

## **EPIC POLICY+INNOVATION COORDINATION GROUP**

### **EQUITY WORKSTREAM – MEETING #3**

**DECEMBER 3, 2020 4:30 PM – 6:00 PM**

>>SPEAKER: Welcome, everybody. We will get started momentarily. Welcome, everybody. We are getting started momentarily. I want to thank everybody for joining us again to discuss questions on how we can ensure the transition to clean energy is equitable, and how do we ensure that our investments are working to overcome the obstacles to getting us there. I am president of the accelerate group I am the California Public utilities commission consultant for the epic policy and coordination group. This is the third and final meeting of the policy and coordination group. We are gathering insights and lessons learned from the projects in the state and working to identify new opportunities from collaboration to accelerate innovation. I want to acknowledge the other epic policy coordination group participants that are joining today including the epic program administrators and staff and advisors, utilities PG&E and CPUC staff. Rebecca and Amanda from the 2RGROUP who will provide helpful information in the chat and Q&A boxes as we go. If you have any questions during the process, reach out to us at the website. I'm going to start my presentation into an introduction before we start our panel presentations. So, we are here today to discuss equitable access to clean energy . The goal of the equity work stream is to create a framework for equitable engagement in our DND projects. This will be developed by gaining an understanding from presenters on lessons learned and best practices for community engagement in RD&D and pilot project. Over the past three months we have gathered information from projects that have been working for the past several years to advance innovative energy projects in partnership with disadvantaged communities. The end goal is to be able to put together a framework for a project that can be useful and be used for epic projects and programs going forward. To ensure that community needs are identified first, and we are working to ensure projects actually address the obstacles and challenges we face in ensuring equitable access to clean energy and not view them as an add-on. We want to thank you for joining us and participating in this effort. Today's equity meeting will focus on presentations from the California energy commission as well ask Southern California Edison on opportunities for collaboration and coordination around RD&D projects. We will also have a presentation from the greenlining Institute to discuss their report on making racial equity real in research and how some of those principles can be applied in the Epic program. We had two meetings already around the equity work stream, so this is the third meeting we are having as part of this process. I think the conversations and discussions we had in the first two meetings were very helpful in understanding and hearing directly from community members and RD&D leaders on ways to center and focus on putting community needs first as part of these efforts to focus on obstacles and challenges and California Energy goals. Some of the key learnings we have heard so far around community engagement need for community engagement to start before election and local credibility is vital to community buy-in and project impact that community impact should be an authentic process done early on in the process and not seen as a checkbox. Project location project itself should reach beyond a DAC designation. Inclusion should be measurable as we continue. Today, we are asking presenters to address some or all of the following core questions. First, what are some existing pathways for researchers, community-based organizations, and companies to engage in partnership-based RD&D? What are some typical challenges rebuilding

equitable partnership-based research? And what are some best practices, recommendations, and resources for researchers, funders, and communities to use in building equitable, partnership-based research? After the presentations we will have a Q&A and panel discussion with the speakers. We will open it after we do the panel discussion further to the audience for those who want to share additional insight around the questions we are posing for to share on their own work as well. As part as the panel discussion we will use the Q&A feature that's here. You -- if it's not showing on your screen and it might be behind a button and if you don't see it there it might be behind three dots. So, as we go, if you have questions or clarification or even broader questions that you would like to post to any of the presenters as we go, please view that Q&A box and we will be able to prioritize that for the Q&A panel discussion. If you have a topic of discussion, please send a check directly to me or Rebecca or Amanda and race that for inclusion in a group discussion woman get to that point after the panel Q&A. I want to start by introducing Erik Stokes. He will discuss about his innovation platform and what they are doing at the California Energy Commission to create and stimulate some coordination and collaboration activities among key leaders in this space. Welcome and thanks for joining us.

>>ERIK: Thanks for having me. I'm going to talk a little bit today about the CEC's approach and really thinking about equity and specifically, as Andrew mission, our platform. I want to talk a little bit about what we have done previously in this space. I think it sets up nicely as to where we are going as far as future activities. So, from CEC and our administration of ethics, it became the focus around 2013 and this is when the chair submitted a letter to the president and announced the commitment to advance diversity and equity in the program. They receive additional policy direction when it comes to equity and most notably the SP 350 barriers study and there were recommendations that came out of that, and that was 25 percent of the epic TD NT funds go to projects located and benefiting a disadvantage. I -- community. (indiscernible) Epic administration and one is a minimum requirement that 10 percent of the funding goes to Loki and become communities. It's important for us to think about how the benefits and impacts of these projects can benefit disadvantaged and low-income communities. So, equity has really become a focus in our epic administration and we developed a four-part strategy, really starting with increasing awareness of EPIC. The stakeholders have engaged, and we've conducted a lot of outreach trying to introduce ourselves and introduce the EPIC program to the stakeholder audience and let them know the opportunities that were available through the EPIC program. The second part of that strategy was willing to try incentivizing technology and project developers to see how projects disadvantage and low-income communities, and we did that in a couple of ways. One of them was either having a requirement set aside for projects located or providing incentive points to those that found a project site. Between these strategies help -- it's really to understand some of the points that low income (indiscernible) and try to design whole solicitations or parts of solicitations to come up with new technology we have tried to solicit input on what some of those pinpoints are no more of the things we've done probably for the past three closings is set panel discussions where we hear from communities and organizations on some of the challenges that these communities are facing and really kind of where there's new technology solutions that can really help overcome some of these challenges. In the fourth part of our strategy is to embed equity in clean energy entrepreneurship. They cited research entrepreneurship so one of the things we've done through the strategy is really set up a state-wide network testing facilities to make sure what part of the state they are in that they have access to these types of programs. The other thing is in our program is the small grant program we set a

