California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee

Full Quarterly CAEECC Meeting #30

September 2, 2021 9:00 – 12:15

Teleconference

Draft Meeting Summary

Facilitators: Dr. Jonathan Raab, Raab Associates & Katie Abrams, CONCUR

On September 2, 2021, the California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee (CAEECC) convened a quarterly meeting of the full CAEECC via WebEx. Over 107 individuals participated, including representatives from 22 CAEECC Member organizations. A full list of meeting registrants is provided in Appendix A.

Meeting facilitation was provided by Dr. Jonathan Raab (Raab Associates) and Katie Abrams (CONCUR). Meeting materials, including presentations, are provided on the CAEECC website here: <https://www.caeecc.org/9-2-21-full-caeecc-meeting>

The PowerPoint presentation used throughout the meeting is available on the CAEECC website (see link above to Meeting Materials, *Combined 9/2 Slide Deck (8.31.21),* under “Documents Posted Before the Meeting”).

Following the presentations, key clarifying questions or comments are listed and relevant *responses to questions* are noted in *italics*. Where multiple responses were given, these responses are listed as sub-bullets. Public comment, and any responses given, is primarily included in Appendix B (Chat Log). Next Steps, at the end of this document, list all next steps discussed at the meeting.

**Introductions**

At the beginning of the meeting, CAEECC facilitator Jonathan Raab opened the meeting, and reviewed the agenda. The focus of the meeting is for Members to receive and discuss updates to Working Groups (WGs), the Third-Party Solicitation Process, CAEECC Groundrules, the CPUC filing template for Business Plans/4-year applications; as well as hear presentations and discuss the PAs’ approach to Segmentation (including new Equity and Market Support segments), and the upcoming two-year evaluation of CAEECC composition and possible invitations for new Members. The meeting also includes a meet-and-greet with CPUC Commissioner Genevieve Shiroma**.**

**SESSION 1A: Important Updates & CAEECC Planning & Procedures**

***3rd Party Solicitation Process***

Brandon Sanders, SCE, provided an update on the investor-owned utility (IOU) third party (3P) solicitation process (see *Combined 9/2 Slide Deck, slides 6-10,* posted to the meeting page).

Clarifying Questions and Comments:

* Where do the PAs anticipate they’ll be with regards to the Biennial Budget Advice Letters (BBALs) and Applications – low end of the range and stretch target?
  + *SCE and SoCalGas anticipate meeting or exceeding the 60% target by the deadline; plan is to stay well above that target for the foreseeable future with 3P as the default model*
  + *PG&E anticipates hitting 52% in early 2022, and achieve the 60% target before the deadline*
* What’s the typical timeline between negotiations and program launch? For some programs listed on the SCE slide, contract negotiations ended about a year ago, but programs haven’t launched yet.
  + *SCE: it’s program dependent; there was an extended review period for program Advice Letters; takes longer if a program is contested. All but one program has been approved and is starting to ramp up.*

Lara Ettenson reminded participants that CAEECC maintains a webpage on solicitations, which can be found here: <https://www.caeecc.org/third-party-solicitation-process>

***Groundrules Update***

Jonathan Raab provided an update on Groundrules language changes made since the 6/24 full CAEECC meeting. The primary changes include: 1) process change for Prospectuses, 2) new enforcement groundrule on dispute communications, 3) member requirement to adhere to CAEECC Groundrules in Working Groups, and 4) Disclosure requirements for non-CAEECC members in Working Groups (see *CAEECC Groundrules Updated per ED Guidance\_8.10.21 (8.24.21)* and *Combined 9/2 Slide Deck, slides 11-12,* posted to the meeting page).

