NOTE: Please see attached document for additional detailed teleconference instructions.

In accordance with AB 361, the Committee will adopt findings that meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees of in-person meetings. Consistent with those findings, this Committee meeting will be held remotely. PCEA shall make every effort to ensure that its video conferenced meetings are accessible to people with disabilities as required by Governor Newsom’s March 17, 2020 Executive Order N-29-20. Individuals who need special assistance or a disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in this meeting, or who have a disability and wish to request an alternative format for the meeting materials should contact Vanessa Shin at least 2 working days before the meeting at vshin@peninsulacleanenergy.com. Notification in advance of the meeting will enable PCEA to make best efforts to reasonably accommodate accessibility to this meeting and the materials related to it.

If you wish to speak to the Committee, please use the “Raise Your Hand” function in the Zoom platform or press *6 if you phoned into the meeting. If you have anything that you wish to be distributed to the Committee and included in the official record, please send to vshin@peninsulacleanenergy.com.

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

PUBLIC COMMENT
This item is reserved for persons wishing to address the Committee on any PCEA-related matters that are not otherwise on this meeting agenda. Public comments on matters listed on the agenda shall be heard at the time the matter is called. Members of the public who wish to address the Committee are customarily limited to two minutes per speaker. The Committee Chair may increase or decrease the time allotted to each speaker.

ACTION TO SET AGENDA AND TO APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

1. Approval of the Minutes for the January 13, 2022 Regular Meeting
2. Adopt Findings Pursuant to AB 361 to Continue Fully Teleconferenced Committee Meetings Due to Health Risks Posed by In-Person Meetings

REGULAR AGENDA

3. Chair Report (Discussion, est. 5 minutes)
4. Review of All-Electric Life Messaging (Discussion, est. 20 minutes)

Public records that relate to any item on the open session agenda are available for public inspection. The records are available at the Peninsula Clean Energy offices or on PCEA’s Website at: https://www.peninsulacleanenergy.com.
5. Review of Results of the 2021 Feedback Survey of Members of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) (Discussion, est. 15 minutes)

6. Review of 2021 CAC Working Group Results and Planning for 2022 Working Groups (Discussion, est. 45 minutes)

7. Recommendations on 2035 Decarbonization Feasibility Plan (Action, est. 20 minutes)

8. Marketing Report (Discussion, est. 5 minutes)

9. Upcoming Topics for Discussion (Discussion, est. 5 minutes)

10. Committee Members’ Reports (Discussion, est. 5 minutes)

**ADJOURNMENT**
Instructions for Joining a Zoom Meeting via Computer or Phone

Best Practices:
- Please mute your microphone when you are not speaking to minimize audio feedback
- If possible, utilize headphones or ear buds to minimize audio feedback
- If participating via videoconference, audio quality is often better if you use the dial-in option (Option 2 below) rather than your computer audio

Options for Joining
A. Videoconference with Computer Audio – see Option 1 below
B. Videoconference with Phone Call Audio – see Option 2 below
C. Calling in via Telephone/Landline – see Option 3 below

Videoconference Options:
Prior to the meeting, we recommend that you install the Zoom Meetings application on your computer by clicking here https://zoom.us/download.

If you want full capabilities for videoconferencing (audio, video, screensharing) you must download the Zoom application.

**Option 1 Videoconference with Computer Audio:**

1. From your computer, click on the following link that is also included in the Meeting Calendar Invitation:
   https://pencleanenergy.zoom.us/j/84975390654?pwd=RWZwOUpHMFR3a0R0VmhHdmttdmIrdz09

2. The Zoom application will open on its own or you will be instructed to open Zoom.
3. After the application opens, the pop-up screen below will appear asking you to choose ONE of the audio conference options. Click on the Computer Audio option at the top of the pop-up screen.

4. Click the blue, “Join with Computer Audio” button
5. In order to enable video, click on “Start Video” in the bottom left-hand corner of the screen. This menu bar is also where you can mute/unmute your audio.