minimum target of funding to go towards underrepresented entrepreneurs in diverse businesses or businesses that are more rural in different parts of the state. In kind of a collective way they've been called the entrepreneurial ecosystem and they been able to leverage to expand their entrepreneurial systems better and underrepresented geographical locations. Our programs have a focus on equity and diversity. Both in terms of trying to attract businesses but also really trying to train some of these companies to really think about to really (indiscernible) in terms of recruitment as they are building an evolving and scaling their business. So, it focused on equity. To me it felt like an afterthought sometimes in the projects, we didn't really incentivize technology to seek out developers that relationship building maybe was a short circuit and it didn't really -- communities didn't feel like they had a say in the design of the project. So, we took and steps to try to address some of those things probably the biggest step we taking his we have scoring criteria to really make sure that the applicants and developers that they have done that engagement with these communities and they really thought about how this project is going to benefit this community. One of the other kind of lessons we have learned that really is information overload, when we are doing a lot of this outreach kind of to these communities, I think one of the things we are having them do is sign up for our epic services and the problem is you get flooded with a lot of information kind of almost everything EPIC focus, and so we needed a better mechanism to incentivize information and so they don't get inundated with all of this other information. The other thing is to really try to put more information at your fingertips not only around funding opportunities but who are some of the technology solution providers and what kind of program, what types of projects have they been involved with. The other lessons learned was we had to have a stronger (indiscernible) trying to put that network infrastructure in place and I think early on when we were developing activity results when these partnerships would take place. One of the things we did early on as we established this networking hub and we had a space online where people would start networking together and that didn't happen. I think we realized we needed to have more active presence and really try to curate and foster those relationships. It was a little challenging because we couldn't play matchmaker. We had to put in some infrastructure. So, kind of talking about one of the things we launched is clean tech. We launched this about a year ago and we had customer discovery such as streamlining communities to help shape the design what types of features and functionality were involved in a platform like this. We also leaned heavily in thinking about the design and some things we implemented is the organization assigns a foundation and communities can describe what are pressing concerns, one of the most worried about and be able to kind of make that visible to either technology or developers or other organizations that might be able to help the system with some of these issues. The other thing we have done is we -- we just did this about three or four months ago. When people do sign up, they can kind of select the topics they are interested in and then we recently started pushing out these digests one of those being equities. Issues described to equity digest and you get kind of a curated list and other support for equity sale get flooded with everything that might be related to cleantech. So, kind of building on the power innovation platform, one of the things we're going to be putting on is what we call events and really trying to bring the right people together kind of the different states and communities Project technology developers and other organizations. For us to provide that networking infrastructure for them to partner on potential opportunities and try to establish better communication and provide training on various ways they can engage them. On the left side of the slide, we kind of -- one of the things we try to think about is why would different people want to attend these events, what they are hoping to learn so we came up with some questions that we thought people might want to

attend an event and this is something we are looking for additional (indiscernible) as they put on this event and assignment. So here is a little -- so on the right side is a little bit of a timeline for the events starting today with the equity work stream. On the left we have a series of questions that we are getting additional input on as we kind of design input on these events, so we hope to get some responses to these questions by December 10 and the best place to submit those questions to is Katrina and her address is at the bottom. One thing is our first power engagement event has been tentatively scheduled for January 28. We wanted to get this one on the books because we think it's going to be exciting. Our next competition will challenge the team to build affordable excuse development, so we think this one is going to attract a lot of interest, so we want to make sure we have two start to see some of those solicitations as well as some other solicitations. We are also moving to the investment plan development for the next four years of funding and so if you want to be able to get some input what are the types of challenges, what might how might that information be used in stakeholders thinking about how we do our funding and investment plan. ? And so, this is a link to the empowered innovation website and we encourage people to sign up and if you are seeking more information about the events, please contact Katrina.

>> The next presentation we will jump in and we have Renée from Southern California Edison is going to talk about the well-being of our community through collaboration. Welcome. Thanks for joining us.

