

**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 3-18-2015 Meeting**

**In attendance:**

Michael Barber, Supervisor Pine's office  
Beth Bhatnagar, Sustainable San Mateo County  
Brian Bishop, PG&E (by phone)  
Ed Cooney, CSG Consultants for Town of Hillsborough  
Rick DeGolia, Town of Atherton\*  
Maryann Moise Derwin, Committee Vice Chair, Portola Valley Town Council\*  
Pradeep Gupta, South San Francisco City Council\*  
Scott Hart, PG&E  
Joe Herr, PG&E  
Deborah Hirst, Supervisor Horsley's office  
John Hoang, C/CAG  
Andree Johnson, BAWSCA  
Joe La Mariana, County of San Mateo RecycleWorks  
Kathy Lavezzo, PG&E  
Nick Pegueros, Town of Portola Valley Town Manager  
Barbara Pierce, Redwood City City Council\*  
Kim Springer, County of San Mateo RecycleWorks (staff)  
Gordon Tong, County of San Mateo Office of Sustainability  
Sandy Wong, C/CAG  
Susan Wright, County of San Mateo RecycleWorks (staff)

**Not in attendance:**

Adrienne Carr, BAWSCA  
Bob Cormia, Foothill De Anza Community College  
Deborah Gordon, Committee Chair, Woodside Town Council\*  
Jorge Jaramillo, San Mateo County Hispanic Chamber of Commerce  
Don Horsley, San Mateo County Board of Supervisors\*  
Debbie Kranefuss, Ecology Action  
Alex Palantzas, San Mateo County Hispanic Chamber of Commerce  
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.

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.

### 3) Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the January 21, 2015 meeting were approved.

### 4) Presentation on PG&E's new Green Option (Joe Herr and Sapna Dixit, PG&E)

After Sapna Dixit's presentation, the committee discussed the program.

- The cost of solar has been declining. PG&E's Generation Rate Credit will fluctuate and continue to go up over time.
- Adjustments to the rates will probably be made annually, but the decision is still being finalized. The green option may be different than standard practice about tariffs. Once people enroll, they can un-enroll at any time, but they can't re-enroll before 12 months.
- The cap number is 272 MW, not a specific number of customers. 45 MW are reserved for residential customers. PG&E can take enrollments until 2019 or until the cap is reached. It's fixed for this phase of the program, but PG&E could go back to CPUC to ask for more. The CPUC has the power to change the number. 600 MW is a starting number statewide.
- All projects for this program will be sited in state and will be preferentially located...sited in areas where people are signing up for the program. It's incremental to PG&E's RPS requirements.

Question: How does the green option affect the load balance? The MW number isn't set according to the portfolio or baseline. If everyone wanted to sign up, PG&E couldn't provide 100% solar for everyone right now. If the CPUC can raise the number, what are they basing that on? Engineering? Program marketing? Availability?

- PG&E doesn't have background on negotiation numbers. That number is probably a programmatic decision. There's a lot to be figured out about how it evolves over time.
- Nationwide this is an unprecedented size.

Question: There are a lot of competing programs, for instance solar incentives, CCAs, businesses selling solar with no down payment. How do you explain all those to customers? Do you explain all options or focus on this one?

Comment: About 75% of utility customers don't have a location for solar that will work. This would serve those customers.

- PG&E is trying to give customers a choice. It addresses the gap in the market for community solar. The green option will be good for people that have looked at the landscape but haven't found a program that met their needs. Customers that have rooftop solar that generates 75% of their electricity could join this program to make their own usage 100% solar. Customers can purchase an amount of usage.
- Next steps – PG&E has to file implementation advice letters to the CPUC about marketing, customers, procurement. There will be a series of workshops in March and April. This program wasn't conceived originally as an alternative to rooftop solar.

Comments: It looks like this is competitive to CCAs?

It's an additional renewable energy option. Customers will get the same electricity whether they sign up or not. Basically customers will be paying a premium to force PG&E to add solar that they wouldn't have done otherwise.

- PG&E won't be marketing this against CCAs.
- The green option is adding renewable power options that weren't being met in the marketplace. This was put in place separate from the soaring amount of utility scale solar going on for the RPS goal.

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.

Question: Can some of the new solar be produced by municipalities, or does it have to be done by commercial entities?

- The Enhanced Community Renewables (ECR) part of the program leaves a lot about the nature of the customer-development agreement to be defined, based on the decision in January. The text actually says things like “we leave it to the imagination of ...”
- The process will be advice letters (3 in March). At the prehearing conference at CPUC, PG&E raised questions about 20 things that need to be defined. During Phase 4 (Sept – Dec), these issues will be handled.
- There’s an opportunity for communities and the developer community to take a look at what has been defined, because the customer-developer agreement doesn’t exist yet.
- The size of projects is smaller (.5 to 3 MW).
- A developer needs to drum up interest to buy in to a subset of a project. KW portion ownership could be offered.

Question: Does this lead to the possibility of microgrids and/or grid enhancements?

Comment: Microgrids have important implications to distributed generation. They’re a benefit in case we are isolated for some reason. Those things have to be designed in to a system by PG&E – it doesn’t happen organically.

Comment: Military bases are a good way to test a microgrid. We need high reliability, resilient technology. Consider 24 hour companies that need refrigeration. We’re going to want to be thinking in that direction.

