

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*

Agenda

Resource Management and Climate Protection Committee (RMCP)

Date: Wednesday, December 17, 2014

Time: 2:00 to 4:00 p.m.

Location: 155 Bovet Rd. – Ground Floor Conference Room
San Mateo, CA

1. Introductions
2. Public Comment
3. Approval of Minutes from August 27, 2014 and October 22, 2014 meetings
(Susan Wright) Action
4. Presentation on ecoAmerica, Communicating on Climate - Guiding Principles
(Kim Springer – Committee Staff) Information, Discussion
5. Update on San Mateo County Sea Level Rise Planning and Community Choice Aggregation
(Dave Pine, County Supervisor) Information, Discussion
6. Review of final draft Energy Strategy RMCP Progress Report 2014
(Kim Springer – Committee Staff)
7. Update on Water Supply and Conservation Efforts in San Mateo County
(BAWSCA staff) Information, Discussion
8. Review and approval of RMCP meeting dates for calendar year 2015
(Kim Springer) Action
9. Committee Member Updates
10. Next Regular Meeting Date: TBD (Item 8)

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.

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.

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 10-22-2014 Meeting

In attendance:

Michael Barber, Supervisor Pine's office
Beth Bhatnagar, Sustainable San Mateo County
Adrienne Carr, BAWSCA
Brandi de Garreaux, Town of Portola Valley
Sapna Dixit, PG&E
Deborah Gordon, Committee Chair, Woodside Town Council*
Pradeep Gupta, South San Francisco City Council*
Joe Herr, PG&E
Debbie Kranefuss, Ecology Action
Alex Palantzas, San Mateo County Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
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
Rick DeGolia, Town of Atherton*
Don Horsley, San Mateo County Board of Supervisors*
Jorge Jaramillo, San Mateo County Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Kathy Lavezzo, PG&E
Maryann Moise Derwin, Committee Vice Chair, Portola Valley Town Council*
Alex Palantzas, San Mateo County Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Barbara Pierce, Redwood City Council*
Dave Pine, San Mateo County Board of Supervisors *
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

The minutes from the August 27, 2014 meeting were tabled because there wasn't a quorum of committee members.

4) Presentation on PG&E Energy Mix and Progress Toward Renewable Portfolio Standard

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.

(Joe Herr, PG&E)

Joe Herr explained the following points as part of his presentation:

- PG&E serves 5% of the U.S. population. 25% of all U.S. rooftop solar installations are in PG&E territory (on the customer side).
- The Renewable Energy System – Bill Credit Transfer involves exporting power to the grid. Local governments can bundle their usage across their own portfolio of facilities.
- The Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) only documents renewables on the utility side, not the customer side.
- Request for Offers (RFOs) are how PG&E gets new renewable projects built. There have been 156 RPS contracts totaling over 10,900 megawatts since the program began in 2002. They are dispersed throughout the state.
- Feed-in Tariff Contracts are all within California. These are smaller projects.
- RPS is for the retail sales only, which is probably 90% of all energy sales. Joe will get that total number. A bundled retail sale is the total amount of sales to PG&E customers. PG&E also has a wholesale side to the business. They provide transmission-level service. RPS is based on hours/usage, not projects.
- PG&E's electric vehicle department is growing. They renamed the department "Electric Vehicles and Electrification." Fuel switching is a reality.
- PG&E has programs that help incubate disruptive technologies like corn husks, etc. Solar came down to \$4 per watt. PG&E pays \$1,000 to \$3,000 when you install one of these technologies. Joe doesn't know as much about long-term scenario planning. Most of the projects are developed by 3rd parties, and PG&E pays for the energy.

The committee members made the following comments:

- Regarding RPS: Pradeep Gupta would like to see apples to apples – gigawatts and gigawatt hours. Also, energy efficiency should be part of the overall pie. It should be considered renewable.
- Deborah Gordon: We should take into account the amount of work accomplished for the energy spent, or "energy value." It's not "doing without," it's doing it better. That concept never comes through on these slides. It's like the miles per gallon for energy.
- Joe: MPGE is efficiency for EVs. There could be a BTU conversion.
- Pradeep: Look at labor productivity. 1 unit of electricity = what output? Right now, energy efficiency is seen as sacrificing. A lot of little things add up.
- Deborah: The cost of natural gas is going down because the United States is producing more. The incentive to do renewables used to be cost, not importing foreign oil/gas. But now we are producing our own. How does the fluctuation of the cost of natural gas change the investments in renewable energy? Joe suggested that we do a follow-up meeting about long-term procurement planning. When PG&E originally procured renewables, the prices weren't as good, but they've come down significantly.
- Adrienne Carr: The jump in GHG between 2006 and 2007 might have been because 2007 was a dry year, so PG&E couldn't get as much power from large hydro.