**Option 2 Videoconference with Phone Call Audio:**

1. From your computer, click on the following link that is also included in the Meeting Calendar Invitation: 
   https://pencleanenergy.zoom.us/j/84975390654?pwd=RWZwOUdHMFR3a0R0VmJtemttdmIrdz09
2. The Zoom Application will open on its own or you will be instructed to Open Zoom.
3. After the application opens, the pop-up screen below will appear asking you to choose ONE of the audioconference options. Click on the Phone Call option at the top of the pop-up screen.

![Choose ONE of the audio conference options](image)

1. Please dial +1 (253) 215-8782
2. You will be instructed to enter the meeting ID: **849-7539-0654 followed by #**
3. You will be instructed to enter in your participant ID. Your participant ID is unique to you and is what connects your phone number to your Zoom account.
4. After a few seconds, your phone audio should be connected to the Zoom application on your computer.
5. In order to enable video, click on “Start Video” in the bottom left hand corner of the screen. This menu bar is also where you can mute/unmute your audio.

**Audio Only Options:**

Please note that if you call in/use the audio only option, you will not be able to see the speakers or any presentation materials in real time.
Option 3: Calling in via Telephone/Landline:

Dial +1 (253) 215-8782

You will be instructed to enter the meeting ID: **849-7539-0654 followed by #**

You will be instructed to enter the meeting passcode **2075 followed by #**
REGULAR MEETING of the Citizens Advisory Committee of the Peninsula Clean Energy Authority (PCEA) Thursday, January 13, 2022

MINUTES

Video conference and teleconference 6:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order at 6:32 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present:
- Morgan Chaknova, Redwood City, Chair
- Diane Bailey, Belmont
- Steven Booker, Half Moon Bay
- Michael Closson, Menlo Park
- Janet Creech, Millbrae
- Kathryn Green, San Mateo
- Alexander Melendrez, San Bruno
- Jason Mendelson, Redwood City
- Cheryl Schaff, Menlo Park, Vice Chair
- Desiree Thayer, Burlingame

Absent:
- Daniel Baerwaldt, Los Banos
- Joe Fullerton, Half Moon Bay

Staff:
- Kirsten Andrews-Schwind, Senior Manager of Community Relations
- Siobhan Doherty, Director of Power Resources
- Masha Doubrovskaia, Account Services Analyst
- Blake Herrschaft, Building Electrification Programs Manager
- Marc Hershman, Director of Government Affairs
- KJ Janowski, Director of Marketing and Community Relations
- Phillip Kobernick, Programs Manager
- Jan Pepper, Chief Executive Officer
- Rafael Reyes, Director of Energy Programs
- Vanessa Shin, Community Outreach Associate
- Jennifer Stalzer, General Counsel

Board Members:
- Donna Colson, Burlingame
- Rick DeGolia, Atherton
A quorum was established.

PUBLIC COMMENT
No public comment

ACTION TO SET THE AGENDA AND APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA

1. Approval of the Minutes for the December 2, 2021 Regular Meeting
2. Adopt Findings Pursuant to AB 361 to Continue Fully Teleconferenced Committee Meetings Due to Health Risks Posed by In-Person Meetings

Motion Made / Seconded: Booker / Closson
Motion passed 10-0 (Absent: Baerwaldt, Fullerton)

REGULAR AGENDA

3. Chair Report (Discussion)

   Morgan Chaknova, Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Chair, announced the resignation of Tim Bussiek, CAC Member.

4. Strategic Goal Implementation in 2022 (Discussion)

   Jan Pepper, Chief Executive Officer, introduced an overview of Peninsula Clean Energy’s 24/7 renewables goal. Committee members raised questions about energy storage, baseload resources, and data availability challenges. Additionally, Committee members discussed opportunities to advance this goal and provided feedback on the Peninsula Clean Energy 24/7 renewables white paper.

