

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 TASK FORCE
Minutes from the 8-27-2014 Meeting

In attendance:

Michael Barber, Supervisor Pine's office
Adrienne Carr, BAWSCA
Ed Cooney, CSG Consultants
Rick DeGolia, Town of Atherton*
Beth Bhatnagar, Sustainable San Mateo County
Deborah Gordon, Committee Chair, Woodside Town Council*
Pradeep Gupta, South San Francisco City Council*
Martha Serianz, Marin Clean Energy
Justin Kudo, Marin Clean Energy
Debbie Kranefuss, Ecology Action
Kathy Lavezzo, PG&E
Maryann Moise Derwin, Committee Vice Chair, Portola Valley Town Council*
Barbara Pierce, Redwood City Council*
Dave Pine, San Mateo County Board of Supervisors (left after 50 minutes)*
Kim Springer, County of San Mateo RecycleWorks (staff)
Sandy Wong, C/CAG
Susan Wright, County of San Mateo RecycleWorks (staff)

Not in attendance:

Bob Cormia, Foothill De Anza Community College
Sapna Dixit, PG&E
Don Horsley, San Mateo County Board of Supervisors*
Jorge Jaramillo, San Mateo County Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Alex Palantzas, San Mateo County Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Nicole Sandkulla, BAWSCA
Eric Sevim, A+ Japanese Auto Repair
*=elected official member

1) Introductions

Attendees introduced themselves and their organizations.

2) Public Comment

There was no public comment.

3) Approval of Minutes

Pradeep Gupta made a motion to approve the minutes from the July 16, 2014 meeting. The motion was seconded by Barbara Pierce. The motion carried.

4) Update on San Mateo County Sea Level Rise Planning (Dave Pine)

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.

Dave Pine reported on the June 27 sea level rise conference. A goal of the meeting was to get attendees to agree on 3 feet of sea level rise for planning purposes.

Three ad hoc working groups have been formed.

1. Vulnerability assessment. Coastal Conservancy is going to partner with the County to work on an assessment. Funds were appropriated at the last minute to work on climate resiliency. The assessment will address both the coast side and the bayside. They will make a staff person available to work on sea level rise issues. There will be a meeting on September 11 to kick off the process with the Coastal Conservancy.
2. Organizational committee. This group will address how we organize ourselves and what the organizational structure will be. John Byers and his team have put together some ideas. It could be a JPA or another organization of some form.
3. Funding structure: to establish a plan for developing funding for eventual protection of vulnerable assets.

The County and SFO have partnered on a project using Coastal Conservancy grant funds. The kick off will be on September 11, and is aimed at areas, mostly north of the airport property including Colma Creek.

FEMA is convening a meeting of the County and bay shore cities on September 30 or October 1 to talk about risk mapping and flooding. They will produce draft flood maps. The meeting will be for technical people.

5) Presentation on Development of Community Choice Aggregation (Justin Kudo, Marin Clean Energy Account Services)

Justin Kudo, from Marin Clean Energy (MCE) gave a presentation about Community Choice Aggregation (CCA).

CCAs have been operating for decades in US. AB 117 enabled CCAs in California in 2002. MCE has been working on getting more solar located locally. Customers are given a choice – Light Green (50% renewable), Deep Green (100% renewable), Sol Shares (100% local solar). MCE is regulated by the CPUC, so they must adhere to the Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS). MCE's percentage of renewables goes over the RPS requirement. The definition of "renewable" is the same between MCE and PG&E.

The benefit of a CCA is local control over contracting – the CCA can purchase more renewables and decide where the solar is sited. The California Independent Service Operator (Cal ISO) deals with load balancing.

Deborah Gordon asked what's the difference is between doing a CCA and encouraging PG&E to do more renewables?

Justin explained that MCE has an Integrated Resource Plan to decide every year what solar projects to pursue. During the Open Season Process they issue an RFP to receive proposals for projects to develop. Two years ago, 80 proposals were received. Last year, 40 were received.