>>RENEE: Thanks for having me. Good evening, everybody. Like Andrew mentioned, I'm going to talk a little bit about ways that folks can get involved in advancing the well-being of our community through collaboration. Next slide, please. So, SCE is designated to meet the greenhouse gas reduction goals. Approximately 45 percent of the households within the territory located in disadvantage and low-income communities. These programs such as EPIC to help bridge the gap and lower the barriers and clean energy adoption and in addition we work directly with community-based organizations, our customers and industry partners to share learning from our projects, increase awareness about electrical safety, promote programs and services to reduce customer energies and increase admission fees. We also try to purposely demonstrate our technologies and disadvantage communities to help create awareness and reduce the barriers to adoption. We have two examples of EPIC three projects being demonstrated in this community are the project located in Montana in the service and distribution center of the future project located in El Monte. , Please. Many of you are here to learn specifically about how to engage in - and collaborate with SCE. We have a website that is going through a makeover right now and early next year this will contain new information for community-based organization, researchers, universities, businesses on how to collaborate with SCE and will I include things about information such as epic projects past and present and will contain a portal for users to submit feedback on proposed project concepts and contain information on how to join the clean energy act working group which I will talk more about any moment. Today you can submit letters -- submit requests for letters of support required for many of the project funding opportunities and grants that are floating around and also get information and request access to our educational outreach program. Next slide, please. So, SCE, along with the greenlining Institute submits the working group. It was created in 2017 to bring together a diverse group of parties interested in addressing challenges and adopting clean energy technology specifically an index and they meet approximately on a monthly basis and it includes representatives from other utilities small

businesses local and state government and as you can see partners and faith-based organizations. His purpose is to provide a platform for stakeholders to discuss and collaborate and design programs were community led approaches which facilitate clean energy adoption. If you are interested in becoming involved with this working group, contact Carolyn Sims the engagement advisor and the contact information is located at the bottom of this slide. Next slide, please. A couple of slides ago I mentioned a collaboration website SCE ideas.com that's currently undergoing a makeover. Today this website -- committee members consummate ideas and request letters of support and commitment provide opportunities operated -- operate -- offered by the SCE for any other funding agreement resources. Agent Clark is the senior manager of technology and engagement at SCE and you could contact her directly for questions about this site and the types of letters we provide, and you can also find information on our SEC ideas.com website. Next slide, please I want to take a moment to highlight some of the work we do around educational outreach for our young future generation of workforce. As many of you know, the skills required for 21st century jobs are changing at a rapid pace. SVC -- SCE actively engages with students to generate excitement about the future clean energy jobs. We do educational outreach events, on-site lab tours and provide internships for college students. We also enjoy working with our interns and to prepare them for jobs and clean technology that did not exist just a few years ago. James, who is pictured in the photo on the top right of this slide is a former engineering intern from adapt who upon graduation was offered a full-time engineering position working as one of the technical leads of an epic project. This project is looking at demonstrating a newer communication standard known as IEC 61 850. If you are interested in learning more about our educational outreach, you can contact Asia Clark and there will be more information on the website next year. Next slide, please. So, thank you and I'm here to answer questions but I think we might be doing that at the end, so I will hold off for now until the question and answer period.

>> Thank you. I had group presentations talking about approaches of program administrators and California Energy commission and ways to get engaged. What to shift gears a little bit because we will get to Q&A session where we can talk questions and we will talk a lot more about how, what's an effective way to do collaboration and coordination and take folks on a little bit of maturity like how we get from a to B from idea or need to kind of pilot and program. But I want to shift gears and talk a little bit about how to make racial equity real and research programs and talk a little bit about what are the best practices and lessons learned that you found as you have gone through and put this together that seem to work out there and what should administrators and researchers and others keep in mind as they are going about in thanks for joining us.

>> I'm glad to be here tonight. For those who are not familiar, it's a duty advocating for racial equity and today I will talk about a little bit of research I conducted over the last few months or so. And you can go ahead and go to the next slide. All right. So, we are first going to talk about why did we feel the need to do this research. Basically, because these are the problems we had in the research field as a research institution that often partner with universities and government to conduct equity-based research. So first, there's so much more funding nowadays for the study of equity and many research grants -- MS fantastic and there's a huge gap around what does it mean to actually study and measure equity. Additionally, the field needs -- meets clear standards on how to conduct the research -- that equity research in a more equitable way. For example, often times when researchers are studying equity impacts, the way they go about it to the nonreciprocal

extractive and culturally insensitive. You see research partners receive funding to something they later admit they didn't actually have the necessary expertise and they lean on us to fill that gap, but we don't get the same credit for the same funding, even if we have been studying the topic for years. That is not equity. We are also asked to be on a committee every year for research projects. They are generally uncompensated, and we are not generally allowed to reshape the research. So often times research scope, methodology is completely finalized by the time they share with the advisory committee and by then there's no ability to change or influence it. And so that type of advisory community feels very symbolic and feels like folks are trying to check the equity box. This is not -- this is a systemic issue that stems from research institutions and research funders. However, there are so many folks trying to flip this paradigm and that's what got us thinking. There has to be a new kind of approach and it needs to become standardized.