- The intent of ECR was to leave enough opportunity space for creative arrangements to evolve. It’s incumbent on developers and customers to bring a project to the utility.
- The procurement mechanism has been specified (same as exists today), but that will be discussed, refined. (The REMAT process.) Companies like Mosaic, Clean Energy Collective, and Sun Shares are starting to have conversations.
- A question that will be answered by the process is, “What would be a transaction schedule that could be beneficial to all parties?”
- PG&E has been interconnecting microgrids for several years. Santa Rita jail and Fort Hunter Ligit are good examples. CEC’s EPIC program works on future R&D needs. At a recent CPUC workshop about microgrids, there was a case study about the UCSD microgrid, which was usually a net importer, but during fires in Southern California it became a net exporter of about 3 MW. Humboldt State Energy Research Lab got an EPIC grant for a reservation used as a regional emergency relief shelter. PG&E supported them in that effort and helped with early technical assistance.

The committee is interested in more information about PG&E’s strategy regarding the following topics at a future meeting:

- Microgrid development
- Distributed power (in general, not just solar)
- Load balancing
- Resiliency

#### **5) Presentation on growth of Customer-side Solar in San Mateo County from 1998 to 2014 (Sapna Dixit, PG&E)**

Sapna Dixit’s slides showed all the interconnections for solar between 1998 and 2014, including the date and installed capacity. The trend is similar in Santa Clara County.

Comment: When individuals are working to put solar on their home, it would be nice if PG&E could guide them and help them get their projects approved as easily and helpful as possible.

- Solar customers may be underserved. PG&E's interconnection times are leading the industry now, but the public doesn't know that. PG&E will consider these comments.

**6) Presentation on Solar Thermal implementation and incentives in California (Brian Bishop, PG&E)**

After Brian Bishop's presentation, the group discussed the program. Additional points were made:

- PG&E is offering workshops for contractors, classes. They're trying to get the word out about the program.
- The program only incentivizes saved therms for solar water heating. PG&E originally had incentives for electric, too, but they were tied to the electric budget, and that isn't available any more.
- The staff report said that the cost per kwh has dropped from \$10 to \$5, but it should have been the cost per kwh *of solar*.
- SMC Energy Watch is working with Brian to find municipal and school projects that could benefit from the higher solar thermal rebates.
- For commercial, "solar wall" technology was just added. It's more efficient to heat air directly rather than heat water first. Direct air space heating is being added. This is popular in colder climates.

**7) Update on Water Supply and Conservation Efforts in San Mateo County (Andree Johnson, BAWSCA)**

- State Water Resources Board put in new restrictions yesterday prohibiting irrigation within 48 hours of rainfall events, and other measures.
- Urban water suppliers must impose limits on the number of days per week that irrigation is allowed. Water suppliers can follow their own policies. Statewide, 2 days is the default. Agencies have flexibility to set up what works for their community.
- There are some exceptions for hand watering and using recycled water or gray water.
- Programs are looking at large landscapes where irrigation is metered separately. BAWSCA is hoping that people start realizing that it's not sustainable to maintain a lawn.
- Restricting irrigation to 2 days a week irrigation doesn't address volume or runoff. Customers have to be on the honor system unless you have AMI or AMR – real-time water monitoring.
- Dublin/San Ramon have reduced water allocations 30-40%, so there are restrictions on filling pools.
- BayAreaGardening.org has a new water Calculator feature. It is a custom irrigation tool.
- Conservation efforts in the BAWSCA service territory last year kept us out of mandatory restrictions this year. Based on the storage levels we have right now, the BAWSCA/Hetch Hetchy system has 3 years' supply.
- If LA only has a few months left of water supply, what happens at the state level regarding sharing the supply?
- Water rates in Redwood City are tiered by use.
- Menlo Park has a program called "Conserve-a-Scape" that offers residents a customized landscaping plan for \$50 if they're participating in the Lawn Be Gone program.
- There will be a meeting of the Large Residential Resource Conservation Collaborative (LR2C2) focusing on Lawn Be Gone marketing on March 31.
- Portola Valley has a formal water committee.

- Hydropower is dropping. PG&E is having to use natural gas to supplement hydro. That will be another factor that impacts emissions.
- BAWSCA has ads about reducing water use that can be shared.
- Messaging about the drought is a complicated thing. There's a need to be careful about scaring people about running out of water. People get concerned about new housing units, but they use far less water than our existing housing does, and they don't have exterior landscaping. The message about water usage is: Use less and be wise about it. Take advantage of the programs that exist.

#### **8) Committee Member Updates**

Beth Bhatnagar: Sustainable San Mateo County's Sustainability Awards dinner/ceremony is coming up on March 26.

Michael Barber: Dave Pine and Jim Porter are trying to establish a County Water District (not sure of what the name will be) to think about how sea level rise, flooding, groundwater, and the Clean Water Act all meshed together. We're one of the few counties that don't have an overriding district. A white paper about the idea went to city managers today.

Susan Wright/Kim Springer: SMCEW is developing the "San Mateo County Energy Watch Challenge" to engage elected officials in encouraging their small businesses to get an energy survey through the SMCEW turnkey program.

#### **9) Next Regular Meeting Date: April 15, 2015**

#### **Attachments:**

None.