File No. 150604 Committee Item No. 3
Board Item No. 22

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Government Audit and Oversight **Date** October 1, 2015

Board of Supervisors Meeting **Date** JANUARY 26 2015

Cmte	Board	
☐	☒	**Motion**
☐	☐	**Resolution**
☐	☐	**Ordinance**
☐	☐	**Legislative Digest**
☐	☐	**Budget and Legislative Analyst Report**
☐	☐	**Youth Commission Report**
☒	☒	**Introduction Form**
☒	☒	**Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report**
☐	☐	**MOU**
☐	☐	**Grant Information Form**
☐	☐	**Grant Budget**
☐	☐	**Subcontract Budget**
☐	☐	**Contract/Agreement**
☐	☐	**Form 126 – Ethics Commission**
☐	☐	**Award Letter**
☐	☐	**Application**
☐	☐	**Public Correspondence**

OTHER **(Use back side if additional space is needed)**

☒	☒	Clerk of the Board (COB) Memo - 7/14/2015
☒	☒	Civil Grand Jury Report - 07/16/2015
☒	☒	COB Memo - 07/16/2015
☒	☒	Response Mayor - 9/14/2015
☒	☒	COB 60-Day Memo - 9/17/2015
☐	☒	RESPONSE MAYOR CONSOLIDATED UPDATED - 01/05/2016
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	

Completed by: Erica Major **Date** September 29, 2015
Completed by: [signature] **Date** 01/21/2016

PREPARED IN COMMITTEE
1/14/2016

FILE NO. 150604 MOTION NO.

[Follow-Up Board Response - 2014-2015 Civil Grand Jury Report - CleanPowerSF At Long Last]

Motion responding to the Civil Grand Jury's request to provide a status update on the Board of Supervisors' response to Recommendation No. 4 contained in the 2014-2015 Civil Grand Jury Report, entitled "CleanPowerSF At Long Last."

WHEREAS, The 2014-2015 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury published a report, entitled "CleanPowerSF At Long Last" (Report) on July 16, 2015; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors' Government Audit and Oversight Committee (GAO) conducted a public hearing to hear and respond to the Report on October 1, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution No. 384-15 reflecting the GAO responses to the Report on October 6, 2015, a copy of which is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 150605; and

WHEREAS, Recommendation No. 4 states: "That San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) integrate the GoSolarSF program into CleanPowerSF to take advantage of their complementary relationship"; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors on October 6, 2015, responded in Resolution No. 384-15 that Recommendation No. 4 "will be implemented for reasons as follows: As the SFPUC's response indicates, CleanPowerSF is designed so that "its customers will be able to access GoSolarSF incentives. [But] the amount of funding CleanPowerSF will contribute to GoSolarSF has not yet been determined." The Board of Supervisors enthusiastically supports this integration and though it cannot predict exactly when the effort will be completed, the Board anticipates it to be one year after the CleanPowerSF rollout in the Spring of 2016, or by May 2017"; and

WHEREAS, the GAO conducted an additional hearing on January 14, 2016, to receive an update from City departments on Recommendation No. 4; now, therefore, be it

MOVED, That Recommendation No. 4 will not be implemented for reasons as follows: Though the Board of Supervisors enthusiastically supports this effort, and though the relevant department, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, is actively working to implement it, the restrictive response options imposed by the Civil Grand Jury process prevent the Board from offering an accurate response. The recommendation involves a multi-year effort being conducted outside of the Board's direct authority, and there is no response option for that situation; and, be it

FURTHER MOVED, That the Board of Supervisors urges the Mayor to cause the implementation of accepted recommendation through his/her department heads and through the development of the annual budget.

FILE NOS. 150604
150606
150608

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO

EDWIN M. LEE
MAYOR

January 8, 2015

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
Attn: Government Audit and Oversight Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Attached please find summary updates of the status of recommendations for the following Civil Grand Jury recommendations:

- 2014-2015 Civil Grand Jury Report, *CleanPowerSF – At Long Last*
  Recommendation 4;
- 2014-2015 Civil Grand Jury Report, *San Francisco's City Construction Program: It Needs Work*
  Recommendations 6, 8, and 9; and
- 2014-2015 Civil Grand Jury Report, *Unfinished Business: A Continuity Report on the 2011-12 Report, Déjà Vu All Over Again*
  Recommendations 3, 4, and 5.

Please include the status of recommendations summary in the official legislative file for consideration by the Government Audit and Oversight Committee.

Sincerely,

Kate Howard
Mayor's Budget Director

1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, ROOM 200
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102-4681
TELEPHONE: (415) 554-6141

STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS: 2014-15 CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORTS

Prepared for January 7, 2016 Board of Supervisors Government Accountability and Oversight hearing

Report Title	Recommendation		Response Required	Response	Response Text
CleanPowerSF – At Long Last	4	That SFPUC integrate the GoSolarSF program into CleanPowerSF to take advantage of their complementary relationship.	BOS, MYR, PUC	The recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented in the future.	SFPUC continues to work toward its goal of integrating GoSolarSF with CleanPowerSF by May 2017, one year after its rollout in the spring of 2016.
San Francisco's City Construction Program: It Needs Work	6	The BOS should request the BLA or CSA to benchmark the City's design and engineering workforce organizational structure against comparable cities and issue a report.	BOS, MYR, CON, DPW	The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted.	The departments participating in this response defer to the Board of Supervisors with respect to involvement of the Board's Legislative Analyst, and the Office of the Controller will consult with the Board regarding which, if any, office performs the analysis. A benchmarking analysis could provide important and helpful insight into best practices for how to improve the organizational structure of the City's design and engineering workforce, and merits further consideration.
San Francisco's City Construction Program: It Needs Work	8	The BOS should either request the CSA or BLA, or retain an outside firm, to benchmark the independent construction management structure of other cities and develop recommendations applicable to San Francisco.	BOS, MYR, CON	The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted.	The City has developed a coordinated capital planning and budgeting process to review and prioritize capital budget requests, coordinate funding sources and uses, and provide citywide policy analysis and reporting on interagency capital planning efforts. Oversight bodies, including general obligation and revenue bond oversight committees, as well as departmental commissions, routinely review and monitor activities related to the City's capital and construction projects under their purview. The departments participating in this response defer to the Board of Supervisors with respect to involvement of the Board's Legislative Analyst, and the Office of the Controller will consult with the Board regarding which, if any, office performs the analysis.
San Francisco's City Construction Program: It Needs Work	9	The BOS should require all City departments to issue final project construction reports within nine months of project completion for all construction projects and for the reports to be posted on each department's website.	BOS, MYR, CON	The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted.	City departments report on projects—especially those funded via the General Obligation bond program, which includes mandatory reporting procedures before, during, and after construction. In addition, Chapter 6 departments must prepare closeout and acceptance documents that must be executed per Administrative Code Section 6.22(k). The departments participating in this response defer to the Board of Supervisors with respect to involvement of the Board regarding construction completion reporting requirements, if any.
Unfinished Business: A Continuity Report on the 2011-12 Report, Déjà Vu All Over Again	3	A user satisfaction survey should be sent to all DT clients, before the end of 2015 and later in six months after the reorganization, to assess whether the new accountability structure is making a difference for clients.	BOS, MYR, TIS	Recommendation has been implemented.	On December 23, 2015, the Department of Technology sent a user satisfaction survey to all clients. The survey, which will remain open until January 15, 2016, will help the department assess its effectiveness, and a follow up survey will be sent within 6 months of the current survey's closing date.
Unfinished Business: A Continuity Report on the 2011-12 Report, Déjà Vu All Over Again	4	The Office of the Controller should develop the skills inventory capability in the eMerge PeopleSoft system to update IT employee skills by the end of FY15-16.	BOS, MYR, TIS, CON	Recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future.	The Office of the Controller is advancing the skills inventory capability through the eMerge PeopleSoft system, which includes functionality to house a skills inventory and link those skills to job classifications, positions, and employees- successful implementation is dependent on citywide departmental engagement and adoption. At the center of this functionality is the use of "competencies," which in PeopleSoft are used to define skills and levels of proficiency expected for job classifications and positions. By properly using the competency and performance appraisal features in the ePerformance module in PeopleSoft, the City could develop skills inventory capability. The current ePerformance Pilot Project is implementing competency and skills assessment for the FY 2015-16 performance appraisal period. The pilot project includes 41 job classifications and 595 employees at the Airport Commission, Controller's Office, Department of Public Health, and Public Utilities Commission. The Controller's Office and its eMerge Division are soliciting additional departments to leverage the ePerformance module for FY 2016-17 performance appraisals. The Office of the Controller will work with the Department of Human Resources and Department of Technology toward citywide deployment after the pilot is successfully concluded.

STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS: 2014-15 CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORTS

Prepared for January 7, 2016 Board of Supervisors Government Accountability and Oversight hearing

Report Title	Recommendation		Response Required	Response	Response Text
Unfinished Business: A Continuity Report on the 2011-12 Report, Déjà Vu All Over Again	5	DHR should publicly present the results of its pilot IT hiring process to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors before the end of CY 2015.	BOS, MYR, DHR	Recommendation has been implemented.	DHR presented the results of its original 1053/1054 Expedited IT Hiring Project (online, on-demand exam for 1053 IS Business Analyst - Senior & 1054 IS Business Analyst- Principal) at the October 15, 2015 GAO hearing. The Project launched January of 2015 with goal of testing effectiveness of online, on-demand examination for permanent civil service hires conducted for IT business analysts. Four departments participated over six months (DPH, TTX, DEM, and City Planning), and eight positions went through pilot and six hires were made that we know—lists borrowed by other departments so may have resulted in additional hires. The time from opening announcement to establishing eligible list ranged between 32 and 37 days. With the implementation of the Project, the timeline for creating eligible list shortened considerably, and the majority of applicants found it convenient and easy to use and felt it helped them see DHR as innovative and forward thinking. Departments found process convenient and effective—especially those at the end of the pilot. Only addresses one component of the hiring process. At the Oct. 15 hearing, DHR advised the GAO that it has expanded on this pilot to a much more holistic and comprehensive approach to IT hiring. On November 19, 2015, DHR presented the expanded pilot and its status to the Committee on Information Technology (COIT), which includes representatives of both the Mayor's Office and the Board of Supervisors. The presentation can be found at this address (beginning on slide 19): http://sfcoit.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=2271

AMENDED IN COMMITTEE
FILE NO. 150605 10/01/2015 RESOLUTION NO. 384-15

[Board Response - Civil Grand Jury - CleanPowerSF At Long Last]

Resolution responding to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings and recommendations contained in the 2014-2015 Civil Grand Jury Report, entitled "CleanPower At Long Last"; and urging the Mayor to cause the implementation of accepted findings and recommendations through his/her department heads and through the development of the annual budget.

WHEREAS, Under California Penal Code, Section 933 et seq., the Board of Supervisors must respond, within 90 days of receipt, to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings and recommendations contained in Civil Grand Jury Reports; and,

WHEREAS, In accordance with California Penal Code, Section 933.05(c), if a finding or recommendation of the Civil Grand Jury addresses budgetary or personnel matters of a county agency or a department headed by an elected officer, the agency or department head and the Board of Supervisors shall respond if requested by the Civil Grand Jury, but the response of the Board of Supervisors shall address only budgetary or personnel matters over which it has some decision making authority; and

WHEREAS, Under San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 2.10(a), the Board of Supervisors must conduct a public hearing by a committee to consider a final report of the findings and recommendations submitted, and notify the current foreperson and immediate past foreperson of the civil grand jury when such hearing is scheduled; and

WHEREAS, In accordance with San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 2.10(b), the Controller must report to the Board of Supervisors on the implementation of recommendations that pertain to fiscal matters that were considered at a public hearing held by a Board of Supervisors Committee; and

WHEREAS, The 2014-2015 Civil Grand Jury Report entitled "CleanPowerSF At Long Last" (Report) is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 150605, which is hereby declared to be a part of this resolution as if set forth fully herein; and

WHEREAS, The Civil Grand Jury has requested that the Board of Supervisors respond to Finding Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, as well as Recommendation Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 contained in the subject Report; and

WHEREAS, Finding No. 1 states: "CleanPowerSF will be a relatively small, low-risk program at startup, but must grow quickly to meet the City's timeline for reducing greenhouse gas emissions;" and

WHEREAS, Finding No. 2 states: "CleanPowerSF's rates will be lower and more affordable to all San Franciscans, if it is free to use unbundled [Renewable Energy Certificates] (RECs) as needed, and to provide less than 100% green power;" and

WHEREAS, Finding No. 3 states: "Local job creation, while desirable, is not the chief purpose of CleanPowerSF, and should not cause further delay in implementing the program;" and

WHEREAS, Finding No. 4 states: "There are ample affordable resources of renewable power to support CleanPowerSF, including local rooftop solar installations such as those funded through the GoSolarSF program;" and

WHEREAS, Finding No. 5 states: "Political discord has at times delayed implementation of CleanPowerSF;" and

WHEREAS, Recommendation No. 1 states: "That CleanPowerSF be designed, first and foremost, to be financially viable and to grow quickly without undue risk;" and,

WHEREAS, Recommendation No. 2 states: "That CleanPowerSF be free to use unbundled RECs, and to provide less than 100% green power, as needed to meet its goals of financial viability and early expansion;" and