Clarifying Questions and Comments:

* Randy Young, SMW Local 104: Regarding the Prospectus process change, what constitutes a small WG, which might necessitate a full CAEECC review and approval?
  + *Jonathan Raab clarified that the proposed new language (“Each Prospectus will specify, on a case-by-case basis, whether the full CAEECC will retain final recommendation-making authority or delegate it to a Working Group, Workshop, or Subcommittee) applies to both small and large WGs, task forces, and sub-committees – and emphasized that the focus is on recommendation-making authority. The small WG was just an example of when CAEECC may not want to delegate recommendation-making authority but rather have those recommendations come back to the Full CAEECC.*

Jonathan Raab asked if any WG members had objections to the newly presented language, and hearing none, he summarized that the facilitation team will finalize the Groundrules document presented to WG members and post the updated version to the CAEECC website.

***Filing Template for Biz Plans/4 Year Applications***

Ely Jacobsohn, CPUC, provided an update on the filing template for Biz Plans/4 year applications (see *Combined 9/2 Slide Deck, slides 13-14,* posted to the meeting page).

Clarifying Questions and Comments:

* When does the CPUC anticipate finalizing the template?
  + *We anticipate providing a final template/guidance by September 31st*
* Can you share insights on how supplemental testimony will be addressed, within the context of concepts like zero-based budgeting?
  + *Cal Advocates expects direct testimony with a sponsoring witness to demonstrate reasonable benefits to justify program costs.* 
    - *CPUC: Attachment A discusses PA requirements for zero-based budgeting*
    - *SCE: We’d welcome feedback if the templates aren’t adequately detailed on zero-based budgeting.*
    - *PG&E: Between tables in the GRC (which puts more emphasis on 5-year historical look back), and ABALs supplemental budget tables, we hope that our supplemental tables provide adequate insights into zero-based budgeting and program justification*

Jonathan asked if CalPA has a a gold-standard example (of filings w/good testimony) it can share with PAs. CalPA responded that they continue to contest based on inadequate information. Jonathan summarized that this could be an area of further discussion offline.

***Topics for next full CAEECC meeting (12/2) including discussion on preparations for February Biz Plans/4 Year Applications***

Dr. Jonathan Raab presented a list of proposed topics for the December quarterly CAEECC meeting (see *Combined 9/2 Slide Deck, slide 15,* posted to the meeting page).

Summary of discussion and feedback:

* Add to the agenda an update and discussion of policy implications to the EE portfolios of the Governor’s recent energy reliability proclamation (July 30, 2021 “Proclamation of a State of Emergency”)
  + *CPUC: Agree with adding this topic to the December CAEECC meeting; good opportunity for Energy Division or others to report out on outcomes for Judge Fitch’s recent EE ruling (regarding how particular resources could help support reliability in 2022 and in 2023)*
* Suggested changes to the BBALs topic:
  + Combined Segmentation topic: revise to include discussion of 1) final WG recommendations and 2) segmentation in final BBAL submittals (first two agenda topics), then focus on Biz Plans/4-year applications
  + CPUC suggested discussing how new programs or programmatic changes will happen over the 2022 to 2023 period

Jonathan Raab summarized that in addition to the Governor’s recent proclamation, a deep dive in Segmentation could be valuable to discuss at the next full CAEECC meeting. He requested that WG members email him with additional ideas for the 12/2 meeting.

**CPUC Commissioner Genevieve Shiroma**

***Meet & Greet CAEECC Members***

Commissioner Shiroma gave remarks about her background and role at the CPUC. She recounted her family history as a farm worker's daughter in the Acampo-Lodi area of San Joaquin County. Her professional history includes 15 years at California Air Resources Board, and 19 years as an elected director of Sacramento Municipal Utility District. Commissioner Shiroma is presently the lead Commissioner for approximately 65 formal proceedings spanning the regulated electricity, gas, telecommunications, transportation, and water industries. As part of her role at the CPUC, she also serves on numerous boards and committees within California and nationally, including Secretary/Treasurer of the Western Conference of Public Service Commissioners of the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC) and the NARUC Emergency Preparedness, Recovery and Resiliency Task Force and Subcommittee on State and National Response to COVID-19.

Each CAEECC WG lead representative briefly introduced themselves and their organization.