Next slide, please. A quick overview of the five steps we identified. First, understand the context of the research of the past and present. Review the challenges and best practices for centering racial equity in about 15 or 20 pages of best practices here step three conduct an equity assessment of your research institution or team step 4 Partner with and pay community partner step five co-create the research questions and scope of work with a community partner. What really made this so impactful was this was a crowd source report. We had over 30 reviewers from across the country which included research funders, state agencies, institutions, researchers and community partners that contributed to this report. Now we go through each step in more detail and for the purposes keeping with the time limit I'm just going to focus on this. So, step two after the research field to review the many challenges and best practices for centering racial equity and research. Really just to give a high-level overview, we categorize those best practices into groups in the field. To emphasize the responsibility lies across the entire research field. So first, research institutions and funders should understand how funding should undercut engagement and involvement. And how a lack of diversity and cultural controversy can create binders and -- blinders and bias. Researchers should establish long-term community trust with the community base which is a study rather than coming in late in the game seeking kind of a superficial equity stamp of approval. They should also give community partners a meaningful goal in the design and conduct and decision-making of the research. Community partners need their expertise built up in order to lead their own research and collaborate on research partnerships. I can't tell you how many reports I write every year and none of them funded by the government, but this ends up influencing policy and decision-making and that's -- we have to be resourced as such. Next slide, please. The third step is an equity assessment of your research institution. To understand your preparedness this is a thought exercise for researchers to set a baseline of where they are at. Have a discussion of their strengths, their gaps and identify potential steps to address those gaps. The full assessment is quite extensive but a few of those questions I picked out or what is your team or organization's understanding of institutional racism, power, and systems change? What is the role of your organization and the larger equity field and how can your position advance rather than duplicate the work of others. Does your team have relationships with community partners? Does your team or organization sufficiently budget for engagement activities such as paying for their time or expertise. After they complete the assessment, there is a whole reflection portion that guides the user for a rainstorm of how do you address those gaps. Next slide, please. So, step 4 is that researchers should partner and pay community partners which we thought as nonprofits equity experts and residents. There is going to be a lot of barriers to this occurring and an equitable way. The grant guidelines say the University can only contract out 20 percent of the budget to an outside party. Now, this is pretty

unfair considering how much leadership strategy existing tools and our time and resources bring to the project. The researchers recognize that. That's not their fault. It's an upstream problem that comes from grant funders. This is the pushback against the structural barriers. So, this fifth and final step is to co-create your research scope of work with the community partner. The purpose of the worksheet is to think through how equity will show up from start to finish. A super expensive worksheet down to a few questions but how will your research align with and support an existing community priorities? How would you design a process to collaborate with the target population in a meaningful way? How we work to bring equity when to data analysis? How we integrate accountability checkpoints to measure outcomes throughout the research project? So, this co-creation of an acquittal partnership is being implemented in a whole series of research collaborations with a series of other research projects. It doesn't always happen in order and the steps don't always happen exactly how we anticipate them too. Currently the research funding process is not set up this way. And so, in this project is funded and we were invited to codevelop and contribute to a proposed scope of work. This was done in an unpaid unofficial way. Once funding was received, we were brought on as paid advisors. Then greenlining conducted an internal self-assessment for the research team to send the baseline for equity where we at where do we go and how do we get there? At next we began to coordinate our overlapping and existing research and find a complementary approach. For example, we specialize in much more of an equity qualitative approach to research. They have a technical data-driven asset and that was a nice synergy and we could help each other about other parts of existing research. Lastly, we will be codifying the equity together and weighing in along the way. So really, we will close out by emphasizing these five steps involve the support of the entire research field. A key piece if that is how research grants are structured and how they incentivize partnerships. You will find many clear examples within the report of exactly what that looks like. Moving forward I would like to\_ that the entire research field will benefit from these kinds of partnerships. It's more equitable and more inclusive and accurate more grounded and actually meeting the needs of the community. Thanks so much and I'm happy to answer questions later on.

>> We will move into the Q&A session with our panel. If you have -- if you have a question for any of the panelists here, use the Q&A feature that's in the WebEx application. If you do not see it may be behind a button on the lower right-hand corner it will be behind those three dots. I'm going to get started here. Judas from the California Public Utilities Commission has come a video to pose a question to the group. Judith, welcome. Audio. We can't hear you.

>> Good evening. I just wanted Hannah to talk a little more, and others as well, about this issue of sufficient budget for engagement. The PEC's role is primarily an oversight one and this is something that's been a difficult task to basically tackle just given some of the governmental guidance that we have and some of the good things that Hannah pointed out. So, if any of the panelists or Hannah wants to talk a little bit more about providing sufficient budget for engagement and therefore codeveloping the scope of work and codeveloping the research a little bit more.

>> Absolutely. We mentioning kind of the barriers compensating for community engagement?

>> Yes. And the date or for the meetings. Providing technical assistance so that you can engage.

