Christian
SoCalREN	Fernanda Craig
The Energy Coalition	Laurel Rothschild
Ex-Officio	
CARB	Emma Tome
CEC	Owen Howlett
CPUC Energy Division	Ely Jacobsohn
CPUC Energy Division	Pamela Rittelmeyer
CPUC Energy Division	Coby Rudolph
Other Interested Stakeholders	
Acterra	Dennis Murphy
Cal Public Advocates	James Ahlstedt
CalTF	Annette Beitel
CalTF	Michael Daukoru
CalTF	Spencer Lipp

CaITF	Tim Melloch
CPUC	Leanne Hoadley
CPUC	Jessie Levine
CPUC	P Li
CPUC	Alex Moisa
CPUC	Gillian Weaver
CPUC	Christopher Westling
Don Arambula Consulting	Don Arambula
Daikin Comfort	Matt Baker
DNV	Lindsay Keane
Eco Services	Nicole Milner
ETCC	Johna Roth
Frontier Energy	Margaret Marchant
Grounded Research	Jennifer Mitchell-Jackson
Grounded Research	Mary Sutter
High Sierra	Pam Bold
Illume Advising	Eileen Hannigan
Illume Advising	Lisa Qu
Independent	Aislyn Colgan
Independent	Rafael Friedmann
Independent	Jan Maes
Lincus	Alyza Khan
Lincus	Patrick Ngo
Mendota Group	Grey Staples
MW Consulting	Mark Wallenrod
PG&E	Angela McDonald
PG&E	Lindsay Tillisch
Resource Innovations	Carly Norris
Resource Innovations	Nils Strindberg
Rising Sun Opportunities	Julia Hatton
RuralREN North	Patricia Terry
SCE	Justine Chao
SCE	Christopher Malotte
SCE	Larry Tabizon
SDGE	John Zwick
SDREN	Aisha Cervantes-Cissna
SDREN	Marissa Van Sant
SDREN	Amy Whitehouse
Silent Running	James Dodenhoff

SoCalGas	Ali Ahmad
SoCalGas	Wayne Chi
SoCalGas	Carlo Gavina
The Energy Coalition	Tim Olsen
The Energy Coalition	Rachel Pennington
Willdan	Jeanne Huntsman
Willdan	Rosie Kang
WRCOG	Casey Dailey
Yinsight	Carol Yin
Facilitators	
Birch Road Consulting	Katie Abrams
Common Spark Consulting	Michelle Vigen Ralston
Common Spark Consulting	Suhaila Sikand
Common Spark Consulting	Mahal Miles
Raab Associates	Susan Rivo