**SESSION 1B: Important Updates; and CAEECC Planning & Procedures**

***Equity and Market Support Metrics Working Groups***

Jonathan Raab and Katie Abrams, co-facilitators, provided an overview of two proposed new WGs on Equity and Market Support Metrics (see *Combined 9/2 Slide Deck, slides 20-23,* posted to the meeting page). There were no clarifying questions or comments.

***Upcoming two-year evaluation of CAEECC composition and possible invitations for new Members***

Jonathan Raab presented a slide explaining that per CAEECC Groundrules, the Committee should evaluate membership composition every two years (see *Combined 9/2 Slide Deck, slide 24,* posted to the meeting page). In the past, the Facilitation Team has led this effort, but this year, is proposing leading a task force comprised of CAEECC Members to ensure greater insights into composition evaluation, suggested additions, and recruitment strategy.

He also presented the following questions for CAEECC member discussion:

1. What types of organizations are currently missing or underrepresented?
2. How could we attract additional participants not represented?
3. Does it make sense for the Facilitation Team to lead this effort alone? If not, who?
4. Other process suggestions?

Co-Chair Lara Ettenson, NRDC, explained that issues of diversity on boards and advisory committees is not unique to CAEECC. CAEECC can identify gaps, and lead recruitment – but those prospective organizations are unlikely to have the capacity and resources to engage, and also the jargon can be intimidating. The CPUC’s intervenor compensation program works best for entities that have the resources to pay their staff while waiting for reimbursement. Other methods beyond the authority of CAEECC may be needed to attract and retain key organizations that are interested in attending but lack resources. She emphasized that NRDC would be very interested in thinking through solutions to make systematic changes, including tactics such as those identified in the Environmental & Social Justice Action Plan.

Co-Chair Jenny Berg, BayREN added that one voice that’s missing from CAEECC member composition is the voice of customer.

Summary of Additional Feedback:

* CAEECC needs to find a way to facilitate resources for prospective member organizations that lack the resources to fully engage
* Intervenor compensation is a burdensome process with a high bar to prove, that can take months to years for reimbursement
* The compensation process outlined in the Market Transformation Administration Decision was set up for a different purpose than the needs of groups like CAEECC
* One possible avenue to explore is PAs supporting resource-constrained members through sub-contracting
* Need to fully consider time requirements: not just meeting attendance, but also to time to read materials and do background research (i.e., to overcome the “jargon barrier” )
* Consider long-term models that account for travel when and if meetings reconvene in person

Jonathan Raab summarized that for question 2, the task force can explicitly discuss resources/funding beyond the intervenor compensation method. For next steps, expect an email in a week or two with an invitation to join the task force.

Commissioner Shiroma acknowledged the challenge of getting participation when intervenor compensation isn’t a good fit and expressed her appreciation for the group’s problem solving. She also suggested tribal representation be considered.

**SESSION 2: Biennial Budget Advice Letters (BBALs): Segmentation**

***Presentation/discussion of PAs’ approach to Segmentation (including new Equity and Market Support segments); and other key anticipated BBAL issues***

Chris Malotte (SCE), Jenny Berg (BayREN), and Rob Bohn (PG&E) each presented slides on their organization’s proposed approach to program segmentation (see *Combined 9/2 Slide Deck, slides 27-43,* posted to the meeting page).

Clarifying Questions and Feedback on SCE Presentation:

* Why wouldn’t market transformation (MT) be part of the Market Support (MS) segment?
  + *MT funds would be covered through the existing BBAL process although the funding would come from outside the existing Biz Plan; SCE included MT in the “other” bucket (outside RA, MS, Equity, and C&S) because it will be requesting rate recovery outside those existing four buckets*
* Has SCE considered the total system benefits (TSB) and impact of segmentation on these buckets, and has SCE thought through attribution issues with RENs?
  + *SCE’s goal is to be cost-effective through the TSB, which will require balancing across the segments.*
  + *CPUC: Can SoCalREN elaborate on its assertion that TSB is likely to discourage PAs from segmenting programs into Market Support?*
    - *SoCalREN: Market Support doesn’t have claimable savings, just attributable savings; IOUs claim the savings and RENs claim the costs. SoCalREN has two resource programs, with about 7.1kWh forecasted savings, $21M costs and about $11M TSB benefit – TSB looks at claimed savings, so it’s still very resource-focused*

There were no clarifying questions or feedback on BayREN’s presentation.