5. 2035 Decarbonization Feasibility Analysis (Discussion)

   Rafael Reyes, Director of Energy Programs, presented the current framework and plan for assessing Peninsula Clean Energy’s goal of contributing to member communities becoming 100% greenhouse gas-free by 2035. Committee members discussed approaches to financing decarbonization and highlighted program models from other jurisdictions.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Drew

6. Approval of Updated 2022 CAC Meeting Schedule (Action)
The 2022 CAC meeting schedule, which was previously approved during the December 2, 2021 CAC meeting, was revised to reflect updated guidance around authorizing teleconferenced meetings pursuant to AB 361. Committee member Jason Mendelson made a motion to approve the revised CAC meeting schedule.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Bill Balson

Motion Made / Seconded: Mendelson / Melendrez

Motion passed 10-0 (Absent: Baerwaldt, Fullerton)

7. Marketing Report (Discussion)

Vanessa Shin, Community Outreach Associate, announced upcoming virtual events around climate and energy. Committee members provided feedback on their preferences for receiving Peninsula Clean Energy media toolkits.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Bill Balson

8. Working Group Reports (Discussion)

Diane Bailey, CAC Member, shared an update on Peninsula Clean Energy’s Home Upgrade Program, including the number of homes enrolled in the program and undergoing upgrades.

Jason Mendelson, CAC Member, expressed interest in continuing the discussion on financing decarbonization with his working group.

9. Upcoming Topics for Discussion (Discussion)

Kirsten Andrews-Schwind, Senior Manager of Community Relations, reviewed topics that Committee members have suggested, including a review of CAC working groups and work plans, an update on the all-electric life messaging campaign, and a discussion on Peninsula Clean Energy’s legislative platform.

10. Committee Members’ Reports (Discussion)

No Committee Member reports.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 8:24 p.m.
TO: Honorable Peninsula Clean Energy Authority Citizens Advisory Committee

FROM: Jan Pepper, Chief Executive Officer, Peninsula Clean Energy Authority

SUBJECT: Resolution to Make Findings Allowing Continued Remote Meetings Under Brown Act

RECOMMENDATION:
Adopt a resolution finding that, as a result of the continuing COVID-19 pandemic state of emergency declared by Governor Newsom, meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees.

BACKGROUND:
On June 11, 2021, Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-08-21, which rescinded his prior Executive Order N-29-20 and set a date of October 1, 2021 for public agencies to transition back to public meetings held in full compliance with the Brown Act. The original Executive Order provided that all provisions of the Brown Act that required the physical presence of members or other personnel as a condition of participation or as a quorum for a public meeting were waived for public health reasons. If these waivers fully sunset on October 1, 2021, legislative bodies subject to the Brown Act would have to contend with a sudden return to full compliance with in-person meeting requirements as they existed prior to March 2020, including the requirement for full physical public access to all teleconference locations from which committee members were participating.

On September 16, 2021, the Governor signed AB 361, a bill that formalizes and modifies the teleconference procedures implemented by California public agencies in response to the Governor’s Executive Orders addressing Brown Act compliance during shelter-in-place periods. AB 361 allows a local agency to continue to use teleconferencing under the same basic rules as provided in the Executive Orders when certain circumstances occur or when certain findings have been made and adopted by the local agency.

AB 361 also requires that, if the state of emergency remains active for more than 30 days, the agency must make findings by majority vote every 30 days to continue using the bill’s exemption to the Brown Act teleconferencing rules. The findings are to the
effect that the need for teleconferencing persists due to the nature of the ongoing public health emergency and the social distancing recommendations of local public health officials. Effectively, this means that agencies, including PCEA, must agendize a Brown Act meeting once every thirty days to make findings regarding the circumstances of the emergency and to vote to continue relying upon the law’s provision for teleconference procedures in lieu of in-person meetings.

AB 361 provides that Brown Act legislative bodies must return to in-person meetings on October 1, 2021, unless they choose to continue with fully teleconferenced meetings because a specific declaration of a state or local health emergency is appropriately made. AB 361 allows for meetings to be conducted virtually as long as there is a gubernatorially-proclaimed public emergency in combination with (1) local health official recommendations for social distancing or (2) adopted findings that meeting in person would present risks to health. AB 361 is effective immediately as urgency legislation and will sunset on January 1, 2024.

