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MS. MATHEWS: Good morning. All right, it looks like we are ready to start. My name is Alana Mathews and I'm the Public Adviser here at the California Energy Commission. And I'm very excited to welcome everyone here to our first Senate Bill 350 Disadvantaged Community Advisory Group meeting.

First, I want to just take care of a few housekeeping items. For those of you not familiar with this building the closest restrooms are located on the first floor. And if you just go out this door, they should be to your left. There is a snack bar on the second floor under the white awning. And lastly, in the event of an emergency and the building is evacuated, please follow our employees to the appropriate exit. So you can follow me, Galen -- raise your hand -- and Dorothy who is right here. We will reconvene at Roosevelt Park, located diagonally across the street from this building. So please proceed calmly and quickly, again following the employees with whom you are meeting to safely exit the building.

So my role is to open us up, of course, with your welcome and then our brief agenda overview. We have so much to cover today and we want to be mindful of the time. We have some members who have come from Southern California
and they have flights, so part of my role today will be our
mindful time keeper.

So first on the agenda, we're going to have our
opening remarks from our Commissioners who are representing
both agencies.

Then we'll go to the introduction of the Advisory
Group Members. And that's the time where you can share
your name and your organization that you are affiliated
with.

At 10:45, we'll have a presentation about the
purpose and goals and overview of the charter. Then we'll
move to the administrative actions which includes the
election of a Chair for this body, as well as the selection
of two liaisons: one for the Low-Income Advisory Board for
the CPUC and another liaison for the Air Resource Board
Environmental Justice Advisory Committee. And then we'll
also need a recorder. As you all have read in your charter
documents there is someone who functions as a recorder of
minutes. So you also need to select someone, who will have
that function for your meetings, including today.

Next, we'll go into priorities for 2018 and
that's an opportunity for an open discussion. I know
Commissioner Rechtschaffen has some information that he
would like to share. And then we'll have lunch.

Before we break for lunch, we have a wonderful
surprise. You guys will have professional portraits taken to use, so I'll be directing everyone to our portrait studio, so that we can update our website with pictures of all of you all. And then we'll break for lunch.

We'll open up with public comment, because we'll have a pretty hopefully good discussion regarding the priorities. So we'll have a chance for anyone -- we have a lot of members of the public here today -- who will want to make a comment. They'll be able to do so at that time.

And then we'll move into what is somewhat of a training or background review for the members, which will then cover the Open Meetings Act and introduction to the California Energy Commission clean energy programs, as well as the California Public Utilities Commission's clean energy programs. Of course, that's the main task that you are as an Advisory Group Member given, is to provide recommendation on those programs.

And lastly, we will have a presentation on the Energy Equity Indicators, which is one of the priorities, here at the California Energy Commission.

And before we close, we'll open it up once again for public comment.

And then we'll look at the next task of looking at the next steps before we adjourn, which would include making sure we have dates. We'll try to get dates for your
meetings in July, August and October or November in those areas.

   So with that, I will turn it over to Commissioner Janea Scott for the first opening remarks.

   COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Great. Thank you very much, Alana. These are new mics, so everyone can hear me through this, correct? Okay. Excellent. So my name is Janea Scott. And as Alana mentioned I'm a Commissioner here at the Energy Commission. In my role, I'm appointed as the Public Member. And I am Lead for our transportation work and also for our SB 350 Barriers Study work, so I'm delighted to have all of you here today. Welcome.

   As you all know, this is part of the SB 350 that the Legislature put together and the Governor signed a couple of years ago. One of the things that the Legislature directed the Energy Commission and the Public Utilities Commission to do is to study the barriers for low-income and disadvantaged communities to get involved in renewable energy and in energy efficiency. So we have put together a report that has 12 recommendations that are working diligently to carry out. How do we put the solutions in place? How do we help fix the barriers that we have identified?

   And part of that, of course, is this group. So we're so excited to have you here. And thank you so much
for lending your insights to us and your expertise. I'm really looking forward to the feedback that you have and the input that you will have for us. And I am also delighted that we get to partner with our friends at the Public Utilities Commission on this.

And so, I would like to turn it over to Commissioner Guzman Aceves, to my left here, to make some opening remarks as well.

COMMISSIONER GUZMAN ACEVES: Thank you. Good morning everybody. I just wanted to reflect a little bit about being here in Sacramento, in the time that we're in. Today is the anniversary of Martin Luther King Junior's assassination. It's a time when our president is trying to militarize our border and a difficult time for Sacramento. But I think, so sometimes it's really hard to focus, but I'm actually very excited to be here today.

I think what we're doing today is recognizing the historic and the current lack of equity of in certain communities in California. And I'm just excited that we have a forum in this state where we can dig deep and start to look at how we're going to cure that divestment in a clean way.

So I'm just really am excited that we're all here. And I want to get to work.

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Thank you. It's
great to have this meeting and this group launch. Commissioner Guzman Aceves and I, as well as a number of folks here, worked on the underlying SB 350 legislation and the portions that created this taskforce. And it's taken us longer than it should to set it up, but we're here and very grateful for that.

There was extraordinary interest in this taskforce. We had about 50 people applying. It was great to see people from all over the state interested and want to thank those of your who are serving for your willingness to join and to participate in this and give us advice. We want to make this group as useful and pragmatic as possible.

As Martha said, and Commissioner Scott as well, we are working together. One of the benefits of the SB 350 mandate and the directive for this taskforce in particular, is that we work together with our colleagues at the Energy Commission and we're already doing that. There's a lot going on. There's a lot that we're doing as a result of statute. There's a lot that we're doing as a result of our own directives. We want to share that with you.

The SB 350 Barriers Working Group is moving forward. We're planning a workshop later this year to showcase and get feedback on some of the efforts we've undertaken. And I think there's a lot that we've
accomplished, but there's a lot more that needs to be done. And we'll rely on this group to really help inform some of how we proceed going forward in that effort and other efforts. So we really look forward to a very productive and cooperative relationship.

I should say we're trying to also coordinate closely with the work that the Air Board's doing in the outreach to disadvantaged communities, their own taskforces and community outreach efforts under AB 617. So that's another part of what we're trying to do here. So I look forward to the discussion today. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: And then I'm going to introduce to you Chair Weisenmiller's advisor, Pam Doughman, and she is standing in for him. He's dashing over here. And I hope we will be here in just a few minutes, but she'll do some opening remarks on his behalf.

MS. DOUGMAN: Yes. Chair Weisenmiller was hoping to be here, but he -- I'm sure he's coming. He'll be here soon, so he asked me to provide a few opening remarks.

He wants to welcome you to the first meeting of the members of the Disadvantaged Communities Advisory Group. And he just wants to highlight two high-priority areas with great potential benefits for disadvantaged communities. And those two areas are clean energy for
goods movement and rapid expansion of demand response. As highlighted in the 2017 IEPR motor vehicles represent the largest source of air pollution in California, overshadowing all other sectors, and accounting for nearly 80 percent of nitrogen oxide emissions and 90 percent of diesel particulate matter emissions in the state.

Work is underway to expand electrification efforts beyond light-duty vehicles into the medium and heavy-duty vehicles: on-road, off-road, maritime, rail and aviation sectors. This is particularly important to improve air quality for disadvantage communities near major transportation corridors in Southern California.

The second item that he wanted to highlight is demand response. Demand response can be a cost effective carbon-free substitute for fossil resources and for capturing excess renewable energy. By encouraging customers to reduce load when needed and increase load during over generation, demand response allows for more cost effective use of electric infrastructure and can increase the resiliency of the electric system. Despite impressive potential demand response is not thriving in California. The 2017 IEPR calls for accelerated efforts to promote rapid growth in demand response.

Finally, I'd like to note that climate change and air pollution disproportionately impact low-income and
disadvantaged communities. Local knowledge is a critical component of efforts to ensure clean energy investment, enhances resilience to climate change. Thank you.

MS. MATHEWS: Thank you.

And now we'll move to the introduction of our Advisory Group Members. And so we will start with Mr. Tyrone Roderick Williams.

MR. WILLIAMS: Tyrone Roderick Williams, Director of Development at the Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency and Director of the Sacramento Promise Zone.

MS. CHARLES: Hi, all. I am Melicia Charles. I am with the Energy Division at the CPUC. And I'm really excited to be here. I welcome all of you.

MR. MARTINEZ: Hi. I'm Adrian Martinez. I am a Staff Attorney with Earthjustice and I'm the only one, so thank you. (Laughter.)

MR. RAMIREZ: Hi, everybody. My name is Andres Ramirez. I am Clean Energy Director with Pacoima Beautiful and I'm excited to be here as well.

MR. GRESCHNER: I'm Stan Greschner, Vice President of Government Relations and Market Development at GRID Alternatives.

MS. PINCUS: Good morning everyone. I’m Jodi Pincus, Executive Director at Rising Sun. And I'm thrilled to be here.
MS. CHEN: Good morning. I'm Stephanie Chen, Energy Equity Director at the Greenlining Institute.

MS. SEATON: Phoebe Seaton, a Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability.

MS. RUCKER-HUGHES: Good morning. I'm Waudieur "Woodie" Rucker-Hughes, President of the Riverside NAACP branch.

MS. ISLAS: Good morning, Angela Islas from the Central California Asthma Collaborative Community Health Worker. I'm working over Madera County and Fresno County.

MS. IKLE: I'm Judith Ikle, Program Manager at Energy Division, CPUC.

MS. GLASNER: I am Alice Glasner, Energy Division CPUC.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: I'm Helen Mickiewicz. And I'm in the Legal Division at the CPUC as well, and Galen down there didn't introduce himself. (Laughter.)

MR. LEMEI: I was letting the members of the Advisory Group go first. I'm Galen Lemei. I'm an attorney here at the California Energy Commission, supporting this effort.

MS. MATHEWS: Thank you, everyone. And I will note that we have nine members present, so we have a quorum of Advisory Group Members and six is required.

So now, we will move on to the next item on the
agenda, which is our Presentation of Purpose and Goals by Alice Glasner. And I'll just mention that in the back of your binder, the last tab is Presentation, so you're welcome to follow along.

MS. GLASNER: Good morning everyone. Hope you can hear me. I’m Alice Glasner, again from Energy Division at the CPUC. And I've very happy to be here as well. I'm going to talk just for a few minutes about the goals of the Advisory Group and the purpose of today's meeting.

So as you know the Advisory Group is a direct result of the passage of SB 350, the Clean Energy and Pollution Reduction Act of 2015. SB 350 touches on many areas. These include greenhouse gas reduction levels by 40 percent by 2030; increasing renewable requirements in energy mix to 50 percent, by 2030; doubling energy efficiency savings; encouraging transportation electrification to reduce economy-wide greenhouse gases and then also transforming the California independent system operator to an organization that would include other western states.

SB 350 brings a focus to disadvantaged communities in several ways. These include, or the requirements are, to consider impacts on disadvantaged communities in CPUC and CEC decision-making processes, improve access to programs in disadvantaged communities,
prioritize air quality improvements, target economic benefits and create the Disadvantaged Communities Advisory Group.

The overarching goal of the Advisory Group is to advise the CPUC and the Energy Commission on clean energy and pollution reduction programs.

The charter aims to reflect SB 350 with respect to improving access to clean energy programs as well as related outcomes for disadvantaged communities. Pursuant to these goals, the duties of the Advisory Group include the activities described here. In the charter's Article 4 a few items are that the Advisory Group shall identify priority programs or subject areas, which impact disadvantaged communities; advise on potential benefits and impact related to the design and implementation of clean energy programs and advise on measuring program effectiveness.

Today's meeting, you know, before we get into the nitty gritty of the rest of our agenda we'll be covering more general, but important, territory today. Of course, getting to know one another, responsibilities of the two Commissions and as Alana said, selecting members for important roles: the Chair, the Vice Chair, someone to record the minutes, and the liaisons to those other advisory groups.
And then we'll end the meeting by discussing some important administrative tasks and next steps.

So that's it for me. Welcome everyone.

MS. MATHEWS: We're doing great with time. Any questions?

And at this time, I just want to welcome and point the Chair or our Energy Commission, Chair Weisenmiller.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Good morning. It's great to be here. Sorry, I was double booked, so I went from one meeting to another and the other one, of course, ran late. But anyway, thanks again for your service on this Committee. It's important.

MS. MATHEWS: So we'll move to the next item on the agenda, which is starting with the Administrative Actions and the election of a Chair and a Vice Chair. I had emailed the Advisory Group Members to ask if anyone was interested. And we did have at least one member who was interested in being the Chair, and that was Mr. Tyrone Roderick Williams. So at this time, I'd like to ask if there's anyone else who's interested?

(Off mic colloquy.)

MR. GRESCHNER: Yes. I'd be interested in exploring the position.

MS. MATHEWS: Anyone else interested?
And then we also have the position of the Vice Chair, so is there anyone who's interested in that position? And remember, we also need a recorder and two liaisons to the EJAC and Low-Income Oversight Board. Is there anyone interested in being Vice Chair?

COMMISSIONER GUZMAN ACEVES: Can we nominate people? (Laughter.)

MS. MATHEWS: Well, we could take a vote on the Chair and perhaps we can look at having whoever gets the most votes become Chair and then the Vice Chair can go to the second if that's agreeable; if there's consensus for that?

MS. RUCKER-HUGHES: Question?

MS. MATHEWS: Yes.

MS. RUCKER-HUGHES: Will the Chair and Vice Chair have say in terms of the agenda, is that one of the things that they'll be helping to prep?

MS. MATHEWS: Yes.

MS. RUCKER-HUGHES: Okay.

MS. GLASNER: And if I might? In the charter, the Vice Chair basically steps in when the Chair is not available for meetings.

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Should we have the candidates say why they want to be Chair, perhaps?

MS. MATHEWS: Yes.
(Cross colloquy.)

MS. RUCKER-HUGHES: Well I had one -- I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: I apologize.

MS. RUCKER-HUGHES: I had one other question. Is there going to be any consideration of having someone from Northern California and one from Southern California, in those roles?

MS. MATHEWS: So that is up to the members of the Advisory Group to weigh that in how you want to decide. So as we share, they have the candidates share their interest in this particular role, then they can also state where they are from.

So I'm just going to, quickly before we open it up for those who are interested, a reminder of what the duties of the Chair. The Chair shall be responsible for the general supervision and direction of the affairs of the Advisory Group. The Chair shall preside at all meetings of the Advisory Group, and in the absence of the Chair, the Vice Chair shall perform the duties of that office. If the Chair and Vice Chair are unavailable for a meeting where a quorum nevertheless exists, the Advisory Group may appoint a Chair pro tem for that meeting.

So with that, we will start with Mr. Tyrone Roderick Williams.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, currently I function in two
roles at the Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency.

As the Director of Development my department oversees all of the federal finance for, and affordable housing finance for both the city and the county. We have an operating budget of almost $190 million a year. So we finance affordable housing and deal with public housing residents, because we also oversee the public housing for the city and the county.

One of the reasons why I volunteered to serve on this committee is that we are actively engaged in already providing services to disadvantaged communities. Our housing authority is the first housing authority in the nation to have electrified vehicles available for low-income public housing residents.

In addition to that, I oversee the Sacramento Promise Zone, which encompasses over 127,000 residents who currently live in disadvantaged communities. And we are working with the Clean Air Board in looking at identifying ways of providing electrified vehicles and low-emission vehicles to those areas. In addition to that we're also working with the Rapid Transit, RT, in looking at ways of providing low-emission buses to our communities as well.

So this is something that I'm actively on a daily basis, engaged in. And we're developing the largest transit-oriented neighborhood in the city of Sacramento, in
the River District, all of that at the same time. So I'm honored to be on the team and happy to serve and represent the residents of California as well as Sacramento.

MR. GRESCHNER: Hi again, my name is Stan Greschner. I'm again the Vice President of Government Relations and Market Development at GRID Alternatives. We're California's and the nation's largest nonprofit solar provider and of course expanding into a lot of renewable services.

Personally, I have ten years of experience in California, advocating for equity inclusion in legislation and the PUCs and the Commissions' energy programs.

I originally joined GRID to lead the implementation of the SASH Program, which is the Single Family Affordable Solar Homes Program that launched a decade ago. And I worked very closely a decade ago with Mike Charles at the Commission to develop a comprehensive program that was very innovative for its time.

I think it has served as a benchmark for a lot of the programs that have followed in that we worked to develop a statewide program that leveraged the solar piece of it to do comprehensive services for low-income families, including integrating enrollment into CARE and the ESPT programs, incorporate job training programs and I think the first ever PUC-directed program that included job training.
Since then SASH, MASH, SOMAH, and hopefully every low-income or disadvantaged community programs going forward has substantive job training programs. Again, I think those were piloted in a model that we developed there statewide.

We are just getting into, like something Martha said, this is an opportunity to dig deep into the issues that the Commissions are undertaking. And just in my capacity at GRID we focus a lot of our efforts on being active in the proceedings at the Commissions have around these issues. Not just those that are focused in disadvantaged communities explicitly, but looking across other programs that are there and asking, in digging there and asking why not disadvantaged communities, why not low-income in this program whether it's SJF/IRP, (phonetic) these others where we participate.

So I definitely have my very good understanding of the programs that the Commissions are undertaking. And then have actively worked for the last decade in informing those conversations.

And a couple of things on -- we're a national organization, as well and so we inform a lot of conversations around the country. And I think have a lot of best practices that we can bring into the conversation that we learned from other states. So we actually maintain
the Low-Income Solar Policy Guide, which has been a reference guide for low-income programs around the state. And has guiding principles around policies, program development, as well as highlighting successful and non-successful programs that showcase what does and does not work in various regulatory and policy environments.

And finally, I think, in whatever capacity we work together this committee, we partner with many of the organizations. So we're very familiar working with Tyrone's organization in Sacramento and Jodi and Greenlining and friends with Pacoima Beautiful. So I have a very deep respect for everyone's perspective that's brought to the table. And I just hope to lead this in this first year, this inaugural year, where there's a lot of conversations already going on. And years of history and context that are embedded in those conversations that are happening now to help, at least in the next 12 months.

And then to ensure this group is engaging as much as much as we can in all of those discussions, so thank you very much.

MS. MATHEWS: Okay, thank you.

So by a show of hands, for the Advisory Group Members, I'll ask those who are in favor of selecting Mr. Tyrone Roderick Williams as Chair, please raise your hands.

MR. WILLIAMS: Can I raise my hand?
MS. MATHEWS: Yes. (Laughter.)

One, two, three, that's four. Thank you.

And those in favor of Mr. Stan Greschner please raise your hand? (Laughter.) One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine; was there an abstention?

ADVISORY GROUP MEMBERS: No, no. (Laughter.)

MS. MATHEWS: This is better than Florida.

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFEN: We were ahead of schedule, but Phoebe wants us to (indiscernible) so let's do it.

We do have two members who have -- we have 11. Just so you know, Kevin Day and Roger Lin are also members of the Advisory Committee and they're not here yet, or I don't know if they are planning to come or not, but we do have an 11 member group here.

(Off mic colloquy.)

MS. MATHEWS: And it is a one-year term, so there will be another year. And each member is appointed for two years. But we either will have to take the vote again or if you'd just like to --

Jodie Pincus: I will go with Mr. Tyrone Williams

(Indiscernible.)

MS. MATHEWS: So we have selected. We have five votes in favor of Mr. Tyrone Roderick Williams.

MR. GRESCHNER: And I'd be honored to serve as
the Vice to Tyrone.

MS. MATHEWS: And we have selected our Vice Chair, Stan Greschner. Thank you. Give yourselves all a round of applause. (Applause.)

So now that we have a Chair and we've read those duties, that responsibility includes presiding over the meeting. So I will step back from the facilitator function and allow Mr. Williams to increase in that role of presiding, if you're okay with that?

MR. WILLIAMS: I'm okay with that. Thank you.

MS. MATHEWS: And if he stands -- (indiscernible) that's now Stan.

So we still need to select the two liaisons as well as the Recorder.

MR. WILLIAMS: Let's first go for the liaison for the Low-Income Advisory Board. Any volunteers?

MS. MATHEWS: So if we can just very quickly have some -- Mel, if you or either one of the Commissioners, just give us a brief overview of our Low-Income Oversight Board.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFEN: That makes sense. The Low-Income Oversight Board is another statutorily-mandated Board. It advises the Public Utilities Commission on energy, electricity, gas and water issues affecting low-
income ratepayers. It meets four times a year. There's overlap for sure in the mandate of the LIOB, although their focus is different as well and we meet around the state four times a year. Historically, a lot of the focus has been on the low-income efficiency programs that the Commission administers, but more recently the LIOB has been entering into a broader set of issues, energy and water issues as well.

MR. WILLIAMS: Very good.

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Excuse me. And for its part, the LIOB selected someone who will be its liaison to this Board. And I don't think it's the Chair, Robert Castaneda, but I don't think he's -- I don't see him here. Oh, is it Maria? Are you sure?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Okay. Well, great. So it's Maria Stamos who's not here. But in any case, there's going to be coordination two ways.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Do you want to just explain some of the duties that we anticipate that the Liaison would take on?