Clarifying Questions and Feedback on PG&E Presentation:

* Why wouldn’t the statewide leads be the primary driver for determining the appropriate segment? Would appreciate an example of a project that would create a conflict between RA and new construction (NC)
  + *There doesn’t always need to be a choice between RA and MS; from an implementation standpoint, if a program falls within RA, it would need to be cost-effective. It’s still important to provide education and marketing, even if a program falls within RA.*
* Assuming new construction has high cost-effectiveness, are you worried about how this might impact total resource cost (TRC) or TSB?
  + *Aggressive code cycles have lowered opportunities to claim savings for new construction. Our understanding of the CPUC’s May Energy Efficiency (EE) Decision is that segmentation should be made based on the primary focus of the program.*
* Segmentation programs in Market Support allows PG&E to claim large spillover benefits that it couldn’t claim in RA
  + *Rather than “spillover” would frame this as the impact exceeds individual projects and influences the broader market*
* Does this allow for parsing New Construction (NC) activities into different programs, some in Resource Acquisition (RA) and some in MS?
  + *PG&E has 4 NC programs; need to choose the primary objective for each offering. Any TSB benefits will accrue towards our goal regardless of which bucket it’s in.*
* In California, a substantial problem is siting low to moderate income housing. To what extent does PG&E and BayREN plan to address this issue?
  + *PG&E: Programs can have multiple objectives. BayREN: We do not have new construction programs.*
* Is the NC example slide specific to the four statewide programs for which PG&E is the lead PA?
  + *Yes the slide is about program-level not measure-level interventions*
* Is the statewide NC program saving energy, and if so, why isn’t it in RA?
  + *The Decision makes it clear that if the primary purpose is Equity or Market Support, then it should go in one of those buckets, even if there’s a RA component*

Jonathan invited other PAs to share their perspective on segmentation; none spoke up.

Jonathan presented the following cross-cutting discussion questions:

1. **Do you agree with, and have any specific feedback on the segmentation approaches proposed by SCE, BayREN, and PG&E, respectively?**

* The PAs need to align with each other on approach, using the same definitions, criteria, goals and metrics. This is critical to ensuring a timely review and smooth justification process.
  + *SCE: Statewide lead for a particular program will drive segmentation decision, which will create a uniform approach across PAs for each statewide program.*
* There are many tradeoffs in segmentation decisions, including budget caps.

1. **PG&E Suggested Discussion Questions:**
   1. **Which segment does EM&V belong in? If multiple, how should these costs be allocated in PA budget advice letters?**

* Consider whether EM&V belongs in a segment like Market Support or including EM&V within the segment where the given program resides.
* There should be uniformity across PAs on how EM&V is handled.
* Currently IOUs request 4% of their budget for EM&V, and the majority of that funding is controlled by the CPUC.
* One option could be 4% of each segment budget, which would allow for insights into the new segments and not just RA

*The CPUC offered to take this question back and respond to PAs and CAEECC.*

* 1. **What do stakeholders expect to see in the 2022-2023 budget advice letters in terms of program segmentation justification?**
* Suggest a robust rationale that assumes the reviewer doesn’t have a background in the program. What comes in through the BBALs will inform the 4 Year Applications. If PAs submit different approaches, then we need to discuss and try to align.
* The same requirements for annual ALs should apply to BBALs: a credible approach that examines what’s actually achievable. Better to be realistic then make overly ambitious proposals that lead to procedural delays and complexity
  1. **What do stakeholders expect to see in the 2024-2031 EE portfolio applications in terms of program segmentation justification?**
* Justification will go back to the authorizing Decision, and require direct testimony and a sponsoring witness (though not for BBALs)

**Wrap Up/ next Steps**

***6.24 Meeting Evaluation***

J.Raab summarized the results from the 6/24 full CAEECC evaluation (see *Combined 9/2 Slide Deck, slide 45,* posted to the meeting page). He thanked participants for attending and encouraged all participants to fill out the CAEECC Evaluation for today’s meeting.