WHEREAS, Recommendation No. 3 states: "That CleanPowerSF be designed to provide as many local jobs as it can, without compromising its financial viability and potential for early expansion;"

WHEREAS, Recommendation No. 4 states: "That [San Francisco Public Utilities Commission] (SFPUC) integrate the GoSolarSF program into CleanPowerSF to take advantage of their complementary relationship;" and

WHEREAS, Recommendation No. 5 states: "That local officials, including the Mayor, put the full weight of their offices behind the success of the CleanPowerSF program;" and

WHEREAS, In accordance with California Penal Code, Section 933.05(c), the Board of Supervisors must respond, within 90 days of receipt, to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on Finding Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, as well as Recommendation Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 contained in the subject Civil Grand Jury report; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court that they agree with Finding No. 1 for reasons as follows: 30-60 megawatts is a modest size for launch, and the Board of Supervisors will work with the SFPUC to expand CleanPower San Francisco (CPSF) as quickly as possible, mindful that moving to 100% clean energy is the single most important thing San Francisco can do to combat climate change; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that they disagree partially with Finding No. 2 for reasons as follows: The Board of Supervisors recently approved language regarding the use of unbundled Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs), saying they "shall be limited to the extent deemed feasible by the SFPUC, consistent with the goals of the program" and state law. Unbundled RECs may have some utility in the short term but should not be the linchpin to ensure CPSF's competitive rates. The Board of Supervisors

supports having two product offerings under CPSF: one with 100% green power and another with less than 100% but more than what PG&E offers; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that they disagree partially with Finding No. 3 for reasons as follows: Providing clean energy to San Franciscans is the chief purpose of CPSF, but creating local jobs is an important and complementary purpose that is not delaying the program; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that they agree with Finding No. 4; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that they agree with Finding No. 5 for reasons as follows: After 12 years of effort, the Board of Supervisors knows this truth all-too-well, and is thankful to finally be collaborating with the Mayor and SFPUC to launch CPSF as quickly as possible; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation No. 1 has been implemented for reasons as follows: The program is designed to be viable and able to grow quickly; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation No. 2 has been implemented for reasons as follows: CPSF is not currently restricted from using unbundled RECs, however the Board of Supervisors recently approved language saying unbundled RECs, "shall be limited to the extent deemed feasible by the SFPUC, consistent with the goals of the program" and state law. CPSF is designed with two product offerings: one with 100% green power and another with less than 100% but more than what PG&E offers; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation No. 3 has been implemented for reasons as follows: CPSF is designed to provide local jobs and its expansion will enable it to create yet more local jobs; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation No. 4 will be implemented for reasons as follows: As the SFPUC's response indicates, CPSF is designed so that "its customers will be able to access GoSolarSF incentives. [But] the amount of funding CleanPowerSF will contribute to GoSolarSF has not yet been determined." The Board of Supervisors enthusiastically supports this integration and though it cannot predict exactly when the effort will be completed, the Board anticipates it to be one year after the CPSF rollout in the spring of 2016, or by May 2017; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation No. 5 has been implemented for reasons as follows: The Board of Supervisors has been putting its full weight behind CleanPowerSF for years, and is thankful to be joined by Mayor Lee, the SFPUC, and a broad coalition of city officials, residents, business owners, and advocates who are committed to CleanPowerSF's success; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors urges the Mayor to cause the implementation of accepted findings and recommendations through his/her department heads and through the development of the annual budget.

City and County of San Francisco
Tails
Resolution

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

File Number: 150605 **Date Passed:** October 06, 2015

Resolution responding to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings and recommendations contained in the 2014-2015 Civil Grand Jury Report, entitled "CleanPower At Long Last;" and urging the Mayor to cause the implementation of accepted findings and recommendations through his/her department heads and through the development of the annual budget.

October 01, 2015 Government Audit and Oversight Committee - AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING SAME TITLE

October 01, 2015 Government Audit and Oversight Committee - RECOMMENDED AS AMENDED AS A COMMITTEE REPORT

October 06, 2015 Board of Supervisors - ADOPTED

Ayes: 11 - Avalos, Breed, Campos, Christensen, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Tang, Wiener and Yee

File No. 150605

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED on 10/6/2015 by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

Unsigned

Mayor

10/16/15

Date Approved

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution, not being signed by the Mayor within the time limit as set forth in Section 3.103 of the Charter, or time waived pursuant to Board Rule 2.14.2, became effective without his approval in accordance with the provision of said Section 3.103 of the Charter or Board Rule 2.14.2.

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

10/16/15
Date

File No.
150605

Major, Erica (BOS)

From: Major, Erica (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 11:45 AM
To: Kelly, Jr, Harlan (PUC); Elliott, Nicole (MYR)
Cc: Howard, Kate (MYR); Simi, Chris (MYR); Ellis, Juliet (PUC); Hood, Donna (PUC); 'barbara.hale@sfgov.org'
Subject: TENTATIVE MEETING - GAO Civil Grand Jury - CleanPowerSF At Long Last
Attachments: REPORT - CleanPowerSF At Long Last.pdf

Greetings:

The follow-up hearing for the 2014-2015 Civil Grand Jury Report "CleanPowerSF At Long Last" is tentatively scheduled for January 7, 2016 at the Government Audit and Oversight Committee Meeting in City Hall, Room 263 at 10:30 a.m.

Please submit and updates or reports your department may have on the current status of Recommendation No. 4 of the Report for the Supervisors consideration during the hearing. As a reminder, a department representative is required to attend and answer any questions raised.

If you have any questions about the follow-up meeting, please email or call my direct line.

Best,

Erica Major
Assistant Committee Clerk
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-4441 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
Erica.Major@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

San Francisco Local Agency Formation Commission
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Tel. 415.554.5184 Fax. 415.554.5163

Received via email
9/30/2015
File Nos. 150604 and 150605

TO: San Francisco Civil Grand Jury

CC: Mayor Ed Lee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

FROM: Jason Fried, Executive Officer

DATE: September 30, 2015

SUBJECT: 2015 Civil Grand Jury Report

On behalf of the San Francisco Local Agency Formation Commission I would like to thank you for all the hard work that went into your report "CleanPowerSF - At Long Last". The report did a good job in highlighting many of the issues that the CleanPowerSF program has faced over the years. Your section on Renewable Energy Credits (REC's) was well written and describes how REC's work. REC's continue to be a point of discussion and confusion. I have referred people to review your report for an easy-to-follow explanation of REC's and how they work.

While there are plenty of good points in the report, there are some references to LAFCo and in particular to a report from an outside consulting firm (EnerNex) did on CleanPowerSF that we wanted to clarify. There are also other details that may not be technically correct and warrant a second look. Below you will find two sections of comments. The first section is areas that pertain to LAFCo and the work we have completed. The second section is other areas that we view as not technically correct or might need some clarification for the lay person to better understand these issues.