MS. MATHEWS: So the Liaison would be responsible for, if not attending at least being appraised of what each, the LIOB as well as the EJAC Committees -- and so the separate liaisons. And where there is an intersection or
overlap, or there's an opportunity to coordinate or collaborate as you give recommendations on the clean energy programs you're tasked with reviewing, you would also bring that to the attention, report back to this Advisory Group.

MR. WILLIAMS: Very good, volunteers or any additional questions? I saw some hands go up initially. Hopefully you haven't changed your mind. Okay.

MS. RUCKER-HUGHES: Mr. Chair, I don't know whether or not it's a conflict. I currently sit on the EJAC in Southern California.

MS. MATHEWS: So am I hearing that there is no conflict, but it does sound like a nomination, self-nomination. (Laughter.) It sounds like you would be very informed and perfectly positioned to be the Liaison to the --

MS. RUCKER-HUGHES: I'll do that.

MR. WILLIAMS: All right. So we have Ms. Rucker's --

MS. RUCKER-HUGHES: Say it right.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. Well, Woodie, I just (indiscernible)?

MS. MATHEWS: Waudier.

MR. WILLIAMS: Waudier, okay.

MS. RUCKER-HUGHES: Woodie though (indiscernible).
MR. WILLIAMS: Well, thanks. Okay.

Are there any other volunteers? Seeing no hands or -- do I see a hand? Seeing no hands or indications, could we have a vote for our representative on the Low-Income Advisory Group?

MS. MATHEWS: This is for the EJAC.

MR. WILLIAMS: Oh, the EJAC. Oh, okay. We're adjusting. Okay.

MS. MATHEWS: We actually have Veronica Eady who is here, if you could just say a few words about the EJAC overview with the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee?

MS. EADY: My name is Veronica Eady. I'm Assistant Executive Officer for Environmental Justice at the Air Resources Board. Sure, I'm happy to say a little bit about EJAC.

So the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee was created pursuant to AB 32, California's Global Warming Solutions Act. It's a group of, I would say 15 to 20 people representing various regions of the state who are active in the environmental justice advocacy space.

We convene the EJAC around the Scoping Plan, so the Board just passed a Scoping Plan or just approved our Scoping Plan in December. So for probably two years, or a little over two years the EJAC had dozens of meetings up and down the state to get public input on the Scoping Plan.
Since the Board just approved the Scoping Plan, the EJAC is not disbanded, but it's less active right now.

And I understand under the charter of this group, there is a requirement to coordinate with the EJAC. And so to that end I would be happy to help facilitate that and contact, in particular, the EJAC leadership, whom I will keep in contact over the course of the coming months and years until we are ready to submit another, and prepare another Scoping Plan.

MS. MATHEWS: Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. Now we'll have -- since there is only one name for consideration at this point are there any objections? Then it's unanimous. (Laughter.) Okay.

MS. MATHEWS: Well, for our record, we just want to have a show of hands.

MR. WILLIAMS: Show of hands.

MS. MATHEWS: For Waudier Rucker-Hayes as the EJAC.

MR. WILLIAMS: All right.

MS. RUCKER-HUGHES: It's Hughes.

MS. MATHEWS: Hughes, I'm sorry, Hughes as the EJAC Liaison.

MR. WILLIAMS: Very good.

All right, so now we'll go to the Low-Income
Advisory Board. Are there any volunteers?

MS. PINCUS: I'm happy to (indiscernible).

MR. WILLIAMS: I saw two hands go up, so we need some resolution on who's in and who's out.

Very good. Okay, so we have -- let's see, I don't see your -- I need your --

MR. RAMIREZ: Andres Ramirez.

MR. WILLIAMS: Andres Ramirez is -- let's have a vote, since he's the only one here.

It's unanimous. Very good, so we now have our two representatives to the Commissions. And we still need to have someone who will volunteer as the Recorder.

So the floor's now open to anyone who would like to volunteer in that capacity. And it is my understanding that if you do that capacity starts as part of this meeting?

MS. MATHEWS: Yes.

MR. WILLIAMS: And given the fact that we all have a note pad and a pen, we are all equipped and ready to perform that duty if anyone is willing to volunteer for that opportunity.

MS. MATHEWS: So one thing that I will just add, and I will note that the charter states that the minutes will be distributed out to the Members of the Advisory Group. We do have a recording of today's proceedings and...
we also have a court reporter, so we have a thorough record. We just want to make sure that we have a summary document that is provided. So that is the responsibility of the recorder.

  MR. WILLIAMS: So given that we have two ways of recording, does that Recorder need to actually take down the minutes or be responsible for making sure that they are assembled and distributed?

  MS. MATHEWS: Be responsible for summarizing the meeting and distributing those.

  MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. Now that we are clear on those responsibilities, I ask the question, are there any?

  MS. MICKIEWICZ: This is Helen Mickiewicz. They can be distributed by email. This is not a print and mail. Yeah, they can just be send out by email. Okay.

  MR. WILLIAMS: Given that those around the table doesn't seem to have an interest at this present moment, does that mean we can volunteer somebody who's on the Commission and didn't show up? (Laughter.)

Okay. Given that the guidelines or the way the statute is written is this a position that we must fill at this particular meeting, to be in accordance with the responsibilities of the Advisory Group?

  MS. MATHEWS: Yes. This is the first convening, so this meeting needs to be summarized and distributed.
MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. All right, yes?

MS. RUCKER-HUGHES: I'm nominating Phoebe.

MR. WILLIAMS: So Phoebe, you've been nominated and the joy on your face indicates that that's something you're contemplating right now or am I --

MS. SEATON: I'll do it.

MR. WILLIAMS: All right. Very good, so we appreciate your service. Could we have a show of hands of all those who support Phoebe as being our Recorder? Thank you, Phoebe. We appreciate that.

Well, I think that concludes the filling the officers' slate for Advisory Group.

MS. MATHEWS: Yes. So there is on the agenda something that talks about the discussion of an Administrative Process. And that is to remind everyone in the charter that under your responsibilities, and I will direct you, if you'll notice that the third tab in your binder says "charter." And so it has the resolution, but if you turn to Article 4, which start on page 4 that outlines the duties.

On page 5, Article four, 4.1(f), yeah so under the tab of charter you should see the resolution. And then flip a couple of more pages and you'll actually see the charter included. On page 5 of the charter, goes into a detail of the following actions of the Advisory Group,
which includes filing an annual report with the Commission, so we just wanted to make sure we highlight that that is a responsibility of the Advisory Group.

And of course, as Alice mentioned in her presentation, it's to identify priority clean energy programs or related subject areas. So that kind of takes us, it's a good segue into the next part of the agenda. But this is pretty much, if there are any questions you have about the process, the meetings you have, the charter also talks about meeting quarterly. So we are currently in the second quarter, so there will need to be another meeting in the summer, July or August, as well as a fall meeting in October or November.

And then there needs to be time to have the report that you guys will write. But we also want to give you an opportunity to discuss the priorities as outlined on page 5 of the duties of the Advisory Group: identify priority clean energy programs or related subject areas, which impact disadvantaged communities.

So to start that conversation off, I understand that Commissioner Rechtschaffen had some information that he wants to share.

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: This is not so much a direction about the priorities that the Board should focus on. That's going to be your chore under the
leadership of your Chair, but Commissioner Guzman Aceves and I wanted to give you a heads up about something we are working on that we would greatly benefit from your input on. And it's very timely.

We are in the process of preparing, for the PUC, an environmental justice strategy and roadmap. We've never had a formal one. We have an Environmental Sustainability Strategic Directive, which encompasses equity issues. We have many legislative mandates. We have administrative direction. But we've never pulled it all together in one document that sets out our philosophy and guidance. We are in the process of developing one.

We have had a number of meetings internally. And we don't have anything quite yet that we can share with you publicly, but we have the broad outlines of what we're doing. And so we just wanted to highlight for you the big points to tell you what's coming.

The goal of the strategy would be to articulate what our vision is and give voice to the vision of achieving environmental justice in our policies; also to provide some substantive direction and guidance in our decisions. And importantly, as well, provide accountability and a monitoring function for the many mandates that we have, the many programs that we are in the process of implementing or have already implemented.
We want to focus on a few broad areas for sure. One is to reduce pollution in disadvantaged communities and especially reduce sources of natural gas, fossil fuel sources -- both stationery sources from natural gas plants and internal combustion engines, fossil fuel, motor vehicles, heavy-duty freight in particular in disadvantaged communities. So that's one overriding goal.

Another, very consistent with many things we've talked about, and in the barrier studies, is to promote greater investment in clean energy programs, clean transportation programs, energy efficiency programs in disadvantaged communities. And importantly, to increase the uptake in the programs what we do offer in these communities.

Another related goal, and this is a more cost cutting goal is to make our processes more accessible to a broader range of the public to make it easier for disadvantaged communities to participate in our programs, to become parties, to provide us with comments, to have meetings in different places. This is a cost cutting theme I think for the Administration as a whole. I know that there are a number of agencies that have been working on these kinds of outreach efforts in disadvantaged communities, under the Cap and Trade expenditure programs, under the Air Board under various mandates.
We don't want to duplicate all of those. We want to build on those and coordinate on those. But at the PUC in particular we decide things differently than most other agencies. We are not, we don't do rulemaking through notice and comment rules. We typically do it through administrative adjudications, which is more formal, more expensive, more difficult for the public to participate.

So we will really -- we'll welcome a lot of advice about how we can better get public input of meaningful public participation in these processes, including what kinds of new forms of public engagement we should engage in.

And then I'd say the final prong is we do a lot of enforcement. We do a lot of compliance assurance, especially in the safety areas, somewhat in the pollution area. We do consumer protection work across various industries. We want to look at whether or not we can strengthen our enforcement programs to better target them to disadvantaged communities, or to better target some of our consumer protection programs in communities that are particularly vulnerable to overreaching and predatory practices.

So those are the general themes. What we envision -- we have an ambitious schedule and maybe too ambitious. But we're always in a hurry to do the right
thing. We're hoping to get this publicly vetted and
discussed and approved by the full Commission by the end of
the year. We'd like to circulate some drafts with this
group in the next month or two, after we have had a chance
to raise and discuss them through our Commission. Through
our own Commission processes we'll have some public
meetings through our Commission or Committee structure
where we'll talk about this. And we'd like to present it
to this group.

And then hopefully devote a considerable time for
discussion at the July meeting to the substance of the
policy and get input along the way. You're totally free to
give input along the way and we will also present it to the
Low Income Oversight Board. And then present it for final
adoption at some time in the fall or winter. So that's in
broad strokes what we're thinking about doing. And as I
say, we -- it's very, very timely, because we have a group
of people here who could really help us in crafting this
policy.

So I'll turn it Commissioner Guzman Aceves for
her thoughts.

COMMISSIONER GUZMAN ACEVES: Thank you.

Just to kind of reinforce a couple of process
improvements that we're trying to do. In general, we have
kind of the more simple programs where we have energy
efficiency funding, even some solar funding. And that
structure is a little easier to understand. That we kind
of go out and we say, "Here's this funding". We're going
to partner with certain organizations to get that out. EVs
(phonetic) is another one.

But part of what I hope we can accomplish with
this group is utilizing the collective knowledge to go a
little deeper on issues that are more complex and don't get
as much time in the communities for sure. I'm talking
about things that are related to procurement of gas
generation, like the Resource Adequacy Proceeding and
really getting some time with all of you to get into the
weeds on how some of that functions, so that you can help
us think more creatively around that.

Some of the priorities that were mentioned by
Commissioner Weisenmiller, the Chair, on goods movement is
another one that is more complex and one that interacts a
lot of agencies. And is one that I think is appropriate
for this group to really take on and think in a way that is
new and beyond just a single agency.

And I would say just you know, demand response is
kind of another example of that where we're attempting to
do, just as an example, disadvantaged community pilots. As
we speak, we're developing that and that is an area that is
another relation to our dependency on gas cycling. And we
don't get a lot of time with all of you on those issues. They're not as sexy as transportation and electrification. So we look forward to working with all of you and certainly now that we have a Chair, Vice Chair, to think through the interest from all of you, but I hope you give us the opportunity to kind of come to you with some of these issues that are ripe. And really give you some of the in-depth.

The benefit that we get is we get a lot of information that comes to us. And we want to share that information with you with a greater degree of depth, so we can not only get your input, but see how do we get that out to the greater public as well?

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Excuse me, but before any of you speak to that, you can't speak to that because it's not on the agenda. So we'll discuss Bagley-Keene this afternoon, but because this item that you put forward is not on the agenda you all can't talk about it today. You can talk about it at your next meeting.

Also, was this part of Administrative Process or was this part of Priorities for 2018?

MS. MATHEWS: It was Priorities for 2018.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Okay. What happened to Administrative Process?

MS. MATHEWS: We just highlighted it and --
MS. MICKIEWICZ: Oh, and moved on?

MS. MATHEWS: -- moved on to the next thing.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Fine. I missed that.

MS. MATHEWS: Okay. Sorry, I've got to make that clear for everybody.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: That's fine. And I just want to clarify, not clarify but emphasize, Commissioner Rechtschaffen, on what your said. Your proposal is to circulate something to the group that they would then discuss at the next meeting, so they can provide you with the input; was that your thinking?

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Right. We also -- but having said that in-between the next meeting all of you members individually are free, and we would encourage you to coordinate with Melissa and Alice, our staff people working on it, on the staff end. And Commissioner Guzman Aceves and I are working on it on the Commissioner end. You're free to give us your input and ideas along the way, so don't wait until the next July meeting where we consider it, where we debate this as a whole. You're more than welcome to individually approach us. And we encourage you to do that.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: And again, you can't communicate to each other. You can only communicate to the CPUC Commissioners or to our staff about that. If you were
communicating with each other, outside of the context of a public meeting, that's a violation of Bagley-Keene. I'll discuss that this afternoon.

So if the Commissioners send something out to all of you to review you can respond back to the PUC, but you can't share all that with each other between meetings. And I'll talk about that more later.

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Well, I don't think that -- we shouldn't get side tracked on that. That's a strict legal interpretation that some of us adhere to because you do exist in your individual capacities and the rules apply. You can't make decisions collectively. The Bagley-Keene rules say you can't make a decision, as a majority of a Board can't meet in private. So I don't want -- the main thing is we don't want to freak you out before you even start. You will get some training this afternoon on the issue, but you're not going to be frozen in your ability to communicate with each other in your roles, or individually, or certainly individually with us. So maybe we'll just leave it at that without getting into a further debate about the rules.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Well, I wanted to highlight for you all a couple of the Energy Commission's priorities for 2018, with this group. And thank you for highlighting the PUC's priorities as well.
One of the things that we have done at the Energy Commission is we have a Diversity Resolution, which encourages us make sure that the business that the Energy Commission does reflects the way that California looks in terms of diversity, geographic diversity, all kinds of diversity. And so in our hiring practices, in the contracting that we do, in the grant giving that we do, kind of across the board, within the Energy Commission.

And I wanted to highlight for you that we will be getting an update from all of our division directors at our April business meeting. The April business meeting is on April 11th. And you are certainly welcome to come in person, to dial in, and to participate on WebEx, or if you don't have time for any of those things, the presentations will be on the Web page and we would certainly welcome your feedback and thoughts and input on that. But I wanted to highlight that for you all. That's coming up next Wednesday, April 11th. And it's kind of a yearly update on how we're doing and how we're making progress in that area.

I also wanted to highlight for you that we are looking to do another joint workshop with the Public Utilities Commission, likely also with the Air Resources Board and the Energy Commission, of course, in August on the SB 350 Barriers Report that we put together. And we have been working diligently to try to put in place some
solutions to the barriers that we -- so we did the study, the Barriers Study and identified barriers. We put in place 12 recommendations for how to overcome those.

And we want to have a progress report, a status update, about how that's coming along, what else needs to be done. And we're looking to do that in August. I don't believe we have pinned down a date, but I just wanted to highlight that for you. That is another priority of the Energy Commission and our colleagues at the Public Utilities Commission.

And last I wanted to highlight also for you the Energy Equity Indicators. And I won't say too much about that, because you're going to get a presentation from Pam this afternoon to go through some details. It's here in your packet. And it's probably up front for the audience members, if you want to grab a copy. It's also posted on our Web page, so that folks can see that.

And we're very much looking forward to your feedback on that. This is the first time, I believe, that the Energy Commission has put together this type of indicator. And we're really looking to have good metrics in place to be able to measure our progress against. And that's what the Energy Equity Indicators will be. And so we're very much looking forward for feedback. Did we get the right ones? Are we talking about them in the right
way? And so that's something that Pam will speak with you about this afternoon.

But these are kind of three priorities that I wanted to just hit at a high level in our Priorities for 2018 discussion.

And I don't know, Chair Weisenmiller, do you want to add anything?

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Yeah, just briefly. I think again as you'll hear this afternoon about Bagley-Keene conflicts and so that's sort of welcome to our world, you know, really. You're not special. We start with that, to live within that framework.

So but certainly we appreciate that. I think what Janea and I just wanted to hit is that we are looking very actively on the Barriers Report. You know, it's just not something we have on the shelf, but are trying to really work with the other agencies and the Governor's Office to implement. And obviously the indicators -- you know you have to track progress. If you don't, what are you doing?

And certainly a number of programs start out more as a layer, but we've had active goals to say if we're doing a demonstration, 25 percent have to be in the disadvantaged community. So again, it's really important to convert our policy goals into real action.
MR. WILLIAMS: Could you share with us the location of the April 11th meeting next week?

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Oh, indeed. That will be right here, in this very room. And there is a meeting notice on our Web page about that, if Alana would be so kind maybe as to just send a link to that to this group. That way you'll have the information, but it's public information. It's up on the Web page.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: And the agenda for that business meeting is also posted at this stage.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: You're welcome.

MS. MATHEWS: And then we have a presentation later on about the Energy Commission and clean energy programs by Michael Sokol. And he'll have more information about the dates as well as some links to information. So you'll have that later on today.

MR. WILLIAMS: And so we'll go back to the agenda that looks at the Priorities for 2018. And this is an open discussion for the members of the Advisory Group.

One of the things that I think that, and I haven't had a chance to poll the rest of the members, but I think the very fact that we signed up and submitted our names to be a part of this group means that we want to be actively involved and actively engaged. And I see this as
a tremendous opportunity to ensure that the policies and
that the programs that are envisioned and implemented
actually benefit the constituencies for which we serve
throughout the state.

And I think there's always -- at the state level
there are always great intentions, but often times by the
time it gets to the neighborhood the impact and the
influence tends to be diminished. And I hope that all of
us working together here, in all of the capacities that we
bring to the group will really be able to see and document,
as part of the Energy Equity Indicators, that the program
and policies are working. And those that aren't can be
modified to ensure greater impact and effectiveness.

So having said that I'll open it up, the
priorities and goals were listed on the website. Some of
us responded to those during the comment section, but given
that we're all here for the first time if there is anyone
who would like to begin the conversation about the goals
and the priorities or any of the elements that have been
identified here, I yield the right to whoever would like to
have that begin the conversation.

MS. MATHEWS: Don't all speak at once.

MR. GRESCHNER: Stan Greschner here, just a
process question. There's obviously, and we spoke about
some specific issues that some of the Commissioners want us
to look at. When we're setting our priorities are there restrictions on what can be discussed here? If there's an active proceeding or a PV, or do we -- is there a collective on -- as groups I know individually our organizations might be parties to a proceeding, but I'm just thinking about setting priorities. Like the whole disadvantaged communities, there's several proceedings ongoing that have disadvantaged communities in their name, but they're active proceedings, right? Can we include those in the priorities list or are there restrictions on what we talk about and how we talk about those?

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: It's going to be addressed at some point, but certainly as you go through hopefully the attorneys can give you the roadmap on some of this.

The rules are different between the two agencies in that the Energy Commission, much of what we do is with administrative processes. So in those types of proceedings you can certainly comment on stuff.

We do have siting cases and in our siting cases there is no ex parte contact, period. So we cannot discuss any pending siting case with anyone outside of that hearing room.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Sure. For the PUC if the proceeding in question is a rulemaking, there are not
restrictions on ex parte communications in a rulemaking similar to what you just said. If it's an adjudicatory proceeding that is a complaint case or enforcement matter, which I'm guessing for the most part your constituents are not going to be involved in, but they might. In that kind of proceeding, no ex parte communications are allowed.

In the middle category, which is a rate setting if you spoke about a topic in that proceeding here, you would have to file, potentially have to file a Notice of Ex Parte Communication. But you know, you could consult with either whoever the lawyer is sitting here about it, or with a judge in the proceeding, but we can kind of cross that bridge when we come to it. But I think the fact that you raised it means that you're mindful of it and you should all be mindful of it. And just act appropriately and ask for advice when you're not sure.

