

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	16-OIR-06
Project Title:	Senate Bill 350 Disadvantaged Community Advisory Group
TN #:	223302
Document Title:	Transcript of the 04042018 Senate Bill 350 Disadvantaged Community Advisory Group Meeting
Description:	N/A
Filer:	Cody Goldthrite
Organization:	California Energy Commission
Submitter Role:	Commission Staff
Submission Date:	5/1/2018 12:49:03 PM
Docketed Date:	5/1/2018

SB 350 DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES ADVISORY GROUP

BEFORE THE

BY THE CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION AND

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

In the Matter of:)
) 16-OIR-06
Senate Bill 350 Disadvantaged)
Community Advisory Group)
Meeting)
 _____)

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
 ROSENFELD HEARING ROOM - FIRST FLOOR
 1516 NINTH STREET
 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 4, 2018

10:00 A.M.

Reported by:
Gigi Lastra

APPEARANCES

ADVISORY GROUP MEMBERS: (*Via telephone and/or WebEx)

Tyrone Roderick Williams, Chair

Stan Greschner, Vice Chair

Adrian Martinez, Member

Andres Ramirez, Member

Jodi Pincus, Member

Stephanie Chen, Member

Phoebe Seaton, Member

Waudieur Rucker-Hughes, Member

Angela Islas, Member

Kevin Day, Member (Absent)

Roger Lin, Member (Absent)

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Robert Weisenmiller, California Energy Commission

Janea Scott, California Energy Commission

Martha Guzman Aceves, California Public Utilities
Commission

Clifford Rechtschaffen, California Public Utilities
Commission

APPEARANCES (Cont.)CEC STAFF PRESENT:

Alana Mathews, Public Adviser, California Energy Commission

Pamela Doughman, Advisor to Robert Weisenmiller

Galen Lemei, Staff Attorney

Michael Sokol, Program Manager, SB 350 & AB 802
Implementation

Lisa Worrell, Environmental Office

CPUC STAFF PRESENT:

Yulia Schmidt, Advisor to Clifford Rechtschaffen

Sarah Sharpe, Advisor to Martha Guzman Aceves

Melicia Charles, Energy Division

Judith Ikle, Program Manager, Energy Division

Alice Glasner, Energy Division

Helen Mickiewicz, Assistant General Counsel

PUBLIC COMMENT: (*Via telephone and/or WebEx)

Arno Powell, San Diego Gas & Electric

Lillian Mirviss, OhmConnect

Arlene Novotny, ACCES

Yana Garcia, CalEPA

Veronica Eady, California Air Resources Board

I N D E X

THE BOARD WILL CONSIDER AND MAY TAKE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING ITEMS:

1.	Welcome and Agenda Overview Alana Mathews, CEC	6
2.	Commissioner Opening Remarks	9
3.	Introduction of Advisory Group Members	14
4.	Purpose and Goals; Overview of charter Alice Glasner, CPUC	16
5.	Administrative Actions • Election of Chair • Selection of Liaisons to Low Income Advisory Board, Environmental Justice Advisory Committee • Discuss administrative process	18
6.	Priorities for 2018	34
7.	Lunch Break	81
8.	Public Comment	78, 81
9.	Open Meetings Act Presentation Helen Mickiewicz, CPUC	87
10.	Introduction to the CEC Clean Energy Programs Michael Sokol, CEC	120

I N D E X (Cont.)

10.	Introduction to the CPUC Clean Energy Programs Melicia Charles, CPUC	149
11.	Introduce Equity Indicators Pam Doughman, CEC	161
12.	Public Comment	170, 178
13.	Next steps and closing	172
	Adjourn	185
	Reporter's Certification	186
	Transcriber's Certification	187

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 APRIL 4, 2018

10:02 A.M.

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

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

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

1 and they have flights, so part of my role today will be our
2 mindful time keeper.

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

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

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

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

25 Before we break for lunch, we have a wonderful

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

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

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

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

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

23 And then we'll look at the next task of looking
24 at the next steps before we adjourn, which would include
25 making sure we have dates. We'll try to get dates for your

1 meetings in July, August and October or November in those
2 areas.

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

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

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

24 And part of that, of course, is this group. So
25 we're so excited to have you here. And thank you so much

1 for lending your insights to us and your expertise. I'm
2 really looking forward to the feedback that you have and
3 the input that you will have for us. And I am also
4 delighted that we get to partner with our friends at the
5 Public Utilities Commission on this.

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

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

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

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

25 COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Thank you. It's

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

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

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

22 The SB 350 Barriers Working Group is moving
23 forward. We're planning a workshop later this year to
24 showcase and get feedback on some of the efforts we've
25 undertaken. And I think there's a lot that we've

1 accomplished, but there's a lot more that needs to be done.
2 And we'll rely on this group to really help inform some of
3 how we proceed going forward in that effort and other
4 efforts. So we really look forward to a very productive
5 and cooperative relationship.

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

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

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

21 He wants to welcome you to the first meeting of
22 the members of the Disadvantaged Communities Advisory
23 Group. And he just wants to highlight two high-priority
24 areas with great potential benefits for disadvantaged
25 communities. And those two areas are clean energy for

1 goods movement and rapid expansion of demand response. As
2 highlighted in the 2017 IEPR motor vehicles represent the
3 largest source of air pollution in California,
4 overshadowing all other sectors, and accounting for nearly
5 80 percent of nitrogen oxide emissions and 90 percent of
6 diesel particulate matter emissions in the state.

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

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

24 Finally, I'd like to note that climate change and
25 air pollution disproportionately impact low-income and

1 disadvantaged communities. Local knowledge is a critical
2 component of efforts to ensure clean energy investment,
3 enhances resilience to climate change. Thank you.

4 MS. MATHEWS: Thank you.

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

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

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

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

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

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

23 MS. PINCUS: Good morning everyone. I'm Jodi
24 Pincus, Executive Director at Rising Sun. And I'm thrilled
25 to be here.

1 MS. CHEN: Good morning. I'm Stephanie Chen,
2 Energy Equity Director at the Greenlining Institute.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

25 So now, we will move on to the next item on the

1 agenda, which is our Presentation of Purpose and Goals by
2 Alice Glasner. And I'll just mention that in the back of
3 your binder, the last tab is Presentation, so you're
4 welcome to follow along.

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

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

21 SB 350 brings a focus to disadvantaged
22 communities in several ways. These include, or the
23 requirements are, to consider impacts on disadvantaged
24 communities in CPUC and CEC decision-making processes,
25 improve access to programs in disadvantaged communities,

1 prioritize air quality improvements, target economic
2 benefits and create the Disadvantaged Communities Advisory
3 Group.

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

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

18 Today's meeting, you know, before we get into the
19 nitty gritty of the rest of our agenda we'll be covering
20 more general, but important, territory today. Of course,
21 getting to know one another, responsibilities of the two
22 Commissions and as Alana said, selecting members for
23 important roles: the Chair, the Vice Chair, someone to
24 record the minutes, and the liaisons to those other
25 advisory groups.

1 And then we'll end the meeting by discussing some
2 important administrative tasks and next steps.

3 So that's it for me. Welcome everyone.

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

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

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

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

22 (Off mic colloquy.)

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

25 MS. MATHEWS: Anyone else interested?

1 And then we also have the position of the Vice
2 Chair, so is there anyone who's interested in that
3 position? And remember, we also need a recorder and two
4 liaisons to the EJAC and Low-Income Oversight Board. Is
5 there anyone interested in being Vice Chair?

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

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

13 MS. RUCKER-HUGHES: Question?

14 MS. MATHEWS: Yes.

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

18 MS. MATHEWS: Yes.

19 MS. RUCKER-HUGHES: Okay.

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

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

25 MS. MATHEWS: Yes.

1 (Cross colloquy.)

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

3 COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: I apologize.

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

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

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

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

25 MR. WILLIAMS: Well, currently I function in two

1 roles at the Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency.
2 As the Director of Development my department oversees all
3 of the federal finance for, and affordable housing finance
4 for both the city and the county. We have an operating
5 budget of almost \$190 million a year. So we finance
6 affordable housing and deal with public housing residents,
7 because we also oversee the public housing for the city and
8 the county.

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

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

23 So this is something that I'm actively on a daily
24 basis, engaged in. And we're developing the largest
25 transit-oriented neighborhood in the city of Sacramento, in

1 the River District, all of that at the same time. So I'm
2 honored to be on the team and happy to serve and represent
3 the residents of California as well as Sacramento.

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

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

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

19 I think it has served as a benchmark for a lot of
20 the programs that have followed in that we worked to
21 develop a statewide program that leveraged the solar piece
22 of it to do comprehensive services for low-income families,
23 including integrating enrollment into CARE and the ESPT
24 programs, incorporate job training programs and I think the
25 first ever PUC-directed program that included job training.

1 Since then SASH, MASH, SOMAH, and hopefully every low-
2 income or disadvantaged community programs going forward
3 has substantive job training programs. Again, I think
4 those were piloted in a model that we developed there
5 statewide.