PG&E filed a proposal for the "Green Option" about 3 years ago. They're expecting a final decision shortly.

1st option: Individual. It will provide customers the option to go with 100% solar within PG&E territory. It will be 100% voluntary. The pool of projects will be .5 to 20 MW. It will include community solar. There will be preferential placement of projects in areas with high participation.

2nd option: Community Solar Option: .5 to 3 MW customers can buy into projects sited in their

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.

same community.

The proposed program will be 272 MW. This will be one of the largest community solar projects in the country.

- Deborah: That goes along with what local governments are trying to do: put solar on their own facilities to generate energy for other municipal buildings. RESBCT enables that now.

California independent system operator slide (#12)

What does a high load case look like? We are already operating in a new era of integration challenges. We have to figure out over-generation, EVs, and storage. They're working on integration through pilots and design challenges.

- Michael: Tesla is looking at the issue of batteries.
- Joe: A Sparks, NV battery plant is coming. The "ramp" on the grid is being considered. We need more flexible generation on the grid than we have today. It needs faster cycling so we can get through the ramps quickly. Generators aren't as upwardly and downward flexible. Demand response has been focused on shifting load off critical peaks. But now we're going to have over-generation during the same time. PG&E currently has rigid time frames for time of use. We will be beneficially moving energy use to when it's needed.
- Deborah: Are we getting in to micro grids? Solar works well in Arizona, but maybe not in Seattle. Are we balancing and optimizing where conditions are different in different parts of the country?
- Joe: Seattle has large hydro. In each area, demand programs are going to look different depending on the generation resource.
- Deborah: We have to look at behavior models being different in different parts of the country. We'll need different messaging.
- Pradeep: This chart (slide #12) is confusing because the scale on the left and right aren't the same. Left: Load & Net Load is 20,000MW to 46,000MW. Right: Wind & Solar is 0 to 10,000MW. PG&E is trying to optimize their investments. For local investments, is PG&E working with me, or trying to accommodate? Are we working together in spirit? What is PG&E corporate thinking?
- Joe: The chart on slide #12 is from the California Independent System Operator to highlight the issue of over-generation. Occasionally we have over-generation events now, but it will increase as we get to 2020.
- Deborah: We need to work with the business community. How can they adapt to take advantage of this, and/or completely new businesses?
- Pradeep: They could be offered incentives to change the way they do business.
- Joe: Demand Response programs interact with businesses to shift load. The scale of programs is 630MW. In comparison, community solar is ~200MW.
- Pradeep: We want to work with PG&E. PG&E has data and long term trends. We have enthusiasm and the ability to bring people together.
- Deborah: We would like to have a follow-up presentation, conversation. Maybe 3 or 4 of us would like to meet in more of a working group setting. What are the PG&E programs that are undersubscribed? How could we work together?
- Pradeep: Some homeowners associations have been exposed to solar pitches. Sometimes they're making promises about net metering. People are confused. Companies are getting their script approved by PG&E. We would like to have a spokesperson on the economics.
- Deborah: We would like to have a template for all the questions being asked. That would be really helpful.
- Kim Springer: That information could go on Energy Sage website.

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.

Per the group discussion, slide #12 was removed from the Power Point file. The slide was considered problematic because the chart included two different MW scales on the Y axis. Joe Herr preferred not to perpetuate use of this chart, as it muddles an already complicated conversation around changing grid conditions.

5) Update on San Mateo County Energy Watch Staffing and Contracting Process (Susan Wright)

Susan Wright showed the committee the presentation that she and Kim Springer were planning to show to the C/CAG Board at their November meeting. The committee gave the following feedback:

- Need more information about the change in GHG emissions.
- Need to include the cost of measurable action.
- Need to answer these questions: “Where would we be if we hadn’t done anything? Where do we need to go? What is the cost per kWh?”
- For the Energy Sage online solar marketplace, can there be an information section to answer questions about the efficiency of solar panels and other issues?
- What is the impact of the program on small businesses?