>> Absolutely. The best practices to contract with a community-based organization or a technical assistance provider and a really effective way. Also, there are so many barriers to how government can or cannot compensate residents for their time, and so a good workaround has been contracting with community-based organizations who then can distribute funds or compensation, whatever form that takes. Sometimes we've seen that's in the form of a cash gift card and so folks have found flexible workarounds to this. But it's like whatever timeline or budget you have for community engagement, go ahead and double it. It's never enough. But I think at least folks are realizing if you want to get that quality engagement, especially around communities who have limited time they are working two jobs, you have to recognize that folks are sharing their expertise with you and therefore they should be compensated as experts. Gone - government contracts millions of dollars every year to have consultants so why not give a resident a five-dollar gift card for showing up and sharing their experience.

>> I want to follow up on that and maybe if Eric could respond. There's a question here in the Q&A box. If you have a question, use the Q&A box, from Anna Gonzales that says is there funding available for CEOs to help engage the community? Can you talk about the history of CEC's funding in places where it's opening up or has the opportunities for some of this upfront engagement that's happening?

>> Yes. I think this question about whether we can provide technical assistance to communities is probably the one we get the most and is probably the recommendation we get the most. We have been able to make sure that there is funding available for the CEOs and communities we don't need to make that a requirement. Making sure that they are compensated as part of that project.

>> I want to add one last thing on technical assistant. No matter where the funds are going I would say especially (indiscernible) you want to be evaluated so for example, we've been involved in programs for technical assistance is provided but the folks providing it are not well-versed on the program on the requirements and we ended up having to step in and we were not getting compensated. So, I just think it's important to create standardized technical assistance and also criteria for how are we actually evaluating where the money is going.

>> She brought up a good point. Something else is how do we evaluate -- we don't really have a framework on how to evaluate them. Are they engaged with the community or are they DD2 they have some other issues?

>> There's questions were the Q&A box for anyone who wants to join in is how can you be sure the interviewees you pay are properly conveying the priority, the opinions, the hopes and concerns they claim to represent.

>> Is a fantastic question. I feel like the first place to start is with some trusted community leader, whether that's here or whether the that's the folks. And I think that might help filter out some of the folks who say maybe they are not exactly representative of the folks here but specifically targeting organizations and locations, whether that's places where the target community gathers, community meeting places or food banks or places folks are already getting other services where they can make sure that's the program they are trying to create.



>> And maybe to follow-up, one thing we have been looking at especially when evaluating CEOs is there a way we can lean on local jurisdictions to better understand who they consider some of the best or some of the top CEOs and their communities. They will have a lot more intelligence, more of the local levels that a state agency would have.

>> She comments that the experience in rural communities that they were engaged supposedly representing the community don't live in or know much about the community. Obviously when we talk about community, this was a core topic of one of our previous meetings and what level are you defining it as a what is the role community and how do you ensure what you're getting is authentic. Are there best practices there, given that you are looking at more rural communities or have a lot more population but also a significant disadvantage, are there best practices therefore rural communities where you can get hyper local?

>> Maybe just a follow-up and just checking in with other organization in that organization. I was wondering your thoughts on that. When we do work outside of California, we are very careful to kind of -- let's say a group has asked us to present our work in a specific location outside of California. We will talk to the other equity groups and other criminal justice groups and community-based organizations and be like is this a good idea? Is this appropriate for us to be in this space? Kind of checking in and vetting.

>> I want to invite Monica Almira to join and try and elevate you up to be I think there are comments we would like to share here. I will get you in and hopefully share some information you shared about the growth counsel as well.

>> I do want opposable more question from Alexander Mugabe. Is there a baseline pay agencies can consider, a general dollar per hour?

>> Not that I'm aware of. I think some of our other system state agencies might have looked into this. But not that I am aware of.

>> If it's helpful, this is just if we are contracted out to do the research or something, I think generally anywhere we charge anywhere from 150 to 250 an hour and it depends on the level that the person is employed. But in terms of from what I have heard it community resident, kind of a workshop, I've heard anywhere from \$25-\$50 an hour.

>> Excellent. Monica, do you have a chance to come on audio.

>> Can you hear me?

>> So, I am Monica just listening and I just added in the chat folks are talking about technical systems and how they can be most useful for communities. Different state agencies and how they can develop typical systems programs that are responding to community needs with the opportunity of the organizations and outlining best practices. It's been a while since I've looked at the document. I think it's helpful for folks just as one resource in the question. That's all.

>>SPEAKER: Excellent. I want to also -- Andrew McKee had a question about local elected officials and their role. If you are able to -- come on audio/video, I will give you a minute to figure that out as well while I post something else. So, one of the things that I want to take us a little bit on a journey of here when we think about this is I think there was a comment that Eric made that there is funding available during kind of the engagement of the project for community-based organizations but not for technical assistance. When we think about this timeline of how we are looking at solving these challenges, trying to find new technology, new solutions, new pilots, to really tackle these challenges to achieving equity and energy access, trying to look and be sure all communities have solutions, where do the ideas start from? They be Renée or Eric, in your experience, where do the kind of energy and the clean energy ideas that ultimately end up whether they are being funded or not being funded, where to those initiate? Where does that sparkle come from? We seen that in the past come from universities. Are we seeing a lot of community ideas bubbling to the top?