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

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

21 And a couple of things on -- we're a national
22 organization, as well and so we inform a lot of
23 conversations around the country. And I think have a lot
24 of best practices that we can bring into the conversation
25 that we learned from other states. So we actually maintain

1 the Low-Income Solar Policy Guide, which has been a
2 reference guide for low-income programs around the state.
3 And has guiding principles around policies, program
4 development, as well as highlighting successful and non-
5 successful programs that showcase what does and does not
6 work in various regulatory and policy environments.

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

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

21 MS. MATHEWS: Okay, thank you.

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

25 MR. WILLIAMS: Can I raise my hand?

1 MS. MATHEWS: Yes. (Laughter.)

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

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

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

7 MS. MATHEWS: This is better than Florida.

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

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

16 (Off mic colloquy.)

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

21 Jodie Pincus: I will go with Mr. Tyrone Williams
22 (Indiscernible.)

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

25 MR. GRESCHNER: And I'd be honored to serve as

1 the Vice to Tyrone.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

21 MR. WILLIAMS: Okay.

22 COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: That makes sense.
23 The Low-Income Oversight Board is another statutorily-
24 mandated Board. It advises the Public Utilities Commission
25 on energy, electricity, gas and water issues affecting low-

1 income ratepayers. It meets four times a year. There's
2 overlap for sure in the mandate of the LIOB, although their
3 focus is different as well and we meet around the state
4 four times a year. Historically, a lot of the focus has
5 been on the low-income efficiency programs that the
6 Commission administers, but more recently the LIOB has been
7 entering into a broader set of issues, energy and water
8 issues as well.

9 MR. WILLIAMS: Very good.

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

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

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

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

22 MS. MATHEWS: So the Liaison would be responsible
23 for, if not attending at least being appraised of what
24 each, the LIOB as well as the EJAC Committees -- and so the
25 separate liaisons. And where there is an intersection or

1 overlap, or there's an opportunity to coordinate or
2 collaborate as you give recommendations on the clean energy
3 programs you're tasked with reviewing, you would also bring
4 that to the attention, report back to this Advisory Group.

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

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

11 MS. MATHEWS: So am I hearing that there is no
12 conflict, but it does sound like a nomination, self-
13 nomination. (Laughter.) It sounds like you would be very
14 informed and perfectly positioned to be the Liaison to the
15 --

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

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

19 MS. RUCKER-HUGHES: Say it right.

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

22 MS. MATHEWS: Waudier.

23 MR. WILLIAMS: Waudier, okay.

24 MS. RUCKER-HUGHES: Woodie though
25 (indiscernible).

1 MR. WILLIAMS: Well, thanks. Okay.

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

6 MS. MATHEWS: This is for the EJAC.

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

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

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

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

21 We convene the EJAC around the Scoping Plan, so
22 the Board just passed a Scoping Plan or just approved our
23 Scoping Plan in December. So for probably two years, or a
24 little over two years the EJAC had dozens of meetings up
25 and down the state to get public input on the Scoping Plan.

1 Since the Board just approved the Scoping Plan, the EJAC is
2 not disbanded, but it's less active right now.

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

10 MS. MATHEWS: Thank you.

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

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

17 MR. WILLIAMS: Show of hands.

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

20 MR. WILLIAMS: All right.

21 MS. RUCKER-HUGHES: It's Hughes.

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

24 MR. WILLIAMS: Very good.

25 All right, so now we'll go to the Low-Income

1 Advisory Board. Are there any volunteers?

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

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

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

7 MR. RAMIREZ: Andres Ramirez.

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

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

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

17 MS. MATHEWS: Yes.

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

22 MS. MATHEWS: So one thing that I will just add,
23 and I will note that the charter states that the minutes
24 will be distributed out to the Members of the Advisory
25 Group. We do have a recording of today's proceedings and

1 we also have a court reporter, so we have a thorough
2 record. We just want to make sure that we have a summary
3 document that is provided. So that is the responsibility
4 of the recorder.

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

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

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

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

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

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

24 MS. MATHEWS: Yes. This is the first convening,
25 so this meeting needs to be summarized and distributed.

1 MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. All right, yes?

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

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

6 MS. SEATON: I'll do it.

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

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

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

21 On page 5, Article four, 4.1(f), yeah so under
22 the tab of charter you should see the resolution. And then
23 flip a couple of more pages and you'll actually see the
24 charter included. On page 5 of the charter, goes into a
25 detail of the following actions of the Advisory Group,

1 which includes filing an annual report with the Commission,
2 so we just wanted to make sure we highlight that that is a
3 responsibility of the Advisory Group.

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

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

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

23 COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: This is not so much
24 a direction about the priorities that the Board should
25 focus on. That's going to be your chore under the

1 leadership of your Chair, but Commissioner Guzman Aceves
2 and I wanted to give you a heads up about something we are
3 working on that we would greatly benefit from your input
4 on. And it's very timely.

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

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

18 The goal of the strategy would be to articulate
19 what our vision is and give voice to the vision of
20 achieving environmental justice in our policies; also to
21 provide some substantive direction and guidance in our
22 decisions. And importantly, as well, provide
23 accountability and a monitoring function for the many
24 mandates that we have, the many programs that we are in the
25 process of implementing or have already implemented.

1 We want to focus on a few broad areas for sure.
2 One is to reduce pollution in disadvantaged communities and
3 especially reduce sources of natural gas, fossil fuel
4 sources -- both stationery sources from natural gas plants
5 and internal combustion engines, fossil fuel, motor
6 vehicles, heavy-duty freight in particular in disadvantaged
7 communities. So that's one overriding goal.

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

15 Another related goal, and this is a more cost
16 cutting goal is to make our processes more accessible to a
17 broader range of the public to make it easier for
18 disadvantaged communities to participate in our programs,
19 to become parties, to provide us with comments, to have
20 meetings in different places. This is a cost cutting theme
21 I think for the Administration as a whole. I know that
22 there are a number of agencies that have been working on
23 these kinds of outreach efforts in disadvantaged
24 communities, under the Cap and Trade expenditure programs,
25 under the Air Board under various mandates.

1 We don't want to duplicate all of those. We want
2 to build on those and coordinate on those. But at the PUC
3 in particular we decide things differently than most other
4 agencies. We are not, we don't do rulemaking through
5 notice and comment rules. We typically do it through
6 administrative adjudications, which is more formal, more
7 expensive, more difficult for the public to participate.

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

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

23 So those are the general themes. What we
24 envision -- we have an ambitious schedule and maybe too
25 ambitious. But we're always in a hurry to do the right

1 thing. We're hoping to get this publicly vetted and
2 discussed and approved by the full Commission by the end of
3 the year. We'd like to circulate some drafts with this
4 group in the next month or two, after we have had a chance
5 to raise and discuss them through our Commission. Through
6 our own Commission processes we'll have some public
7 meetings through our Commission or Committee structure
8 where we'll talk about this. And we'd like to present it
9 to this group.

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

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

22 COMMISSIONER GUZMAN ACEVES: Thank you.

23 Just to kind of reinforce a couple of process
24 improvements that we're trying to do. In general, we have
25 kind of the more simple programs where we have energy

1 efficiency funding, even some solar funding. And that
2 structure is a little easier to understand. That we kind
3 of go out and we say, "Here's this funding". We're going
4 to partner with certain organizations to get that out. EVs
5 (phonetic) is another one.

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

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

21 And I would say just you know, demand response is
22 kind of another example of that where we're attempting to
23 do, just as an example, disadvantaged community pilots. As
24 we speak, we're developing that and that is an area that is
25 another relation to our dependency on gas cycling. And we

1 don't get a lot of time with all of you on those issues.
2 They're not as sexy as transportation and electrification.
3 So we look forward to working with all of you and certainly
4 now that we have a Chair, Vice Chair, to think through the
5 interest from all of you, but I hope you give us the
6 opportunity to kind of come to you with some of these
7 issues that are ripe. And really give you some of the in-
8 depth.

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

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

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

22 MS. MATHEWS: It was Priorities for 2018.

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

25 MS. MATHEWS: We just highlighted it and --

1 MS. MICKIEWICZ: Oh, and moved on?

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

3 MS. MICKIEWICZ: Fine. I missed that.

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

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

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

23 MS. MICKIEWICZ: And again, you can't communicate
24 to each other. You can only communicate to the CPUC
25 Commissioners or to our staff about that. If you were

1 communicating with each other, outside of the context of a
2 public meeting, that's a violation of Bagley- Keene. I'll
3 discuss that this afternoon.

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

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

22 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Well, I wanted to highlight
23 for you all a couple of the Energy Commission's priorities
24 for 2018, with this group. And thank you for highlighting
25 the PUC's priorities as well.

1 One of the things that we have done at the Energy
2 Commission is we have a Diversity Resolution, which
3 encourages us make sure that the business that the Energy
4 Commission does reflects the way that California looks in
5 terms of diversity, geographic diversity, all kinds of
6 diversity. And so in our hiring practices, in the
7 contracting that we do, in the grant giving that we do,
8 kind of across the board, within the Energy Commission.