Deborah asked if everyone in PG&E territory wanted Deep Green or Sol Shares, could they all? Justin explained that this goes to the Cal ISO, which is tasked with grid stability and resource adequacy costs and obligations. 100% of customers couldn't sign up for Deep Green at this time. MCE gives people the option to do something different from what is available from PG&E. MCE

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.

has contracts with 13-14 energy suppliers. When MCE first started, there were no utility scale projects in MCE service areas. There is a minimum threshold for the size of projects: 1MW. Larger projects are between 2 and 30 MW. There is a project in Corte Madera for 1/3 MW.

Pradeep Gupta commented that the grid infrastructure needs to change.

Justin said to make a CCA cost effective there should be at least 125,000-150,000 customers. RECs are an accounting tool for tracking renewable energy production. Check US EPA for more info. You can't track individual electrons and where they're going. You can track what's being generated by each utility. WREGIS – Western Renewable Energy Generation Information System.

Michael Barber said that AB 2145 is in the Senate right now. It restricts CCAs.

Martha Serianz said that the bill has been amended a lot since it was introduced in April. The bill stated that a CCA couldn't expand beyond three contiguous counties. Originally, the bill required customers to opt in rather than opt out. MCE is opposed to the bill in general, but they aren't actively lobbying on it. Why MCE is against it:

1. Three-county provision. MCE doesn't see the need to limit. That could make it harder for people in less populous counties.
2. Any time a CCA provides information, they have to provide a summary of all rates in comparison to the utility. MCE doesn't support this because PG&E and other IOUs don't have this requirement.

The only supporters of the bill are PG&E, SDG&E, and the electricians union. Hundreds of groups oppose the bill.

Deborah asked what mix of customers is needed to make a CCA viable.

Justin said that large industrial customers tend to have direct access, and would probably want to stay with that. MCE's customer mix is 50/50 – residential vs. commercial by unit. It's also important to look at time of use. Over 90% of MCE's customers are residential.

Kim Springer asked about the infrastructure of MCE's JPA. Who is making decisions about load, contracts, rates, etc? Contractors or the JPA?

Justin explained that the largest contract is with Shell Energy North America. MCE buys wind and biomass through them. This energy was previously sold to PG&E. MCE needs to buy power through 3rd party – bridge contract with Shell through 2017 until they can get their own. The goal is to get off of that contract. MCE now has contracts with 12 different power providers. At first, MCE did the analysis externally. They used two people from Paradigm – John Delessy and Kirby Desell. They are slowly bringing analysts in-house. Consultants are helping out.

Kim commented that if a larger area became a CCA, there may be a bidding war for renewable energy – whoever is willing to pay the most.

Justin said that he hasn't seen a shortage of contracts. PG&E spent \$5 to \$6 million marketing against MCE originally. PG&E spent \$40 million on Prop 16. MCE was told that no one would sell them power because they were an unproven concept.

The Napa County Board of Supervisors voted to join MCE. (The County, not the individual cities.)

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.

MCE includes all of Marin County and cities. They have done a study for City of San Pablo and Benicia for them to join MCE. San Francisco asked MCE to do a study. Study costs \$20,000 to \$30,000 for smaller area. \$100,000 for San Francisco. MCE has to see what the impact will be if they add this load.

A lot of communities have looked at it on their own. East Bay MUD declined to take it on. SF Board of Supervisors voted it, but commissioners refused to set rates (political issue). San Joaquin irrigation district formed a JPA, but got too much opposition to get it going. The first step would be to evaluate costs. Alameda County has allocated \$1 million for a feasibility study. Monterey has allocated \$330,000 for a feasibility study.

Michael said that the County has started an internal conversation for San Mateo County. The bill talks about grandfathering in non-contiguous counties. The current wording is that you have to have already voted to become part of a CCA. Jerry Hill has been supporting AB 2145 through committee. If elected officials have an opinion, they should make it known because the bill is on the floor.

6) Presentation on Local Government Commission, Beacon Award: Local Leadership Solving Climate Change (Susan Wright)

SMC Energy Watch thinks it would be valuable for the climate action work cities are doing to be more visible to the community. To this end, SMCEW is recommending that cities participate in the Beacon Award program administered by the Institute for Local Government. C/CAG is planning to serve as a Beacon Energy Champion to assist cities in participating in the program. Most of the information needed for awards is already available through GHG inventories and PG&E. SMCEW will also support interested cities in developing an annual report on climate action progress. The report will use the information that is collected for the Beacon Award. The suggested timing for the next annual report is Earth Day 2015.