>> I can take a stab at that question. I would like to say that it comes from many directions, both from the outside in and the inside out. We do get a lot of requests for support and commitment from various organizations, universities, national labs, small businesses, and we tried to participate in any of those projects as we can. We also are trying to become more actively involved in sharing problems that we need help with the local trust to help solve in terms of electrical distribution and integrating distributed energy resources onto the grade. So, it really comes from all directions.

>> I would just like to add some communities are just that such limited capacity that it's not even feasible for them to come up with an idea, and so I think it's important to resource that. And so, I want to highlight two programs. Clean mobility options in disadvantaged communities and the sustainable transportation equity project, which resources those below capacities to conduct a needs assessment to develop an idea for a project they want funded. And then the next step from there is too -- I think that's a good model like what that ideation even looks like.

>> I will add to that. These programs are meant to solve problems or to try to help goals. I think part of the challenge is we don't have a good inventory of what some of these problems are. It makes it challenging when technology solutions I think it really needs to be this process, this kind of combined ideation between multiple groups, the technology developers there's probably other stakeholders need to be engaged with the spirit.

>> I saw in your presentation I really focused on identifying pain points. The way the structure works you create funding opportunities that they are aligned, and they are great opportunities but if its community doesn't match with them, it's too late for that. How do we get the ideation there in the beginning? In the question for you on video is how to resource on that? The inventory that Eric mentioned. What are good places to source it. Maybe want to pose that to the group here.

>> Great facilitation because that's a perfect segue. Like Eric says it's hard to take a holistic view my name is Alexandra I work at MCE at the choice agency that works in the Bay Area and the Board of Directors is made up of elective officials that make up the communities that we serve. We often go to the board and kind of use them as an advisory committee to understand this is a project we are proposing. Does that fit your community needs? My question for greenlining was

how do you feel about there being elected officials as a proxy or representation as a community. As a single perspective that needs to be complemented the engagement, but which we also do but I wanted to get your thoughts on engaging with elected officials with the way things have been imposing here.

>> In some cases, this has worked well and it worked really hard on the support from the mayor but I would say with anything vetting those ideas it came with a really cool idea and making sure that is representative of folks and I think there is absolutely no way to lean on his elected officials in a way that is just kind of checking resources.

>> Renée, you guys work a lot with local effect it's when you are looking at challenges. Obviously, when you really think about epic, another (indiscernible) is not a source in the beginning, kind of a prevalent.

>> Historically we have done a lot of the ideation intern duty internally. We have made a proactive effort to socialize our ideas for all of the reasons we have become aware that the things we thought were important might not be representative so part of the reason why we are here today is to learn more about that and engage with more community-based organizations so we can get that input and better scope and create projects that meet the needs of the community.

>> We do have a question here just for clarity. You may have covered this a little bit but there is a question what are some of the types of clean energy projects as part of research. I think this is for you, Renée, and Anna.

>> I have a team of project managers that deal primarily with distribution projects that are looking to prepare the grid for large quantities and clean technologies such as rooftop solar electric vehicles. There's a lot of work that needs to be done itself to prepare to accommodate all of the technologies. I have a peer who does a lot of projects on actual energy resources control and optimization microgrids, transportation. We tried to do a little bit of everything.

>> My focus is sustainability. My colleagues work on vehicle electrification. We call it the energy team.

>> I elevated to ask a question. (indiscernible) Any other folks with the panelists if you don't want to put your question in the Q&A come on video and I will call you for your question. Judith?

>> This is an energy program, energy research program and one of the questions I wanted to elevate was from (word?) talking about most of the Valley designated for more than 45,000 have been converted so I just wanted to have the panel -- when the panel is not so much a -- a transit problem or a housing problem how do you kind of integrate that perspective in what is an energy program? And I just say for Jaclyn it's something we very much have on our radar but it's more on the dedication side and stuff like that. It's something that definitely impacts the community especially in the state.

>> I will take the first stab at the question. One of the things we look at all the way down to projects is the benefits and the decision really kind of played out what those benefits are. We really look at it through that lens. Are there unintended consequences from these projects? I think the second screen is this something addressed by the program or does this need to be elevated towards policy discussion? That's one of the screens to look through after we encounter some of these challenges.

>> I would also add that as we get more sophisticated with our cleaner energy and technology and start to see some of these unintended consequences of stuff that we are deploying, it's becoming more and more important to look holistically at the entire system. Not just the energy system but the transportation system, the education system and really think about what the impact is of what you are doing and paying attention and testing for those impacts along the way. The smart city's project, that's part of the epic portfolio is the first attempt to start to look at that. There's a whole lot more work that needs to be done and we are really just chipping away at the surface of this bigger systemic problem that I think it is becoming more and more awareness as being applied to it today.