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

20 I also wanted to highlight for you that we are
21 looking to do another joint workshop with the Public
22 Utilities Commission, likely also with the Air Resources
23 Board and the Energy Commission, of course, in August on
24 the SB 350 Barriers Report that we put together. And we
25 have been working diligently to try to put in place some

1 solutions to the barriers that we -- so we did the study,
2 the Barriers Study and identified barriers. We put in
3 place 12 recommendations for how to overcome those.

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

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

18 And we're very much looking forward to your
19 feedback on that. This is the first time, I believe, that
20 the Energy Commission has put together this type of
21 indicator. And we're really looking to have good metrics
22 in place to be able to measure our progress against. And
23 that's what the Energy Equity Indicators will be. And so
24 we're very much looking forward for feedback. Did we get
25 the right ones? Are we talking about them in the right

1 way? And so that's something that Pam will speak with you
2 about this afternoon.

3 But these are kind of three priorities that I
4 wanted to just hit at a high level in our Priorities for
5 2018 discussion.

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

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

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

21 And certainly a number of programs start out more
22 as a layer, but we've had active goals to say if we're
23 doing a demonstration, 25 percent have to be in the
24 disadvantaged community. So again, it's really important
25 to convert our policy goals into real action.

1 MR. WILLIAMS: Could you share with us the
2 location of the April 11th meeting next week?

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

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

11 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

12 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: You're welcome.

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

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

21 One of the things that I think that, and I
22 haven't had a chance to poll the rest of the members, but I
23 think the very fact that we signed up and submitted our
24 names to be a part of this group means that we want to be
25 actively involved and actively engaged. And I see this as

1 a tremendous opportunity to ensure that the policies and
2 that the programs that are envisioned and implemented
3 actually benefit the constituencies for which we serve
4 throughout the state.

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

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

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

23 MR. GRESCHNER: Stan Greschner here, just a
24 process question. There's obviously, and we spoke about
25 some specific issues that some of the Commissioners want us

1 to look at. When we're setting our priorities are there
2 restrictions on what can be discussed here? If there's an
3 active proceeding or a PV, or do we -- is there a
4 collective on -- as groups I know individually our
5 organizations might be parties to a proceeding, but I'm
6 just thinking about setting priorities. Like the whole
7 disadvantaged communities, there's several proceedings
8 ongoing that have disadvantaged communities in their name,
9 but they're active proceedings, right? Can we include
10 those in the priorities list or are there restrictions on
11 what we talk about and how we talk about those?

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

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

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

24 MS. MICKIEWICZ: Sure. For the PUC if the
25 proceeding in question is a rulemaking, there are not

1 restrictions on ex parte communications in a rulemaking
2 similar to what you just said. If it's an adjudicatory
3 proceeding that is a complaint case or enforcement matter,
4 which I'm guessing for the most part your constituents are
5 not going to be involved in, but they might. In that kind
6 of proceeding, no ex parte communications are allowed.

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

17 COMMISSIONER GUZMAN ACEVES: I would just add to
18 that to say that when we, moving forward, here we're
19 talking pretty high level about issues. And but when we
20 get to a point when we want to agendize the topic it's very
21 easy to Notice that to our relevant proceeding so that
22 we're checking that box. So that would be the most
23 necessary point is to just coordinate beforehand, so we
24 could publicly notice that. But there should be no
25 limitation to us discussing (indiscernible).

1 COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Right ,and if you
2 have any questions you should consult with the PUC and the
3 CEC's lawyers ahead of time, because they're available to
4 help members of the Advisory Board figure this stuff out.

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

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

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

24 MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. In the charter, on page 5
25 there is a list that says the Advisory Group will undertake

1 the following actions and report to the Commission. So as
2 we talk about our priorities, this may be a good guide for
3 us to kind of have our discussion as we have each one of
4 these priorities listed. And then if there are some that
5 any of the members want to highlight, or to expand on, or
6 to bring clarity or illumination to, we could use this list
7 to begin the conversation. And then if there's something
8 other than what's listed here, we have an opportunity for
9 that as well.

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

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

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

1 of information.

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

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

12 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Certainly, we can do
13 that.

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

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

1 the middle of the -- not in a crisis period.

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

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

10 MS. RUCKER-HUGHES: Can I?

11 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes?

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

21 And then the idea that in the local weeklies,
22 newspapers and what have you that they get in the church, I
23 don't see the information as I think it should be. Because
24 this is too important, every bit of this, that everyone
25 should not have a vested interest. And in order for them

1 to have a vested interest you've got to go where they are.
2 Just my thought.

3 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, Stephanie?

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

15 I think one of the things that this group needs
16 to be particularly aware of, which we probably all are in
17 our daily lives and need to bring into our policy context
18 as well, is the particular challenge for renters around the
19 potential for displacement. I think a lot of us really
20 want to go big on energy measures, energy efficiency and
21 clean energy measures in rental homes, because of the
22 incredible potential for savings there. But with the
23 housing market being what it is, really all across
24 California we have to think very carefully about how to
25 thread the needle in a way that we can get clean energy

1 solutions to the populations who we really want to reach.
2 And make sure that those folks aren't then turned out of
3 their apartments by their landlords where the landlord
4 goes, "Ooh, I have this brand-new energy efficient
5 apartment, I can get more rent for this."

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

20 MS. PINCUS: So with this group, I'd like us to
21 think about how we can -- and maybe this is going to go
22 into the Equity Indicators conversation, but what kind of
23 equity think policies or principles do we want to see
24 across the board? So that we're not just focusing on one
25 sector, but we're focusing on concepts like equity

1 concepts, workforce concepts, jobs standards concepts,
2 things that are all connected to that. So that would be a
3 priority that I think we should think about.

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

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

23 And I would love clarification on the Clean
24 Energy for Goods Program. I actually don't know what that
25 is.

1 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: So goods movement, at
2 this stage a lot of goods come into particularly Los
3 Angeles, through either Long Beach or the L.A. Harbor. And
4 they move through there to every county in the U.S. That's
5 like 20 or 30 percent of the economy in Los Angeles is
6 goods movement.

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

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

1 pollution and just deal with what's really tangible health
2 impacts in those areas.

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

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

22 There's also a clean freight strategy that
23 involves Caltrans and the Air Board and other state
24 agencies. It fits within your cross cutting approach to
25 things. It's a big problem that we're dealing with across

1 the board, but the energy agencies have a piece of it for
2 sure.

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

17 And I would I think for all of the Commissioners,
18 just we'd like to at least put out there that every
19 conversation that happens around those more detailed in
20 depth -- because that's where a lot of like community
21 organizations aren't participating, can't participate. I
22 mean, it's technical. It's in the weeds. That there's a
23 charge from all of you to your staff or whoever, that
24 disadvantaged community is need to be part of the front-end
25 conversation in how do we, you know, when you look at grid

1 services and pricing how do you make sure that you have the
2 right signals for low-income families and disadvantaged
3 communities? They're going to be different, you know, than
4 for the general market. We've seen that in every single
5 program that's been successful or not successful that's
6 trying to reach disadvantaged communities, the general
7 market responds differently than disadvantaged communities
8 and low income. And that's got to be taken into
9 consideration in whatever program is being offered.

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

19 But when we're talking about community resiliency
20 and upward economic events or in communities or energy
21 burden being reduced, those are real values to communities.
22 There's also values of distributed resources, you know,
23 they're inherent. And are in these programs that aren't
24 adequately I think valued. So I think those are huge
25 conversations that are happening, but I would just charge

1 that we look at those especially for low-income and
2 disadvantaged community conversations.

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

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

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

22 So just a couple of more thoughts, I'd mentioned
23 RA. We talked DR. There's also the energy resource
24 planning, which has a lot of scenario planning that goes
25 into it that we receive the benefit of briefings on. That

1 maybe that's another area for you to consider a briefing
2 on. And just thinking, being conscious of, I have ideas in
3 my head, you have ideas in your head, some of which you may
4 not even know.

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

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

18 MR. MARTINEZ: Hi. So I'm really concerned about
19 greenhouse gases and that's an important issue for me. But
20 my main core of my work is around air quality and
21 particularly air quality in the South Coast Air Basin,
22 which is Los Angeles, the Inland Valley, Orange County.
23 I'm a transplant to California. I moved here in 2004, but
24 I've been working on air quality since then. I feel like
25 I've slowly embraced California in most ways. I'm now a

1 Dodgers fan, so that indicates, you know, my California
2 nature. (Laughter.)

3 But one thing I don't embrace is you talk to
4 people who live in Los Angeles or even people throughout
5 the state about air quality. And it's an initial reaction
6 that I think is a dangerous one for all of the people in
7 power and decision makers, it's that it was so bad in the
8 '60s and '70s; isn't it so much better now? And that's
9 true. The air is cleaner than it was in the '70s and '80s.

10 And I think we have to break free from this
11 notion that just making it cleaner than what the '70s and
12 '80s was is acceptable. People are getting sick and dying
13 from breathing in several parts of the state. So the air
14 quality issues, I think, are really an important issue.
15 And I think just to state simply, we need our energy
16 agencies to be operating on full cylinders with our
17 coordinating with the air agencies, because it's the
18 perfect confluence of where we need all of our agencies to
19 work together.