COMMISSIONER GUZMAN ACEVES: I would just add to that to say that when we, moving forward, here we're talking pretty high level about issues. And but when we get to a point when we want to agendize the topic it's very easy to Notice that to our relevant proceeding so that we're checking that box. So that would be the most necessary point is to just coordinate beforehand, so we could publicly notice that. But there should be no limitation to us discussing (indiscernible).
COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Right, and if you have any questions you should consult with the PUC and the CEC's lawyers ahead of time, because they're available to help members of the Advisory Board figure this stuff out.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Helen, do you have any further explanation of what I said or corrections?

MR. LEMEI: None, really much to add except that consistent with what Cliff and Martha said these considerations shouldn't be a constraint on what you're able to speak about. It creates potential obligations on our end to either check the appropriate boxes or otherwise ensure that this forum doesn't become a vehicle for an ex parte communication about a specific proceeding. I think that that coming up will be relatively, at least in the strict ex parte context, relatively unusual.

But as said, we'll communicate about the agendas and if something is coming up that comes close to a potential issue, we'll make sure that it's taken care of on our end, or we'll take other appropriate measures. But this body should be free to discuss -- these constraints don't apply to the members of this body, talking amongst themselves in this forum. This is your meeting. We're here to support your discussion.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. In the charter, on page 5 there is a list that says the Advisory Group will undertake
the following actions and report to the Commission. So as we talk about our priorities, this may be a good guide for us to kind of have our discussion as we have each one of these priorities listed. And then if there are some that any of the members want to highlight, or to expand on, or to bring clarity or illumination to, we could use this list to begin the conversation. And then if there's something other than what's listed here, we have an opportunity for that as well.

And so they are listed on page 5 starting with A through I.

COMMISSIONER GUZMAN ACEVES: Mr. Chair, if I could just also potentially ask if there's any reflections on what you heard from us as Commissioners share with you on priorities, any reflection on that. Certainly, the Chairman mentioned two very specific ones earlier: heavy-duty transportation and demand response. That might be a good starting point if there are reflections on those.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, I think on rapid response and this is an element of behavior modification. And I think to a large degree not only most residents are not familiar with the adjustments that can be made to reduce their billing rates. And so I think one of the elements is if we are not seeing the level of participation, it goes back to education. And education goes back to distribution
of information.

So I think we may want to look at what are the ways in which we're sharing that message. And is that vehicle or are those vehicles effective for the particular populations that they are intended to reach? And at this point, I'm not aware of what the full "marketing strategy" is, but if we're not getting the desired results, clearly there's an opportunity to adjust or amend that strategy to increase those results.

Is that something that you want to share or provide clarity, since that's a highlight?

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Certainly, we can do that.

I think part of the things that we're struggling with is that some of the responses can be relatively simple. It's sort of like I'm sure all of us and our grandparents remember when the telephone company was telling us these are when the rates are cheap and these are when they're expensive. And I think to tell you my parents never made the calls in the expensive periods, but waiting for the time to change.

And certainly, here on the demand response side we will provide signals on critical days, when we really need people to help out. And again helping out could be things like don't run your dryer that day at least not in
the middle of the -- not in a crisis period.

So again, there's certainly a lot of things we can do to make that more meaningful for people. And to the extent that you can give us feedback on the programs and information we've provided, that can be very important to make it more effective and help people save money and reduce air pollution.

MR. WILLIAMS: Very good. I'm sure we will hear more about the programs and how they're being communicated

MS. RUCKER-HUGHES: Can I?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes?

MS. RUCKER-HUGHES: Mr. Chair, I'd like to elaborate on that that you spoke in regards to communication, education. We may be doing it. However, I don't see it. When we, the practice around what we are here for should become almost like a household, household words and household thoughts. And in order to do that, of course, we have to go -- we have to start early, with young people, coloring books, whatever. But the idea that they then will chide their parents and it goes on and on.

And then the idea that in the local weeklies, newspapers and what have you that they get in the church, I don't see the information as I think it should be. Because this is too important, every bit of this, that everyone should not have a vested interest. And in order for them
to have a vested interest you've got to go where they are.
Just my thought.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, Stephanie?

MS. CHEN: Thanks. In addition to the energy education opportunities, which I think are very important for demand response, but also go much further into really all other ways that we interact with fuels and energy. I think I would also want us to think about different ways to invest auto demand response into communities, for folks for whom asking them to change their daily behaviors might not be reasonable. If you're working two, three jobs, taking the kids to school back and forth an automated solution might be best for that household. So I would want to think about that as well.

I think one of the things that this group needs to be particularly aware of, which we probably all are in our daily lives and need to bring into our policy context as well, is the particular challenge for renters around the potential for displacement. I think a lot of us really want to go big on energy measures, energy efficiency and clean energy measures in rental homes, because of the incredible potential for savings there. But with the housing market being what it is, really all across California we have to think very carefully about how to thread the needle in a way that we can get clean energy
solutions to the populations who we really want to reach. And make sure that those folks aren't then turned out of their apartments by their landlords where the landlord goes, "Ooh, I have this brand-new energy efficient apartment, I can get more rent for this."

And the last thing I want to highlight is I really want to appreciate the PUC's interest in getting into the not-sexy topics, around reverse adequacy and procurement and the way that we think about some of those processes as well. Because I think there's a lot of decisions that happen in those forums that could either take the state in a cleaner direction or a less clean direction. And I think because of their technical complexity and whatnot, that it's often a place where a lot of decisions impacting communities are made, where folks don't even know that it's happening, much less have the opportunity to meaningfully participate. So I want to really appreciate that and offer Greenlining support, where ever we can.

MS. PINCUS: So with this group, I'd like us to think about how we can -- and maybe this is going to go into the Equity Indicators conversation, but what kind of equity think policies or principles do we want to see across the board? So that we're not just focusing on one sector, but we're focusing on concepts like equity
concepts, workforce concepts, jobs standards concepts, things that are all connected to that. So that would be a priority that I think we should think about.

I also think we have to make sure funding and resources are there, because this is all really good in theory, but if the funding doesn't trickle down then these programs will not get adopted. So I think we have to really make sure that that is there across the board as well and that these become priorities across the board.

In terms of the CPUC EJ strategy and roadmap, I'm really happy to hear about that. And I think that this group can play a really key role in commenting and advising and thinking about that across the board. And the question of accessibility, I think, is a really important question, because the CPUC is incredibly complicated to understand, how to access, coming from somebody that's been in this space for ten years, and now just figuring out how to access and gain access to it. So I think we really have to think about how to take legalese language and complicatedness and how we really can create access into all government agencies, so that we can give voice to the communities that we serve.

And I would love clarification on the Clean Energy for Goods Program. I actually don't know what that is.
CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: So goods movement, at this stage a lot of goods come into particularly Los Angeles, through either Long Beach or the L.A. Harbor. And they move through there to every county in the U.S. That's like 20 or 30 percent of the economy in Los Angeles is goods movement.

Now having said that, so it's a critical part of the economy there, that's one of the really major drivers of pollution. If you're living next to a freeway, certainly the South Coast has done a study to indicate your children have a much higher likelihood of asthma than otherwise.

So on the one hand, one of the things we're really looking at is trying electrify the transportation system and frankly it's a lot easier with automobiles than it is with heavy-duty vehicles. But it's sort of critical if you're really trying to clean up the air in Los Angeles and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It's like 50 percent of our greenhouse gas emissions are from transportation. They're not from power plants. And over 80 percent of the criteria pollutants are from transportation. And it's really concentrated in those corridors. I guess what I'm saying is there's strong economic impacts in jobs, good jobs, in Los Angeles. But we really need a way to clean that up to really achieve our goals on greenhouse gas and
pollution and just deal with what's really tangible health impacts in those areas.

As I said, I think it's such an important economic engine and job engine, that we need to figure out a way for it to thrive and grow. But we need to figure out ways of mitigating impacts. So that could be at this point -- again it's sort of you maybe have seen pictures -- there's a couple of potential all-electric trucks. But again we're talking there's thousands of trucks every day going through Long Beach, you know, when I've been there. So the notion of here's one that might come out in a couple of years is not solving the problem now.

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: And it's an issue that's being addressed across agencies. So the PUC has a piece, because we approve utility investment and infrastructure, which electric infrastructure which could include charging stations for heavy-duty, medium-freight. The Energy Commission has similar programs and also things very hard about where to site infrastructure around the state. The Air Board has numerous mandates to reduce emissions from heavy-duty vehicles.

There's also a clean freight strategy that involves Caltrans and the Air Board and other state agencies. It fits within your cross cutting approach to things. It's a big problem that we're dealing with across
the board, but the energy agencies have a piece of it for sure.

MR. GRESCHNER: So just building off of the demand response, if you ever (indiscernible) here. But I think another opportunity to explore is that education piece. That's where we should all start or be starting in auto response. And then there's price signals and pricing of some of these things like you see in the goods services. And how when you said demand response, it comes to a lot of things, but I know there's a lot of conversations happening now around how do we develop kind of the platform of the future technologies. To interplay with one another to drive behavioral change, to auto responders, to price signals, but goods service, battery storage. I mean, there's a lot of automation that's built into some of these newer technologies coming out.

And I would I think for all of the Commissioners, just we'd like to at least put out there that every conversation that happens around those more detailed in depth -- because that's where a lot of like community organizations aren't participating, can't participate. I mean, it's technical. It's in the weeds. That there's a charge from all of you to your staff or whoever, that disadvantaged community is need to be part of the front-end conversation in how do we, you know, when you look at grid
services and pricing how do you make sure that you have the
right signals for low-income families and disadvantaged
communities? They're going to be different, you know, than
for the general market. We've seen that in every single
program that's been successful or not successful that's
trying to reach disadvantaged communities, the general
market responds differently than disadvantaged communities
and low income. And that's got to be taken into
consideration in whatever program is being offered.

I would also, I just mean generally, state that
the non-energy benefits are that we take a serious look at
how do you quantify the benefits that we're all talking
about. And we've talked a lot about this over the past,
you know, decade and we're getting better and better and
better at it. And I think the SASH and MASH evaluations
were the first time at the PUC where non-energy benefits
were factors into the evaluations it seemed like, in trying
to value those things, right?

But when we're talking about community resiliency
and upward economic events or in communities or energy
burden being reduced, those are real values to communities.
There's also values of distributed resources, you know,
they're inherent. And are in these programs that aren't
adequately I think valued. So I think those are huge
conversations that are happening, but I would just charge
that we look at those especially for low-income and
disadvantaged community conversations.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Yeah. We could easily
spend a long of time on it, but I was going to say one of
the most fundamental things the PUC does is rates and price
signals and lots of complicated tradeoffs on that. And I'm
sure again, there will be a long conversation later.

COMMISSIONER GUZMAN ACEVES: Yeah, you know --
sorry Adrian, go ahead.

Well, I was just going to offer that in addition
to ratemaking being a bit far, and I certainly think that
things like time of use have a very -- need more discussion
with a body like yourselves. One thing I'm really hoping
to hear from you and it may not all happen today, but you
should know that as all the Commissioners have mentioned,
we're happy to think through this with you offline in terms
of what the priorities for this body should be. Because
there are 400 proceedings that we could discuss, and as
much as I'd like to say that we could just have our staff
analyze this in every one they won't have the thoroughness
that all of you could bring to it.

So just a couple of more thoughts, I'd mentioned
RA. We talked DR. There's also the energy resource
planning, which has a lot of scenario planning that goes
into it that we receive the benefit of briefings on. That
maybe that's another area for you to consider a briefing on. And just thinking, being conscious of, I have ideas in my head, you have ideas in your head, some of which you may not even know.

Recently, as another example, our Policy and Planning Division put out a whitepaper on the TNC and no electrification and lack thereof, of the TNCs and so more kind of leading edge area. Is that you guys want to think through? I think we should think about it. What is -- do we -- you know, we certainly should talk about. We all agree on the need to be more in the community and have more education. But also, we almost really need to, at least for this year, think about what are maybe the top few issues that we want to drill down on and really see progress, the Lyfts and Ubers.

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: So I've been at the PUC a year and a quarter and I'm already full of acronyms.

MR. MARTINEZ: Hi. So I'm really concerned about greenhouse gases and that's an important issue for me. But my main core of my work is around air quality and particularly air quality in the South Coast Air Basin, which is Los Angeles, the Inland Valley, Orange County. I'm a transplant to California. I moved here in 2004, but I've been working on air quality since then. I feel like I've slowly embraced California in most ways. I'm now a
Dodgers fan, so that indicates, you know, my California nature. (Laughter.)

But one thing I don't embrace is you talk to people who live in Los Angeles or even people throughout the state about air quality. And it's an initial reaction that I think is a dangerous one for all of the people in power and decision makers, it's that it was so bad in the '60s and '70s; isn't it so much better now? And that's true. The air is cleaner than it was in the '70s and '80s.

And I think we have to break free from this notion that just making it cleaner than what the '70s and '80s was is acceptable. People are getting sick and dying from breathing in several parts of the state. So the air quality issues, I think, are really an important issue. And I think just to state simply, we need our energy agencies to be operating on full cylinders with our coordinating with the air agencies, because it's the perfect confluence of where we need all of our agencies to work together.

I can't talk about some things because I am active in several proceedings, but on the air quality front I think -- I view as three issues in L.A. I'm sure they're different in the other parts of the state, but on the stationary end one thing I think we need to think about, we have a lot of manufacturing. We have a lot of refining.
We have a lot of stationary polluters in the South Coast Air Basin.

We're in the midst of shifting from a trading program for our NOx, which is the byproduct of combustion, from a NOx reclaim program, which is trading to a command and control. And the recent estimates is that more than 1,000 pieces of equipment throughout the region are going to be needing to be replaced. And that provides an immense opportunity.

Are we going to switch from combustion to another, cleaner, combustion? Or is there an opportunity to figure out how do we switch from combustion to non-combustion for some of our industrial facilities. And I think it actually aligns nicely with 617 and the work that's happening there, because a lot of these stationary sources are in disadvantaged communities.

On the mobile source end, I agree this is the huge, huge issue that we need to tackle. And I think what I'd hope for our committee is to really identify and unpack what are technological problems versus what are political constraints? Because I think on moving zero emissions there's a lot of political arguments unpacked together with technical arguments. I think we're California, we have a lot of ingenuity. We can figure out these problems.

I'd like to also kind of identify what are the
big challenges? You know, we see it with large
infrastructure projects. How do we get a truly zero
emissions corridors to move our freight? How do we get
zero emission ports?

One thing I'll highlight, because the proceeding
actually, this is part of proceeding that ended, is today
down at the Port of Long Beach I think they're doing a
ceremony for a project to get several pieces of cargo-
handling equipment electrified in the charging
infrastructure. And that's the project where the CEC, the
CPUC, the air districts, the Ports were all engaged. And I
think it's kind of the gold standard for what we need to
see. We just need to see that on a much bigger scale
throughout the state.

And then finally, I think the other part we focus
on are area sources, those are little pieces of pollution
that while each individual unit may not be a big deal, from
an air quality standpoint when you aggregate them together,
they're important. And you know water heaters, things like
that.

You know, I think that's something, I hope that
we can kind of tackle. How do we get these zero emissions
not only in Beverly Hills and Pacific Palisades, but
throughout the places in the South Coast and other parts of
the state that would benefit just as much as anyone else.
But I'm excited and appreciative of everyone participating and I look forward to kind of really unpacking the air quality components and how we can get the energy agencies to really dial in on making air better in disadvantaged communities.

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Adrian, can I follow up with a follow up question? As to your first point, that's a very interesting suggestion. What is the timeframe for those 1,000 sources that will need new permits?

MR. MARTINEZ: Yeah. So right now the air district is kind of unraveling the Reclaim Program, which as many of you know this was a program that covered lots of different facilities, about 275, lots of different types of equipment. They're going to be, probably over the next year, kind of moving from that trading program to a command and control. My guess is their interpretation is that 617 will require the new equipment, by 2023. But some of those deadlines for things like industrial boilers will probably be a little bit sooner.

And, you know, when we were working on this initially we kind of pointed at the refineries as the ones who weren't installing controls. But when we kind of looked under the hood of this program, it was a lot of facilities who don't have the cleanest technology, and a
lot of these kind of smaller and medium-sized industrial facilities. And I think it's a huge opportunity to kind of figure it out.

And this is an issue I think that's almost like two years from now, kind of how do you get away from combustion in these facilities. But I think if we start thinking about it now, we can kind of align the timing of the two things.

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Well, I would agree that that would be a very important opportunity for this group to look at and for the energy agencies to look at.

MR. WILLIAMS: Are there any more comments from anyone? I think that what I'm hearing is there are programs that are already in place now. So I would call those kind of short, low-hanging fruit. And then there's the midrange that will take new technology and new programs. They're kind of midrange. And then there's new technology information that could be four or five years and beyond, but are very important for us to begin the lay the groundwork now.

As with all of the programs that are currently underway, I think that it would be really helpful at least for me to understand what they are, first and foremost. Because it sounds like we're aware in our individual areas of unique programs, but it sounds like there are a plethora
of programs currently available and accessible. And I would consider that the low hanging fruit to see what can we do to expand the impact and the outreach and the participation in programs that are currently now available, but many of the residents may not be aware of them.

But for the sake of time, and I want to make sure that we're on time, if we could identify our kind of three main areas that we could come out of this meeting with. I guess there's going to be a lot of conversations about all of the many different programs and looking how to coordinate and collaborate with those. But our task is to really kind of identify I'd say three or so priorities that we could mention that were stated in this meeting, knowing that there are many others.

And all of us are interested in job training and access to new business development, particularly from disadvantaged communities in the clean energy field. We're interested in health outcomes. A lot of the pollution that currently exists is going to take a while to eliminate. But people are breathing air every day and that is impacting their health.

So all of these are -- boy, we've got an opportunity to make an impact through our work and through our service here. But I just want to open back up all the -- just from our discussions or something that may not have
been mentioned. If we could identify some top priorities, knowing that there are many others that we will have individual and collective conversations about.

MR. MARTINEZ: I really think it's important that we emphasize the piece that Stephanie brought up in regards to unintended consequences of investment. I think that's a real pertinent issue for all activities. And I think it should be something that we discuss in depth.

MS. CHEN: To go just a little bit further down the rabbit hole on larger vehicle electrification, but with purpose. I want to offer up the following: those big batteries that we're trying to figure out how to make and make viable to haul all of the trucks up and down, those are in my lack of technical expertise, probably kind of similar if not exactly the same as the batteries that it would take to power electric public transit, electric buses, as well as electric school buses. And there are efforts and companies in California today that are working on those technologies. And what I want to offer up, as we're thinking about this is the, what is it folks, they feed two birds with one seed kind of approach to these things.

So with an investment in, for example, electric public transit and electric school buses, not only are you helping to clean up sources of mobile pollution, but you're
also potentially helping the grid if you're charging those things at the right time. And with transit it's real easy to schedule that bus for when the grid needs it. And the other win that you can achieve there is of course better mobility and more sustainable mobility for folks.

So as we're thinking about some of the challenges that come up, I also want to think about how can we pack as many wins into the problem that we're solving as we can. And so I bring up the example about electrified public transit, because it really does hit on a lot of those different wins, many of which are tied to the grid and tied to air quality, but also many of which go beyond that. And I think that this group is very well positioned to be thinking about how to really maximize all of the different kinds of community benefits that come with clean energy investment.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: So one of the things, China with their air quality is much worse, but some of the interesting things their cities are doing is requiring all taxis to flip to electric or hydrogen at this stage; again as a way to try to deal with the horrible air in Beijing, or Jinchang, or other places. That's sort of another piece of the puzzle probably is the taxis or Uber, Lyft.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: You know, and these are things that the Energy Commission is very much thinking
about. And I'm sure our colleagues at the PUC are as well. And we do have some money that we can put towards cleaner school buses and we actually are very much thinking about how you package that with potentially with the ancillary services that could come along with that. We have to probably find a school district that's really excited about that to make sure that it just needs to be simple and seamless and not complicated, but to put those things together in just that way. So that's something I think that we're very much thinking about.

We're also thinking about smart e-mobility and are there ways to have your TNCs or Ubers or your Lyfts or other programs where public transit is not necessarily working for folks, for them to be able to get where they need to go in a reasonable amount of time. So we've got a program called Volt to College. And so it's actually using the Chevy Volt. And it's able to pick up four or five students and get them directly to where they're going versus maybe a two-hour bus ride or something like that. So we're trying to figure out where these niches are, where you can also get and make mobility services much better for people, but also have them be electric and clean.

And so we're really excited about ideas like that and would love more thoughts and ideas about how we can spend those dollars that we have in this space in that way,
so I really appreciate you bringing that up.

But I also wanted to just make a point on the outreach, which is something that we work very hard on every day. And it's a little bit of a, we could really use your help there, I think. The best way for us to get information out to people is through our listservs. People sign up for our listservs when they know about energy and they're interested in it. And so if you not an energy wonk, it's everyone's welcome, but if you're not an energy wonk you don't even know kind of where to look or how to get the information. And so we're always thinking about how to get information out and in a more accessible way.