6) Update on San Mateo County Sea Level Rise Planning (Michael Barber)

Vulnerability assessment committee hosted a second meeting. The County is seeking a \$400-500k grant for larger vulnerability scoping for the coast side and bay side. The County applied for an Army Corps in-kind grant. We’re likely to get it. Dec. 4 – Coastal Conservancy meeting to find out if they get the grant. Dec. 11 – 3rd scoping meeting. By the end of next year, we’ll be the forefront of California

Finance committee is looking at how projects would get financed.

Everyone is impacted by sea level rise because we all use the wastewater treatment facilities. We hope to get a study done early next year. We’re hoping to bring people on board because resources are scattered. We’re trying to avoid each city trying to manage their own creek problems one at a time. We need to work regionally.

- Sapna Dixit: PG&E is doing a lot of work internally on adaptation. They’re doing a vulnerability analysis on substations and have a monthly internal working group. Scott Hart has been attending meetings of Silicon Valley 2.0 and staying engaged.
- Pradeep: Sea level rise is one of the new factors for the next One Bay Area plan.

7) Update on Water Supply and Conservation Efforts in San Mateo County (Adrienne Carr)

We’re in the driest 3-year period since 1776-1778. We are able to manage storage. 10% reductions will continue through April when we will really know the status from winter rains. If it stays dry, we’ll need to do a 20% reduction. In the county, reductions have ranged between 7% and 31%. Mid-Peninsula is getting 28% reduction.

There is a 2/3rds chance of getting a better than average wet year.

Update on drought activities:

- Running Youtube ads.

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.

- BAWSCA is promoting WaterSmart Software or another program to create home water use reports for customers. Only one agency has signed up so far.
- Started a rainbarrel rebate program. This has stormwater as well as water conservation benefits.
- There's interest in incentives for weather-based irrigation controllers.

8) **Committee Member Updates**

Beth Bhatnagar: Nominations for Sustainable San Mateo County's Sustainability Awards are due November 21. The release of the Indicator's Report on transportation is on November 12.

9) **Next Regular Meeting Date**

Sustainable Silicon Valley is having their WEST Summit on November 19 from noon to 6pm, so we will skip a November meeting.

The next meeting will be December 17.

Attachments:

None.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: December 17, 2014
To: Resource Management and Climate Protection Committee
From: Kim Springer, Committee Staff
Subject: Presentation on ecoAmerica, Communicating on Climate – Guiding Principles
(For further information contact Kim Springer at 650-599-1412)

RECOMMENDATION

Receive a presentation on a document called Communicating on Climate – Guiding Principles, published by ecoAmerica.

FISCAL IMPACT

None

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Most all SMCEW program staff costs and expenses are paid for by funding under the C/CAG – PG&E Local Government Partnership (LGP) agreement.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

On several occasions, RMCP Committee members have discussed concerns about how to communicate the energy efficiency and climate change message to residents, businesses and other potential stakeholder partners in San Mateo County.

One of the concerns expressed by the Committee has been to not overwhelm the “listener” or to create fear by delivering too strong a message and staff believes it would be in the interest of the Committee to have some guiding principles to lead communication efforts.

EcoAmerica, based in Washington DC and San Francisco, recently released a number of guidelines based on considerable market research on how to approach this issue. The following is a quote from the ecoAmerica website (<http://ecoamerica.org/>):

“ecoAmerica starts with people to genuinely understand and address Americans’ core concerns and how they relate to climate and sustainability. We seek greater effectiveness in the way we engage with people, always with the goal of growing the base of support. Our vision is of a coalition of the whole. As Americans, we can join across our differences to solve the biggest problem that affects us all: climate change.”

Staff will be prepared to make a presentation and lead a discussion on the attached document: Communicating on Climate: 13 Steps and Guiding Principles, but will also attempt to get staff from ecoAmerica to present and answer questions about the research completed in the development of their guidance documents.

ATTACHMENTS

Communicating on Climate: 13 Steps and Guiding Principles



COMMUNICATING ON CLIMATE

13 Steps and Guiding Principles

DECEMBER 2013



ecoAmerica

COMMUNICATING ON CLIMATE

Let's face it, we've all had times when talking about climate change has felt like a difficult task that results in dissonance and disagreement. For most people, climate change is an abstract subject tainted with divisive political positions. We've heard bits of guidance from select experts that we've tried to employ, such as getting the message and the messenger right. To some people, this means having scientists explain climate science to politicians. To others, it means having faith leaders talk about climate change in church. But there's more to it than that.