Should you have any questions on this, please do not hesitate to contact me.

<u>LAFCo Items mentioned in the report:</u>

As previously stated, over all, Civil Grand Jury (CGJ) report did a good overview of the CleanPowerSF program, but on pages 17 and 18 it misinterpreted the purpose, reasoning, and results of the EnerNex report that LAFCo commissioned. As background, in

August of 2013, the SFPUC Commission decided not to set rates and innumerated many reasons why it did not want to move forward. By the beginning of 2014, LAFCo believed no real progress was being made, so an RFP was issued to have an independent expert look at the design of the program. Concerns from the SFPUC Commission and the Mayor were reviewed to see how to best address them and get the program moving forward again. EnerNex issued several drafts of the report and issued its final report to LAFCo in January 2015.

On page 17 in the CGJ report, it states "Be that as it may, the Civil Grand jury concludes that 'job creation' in relationship to clean power is a red herring, not helped by the EnerNex report." LAFCo has issue with this comment given that the lack of job creation was one of the reasons given for why the program was not moving forward. One needs to look no further than the January 26, 2015 joint press release by Mayor Ed Lee and Board of Supervisors President London Breed that stated, "The report also identified potential renewable energy projects and estimates for job creation...the Mayor was pleased to see some progress on a key aspect of the program that was missing in the previous iteration of CleanPowerSF. The Mayor considered the report a good starting point." These basic comments were repeated at the joint LAFCo/PUC meeting held January 30, 2015.

In LAFCo's opinion, the report did exactly what it was intend to do address the concerns that had been raised and give suggestions on how to change or modify the program to address those concerns. Without this report, I am not sure the program would be on its current path to launch in early 2016.

Also on page 17 in the CGJ report it states "The estimates in the report are debatable and were criticized at the meeting as being too optimistic." This statement is overly simplified and can confuse people. First, we do not agree that the numbers for any project are "debatable." The estimates are based on the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) and Jobs and Economic Development Impact (JEDI) models that focus on the size and type of renewable generation. While the accuracy of the JEDI model can be debated, the EnerNex report is based on an industry standard methodology as represented in the JEDI models. While this is not the same system that the City uses, the NREL and JEDI systems are very similar to models that are used by the City and city staff had no objection to NREL and JEDI being used. Secondly, the estimates are not overly optimistic, but are representative of what could happen if all the projects got built. As stated in the report and repeated by both EnerNex and LAFCo staff at various meetings, not all the projects are currently viable options based on cost and, in some cases, may need additional fine tuning. While not widely known, the report left out some projects, mainly the in-pipe water delivery small hydro area, since the SFPUC has a water-first policy which requires further study to determine impacts on water delivery and ensure no negative impacts occur to water delivery as a result of installation of power generation along the system.

On page 18 of the CGJ report states "Because just as the majority of new clean energy projects are geographically far away from San Francisco, so are the jobs

associated with building them." The report indicates that about half of the potential jobs created are in or near San Francisco. EnerNex used the City's local hire ordinance to determine local/regional, as those projects would need to ensure that a percentage of the jobs are given to San Franciscans, even if the project is not within San Francisco itself.

The CGJ report also states on page 18 that "More than one interviewee suggested that the real opportunity to create local jobs lies not in generating renewable energy, but rather in energy efficiency." The EnerNex report also reaffirms this statement because no clear amount of funding and a lack of actual programs were know at the time of the report it could not create a jobs estimate for those programs. Instead EnerNex gave some suggestions and steps that are needed before the energy efficiency estimate can be created. In LAFCo's opinion, the SFPUC has been following this path so that it might be possible have an estimate for the program by the end of year, or early next year.

Non LAFCo/EnerNex report related matters in the CGJ report:

The Civil Grand Jury report focused in several areas on how jobs seem to be a driving force but were not part of the original planning of the program. While, from a technical point, job creation was not central to the program when first conceived, it does directly relate to what was discussed at the time. From the start, building and owning its own renewable generation system along with large amounts of energy efficiency and load demand reductions were part the program being discussed here in San Francisco. Jobs would need to be created in order to accomplish all the new generation, energy efficiency, and load demand reductions. Over time, these goals and job creation simply became one discussion, since the more new generation, energy efficiency, and load demand reductions that get completed the more jobs are created. The main discussion now tends to be about how many jobs are created, and that simply translates to how quickly are we building new generation and reducing our electricity needs on the whole, which has always been part of the discussion related to the creation of a CCA program here in San Francisco.

The size of the program is also discussed in several areas about how small our CCA program is compared to other CCA programs. It is not always clear in the CGJ report if they are comparing our program at launch to the other programs at launch as they are today. In either case it should be noted that the other programs have the ability to serve various local governmental loads in their jurisdiction, whereas San Francisco already has its own generation system to serve its load. If you took out the municipal load of the first phase of the other programs you would likely see that their program at launch for phase one is not as small compared to the other 2 programs. While LAFCo agrees that we should get to city wide full service as soon as possible, the current plan of the SFPUC does a good job of balancing risk of launching a new program with desire for a program.

On page 7 of the report it states that "Members of the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor publicly expressed disapproval of contracting with SENA..." While this

statement is correct it should be noted that while members of the Board of Supervisors did at the time expressed dissatisfaction with contracting with SENA, it remained supportive of doing so with a super majority approving the contract with SENA. It was viewed simply as a bridge contract to help get the program moving forward, similar to what occurred in Marin.

On page 9 of the report it states "Mayor Lee, the City's Commission on the Environment and members of the labor movement objected that unbundled RECs are not green energy." LAFCo disagrees with this statement. Neither the Environment Commission nor the labor movement have officially objected to REC's. Some of the members of the Environment Commission at its August 2013 meeting tried to pass a motion claiming that the CCA was no longer green because of REC's. This motion failed so the position that the Environment Commission took in 2012 in support of the program still stands and can be found here:
http://www.sfenvironment.org/sites/default/files/agenda/attach/res_009-12-coe_support_of_cleanpowersf.pdf

LAFCo has also found no position taken by the local labor movement against REC's. In 2013, the San Francisco Labor Council took a position that supported the creation of CCA, as long as they followed some basic labor friendly principals, with no mention of RECs, which can be found here:
http://sflaborcouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/05-13-13ResSptLbrFrndlyCCA.pdf

In many cases this report tends to refer to labor as one united body, yet seems to only refer to the position of one labor union, IBEW 1245. There have been several unions that, for some time now, have been supportive of the creation of the CCA program which are not acknowledged in the report. In many cases, when the report refers to "labor" it really means to refer to IBEW 1245's position.