On September 25, 2021, the Peninsula Clean Energy Board of Directors approved a thirty (30) day extension of remote meetings in accordance with AB 361. Out of an abundance of caution given AB 361’s narrative that describes each legislative body’s responsibility to reauthorize remote meetings, staff and counsel brings this memo and corresponding resolution to the attention of the Citizens Advisory Committee.

**DISCUSSION:**
Because local rates of transmission of COVID-19 are still in the “substantial” tier as measured by the Centers for Disease Control, it is recommended that the Peninsula Clean Energy Citizens Advisory Committee avail itself of the provisions of AB 361 allowing continuation of online meetings by adopting findings to the effect that conducting in-person meetings would present an imminent risk to the health and safety of attendees. A resolution to that effect, and directing staff to return each 30 days with the opportunity to renew such findings, is attached hereto.
RESOLUTION NO. _____________

PENINSULA CLEAN ENERGY AUTHORITY, COUNTY OF SAN MATEO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

*   *   *   *   *   *

RESOLUTION FINDING THAT, AS A RESULT OF THE CONTINUING COVID-19 PANDEMIC STATE OF EMERGENCY DECLARED BY GOVERNOR NEWSOM, MEETING IN PERSON FOR MEETINGS OF THE PENINSULA CLEAN ENERGY CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE WOULD PRESENT IMMINENT RISKS TO THE HEALTH OR SAFETY OF ATTENDEES

WHEREAS, on March 4, 2020, the Governor proclaimed pursuant to his authority under the California Emergency Services Act, California Government Code section 8625, that a state of emergency exists with regard to a novel coronavirus (a disease now known as COVID-19); and

WHEREAS, on June 4, 2021, the Governor clarified that the “reopening” of California on June 15, 2021 did not include any change to the proclaimed state of emergency or the powers exercised thereunder, and as of the date of this Resolution, neither the Governor nor the Legislature have exercised their respective powers pursuant to California Government Code section 8629 to lift the state of emergency either by proclamation or by concurrent resolution in the state Legislature; and

WHEREAS, on March 17, 2020, Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-29-20 that suspended the teleconferencing rules set forth in the California Open Meeting law, Government Code section 54950 et seq. (the “Brown Act”), provided certain requirements were met and followed; and
WHEREAS, on September 16, 2021, Governor Newsom signed AB 361 that provides that a legislative body subject to the Brown Act may continue to meet without fully complying with the teleconferencing rules in the Brown Act provided the legislative body determines that meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees, and further requires that certain findings be made by the legislative body every thirty (30) days; and,

WHEREAS, California Department of Public Health (“CDPH”) and the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (“CDC”) caution that the Delta variant of COVID-19, currently the dominant strain of COVID-19 in the country, is more transmissible than prior variants of the virus, may cause more severe illness, and that even fully vaccinated individuals can spread the virus to others resulting in rapid and alarming rates of COVID-19 cases and hospitalizations (https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/variants/delta-variant.html); and,

WHEREAS, the CDC has established a “Community Transmission” metric with 4 tiers designed to reflect a community’s COVID-19 case rate and percent positivity; and,

WHEREAS, the County of San Mateo currently has a Community Transmission metric of “substantial” which is the second most serious of the tiers, and;

WHEREAS, the Committee has an important governmental interest in protecting the health, safety and welfare of those who participate in its meetings;

WHEREAS, on September 25, 2021, the Peninsula Clean Energy Board of Directors approved a thirty (30) day extension of remote meetings in accordance with
AB 361. Out of an abundance of caution given AB 361’s narrative that describes each legislative body’s responsibility to reauthorize remote meetings, staff and counsel bring this resolution to the attention of the Citizens Advisory Committee, and;

WHEREAS, in the interest of public health and safety, as affected by the emergency caused by the spread of COVID-19, the Committee deems it necessary to find that meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees, and thus intends to invoke the provisions of AB 361 related to teleconferencing;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY DETERMINED AND ORDERED that

1. The recitals set forth above are true and correct.

2. The Committee finds that meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees.

3. Staff is directed to return no later than thirty (30) days after the adoption of this resolution with an item for the Committee to consider making the findings required by AB 361 in order to continue meeting under its provisions.