Next steps are as follows:

**CAEECC Members:**

* **Evaluation:** Fill out the CAEECC Evaluation of the meeting (as required by our CAEECC groundrules) no later than Thursday September 9, 2021

**CPUC:**

* Provide PAs (and CAEECC) guidance on which segment EM&V belongs in
* Post final Filing Template for Biz Plans/4 Year Applications by September 31st

**Facilitation Team:**

* **Groundrules Update**
  + Finalize Groundrules document presented to and approved by CAEECC members at today’s meeting – and post to CAEECC website by Thursday September 9th
* **Upcoming two-year evaluation of CAEECC composition and possible invitations for new Members** 
  + Request participation in a task force on CAEECC composition and revise the scope to explicitly discuss resources/funding beyond the intervenor compensation method. Recommendations to be discussed by Full CAEECC at its December meeting.
* **Meeting Facilitation:**
  + Develop, post and notice draft meeting summary (this document) to the meeting webpages by Thursday September 9, 2021, COB.
  + Review and analyze survey evaluations of today’s Full CAEECC meeting for continuous improvement opportunities
  + Prepare for next Full CAEECC meeting (December 2, 2021) – including adding agenda topics for the Governor’s recent energy reliability proclamation, and a consolidated deep dive on segmentation

**Appendix A: Meeting Attendants**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Organization** | **First Name** | **Last Name** |
| **CAEECC Member Representatives, Alternates, & Presenters** | | |
| 3C-REN | Alejandra | Tellez |
| BayREN | Jennifer | Berg |
| CalAdvocates | Mike | Campbell |
| CEC | Brian | Samuelson |
| CEDMC | Serj | Berelson |
| CEDMC | Greg | Wikler |
| Code Cycle | Dan | Suyeyasu |
| CSE | Stephen | Gunther |
| LGSEC | Demian | Hardman-Saldana |
| LMCC | Bernie | Kotlier |
| MCE | Alice | Havenar-Daughton |
| NRDC | Lara | Ettenson |
| PGE | Rob | Bohn |
| PGE | Lucy | Morris |
| RCEA | Aisha | Cissna |
| RCEA | Stephen | Kullmann |
| SBUA | Ted | Howard |
| SCE | Christopher | Malotte |
| SCE | Brandon | Sanders |
| SDGE | Mike | McConnell |
| SF Dept of the Environment | Lowell | Chu |
| Sheet Metal Workers Local 104 | David | Vincent |
| Sheet Metal Workers Local 104 | Randy | Young |
| SJVCEO | Courtney | Kalashian |
| SoCalGas | Kevin | Ehsani |
| SoCalREN | Lujuana | Medina |
| The Energy Coalition | Laurel | Rothschild |
| The Energy Coalition | Marc | Costa |
| **Ex Officio** | | |
| CPUC | Commissioner | Shiroma |
| CPUC | Ely | Jacobsohn |
| CPUC | Jennifer | Kalafut |
| CPUC | Nils | Strindberg |
| CPUC | Leuwam | Tesfai |
| CPUC | Christina | Torok |
| CPUC | Cheryl | Wynn |
| **Facilitators** | | |
| Raab Associates | Jonathan | Raab |
| Concur | Katie | Abrams |
| **Other Participants** | | |
| 2050 Partners | Ted | Pope |
| Alliance to Save Energy | Scott | Thach |
| Cadmus | Karen | Horkitz |
| Cadmus | Cynthia | Kan |
| CEC | Kristy | Chew |
| Clearesult | Joanne | O'Neill |
| Coachella Valley Assoc. of Govts | Benjamin | Druyon |
| CPUC | Jessica | Allison |