The truth is, we can all be effective communicators on climate change. Most Americans know that the climate around them is changing, and they are concerned. They want information that builds their understanding and confidence in ways that are consistent with their values and beliefs. If you truly understand and connect with those concerns, you can provide them with answers that they in turn can communicate to their networks.

These general guidelines work with any audience. They draw on research and real life experience from by ecoAmerica and others in creating effective programs that engage people on climate change. The first step, however, directs you toward specific audiences. Conservationists have different concerns than health care professionals or businesspeople. Grounding yourself in their specific concerns, versus your own or more general concerns, is the key to bringing out the realities of climate change.

Further information and additional research studies can be found at ecoAmerica.org/research, on the ecoAffect.org blog under the research section, as well as on ClimateCommunication.org, ClimateAccess.org, ClimateChangeCommunication.org, ClimateNexus.org and others. We welcome your comments and suggestions.

ecoAmerica

THE 13 STEPS

1. *Start with people, stay with people*
2. *Connect on common values*
3. *Acknowledge ambivalence*
4. *Scale from personal to planet*
5. *Sequence matters*
6. *Use “facts,” not science*
7. *Inspire and empower*
8. *Be solutions-focused*
9. *Describe, don't label*
10. *Have at least 1 powerful fact from a trusted messenger*
11. *Prepare don't adapt*
12. *Speak from the mountaintops, don't fight in the trenches*
13. *Message discipline is critical*

13 STEPS AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The following are the 13 steps to crafting an emotionally resonant, personalized, and effective message on climate change.

1. **Start with people, stay with people.** Doing homework on your audience and their work and concerns demonstrates respect. If you can connect what they care about to climate change in their own words, they will listen to you. If you research to understand their needs and relate to them where they are, it will open hearts and minds. Start from their perspective, and infuse what they care about throughout the entirety of your conversation or communication. ^{1,2}
2. **Connect on common values.** Many people talk about the science of climate change, the causes and consequences, and what must be done to address the issue. However, if you want people to care and act, you need to make the issue relevant to them. Connecting on values that bring us together – family, community and America – opens up emotional and motivating bonds that humanize yourself and form the foundation of a productive discussion on climate change. ^{1,2,3,4}
3. **Acknowledge ambivalence.** Not all of us have the same information on climate change, and many Americans are focused on other priorities. If you start out assuming everyone knows, or should know, or cares, or should care as much as you do, you will lose much of your audience. A simple line like, “Some people are worried more about climate change, and some people are less concerned,” will allow people to be comfortable where they are, and listen to you with an open mind. ¹
4. **Scale from personal to planet.** People understand what they can see around them with their own eyes. If you talk about Superstorm Sandy or wildfires in the Rockies, people get that. Then you can scale up to other areas of the country or the planet. Starting with global catastrophe leads to fatalism, since many people can’t see how their actions could address such a big problem. ^{1,2}
5. **Sequence matters.** Research reveals that you can take the same set of six facts, arrange them in different ways, and end up with very different results. Connect on common values, acknowledge ambivalence, and scale from personal to planet. If you start with the negative and impersonal, it’s very hard to get to the positive, personal and relevant. Try going the other way. ¹
6. **Use “facts,” not science.** Every time you read about science, it’s refuting some other science. We have our scientists, and the other side has theirs. Everyone knows scientists argue, and that science can be mutable. Talking about science opens the door to question and debate. It’s better to assume the science, and talk about the facts. Over 80% of Americans notice that the climate and weather are changing. Talk about the facts of warmer summers and droughts. After all, you don’t talk about the science of smoking cigarettes - you talk about health. ^{1,2}
7. **Inspire and empower.** The most important thing to do to get people to engage on climate change is to convey a sense of hope and potential. Many of us avoid the subject because it can be depressing. America has doubled the supply of solar energy in just the past 2 years. America has solved great challenges before, and we know we can solve this one too. ^{1,2,5,6}
8. **Be solutions-focused.** If climate change is as large of a problem as we say it is, Americans will expect us to offer (and will respond better to) practical solutions that match at scale. Even if you talk about light bulbs, it’s about what can happen when all of us change them. Show the path to achieve your solution. Will it seem realistic? Overwhelm problems with solutions, presenting five solutions for every 1 problem, ensuring you focus on solutions actively in place all around them. Doing so will quell any feelings of futility and fatalism, while at the same time motivating them on what is possible. Avoid suggesting people sacrifice. Americans have shallow tolerance for more problems; they are strapped for time, resources, and money. Offer a path to a better life, not a lesser life. ^{1,2,3,4,5,6}
9. **Describe, don’t label.** Labels are code words that bring up other, sometimes negative, associations. Abstractions don’t have the same power as do concrete terms. A lot of climate change terms, like “mitigation,” don’t mean much to Americans. Rather than talk about “alternative energy,” talk about wind and solar power. Rather than “ecosystem collapse”, talk about the plants and animals that we depend on to survive. The most persuasive language is vivid, familiar, and descriptive. ^{1,6}
10. **Have at least 1 powerful fact from a trusted messenger.** One or two facts with a lot of emotional power can add significant weight to your message. Highly trusted messengers - different for different audiences - lend credibility and importance. Find a great, relevant quote from someone your audience knows and trusts. ^{1,7}
11. **Prepare, don’t adapt.** Adaptation is a disempowering term that leads to fatalism and resignation. You can’t do anything about it, so just adapt. Preparation, on the other hand, leads to action. Preparation implies there’s a problem that we can do something about. Americans know how to prepare, and part of preparation is risk mitigation. ^{6,8}
12. **Speak from the mountaintops, don’t fight in the trenches.** Focus on the big picture, on what’s important, on working together to achieve common good. Arguing details turns off your audience and distracts from the important point. Whether the drought is the worst or the second worst ever is not the point. The point is the trend, the big issue, and the solutions. ^{1,2}
13. **Message discipline is critical.** Simple messages, repeated often, by trusted messengers are powerful. Follow the rules above, be consistent, and don’t be afraid of repeating critical points. Explaining the same thing in different ways may be more confusing than it is enabling. ^{1,2,3,4,5}