4. Staff is directed to take such other necessary or appropriate actions to implement the intent and purposes of this resolution.

* * * * * *
Results of 2021 Citizens Advisory Committee Feedback Survey

Total Number of CAC Members in December 2021: 16; Number of Survey Responses: 13

1. Please rate on a scale of 1-5 the progress the CAC made in 2021 toward meeting its objectives.

![Bar Chart]

Total Number of Responses: 13

1a. Why did you give this rating?

- The CAC has clearly defined goals and projects which are to be worked on allowing for continued development of our communities.
- I'm unsure of what work was done toward some of the objectives; most are not easily quantifiable.
- I felt personally like I was "spinning my wheels"
- The pandemic continues to restrict public gatherings thereby limiting the methods of outreach available to meet goals 1, 3, and 5.
- I am happy with the progress we have made since I joined the CAC although I personally don’t feel like we do much as a liaison or outreach - could discuss ways to improve if there is interest.
- Our ability to interact with the community remains almost entirely virtual. Without in person interactions, our ability to do outreach is hampered. This isn't anyone’s fault, it's just a reality of the pandemic & should be acknowledged.
- Though somewhat reduced due to COVID, the CAC is active in objectives 1 through 3 and sometimes 4. Other than having our meetings open to the public to allow public comment on items related to reduction of carbon emissions, the committee hasn't been able to provide a formal forum for community discussions (objective 5).
- The CAC played essentially no role in PCE advisory, strategy, execution or outreach. One of the clearest examples of the CAC being completely ignored is the urgency the CAC brought to changing the strategic objectives of PCE, highlighting the urgency of the climate crisis and opposing the pretense of action (moving to earlier than 2045). In response the previously
existing goal of 2045 has been taken down, meaning that the $27M spent on programs is now without any goalposts.

- I think we made lots of progress on the advising side, but it is difficult to do the legwork during a pandemic. It was hard to Act as liaison to community - 2; Provide feedback on PCE policy and operational objectives - 4 - I think we did this more than in the past; Engage in outreach to community, including encouraging ratepayers to participate in PCE offerings and programs, and implement other carbon reducing practices - 4 - mostly on social media and word of mouth here; Assist with legislative advocacy in conjunction with staff and board - 3 - we did a little on this; Provide forum for community discussions on wide variety of strategies to reduce carbon emissions in conjunction with staff and board - 3 - I think we could improve on this
- I've been impressed with the CAC's push to be influence and more than just a body that exists for accountability.
- We made a lot of progress, but I think the confusion about working groups caused some things to fall by the wayside.
- Realizing the pandemic is still ongoing, it would have been great to engage more with the community besides through social media postings. The CAC had discussed virtual forums and it would have been great to make those happen and engage and inform the community more, especially during a time when people are at home more and have an influx of extra cash to do home upgrades.

2. How satisfied are you with your experience serving on Peninsula Clean Energy's Citizen Advisory Committee in 2021?

Total Number of Responses: 13

2a. Why did you give this rating?

- It is enjoyable to be a part of the committee, but currently there is not much I can represent my own city on as the process or integration is still underway.
- I'm stimulated by my interactions with CAC members and PCE staff, by info—presented live and written—that's shared with me and by my work on understanding where communities are in
streamlining EVCS permits. It's also thrilling walking alongside PCE that's literally fighting climate change every minute.

- Lack of staff interest in really promoting micro-grids — the DER working group failed
- I find the meetings interesting, but I don't feel like I am able to contribute anything of value. My second term expires in 2022 so I will be termed out. I guess I have short-timers syndrome and pandemic paralysis.
- It is an incredible organization with wonderful staff and the members of the CAC are passionate and knowledgeable - so overall participation is rewarding and worthwhile. The only downside to me is the sort of odd organizational design and sometimes feeling unsure how to make the CAC most effective and helpful.
- Sometimes we CAC members feel like more of a pest to staff than a help.
- Overall I am very satisfied. Some staff are better than others at engaging with CAC working groups.
- The CAC is treated as a necessary fig leaf only. As citizen advisors it would be expected that PCE would be interested or heed the advice given.
- I enjoy the meetings, but hope we can do more in the future.
- Overall I gave it a 4 because I want to continue my service on the CAC. I still need to find a working group to be a part of. However I have found participating in a few projects here and there has been good as well.
- I loved the group and everyone was very passionate about our mission, but sometimes the bureaucratic side of things made it hard to make progress.

