

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

Resource Management and Climate Protection Committee (RMCP)

Minutes of April 18, 2018 Meeting

In Attendance:

Diane Papan, Councilmember, San Mateo*
Pradeep Gupta, South San Francisco City Council*
Beth Bhatnagar, SSMC Board Member*
Adrienne Carr, BAWSCA*
Michael Barber, Supervisor Pine's Office
Kim Springer, County Office of Sustainability
Jeff Aalfs, Town of Portola Valley
Ed Cooney, CSG Consulting

Not in attendance:

Deborah Gordon, Committee Chair, Woodside Town Council*
Maryann Moise Derwin, Committee Vice Chair, Mayor Portola Valley*
Dave Pine, County Supervisor*
Rick DeGolia, Town of Atherton*
Don Horsley, County Supervisor*
Bill Chiang, PG&E*
Robert Cormia, Professor Foothill-DeAnza*
Ortensia Lopez, El Concilio of San Mateo County*

* Committee Member (voting)

1. Introductions
2. Public Comment
3. Approval of Minutes from February 21, 2018 and March 21, 2018 Committee meetings:
No Quorum – postpone to following meeting
4. Presentation on Advanced Energy Community residential microgrid proposal:

PUBLIC NOTICING: All notices of C/CAG Board and Committee meetings are posted at:
San Mateo County Transit District Office, 1250 San Carlos Ave., San Carlos, CA.

Daniel Hamilton gave a presentation on the Oakland EcoBlock, Phase 1 design, CEC advanced Energy Community grant program project.

The project has 25, locations, some with 3 or 4 units per location. The project studied the solar generating capacity of the block, and the energy demand in terms of annual kWh and peak. Storage design is based on mechanical flywheel, which can be used to shave peak load or ancillary loads, etc. The mechanical system has very low lifecycle emissions.

The microgrid design includes a utility loop under the sidewalk, and EV charging infrastructure.

Gupta: how will you change from having so many meters to a single meter for an entire block area.

Hamilton: It requires a discussion with PG&E, but PG&E will not enter into discussions specific to the project until an application is filed with them to complete the necessary engineering. This is something new for PG&E, so the guess is it will take a lot of time to settle on how it will work. This will be one of the most challenging obstacles for the project if it received Phase 2 funding.

Considering the many residential blocks in Oakland, and looking out to 2050, the potential saving is enormous. The block that was studied has very old homes, no wall insulation, etc., so the cost for retrofit is very high, compared to a block of newer homes.

The results are that the Oakland EcoBlock “appears to be technologically and legally permissible, but requires changes to local codes, expansion of finance tools, and cooperative arrangements at the neighborhood level to accomplish.”

The homeowner engagement process was not well designed, and the project partners acknowledged that. If the project does receive Phase 2 funding, there is consideration of having a competition for blocks of residents to select the eventual EcoBlock, so that there is a well-engaged set of property owners.

Gupta: Did the project look at larger scales and including things such as district heating?

Hamilton: It wasn't studied here, but in a larger scale this is something that could be included.

Aalfs: In terms of changing 70 meters into one meter, did PG&E give any indication if they would do that?

Hamilton: They have participated in several meetings, including one on site, and they seemed to be willing to entertain it, but it's yet to be seen. No formal opposition to it formally to the CPUC or otherwise, but this is likely to become a “fight” eventually.

Springer: Just about any project under the Advanced Energy Community grant program will include a microgrid, so this is bound to come up.

Please refer to the slide deck posted here: <http://ccag.ca.gov/committees/resource-management-and-climate-protection-committee/>

5. Update on California Public Utility Commission's Business Plan process, proposed decision:

Kim Springer gave a presentation on the CPUC's proposed decision. The proposed decision came out on April 4th, 2018, and is some 270 pages. The soonest the CPUC can vote to approve the decision is May 31, 2018.

Many local government partners and third-party programs are urging others to become parties to the decision and make comments to the CPUC, especially in terms of cost effectiveness, definition of herd to reach customers, and energy efficiency project requirements. There is, general, a concern that, if adopted, the proposed decision will make is difficult for implementers to serve small commercial customers.

The proposed decision approves the business plan proposals of the IOUs and BayREN, Marin Clean Energy, but not of the LGC-LGSEC.

Aalfs: Will MCE be the sole provider in Marin County?

Springer: Probably not, since PG&E will still be operating in that territory with 3rd party implementers to PG&E.

Gupta: when you say Program Administrators, how does that lay out in terms of territories?

Springer: It varies: if you are talking about the IOUs, it will be their territories, but in the case of MCE, it depends on the program they proposed.

Aalfs: MCE went through great pains to gain access to the ratepayer funds.

The guidelines for programs are being set out from 2018 through 2025, not a full 10 years. Steps after the proposed decision is commented on, and a final decision made, will be to start building implementation plans and structure for contracting.

Discussions are ongoing with other local government partners and REN programs in terms of comments, some of which will be filed jointly and other individually.

The ultimate outcome, in terms of funding for the SMCEW, is still unknown, but will be determined by PG&E based on the final decision outcome and how they piece together their entire portfolio to meet the new requirements.

6. Review and comment on San Mateo County Energy Strategy 2025 draft proposed documents: guiding principles, comparative review and contents, and stakeholder lists:

Kim Springer presented a set of guiding principles, review of content between the original Energy Strategy document and the proposed new document, to the committee for consideration.

Papan: This really goes after what we want to achieve in terms of principles, very well put together.

Gupta: a few of us started with a set of only four bullets and it slowly expanded to this, which I agree is well thought out.

Supervisor Pine asked that staff look at what was covered in the first strategy document and consider what we want to cover in this document. In addition, staff decided to also establish a proposed set of stakeholders for each of water and energy, which was also presented to the committee.

The committee suggested the addition of a stakeholder in the Energy list to come from the businesses community, perhaps a real estate developer, also adding a topic related to financial benefit of retrofit, LEED and ZNE. Gupta recommended that Transportation be included, such as Hydrogen.

The committee moved to the water section and it was suggested that grey water be included as a topic, and noted that water recycling, even to potable standards, is relatively new but progressing. The committee also noted that a progressive rate structure is also possible, as well as efficient landscape irrigation and groundwater recharge, as additions to the water section of the new document.

In terms of water stakeholders, the Committee suggested RCD and a water technology landscaper or biotech so that businesses is added.

7. Committee Member Updates

There were no committee updates.

8. Next Meeting Date: May 16, 2018 – Bovet Rd, San Mateo