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

1 We have a lot of stationary polluters in the South Coast
2 Air Basin.

3 We're in the midst of shifting from a trading
4 program for our NOx, which is the byproduct of combustion,
5 from a NOx reclaim program, which is trading to a command
6 and control. And the recent estimates is that more than
7 1,000 pieces of equipment throughout the region are going
8 to be needing to be replaced. And that provides an immense
9 opportunity.

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

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

25 I'd like to also kind of identify what are the

1 big challenges? You know, we see it with large
2 infrastructure projects. How do we get a truly zero
3 emissions corridors to move our freight? How do we get
4 zero emission ports?

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

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

21 You know, I think that's something, I hope that
22 we can kind of tackle. How do we get these zero emissions
23 not only in Beverly Hills and Pacific Palisades, but
24 throughout the places in the South Coast and other parts of
25 the state that would benefit just as much as anyone else.

1 But I'm excited and appreciative of everyone participating
2 and I look forward to kind of really unpacking the air
3 quality components and how we can get the energy agencies
4 to really dial in on making air better in disadvantaged
5 communities.

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

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

21 And, you know, when we were working on this
22 initially we kind of pointed at the refineries as the ones
23 who weren't installing controls. But when we kind of
24 looked under the hood of this program, it was a lot of
25 facilities who don't have the cleanest technology, and a

1 lot of these kind of smaller and medium-sized industrial
2 facilities. And I think it's a huge opportunity to kind of
3 figure it out.

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

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

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

21 As with all of the programs that are currently
22 underway, I think that it would be really helpful at least
23 for me to understand what they are, first and foremost.
24 Because it sounds like we're aware in our individual areas
25 of unique programs, but it sounds like there are a plethora

1 of programs currently available and accessible. And I would
2 consider that the low hanging fruit to see what can we do
3 to expand the impact and the outreach and the participation
4 in programs that are currently now available, but many of
5 the residents may not be aware of them.

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

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

22 So all of these are -- boy, we've got an
23 opportunity to make an impact through our work and through
24 our service here. But I just want to open back up all the
25 -- just from our discussions or something that may not have

1 been mentioned. If we could identify some top priorities,
2 knowing that there are many others that we will have
3 individual and collective conversations about.

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

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

23 So with an investment in, for example, electric
24 public transit and electric school buses, not only are you
25 helping to clean up sources of mobile pollution, but you're

1 also potentially helping the grid if you're charging those
2 things at the right time. And with transit it's real easy
3 to schedule that bus for when the grid needs it. And the
4 other win that you can achieve there is of course better
5 mobility and more sustainable mobility for folks.

6 So as we're thinking about some of the challenges
7 that come up, I also want to think about how can we pack as
8 many wins into the problem that we're solving as we can.

9 And so I bring up the example about electrified public
10 transit, because it really does hit on a lot of those
11 different wins, many of which are tied to the grid and tied
12 to air quality, but also many of which go beyond that. And
13 I think that this group is very well positioned to be
14 thinking about how to really maximize all of the different
15 kinds of community benefits that come with clean energy
16 investment.

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

24 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: You know, and these are
25 things that the Energy Commission is very much thinking

1 about. And I'm sure our colleagues at the PUC are as well.
2 And we do have some money that we can put towards cleaner
3 school buses and we actually are very much thinking about
4 how you package that with potentially with the ancillary
5 services that could come along with that. We have to
6 probably find a school district that's really excited about
7 that to make sure that it just needs to be simple and
8 seamless and not complicated, but to put those things
9 together in just that way. So that's something I think
10 that we're very much thinking about.

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

23 And so we're really excited about ideas like that
24 and would love more thoughts and ideas about how we can
25 spend those dollars that we have in this space in that way,

1 so I really appreciate you bringing that up.

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

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

25 MS. CHARLES: I just wanted to -- Stephanie, hi.

1 It's Melicia Charles at CPUC. I did also want to speak to
2 your comment about transit and fleets. It's something you
3 may be actually familiar with this already, but the CPUC
4 did approve over \$40 million in transportation
5 electrification pilot projects.

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

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

20 On the access side, so one of the things that --
21 and a huge shout-out to CEC in the barriers and the
22 outreach through barriers, we continue to highlight that
23 process as like a really strong process for getting
24 community outreach with working in partnership with
25 community-based organizations to cohost the meetings and

1 what not. I thought that was a great process and should be
2 replicated kind of back to the geography.

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

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

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

21 MR. GRESCHNER: Just to address what you're
22 asking for the like setting priorities for this group. I
23 think Cliff and Martha laid out a nice framing for some of
24 these conversations to happen, if they're undertaking their
25 EJ (indiscernible) strategy and roadmap that includes

1 transportation, natural gas, renewables. I mean, it seems
2 like a great thing for us as a priority, so I would just
3 say yes, we should do that. And there's probably the
4 framework for a lot of this conversation to happen to
5 potentially.

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

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

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

25 So something you could think about too, but

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

7 MR. WILLIAMS: Very good.

8 Well, yes?

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

20 It's a pretty packed agenda, but if in the event
21 that we were ahead of schedule and time did permit, you
22 could if you wanted leave discussion of this item open and
23 allow for the possibility of it being revisited in light of
24 that discussion, if you thought that made sense. But of
25 course I don't know if time will actually work out to make

1 that easy to do.

2 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you for that point and I
3 will take your comments and suggestions as something that I
4 would like to do. So with the approval of the group, we
5 will pause on the discussion around priorities. And time
6 permitting continue to pick it up later on this afternoon,
7 after we've had a chance to hear more about the programs.

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

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

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

23 COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Right. No I assume
24 people would -- we would just get started if there's people
25 who are here.

1 MR. WILLIAMS: We currently have --

2 COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: And we apologize.
3 We will avoid the scheduling so that we'll be here for
4 public comment in the future.

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

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

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

18 MR. POWELL: I can leave a way.

19 MR. WILLIAMS: Okay, very good. Thank you.
20 Are there any others?

21 MS. MIRVISS: Hi. My name is Lillian Mirviss.
22 I'm here on behalf of OhmConnect. We're a residential
23 demand response software platform. And we actually have a
24 really high success rate in the disadvantaged communities.
25 To give you a really quick overview on what we

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

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

23 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

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

25 MS. MATHEWS: So very quickly, if you notice on

1 the screen, I have up the Web page for the California
2 Energy Commission's Disadvantaged Advisory Group. And I
3 wanted to draw your attention to that page, because that's
4 where we'll have all of the information docketed. So all
5 of the presentations today, the agenda, of course all the
6 other documents related to the Advisory Group is going to
7 be presented there. And there is also a link, which links
8 to the CPUC. They also have a Disadvantaged Advisory Group
9 page and so we try to duplicate, but we do have an official
10 docketed system, which allows you to make comments. And
11 we'll have updates. So I just wanted to draw that to your
12 attention.

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

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

23 MS. MATHEWS: And you're welcome to leave your
24 things here, while we take the pictures. We'll be here in
25 the room.

1 (Off the Record at 11:56 a.m.)

2 (On the record at 1:07 p.m.)

3 MR. WILLIAMS: Very good. Well, we're going to
4 continue with our session. And at this point, we're going
5 to open up for public comment and I have two public comment
6 cards, but if you -- or at least I thought I did.

7 (Off mic colloquy.)

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

13 MS. NOVOTNY: I'm here, yes.

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

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

19 So the comment is primarily with the federal
20 monies that has a lot of restrictions on it and what we can
21 use it for, excuse me. And if there's any way possible to
22 have some set aside for some minor home repairs or home
23 repairs, so that more energy efficient measures can be
24 done? I know that GRID understands this, because we
25 (indecipherable) some things like that, so that we could

1 actually get some of the bigger ticket items that would
2 save more GHGs. So thank you.

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

5 Next, Veronica Eady?

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

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

22 So I just wanted to thank you all for your time
23 and really put out a plug that we embrace that role. That
24 we really think of the ideas that are coming from our
25 communities, the solutions that are coming from our

1 communities and really pushing those forward as we move
2 along.

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

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

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

20 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

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

25 Alana Mathews asked both Yana and I to say a few

1 words, hence our comment cards. I think AB 617 came up a
2 couple of times this morning. I remember Adrian mentioned
3 it. And so I thought I'd say a few words about what that
4 is and where we can see specifically some synergies. AB
5 617 is a law that was passed last summer and signed by
6 Governor Brown in August. And it is an air pollution law
7 that requires neighborhood-scale emission reductions from
8 air pollutants and air toxics, as well as in communities
9 where there are data gaps, community air monitoring. It's
10 a very ambitious program. The law required us, as an
11 agency, to make a number of moves before October 1st of
12 this year.

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

1 rest of the country.

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

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

22 The other thing that I wanted to mention though
23 is that we developed an advisory body called the AB 617
24 Consultation Group. And that group is comprised of a
25 variety of stakeholders that include people working in

1 community-based organizations and environmental justice
2 groups, public health people, local government, as well as
3 the air districts and some representatives from industry.

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

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

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

24 (Off mic colloquy.)

25 MS. MICKIEWICZ: Okay. We got that out of the

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

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

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

1 acknowledge that.