7) Presentation on 2014 California Adaptation Forum (Kim Springer & Susan Wright)

Last year's National Climate Adaptation Forum drew 450 people. The California Adaptation Forum in August drew 800 people, about 200 more than expected. In addition to California, attendees came from 16 states; one participant came from Australia.

Key points from some of the sessions:

John Norgren from Kresge Foundation. Kresge is doing lots of work related to disadvantaged populations.

Michael McCormick from OPR. Best adaptation strategies reduce GHG emissions for a win-win. It's important to get all levels of government moving together: federal-state-regional-local.

Ken Alex – Director of OPR. Going forward, there will be a large emphasis on energy storage. California vehicle standards are now national vehicle standards. The State will probably meet 2020 emissions reduction goals, but there is concern about how to reach 80% reduction by 2050.

Francis Spivy-Weber – Water Resources Control Board. – We need to think about where the water will fall. A large water bond is on the November ballot. The Governor is providing leadership on the drought. Heavy marketing is being done to increase conservation, but they don't want to go too far.

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.

Ken Pimlock from California Department of Forestry. 4,100 fires have happened in California this year, which is 500 more than usual. In January alone, there were 400 fires. This isn't usually fire season. 50% of the worst fires in California history have happened since 2003.

Resiliency of energy systems. Sea level rise, high heat, flooding, and wildfire will all put stresses on equipment. There will be increased peak energy demand.

Transportation. – The system will double in 30 years. Because of the changing population, there will be an increased need for public transportation. There will be issues with heat.

Funding. NOAA pointed out the need to connect science/research with decision makers. We should connect with educational institutions to partner on grant opportunities.

Urban heat island effect – cool roofs. The color of roof and pavement can make a multiple degree difference in your environment. LBNL has a heat island group. The sun doesn't heat the air, it heats what it hits.

Regional collaboratives. There are regional collaboratives of local governments in Los Angeles, San Diego, Sacramento and the San Francisco Bay Area. Our region is the farthest behind. The collaboratives tend to be membership organizations with staff.

Federal support . FEMA's programs discourage rebuilding in hazardous conditions. FEMA funds holistic resilience programs. Staff emphasis is on planning and investment. FEMA is doing a pilot with Stanford to consider: "What are the policy implications of managed retreat?" US EPA is working with ABAG on One Bay Area Plan to reduce risk in new development areas.

Sea level rise tools. River flow into the bay and ocean is now being included in tools. Tools for mapping and/or planning are: Our Coast Our Future, Adapting to Rising Tides, Cal Adapt, NOAA, Silicon Valley 2.0, Pacific Institute, The Nature Conservancy (Ventura County).

Land Use Planning. As the sea rises, boundary issues and jurisdiction issues come up. California State Lands Commissions and California Coastal Commission have different jurisdictions.

Mayor of Lancaster. Lancaster is looking to be the first zero net energy city. The mayor takes the upstream approach to getting things done.

8) Update on San Mateo County Energy Watch (Susan Wright)

This item was postponed to the next meeting.

9) Committee Member Updates

Pradeep Gupta: FirstElement Fuel, Inc. was awarded \$24,667,000 from the California Energy Commission to construct 100 percent renewable refueling stations located in South San Francisco and 16 other cities. There was an event in South San Francisco to let people test hydrogen electric vehicles from Mercedes, Honda, Hyundai, and BMW.

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.

Kim Springer: John Hoang from C/CAG got a grant to develop an alternative fuel readiness plan. It will inform city staff and elected officials about rebates, funding opportunities, and safety requirements. This is a state initiative toward the low-carbon fuel standard.

Rick DeGolia: EV charging is a subject that we should collaborate on as a county. Atherton is going to include 10-15 EV charging stations in an upcoming project.

Barbara Pierce: David Gershon has a webinar series about behavior change in communities:

<http://www.eventbrite.com/e/webinar-series-featuring-david-gershon-october-december-2014-registration-11158255643>

10) Next Regular Meeting Date – September 17 @ 2pm at BAWSCA, 155 Bovet Road, Suite 650, San Mateo

Attachments:

None.

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.