3. Please rate on a scale of 1-5 the quality of PCE staff support for the CAC in meeting its objectives in 2021.

![Bar chart showing the distribution of responses.]

**Total Number of Responses: 13**

3a. In what ways do you think staff does well at supporting the Citizens Advisory Committee?

- I am very satisfied with the quality of materials provided in our meetings.
- Staff makes participation easy, efficient and significant with professional planning, facilitation of meetings and follow through.
- Good meeting prep
The staff I know is skilled, passionate, and personable. However, PCE has grown to the point where I don't recognize most of the staff listed on the website. At CAC meetings we only see them during reports when the interactions are focused, therefore limited.

Staff is incredibly supportive, engaged, and works very hard to address CAC interests and objectives.

Staff does a great job on programs and communications and relaying information to the CAC. They are also generally very nice to work with and many have made themselves accessible for questions and additional dialogue. A few are extremely generous in this way.

The staff formally assigned to help run the CAC do a great job supporting the committee. Kirsten, Shayna, and Vanessa have done a great job throughout 2021.

Meetings and communications are organized well.

The staff is great, engaged and willing to work with us.

Staff provides a large amount of support and information while also being highly appreciative of feedback. I feel very listened to and heard by staff as well as, when capacity allows, empowered.

Very responsive and helpful in providing information.

Staff is always super helpful and available to answer questions or make themselves available. They have done a great job following up on requests from the CAC in a timely manner.

3b. How can staff improve its support of the Citizens Advisory Committee?

- Use us to amplify PCE's plans, programs and achievements. Ratepayers know almost nothing about PCE. We could each magnify PCE communications via social media, emails, even small group conversations, if directed to share upbeat messages that you create strategically. Help us to communicate that electrification is possible and urgent NOW and that San Mateo County is ready because of PCE. The knee-jerk reaction to talk about electrifying among too many citizens is "electric rates are already too high, PG&E can't handle our electricity needs now and PCE makes our electricity more expensive." Or "Where is all of this electricity going to come from?" Broad community knowledge of PCE's mission, fantastic work supplying clean energy and continuous improvement plans could help pave the way for community climate teams to convince residents that we're ready to electrify. I envision lots of people driving around every town in the county with car roof signs that say "Electrify Everything: We're Ready with PCE Clean Energy."

- Better working groups

- I would like to see meetings in which staff and CAC members could informally explore ideas in addition to the current formal "report out" of programs. I feel like CAC involvement is pro forma and not formative.

- Helping CAC stay on top of topics where it is most relevant and important for CAC to submit formal advisory letter / proposal to the board

- Staff on the workgroups for the CAC are sometimes annoyed at having to spend time with CAC and prefer to only relay info but not to consider input or collaboration. We CAC members
understand that this may be a result of too much work to do and not enough time but at the same time often feel underutilized or like a meeting can be a charade of sorts.

• The working group on the DAC DER only met a couple of times and didn’t have much that could be tasked to the CAC members. Other than connecting the PCE staff to city staff, it is unclear how the working group could continue and how PCE staff are moving forward with the DAC-GT/CSGT Solar Program.

• Not shielding PCE from the CAC anymore, but enabling at least 2-3 areas of real CAC impact (impact in real life, in recognizable climate action, in the local community).

• We need to get the working group meetings in better shape. This is my fault on some of the ones I work on.

• I have been interested in a while in a legislative CAC meeting for state (possibly local) policies that PCE wishes to pursue and how CAC members can best support what staff sees as a priority. This doesn’t really answer the question directly, but I strongly believe staff supports the CAC well.