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

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

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

24 So the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act applies to
25 any state body. And that includes a state body -- the Act

1 defines state bodies of groups as all mandated state
2 boards, commissions and similar multi-member groups as well
3 as committees of these groups that have been delegated
4 authority to make decisions and advisory committees of two
5 or more members.

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

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

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

1 end.

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

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

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

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

22 MS. MICKIEWICZ: Seven, six right, yes.

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

24 MS. MICKIEWICZ: Right. Yeah, so you've got to
25 have six people here for a meeting to take place. That's

1 really the point of this. And again, the members have to
2 be physically or virtually present. And the gathering is
3 to discuss a topic related to the group's jurisdiction.

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

21 And I'll tell you the story. The story was this.
22 The Police Chief of Fremont, I think it was, wanted the
23 City Council to take action. And so he went from one City
24 Council Member's office to another and presented his
25 proposal. And each one of them in turn said, "Sure great,

1 no problem." And then the City Council got together and
2 met and the item came up on the agenda. And without any
3 discussion the City Council Members voted it out.

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

15 Now, how can you all do business together,
16 outside of a meeting? You can do that by setting up
17 subcommittees. And if there are five or fewer people then
18 you all can get together and talk, as long as it's less
19 than a majority. You could have different subcommittees as
20 long as they're not talking to each other. Because you
21 have to avoid a majority of members communicating outside
22 of the public eye about a topic on which this body is going
23 to act or that might even come before the body and you
24 might not act. I mean the law says, "Within a topic
25 related to the jurisdiction of the group."

1 So we are, Galen and I, are happy to provide you
2 with advice on this, as it may come up. And again, you can
3 set up a subcommittee and the subcommittee can meet and
4 communicate by email or by telephone and that's fine. And
5 then you can present a subcommittee's recommendations to
6 the full body and they can discuss it in public and then
7 take a vote. But you can't be sending around emails to the
8 whole body, offline. I mean, outside of the public eye.
9 And I'm happy to entertain any questions about that.

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

19 MS. PINCUS: Can I just clarify something?

20 MS. MICKIEWICZ: Yes, please?

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

23 MS. MICKIEWICZ: You can't discuss business.

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

25 MS. MICKIEWICZ: Oh, yes. Yes. You can go out

1 to lunch and you can talk about your latest travels and the
2 weather and who's going to get elected Governor next year,
3 but you can't talk about the business of the committee, as
4 a group.

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

8 MS. MICKIEWICZ: Thanks, Galen.
9 Phoebe?

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

17 MR. LEMEI: Can you explain what 617 is?

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

20 (Off mic colloquy.)

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

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

1 our of work.

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

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

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

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

1 Galen?

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

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

21 The 617 call, I'm not super familiar with how
22 that works. It doesn't sound like that's a formal noticed
23 meeting. And actually that could present a problem in
24 terms of if six of you are on that call and that ends up
25 being a vehicle for a serial discussion amongst yourselves,

1 of these issues. That doesn't mean that topics can't come
2 up. That doesn't mean you can't participate. But you do
3 need to be cognizant and mindful, that that not become a
4 vehicle for six of you to effectively meet about something
5 that is within the scope of your jurisdiction here, or of
6 your -- I'll avoid the use of jurisdiction, buy you know
7 the code uses it within the scope of your responsibilities
8 and activities.

9
10 MS. MICKIEWICZ: Yeah, right. And so the trick
11 is that if you find yourselves in a position where you are
12 talking about something that really is a subject that this
13 body should be discussing you stop and say "let's defer
14 that," because if you continue you're privately discussing
15 the state's business and that's what the act is about,
16 correct. That's what the act is intended to prevent.
17 Okay.

18 So let's move on to Open Meeting requirements.
19 So the body must provide a meeting notice and an agenda,
20 which is why I mentioned earlier after Commissioner
21 Rechtschaffen presented the priority that he and
22 Commissioner Guzman Aceves have for the PUC this year, and
23 the need for your input, I said well you can't really
24 respond to that. And what I meant was that you couldn't
25 respond to the substance of what he was saying. And

1 clearly, it was fine for you all to talk about that as a
2 priority and you did. But the reason that you couldn't
3 discuss the substance of what he was saying is that it
4 wasn't on the agenda as an item. So any item you're going
5 to discuss and potentially on which you would take action
6 needs to be on the agenda.

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

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

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

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

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

25 MS. SCHMIDT: My name is Yulia Schmidt. I'm an

1 advisor for Commissioner Rechtschaffen. Actually I have
2 two questions.

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

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

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

24 Now, those are formal items that become in
25 essence law. And the materials that you're all -- I mean,

1 the items that you're all going to be discussing and acting
2 on don't have that weight of law. But they -- so the
3 extent to which they need to be described is there's
4 probably more flexibility in how you describe these items.
5 I can provide some of you with agendas we have for some of
6 the other advisory committees showing you how items are
7 described.

8 MS. SCHMIDT: I think that might be helpful.

9 MS. MICKIEWICZ: Stan?

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

17 MS. MICKIEWICZ: Good question.

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

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

1 Galen?

2 MR. LEMEI: If I could just elaborate, briefly,
3 and share my philosophy, particularly in response to your
4 question. The answer to your question is that it shall
5 include, "a brief general description of an item generally
6 need not exceed 20 words. A description of the item in
7 terms of action in closed session is separate." Okay, so
8 20 words is your target.

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

19 Now the writers of the Act made it very clear
20 that it applies to a body like this, but they didn't
21 provide a lot of clarity on what that means given the high
22 level and topical nature of the discussions that are likely
23 to take place here. And that sort of leaves it to us to do
24 our best to make sure that we are providing the public with
25 notice of what's being discussed.

1 With respect to the question that specifically
2 came up earlier this morning, I think that Helen just sort
3 of chimed in and gave us all a reminder that we hadn't --
4 an in-depth discussion of the priorities as set forth vis a
5 vis that particular document, wasn't something that we
6 really gave the stakeholders information that we were going
7 to be putting on the table. And therefore, we should maybe
8 refrain from making that specific thing the topic of
9 prolonged discussion. That said we all understand and
10 acknowledge that insofar as that has formed a broader
11 discussion of priorities that was fine.

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

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

25 MS. MICKIEWICZ: I echo everything Galen said.

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

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

14 MS. SCHMIDT: May I ask one more question.
15 Sorry.

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

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

24 So just as an example, let's say there is a great
25 environmental justice awards banquet. And every one of

1 these organizations is being recognized, so every one of
2 these board members is there. And each goes up and makes a
3 speech about the work they've done. It's all pretty
4 specific. It's all sort of within the body of work that
5 this body does. But as I understand that's not the type of
6 communication that would be prohibited.

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

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

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

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

24 MR. LEMEI: So in the meetings defined exceptions
25 -- quick question. Does anybody on this body happen to be

1 the misfortune of being an attorney?

2 MS. SEATON: (Indiscernible)

3 MS. MICKIEWICZ: Oh, Phoebe.

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

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

1 participating. They were comments --

2 MR. RAMIREZ: Informational.

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

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

13 MS. MICKIEWICZ: We can cure it.

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

16 MS. MICKIEWICZ: Right.

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

21 MS. MICKIEWICZ: Okay, so I'm going to finish my
22 bullets here on this page. I think I mentioned or maybe I
23 didn't get to this one. "Written materials must be made
24 available to the public for inspection." And that is any
25 documents, electronic or hard copy that is discussed at a

1 meeting at a meeting or even referenced at a meeting, needs
2 to be made available. That is why all of the materials in
3 your binder were posted on the Internet. And so that's
4 part of the requirements.

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

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

20 So anyway I don't necessarily know that you plan
21 to do that or would do that. I would think you probably
22 wouldn't. As long as the sub-bodies are not exercising
23 decision making or formally advisory bodies to you, then
24 you're fine. And it's very common for groups like this to
25 create sub-groups.

1 MS. MICKIEWICZ: Yeah. And in my experience what
2 the sub-groups do is they explore an issue in some depth,
3 and bring back to the full committee or group a
4 recommendation, which this full group can then discuss and
5 take action. That's really the point of subcommittees is
6 that -- or it might even be that the committee has decided
7 it wants to submit a letter to the Energy Commission and
8 the PUC with a recommendation. And you delegate to two or
9 three people the task of drafting that. And they can do
10 that, but then again, they have to bring that back to the
11 full body.

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

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

1 get assembled in open discussion.

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

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

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

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

1 to discuss legislation.

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

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

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

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

19 MS. MICKIEWICZ: Right.

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

24 MS. MICKIEWICZ: Right. And then there are
25 emergency meetings, which I'm not going to talk about. You

1 can read it. But I just cannot envision a situation in
2 which this body would be required to have an emergency
3 meeting. However, the Energy Commission might be and the
4 California PUC certainly has had to hold emergency
5 meetings. So this provision is here just so you're aware
6 of it, but it doesn't really apply to this body.

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

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

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

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

1 disruption.

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

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

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

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

24 There's also some reference discussion in the
25 Simple Guide to Bagley-Keene to closed sessions. That

1 again doesn't really doesn't apply here. Those are the
2 kinds of things we take up in closed sessions at the
3 California PUC are potential litigation or existing
4 litigation, personnel matters, those kinds of things, which
5 really don't apply here, but their sections are included in
6 the handbook.