At the bottom of page 11 the report mentions that "unbundled RECs usually represent power generated at a distance." LAFCo does want to note that unbundled RECs can also be produced both in state as well as in city through such programs as GoSolarSF. Treating all unbundled RECs as energy produced far away is not always correct. On a similar subject matter on page 13, the report states "In 2010 almost all of MCE's renewable energy derived from unbundled RECs generated outside California. Today unbundled RECs represent about half of its renewable energy." LAFCo would like to note that at the time of MCE'S launch this was the only way to launch as the first CCA in the state. Over time they have been moving away from out of state unbundled REC's. By next year, they will have a very small amount of their energy coming from out-of-state unbundled REC's.

For the rate section on page 14, it should be highlighted that this is a generation line item. This is not how the average person looks at their bill, which is usually based on either total electricity portion of the bill or total gas and electricity costs.

BOARD of SUPERVISORS

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 544-5227

DATE: September 17, 2015

TO: Members of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

SUBJECT: 2014-2015 Civil Grand Jury Report "CleanPowerSF At Long Last"

We are in receipt of the following required responses to the San Francisco Civil Grand Jury report released July 16, 2015, entitled: CleanPowerSF At Long Last. Pursuant to California Penal Code, Sections 933 and 933.05, the City Departments shall respond to the report within 60 days of receipt, or no later than September 14, 2015.

For each finding the Department response shall:
1) agree with the finding; or
2) disagree with it, wholly or partially, and explain why.

As to each recommendation the Department shall report that:
1) the recommendation has been implemented, with a summary explanation of how;
2) the recommendation has not been implemented, but will be within a set timeframe as provided;
3) the recommendation requires further analysis and define what additional study is needed, the Grand Jury expects a progress report within six months from the publication of the Report; or
4) the recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable, with an explanation of why.

The Civil Grand Jury Report identified the following City Departments to submit responses (attached):
- Mayor's Office (consolidated response)
  Received September 14, 2015, for Findings 1 through 5 and Recommendations 1 through 5
- Public Utilities Commission (consolidated response)
  Received September 14, 2015, for Findings 1 through 5 and Recommendations 1 through 5

These departmental responses are being provided for your information, as received, and may not conform to the parameters stated in California Penal Code, Section 933.05 et seq. The Government Audit and Oversight Committee will consider the subject report, along with the responses, at an upcoming hearing and will prepare the Board's official response by Resolution for the full Board's consideration.

c:

Honorable John K. Stewart, Presiding Judge
Jay Cunningham, 2015-2016 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury
Alison Scott, 2015-2016 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury
Janice Pettey, 2014-2015 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury
Philip Reed, 2014-2015 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury
Kate Howard, Mayor's Office
Chris Simi, Mayor's Office
Harlan Kelly, Jr., Public Utilities Commission
Juliet Ellis, Public Utilities Commission
Donna Hood, Public Utilities Commission
Jon Givner, Deputy City Attorney
Rick Caldeira, Legislative Deputy
Severin Campbell, Budget and Legislative Analyst
Debra Newman, Budget and Legislative Analyst
Jadie Wasilco, Budget and Legislative Analyst

Major, Erica (BOS)

om:	Major, Erica (BOS)
ent:	Thursday, September 17, 2015 3:40 PM
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	BOS-Legislative Aideshttps://outlook.office365.com/ecp/UsersGroups/EditDistributionGroup.aspx?reqId=1441732280579&pwmcid=5&ReturnObjectType=1&id=e461de0a-e6fa-453b-849b-ab7bfda77739#; jcunningham@sfcgj.org; ascott@sfcgj.org; Janice Pettey; Philip Reed; Howard, Kate (MYR); Simi, Chris (MYR); Kelly, Jr, Harlan (PUC); Ellis, Juliet (PUC); Hood, Donna (PUC); Givner, Jon (CAT); Caldeira, Rick (BOS); Campbell, Severin (BUD); Newman, Debra (BUD); Wasilco, Jadie (BUD); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	Civil Grand Jury 60-Day Response Receipt - CleanPowerSF At Long Last
Attachments:	60 Day Memo Receipt - CleanPowerSF At Long Last.doc.pdf

Supervisors:

Please find the attached 60-day receipt from the Clerk of the Board documenting the required department responses for the Civil Grand Jury Report, "CleanPowerSF At Long Last." We will be working with Supervisor Yee's Office on a hearing date to be scheduled in the Government Audit and Oversight Committee. The departments included in the consolidated response are as follows:

- ✓ Public Utilities Commission
- ✓ Mayor

Erica Major
ɔsistant Committee Clerk
ɔard of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-4441 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
Erica.Major@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

RECEIVED VIA EMAIL
7/14/2015
FILE NOS. 150604-605

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO

EDWIN M. LEE
MAYOR

September 14, 2015

The Honorable John K. Stewart
Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco
400 McAllister Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Judge Stewart:

Pursuant to Penal Code sections 933 and 933.05, the following is the official City and County of San Francisco response to the 2014-2015 Civil Grand Jury report, *CleanPowerSF – At Long Last.*

We want thank the Civil Grand Jury for its report on CleanPowerSF. Transitioning from fossil fuels to renewable sources of power is an important component of our City's climate action strategy and one that the Mayor and San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) fully support.

At the beginning of the year, the Mayor worked with Board President Breed to call on the SFPUC to develop a new version of CleanPowerSF, the City's renewable energy alternative to PG&E. Since then, the SFPUC has made great progress. The new version of CleanPowerSF will be greener and competitively priced compared to PG&E, not rely on renewable energy credits, and create new job opportunities.

We have worked closely with President Breed and the Board of Supervisors to enact legislation to quickly move the program forward. SFPUC is on track to launch the first phase of CleanPowerSF in January 2016. Most importantly, consumers can be confident that the new version of CleanPowerSF is a much improved program that is affordable and delivering real renewable energy.

A detailed response from the Mayor's Office and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to the Civil Grand Jury's findings and recommendations follows.

Sincerely,

Edwin M. Lee
Mayor

Harlan Kelly
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, ROOM 200
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102-4681
TELEPHONE: (415) 554-6141

Finding 1: CleanPowerSF will be a relatively small, low-risk program at startup, but must grow quickly to meet the City's timeline for reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Disagree with finding, partially. The Mayor's Office and the SFPUC agree that the program will be relatively small and low-risk at startup. We disagree, however, with the Civil Grand Jury's report that the SFPUC use unbundled RECs to grow CleanPowerSF. CleanPowerSF is designed to not rely on unbundled RECs.

The long term success of the program, and therefore, the ability of the program to achieve significant greenhouse gas reductions, depends on offering consumers a product that is reliable, transparent, and affordable. SFPUC has designed the program to offer such a product.

