

The Energy Coalition

CPUC ESJ Action Plan 2.0 Comments

General Comments

- The plan needs to illustrate better what “actions” will result. What’s the investment? Will this result in more money spent in ESJ communities? *(Effectiveness issue)*
- Regarding Goal #7: Will the CPUC set targets for “high road careers?” Currently, the language reflects “partnership” and “maximizing opportunities” but does not establish anything measurable or goal-oriented. *(Accountability issue)*
- Needs to distinguish between community engagement, public participation, stakeholder engagement, etc. These are different avenues of engagement and soliciting feedback and should be informed by CBOs working in ESJ communities. *(Clarity and understanding)*
- High Road careers refer to construction jobs. Will the CPUC also measure economic and workforce opportunities created for professional services jobs essential to energy resilience programs but not specific to construction. *(Clarity and understanding)*
- Emphasis on working directly and collaboratively with the utilities, but not with other Program Administrators (RENs, for example) or implementors. *(Clarity and understanding)*
- In general, the plan lacks actions and accountability. What will the CPUC use to measure its success or failure? *(Accountability issue)*

Recommendations

- Need to employ best practices of procedural equity in the ESJ development and rollout, including during the workshop. People were not allowed to comment, see each other or engage unless they were called upon. *(Equity issue)*
- Method and delivery of ESJ action plan is not equitable (technology is inaccessible, for example), and the platform and process for designing and delivering this work should be revisited *(Equity issue)*
- Rethink the timeframe and self-imposed constraints for how public participation and community engagement are conducted. *(Equity issue)*