>> Excellent. Thank you. And there is sincere appreciation from Jacqueline for raising the question. Mya, I'm going to go to your question and talk more about this kind of journey. There's a need or challenge they're looking to solve. They get past the point or maybe they have the spark or maybe ideas are generated and there is desire to kind of partner with the community and mya, your question was around the timeline and the time to authentically build that trust and I welcome you if you want to ask that question in full.

>> Thank you for putting this together. I have to say what a big fan I am in especially the underlying work that I've been doing. But question -- I worked at a large profit. I'm a representative of a much larger -- develop these in local communities all the while managing grant proposals or project timelines that need to happen so I'm trying to figure out what are the best practices for engaging authentically with the community that I'm involved in that I live in while recognizing that there is no perfect way for me to -- I went to a race the stigma that comes with the work that I do really just focusing on how do I build a better future while also helping my project timelines.

>> I totally agree that timelines don't allow for that. I would say the thing we found to be very effective is having a long-established relationship whether it's University. And I think what's been helpful is this one University kind of has been a real ally in helping us, whether that's reviewing reports, providing kind of an advisory role and doing a lot for us before ever asking anything of us. And then by the time an actual partnership opportunity did come along it was kind of just like a no-brainer we would partner with them because we knew them, we knew our work was aligned and it was compared to other potential partnerships and folks would hit us up out of the blue and would have no idea who you are. I don't have anything here to understand if we are on the same page and it doesn't feel quite as natural. It's definitely worth putting the time and resources into hearing what the needs and priorities of that community are. Before ever asking anything of them as well as offering what kind of technical systems or services can you offer them and in that way of building trust over the long-term.

>> I would just add a think that's a great question. I think one of our lessons was the funding opportunities. We would release the funding opportunity and (indiscernible) it's a really short timeline to then try to find that partnership and at the same time we get that ready to submit and I think that's why we decided to start setting up these empowerment is these partnerships really need to happen before there's a solicitation release and really have those types of relationships it looks like it's a good fit, I think we learned this in too short of a timeframe for any meaningful engagement to happen.

>> I thought it was going further down the timeline, but you -- we have to go backwards on that. Once an idea sparked, it may not be sufficient time. I think it goes to identifying and understanding the needs of being in the community to be able to identify where those opportunities might exist around the state with these communities when these ideas emerge in making sure we have benefits equitably.

>> Judith has come on. Welcome back to our question session.

>> Just to mention what Eric was saying, always wondering about those relationships and having an open process as a government agency. You know, we don't want to create an appearance that it's -- we work with this community and those of the ones we are going to get a grant to.

>> I think it's something we brought up is we can't be seen as matchmakers, so I think we've been trying to put some of that network infrastructure in place and not -- kind of providing the infrastructure where people can come together and form partnerships on their own but without that infrastructure is I think we learned it won't happen.

>> On that I pulled out that same thing from your presentation around the matchmaker comment. And I wrote down so who can be. Who can be those matchmakers engaging out there that's not the thunder?

>> So, I think for us we had (name?) under contract to do market research and some other assistance so they will help us put on the power innovation events so I'm not saying the staff to be there. We just have to make sure we have an active solicitation. There is really an onus on us to make sure we have those barriers.

>> For the program that funds communities to develop their own community driven pilot projects, they have a list of mobility companies out there who are familiar with the project. They are ready and willing to partner. We have an equity focus so that's one less thing that a community group who has very little capacity has to do. They can see a list and are like they might be good partners in this project.

>> That's helpful. I want to zoom ahead on my timeline and actually ask about what happens afterwards. So, an excellent research project a partnership is in place a great series of widgets are installed in a community and then what. What does it look like long term? What does the engagement look like for the life of the systems in place? I have heard a lot about the fear of research is doing a quick project and then walking away leaving it malfunctioning or not working or misaligned infrastructure in place that now is either a burden or a false expectation,

so I cannot look like? What look like in the right way once a project has been completed or a project is close to being completed or already done for.

>> And little bit of shameless self-promotion. We're seeing an equity evaluation of a whole series of programs and pilots and we intended for this equity evaluation of methodology to be equitably -- and so we are currently in the process of developing the technology that operates as a scorecard but kind of a qualitative worksheet to think flu breaking down many different categories and breaking down the basic bear meeting. You at least have to have this component. We have a lot more kind of researches and trusts and shifting power and are definitely a lot more challenging. At the same time, we are really breaking down if we are evaluating a program, how is equity showing up in the mission, how is it showing up in the process, in the outcome and how are you managing it would be very extensive and comprehensive.