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

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

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

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

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

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

17 MS. MICKIEWICZ: It's all right.

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

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

25 MR. LEMEI: So I'll hold that thought there until

1 you're done.

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

6 MR. LEMEI: In the dark ages.

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

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

24 And if there is a vote taken on a matter, while
25 someone is on the phone or Tandberg, the vote has to be by

1 roll call. It can't be just a show of hands since no one
2 can see your hand if you're on the phone. I'm trying to
3 think if there's something else I'm missing; is there
4 something else? I think that's generally it.

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

7 MS. MICKIEWICZ: Oh, yes we do.

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

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

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

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

25 Literally, our Commissioners do this. They will

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

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

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

23 MR. WILLIAMS: I've got a clarification.

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

25 MR. WILLIAMS: So today, clearly there are a lot

1 of issues and information that the Advisory Group will have
2 to dive into.

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

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

22 MS. MICKIEWICZ: So I'm going to go first. Galen
23 is gesturing at me. This is what I would say. And Galen
24 might disagree with me, but I would say let's go back to
25 that topic of Administrative Process that we had in the

1 morning, that kind of we blew past and revisit that topic.
2 And under that heading say let's discuss setting up
3 subcommittees and what would be the broad topics of those
4 subcommittees, without getting into any detail of
5 substance. I think that would be okay.

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

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

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

22 And again, if all you're doing is agreeing this
23 is an important topic. And by the way, between now and the
24 next meeting these individuals that are less than a quorum,
25 are going endeavor to have some internal dialogue for

1 discussion at the next meeting. I see that as a pretty
2 practical way forward to allow us to move forward with the
3 business that you want to conduct during your precious time
4 here at this first meeting.

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

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

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

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

23 MR. WILLIAMS: Well, thank you.

24 MS. MICKIEWICZ: (Indiscernible)

25 MR. LEMEI: Oh, sure. I can do it now or just

1 make sure, I was hoping to make sure that I talked with
2 each of you before the day was over, but anyway, so.

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

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

20 So, again very high level, broadly the Energy
21 Commission, for those that aren't super familiar we have a
22 number of key roles across the state, starting with
23 developing efficiency standards for buildings and
24 appliances. We have some incentive programs and some
25 policy regulations for renewable energy through the

1 Renewable Portfolio Standard Program, as well as on the
2 transportation side for electric vehicles and alternative
3 fuels.

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

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

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

15 A lot of kind of what I talked about, and this is
16 sort of just the vision of a lot of what the elements of
17 350 are doing, but it's really moving from this historical
18 grid where we've had sort of a centralize polluting power
19 plants that go with the one-way power flow through these
20 big transmission lines covering a broad swath of the
21 landscape. And then out through the distribution system to
22 individual homes and businesses and industry, where they're
23 consumed.

24 And so it's kind of this one-way power flow;
25 again kind of a little more fixed and stagnant versus what

1 we're moving towards. And this is already becoming a
2 reality in front of our eyes, which is really more of a
3 smart grid kind of a system, where you have a lot more
4 rooftop solar or distributed renewable energy, or things
5 like smart meters that are collecting data. And it's very
6 much more an interactive kind of two-way multi-faceted
7 grid.

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

17 Just giving again a high-level overview of 350, I
18 think you heard this described by Alice Glasner this
19 morning at a high level, but the major goals that most
20 folks are probably familiar with already are requiring a 50
21 percent renewable energy for the state's utilities by 2030.
22 Also, looking at a doubling of energy efficiency savings by
23 2030, encouraging widespread transportation electrification
24 across the state, which is going to increase sort of the
25 load on the electricity side where it's going to reduce the

1 emissions overall and the pollution.

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

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

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

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

1 other state agencies.

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

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

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

25 I included a link here at the bottom that has

1 some more information on tracking progress, a more detailed
2 breakdown of how the portfolio mix looks like and a number
3 of factors.

4 Is there a question here? Yeah?

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

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

8 MR. GRESCHNER: Thank you.

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

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

21 So the next big key sweeping goal is to double
22 the end use energy efficiency savings for California and
23 this includes both consumption on the electricity side, and
24 also on the natural gas side. So what you see here is this
25 is the specific requirement from the language from SB 350.

1 It turns out a good maybe 40 percent or even half of the
2 bill language itself is focused on this particular goal.
3 So I just pulled out the key excerpt here, but the
4 requirement was also for the Energy Commission to
5 collaborate with PUC to develop specific targets for
6 achieving that double --

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

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

12 MR. GRESCHNER: I do have another question.

13 MR. SOKOL: Yes?

14 MR. GRESCHNER: I don't know if it's a comment or
15 question, how this is measured, how savings are measured.
16 And when we're talking about disadvantaged communities, and
17 I've heard this argument, I don't if so much California as
18 in other parts of the country for sure, is when we're
19 making investments in low-income communities and around
20 energy efficiency and solar, there's also an opportunity to
21 like increase a person and family's quality of life,
22 because now they can actually afford to run the air
23 conditioner in the Central Valley when they couldn't
24 before. So they may have an increased load occasionally,
25 but with that renewable, that clean energy can help to make

1 it possible. So I don't want -- do I think we should
2 account for some of those things. I don't know how you're
3 measuring. But that with all the other things that are
4 happening with these programs.

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

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

24 I'm not sure we have a full scale up there yet,
25 but that maybe an area that folks are interested in

1 weighing in on, at some point.

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

6 MR. SOKOL: Yeah.

7 A question?

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

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

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

24 MR. SOKOL: That's also a great question. I
25 think generally they fall underneath the CPUC's

1 jurisdiction and so generally under that wedge, so to
2 speak. But that's again, given that there's such an
3 evolution in the landscape that's something that's going to
4 continue to be a priority and part of the conversation as
5 we move forward.

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

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

20 And a lot of that is done under our Integrated
21 Resource Planning Proceeding, but there's a whole range of
22 incentives and different mechanisms in which we engage with
23 the POUs to really support them in developing that
24 infrastructure across the state. And again, I included
25 just a link here with a ton more information on our

1 website. You can reach out to me if there's more specific
2 questions.

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

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

1 early priority for disadvantaged communities.

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

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

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

20 This was required by SB 350 where the Energy
21 Commission was tasked with looking at the barriers for
22 solar, for energy efficiency and weatherization, and also
23 for local small business contracting opportunities for low-
24 income customers including those in disadvantaged
25 communities. So we did put out and adopt this report in

1 December. There's also a sort of in-parallel a requirement
2 that the Air Resource Board is working on low-income
3 transportation options. And so that's part B of the
4 Barrier Study, which is also available on their website.

5 And working with both of those in conjunction,
6 we've actually been working closely and coordinating on how
7 to move forward with a number of the recommendations that
8 were laid out in both of those studies. So just to give
9 you a quick flavor to the Energy Commission there were 12
10 key recommendations that were noted in there, including
11 working collaboratively in kind of a taskforce with the
12 other agencies to coordinate eligibility and program
13 funding etcetera; a key priority for addressing issues in
14 multifamily buildings, which is of course a key issue on
15 the low-income landscape; and also thinking more about
16 renters rather than just the homeowners for like rooftop
17 solar and things like that. Speaking of that there's also
18 a broad mandate to look more closely at some of the low-
19 income solar offerings and ways to increase funding and be
20 more inclusive on some of those with community solar type
21 of offerings; looking at a statewide clean energy workforce
22 development strategy in coordination with the PUC and with
23 a number of other agencies as well. Thinking how to expand
24 access to clean energy technologies for low-income
25 customers, through new types of financing mechanisms and

1 pilots to make sure those are going to be feasible.

2 And then the last kind of key priority that was
3 laid out was better leveraging data to establish a baseline
4 and then track performance over time to make sure to see
5 how state programs are performing in low-income and
6 disadvantaged communities. And again, you'll hear a
7 better, more detailed presentation on that effort in just a
8 moment.

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

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

25 MR. WILLIAMS: I've got a question related to

1 that. I know that just a couple of weeks ago there was the
2 deadline for public comment. And I'd just like to know,
3 how are those comments related to the barriers being
4 incorporated or reviewed or considered?

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

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

22 So just moving through again, one of the
23 requirements of 350, as you all well know, is establishing
24 this Advisory Group. So just the mere fact of getting this
25 up and running I think is a great venue to continue to have

1 a lot of these conversations and make sure we're on the
2 right track.

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

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

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

23 There's also a requirement that the Energy
24 Commission looks at, basically a responsible contractor
25 policy with some consumer protection guidelines. And so

1 that relates to one of the barriers sub-recommendations
2 initial work in our Efficiency Division related to that.

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

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

18 The last thing I just wanted to cover very
19 quickly. And this is not something that's specific to
20 Senate Bill 350, but it is really important for those to be
21 aware of is our EPIC Program, the Electric Program
22 Investment Charge. The CPUC actually oversees that
23 program. The Energy Commission administers a big portion
24 of the funding for that program. But there's a wide range
25 of funding opportunities associated with that, many of

1 which have specific benefits for low-income customers and
2 disadvantaged communities, but ranging from applied
3 research to sort of coming up with better techniques,
4 approaches, technologies, to demonstrating those
5 technologies at a scale that's going evaluate the economics
6 around things, and then also looking at some of the
7 nontechnology barriers that can be addressed through market
8 facilitation and energy deployment-type of projects.