Furthermore, the City has a comprehensive climate action strategy and is not solely depending on CleanPowerSF to reach its targets and timelines. The City has reduced its greenhouse gas emissions by 23% below 1990 levels while the City's economy and population have grown. The City is on track to reach its goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions 25% below 1990 levels by 2017 and 40% by 2025. CleanPowerSF is one of several strategies to achieve the City's greenhouse gas reduction goals, including improving the energy-efficiency of municipal, commercial and residential buildings, significantly increasing sustainable modes of transportation like walking, biking, and transit, and achieving the City's Zero Waste goal.

Recommendation 1: That CleanPowerSF be designed, first and foremost, to be financially viable and to grow quickly without undue risk.

The recommendation has been implemented. CleanPowerSF is designed to be financially viable and to grow quickly without undue risk.

The Mayor's Office and the SFPUC, however, reject the Civil Grand Jury's suggestion that the program use unbundled RECs as a tool to support the program's growth and financial viability.

We believe purchasing unbundled RECs to claim non-renewable power as renewable is not appropriate for the City's community choice aggregation program. Moreover, unlike the experience of Marin Clean Energy recounted in the report, San Francisco is procuring supply for a CleanPowerSF program at a time when electricity prices – including bundled renewables – are quite low, and projected to remain low. As a result, San Francisco's program at launch is expected to be affordable with bundled renewable supplies, avoiding the arguments explained in the report about the degraded quality of programs reliant upon unbundled RECs.

CleanPowerSF is designed to not rely on unbundled RECs. We believe that the program will grow more quickly if consumers have the confidence that the renewable power procured and claimed by the program is high quality renewable. We have made the policy decision to only launch the program if the affordability goals can be met with bundled renewables supplying the program.

Finding 2: CleanPowerSF's rates will be lower and more affordable to all San Franciscans, if it is free to use unbundled RECs as needed, and to provide less than 100% green power.

Disagree with finding, partially. The Mayor's Office and SFPUC agree with the finding that CleanPowerSF "provide less than 100% green power." In January 2015, the Mayor asked for a program that

included a default product with a higher renewable energy content than PG&E at a competitive price, and a premium 100% renewable option. The SFPUC has designed CleanPowerSF accordingly.

Given today's low electricity prices, we disagree that CleanPowerSF needs to use unbundled RECs to meet affordability goal for its customers. And, as mentioned above, we believe the use of unbundled RECs is not appropriate for CleanPowerSF.

Recommendation 2: That CleanPowerSF be free to use unbundled RECs, and to provide less than 100% green power, as needed to meet its goals of financial viability and early expansion.

The recommendation will not be implemented. CleanPowerSF is designed to be financially viable without using unbundled RECs. Moreover, as previously stated, the Mayor's Office and the SFPUC reject the use of unbundled RECs for CleanPowerSF to meet its financial goals or increase the growth of the program. CleanPowerSF will be honest and transparent about the renewable content of the power it is procuring for its customers.

There is a growing consensus against the use of unbundled RECs. In July 2015, the Board of Supervisors passed 8-0 an initiative ordinance including the following language:

> "It is the City's policy that the use of unbundled renewable energy credits for CleanPowerSF customers *shall be limited* to the extent deemed feasible by the SFPUC, consistent with the goals of the program." (Italics added for emphasis)

As discussed above, however, the recommendation to include a renewable power option that is less than 100% has been implemented.

Finding 3: Local job creation, while desirable, is not the chief purpose of CleanPowerSF, and should not cause further delay in implementing the program.

Disagree with finding, partially. CleanPowerSF is a program designed to provide ratepayers with a competitively priced renewable energy product that will help the City reduce its greenhouse gas emissions. Local job creation, however, is more than "desirable." The Mayor expects local jobs to be created through the implementation of the program and has requested a plan from the SFPUC, which is in the process of creating one.

Recommendation 3: That CleanPowerSF be designed to provide as many local jobs as it can, without compromising its financial viability and potential for early expansion.

The recommendation has been implemented. CleanPowerSF is designed to provide as many jobs as it can and add more jobs with its growth.

Finding 4: There are ample resources of renewable power to support CleanPowerSF, including local rooftop solar installations such as those funded through the GoSolarSF program.

Agree with finding.

Recommendation 4: That SFPUC integrate the GoSolarSF program into CleanPowerSF to take advantage of their complementary relationship.

The recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. The CleanPowerSF program design envisions its customers will be able to access GoSolarSF incentives. The amount of funding CleanPowerSF will contribute to GoSolarSF has not yet been determined.

Finding 5: Political discord has at times delayed implementation of CleanPowerSF.

Disagree with finding, wholly. There have been delays to the implementation of CleanPowerSF due to vigorous and substantive policy debates about the design of the program. We disagree with the Civil Grand Jury's characterization of the policy debate as "political discord."

Today's version of CleanPowerSF is a much improved program with a high likelihood of success and minimal risk as a result of the policy debates. As currently designed, CleanPowerSF will offer a default product that: is priced at or below PG&E base rate; has more renewable energy content than PG&E without using unbundled RECs; and is administered by the SFPUC. The SFPUC has designed a program that provides its ratepayers with reliable and affordable power that is greener than PG&E.

Recommendation 5: That local officials, including the Mayor, put the full weight of their offices behind the success of the CleanPowerSF program.

The recommendation has been implemented. The Mayor, Board President Breed, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and the SFPUC have been working to ensure the success of CleanPowerSF.

Major, Erica (BOS)

From: Major, Erica (BOS)
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2015 4:01 PM
To: Kelly, Jr, Harlan (PUC); Wheaton, Nicole (MYR)
Cc: Ellis, Juliet (PUC); Hood, Donna (PUC); Simi, Chris (MYR); Kim, Roger (MYR)
Subject: Response Reminder - Civil Grand Jury Report - CleanPowerSF At Long Last
Attachments: REPORT ONLY - CleanPowerSF At Long Last.pdf

Importance: High

Greetings All,

Within 60 days your department is required to respond to the 2014-2015 Civil Grand Jury Report entitled, "CleanPowerSF At Long Last" (attached). We anticipate a hearing in the Government Audit and Oversight Committee sometime in September. We will update you as the date approaches.

Please make sure to deliver a copy of your response to the Clerk of the Board, Attn: Government Audit and Oversight Committee, no later than September 14, 2015, and confirm the representative who will be handling this matter and attending the hearing.

If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to call or email me. Thank you.

Best,

Erica Major
Assistant Committee Clerk
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-4441 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
Erica.Major@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org


Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

BOARD of SUPERVISORS

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

Date: July 16, 2015

To: Honorable Members, Board of Supervisors

From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Subject: 2014-2015 CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT

We are in receipt of the San Francisco Civil Grand Jury (CGJ) report released Thursday, July 16, 2015, entitled: **CleanPowerSF At Long Last** (attached).