If there's something that's taking place, for example, in one of the legislators' districts, we'll send them a little note about that so they can put it in their newsletter if they want to. They can let their constituents know. We're trying to be creative about how we outreach to make sure more people know. But it's a little bit of a vicious circle, where it's kind of you're an energy wonk, if you're interested in energy and you want all of this information and otherwise you just literally don't really think about it. So trying to kind of broaden that we would love your thoughts and best ideas for how we can do that.

MS. CHARLES: I just wanted to -- Stephanie, hi.
It's Melicia Charles at CPUC. I did also want to speak to your comment about transit and fleets. It's something you may be actually familiar with this already, but the CPUC did approve over $40 million in transportation electrification pilot projects.

And so of those, we authorized Edison to spend almost $4 million on electric transit bus infrastructure. And then we also authorized PG&E to spend $2 million on electric school bus infrastructure. And in that there is a consideration and an examination of how to integrate renewables. So this is something that is on topic and what we are looking at right now, at the CPUC.

MS. SEATON: I'll go quickly, just picking up on this point. A couple of people have mentioned it, but looking at what is making sure that the programs are addressing the diverse geographies of California. So what works for transit? Where does flexible transit work better? And we have a little bit of experience on van pool programs that would be happy to share all electric.

On the access side, so one of the things that -- and a huge shout-out to CEC in the barriers and the outreach through barriers, we continue to highlight that process as like a really strong process for getting community outreach with working in partnership with community-based organizations to cohost the meetings and
what not. I thought that was a great process and should be replicated kind of back to the geography.

One of the things that we highlight in the Barriers Report was especially with substandard homes and like this continued perpetuating lack of access if you have substandard homes and you can't access some of the energy efficiency issues. And so looking at how we're making sure that all of the programs are getting to the most of the vulnerable communities and areas.

And on the geography side, I think we'll probably talk about this lot, is looking at energy generation and making sure that the shifts that we're making on energy generation side aren't harming certain regions of the state, to the benefit of others. And I think it seems like this is a really great group of folks who represent a lot of different areas. And there's a lot of great local input that's going help drive that conversation.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. We have time for two more comments. And then we're going to need to wrap it up to stay on schedule. Okay?

MR. GRESCHNER: Just to address what you're asking for the like setting priorities for this group. I think Cliff and Martha laid out a nice framing for some of these conversations to happen, if they're undertaking their EJ (indiscernible) strategy and roadmap that includes
transportation, natural gas, renewables. I mean, it seems like a great thing for us as a priority, so I would just say yes, we should do that. And there's probably the framework for a lot of this conversation to happen to potentially.

COMMISSIONER GUZMAN ACEVES: May I ask a question, Mr. Chair?

One of the things, on a different approach I think that Adrian kind of provided an additional strategy on is to look at the opportunity in a geographical area, like the transition from reclaim to direct measures. And I wonder for the other areas if there's any thoughts on, you know, is there an approach for the Central Valley that might work kind of looking at it from that approach?

Because it is actually a really strategic alternative way, or concurrent way to look at this effort here, is pooling. Looking at the end goal being really impacting that transition in a positive way how do we pool all of our existing programs like our, we have -- we were just talking we have a CHP, a fuel cell program, we have a battery storage program. And kind of using -- a lot of those have already set asides for disadvantaged communities, but they could go further to be really impacting their quality side.

So something you could think about too, but
there's obviously not really an equivalent on the San Joaquin Valley Air Quality Control District side, but is there another opportunity similar that is happening in the Valley or Inland Empire that is something for us to be consciously aware of in the region that's transitioning that we could provide clean air energy inputs to?

MR. WILLIAMS: Very good.

Well, yes?

MR. LEMEI: Hi. This is Galen, Attorney for the Energy Commission. I just want to make a procedural observation. Chair, one of the things you acknowledged earlier on your comments was that a better understanding of the underlying programs or the programs that are underway could be helpful in informing the discussion and the setting of priorities. And I just wanted to point out that this afternoon, we do have some presentations. I doubt that it we'll be able to touch on everything that's ongoing, but certainly on some of the activities that are ongoing.

It's a pretty packed agenda, but if in the event that we were ahead of schedule and time did permit, you could if you wanted leave discussion of this item open and allow for the possibility of it being revisited in light of that discussion, if you thought that made sense. But of course I don't know if time will actually work out to make
MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you for that point and I will take your comments and suggestions as something that I would like to do. So with the approval of the group, we will pause on the discussion around priorities. And time permitting continue to pick it up later on this afternoon, after we've had a chance to hear more about the programs.

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Mr. Chair, I don't know if you had anything else on the agenda for this morning, but I was going to ask you, we, the four Commissioners have to leave at lunch and we will not be back. Unfortunately, that means we're going to miss public comment. I'm wondering if we could take, if it's okay if we could take 10 minutes of public comments, especially from anyone who's not going to be here. We're not going to be here in the afternoon, but anyone who's --

MR. WILLIAMS: Do we have the cards for public comment?

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Can I just say that you can do that, but you also have to allow for public comment after lunch, for those people who were going to come just at that time.

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Right. No I assume people would -- we would just get started if there's people who are here.
MR. WILLIAMS: We currently have --

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: And we apologize.

We will avoid the scheduling so that we'll be here for public comment in the future.

MR. WILLIAMS: We have one person who is in the room for public comment and the last name of Powell. All right, sir.

MR. POWELL: This is going to be relatively short. My name is Arno Powell. (phonetic) And I am here on behalf of San Diego Gas and Electric. And I am our Disadvantaged Communities Policy Advisor for our Customer Programs. I just wanted to introduce myself and say that I look forward to working with all of you. And we are here to work with you and support the efforts in ways we deem fit. Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMS: Is it appropriate to ask, Arno, if you have cards that you could leave to a way to contact?

MR. POWELL: I can leave a way.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay, very good. Thank you.

Are there any others?

MS. MIRVISS: Hi. My name is Lillian Mirviss. I'm here on behalf of OhmConnect. We're a residential demand response software platform. And we actually have a really high success rate in the disadvantaged communities.

To give you a really quick overview on what we
do, our whole thing is save energy, get paid, so we ask people to sign up. They give us access to their smart meter data. We then tell them when there's a good time to save energy. They can respond behaviorally by turning off their lights, or they can also automate the process, so that they have smart thermostats or smart plugs that will automatically help them save. And based on how much they save, we pay them. So it's a really awesome win-win, both environmentally and financially for the energy grid as well as for disadvantaged communities. People use it for the cash at the end of the day.

I want to commend everyone by having this conversation. OhmConnect is really excited about hearing what comes out of it. Specifically, you know, we've successful in disadvantaged communities. But we know there's a lot more to happen when it comes to education. So the point on how do we get the marketing out there? How do we get the message out there? We're really looking forward to hear what comes out of this Advisory Board. And we are really excited to work with people on how we can improve our product, improve our messaging, so that it's sensitive and impactful at the same time. Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

I'd like to turn it back over to Alana.

MS. MATHEWS: So very quickly, if you notice on
the screen, I have up the Web page for the California Energy Commission's Disadvantaged Advisory Group. And I wanted to draw your attention to that page, because that's where we'll have all of the information docketed. So all of the presentations today, the agenda, of course all the other documents related to the Advisory Group is going to be presented there. And there is also a link, which links to the CPUC. They also have a Disadvantaged Advisory Group page and so we try to duplicate, but we do have an official docketed system, which allows you to make comments. And we'll have updates. So I just wanted to draw that to your attention.

And then lastly, it's picture time. So we're going to have everyone -- Katy, can you stand? She's going to lead everyone out to the steps to take a group picture. And then we'll just have all the members follow her in, so that you can take your individual portraits and still have enough time to have lunch. So at this time, we can have everyone follow Katy.

MR. WILLIAMS: To all the Commissioners, thank you all. We look forward to working with you. And it's a privilege to serve here. Thank you.

MS. MATHEWS: And you're welcome to leave your things here, while we take the pictures. We'll be here in the room.
MR. WILLIAMS: Very good. Well, we're going to continue with our session. And at this point, we're going to open up for public comment and I have two public comment cards, but if you -- or at least I thought I did.

MR. WILLIAMS: Oh, okay. I have currently one comment card. If you have a comment and have not filled out a card, we encourage you to do so. And at this point, we're going to call up Arlene if I'm pronouncing the name correctly, with ACCES, are you in the room?

MS. NOVOTNY: I'm here, yes.

MR. WILLIAMS: Oh, okay. Very good. Let's see is there a -- right here at the mic, please.

MS. NOVOTNY: Yes, hi. My name is Arlene Novotny from ACCES, (phonetic) (indiscernible) association with the low-income weatherization programs.

So the comment is primarily with the federal monies that has a lot of restrictions on it and what we can use it for, excuse me. And if there's any way possible to have some set aside for some minor home repairs or home repairs, so that more energy efficient measures can be done? I know that GRID understands this, because we (indecipherable) some things like that, so that we could
actually get some of the bigger ticket items that would save more GHGs. So thank you.

MR. WILLIAMS: Very good. Thank you for your comment.

Next, Veronica Eady?

MS. GARCIA: I am not Veronica Eady. I'm Yana Garcia, but I'm going to give just a really, really, quick comment. I am the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Justice and Tribal Affairs at CalEPA. I just wanted to thank this group for taking the time to do the service that you're really doing here.

I think advisory groups are at this point nothing totally new to the state. We have some examples of past advisory groups. And I hope that as we continue to convene these types of spaces that we can move forward from this idea of disadvantaged communities as a sort of case study of what we're looking at when we're thinking about cumulative health burdens and environmental exposures to more solutions-oriented forward-looking work. And I really see the role of this particular group as doing exactly that.

So I just wanted to thank you all for your time and really put out a plug that we embrace that role. That we really think of the ideas that are coming from our communities, the solutions that are coming from our
communities and really pushing those forward as we move along.

My colleague, Veronica, is of course going to talk about how this particular group can interplay with some of the other efforts that we have statewide in our regulatory implementation, namely in AB 617, to address pollution at the community level.

And I also just want to say as we're transitioning into a new administration, you know, wrapping up this one and going on into the next I again think it's groups like these whose role is really, really pivotal in making sure that we carry forward these issues into the next administration, not only in the state, but also as a national model. There are many other states that are looking at doing exactly this, more and more and internationally, as we transition into the new administration.

Thank you very much for all of your time. I look forward to working with all of you.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MS. EADY: So I won't speak long. This is Veronica Eady again. I am the Assistant Executive Officer for Environmental Justice with the California Air Resources Board.

Alana Mathews asked both Yana and I to say a few
words, hence our comment cards. I think AB 617 came up a couple of times this morning. I remember Adrian mentioned it. And so I thought I'd say a few words about what that is and where we can see specifically some synergies. AB 617 is a law that was passed last summer and signed by Governor Brown in August. And it is an air pollution law that requires neighborhood-scale emission reductions from air pollutants and air toxics, as well as in communities where there are data gaps, community air monitoring. It's a very ambitious program. The law required us, as an agency, to make a number of moves before October 1st of this year.

So what we do is we are putting together basically the framework and the criteria to help the 35 local air districts identify highly exposed communities within the regions, and to develop in partnership with local community residents and other community stakeholders specific emission reduction plans, where there are a real decline in emissions. And one of the things the Adrian mentioned this morning in talking about goods movement in the goods corridor, that is a highly overburdened community in Southern California running from the Ports of L.A. and Long Beach, all the way into the Inland Empire, where there are numerous warehouses that house all of the things that are delivered to our steps and actually 40 percent of the
rest of the country.

    We're putting together that criteria. We're also putting together criteria around community scale air monitoring. What we're required to do, besides putting together this framework, is to identify the initial list of communities that are going to be the focus of air monitoring and community emission reduction. So we're in the process of a really robust community engagement. We have some draft documents that are out for public comment and this is going to continue throughout the rest of the summer.

    The other thing that I wanted to mention about it though is that besides the synergies, and just to put a finer point on what Adrian was talking about and I think also Stephanie, that AB 617 as well as other laws, our freight regulations, etcetera, call for large scale electrification and zero emissions. And so that is a really big overlap with the mission here of this body as well as the CPUC and the CEC. So that's one thing that I wanted us, as an agency, and you all to pay attention to, as I'm sure you will.

    The other thing that I wanted to mention though is that we developed an advisory body called the AB 617 Consultation Group. And that group is comprised of a variety of stakeholders that include people working in
community-based organizations and environmental justice groups, public health people, local government, as well as the air districts and some representatives from industry.

We're meeting a number of times between now and the end of September when we go to our Board for approval of the statewide framework. And while we do have the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee at the Air Resources Board I just wanted to make you all aware that there is this other advisory body that we have. And so as you think about liaisons to the EJAC, I think that this body would be another body where it's helpful for me to come to these meetings. And it would be helpful for either members of this group or Commissioners or staff of the two agencies to attend some of our meetings. So we'll make sure that you all have that information. And like Yana, I look forward to working with you.

MR. WILLIAMS: At this point that concludes the number of cards that I have. Before we move on, is there anyone who has not completed a card who would like to and provide comments?

All right, seeing that there's no response we're going to go -- I'd like to move next to the Open Meetings Act Presentation.

(Off mic colloquy.)

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Okay. We got that out of the
Thank you all for being here, of course. My name is Helen Mickiewicz. You don't need to spell it. I am an Assistant General Counsel at the California Public Utilities Commission. I've been there for 31 years. And my area of expertise is actually telecommunications. But in the years that I have worked at the Commission I have spent -- well, I spent 20 of the last 31 years working with advisory boards, mostly on the telecomm side. But the rules apply to all of them pretty much the same.

And I also am one of the in-house experts in the Legal Division at the PUC on the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. So I'm going to do this little presentation today. But before I do that, I want to refer to something that Commissioner Guzman Aceves mentioned just briefly this morning, and that is that today is the 50th anniversary of the assassination of Martin Luther King. I remember that day. I was in high school. It was a devastating and tragic event.

This morning on the radio I heard Andrew Young, who spoke at an event yesterday in Memphis. And he said that he had been there, with Martin Luther King. And I knew that I had read that before. And then he went on to observe, he said Africans have a belief that you're not really dead if people still remember you. And we certainly do remember Dr. Martin Luther King. And I just wanted to
acknowledge that.

Okay. The Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act applies to this body, but even before I get into the details of that, I will tell you that the purpose of the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act is that the business of government should be done in public. It's to ensure that public agencies conduct business openly and that the public gets to participate.

There is, by the way, a parallel statute for local jurisdictions, the Brown Act. But the governing statute for state bodies is the Bagley-Keene Act. Oh, I just said that.

Okay, so I'm going to supplement my slides with some information from my simple guide to Bagley-Keene, which all of you received in your binder. I was one of the authors of this. And also I don't know if this was provided to you, but it is a reference material. And I think it was emailed, but if for some reason you didn't get it and you want it, this is the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act 2018 Advisory Publication from the Attorney General's Office. We refer to this all the time. And when we have questions we want to address, internally or for advisory boards.

So the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act applies to any state body. And that includes a state body -- the Act
defines state bodies of groups as all mandated state
boards, commissions and similar multi-member groups as well
as committees of these groups that have been delegated
authority to make decisions and advisory committees of two
or more members.

And I wanted to refer you to -- I didn't include
code sections here, so if anybody wants the specific
reference you can look in this -- code references are not
in the slides. They're in the simple guide to Bagley-
Keene. But Action 11121 specifically states, "An advisory
board, advisory commission, advisory committee, advisory
subcommittee or similar multi-member advisory body is
covered by the Act if it was created by formal action of a
state body or any member of a state body." And in this
case, there were two Commissions that created this body and
the advisory board created consists of three or more
people, which this clearly does.

So there really isn't any question about the
applicability of the act to this group. So when does it
apply? Well, it applies to everything you do and requires
that what you do be done in a meeting.

What is a meeting? A meeting is a majority of
members or virtually or physically present. By the way, I
was told you might have questions about teleconferencing,
meetings by teleconference. And I will address that at the
end.

The majority of members are virtually or physically present. They are indirectly communicating electronically or through mediaries [sic], so that's a second way they could be meeting. I want to emphasize that: a majority of members are indirectly communicating electronically or through intermediaries. That was mentioned this morning.

Also, a majority of members are discussing topics relevant to the group's jurisdiction. Now, you don't have jurisdiction, in a legal sense. But you have jurisdiction in that the two agencies that created this body have given you subject areas in which they need your advice and input. And that's your "jurisdiction".

A meeting occurs whenever a majority or a quorum, and a quorum is one more than a majority I mean one more than yeah -- is that right, one more than a majority? I can never remember the exact rule. Galen, please help me here.

MR. LEMEI: It's a majority, but in this case it's a majority, which in this case would be six --

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Seven, six right, yes.

MR. LEMEI: -- because five is not a majority.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Right. Yeah, so you've got to have six people here for a meeting to take place. That's
really the point of this. And again, the members have to be physically or virtually present. And the gathering is to discuss a topic related to the group's jurisdiction.

Now, a meeting -- see the big red caution -- a meeting can take place when a majority of members discuss, deliberate or take action using direct, that is speaking in person, or indirect such as email or speaking through intermediaries, that kind of communication. And this is why I cautioned this morning that if the Commissioners send out a document, whether it's electronic or hard copy, to you to be reviewed and about which they want input from you, you can't engage in email communication as a group with each other. You just can't. It's a violation of Bagley-Keene. And with all due respect, Commissioner Rechtschaffen and this notion that some of us are stricter in our interpretation than others. I can just tell you that this is what the law is and this is how the courts have interpreted it. And in fact, Bagley-Keene was amended some years ago and it has to do with the very next paragraph, serial meetings.

And I'll tell you the story. The story was this. The Police Chief of Freemont, I think it was, wanted the City Council to take action. And so he went from one City Council Member's office to another and presented his proposal. And each one of them in turn said, "Sure great,
no problem." And then the City Council got together and
met and the item came up on the agenda. And without any
discussion the City Council Members voted it out.

And a member of the public who was there, and who
had something to say about this proposal, objected and
ultimately filed a lawsuit, which went to the California
Supreme Court. And the California Supreme Court issued a
decision in which it said, "In case the statute isn't
clear, let us clarify that you can't do that. That is
called serial meetings, going from one to another and
securing votes and then having a public meeting where
there's not discussion and you take the vote." So the
Legislature amended the Open Meeting Act, after that
decision to make clear that serial meetings are prohibited.

Now, how can you all do business together,
outside of a meeting? You can do that by setting up
subcommittees. And if there are five or fewer people then
you all can get together and talk, as long as it's less
than a majority. You could have different subcommittees as
long as they're not talking to each other. Because you
have to avoid a majority of members communicating outside
of the public eye about a topic on which this body is going
to act or that might even come before the body and you
might not act. I mean the law says, "Within a topic
related to the jurisdiction of the group."
So we are, Galen and I, are happy to provide you with advice on this, as it may come up. And again, you can set up a subcommittee and the subcommittee can meet and communicate by email or by telephone and that's fine. And then you can present a subcommittee's recommendations to the full body and they can discuss it in public and then take a vote. But you can't be sending around emails to the whole body, offline. I mean, outside of the public eye. And I'm happy to entertain any questions about that.

So moving on from that there are circumstances in which you can all be together and it's not a violation of Bagley-Keene. And that is one of you is getting married and invites all the rest of the committee members. Or there is a conference and all of you happen to be at a conference together and even in the same room for panels, or at a reception, that's not a violation of Bagley-Keene as long as you're not discussing the business of the committee.

MS. PINCUS: Can I just clarify something?

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Yes, please?

MS. PINCUS: What about if like we go out to lunch, all of us decided to (indiscernible)?

MS. MICKIEWICZ: You can't discuss business.

MS. PINCUS: But we can go out to lunch?

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Oh, yes. Yes. You can go out
to lunch and you can talk about your latest travels and the weather and who's going to get elected Governor next year, but you can't talk about the business of the committee, as a group.

MR. LEMEI:  Just to remind everyone, when they're asking questions if they can turn on our mics, so that folks who might be listening in can follow along?

MS. MICKIEWICZ:  Thanks, Galen.

Phoebe?

MS. SEATON:  Sure, so a lot of the work is pretty broad. The scope of this is very broad and intersects with a lot of the work that we're doing. And so I think -- I don't know if you're going to get into this later, but you're thinking -- I could easily imagine a time when six of us are at a meeting or on a phone call on 617. And 617 kind of interlinks with some of the work that we're doing.

MR. LEMEI:  Can you explain what 617 is?

MS. SEATON:  Yeah, 617. Yes, is the -- didn't Veronica just talk about that?

(Off mic colloquy.)

MR. LEMEI: Sorry, you got it. Thanks.

MS. SEATON:  And so anyways, it seems like not that it's a gray area, it's just an issue that we without this committee would be discussing together. Yet it could inform some of our feelings, our thoughts with respect to
our of work.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Okay. So have any of you ever served on a "state body" before? You have. Okay, so most of you have not.