>> I'm going to take a little bit of a different stance. One of the things we want to make sure with these projects, especially when we're doing the demonstration is we don't leave these communities with a stranded asset that doesn't work. There're additional costs. It's really the onus on us when we are evaluating proposals. Is there a plan in place to maintain this equipment for the life of the project? What's that model look like we want them to continue to keep working and don't just become something the community has to deal with or because of the technical issues or challenges they might face.

>> It's helpful. We are close to wrapping up. We will probably have time for couple more questions. If you have a question you would like to have asked year, use the Q&A box and we will try to get one left and or pop something in on chat if there's a comment you would like to make. I want to go and get similar along this line around the kind of metrics discussion. When we are looking at projects around and ensuring equitable access, are there different types of metrics we should be looking at here? And is it more metrics? Is it focused metrics, is it less metrics? What's the goal here? What should we be tracking?

>> I say it's the relevant metrics. People are always asking is there equity metrics? And you really have to put those indicators and no community looks the same. And I think the idea is to have an intersectional lens with your indicators and not just focus on energy and health but also access and economic opportunities but at the end of the day have decision-making around communities really being able to weigh in on what kind of metrics be -- meet the needs of the community.

>> I think part of the metrics is not quantitative. It's more qualitative. It's what does this project lead to. Does this lead to increase adoption or increase in the barriers that these communities face? And I think that's one of the lenses that we look for a woman look at the success of these projects. It's what type of success and benefits. It's does it lead to additional deployments throughout the state?

>> And really quick. Is it really -- did it really better the lives of the community? I love the part about the metrics. It's like anecdotal stories. How is this impacted.

>> I know its kind of an important question here. I think we've looked at -- I think we looked at kind of the qualitative metrics and is this bettering people's lives in looking at those beyond kind of a pure economic development of results or how can we get technology here. It's really looking at these core issues. Not just -- it helps give a voice to communities to get a broader audience where they actually want to be serving that need but don't know where people are having kind of an interest and will to take on a project like that, so I think that's an interesting question. I do have two last questions here. The first is, you are a community, you would do get engaged and you have a great idea. What's the first step. Maybe start with one. What's our first step.

>> This is the SECideas.com website and we will take it from there. I would say option number two is to join the access working group and become part of the community and folks working together to further that cause and make those connections and network and build those relationships that are so important that Hannah talked about for building the projects for building that way down the road.

>> Excellent.

>> Yes. I would point folks to the California resource. There are so many programs out there in California is mind-boggling. So, to really help guide folks based on their eligibility, based on the location, the characteristics of their community, like what actual programs are they eligible for. So, I'm glad to point folks to this resource.

>> Yes, I will just encourage people to sign up. And create a profile. A lot of the innovation not just from that but from the other state agencies and federal agencies and other activities out there. I think that's a good place to wrap it up. I did get another comment here and the questions it says in our area the issue of whether people's lives are improved in the community where the project is located is the most important metric. He's echoing I think what you had said. The clean energy act group clarifying question is SCE, clean energy act as the working group, is that right for and you can reach out -- Renée, if you can put out the contact information in the chat, that would be super helpful.

>> I believe it went up in the chat earlier. It's there. Carolyn's Sims and that's facilitated by the green lighting and trip 18.

>> I want to thank everyone for joining. It's beneficial. Ultimately our task here is to just pull out some lessons and insights. We're not going to be able to solve all the problems in this work stream as much as I would like to. We are pulling out experiences in key learnings from projects and we had great first two sets of meetings where we really figured out a little bit of what works well and what doesn't and what are some key lessons learned. We can hopefully encourage researchers and partners to participate in -- I've got jokes in the chat. The most important thing we have learned here is what you ask for them and figure out what you're going to be partnering with now in advance of maybe just a funding opportunity that rides up. How do we look at this engagement beforehand so we're looking at collaboration and coordination is a natural occurrence as opposed to extra effort? So, I think those are super important takeaways we have here. Also, we can find folks to start building these bridges and allow these partnerships to occur. It seems like they need constraints. So, these are all things I think we will try to incorporate into

the report for this work stream to have key learning takeaways that we will share in his hopefully something that's useful in the policymakers at the commission and energy commission as they continue to look at what is the assistant epic program look like and what does the future look like as well? I also want to put it a plug for what comes next. When we put this report out to the work stream, you will all have a chance to provide additional comments and feedback as well along the way. If you have a comment you would like to send it now, send it to me to be Québec will put something in the chat with our email address and by December 10. If you have any resources, you want us to include that we circulate that would be fantastic. And around February we will put together was called a policy innovation forum where we will hold an event with all four work streams together and that's the equity work stream, the qualifier mitigation work stream, the transportation electrification work stream and the power shut off work stream and it will bring us together to talk about some of the key learnings and outcomes from all of these efforts as we have gotten these insights from the DAC project. That will be in February. We are working to finalize the date. You will receive plenty of notification as we work to schedule that, and have you registered participate in these discussions. Comments or questions, please email us to the email address that's in the chat. I don't know how to play the trumpet. Thank you for joining and I really appreciate it and hope to talk to you again. Thank you.