Pursuant to California Penal Code, Sections 933 and 933.05, the Board must:

1. Respond to the report within 90 days of receipt, or no later than October 14, 2015.
2. For each finding:
   - agree with the finding or
   - disagree with the finding, wholly or partially, and explain why.
3. For each recommendation indicate:
   - that the recommendation has been implemented and a summary of how it was implemented;
   - that the recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation;
   - that the recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation of the scope of the analysis and timeframe of no more than six months; or
   - that the recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable, with an explanation.

Pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 2.10, in coordination with the Committee Chair, the Clerk will schedule a public hearing before the Government Audit and Oversight Committee to allow the Board the necessary time to review and formally respond to the findings and recommendations.

The Budget and Legislative Analyst will prepare a resolution, outlining the findings and recommendations for the Committee's consideration, to be heard at the same time as the hearing on the report.

Attachment

c: Honorable John K. Stewart, Presiding Judge (w/o attachment)
Nicole Elliott, Mayor's Office
Ben Rosenfield, Controller
Jon Givner, Deputy City Attorney
Rick Caldeira, Legislative Deputy
Debra Newman, Office of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
Severin Campbell, Office of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
Asja Steeves, Civil Grand Jury Coordinator
Janice Pettey, Foreperson, San Francisco Civil Grand Jury (w/o attachment)

Major, Erica (BOS)

om:	Major, Erica (BOS)
Sent:	Thursday, July 16, 2015 3:54 PM
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	BOS-Legislative Aides; Elliott, Nicole (ADP); Wheaton, Nicole (MYR); Rosenfield, Ben (CON); Givner, Jon (CAT); Caldeira, Rick (BOS); Newman, Debra (BUD); Campbell, Severin (BUD); Steeves, Asja (CON); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	Public Release: Civil Grand Jury Report - CleanPowerSF At Long Last
Attachments:	Public Release Memo 07.16.2015.pdf

Supervisors:

Attached please find the Clerk of the Board's memo of receipt of the following 2014-2015 Civil Grand Jury report released today, July 16, 2015, entitled: **CleanPowerSF At Long Last.**

Best,

Erica Major
Assistant Committee Clerk
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-4441 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
rica.Major@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

BOARD of SUPERVISORS

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

Date: July 14, 2015

To: Honorable Members, Board of Supervisors

From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Subject: 2015-2016 CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT

We are in receipt of the advanced confidential copy of the San Francisco Civil Grand Jury (CGJ) Report, entitled: **CleanPowerSF At Long Last** (attached). **This report is to be kept confidential until the public release date scheduled on Thursday, July 16, 2015.**

Pursuant to California Penal Code, Sections 933 and 933.05, the Board must:

1. Respond to the report within 90 days of receipt, or no later than October 14, 2015.
2. For each finding the Department response shall:
   - agree with the finding; or
   - disagree with the finding, wholly or partially, and explain why.
3. For each recommendation the Department shall report that:
   - the recommendation has been implemented, with a summary of how it was implemented;
   - the recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation;
   - the recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation of the scope of the analysis and timeframe of no more than six months from the date of release; or
   - the recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable, with an explanation.

Pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 2.10, in coordination with the Committee Chair, the Clerk will schedule a public hearing before the Government Audit and Oversight Committee to allow the Board the necessary time to review and formally respond to the findings and recommendations, as detailed above.

The Budget and Legislative Analyst will prepare a resolution, outlining the findings and recommendations for the Committee's consideration, to be heard at the same time as the hearing on the report.

Attachment

Major, Erica (BOS)

From: Major, Erica (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2015 5:02 PM
To: Gosiengfiao, Rachel (BOS)
Cc: Somera, Alisa (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Caldeira, Rick (BOS)
Subject: RE: Please Distribute - Confidential CGJ Report: CleanPowerSF At Long Last
Attachments: Memo to Board - CleanPowerSF At Long Last.doc.pdf

Importance: High

Apologies, please send this attachment.

Best,

Erica Major
Assistant Committee Clerk
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-4441 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
Erica.Major@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org


Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

From: Major, Erica (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2015 5:01 PM
To: Gosiengfiao, Rachel (BOS)
Cc: Somera, Alisa (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Caldeira, Rick (BOS)
Subject: Please Distribute - Confidential CGJ Report: CleanPowerSF At Long Last
Importance: High

Hi Rachel,

Please distribute the attached to all of the Board of Supervisors via email. The report is to be kept confidential until the public release date of Thursday, July 16, 2015.

Best,

Erica Major
Assistant Committee Clerk
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-4441 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Erica.Major@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

GAO Clerk, COB
C-Page

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
CIVIL GRAND JURY

July 13, 2015

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

The 2014 – 2015 Civil Grand Jury will release its report entitled, "CleanPowerSF At Long Last" to the public on Thursday, July 16, 2015. Enclosed is an advance copy of this report. Please note that by order of the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, Hon. John K. Stewart, this report **is to be kept confidential until the date of release (July 16th).**

California Penal Code §933 (c) requires a response to be submitted to the Presiding Judge within 90 days. California Penal Code §933.5 states that for each finding in the report, the responding person or entity shall indicate one of the following: (1) agree with the finding; or (2) disagree with it, wholly or partially, and explain why.

Further, as to each recommendation, the Board's response must either indicate:

1) That the recommendation has been implemented, with a summary of how it was implemented;
2) That the recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation;
3) That the recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation of the scope of that analysis and a timeframe for discussion, not more than six months from the release of the report; or
4) That the recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable, with an explanation.

Please provide the Board's response to Presiding Judge Stewart at the following address:

400 McAllister Street, Room 008
San Francisco, CA 94102-4512

Respectfully,

Philip Reed, Foreperson Pro Tem
San Francisco Civil Grand Jury, 2014 – 2015

CleanPowerSF

At Long Last

June 2015

City and County of San Francisco
Civil Grand Jury, 2014-2015

Members of the Civil Grand Jury

Janice Pettey, Foreperson

Philip Reed, Foreperson Pro Tem

Anne M. Turner, Recording Secretary

Morris Bobrow

Leonard Brawn

Daniel Chesir

Matthew Cohen

Jerry Dratler

Herbert Felsenfeld

Allegra Fortunati

Mildred Lee

Marion McGovern

Fred A. Rodríguez

Gary Thackeray

Jack Twomey

Ellen Zhou

THE CIVIL GRAND JURY

The Civil Grand Jury is a government oversight panel of volunteers who serve for one year. It makes findings and recommendations resulting from its investigations.

Reports of the Civil Grand Jury do not identify individuals by name.

Disclosure of information about individuals interviewed by the jury is prohibited.

California Penal Code, section 929

STATE LAW REQUIREMENT

California Penal Code, section 933.05

Each published report includes a list of those public entities that are required to respond to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court within 60 to 90 days, as specified.