The reason I ask is that this is all new and as you roll along, these kinds of things will come up. And we give this presentation and we make ourselves available to answer your questions, but you're on your own and we expect you to exercise reasonable judgment. So you could be having a conversation, six of you, about who's going to get elected Governor next year. And somehow that morphs into some discussion about what changes that might mean for energy policy for the State of California. And then somehow that morphs into something more specific to what you all are doing here.

And at some point in that progression I would hope that one of you would say, "Hey, wait. I think we're getting too close to the topics that we discuss on the committee, so we should probably put this off and take it up when we're in a meeting." You have to use your judgment and kind of decide when you think you've slipped over the line or are about to slip over the line. And you just stop.

I mean that's the best advice I can give you. You have to use your judgment.
Galen?

MR. LEMEI: Yeah, if I could just elaborate on that I strongly concur with everything that Helen just explained. It is a question of individual judgment and one of the realities is it's on each of you to be individually cognizant. But again, this is only going to arise if you find yourself communicating directly or indirectly with potentially five of your other members. Otherwise, this wouldn't kick in.

With respect to activities in other forums there are a number of specific exceptions that Helen touched upon, that more or less amount to the same thing in different contexts whether it's a wedding or a meeting of the Energy Commission, or a symposium at UC Davis. There's all sorts of different ways it could happen, but you're allowed to participate fully in that. Well, especially if it's a noticed activity of another body in that. And if your participation in that noticed meeting of another body does include or touch upon your work here, then that might be okay.

The 617 call, I'm not super familiar with how that works. It doesn't sound like that's a formal noticed meeting. And actually that could present a problem in terms of if six of you are on that call and that ends up being a vehicle for a serial discussion amongst yourselves,
of these issues. That doesn't mean that topics can't come up. That doesn't mean you can't participate. But you do need to be cognizant and mindful, that that not become a vehicle for six of you to effectively meet about something that is within the scope of your jurisdiction here, or of your -- I'll avoid the use of jurisdiction, but you know the code uses it within the scope of your responsibilities and activities.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Yeah, right. And so the trick is that if you find yourselves in a position where you are talking about something that really is a subject that this body should be discussing you stop and say "let's defer that," because if you continue you're privately discussing the state's business and that's what the act is about, correct. That's what the act is intended to prevent. Okay.

So let's move on to Open Meeting requirements. So the body must provide a meeting notice and an agenda, which is why I mentioned earlier after Commissioner Rechtschaffen presented the priority that he and Commissioner Guzman Aceves have for the PUC this year, and the need for your input, I said well you can't really respond to that. And what I meant was that you couldn't respond to the substance of what he was saying. And
clearly, it was fine for you all to talk about that as a priority and you did. But the reason that you couldn't discuss the substance of what he was saying is that it wasn't on the agenda as an item. So any item you're going to discuss and potentially on which you would take action needs to be on the agenda.

The agenda must be published at least ten days in advance. And we now do that on the Internet, although in the old days, we used to have a daily calendar that we circulated at the PUC. I still have copies of those, but it's been on the Internet for many years.

Agenda items should describe the item to be discussed. And once it's made available, the agenda item cannot be changed within that ten days. I mean if somebody's working on an agenda item before it's published, it can be modified. But once it's published, you can't change that agenda item without formal action by the body and notice.

Written materials that you all -- oh, I'm sorry, excuse me. Yulia.

MS. SCHMIDT: Sorry. I don't mean to interrupt. I just wanted to hear --

MS. MICKIEWICZ: No. No, I can't see you because of the screen, also.

MS. SCHMIDT: My name is Yulia Schmidt. I'm an
advisor for Commissioner Rechtschaffen. Actually I have two questions.

One is on the agenda question, because it came up today. So the Environmental Justice Item Action Plan that was talked about was under the Priorities for 2018's item. At least that's how we had sort of internally worked out the agenda. So if you could maybe give a little clarity as to how specific the agenda needs to be, because this body will be putting together agendas in the future. I think that might be helpful.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Okay. So what I saw on the agenda was 2018 Priorities, which is not specific. If you wanted to discuss a plan that one or more Commissioners or member of the body is putting forward, then you would have to describe what that is. So for example, if that item were going to be discussed today, it would have said 2018 Priorities. And then under that sub-item a) would be "CPUC proposal to..." and you have some words describing what that is.

I know that the California PUC, and I've never seen it, but I have to know that the Energy Commission, they publish agendas in which they describe the items that are going to be voted on.

Now, those are formal items that become in essence law. And the materials that you're all -- I mean,
the items that you're all going to be discussing and acting
on don't have that weight of law. But they -- so the
extent to which they need to be described is there's
probably more flexibility in how you describe these items.
I can provide some of you with agendas we have for some of
the other advisory committees showing you how items are
described.

MS. SCHMIDT: I think that might be helpful.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Stan?

MR. GRESCHNER: Yes, a related question. Like in
future agendas, because it seems like that will probably be
something that we continuously look at it seems like
there's very specific things that are under that Strategy
Plan, like heavy-duty vehicles. And under the specifics if
it's just referenced, we're going to talk about items that
are in the Plan?

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Good question.

MR. GRESCHNER: Or does that cover everything
that's in the Plan?

MS. MICKIEWICZ: It doesn't have to be that
specific. It doesn't have to have bullets, like every
item. It doesn't have to have bullets, like every item.
It just has to say, "CPUC proposal to adopt a plan that
would include or would cover," you know, a sentence or two
at the most. It doesn't have to be a detailed account.
Galen?

MR. LEMEI: If I could just elaborate, briefly, and share my philosophy, particularly in response to your question. The answer to your question is that it shall include, "a brief general description of an item generally need not exceed 20 words. A description of the item in terms of action in closed session is separate." Okay, so 20 words is your target.

Now your question was how broad or how narrow does it need to be? And I'm just going to step back a moment and say from my perspective it's a tough question, because the Open Meetings Act is written with more formal bodies in mind, so some extent. Like the Energy Commission, like the CPUC, where you might be taking a vote to approve a power plant or to set a particular rate for utility customers. Or any number of things that are specific and concrete. In that case it's very, very clear that that action needs to be specifically agendized.

Now the writers of the Act made it very clear that it applies to a body like this, but they didn't provide a lot of clarity on what that means given the high level and topical nature of the discussions that are likely to take place here. And that sort of leaves it to us to do our best to make sure that we are providing the public with notice of what's being discussed.
With respect to the question that specifically came up earlier this morning, I think that Helen just sort of chimed in and gave us all a reminder that we hadn't an in-depth discussion of the priorities as set forth vis a vis that particular document, wasn't something that we really gave the stakeholders information that we were going to be putting on the table. And therefore, we should maybe refrain from making that specific thing the topic of prolonged discussion. That said we all understand and acknowledge that insofar as that has formed a broader discussion of priorities that was fine.

So I think that what we're going to do, on an ongoing basis is do our best to provide the stakeholders, keep in mind the guiding star of the Act which is to provide stakeholders notice of what we're going to be discussing, as best we can. And try to be transparent. And as the discussion meanders into areas that are really beyond the scope of what we noticed, try to be cognizant of that, but there's not necessarily bright lines. It's a matter of judgment and we'll all do our best to stay mindful.

And in my experience, when you're mindful and cognizant and conscious, and do your best to honor the spirit of the law, you're usually doing pretty well.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: I echo everything Galen said.
And I just wanted to add that in my, again 20 years of experience in working with advisory boards I have learned that just as Galen said, the rules are written for the Energy Commission. And the statute was really written for the Energy Commission and the California PUC and every other state agency that is doing the public's business. We have, at the PUC, always been a little bit more flexible with advisory boards, because of the nature of the work you do and the irregularity with which you meet.

And so again, the things is it's a learning experience. And as we go along you are welcome to consult with us and we will advise on how we comply best with the act.

MS. SCHMIDT: May I ask one more question.

Sorry.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Yes. Sorry, Yulia. I can't see you again, because I'm behind this screen.

MS. SCHMIDT: I know. I know. And I just wanted to put a little more color to, or ask you regarding something you mentioned, maybe a slide or two ago. I'm just thinking everyone on this board has a job and actually many of your directors of organizations and so on. And I want to make sure they continue to do their jobs.

So just as an example, let's say there is a great environmental justice awards banquet. And every one of
these organizations is being recognized, so every one of these board members is there. And each goes up and makes a speech about the work they've done. It's all pretty specific. It's all sort of within the body of work that this body does. But as I understand that's not the type of communication that would be prohibited.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Well, I would agree with that as a general matter. There might be some specific thing that I can't think of at the moment where I would say, "Oops, somebody crossed the line." But generally speaking the Act is not intended to apply to that kind of situation.

And I also wanted to say in fairness to Commissioner Rechtschaffen, I think what he was saying was kind of what Galen and I just said. That we have some measure of, or try to have some measure of flexibility, with advisory boards that we wouldn't apply to formal bodies. But that flexibility is -- it's not a license to deviate at will from the requirements of the statute.

MR. LEMEI: Right. And just to, again because you asked a very specific question I think I can provide a fairly specific answer to that specific question. You asked about -- there is a ceremony awards provision.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Oh. I didn't even know that.

MR. LEMEI: So in the meetings defined exceptions -- quick question. Does anybody on this body happen to be
the misfortune of being an attorney?

MS. SEATON: (Indiscernible)

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Oh, Phoebe.

MR. LEMEI: I'm so sorry. (Laughter.) So I'm mostly tailoring my communications for those that are not attorneys, although I sometimes can't help myself. But there is a provision under this, Exceptions 10125(c) "The provisions in this article do not apply to the following," scroll on down and you have, "The attendance of the majority of the members of a state body, at a purely social or ceremonial occasion, provided that a majority of the members do not discuss amongst themselves business of a specified nature, business of the subject matter of the state body."

So this means you're at this awards banquet and six of you are off in a corner talking and naturally stuff comes up. That maybe it's the CPUC's plan that Cliff referenced earlier this morning. Gosh, you know, probably you shouldn't -- it really would be not great to engage in an in-depth discussion of that there. But, let's say that each of you, as you step forward happens to mention, during your remarks at the public ceremony to everyone else that everyone in the room happens to hear you touch on that thing. Well, I would say that your comments were not an offline discussion that deprived the public from
participating. They were comments --

MR. RAMIREZ: Informational.

MR. LEMEI: They were informational. They didn't facilitate a discussion behind the scenes and they were part of the ceremony themselves. So that's sort of how I would answer that specific question.

However, there are tens, if not hundreds of thousands of permutations that you can come up with. And when it doubt, ask us. And if something happens that you think may have been a concern let us know, because you know we can take steps to make sure what we -- again, even if something happens that maybe wasn't perfect --

MS. MICKIEWICZ: We can cure it.

MR. LEMEI: We can take steps to either cure it, or cure it formally, or in spirit.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Right.

MR. LEMEI: And the likelihood that somebody actually sues this body for violation of the serial meeting prohibition is probably pretty low. But you know it's not just the law, it's also a good idea from our perspective.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Okay, so I'm going to finish my bullets here on this page. I think I mentioned or maybe I didn't get to this one. "Written materials must be made available to the public for inspection." And that is any documents, electronic or hard copy that is discussed at a
meeting at a meeting or even referenced at a meeting, needs
to be made available. That is why all of the materials in
your binder were posted on the Internet. And so that's
part of the requirements.

And then committees or subcommittees that meet,
if that subcommittee is six or more members then you're
representing a majority of the committee. And then you
have to follow Bagley-Keene. So if your subcommittees are
five or fewer then you don't have to follow all of these
rules.

MR. LEMEI: I would just add to that, that's true
as long as you don't actually delegate to that subcommittee
decision-making authority on your behalf, which gets to be
you can end up with a -- you're a state body, because we
need you; we, the Energy Commission and the CPUC. But now
that you're a state body, you actually have the power to
make other state bodies, if you deputize them. You know,
create a subcommittee that is imbued with the decision-
making power on behalf of your body, if it consists of.

So anyway I don't necessarily know that you plan
to do that or would do that. I would think you probably
wouldn't. As long as the sub-bodies are not exercising
decision making or formally advisory bodies to you, then
you're fine. And it's very common for groups like this to
create sub-groups.
MS. MICKIEWICZ: Yeah. And in my experience what the sub-groups do is they explore an issue in some depth, and bring back to the full committee or group a recommendation, which this full group can then discuss and take action. That's really the point of subcommittees is that -- or it might even be that the committee has decided it wants to submit a letter to the Energy Commission and the PUC with a recommendation. And you delegate to two or three people the task of drafting that. And they can do that, but then again, they have to bring that back to the full body.

Consistent with what Galen is saying, whatever you develop in a subcommittee it has to be discussed and then acted on by the full committee.

MR. LEMEI: Or another real world example, you might have for example an annual report that you're trying to pull together, because that's one of your responsibilities under the charter. And as we established unfortunately you can't just have a group email, which would be super convenient, because that's clearly something that you're ultimately going to be preparing. So that might be a natural place where you assign a few people the responsibility to work together on that. Or maybe even parse out pieces of it and give those groups responsibility over the pieces. And then have it come back together and
get assembled in open discussion.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: So I want to just mention the last item. "A state body cannot act on a matter raised by a member of the public, unless it is on the agenda," which that came up this morning.

And I will tell you that in my experience, what is more common is that one of you will come to the meeting and say, "I want to bring up the fact that this morning I read or I heard, and it occurred to me that that is something this committee should be taking up." And then before you know it a number of people have responded and you're having a conversation about something. At which point if Galen or I are here we will say, "Whoa. Please put that on the agenda for the next meeting. It's not on the agenda for today, so you can't discuss it today. You can flag it as an issue you all want to take up at a future meeting, but you can't discuss it today."

And that could also be occurring in response to something a member of the public says, but in my experience it's more common for an Advisory Board Member to do it.

Okay. So I'm going to go on to the next slide. And there's not really very much I'm going to talk about here, because this doesn't really apply to you. There are exceptions to this ten-day notice requirement. And there are these things called special meetings, which are called
to discuss legislation.

Now, it's possible that would occur for this body, but in my experience with advisory boards it generally doesn't. But it's possible, because of the nature of your work it could be that you do that and then the requirements are immediate action has to be taken, for example, to discuss proposed legislation.

"At the beginning of the meeting the body must make a finding that the ten-day notice would impose a substantial hardship and immediate action is required. And then notice must be provided at least 48 hours before that meeting."

Again, this is unlikely to occur, but it's possible.

MR. LEMEI: And catch that there. This is like you know something super-urgent happened. You still can't just discuss it at the meeting. You still had to notice it two days in advance --

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Right.

MR. LEMEI: -- instead of the full ten days and then you have to make a finding. So it's not even as good as it sounds. Plus it's pretty narrow and specific and less likely to apply to these folks.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Right. And then there are emergency meetings, which I'm not going to talk about. You
can read it. But I just cannot envision a situation in which this body would be required to have an emergency meeting. However, the Energy Commission might be and the California PUC certainly has had to hold emergency meetings. So this provision is here just so you're aware of it, but it doesn't really apply to this body.

So let's talk a little bit about public participation. I have a couple of things at the end that are not on the slides that I'll mention. Because the Act is all about doing the public's business in the public eye, the public is allowed to be here and to monitor and participate in these meetings. And we saw that.

The site must be accessible to the public generally, and specifically to the disabled. These meetings have to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

The state body is prohibited from imposing any conditions on attendance at the meeting. And that includes, by the way, sign-in sheets. I mean not that you can't have a sign-in sheet, but you can have a sign-in sheet but sign in has to be voluntary and the sign-in sheet has to say that at the top. So no one has to be required to sign in, in order to sit in this room.

The public is entitled to record and broadcast audio or video of the meetings unless doing so causes a
disruption.

And of course, you're recording it yourselves and that recording has to be publicly available. There must be reasonable time for members of the public to speak.

And I mentioned to Commissioners Guzman Aceves and Rechtschaffen that the reason that we picked 1:30 in the afternoon is that we wanted there to be a specific time when the public knew that it could show up and speak. And not have to sit through several hours of deliberations by the body before you got around to taking their comment.

Now, you can pick whenever you want to have public comment. That is a matter for you all to decide. We are, not arbitrarily, but we picked that time of 1:30, or 1:00 o'clock for the reason I mentioned. But if you wanted to do it, which the California PUC does at the beginning of its meeting at 9:30 or 10:00 when you start, you can do that. That's up to you.

I touched on briefly, but I'm just going to emphasize that the public has a right to access anything you discuss, any records of this meeting, any documents. All of that should be available to the public. And if somehow it isn't then if somebody files a Public Records Act Request it hast to be made available.

There's also some reference discussion in the Simple Guide to Bagley-Keene to closed sessions. That
again doesn't really doesn't apply here. Those are the kinds of things we take up in closed sessions at the California PUC are potential litigation or existing litigation, personnel matters, those kinds of things, which really don't apply here, but their sections are included in the handbook.

That's kind of all I have. Does anybody have any more questions? Galen, you don't get to have a question.

MR. LEMEI: Does anyone have questions or I was going to add an obnoxious --

MS. MICKIEWICZ: I made a joke and you didn't hear it. I said you don't get to have a question.

MR. LEMEI: Oh, I don't have questions.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: No, no. I was kidding. I'm kidding. Go ahead, go ahead. (Laughter.)

MR. LEMEI: I didn't hear it. I apologize.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: It's all right.

MR. LEMEI: So there's one, on this public participation and this sort of gets to the -- are we going to touch on the practical question of remote access separately?

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Oh, no. Thank you for reminding me. No. I was going to talk about that. I was going to talk about telephone conferencing.

MR. LEMEI: So I'll hold that thought there until
you're done.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Okay. Okay, so thank you. I did say I was going to talk about that, but I didn't write it down. So teleconferencing and remote access. The Act was written before --

MR. LEMEI: In the dark ages.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Yeah, before conference calls and things like Tandbergs, if you know what those are, became common in public business and private business. And so, the rules are a little bit archaic.

If one of you wants to participate in this meeting from Southern California you would have to make some arrangements to you. Either if you wanted to stay home and do it you would have to open your home to the public, which usually isn't desirable to people. So you would have to find a location or one of the commissions would have to help you find a location. It could be, California PUC has an office in Southern California, I don't know about the Energy Commission, but we'd have to arrange for you to be in a place that is publicly accessible. The public has to be able to come to wherever you are if you're not here with this body. And that location also has to be ADA compliant.

And if there is a vote taken on a matter, while someone is on the phone or Tandberg, the vote has to be by
roll call. It can't be just a show of hands since no one can see your hand if you're on the phone. I'm trying to think if there's something else I'm missing; is there something else? I think that's generally it.

MR. LEMEI: Yeah, so we also do need to, in our notice that we put out, we do identify --

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Oh, yes we do.

MR. LEMEI: -- so let me just back this up.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: But wait, let's just finish that part. You have to identify that location in the -- when the agenda mails the location of that remote access has to be identified.

MR. LEMEI: Right. So here's my practical suggestion. And I anticipate that there will be people who would like to be able to call into these meetings, because it's difficult to get to Sacramento or San Francisco.

So here's what I would suggest. First of all, let us know in advance that you'd like to do that. We'll see if we can figure out a location that might work in your area. Maybe it's a public library. Usually, there's going to be a way to do it. We'll make sure it's in the agenda. I think technically -- I don't know if you mentioned this, Helen, you're supposed to tape a copy of the agenda on the wall, there.

Literally, our Commissioners do this. They will
call in from wherever they might happen to be. They'll be sitting in the public library in whatever city they're in. They'll have a note on the wall. Nobody shows up. Nobody wants to go to the library in whatever random city. And it's one of those things that occasionally we maybe don't comply with this fully and it's rarely an issue. But again, we try to comply with the requirements, even the archaic ones to the extent that we can.

So if you think you want to call in, call us, talk to us. We'll try to figure out a way that does it that's all buttoned down if we can. And unfortunately, that means that calling in from your home, from your car, unless you have a really nice and open home or a really large car that's maybe a convertible, might not work as well as we all would hope. (Laughter.)

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Yeah. We've had Commissioners, at times they were in transit somewhere and so they had to go to a small conference room at a hotel near the airport and call in from there. Or find a lounge at the airport and call in from there. I mean, all arranged ahead of time mind you. So we can and have made accommodations, but those are the rules. So if nothing else, then --

MR. WILLIAMS: I've got a clarification.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes?

MR. WILLIAMS: So today, clearly there are a lot
of issues and information that the Advisory Group will have to dive into.

So given the opportunity of creating committees is that something that we could have a discussion about today or is there a way -- I think one of the real concerns is that meeting four times a year on these meaty issues and items is really not going to move the initiatives forward in a way that we would like to see it done. So we've got to look at other ways that fall within the guidelines to be able to have conversations that fall within the guidelines, but still be able to address the issues and the many issues that there are.

So the real question is, and I think you've done a good job of explaining the do's and the don'ts, but what we can do is form committees. And what we can do is have the conversations as long as we don't have -- we don't enter into any of these conflicts. So I just want to get your opinion on what can we do today, so that we are active during the next weeks and aren't waiting until July when the next meeting comes, to really begin to do some serious work and provide comments to the Commissioners?