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

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

21 And so starting with April 20th there's a
22 regional workshop up on the North Coast in Arcata that's
23 focused a little more on kind of the offshore wind
24 discussion, but will also include some discussion on tribal
25 energy needs essentially. And sort of a disadvantaged

1 community efforts that are relevant for the region up
2 there.

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

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

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

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

23 And then on August 29th, there's a big joint
24 agency workshop that's being planned here in Sacramento
25 that really highlights a lot of the equity achievements

1 from the SB 350 interagency work that's going on. And so
2 that's directly related to the Barrier Study work that I
3 described in detail earlier today. But there's so many
4 things to talk about there that that should be a very
5 relevant workshop.

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

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

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

21 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Michael.

22 We have a question, Angela?

23 MS. ISLAS: Hi. So I wanted to get maybe like a
24 little bit of an elaboration on the Barrier Study, so
25 looking at the two counties that I represent obviously is

1 Fresno County and Madera County, and Madera County
2 especially is very unique, because it's full of urban
3 cities and the rest are all unincorporated communities. So
4 these are communities that are living out near a lot of
5 industry. And there's a lot of representation in those
6 areas specifically, that struggle really to kind of have
7 more accessibility to energy efficiency programs and having
8 those kind of established in their homes. So I wanted to
9 ask in regards to the city I'm not sure that was there a
10 consideration of like a nomination of which community you
11 would be focusing on, on this study? Like one in
12 particular area is more disadvantaged than another or how
13 is that process going to work? I'm just curious about
14 that.

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

1 of those barriers?

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

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

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

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

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

24 MR. WILLIAMS: Well right now we'll go to the
25 introduction of the California Public Utilities Commission

1 Clean Energy Program.

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

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

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

22 I think a lot of the next steps that we're seeing
23 are through this interagency work. And then specifically
24 thinking, so there's kind some best practices through the
25 Barrier Study and a lot of related efforts that as we move

1 forward with the development of new programs, should be
2 imbedded from the get go. And that's kind of the way that
3 we see the conversation evolving as of right now.

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

8 MR. GRESCHNER: All right. Thank you.

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

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

22 One of the things that we are, I think finding as
23 we analyze the impacts of contracts on that community, is
24 that CalEnviroScreen doesn't include census tracts that are
25 zoned industrial, because it's geared towards residential.

1 You know, so much of the component is residential, so
2 sometimes when you're looking at a project you kind of
3 aren't able to do the analysis on the DAC impact.

4 (phonetic) I mean it kind of is a little bit of what you
5 were talking about. And I don't know if there's kind of
6 agreement that that may be a barrier to doing a robust
7 analysis of these facilities.

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

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

24 And so I just wanted to point that out that, you
25 know, there are all these communities that are out

1 surrounded by industry that may not even be within the
2 census tract and they're not being tracked, so.

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

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

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

18 Like are they communities that are overburdened
19 with industry that are in city limits? Or is there like
20 should we consider communities that aren't even in the
21 census tract, but they're living outside of the sphere of
22 influence near a city and have to do like certain --
23 therefore certain obstacles where they have to try to get
24 the necessary resources that they need in the community?
25 So that's kind of why there are (indiscernible) from the

1 work that I'm doing that's been a confliction for me to
2 understand.

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

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

13 MS. ISLAS: Okay.

14 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

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

21 I mean we are discussing definitions at the CPUC
22 in a number of a different proceedings. I just have a
23 little bit of a concern that the statute lays out that
24 CalEnviroScreen defines disadvantaged communities certain
25 ways, for this body. That's my sense of it.

1 MR. GRESCHNER: Well, I just want to point out
2 that -- he's not here today, but we have a representative
3 from the tribes and we have Yana here who's represent the
4 tribes. And we work with 30 plus tribes throughout the
5 state. Extremely economically disadvantaged communities,
6 disadvantaged in any way you can define the term except for
7 EnviroScreen likely, and they don't qualify for any of
8 these programs. So we're going to have a representative
9 here talking about solutions to their communities. And
10 right now several communities -- I don't know one that
11 qualifies in EnviroScreen, so I think we need to talk about
12 how, which communities (indiscernible) we're finding
13 solutions for.

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

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

24 But I think it would be good for discussion in
25 the future, that you as a group spend time talking about

1 your definitions and your terminology that you agree upon.
2 And you know it's also as staff we can offer more training
3 on different topics if there are things you would like us
4 to prepare and put on your agenda.

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

12 However, when it comes to the scope of your work,
13 and what's properly within your purview to consider, in my
14 legal opinion you are not constrained. If your advice is -
15 - questions the full accuracy or desirability or have
16 recommendations that pertain to how that statutory
17 definition or the thing that's established pursuant to
18 statute, you should understand that your recommendation
19 might ultimately require legislation to be effectuated.
20 And that the Commissions that you are advising are
21 constrained to use the tools established by the
22 Legislature. But that doesn't constrain you from analyzing
23 those legislatively-designated tools and making
24 recommendations about those, as you see fit as a body.

25 Does that clarify?

1 MS. CHARLES: Okay. I feel like I'm interrupting
2 a very good conversation. Just to reintroduce myself, I am
3 Melicia Charles, for those of you who don't know me. I go
4 by Mel, so feel free to call me Mel. I am the Supervisor
5 that oversees the activities and Energy Division at the
6 CPUC related to this Advisory Group. So I, Alice Glasner,
7 Judith, we are technical advisory staff to those
8 Commissioners on this. So if you have any questions,
9 please feel free to reach out to us. I have cards. I'm
10 happy to hand them out for those of you who don't have my
11 contact information.

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

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

1 utilities.

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

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

24 And a couple of things about what I'm going to
25 discuss. I apologize in advance if I get into like

1 acronym-speak and alphabet soup. I will really try not to
2 do it. It's really hard for me not to and so I will go
3 ahead and do that. I will talk about that, but I will talk
4 about all of this at a very high level. I know Alice gave
5 you guys fact sheets about the program, so you can dig deep
6 and talk about all day about each of these programs. But
7 we'll keep it very high level right now. Feel free to stop
8 me if you have questions. And we can definitely follow up
9 with any additional questions, if you really want to sort
10 of dig a little bit deeper in any of these programs.

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

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

1 program was funded by a different funding source.

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

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

19 So similar to the rooftop solar programs, we also
20 have the Self-Generation Incentive Program or SGIP. And
21 there's actually a special carve-out within SGIP for
22 disadvantaged communities. And so what SGIP does is it
23 provides incentives for, we say mostly customer-side
24 storage and other distributed generation technologies that
25 don't include solar, so like wind.

1 We also have combined incentives for combined
2 heat and power technologies, which go to residential and
3 nonresidential customers, throughout the state. And
4 basically what the SGIP equity budget does is it sets aside
5 25 percent of the budget, I think about 59 million, for
6 projects that are located in disadvantaged communities.

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

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

1 you want brought up? Okay.

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

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

20 As I mentioned before, we just approved another
21 42 million for transportation electrification pilots, which
22 are more broadly looking at not only infrastructure and
23 looking at rates, but also looking at transportation
24 electrification beyond electric vehicles. So it's broadly
25 electric vehicles, but there's also looking at port

1 electrification. It's looking at other technologies to
2 help electrify the grid as it relates to transportation.

3 And then another sort of new development that
4 just happened last Friday is that we have another proposed
5 decision out that approves 589 million for larger
6 transportation electrification projects that will be heard
7 in coming weeks by the Commission.

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

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

20 So I wanted to keep both of these programs on
21 your horizon, in terms of where we are in natural gas R&D
22 program. We approved the budget for last year. The Energy
23 Commission literally, like a few days ago just submitted
24 their proposed budget program plan for this year. And
25 they'll be considering it in the next few months.

1 Okay. So I also wanted to talk about not just
2 the sort of disadvantaged communities SB 350 programs, but
3 also some of our legacy programs. So that includes our ESA
4 Program, our Energy Saving Assistant Program, which
5 provides no-cost weatherization services to low-income
6 households. And then there's the California Alternative
7 Rates for Energy, which provides a bill discount to
8 qualified low-income customers. And both programs have
9 allocated a lot of funding and are underway and continue to
10 serve low-income communities.

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

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

19 And we also have an energy storage procurement
20 target. We have a target of 1.3 gigawatts to procure,
21 actually directed the utilities to procure 1.3 gigawatts of
22 energy storage by 2020. And within that program we
23 allocate 500 megawatts of storage with a priority given to
24 public sector and low-income customers. And yes, the
25 applications, in terms of where we are on this program,

1 were submitted on March 1. March seems to be a big month
2 in terms of when applications are submitted.