¹ "Climate Truths," ecoAmerica, 2009

² "American Climate and Environmental Values Survey," ecoAmerica, 2011

³ "The Psychology of Climate Change Communication," Center for Research on Environmental Decisions, Columbia University, 2009

⁴ "Common Cause: The Case for Working with our Shared Values," World Wildlife Fund, 2010

⁵ "New Rules, New Game – Communication Tactics for Climate Change," Futerra Sustainability Communications, 2011

⁶ "Climate Impacts: Take Care and Prepare," ecoAmerica, 2012

⁷ "Engaged Nurses, Healthy Americans," ecoAmerica 2012

⁸ "The American Public's Preference for Preparing for the Possible Effects of Global Warming: Impact of Communication Strategies," Stanford Woods Institute for the Environment, 2013

PUTTING METHOD INTO PRACTICE

A Hypothetical Example Using the 13 Steps

1. Start with people, stay with people:

Janine begins by showing understanding of and appreciation for her audience, and connects with their values throughout her speech.

2. Connect on common values: Janine builds rapport by connecting with her audience's values through a community treasure.

3. Acknowledge ambivalence: Here, Janine carefully introduces climate change, respects the potential spectrum of audience attitudes, and allows people in the room to hold differing beliefs.

4. Scale from personal to planet: Janine makes climate personally relevant by pointing to the local impacts, then scales up.

5. Sequence matters: By this point in her speech, Janine is able to ease into talking to her audience about climate change because she has followed the first four steps to open up the conversation (and her audience's minds).

6. Use "facts," not science: Janine talks about the drought; the water level is down, fish are impacted, and water supplies are diminished. Here Janine points to irrefutable facts that her audience can see with their own eyes.

7. Inspire and empower: After discussing the impacts of climate change, Janine moves quickly to motivate her audience. She does this by conveying hope, potential, and ability.

Janine Robert's Speech to the Rotary Club of Sioux Falls, IA

Hello, and good afternoon. Thank you so much for the opportunity to speak today. I am a big fan of your mentorship program here in the local high schools – it's a perfect example of the business community playing a leadership role to improve our civic life.

Today I am here to talk about one of our city's treasures, the Big Sioux River. Most of us have grown up fishing or rafting there, or just walking along its banks. I bet if I asked, each of you could recall several wonderful memories with family and friends along its shores, or wading in its waters. My husband and I have spent weeks fishing there with the kids.