MS. MICKIEWICZ: So I'm going to go first. Galen is gesturing at me. This is what I would say. And Galen might disagree with me, but I would say let's go back to that topic of Administrative Process that we had in the
morning, that kind of we blew past and revisit that topic. And under that heading say let's discuss setting up subcommittees and what would be the broad topics of those subcommittees, without getting into any detail of substance. I think that would be okay.

And again this is one of those areas where we want to be flexible, because you only meet a few times a year. This is your first meeting. And we want to encourage you to get some business done. Does this make sense to you, Galen?

MR. LEMEI: Yeah. I was going to say something similar.

I mean in an ideal world, we would have seen into the future and prepped, you know, maybe. And maybe, by the way, we might -- I hate to be picayune, but we might want to call them like working groups just to sort of not make it overly formal. Not that it really makes a big difference what nomenclature you use. But a similar thought, you could use an administrative processes. You could use discussion of priorities or both of those topics together.

And again, if all you're doing is agreeing this is an important topic. And by the way, between now and the next meeting these individuals that are less than a quorum, are going endeavor to have some internal dialogue for
discussion at the next meeting. I see that as a pretty
practical way forward to allow us to move forward with the
business that you want to conduct during your precious time
here at this first meeting.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: I'm going to stop now. And then
unless anybody else has any other questions, I was going to
stop and just show you the last slide.

And Galen, I should have put your name and number
on here, but I didn't because we prepared it and we're
self-absorbed. So but on here is the two names are mine,
and Jason Reiger who's an attorney at the California PUC,
who is really the Bagley-Keene expert, but we work
together. He was going to make this presentation, but it's
spring break and he had childcare issues, so I'm here.

Any other questions? Okay. We'll move on to the
next topic.

MR. LEMEI: And I'll make sure that you all have
my -- I have a little stack of cards. My cards also use
our old logo, so I'm in good company on that. And I'm also
a resource on Bagley-Keene and other issues that might
arise. So you can ping both of us and if you don't get the
exact same answer, it should be close enough, so.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, thank you.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: (Indiscernible)

MR. LEMEI: Oh, sure. I can do it now or just
make sure, I was hoping to make sure that I talked with each of you before the day was over, but anyway, so.

MR. WILLIAMS: All right. Then we'll go to our next presentation: the introduction of the California Energy Commission, Clean Energy Programs.

MR. SOKOL: All right, good afternoon everyone. I'm Michael Sokol with the California Energy Commission. And it's a pleasure to be here talking with you all. I work for the Commission as a coordinator role, in our Executive Office where I oversee our SB 350 implementation activities. And so it's great to see that this group is up and running, off the ground. I know that this is a key priority laid out in SB 350, which is a very broad and ambitious piece of legislation. And so, what I've done is pull together a pretty high level overview of some of the major programs as a result of SB 350. And also, just some related activities that are going on here at the Energy Commission, to give some context for how things fit together and what we do here.

So, again very high level, broadly the Energy Commission, for those that aren't super familiar we have a number of key roles across the state, starting with developing efficiency standards for buildings and appliances. We have some incentive programs and some policy regulations for renewable energy through the
Renewable Portfolio Standard Program, as well as on the transportation side for electric vehicles and alternative fuels.

We do take the lead on licensing for large thermal power plants that are larger than 50 megawatts in size. We're the lead agency for California for energy emergencies. And we forecast for all facets for energy supply and demand.

And lastly, we also conduct extensive research development and demonstration activities for a broad range of energy technologies.

So in summary, we're sort of the lead policy and planning agency for the state of California, for the energy side.

A lot of kind of what I talked about, and this is sort of just the vision of a lot of what the elements of 350 are doing, but it's really moving from this historical grid where we've had sort of a centralized polluting power plants that go with the one-way power flow through these big transmission lines covering a broad swath of the landscape. And then out through the distribution system to individual homes and businesses and industry, where they're consumed.

And so it's kind of this one-way power flow; again kind of a little more fixed and stagnant versus what
we're moving towards. And this is already becoming a reality in front of our eyes, which is really more of a smart grid kind of a system, where you have a lot more rooftop solar or distributed renewable energy, or things like smart meters that are collecting data. And it's very much more an interactive kind of two-way multi-faceted grid.

And one of the -- it's not like we're moving away from the centralized resources too, but it's looking at more a mix of the large-scale clean resources, reducing pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, which is a thrust of SB 350. But really, I think while we're all here, is to make sure as we transition that this is really an inclusive process. And so that when, as this clean energy economy continues to evolve, that all Californians are able to benefit from the transition to clean energy.

Just giving again a high-level overview of 350, I think you heard this described by Alice Glasner this morning at a high level, but the major goals that most folks are probably familiar with already are requiring a 50 percent renewable energy for the state's utilities by 2030. Also, looking at a doubling of energy efficiency savings by 2030, encouraging widespread transportation electrification across the state, which is going to increase sort of the load on the electricity side where it's going to reduce the
emissions overall and the pollution.

And underlying a lot of those efforts is a shift towards more integrated resource planning, which looks at both the supply side of things and also the demand side, to think more holistically about how to most cost effectively reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the electricity sector.

And lastly, certainly not least and a lot of the reason why we're here today, is 350 included a key priority for addressing the barriers faced by low-income residents and disadvantaged communities in the clean energy economy.

So again, there's a number of other smaller requirements and programs that are imbedded in 350, which I don't expect anyone has read and as I spend full time on it, and I probably haven't read all the words that are in there. I'll be honest. But I'll get into a little bit more detail about where we're at with some of those programs in a little more depth.

So you can see here what I did is pull an excerpt of the specific requirements from SB 350. And again, this is from the Energy Commission's perspective, so these are a lot of the programs that we're leading. But many of these are in coordination with the Public Utilities Commission as well, in addition to other state agencies. And, of course, a broad range of local stakeholders as well and a number of
other state agencies.

So the 50 Percent Renewable Portfolio Standard, again this is the requirement by 2030 that basically half of the state's electricity needs to come from renewable resources. And this was laid into effect by SB 350. And of course there's discussions, moving forward, about potentially even increasing this with proposed legislation, but zeroing in on 350, so we have this 50 percent by 2030 goal.

You can see on the bottom left here, it shows what is called our Tracking Progress Report. And so as of last November we're at 30 percent for the state and so we're actually on a pretty good track there. But by all means we don't want to say, "Okay. We're good to go," right? There's still a lot of work to be done to get to that 50 percent and then thinking beyond that how to make sure the benefits are widely distributed across the state.

And on the bottom right, you can just see there's a breakdown of where those resources are coming from. So we're seeing a lot of new solar resources coming into play. Of course, there's been a lot of wind in the state for a while now. We've had some geothermal energy. And then small hydro power and biomass make up a smaller contribution to the renewable portfolio.

I included a link here at the bottom that has
some more information on tracking progress, a more detailed breakdown of how the portfolio mix looks like and a number of factors.

Is there a question here? Yeah?

MR. GRESCHNER: In terms of is this where we're at now or where we (indiscernible)?

MR. SOKOL: This is as of now, yeah.

MR. GRESCHNER: Thank you.

MR. SOKOL: So and I just wanted to mention again from the Energy Commission's perspective, we tend to oversee a lot of the publicly owned utility side of the equation. And so that Public Utilities Commission, they oversee the investor owned utility, which is largely the Pacific Gas and Electric, Southern California Edison and San Diego Gas and Electric, a number of others as well. But we work together collaboratively, because there's a lot of kind of cross-jurisdictional issues.

But Energy Commission, we develop a guidebook for the eligible resources. And we have some regulations and enforcement procedures on the publicly owned utility side.

So the next big key sweeping goal is to double the end use energy efficiency savings for California and this includes both consumption on the electricity side, and also on the natural gas side. So what you see here is this is the specific requirement from the language from SB 350.
It turns out a good maybe 40 percent or even half of the bill language itself is focused on this particular goal. So I just pulled out the key excerpt here, but the requirement was also for the Energy Commission to collaborate with PUC to develop specific targets for achieving that double --

(Audio cuts out from 2:10:58 to 2:12:10)

MR. SOKOL: -- in that landscape. And there's a link to the bottom here for the full report and more information. And if you have questions as I'm going feel free to chime in and raise your hand.

MR. GRESCHNER: I do have another question.

MR. SOKOL: Yes?

MR. GRESCHNER: I don't know if it's a comment or question, how this is measured, how savings are measured. And when we're talking about disadvantaged communities, and I've heard this argument, I don't if so much California as in other parts of the country for sure, is when we're making investments in low-income communities and around energy efficiency and solar, there's also an opportunity to like increase a person and family's quality of life, because now they can actually afford to run the air conditioner in the Central Valley when they couldn't before. So they may have an increased load occasionally, but with that renewable, that clean energy can help to make
it possible. So I don't want -- do I think we should account for some of those things. I don't know how you're measuring. But that with all the other things that are happening with these programs.

MR. SOKOL: That's great. I mean, I think fundamentally, this is a forward-looking exercise that you see here, right? And so it's projecting out into the future. There are some specific requirements in the legislation that the projections have to be based on what's cost effective and feasible for one thing. And they're based off of what's called the Potential and Goals Study that's done by some of the utilities, is a big contribution to where that's expected to come from.

One thing I wanted to note, and this is discussed in the narrative in this report that's linked at the bottom, but as we move forward in our 2019 planning efforts we have to actually specifically describe and try to quantify some of the impacts of the energy efficiency programs on disadvantaged communities. And so that's something that's going to be more of a core focus in figuring out how to leverage those contributions in terms of maybe there's the opportunity to talk about some of the other quality of life, non-energy benefits.

I'm not sure we have a full scale up there yet, but that maybe an area that folks are interested in
weighing in on, at some point.

MS. SCHMIDT: Sorry, this is Yulia from PUC again. I'm no expert on this, but I do believe the PUC's low-income energy efficiency programs have some language regarding comfort and safety. So that could help you out.

MR. SOKOL: Yeah.

A question?

MS. SEATON: Yeah, and not just your presentation, but this kind of jogged -- I keep forgetting to ask. Data, I think that the existing and developing data is going to help us a lot, kind of on these loads, but other stuff too looking at where investments are going, where money's going. Do you know what mechanism we can use, you're probably the wrong person to ask, but how we can get that data here to us that we think is important?

MR. SOKOL: I think that's absolutely a great question. I'll actually get to a little bit of a discussion on that in a few minutes. And then the next presentation on Energy Equity Indicators I think is going to touch on that in a lot more detail.

MS. PINCUS: I'm just curious, CCAs and the REMS and all these new entities, where are they measured on this chart?

MR. SOKOL: That's also a great question. I think generally they fall underneath the CPUC's
jurisdiction and so generally under that wedge, so to speak. But that's again, given that there's such an evolution in the landscape that's something that's going to continue to be a priority and part of the conversation as we move forward.

So if there's no other questions on this slide, and again, this is very high-level skimming the surface. There's a ton more detail in this report here. Or again, you can feel free to reach out with questions, but I'll just keep going through.

I wanted to quickly talk about some of the transportation and electrification work. Again, you heard just a very small update from the CPUC that has a pretty extensive transportation electrification portfolio, on the investor owned utility side. For the Energy Commission we work primarily with the publicly owned utilities on encouraging investments in electric vehicle charging infrastructure and then planning for medium and heavy-duty transportation electrification as well.

And a lot of that is done under our Integrated Resource Planning Proceeding, but there's a whole range of incentives and different mechanisms in which we engage with the POUs to really support them in developing that infrastructure across the state. And again, I included just a link here with a ton more information on our
website. You can reach out to me if there's more specific questions.

Related to the transportation and electrification piece, this is really the more broad planning mechanism that 350 required a shift towards, which is integrated resource planning. And on the Energy Commission side we were tasked with developing guidelines for the publicly owned utilities to submit integrated resource plans by early 2019. And so last August we actually adopted these guidelines, which basically take the specific requirements laid out in SB 350 and then put them into specific guidance and sort of provide some forms and instructions and more of a standardized framework for the utilities to use for reporting to the Commission.

I should mention that SB 350 again is very clear on the requirements for the publicly owned utilities, which is that they have to meet specific greenhouse gas emission reduction targets that are established by the Air Resources Board. There is actually a proceeding going on right now to actually describe that process and solidify some planning targets. And then they have to meet the 50 Percent Renewable Portfolio Standard. Beyond that there's a number of requirements like maintaining just and reasonable rates for the ratepayers. But also minimizing localized air pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions with
early priority for disadvantaged communities.

And so that's an area where there may be additional updates in the future, to the guidelines. Certainly the CPUC is going through their own IRP process for the investor owned utilities. I think this may be an area where this group may have an interest in at some point in the future.

And I included a link here at the bottom to the Energy Commission's webpage on IRPs. We also have a subpage that's linked here, where it will point to the local planning processes that are taking place for the publicly owned utilities. So if anyone's interested in really digging into more detail on that, there's a lot more.

So the next up, and this is crucial for this conversation and so I think this maybe should be widely distributed if it hasn't been already to folks, but the Energy Commission put out in December of 2016 -- was formally adopted -- the SB 350 Low-Income Barrier Study.

This was required by SB 350 where the Energy Commission was tasked with looking at the barriers for solar, for energy efficiency and weatherization, and also for local small business contracting opportunities for low-income customers including those in disadvantaged communities. So we did put out and adopt this report in
December. There's also a sort of in-parallel a requirement that the Air Resource Board is working on low-income transportation options. And so that's part B of the Barrier Study, which is also available on their website.

And working with both of those in conjunction, we've actually been working closely and coordinating on how to move forward with a number of the recommendations that were laid out in both of those studies. So just to give you a quick flavor to the Energy Commission there were 12 key recommendations that were noted in there, including working collaboratively in kind of a taskforce with the other agencies to coordinate eligibility and program funding etcetera; a key priority for addressing issues in multifamily buildings, which is of course a key issue on the low-income landscape; and also thinking more about renters rather than just the homeowners for like rooftop solar and things like that. Speaking of that there's also a broad mandate to look more closely at some of the low-income solar offerings and ways to increase funding and be more inclusive on some of those with community solar type of offerings; looking at a statewide clean energy workforce development strategy in coordination with the PUC and with a number of other agencies as well. Thinking how to expand access to clean energy technologies for low-income customers, through new types of financing mechanisms and
pilots to make sure those are going to be feasible. And then the last kind of key priority that was laid out was better leveraging data to establish a baseline and then track performance over time to make sure to see how state programs are performing in low-income and disadvantaged communities. And again, you'll hear a better, more detailed presentation on that effort in just a moment.

There's also a broad range of other recommendations in there as well such as looking at how to develop a one-stop shop that's more consumer focused on helping folks navigate the different incentives and program offerings that may be available to them. And so that's something where there's ongoing conversations and things being developed that may be an interest to this group here.

But also thinking about consumer protection in the clean energy economy; ways to better improve small business contracting opportunities; research and development projects that specifically benefit and target low-income and disadvantaged communities; and then engaging closely with community-based organizations on the program outreach side and local community engagement; and lastly expanding tax credits for including clean energy upgrades on low-income housing.

MR. WILLIAMS: I've got a question related to
that. I know that just a couple of weeks ago there was the deadline for public comment. And I'd just like to know, how are those comments related to the barriers being incorporated or reviewed or considered?

MR. SOKOL: Yeah, that's great. And I noticed a couple of folks participating here on the Advisory Group provided comments. And so really I want to thank you guys for that. I want to clarify though that so this Barrier Study itself was actually adopted by the Commission. And so it's kind of a finalized document for now.

But what the open comment period was for, is the Energy Equity Indicators effort that you'll hear described in more detail in a moment. That was essentially an offshoot of the Barriers Study. And so, the way it works is the comments that we receive, which there were six sets in total, we kind of go through and we break them down into comments on different pieces, pull in and make improvements. And then we'll put out a final draft of the Indicators Tracking Progress Report, which will then be live on our website. And then we update that on an annual basis, moving forward.

So just moving through again, one of the requirements of 350, as you all well know, is establishing this Advisory Group. So just the mere fact of getting this up and running I think is a great venue to continue to have
a lot of these conversations and make sure we're on the right track.

A couple of related priorities that are worth noting is SB 350 also laid some of the groundwork for moving to more of a regional grid across the west. And so not to get too far into the weeds of the way the electricity grid works for those that aren't super plugged in, but the California Independent System Operator would be more of a western body. But this is again something that's an ongoing conversation. There would need to be additional pieces of legislation. This just kind of kicked off a lot of the process around that.

Other SB 350 requirements, there's sort of some technology incentive evaluation requirements and providing recommendations on how to improve some of the program offerings. And that kind of relates to the Barrier Study that I mentioned.

There's a requirement the Energy Commission has a publicly available tracking system. And so those tracking progress reports that I linked to and pointed out earlier, is a starting point for that. This Energy Equity Indicators work fills in some of the gaps on that.

There's also a requirement that the Energy Commission looks at, basically a responsible contractor policy with some consumer protection guidelines. And so
that relates to one of the barriers sub-recommendations
initial work in our Efficiency Division related to that.

And lastly, I mentioned that there's a really big push for additional data needs to support improvements to the Energy Commission's forecasting abilities. Making sure we really know what's going on out there in the landscape, but also how we're performing in different sectors and in low-income communities and disadvantaged communities, so that we can make more informed policy recommendations and program improvements over time.

And also related to SB 350 is something called Assembly Bill 802, that really looks at using data and basically benchmarking for large commercial and multifamily buildings to hopefully drive additional energy efficiency opportunities. And so there's likely to be some interplay there as the program evolves for identifying say multifamily building opportunities.

The last thing I just wanted to cover very quickly. And this is not something that's specific to Senate Bill 350, but it is really important for those to be aware of is our EPIC Program, the Electric Program Investment Charge. The CPUC actually oversees that program. The Energy Commission administers a big portion of the funding for that program. But there's a wide range of funding opportunities associated with that, many of
which have specific benefits for low-income customers and disadvantaged communities, but ranging from applied research to sort of coming up with better techniques, approaches, technologies, to demonstrating those technologies at a scale that's going evaluate the economics around things, and then also looking at some of the nontechnology barriers that can be addressed through market facilitation and energy deployment-type of projects.

So I just wanted to draw attention to that. That program's ongoing and we also have a research or a transportation-focused program as well, as I mentioned in the beginning.

The last thing I wanted to bring your attention to is for this year, on the Energy Commission side, we have a big overarching proceeding that's done every other year that's called the Integrated Energy Policy Report. And this year there's a sub-docket that's called Energy Equity. And there are a number of upcoming workshops and events that you folks might want to be aware of, I think that are relevant to the conversation.

And so starting with April 20th there's a regional workshop up on the North Coast in Arcata that's focused a little more on kind of the offshore wind discussion, but will also include some discussion on tribal energy needs essentially. And sort of a disadvantaged
community efforts that are relevant for the region up there.

There's a workshop on May 15th in Kern County, that's going to be similarly tailored to that local area and some of the needs and priorities within Kern County.

The day after somewhere in the Central Valley, and we're still not 100 percent sure on the location, but having something that's more specific to the needs and the resources in the Central Valley.

On May 30th, there's a workshop planned here in Sacramento, for specifically work being done on the multifamily building front and ways to accelerate deployment of distributed energy resources in multifamily building. And so of course there's a key focus there for affordable housing. That's very much a cross-cutting conversation. And I think that's something that people may want to tune into.

In June, there will likely be a webinar to highlight this Energy Equity Indicators work in more detail once things are finalized and we move towards kind the next steps, next iterations of the tools that are coming out of that.

And then on August 29th, there's a big joint agency workshop that's being planned here in Sacramento that really highlights a lot of the equity achievements
from the SB 350 interagency work that's going on. And so that's directly related to the Barrier Study work that I described in detail earlier today. But there's so many things to talk about there that that should be a very relevant workshop.

And the link you see at the bottom here will take you to our Integrated Energy Policy Report webpage where you can sign up for the listserv for upcoming workshop announcements. All the notices and meeting materials are posted there as well, so I would encourage each of you to sign up for that if you have not already.

I'm not going to go read through these, but these are just links that are probably relevant to the conversation of what I covered and related programs that the Energy Commission administers.

So with that I'm happy to answer any questions. I covered a lot of ground and again it's very high level, so you can always reach out to me with additional questions or follow up. But if there are any immediate questions, please let me know.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Michael.

We have a question, Angela?

MS. ISLAS: Hi. So I wanted to get maybe like a little bit of an elaboration on the Barrier Study, so looking at the two counties that I represent obviously is
Fresno County and Madera County, and Madera County especially is very unique, because it's full of urban cities and the rest are all unincorporated communities. So these are communities that are living out near a lot of industry. And there's a lot of representation in those areas specifically, that struggle really to kind of have more accessibility to energy efficiency programs and having those kind of established in their homes. So I wanted to ask in regards to the city I'm not sure that was there a consideration of like a nomination of which community you would be focusing on, on this study? Like one in particular area is more disadvantaged than another or how is that process going to work? I'm just curious about that.