| CPUC | Dan | Buch |
| CPUC | Peter | Franzese |
| CPUC | Peng | Gong |
| CPUC | Sasha | Merigan |
| CPUC | [Coby](javascript:void(0);) | [Rudolph](javascript:void(0);) |
| CPUC | Jason | Symonds |
| CPUC | [Christina](javascript:void(0);) | [Torok](javascript:void(0);) |
| CSE | Fabiola | Lao |
| Daikin Comfort | Matt | Baker |
| DNV | Nick | Brod |
| Don Arambula Consulting | Don | Arambula |
| Energy Resources Integration | Eric | Noller |
| Franklin Energy | Brett | Bishop |
| Franklin Energy | Chad | Ihrig |
| Frontier Energy | Nancy | Barba |
| FS Consulting | Frank | Spasaro |
| Greenbank Associates | Alice | Sung |
| Greencat | David | Shallenberger |
| Grounded Research | Jenn | Mitchell-Jackson |
| LGSEC | Garrett | Wong |
| Lincus | Cody | Coeckelenbergh |
| Lincus | Patrick | Ngo |
| MCE | Jana | Kopyciok-Lande |
| Mendota Group | Grey | Staples |
| MWC | Mark | Wallenrod |
| Pacific Corp | Nancy | Goddard |
| PGE | Caroline | Massad Francis |
| PGE | Ben | Brown |
| PGE | Izzy | Carson |
| PGE | [Mananya](javascript:void(0);) | [Chansanchai](javascript:void(0);) |
| PGE | Pat | Eilert |
| PGE | Caroline | Massad Francis |
| PGE | Lester | Sapitula |
| PGE | Kate | Schulenberg |
| PGE | Lindsey | Tillisch |
| Quality Conservation Services | Allan | Rago |
| RCEA | Marianne | Bithell |
| Reliable Energy | Ron | Garcia |
| Resource Innovations | Corey | Grace |
| RMS Energy Consulting | Martin | Vu |
| SCE | Marissa | Barrera |
| SCE | Pei-Chi | Chou |
| SCE | Matt | Evans |
| SCE | Mark | Martinez |
| SCE | Patricia | Neri |
| SCE | Jarred | Ross |
| Silent Running | James | Dodenhoff |
| SoCalGas | Michael | Diaz |
| SoCalGas | Allison | Dourigan |
| SoCalGas | Halley | Fitzpatrick |
| SoCalGas | Sebastian | Garza |
| SoCalGas | Andrew | Kwok |
| SoCalGas | Karen | Mar |
| SoCalGas | Sergio | Rojas |
| SoCalREN | Fernanda | Craig |
| Strategic Energy Innovations | Stephanie | Doi |
| TEAA | Ross | Colley |
| The Energy Coalition | Craig | Perkins |
| TRC | David | Paton |
| Tre'laine | Pepper | Hunziker |
| Willdan | Eric | Bornstein |
| Willdan | [Richard](javascript:void(0);) | [Sperberg](javascript:void(0);) |

**Appendix B: Chat Log**

from Alice Sung to All Panelists: 1:41 PM

ALSO missing is the public school districts voices

from Alice Sung to All Panelists: 1:43 PM

BEing able to resource EJ and equity orgs and individuals is necessary. YES to Lara's important comment. Another barrier is the criteria for already being knowledgeable about the "Cost-effectiveness" formulas and derivation.

from Alice Sung to All Panelists: 1:48 PM

Compensation should not just be an hourly rate or single stipend /meeting attendenace. Its takes HOURS and WEEKS of reviewing the materials and seriously understanding the complexity of the entire process to hone in on problems and solutions that would work toqrds equity,, and bujilding on Justice 40 principles and addressing the economic disparites in implementation.

from Alice Sung to All Panelists: 1:50 PM

Who here wold be here if not that it is within their fulltime JOB description?