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

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

19 And we continue to have coordination with our
20 sister agencies in terms of addressing these barriers. And
21 as mentioned earlier we are in the process of developing an
22 Environmental Justice Action Plan. It was also called the
23 Strategy and Work Action Plan. Good, because I was like I
24 was like I have to change my slide? So we are developing
25 the action plan right now. And again, I am a broken

1 record, but I do welcome your thoughts. We'll be coming to
2 you formally within these meetings, but I do welcome your
3 thoughts and your insights as we are in the process of
4 developing this in between meetings too.

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

10 MR. WILLIAMS: Very good, thank you.

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

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

24 In terms of the electric transportation proposed
25 decision that has been released, we have some money to do

1 an evaluation of that program going forward. I don't think
2 we really have thought a lot about evaluation from the
3 perspective of disadvantaged communities and what the
4 metrics would be and things like that. So any input on
5 that would be very, very useful and timely.

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

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

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

1 MR. WILLIAMS: Very good. Thank you.

2 Yes?

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

19 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

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

22 MR. LEMEI: If I can just chime in here? I'm
23 going to acknowledge that we are -- it is currently just a
24 little after 3:00 o'clock, which is the end of our
25 scheduled time. However, we managed to clear out and make

1 this room available for a continued discussion. I don't
2 know if anyone has urgent planes they need to catch. We
3 want to obviously honor that. But I just wanted to make
4 sure that we were all aware that we were running over.
5 That's fine. We've got the time for it. And if anyone has
6 concerns about that, please speak up or just excuse
7 yourself if you need to.

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

11 MS. SEATON: It's 3:15.

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

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

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

25 One of the points that was mentioned in the

1 Barriers Study is that there are many definitions of low-
2 income communities used for various programs. So for the
3 purposes of the energy equity indicators we picked one of
4 the lowest common denominators to identify the broadest set
5 of areas of California that may be eligible to one or more
6 programs.

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

21 So the structure of the Energy Equity Indicators
22 is we search back and we thought about what are we really
23 trying to achieve? What do we want to improve? And so we
24 focused on access, investment and resilience. And then we
25 organized indicators under those three objectives. So we

1 have indicators for the numbers served, the small business
2 contracts, clean energy jobs, the amount invested, energy
3 savings, rooftop solar. And then resilience, we have
4 August electricity bill, health and safety issues abated,
5 and measures indicators for energy resilient communities.

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

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

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

1 indicators report.

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

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

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

24 But we wanted to get started with some
25 indicators. So using the available data, this is at the

1 county level, we have on the left an indication of clean
2 energy jobs per county. That's kind of the left side of
3 each left semicircle. And this is just plotted in the
4 center of each county. But it represents the county
5 overall.

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

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

19 In the meantime using the data that's currently
20 available, we have an indication, this is from the
21 Department of General Services, looking at the percent of
22 annual total contract dollar amount that's going to small
23 businesses and microbusinesses. But this does not readily
24 identify whether this is comparable for low-income
25 communities or disadvantaged communities. So that's an

1 area that's on our wish list to improve on in the future.

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

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

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

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

22 MS. SEATON: Thank you, and how embarrassing. I
23 mean, the biggest for me question on this issue is what's
24 clean energy? What's called clean energy and so talking
25 through what that analysis and that's probably another --

1 that's the list of things I would love for us to inform.

2 MR. WILLIAMS: Very good.

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

9 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes?

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

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

23 MS. SEATON: Thank you.

24 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you for being here and thank
25 you for your service.

1 So at this point we're looking for someone to
2 continue with the note-taking given that Phoebe was the
3 only one who raised her hand to take on that
4 responsibility. I'll do my best, I'm not the best, but I
5 am present.

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

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

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

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

1 available.

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

4 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Pamela.

5 Are there any questions? Stan?

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

9 MS. DOUGHMAN: This is implementing part of the
10 Recommendation No. 5 in the Barriers Report that was in SB
11 350 Barriers Report. But we are interested in a broader
12 scope where we're not limiting it to SB 350 in particular.

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

21 MS. DOUGHMAN: Yes. And we're focusing primarily
22 on the solid green, the low-income, the 60 percent of
23 statewide median income. And then the interactive tool
24 will be statewide, so you can zoom into whichever community
25 is of interest and that, you can use that to identify

1 opportunities where programs, additional resources may be
2 needed.

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

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

14 MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. Any more questions?

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

20 MS. CHARLES: So at this moment in time we're in
21 the preliminary phases of development, but we will once we
22 have documents to make available publicly they'll be posted
23 on our disadvantaged communities website. And our
24 presentation should be posted online and if you look at the
25 last page, the last slide of the CPUC Clean Energy

1 Presentation I just gave a few minutes ago, that actually
2 has a link to the website.

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

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

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

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

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

24 MR. SOKOL: There is, so yes.

25 MR. LEMEI: Okay. Great, so yes, thank you.

1 MR. SOKOL: So there is a new listserv for this
2 group.

3 MR. LEMEI: There should be.

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

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

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

19 MR. WILLIAMS: Very good.

20 Well, we're down to the Next Steps. We've had
21 great presentations and it's like drinking out of a fire
22 hydrant on the first day, but we have great liquid
23 capacity. And so we are going to be getting down to the
24 Next Steps, but under the Administrative Process -- we want
25 to revisit that again -- there clearly we would like to

1 move forward with establishing some working groups or
2 committees.

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

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

18 What do you think, Galen?

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

1 that is of topical currency to your group.

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

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

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

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

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

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

23 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. Okay. Very Good.

24 Well, under the Process and Procedures, are there
25 -- I think I'd like to have some suggestions of some

1 working groups that we could establish and actually begin
2 to move into action between now and the next formal
3 meeting, which I think is scheduled for July. Are there
4 any suggestions of specific kinds of committees that we
5 want to establish at this meeting? Maybe in July there'll
6 be another opportunity to look at revising, but I do want
7 to put that on the floor for consideration.

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

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

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

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

22 MR. RAMIREZ: What I'm suggesting is a small
23 group to do any priorities thinking. That's more I guess
24 all out, so by the time we meet again as an entire group
25 there's recommendations that folks can build from.

1 MR. WILLIAMS: All right, are there any Advisory
2 Group members who would like to serve on that Priorities
3 Committee? All right, Jodi? Stan? All right, was --

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

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

19 Does that make sense?

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

22 MR. LEMEI: Oh, you would?

23 MS. MICKIEWICZ: Yeah, I think if the committee
24 is delegating the subcommittee the task of doing some work
25 on priorities, which they're then going to bring back to

1 the full group to consider, that they should vote on it.
2 But I mean, you know, I don't think it's big deal if you
3 don't.

4 MR. LEMEI: Fair enough.

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

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

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

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

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

20 MR. GRESCHNER: Five, yes.

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

25 MS. MICKIEWICZ: Well, if they read the summary

1 or are listening on the phone, anyone who wants to do that
2 in my opinion, should contact the Chair and say this person
3 wants to be on the subcommittee with the other three. And
4 then you just say okay fine. And when you all reconvene
5 next time you can say at that time that Kevin or whoever
6 isn't here, or maybe Phoebe after the fact, wants to be on
7 that subcommittee. Then you just announce that person.
8 Just don't go over five.

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

12 MR. RAMIREZ: No.

13 MR. LEMEI: So that's three?

14 MR. RAMIREZ: Yeah.

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

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

25 There was a comment about training the Committee

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

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

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

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

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

23 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. I'm going back to the
24 Committee. Is there another topic for which someone would
25 like to propose a committee?

1 MS. MICKIEWICZ: I would suggest that it might be
2 too early for more than one, but I mean obviously it's up
3 to you. But you kind of -- I think the Priority
4 Subcommittee is a good way to start. And then once you've
5 got your priorities steps then you can figure out if there
6 are other subcommittees you all need to establish. Does
7 that make sense? I mean, I'm not trying to tell the
8 Committee what to do. I'm just offering a suggestion.

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

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

17 MS. MICKIEWICZ: Yeah, please submit your
18 receipts.

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

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

25 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes?

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

6 MR. WILLIAMS: There's still room.

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

9 MS. ISLAS: Sorry. (Laughs.)

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

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

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

25 MS. CHARLES: Yeah, the only thing I was

1 wondering is we don't have the Commissioners here.

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

5 MS. CHARLES: Okay.

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

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

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

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

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

25 Well, here's the other constraint, in addition

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

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

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

18
19 MR. GRESCHNER: Just the future (indiscernible)
20 it's the first Wednesday of July? Isn't that the 4th of
21 July?

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

24 MR. GRESCHNER: Well, subject to change and
25 that's where we'll all want to work with the Commission

1 anyways. Okay. Let's not pick the 4th of July.

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

8 (Cross colloquy from multiple people.)

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

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

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

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

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

24 MR. WILLIAMS: It is my understanding that
25 whatever day we pick, that the location is San Francisco?

1 MS. MICKIEWICZ: That's our understanding as
2 well, yeah.

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

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

6 Well, hearing none this meeting is adjourned.
7 Thank you everyone.

8 (Adjourned at 3:40 p.m.)

9 --oOo--

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were reported by me, a certified electronic court reporter and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 30th day of April, 2018.



Eduwiges Lastra
CER-915

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were transcribed by me, a certified transcriber and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 30th day of April, 2018.



Myra Severtson
Certified Transcriber
AAERT No. CET**D-852