MR. SOKOL: That's a great question. And I would note that I think again the next presentation may help inform some of the response to that. But in terms of the Barrier Study that we published, it really is sort of the statewide snapshot overview. But there was a lot of local and regional engagement, where we did a whole series of regional workshops. Alana pulled those together in coordination with community-based organizations where we had a lot of local representation. It was really a brainstorming of what are the ideas that folks on the ground are actually dealing with or ways to overcome some
of those barriers?

There was an extensive literature review process that was conducted with over 100 different articles and reports that were reviewed.

And then we had actually a few large workshops up here where we brought in experts in various related fields to help sort of ground truth some of the recommendations to make sure we're on the right track.

And then the public engagement process of putting out the draft report, putting out the draft recommendations and all that sort of culminated in late 2016.

But I think we realized that that's a good step along the right direction, but it's not the end all to be all for everything, right? And so what we are continuing to do is look at ways that we can better leverage data, specific to some of the different regions where there's unique needs that are faced by folks. And use a lot of different data sources from various actors to build a better picture that can be useful for a variety of purposes.

And so our Energy Equity Indicators work continues to make progress down that path. And that's something that will continue to evolve, as we move forward.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well right now we'll go to the introduction of the California Public Utilities Commission
Clean Energy Program.

MR. GRESCHNER: Excuse me. I have one question on that before the staff move on, how -- the Barriers Report was very comprehensive, released in 2016, right? Technology is rapidly changing and programming opportunities that weren't envisioned in 2015 and '16 when we were discussing the report, weren't available at that time. How are you all looking to incorporate the new discussions whether it's goods services, distributed resources, other things that maybe weren't specifically called out in that report? To incorporate them in, I think the successes, if they're reaching disadvantaged communities in the future.

And just curious how that report evolves? I know it had static 12 items, but it could be 16 by the end of this year or something like that.

MR. SOKOL: I think that's also a great point. I would note that the specific requirements of SB 350 were to put the report out and adopt it. But that doesn't mean that our efforts related to implementation and continuing to flesh out the barriers are done by any means.

I think a lot of the next steps that we're seeing are through this interagency work. And then specifically thinking, so there's kind some best practices through the Barrier Study and a lot of related efforts that as we move
forward with the development of new programs, should be 
imbedded from the get go. And that's kind of the way that 
we see the conversation evolving as of right now.

Let's make sure we're continuing to talk across 
the agencies, engage with locals, and really put into 
practice some of the best practices we saw identified in 
the Barrier Study.

MR. GRESCHNER: All right. Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMS: And according to our agenda here 
we are a little bit behind schedule, but we're still on 
target. I just wanted to make sure that if anyone needs to 
be able to leave the meeting to catch some source of 
transportation back to your home that we adjourn in time 
for you to do that. But we do want, because we're here, to 
be able to have an opportunity to have helpful conversation 
and presentations move forward, based on what's been 
prepared.

MS. IKLE: Okay. We're just going to have a 
conversation, kind of following up on her point. I'm 
Judith Ikle, Energy Division Staff and so I just wrote a 
note to her.

One of the things that we are, I think finding as 
we analyze the impacts of contracts on that community, is 
that CalEnviroScreen doesn't include census tracts that are 
zoned industrial, because it's geared towards residential.
You know, so much of the component is residential, so sometimes when you're looking at a project you kind of aren't able to do the analysis on the DAC impact. (phonetic) I mean it kind of is a little bit of what you were talking about. And I don't know if there's kind of agreement that that may be a barrier to doing a robust analysis of these facilities.

In Energy Division's case, we are now looking at adjacent census tracts to see if that will catch things that are located in disadvantaged communities. This would be when we're, for example, a purchase agreement comes before us for approval that's for example a CHP or something like that.

MS. ISLAS: No, I disagree with kind of having that consideration just because we kind of -- I started noticing a lot of disadvantaged community areas, like they were tracked within the census tract, but then there's those who live outside what (indiscernible) learning. Is like there are some communities that are living outside of the sphere of influence of city boundaries and those types of communities aren't even considered at all. And it's kind of like they're just there trying make the best means to have all the resources necessary in their communities.

And so I just wanted to point that out that, you know, there are all these communities that are out...
surrounded by industry that may not even be within the
census tract and they're not being tracked, so.

MS. PINCUS: I mean, I think this brings up a
good point, is when we're looking at this body, what
definition of disadvantaged community we want to use.

MS. ISLAS: I was going to mention that earlier
in the meeting, but it is kind of like I wanted to see
where you know our conversations went towards this.

That's part of my confliction, you know, because
I'm starting my job and I'm starting to figure out all of
these different barriers with some of the definitions. And
so with disadvantaged communities I started really seeing
that there is like sort of a difficulty trying to find the
right definition. Because then there's unincorporated that
isn't mentioned within the definitions and that's where I
sort of had a confliction with what's the real definition
of those types of communities?

Like are they communities that are overburdened
with industry that are in city limits? Or is there like
should we consider communities that aren't even in the
census tract, but they're living outside of the sphere of
influence near a city and have to do like certain --
therefore certain obstacles where they have to try to get
the necessary resources that they need in the community?
So that's kind of why there are (indiscernible) from the
work that I'm doing that's been a confliction for me to understand.

MS. PINCUS: Yeah. And I think this group, like I recommend that we come up -- we figure out like what's the most expansive definition, because there's that. There's also many low-income communities that don't fit into the Cal Environmental Screens definitions of disadvantaged communities. There's hard to reach communities, so just maybe not for now, but for later on how we think through the definition.

MR. WILLIAMS: Maybe we can handle that in a committee? (Laughter.)

MS. ISLAS: Okay.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MS. GLASNER: Yeah, just one -- this is Alice again -- and just one point that the statute does say that, and SB 350 does say that disadvantaged communities is defined by CalEnviroScreen. We all know there are a lot of problems with that. You know, if you want to discuss it, maybe we should have an attorney involved.

I mean we are discussing definitions at the CPUC in a number of a different proceedings. I just have a little bit of a concern that the statute lays out that CalEnviroScreen defines disadvantaged communities certain ways, for this body. That's my sense of it.
MR. GRESCHNER: Well, I just want to point out that -- he's not here today, but we have a representative from the tribes and we have Yana here who's represent the tribes. And we work with 30 plus tribes throughout the state. Extremely economically disadvantaged communities, disadvantaged in any way you can define the term except for EnviroScreen likely, and they don't qualify for any of these programs. So we're going to have a representative here talking about solutions to their communities. And right now several communities -- I don't know one that qualifies in EnviroScreen, so I think we need to talk about how, which communities (indiscernible) we're finding solutions for.

MS. SHARPE: Hi. I'm Sarah Sharpe. I'm an Advisor to Commissioner Guzman-Aceves sitting in for her as she left.

I just wanted to echo what Alice said that it is in the statute that we were going to be using the CalEnviroScreen definition of disadvantaged communities, and just reassure Angela that most unincorporated areas that you're working in are considered disadvantaged, based on the definition that we are using. And there is no place in California that's not in a census tract.

But I think it would be good for discussion in the future, that you as a group spend time talking about
your definitions and your terminology that you agree upon. And you know it's also as staff we can offer more training on different topics if there are things you would like us to prepare and put on your agenda.

MR. LEMEI: This is Galen, if I could -- just because the legal question of what the statute says about this issue was raised, very good point. There is this vehicle, this tool that was identified in statute, indeed this body is intended to be established of groups consisting of representatives of disadvantaged communities as defined in the statute.

However, when it comes to the scope of your work, and what's properly within your purview to consider, in my legal opinion you are not constrained. If your advice is -- questions the full accuracy or desirability or have recommendations that pertain to how that statutory definition or the thing that's established pursuant to statute, you should understand that your recommendation might ultimately require legislation to be effectuated. And that the Commissions that you are advising are constrained to use the tools established by the Legislature. But that doesn't constrain you from analyzing those legislatively-designated tools and making recommendations about those, as you see fit as a body. Does that clarify?
MS. CHARLES: Okay. I feel like I'm interrupting a very good conversation. Just to reintroduce myself, I am Melicia Charles, for those of you who don't know me. I go by Mel, so feel free to call me Mel. I am the Supervisor that oversees the activities and Energy Division at the CPUC related to this Advisory Group. So I, Alice Glasner, Judith, we are technical advisory staff to those Commissioners on this. So if you have any questions, please feel free to reach out to us. I have cards. I'm happy to hand them out for those of you who don't have my contact information.

I know we're running short on time so I'm going to actually try to be brief on this. In terms of this presentation I know there's different levels of engagement of different Advisory Group Members, so I decided to start at the very beginning and talk about what the CPUC does, the role of the CPUC, and how it's different from the Energy Commission.

Basically we regulate electricity and natural gas, telecommunications, water and transportation sectors. We have oversight as Mike said earlier, of the investor owned utilities and that includes the three large electric utilities, which are PG&E, Southern California Edison and San Diego Gas & Electric. As I guess was mentioned we also oversee the natural gas utilities and small investor owned
utilities.

So in terms of what we regulate and oversee, we regulate retail rates through general rate cases, where we approve those rates. We regulate quality of electricity and natural gas service and that includes safety and reliability. And as Mike talked about earlier, we also do integrated resource planning. And we develop and design and oversee clean energy programs, which I’m going to talk about later. SB 350, which has been talked about at length today and related legislation are definitely key drivers in the past, I would say now almost three years of our clean energy activities though we have legacy programs that span over a decade, maybe two decades or multiple decades.

So the way I decided to frame this was to talk about the SB 350-related programs. So it's not only programs that have been developed in response to SB 350, but also just to talk about programs that may have been developed before SB 350, but have been implicated, for lack of a better word by SB 350, so distributed generation, rooftop solar programs. Mike talked about the EPIC Program. I'm going to touch briefly upon that and other related programs that fall within the sort of umbrella of clean energy programs.

And a couple of things about what I'm going to discuss. I apologize in advance if I get into like
acronym-speak and alphabet soup. I will really try not to do it. It's really hard for me not to and so I will go ahead and do that. I will talk about that, but I will talk about all of this at a very high level. I know Alice gave you guys fact sheets about the program, so you can dig deep and talk about all day about each of these programs. But we'll keep it very high level right now. Feel free to stop me if you have questions. And we can definitely follow up with any additional questions, if you really want to sort of dig a little bit deeper in any of these programs.

So the first sort of tranche of programs are rooftop solar programs. They include newly developed and legacy programs. So the first program that was just approved earlier this year is the Solar on Multifamily Affordable Housing Program, or the SOMAH Program, which basically provides incentives for solar PV systems on multifamily housing located in or outside disadvantaged communities.

This actually replaces a program we had, which was the Multifamily Affordable Solar Housing or MASH program, which was a similar program that also provided incentives for affordable housing. The difference between these programs, one of the key differences is sort of the funding source. This new SOMAH Program is funded by Cap-in-Trade revenues that the utilities receive where the MASH
program was funded by a different funding source.

We also have a Single-Family Affordable Solar Homes Program, or the SASH Program, which again provides incentives for solar for single-family homes. SASH Program is currently underway. The MASH Program's budget is committed and now SOMAH is going to be sort of the new program that addresses multifamily housing.

Sort of hot off the presses there is a proposed decision at the Commission that is looking alternatives for expanding solar in disadvantaged communities. It basically is going to expand solar in disadvantaged communities, and for CARE and FERA customers. I'll talk a little bit about CARE later, but these are low-income communities -- the proposed decision. And then there is an alternate by Commissioner Guzman Aceves have been issued with proposed new green tariffs and single-family solar and community solar programs. So look for that to be developing in coming weeks.

So similar to the rooftop solar programs, we also have the Self-Generation Incentive Program or SGIP. And there's actually a special carve-out within SGIP for disadvantaged communities. And so what SGIP does is it provides incentives for, we say mostly customer-side storage and other distributed generation technologies that don't include solar, so like wind.
We also have combined incentives for combined heat and power technologies, which go to residential and nonresidential customers, throughout the state. And basically what the SGIP equity budget does is it sets aside 25 percent of the budget, I think about 59 million, for projects that are located in disadvantaged communities.

Now, sort of taking a little shift to the larger solar programs, we have our Renewables Portfolio Standard Program. And again, I'm going to keep referring to your presentation, Mike. So Michael was talking about the RPS Program and the target of how it has been increased to 50 percent by 2030. One of the key provisions in SB 350 is it does require the Commission to consider disadvantage communities in our procurement processes. And so at this moment, the program is well underway. It's been going on for years. But we are in the process of considering how disadvantage communities are impacted by our RPS Program.

And then I did want to give a plug, and I may look at Judith for this, is that we do have the report coming out -- oh, okay. We do have a report coming out on May 1st, which is a legislative report, which will provide some high-level information on the program and will provide information on the costs and the savings that result from the RPS Program. So that will be available to you once it's released on May 1st. Is there any other information
you want brought up? Okay.

Also, we have electric vehicle pilots. The work that we do at the CPUC on electric vehicles and transportation electrification broadly, a lot of it is investments in infrastructure. And also developing rates to support the charging of electric vehicles to help optimize the grid and to help benefits customers.

And so we have, right now, three existing infrastructure pilots. I think the combined budget is just under 200 million, which basically will install a collective, I think, over 12,000 electric vehicle chargers in multifamily residences and other nonresidential businesses. All three of the pilots are -- which are in each of the electric investor owned utility territories -- carve out 10 to 15 percent of the budget for disadvantaged communities. And they are underway. And all of them are pretty much on track or over this 10 to 50 percent allocation in terms of investment in disadvantaged communities.

As I mentioned before, we just approved another 42 million for transportation electrification pilots, which are more broadly looking at not only infrastructure and looking at rates, but also looking at transportation electrification beyond electric vehicles. So it's broadly electric vehicles, but there's also looking at port
electrification. It's looking at other technologies to help electrify the grid as it relates to transportation. And then another sort of new development that just happened last Friday is that we have another proposed decision out that approves 589 million for larger transportation electrification projects that will be heard in coming weeks by the Commission.

And then we also have the EPIC Program, which was discussed earlier. And the EPIC Program actually does allocate 25 percent of its budget to R&D projects in disadvantaged communities. And then, as statutorily required from AB 523, 10 percent of its additional budget must be allocated to low-income communalities.

And I also wanted to mention another research and develop program we have, which is a natural gas R&D program, which is approved by our Commission each year and is basically administered by the Energy Commission. It also allocates a portion of its budget to disadvantaged communities.

So I wanted to keep both of these programs on your horizon, in terms of where we are in natural gas R&D program. We approved the budget for last year. The Energy Commission literally, like a few days ago just submitted their proposed budget program plan for this year. And they'll be considering it in the next few months.
Okay. So I also wanted to talk about not just the sort of disadvantaged communities SB 350 programs, but also some of our legacy programs. So that includes our ESA Program, our Energy Saving Assistant Program, which provides no-cost weatherization services to low-income households. And then there's the California Alternative Rates for Energy, which provides a bill discount to qualified low-income customers. And both programs have allocated a lot of funding and are underway and continue to serve low-income communities.

We also have a San Joaquin Affordable Energy Proceeding, which is looking at affordable alternatives to existing propane and wood fuels in San Joaquin Valley.

A green tariff shared renewables, which is kind a community solar program, which allows ratepayers or customers to get 50 to 100 percent of their electricity from solar. And in that program 100 megawatts are set aside for disadvantaged communities.

And we also have an energy storage procurement target. We have a target of 1.3 gigawatts to procure, actually directed the utilities to procure 1.3 gigawatts of energy storage by 2020. And within that program we allocate 500 megawatts of storage with a priority given to public sector and low-income customers. And yes, the applications, in terms of where we are on this program,
were submitted on March 1. March seems to be a big month in terms of when applications are submitted.

So in terms of like activities that are going on in 2018, you've heard a lot of them this morning. The only thing I just wanted to add is that we continue to develop and implement these programs. And we implement them and develop them with a mind towards looking at disadvantaged communities and low-income communities more holistically.

And the one thing I do want to say, now that this body is together and is truly initiated now, is that we welcome anything, all of your feedback. I think all the feedback we've gotten today has been excellent. One of the things that really resonates with me, and I've been thinking about a lot, is in terms of engagement and making the CPUC more accessible and less opaque. And so I welcome your expertise in that area in terms of how we can do that, as we are implementing these programs, as the utilities are implementing these programs.

And we continue to have coordination with our sister agencies in terms of addressing these barriers. And as mentioned earlier we are in the process of developing an Environmental Justice Action Plan. It was also called the Strategy and Work Action Plan. Good, because I was like I was like I have to change my slide? So we are developing the action plan right now. And again, I am a broken
record, but I do welcome your thoughts. We'll be coming to you formally within these meetings, but I do welcome your thoughts and your insights as we are in the process of developing this in between meetings too.

So that's basically it. Thank you. Oh, that's not it. So right there is a link to our website, which basically has links to other pages on the CPUC and has a lot of resources. So please do take note of it. And please do reach out.

MR. WILLIAMS: Very good, thank you.

Do you have any points of qualification? Very good, yes Judith?

MS. IKLE: Judith, I'll just add one thing in terms of some kind of sleepers that the Commission has got. So the $24 million in RD&D and natural gas is going to be a real quick process. That's quite a bit of money. We generally don't have a lot of input from the perspective that this Advisory Group represents. When the gas system isn't working, as it wasn't a little while ago, there were some alerts on the CAISO system. You know, prices go up for everybody potentially, so that might be something that a little bit of looking at might gain some good gains in terms of where we're looking to do R&D.

In terms of the electric transportation proposed decision that has been released, we have some money to do
an evaluation of that program going forward. I don't think we really have thought a lot about evaluation from the perspective of disadvantaged communities and what the metrics would be and things like that. So any input on that would be very, very useful and timely.

The other thing is that we just released, and I believe it's an OIR on the disaster preparedness and so all communities are -- disaster strikes all communities, but sometimes it's much tougher on disadvantaged communities to come back. So that's another proceeding at the Commission. That includes water companies.

It's a little bit right now I think they geared towards if your house has burned down that you don't keep getting bills and the credit agencies and get in trouble and things like that. You probably know more about it. But I think that would be another area at the Commission which is you know, right, right now. And your perspective would be useful.

MS. SHARPE: Yeah. Thank you, Judith. Just it's actually a disaster response rulemaking that we just opened and it's really focused on consumer protections for those who were affected by wild fires and other disasters. And we can certainly use any new or interesting creative ideas people can bring to the table, especially as we face more and more disasters in the future, potentially.
MR. WILLIAMS: Very good. Thank you.

Yes?

MS. GARCIA: I'd like to offer a quick comment.

I think (indiscernible) Sorry, this is Yana Garcia from CalEPA. Since we've had such an interesting conversation about disadvantaged communities and the designation, I'd also just like to offer to this group some kind of a briefing or workshop on just how the CalEnviroScreen tool works. We're always taking input on CalEnviroScreen. It's a tool for a statewide purpose. We recognize its limitations. It's also been an iterative tool that's changed over time. And so we're always looking at ways in which we can refine it and improve it. So we'd really like to -- I just want to offer that as a resource and maybe just a little discussion on how the CalEnviroScreen tools works, versus the disadvantaged community designation, which is different than the CalEnviroScreen tool itself.

Thanks.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

Any other questions? All right, let's move on to our Energy Equity Indicators, please?

MR. LEMEI: If I can just chime in here? I'm going to acknowledge that we are -- it is currently just a little after 3:00 o'clock, which is the end of our scheduled time. However, we managed to clear out and make
this room available for a continued discussion. I don't know if anyone has urgent planes they need to catch. We want to obviously honor that. But I just wanted to make sure that we were all aware that we were running over. That's fine. We've got the time for it. And if anyone has concerns about that, please speak up or just excuse yourself if you need to.

MR. WILLIAMS: Before she starts are there any members of the advisory group who have to leave at a specific time? 4:00 o'clock is the drop-dead time. Okay.

MS. SEATON: It's 3:15.

MR. WILLIAMS: It's 3:15, all right. And by my device it's 3:04 now.

MS. DOUGMAN: Okay, so I'll talk really fast. My name is Pam Doughman. I'm an Advisor to Chair Weisenmiller. And I'm going to give an overview of the Draft Tracking Progress Report for the Energy Equity Indicators.

So as Mike Sokol mentioned earlier the Energy Equity Indicators is implementing part of the data recommendation in the Barriers Study. And the idea is to identify opportunities to improve the programs underway that address clean energy for disadvantaged communities and specifically also low-income communities.

One of the points that was mentioned in the
Barriers Study is that there are many definitions of low-income communities used for various programs. So for the purposes of the energy equity indicators we picked one of the lowest common denominators to identify the broadest set of areas of California that may be eligible to one or more programs.

So this map is from the Draft Tracking Progress Report. It shows disadvantaged communities using the CalEnviroScreen 3.0. It shows tribal lands. And it shows areas with less than 60 percent of the statewide median household income. That's in the solid green. And then also we have in a kind of hashtag green, the areas of the state that are between 60 and 80 percent. Those are some of the definitions of low income. There're some others that are mentioned in the report as well. Also, the indicators point to -- the report points to key data gaps and additional future analysis. We're just getting started. This'll be -- when we finalize this, this year, it'll be the first, but we plan to update it and improve it over time.