from Alice Sung to All Panelists: 1:51 PM

Yes, thank you Lucy

from Stephen Gunther to All Panelists: 1:53 PM

As this new Task Force thinks through these barriers to participation, it will be important to bring in voices from non-CAEECC members to better understand their needs and concerns

from Lara Ettenson to All Panelists: 1:56 PM

Yes and compensate them if we ask to interview or spend time with them. There is also the opportunity to set up complementary opportunities for meaningful engagement that may not require full membership, but would allow for opportunities to weigh in on decisions. This could be held at community venues (once back in person) and provide some sort of monetary support for attending. There are a lot of models out there across the country and within CA that we could pull from.

from Alice Sung to All Panelists: 2:10 PM

While it is a very great thing that CAEEC is finally looking seriously at examining the self-perpetuation of extant power structures, I'm not sure the right people to identify your gaps and areas for improvement toqrads true equity-not only in internal make-up but also in implementation and in outcomes are even in the room . concern that

from Alice Sung to All Panelists: 2:11 PM

Criteria needs revisions.

from Alice Sung to All Panelists: 2:12 PM

sorry for all the typos.

from Alice Sung to All Panelists: 2:13 PM

CAEEC define "Equity"? and what are the metrics - cold you share the current draft list?

from Lara Ettenson to All Panelists: 2:13 PM

Hang on Alice, i'll cut and paste the decision language

from Alice Sung to All Panelists: 2:14 PM

It seems like

from Lara Ettenson to All Panelists: 2:15 PM

“programs with a primary purpose of providing energy efficiency to hard-to-reach or underserved customers and disadvantaged communities in advancement of the Commission’s Environmental and Social Justice (ESJ) Action Plan. Improving access to energy efficiency for ESJ communities, as defined in the ESJ Action Plan, may provide corollary benefits such as increased comfort and safety, improved air quality, and more affordable utility bills, consistent with Goals 1, 2, and 5 in the ESJ Action Plan.”

from Lara Ettenson to All Panelists: 2:15 PM

equity segement includes the quote

from Lara Ettenson to All Panelists: 2:15 PM

D.21-05-031, p14

from Lara Ettenson to All Panelists: 2:16 PM

<https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=ALL&DocID=385864616>

from Alice Sung to All Panelists: 2:17 PM

buckets" (of funding) are in these 4-5 areas-- If the "equity bucket" ends up being 25% of $12 B. , for example, doesn't that mean "75% of it is allowing the investments to go towards contributing to greater INequity?

from Brett Bishop to Host (privately): 2:20 PM

TSB can be supportive of Equity & Market Suppot. So long as implementors install more durable measures. Insulation lasts 20 years (per policy, but longer in actuallity), or HP technologies that last 15 years. All it does is discourage short lived measures.

from Lara Ettenson to All Panelists: 2:20 PM

its the total systems benefit, new calculation

from Lucy Morris to All Panelists: 2:21 PM

"supporting projects to completion" may be one type of market support program, but I think there could be many other program designs that fit within market support. That's my understanding but please correct me if that's not correct.

from Alice Sung to All Panelists: 3:00 PM

Agreed, NEW construction market incentives probably have very little benefits to IMpacted DACs and LI BIPOC communities. Conversely, would probably benefit the already wealthier population; similar to how EV rebates went to waelthy Tesla buyers etc, that did not NEED the incentives. The question is where is the EQUITY overall in what is invested in and WHAT is NOT ? (To Mike C.'s point.)

from Alice Sung to All Panelists: 3:04 PM

Why do any opf these "activities" like EM&V need to be categorized in any one "Segment" or a Bucket?'' ISNT EM&V necessary across all activites?

from Alice Sung to All Panelists: 3:07 PM

Why do activities need to be "buckets " or segments" at all? As long as "Equity" is a segemnt, we will never achieve it. It will always be incremental and marginalized . maybe The system of investing public good charges needs radical transformation. ?

from Alice Sung to All Panelists: 3:08 PM

Which decision governs this bucketing?

from Alice Sung to All Panelists: 3:10 PM

Thanks Nils- pg?

from Lara Ettenson to All Panelists: 3:11 PM

The decision is linked above Decision 21-05-031

from Lara Ettenson to All Panelists: 3:11 PM

<https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=ALL&DocID=385864616>