Who has been to the Big Sioux River lately? For those of you who have, I think you'll agree it's not hard to see that the river isn't what it used to be.

Now I can bet we have many differing opinions in the room on what or who's to blame for these changes in our climate, and I would also wager that we can all agree we need The Big Sioux River! And, it needs us.

There is change happening right in our backyards, in the backyards of all of Iowa, and throughout the country. The water level is down, and higher water temperatures are impacting fish counts and fish health. Our main source of clean drinking water is diminishing.

We have the opportunity and ability to do something about it. We can help restore and protect not only the Big Sioux River, but also our livelihoods and our nation, for ourselves, our children, and future generations.

The good news is that there are already leaders in this community who have started to do something to help. Some of the high schools in your mentorship program are helping to plant trees near the river, the Mayor has implemented smart water use, several of our churches and church goers have taken The St. Francis Pledge to lead by example in reducing their impact, and solar power is a rapidly growing industry in the state. According to the Argus Leader, the solar power industry in Iowa grew 33 percent in just one year. These are just a few examples of the many meaningful and powerful things we can do to prepare for and help prevent further climate change.

And so I am asking you, as leaders in the business community, to be part of the solution. Solutions can be accessible, effective, meaningful, and good for business. Whether it is making your operations more efficient or planting native plants in your garden, there is something for everyone to do. In fact, there are over 100 ideas listed in the materials you have in your hands. I am happy to discuss them with you.

Finally, you have the power to set a new example, to help prepare and protect our community from the impacts of climate change, and to work to preserve our treasured natural heritage, the Big Sioux River. Join me in being part of the solution.

Individually we can make a difference; collectively we can do so much more.

Thank you. I look forward to collaborating with you.

8. Be solutions-focused: Janine is showing that solutions are accessible and meaningful. Notice that she avoids asking her audience to sacrifice.

9. Describe, don't label: Throughout this speech, Janine is using concrete and descriptive language that is familiar to her audience. She avoids technical terms or abstractions, like "mitigation."

10. Have at least 1 powerful fact from a trusted messenger: Janine doesn't weigh her speech down with numbers (which cause people to tune out). Instead, she inspires them with 1 powerful fact on the statewide increase in solar power.

11. Prepare, don't adapt: Janine uses the term "preparation" instead of "adaptation" to inspire action. She knows her audience understands the term, which conjures up proactive and preventative steps that scale.

12. Speak from the mountaintops: Janine increases the momentum she has built up in the room. She talks big picture, and focuses on common good. In the question and answer session that follows this speech, Janine will be sure to avoid argument, specifically on details.

13. Message discipline is critical: Message consistency makes it easy for audiences to understand, remember, and share. Janine stays on point, and is clear and consistent.

ecoAmerica

start with people

1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW
Suite 200
Washington, DC 20036

870 Market Street
Suite 428
San Francisco, CA 94102

202.457.1900
ecoAmerica.org
MomentUs.org

ecoAmerica grows the base of popular support for climate solutions in America with research-driven marketing, partnerships, and national programs that connect with Americans' core values to bring about and support change in personal and civic choices and behaviors.

This report is printed on post-consumer fiber content recycled paper.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: December 17, 2014
To: Resource Management and Climate Protection Committee
From: Dave Pine, RMCP Committee Member
Subject: Update on San Mateo County Sea Level Rise Planning and Community Choice Aggregation
(for further information contact Kim Springer at 650-599-1412)

RECOMMENDATION

Receive an update on San Mateo County sea level rise planning and community choice aggregation (CCA).

FISCAL IMPACT

Staffing of the RMCP Committee is contracted to the County of San Mateo, Department of Public Works and paid by C/CAG from Congestion Relief funds.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

San Mateo County has progressed on climate mitigation over the past several years, through the work of individual cities and the C/CAG- and PG&E-funded Regionally Integrated Climate Action Planning Suite (RICAPS) project. Over the past few years, some of the discussions and efforts, locally and regionally, have turned towards the importance of adapting to potential climate change risks, such as higher daytime temperatures, increased fire incidents and flood occurrences. One of the largest and potentially most costly risks to San Mateo County is Sea Level Rise (SLR). County Supervisor Dave Pine has taken the lead in San Mateo County on this issue.