So the structure of the Energy Equity Indicators is we search back and we thought about what are we really trying to achieve? What do we want to improve? And so we focused on access, investment and resilience. And then we organized indicators under those three objectives. So we
have indicators for the numbers served, the small business contracts, clean energy jobs, the amount invested, energy savings, rooftop solar. And then resilience, we have August electricity bill, health and safety issues abated, and measures indicators for energy resilient communities.

And as I mentioned this is a draft. And we did put it out for comment. And I'll talk a little bit more about next steps after I show a few examples of maps from the draft report.

So the August electricity bill, this looks at areas in California. And we, for the purposes of the draft report, we zoomed in to key areas in the state as examples. And so the San Bernardino area in the Inland Empire in Southern California is shown on this map. And this is showing the August electricity bill for census tracts that are low income. And we've got an orange dot where there is it's a single-family residence. And they had the mean August electricity bill in that census tract was $300 or more. And so we think this indicates, while an opportunity for energy efficiency, for other measures to look at what's going on? Why is the electricity bill so high and what can we do about it?

But this report is focused on showing the opportunity for improvement and then who can providing the data for further discussion. But this is really just an
indicators report.

When people look at this and immediately say, "Wow, well what can we do about that?" That's success in our mind, because we want to start that conversation.

Okay. So then I want to highlight that we also have some information here from the Cal-Adapt showing how climate change may increase the cooling degree days substantially and so we've put in a sort of a tan hashtag a large part of the San Bernardino area. This is the City of San Bernardino. And it is expected to get a lot warmer. Okay, so that's just one example.

Clean energy jobs, so this is an area where additional data would be very helpful. We earlier, was it May 2017 we came out with a framework report, kind of our wish list of, wow if we could do the great clean energy jobs indicator, what would be all the things that we would include? We would include things like job quality, workforce development, whether people living in low income and disadvantaged communities are getting the jobs, also apprenticeship and pre-apprenticeship opportunities, as well as the number, trend and location of community workforce agreements. So those are some of the things where additional data would help us with that.

But we wanted to get started with some indicators. So using the available data, this is at the
county level, we have on the left an indication of clean
energy jobs per county. That's kind of the left side of
each left semicircle. And this is just plotted in the
center of each county. But it represents the county
overall.

And so you can see areas in the Central Valley
have fewer clean energy jobs per county than some areas
such as Los Angeles, Orange County, even San Bernardino
County. And then the right semicircle shows the clean
energy jobs by population and so this shows in the Central
Valley that are behind some other areas. And in Northern
California, there are many areas that have a small
population but a pretty substantial number of clean energy
jobs, per the population in the county.

And then small business opportunities, this is
another area the Barriers Study indicates as one of the
recommendations that we want to do a follow-on study
specifically on this topic.

In the meantime using the data that's currently
available, we have an indication, this is from the
Department of General Services, looking at the percent of
annual total contract dollar amount that's going to small
businesses and microbusinesses. But this does not readily
identify whether this is comparable for low-income
communities or disadvantaged communities. So that's an
area that's on our wish list to improve on in the future.

And then on the right we have an indication here.
One of the recommendations in the Barrier Study is one-stop shops. How to provide additional information, so that people know, "Hey, I'm eligible for all these different programs," and make it easy for them to gain access to that material and those resources.

And then in terms of small businesses helping them know about, and learn about how to apply for state contracts and partner with others, etcetera.

So we've identified here some areas where there are small businesses and where there may be like the USDA Rural Service Center, for example, within a certain distance. And that might be an opportunity to leverage an existing service center and provide additional information regarding clean energy.

MR. WILLIAMS: Excuse me, I'd like to -- I understand that it's right about 3:15 and Phoebe has to go. But I do want to just pause to say are there any comments or information that you'd like to leave with us, given the time constraint that you're under?

MS. SEATON: Thank you, and how embarrassing. I mean, the biggest for me question on this issue is what's clean energy? What's called clean energy and so talking through what that analysis and that's probably another --
that's the list of things I would love for us to inform.

MR. WILLIAMS: Very good.

MR. LEMEI: I'll also just point out that we're losing our intrepid note taker who volunteered to do that for these meetings. I don't know if anyone else can pinch hit. I'm certainly trying to take notes as best I can, so I can try to help fill in any gaps. But anyone else who wanted to also help with that would be great.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes?

MS. SEATON: On that I was just going to -- they're pretty basic, they're pretty much takeaways in issues that people highlighted as priorities. Should I just go ahead and send them out as a word document or as an email? Do folks --

MR. LEMEI: No. I think the best way to handle this is why don't you work with us in sort of framing those. And then we'll blast them out, probably by email via like BCC just so it doesn't create a "reply all" situation. But we'll talk. I don't know that I -- I'm sure I have your contact information, but I'll touch base with you later this week and we'll figure out how to get that around to the group.

MS. SEATON: Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you for being here and thank you for your service.
So at this point we're looking for someone to continue with the note-taking given that Phoebe was the only one who raised her hand to take on that responsibility. I'll do my best, I'm not the best, but I am present.

MR. LEMEI: You and I can do our best to fill in, in Phoebe's big shoes.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. Very good. I apologize that we interrupted the final slide, but just wanted to take care of that business we continued. So you can continue.

MS. DOUGMAN: Okay. And just quickly, thank you to those who commented. We are considering taking all the comments into consideration and we plan to post a Final Tracking Progress Report for the Energy Equity Indicators later this month. And then we're developing an interactive mapping tool that will allow people to zoom in and look at the various layers of data, zoom into your particular communities of interest. We hope to post that and make that available this summer.

And then we plan to update the Energy Equity Indicators each year. For the first year we plan to provide an update in December. As I mentioned, this is a draft and a launch, and we plan to continue to improve going forward, especially as additional data becomes...
available.

All right, and then we have some links here for more information. And here's my contact. Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Pamela.

Are there any questions? Stan?

MR. GRESCHNER: I do have one. Just to clarify, this is specifically for SB 350 tracking or is it not related to 350 and the Barriers Report or?

MS. DOUGMAN: This is implementing part of the Recommendation No. 5 in the Barriers Report that was in SB 350 Barriers Report. But we are interested in a broader scope where we're not limiting it to SB 350 in particular.

MR. GRESCHNER: Well, I think this goes back to Angela's concern and question at the beginning, which indicates here that they're tracking across a lot of different geographic areas. Like, they invited CalEnviroScreen disadvantaged communities, but then they do have other census tracts that are lower income and tribal communities. And so you are tracking against all of these that have color on your map here?

MS. DOUGMAN: Yes. And we're focusing primarily on the solid green, the low-income, the 60 percent of statewide median income. And then the interactive tool will be statewide, so you can zoom into whichever community is of interest and that, you can use that to identify
opportunities where programs, additional resources may be needed.

MS. PINCUS: So just to clarify so I'm confused, because this seems much broader than the statute. And so which I would say this is what we want, well this is what I want, I'll say that. So I'm just confused which -- I would like clarity.

MS. DOUGHAMAN: Well, I think the discussion earlier was maybe at a minimum disadvantaged communities should be addressed. But I think there's no restriction to going beyond that using the CalEnviroScreen definition. Certainly, the part of the statute that applied to the Barriers Report did explicitly mention low-income.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. Any more questions? Very good, well at this point we're going back to the public comment. I have one card that's been submitted from Alexandria McGee online. And the question is, "Where can we learn more about the CPUC EJ, I guess Environmental Justice Action Plan?"

MS. CHARLES: So at this moment in time we're in the preliminary phases of development, but we will once we have documents to make available publicly they'll be posted on our disadvantaged communities website. And our presentation should be posted online and if you look at the last page, the last slide of the CPUC Clean Energy
Presentation I just gave a few minutes ago, that actually has a link to the website.

MR. WILLIAMS: Very good, any more public comments?

MS. PINCUS: Mr. Chair, I think that actually brings up a good administrative question about if anybody wanted to just subscribe from the public, was interested in subscribing to getting all the information that this Disadvantaged Community Advisory Group is going to be covering, do we have a service list for that yet? Or should we -- or would the Board like us to set something up like an email list or something?

MR. LEMEI: Right, so I'm being called out here. The Energy Commission has a listserv on -- Mike, I'm looking at you, because you might know the formal name of it. I am not recalling, not a question I get all the time.

MR. SOKOL: So we do have a number of listservs that I think are relevant. The one that comes immediately to mind is the Barriers Listserv that was kind of the implementation of the Barriers Study. I don't know if there's another new listserv specifically for the Advisory Group.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. SOKOL: There is, so yes.

MR. LEMEI: Okay. Great, so yes, thank you.
MR. SOKOL: So there is a new listserv for this group.

MR. LEMEI: There should be.

MR. SOKOL: Great. All right, so we do.

MR. LEMEI: So right, so that would be an ideal listserv. Certainly everything will be -- we at the Energy Commission will be using that as our vehicle to communicate and in so far as this is a cross-cutting body, that is probably a way for being facilitated jointly by the Energy Commission and the Public Utilities Commission, providing support. That probably is an appropriate vehicle. I don't know if the CPUC has a separate list for doing one.

MR. SOKOL: And just to clarify, so if you go to the Energy Commission's website, which is the links are included in the presentation, but it's also here on the screen the SB 350/DECAG you can sign up for the listserv on the bottom right here. And it's called Disadvantaged Communities Advisory Group Listserv, so there you go.

MR. WILLIAMS: Very good.

Well, we're down to the Next Steps. We've had great presentations and it's like drinking out of a fire hydrant on the first day, but we have great liquid capacity. And so we are going to be getting down to the Next Steps, but under the Administrative Process -- we want to revisit that again -- there clearly we would like to
move forward with establishing some working groups or committees.

I'd also like clarity on trainings, both -- there's been a number of opportunities to offer for additional training. I want to be clear on how could that training occur for the Advisory Group without us requiring posting a public meeting. Are there other options for training in which we would not be making a decision, but we would be informed by others about specific aspects of the work?

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Well, my immediate reaction to that is that training isn't a meeting. I mean, it depends on what your training is about, but generally speaking training isn't -- you're not meeting as a group to take action or deliberate or discuss an item before you. You're getting trained on something, some aspect of what you do know. Again, if it -- I mean, that's my sense.

What do you think, Galen?

MR. LEMEI: Well, I agree with that. I think it depends on how it goes and what we mean by training, but a training where all of you got together and somebody stood up and presented on something that is related to what you do. And then questions ensure, there's a good argument that if that's how it's going it is a meeting, because there you are, all of you in the room, discussing something
that is of topical currency to your group.

In contrast, if it's like you're WebExing in, you're not talking amongst yourselves, the information's flowing to you, but you're not really cross-pollinating then it wouldn't be a meeting.

So I think we need to be clear what it is we have in mind and then figure out if we want to make that happen at a meeting or if we want to do it in a way that doesn't need to be a meeting. And we'll just need to figure that out when we get specific about what trainings we're talking about.

And then, of course, another way to do it is just to take it in subgroups than the full, or fewer than a quorum I should say, is another way to avoid that problem.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: I agree with Galen's testimony.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. So it's better -- it's less problematic at the Committee level?

MR. LEMEI: Well, yeah. If you're just less than the majority it's not problematic at all. If it's more of you then as long as the information is flowing one way, but it's -- in any good class that I've been at or any of the training I've been at, there is a dialogue.


Well, under the Process and Procedures, are there -- I think I'd like to have some suggestions of some
working groups that we could establish and actually begin
to move into action between now and the next formal
meeting, which I think is scheduled for July. Are there
any suggestions of specific kinds of committees that we
want to establish at this meeting? Maybe in July there'll
be another opportunity to look at revising, but I do want
to put that on the floor for consideration.

MR. RAMIREZ: I feel like the discussion on
Priorities is one that we should probably follow up on
between now and the next meeting, so maybe that could be
one of the first subcommittees that we establish? Just to
kind of think out and propose recommendations in regards to
priorities for the group based on what was discussed today.

MR. GRESCHNER: Would it need to be if everyone
wanted to participate in that? Would it have to be like
two subcommittees that are exploring it with a smaller
group, different priorities or (indiscernible) people?

MS. MICKIEWICZ: If it's a subcommittee of all of
you it's not a subcommittee.

MR. GRESCHNER: Like two different conversations
going is what I'm saying and then you come together and --

MR. RAMIREZ: What I'm suggesting is a small
group to do any priorities thinking. That's more I guess
all out, so by the time we meet again as an entire group
there's recommendations that folks can build from.
MR. WILLIAMS: All right, are there any Advisory Group members who would like to serve on that Priorities Committee? All right, Jodi? Stan? All right, was --

MR. LEMEI: Just if I can chime in what I think is happening right now is I see people that are volunteering to work offline between now and the next meeting. And try to give some more specificity to right now it's about priorities. You could decide to make it narrower and focus or if another group of folks wanted to divide priorities up into different universes and maybe do that too.

But right now we've just got priorities, generally you all are -- I don't see this as something that requires a vote of this body. This isn't really formal. This is just a group of individuals that are committing to both time and resources to work together and come back hopefully with something more concrete for the next meeting to accelerate the discussion.

Does that make sense?

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Yeah. I would disagree with that.

MR. LEMEI: Oh, you would?

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Yeah, I think if the committee is delegating the subcommittee the task of doing some work on priorities, which they're then going to bring back to
the full group to consider, that they should vote on it. But I mean, you know, I don't think it's big deal if you don't.

MR. LEMEI: Fair enough.

MR. WILLIAMS: I think we can vote on it.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: I think you can vote on it --

MR. WILLIAMS: Will all those in favor of establishing a general Priorities Committee, and for a subcommittee to be manned by those who've raised their hands and indicated that they'd like to participate, all in favor? Show of hands, please? Okay. Based on a show of hands it's unanimous for those who are still here in the meeting.

MR. GRESCHNER: Mr. Chair, I would just offer an amendment that if any of the parties that aren't present right now, they would like to participate if it doesn't go up to quorum would also --

MR. WILLIAMS: I think the most we can get is what, five?

MR. GRESCHNER: Five, yes.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, there's four now, so that means one other person who may not be in the room can participate. Now, how does that work if they're absent and they would like to be --

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Well, if they read the summary
or are listening on the phone, anyone who wants to do that in my opinion, should contact the Chair and say this person wants to be on the subcommittee with the other three. And then you just say okay fine. And when you all reconvene next time you can say at that time that Kevin or whoever isn't here, or maybe Phoebe after the fact, wants to be on that subcommittee. Then you just announce that person. Just don't go over five.

MR. LEMEI: And for clarity's sake, the individuals right now are Jodi, Stan, Andres and was there a fourth?

MR. RAMIREZ: No.

MR. LEMEI: So that's three?

MR. RAMIREZ: Yeah.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. All right, yes. Well I'm going to pause right now, because we have a public comment from Lisa who's here in the room. We're going to pause on the Committee discussion to address the public comment.

MS. WORRALL: Hi. I'm Lisa Worrall. I actually work at the Energy Commission in the Environmental Office Siting Division. I have worked extensively with environmental justice analysis and CalEnviroScreen translation as well. I created a STEP Division Translation Policy.

There was a comment about training the Committee
and I noticed, I don't remember the name of the woman from CalEPA who left and she was talking about someone coming in and maybe she comes in and trains up the Committee. I think it would be a really good idea to include the public in those types of events, because it's about information not only the Committee, but also the public. So that they can make thoughtful comments and be more aware of the subject area, and especially CalEnviroScreen I found that a lot of people don't really understand it very well.

MR. WILLIAMS: Is there already a standard training with slides or a webinar?

MS. WORRALL: I believe that would probably be at EWIHA (phonetic), you know the Division under CalEPA.

MR. WILLIAMS: And the reason that I ask is because if there is an opportunity for us to promote a special training, and that we could help alert people that the opportunity was there, that would be a broader opportunity.

MS. GLASNER: Well, I just want to mention that I know they did give training to the EJAC, so I know there is a training, that they probably have something ready that they could come and give.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. I'm going back to the Committee. Is there another topic for which someone would like to propose a committee?
MS. MICKIEWICZ: I would suggest that it might be too early for more than one, but I mean obviously it's up to you. But you kind of -- I think the Priority Subcommittee is a good way to start. And then once you've got your priorities steps then you can figure out if there are other subcommittees you all need to establish. Does that make sense? I mean, I'm not trying to tell the Committee what to do. I'm just offering a suggestion.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, having no other suggestions for committees at this time, I think that addresses our Administrative Process questions and issues that were still outstanding.

As we prepare to wrap up I want to remind everyone about retaining original receipts for travel expense claims within the next ten days of today. So and also submit it, all right. That's important.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Yeah, please submit your receipts.

MS. WILLIAMS: That's a big difference and an important difference.

MS. GLASNER: You guys all received guidelines for what you can charge in TEC, we call them, forms. So send that information to me within ten days; that'd be great.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes?
MS. ISLAS: I'm sorry, but I think at this point did we just like for getting to the Priorities Committee? Because I was trying to get it through my head, but I was wanting to be a part of that Priorities Committee or do I still have a chance?

MR. WILLIAMS: There's still room.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: There's still room on that Committee, yes.

MS. ISLAS: Sorry. (Laughs.)

MR. WILLIAMS: Very good. You're on, you're on.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Before you wrap up Mr. Chair, I wanted to point out that the charter says the place, time and location of each meeting shall be scheduled at the preceding meeting. So theoretically, you should pick a meeting date today, but I don't know what the staffs of the two Commissions had in mind about meeting times. But since you're the Committee you get to pick a meeting date and time.

And one way you can do it is since you're supposed to meet, at a minimum on a quarterly basis, you could pick the third Wednesday of every month or I mean of the month of every quarter. Or you could pick a specific date, but I sort of don't know how you want to do and now you're looking a little pained.

MS. CHARLES: Yeah, the only thing I was
wondering is we don't have the Commissioners here.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: But they are not members of the Committee, so the Committee members get to decide when they meet.

MS. CHARLES: Okay.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: But recognizing that, it may be that -- and the Commissioners left -- so it might be that, for example, at the next Committee meeting if the Commissioners are here you all pick a date at the beginning of the meeting, so that everybody's on the same wavelength.

For now, I'm pointing this out, it is a technicality. Since this is only the first meeting and you're just getting your feet wet, if we want to hold off on picking a meeting date you could actually -- I don't know.

MS. CHARLES: You could pick "subject to change."

MS. MICKIEWICZ: Yeah, you could pick "subject to change" or you could pick two or three dates and then later -- you know, I don't think that they -- Galen, can they pick a meeting date by email, because that's not a substantive matter.

MR. LEMEI: I mean technically, I don't think that there's a procedural exception, but this is like sort of a practical thing.

Well, here's the other constraint, in addition
Commissioner availability, which is not technically -- you know, as members of this body may wish to try to accommodate them -- in so far as the Energy Commission or the CPUC are going to be providing infrastructure, like rooms, like this. We also need to make sure there's availability, so Helen is actually right that that's what the charter says.

And I think it would be fine to "subject to rescheduling," tentatively plan to meet at the third Wednesday. But we'll have to subject to availability of the room, subject to the availability of a quorum of members or ideally all the members are able to participate. So I think that as we move forward, we'll figure out how to make this more regular.

At this point I think it would be great too if you think it's appropriate, make that on a Wednesday if that makes sense or whatever (indiscernible) on a Sunday --

MR. GRESCHNER: Just the future (indiscernible) it's the first Wednesday of July? Isn't that the 4th of July?

MR. LEMEI: No, it's not the 4th, but it's that week.

MR. GRESCHNER: Well, subject to change and that's where we'll all want to work with the Commission
anyways. Okay. Let's not pick the 4th of July.

MS. SHARPE: Mr. Chair, I would like to say on behalf of the Commission or at least our Commissioner, I know that she prefers, she would like to attend as much as possible. So if her schedule could be considered it would be appreciated, but knowing that she is not required to be here.

(Cross colloquy from multiple people.)

MR. LEMEI: There's also no harm, no foul, if you prefer to not. If you prefer to hold off, notwithstanding the charter, I don't think it's a big deal.

MR. WILLIAMS: I think we'd prefer to hold off.

MR. LEMEI: So but and I think that --

MR. WILLIAMS: And our desire is to try to pick a date where if not all of the Commissioners will be present, the majority of them could be present. I think it's very important for us to have meetings with them present as opposed not having them present, let's put it that way.

MS. MICKIEWICZ: So maybe we'll just have to float some dates. The staffs will have to float some dates by email and work it that way, like we did this time. And with the understanding that at the next meeting we should try and pick a regular meeting time.

MR. WILLIAMS: It is my understanding that whatever day we pick, that the location is San Francisco?
MS. MICKIEWICZ: That's our understanding as well, yeah.

MR. LEMEI: I think they were going to trade off.

MR. WILLIAMS: Very good. Well, are there any other outstanding issues before we adjourn?

Well, hearing none this meeting is adjourned.

Thank you everyone.

(Adjourned at 3:40 p.m.)
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