• Helping us to understand the bureaucracy

4. In your CAC role as a community liaison, which messages about Peninsula Clean Energy programs and savings opportunities were you inspired to share with your community this year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Message</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heat Pump Water Heater Rebates</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power on Peninsula (Solar + Battery Storage) Program</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Electrification Reach Codes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Information about Peninsula Clean Energy (e.g., Goals, Community Benefits)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebates for Purchasing a Used EV</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebates for Purchasing an E-Bike</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebates for Renting an EV</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Electric Building Awards</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV Charging Infrastructure Incentives</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. How did you share these messages?

- Word of Mouth: 11 responses
- Facebook: 7 responses
- Email: 6 responses
- Twitter: 4 responses
- NextDoor: 4 responses
- Announcements at Meetings: 4 responses
- LinkedIn: 4 responses
- Visiting Local Businesses: 0 responses

Total Number of Responses: 13
Additional Responses: Local council meetings; electronic newsletters

6. If there are ways that we can make sharing information about Peninsula Clean Energy easier for you, please share your ideas here.

- PCE professional staff could do more webinars to which we could invite friends, just like Josh Becker, Stanford environmental profs, leaders of top climate-change mitigation orgs do. I’ve attended dozens. The public needs to know PCE exists, that you’re one of the few ANSWERS to our climate crisis doing excellent work and growing your program list constantly.
- No, I think this is already well covered. The press releases help & PCE social media is easy enough to share. Also the CEO weekly email is a wealth of excellent info.
- PCE would have to take a stand, take a position, to become relevant for the general population in some way because it does something important. Currently it is operating more like a nicer utility, and its shying away from the climate crisis conversation and playing a role.
- Nothing as far as our ability to share information. As an organizer, it’s easier for me to find information that may be “wonky” and distill it OR ask staff what I can need to bridge that gap.
- Providing items we can share on social media and letting us know when posts are being made
- The social media kits are always appreciated and have been super helpful when crafting posts to share.
7. What feedback did you hear from your community this year about Peninsula Clean Energy that you would like to share with us?

- More ebike incentives and a higher income threshold to qualify
- People are disenchanted with electric rates in CA and, when uninformed, blame PCE for them. Or, they have no idea who PCE is.
- A lot of people still don't know much about PCE
- Unfortunately my sense is most people are unaware of PCE or think it's a 3rd party middle man situation and are very confused about PCE vs PG&E
- There's a lot of misinformation about PCE & confusion between PCE & PG&E. PCE put out a lot of great info this year to help address that misinformation. When community members hear about individual projects or how clean PCE's power is, they are always extremely enthusiastic and pleased.
- The sustainability coordinator in my city recently reported that PCE is the city's biggest source of carbon emission reduction and having the biggest impact to reach the city's climate action plan goals.
- In its 6th year of providing electricity to just about all county constituents, most people don't know PCE as it has not yet found its role in the community. The silence and inaction during the climate crisis of the last years will make it very hard to change this in the current setup as people will ask "as the main entity responsible for climate action (the only one with budget), where were you?"
- People still don't really know we exist. Also people hate PG&E and so the most questions I get were about messed up bills, or misunderstandings about the same
- A think a lot of people still don't know of the work PCE does. People are excited to take on many of the programs PCE offers, but don't often believe they can afford the costs, if any. Strangely enough the most amount of disinformation I have encountered has been around electric water heaters. But the disinformation revolves around electrification skepticism in general.
- They still don't know who we are!
Select Results of 2020 Citizens Advisory Committee Feedback Survey

1. Please rate on a scale of 1-5 the progress the CAC made in 2020 toward meeting its objectives.

1. Please rate on a scale of 1-5 the progress the CAC has made in 2020 toward meeting its objectives.
   13 responses

2. How satisfied are you with your experience serving on Peninsula Clean Energy’s Citizen Advisory Committee in 2020?

2. How satisfied are you with your experience serving on Peninsula Clean Energy’s Citizen Advisory Committee?
   13 responses
3. Please rate on a scale of 1-5 the quality of PCE staff support for the CAC in meeting its objectives in 2020.

13 responses

![Bar chart showing the ratings and percentages.]
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