Two meetings, one on December 9, 2013 and one on June 27, 2014, were organized by Supervisor Pine's office to launch awareness and planning efforts on SLR. Another meeting to establish a SLR vulnerability assessment working group was held on September 29, 2014. More recently, the County has applied for a grant from the Coastal Conservancy to begin the vulnerability assessment process. This work is being coordinated through the County Office of Sustainability.

Another project being coordinated through the County Office of Sustainability is a countywide approach to CCA. A discussion was held at the December 9, 2014 County Board of Supervisor's

(BOS) meeting to explain CCA and to gain support from the BOS to move ahead with the project.

Supervisor Pine will give an update on sea level rise planning and future steps to coordinate CCA in San Mateo County.

ATTACHMENT

None

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: December 17, 2014
To: Resource Management and Climate Protection Committee
From: Kim Springer, Committee Staff
Subject: Review of final draft Energy Strategy RMCP Progress Report 2014
(For further information contact Kim Springer at 650-599-1412)

RECOMMENDATION

Review and comment on final draft Energy Strategy RMCP Progress Report 2014.

FISCAL IMPACT

\$40,000 annually for staffing of the RMCP Committee.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Staffing of the RMCP Committee is contracted to the County of San Mateo, Department of Public Works and comes from Congestion Relief funds.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

At the February 19, 2014 RMCP Committee meeting, committee member Pradeep Gupta suggested that some sort of reporting structure should be established. It should provide an overview of projects overseen by the RMCP Committee, a historical record of work completed with progress to date, next steps and goals, and a source of material for new committee members to understand the scope of work by the committee.

Staff developed a template for a progress report that took these elements into consideration and filled out one section of the template for review by the Committee, which was presented at the March 19, 2014 RMCP meeting.

Staff has completed a final draft of the document for 2014 for review by the committee and requests comments. The document is provided as an attachment to this staff report.

With committee comments addressed, the report will be provided to PG&E as a progress report for the 2013-14 program cycle.

ATTACHMENTS

RMCP December 2014 Progress Review (to follow under separate cover)

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: December 17, 2014
To: Resource Management and Climate Protection Committee
From: Kim Springer, BAWSCA, Committee Staff
Subject: Update on Water Supply and Conservation Efforts in San Mateo County

(For further information contact Kim Springer at 650-599-1412)

RECOMMENDATION

Receive an update on current water supply and water conservation efforts in San Mateo County.

FISCAL IMPACT

None

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Most all SMCEW program staff costs and expenses are paid for by funding under the C/CAG – PG&E Local Government Partnership (LGP) agreement.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

With ongoing dry conditions throughout California, on January 31, 2014 the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), the third largest utility in California, serving 2.6 million customers, requested a 10% voluntary water use reduction from all customers of the Hetch Hetchy Regional Water System. The Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency (BAWSCA), which represents the 26 wholesale customers of the Hetch Hetchy Regional Water System, is working with its member agencies to achieve the 10% reduction goal.

Adrienne Carr, Senior Water Resource Specialist with BAWSCA, gave a short update of conditions related to the current drought at the February, March, May and October 2014 RMCP Committee meetings.

A BAWSCA staff member will provide an update on the current water supply outlook, conservation outreach, and other topics, especially in light of the recent storms in California and the Bay Area.

ATTACHMENTS

None

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: December 17, 2014
To: Resource Management and Climate Protection Committee
From: Kim Springer, Committee Staff
Subject: Review and approval of RMCP meeting dates for calendar year 2015
(For further information contact Kim Springer at 650-599-1412)

RECOMMENDATION

Review and approve RMCP meeting dates for calendar year 2015

FISCAL IMPACT

None

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Most all SMCEW program staff costs and expenses are paid for by funding under the C/CAG – PG&E Local Government Partnership (LGP) agreement.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

At the end of each calendar year, the committee reviews and approves the meeting dates for the following calendar year.

The RMCP Committee will continue to meet on the third Wednesday of each month from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m., provided staff has sufficient business to conduct at the meeting. Staff may cancel a meeting or shift a meeting date with notice to the committee and the public. Meetings will continue to be held at the 155 Bovet Rd., San Mateo location from 2015 unless modified by the committee.

The following dates are the planned meeting dates for the RMCP Committee in 2015:

January 21	July 15
February 18	August 19
March 18	September 16
April 15	October 21
May 20	November 18
June 24 (SEEC Forum)	December 16

ATTACHMENTS

None