A copy must be sent to the Board of Supervisors. All responses are made available to the public.

For each finding the response must:

1) agree with the finding, or
2) disagree with it, wholly or partially, and explain why.

As to each recommendation the responding party must report that:

1) the recommendation has been implemented, with a summary explanation; or
2) the recommendation has not been implemented but will be within a set timeframe as provided; or
3) the recommendation requires further analysis. The officer or agency head must define what additional study is needed. The Grand Jury expects a progress report within six months; or
4) the recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable, with an explanation.

Table of Contents

Summary 5

Background 6

Methodology 7

Discussion 7

Will CleanPowerSF Be Financially Viable? 8

Is an Unbundled REC Really Green? 9

How Does CleanPowerSF Compare with Other Bay Area CCAs? 12

Financial Viability: Conclusions 15

Is CleanPowerSF A Jobs Program? 17

Green Power Resources: Are There Enough? 18

Findings 20

Recommendations 20

Request for Responses 21

Response Matrix 22

Glossary of Abbreviations and Definitions 23

Appendix 26

Endnotes 29

Summary

San Francisco has spent more than a decade trying to implement a Community Choice Aggregation (CCA) program known locally as "CleanPowerSF" that would sell renewable or "green" power to residents and businesses. Implementation, however, has moved forward at a glacial pace.

The Civil Grand Jury has studied the challenges that led to the delay and finds that they are primarily political. Stakeholders disagreed over how to define "green" power and where to acquire it, whether it could be provided at rates that all could afford, and the extent to which the program would provide jobs in the local community.

While we are glad to report that rollout of CleanPowerSF is scheduled to occur within the next twelve months, some of those disagreements still exist and could cause further delay. In this report we identify these challenges and suggest ways to overcome them.

We first compare CleanPowerSF with CCAs in two neighboring counties, and find that CleanPowerSF will be a much smaller program than those others at rollout, which will reduce its risk and provide much potential for growth. By the same token CleanPowerSF will need to grow quickly to keep pace with the City's ambitious goals for reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, which have been established by law.

As a cost-cutting measure both neighboring CCAs use an accounting mechanism known as "unbundled" Renewable Energy Credits (RECs) to provide some of their green power. Critics oppose this on the ground that such power is not really "green." We look at this controversy, and conclude that there is no compelling reason why CleanPowerSF should not use unbundled RECs, if necessary, to support the growth of its enterprise.

With regard to job creation, we find that this was not a core element of the program as originally constituted, and while it is a laudable goal, CleanPowerSF will have a relatively small impact on local employment for reasons both legal and practical. By law, a CCA takes no part in distributing the power that it sells, which is the most labor-intensive part of the business. That task is retained by the preexisting electric utility – in this case, Pacific Gas and Electric Company. And as a practical matter, based on the City's geography, most of its energy needs must be satisfied from out-of-town sources. While green sources are plentiful and their numbers are growing, most are located far outside the City limits, and so, therefore, will be most of the jobs that they create.

That is not to say that CleanPowerSF cannot create local jobs. It can, particularly those associated with installing and maintaining rooftop solar generation systems. For that reason, we consider another City program known as GoSolarSF, which provides financial assistance to property owners who install such systems, and find

that CleanPowerSF and GoSolarSF are complementary in nature and can help each other.

Finally, we make several recommendations – most notably, that CleanPowerSF be designed, first and foremost, to be financially viable and to grow quickly without undue risk; that its other policy goals be subordinated to those needs; and that local officials, including the Mayor, put the full weight of their offices behind the success of the program.

Background

Community Choice Aggregation (CCA) is an idea adopted by a number of states that allows local governments to aggregate (i.e. gather) the buying power of local customers to secure alternative energy supply contracts and/or a better price for power. In power-industry parlance, "aggregation" means combining the "loads" (i.e. demand for electric power) of multiple customers.

California first adopted the CCA system in 2002, under a law popularly known as AB 117.[1] In 2004 the Board of Supervisors passed an ordinance establishing such a program in San Francisco.[2] For the next three years various city agencies and outside advocacy groups debated the program design. In June 2007 the Board of Supervisors adopted a draft implementation plan and assigned SFPUC to manage the program.[3] More than two years later, in November 2009 SFPUC issued its first Request for Proposals (RFP) seeking an outside contractor to provide power and other services for the system.[4] A potential contractor was selected and negotiations ensued, but were unsuccessful.

In August 2010 SFPUC issued a second RFP, again seeking an electricity supplier for the program. No bidders met the minimum qualifications and further delays ensued. After two more years a draft contract was negotiated with Shell Energy North America (SENA), and in September 2012, the Board of Supervisors authorized the General Manager of SFPUC to sign it provided certain conditions were met.[5] In August 2013 SFPUC declined to approve a rate structure for the program, which effectively nullified the contract and sent the CCA process "back to the drawing board."[6] Mayor Edwin M. Lee concurred in this decision.

Another two years of work ensued both at SFPUC and the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO). Consultants were hired and reports issued, and in early 2015 – nearly 11 years after a CCA was first authorized – yet another type of program was suggested. At a joint meeting of SFPUC and LAFCO on January 30, 2015, SFPUC instructed its staff to design a new program along the lines suggested by the consultant. Mayor Lee supported this action, provided the new design met certain criteria that he set out. On February 24, 2015, SFPUC approved a timeline to complete the design and implement the new program, which is projected to begin serving customers in 2016.

Methodology

Members of the Jury conducted legal research using materials from the Government Information Center of the San Francisco Public Library and the online compilation of local ordinances provided by the Board of Supervisors. We also relied on reports and other materials provided online by various sources including the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), the San Francisco Department of the Environment (DOE), San Francisco's Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO), Marin Clean Energy (MCE), Sonoma Clean Power (SCP), International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW) Local 1245, and Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E). We interviewed members and staff of these same entities, others with expertise in the power industry, and past and current City officers and employees. We also attended SFPUC and LAFCO public meetings. Additionally, we reviewed the documents and statistics provided to us by those entities and interviewees.

Discussion

The Civil Grand Jury decided to investigate San Francisco's CleanPowerSF for two reasons:

- because we wondered why the program has taken an extremely long time to develop, and
- because even though by February 2015 CleanPowerSF seemed to be on its way to rollout, we questioned whether some of the issues that had caused delay might reassert themselves and further delay implementation.

We discovered that political pressures were interfering with SFPUC's ability to stick to its first priority—development of a financially viable program serving as many San Franciscans as possible with affordable clean power. Members of the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor publicly expressed disapproval of contracting with SENA, a large fossil fuel company, to provide green energy. Mayor Lee also criticized the program for lacking specific job creation plans, and questioned whether it would be an economic burden on lower-income San Franciscans. The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW) Local 1245, which represents many PG&E workers, shared the worry about job creation. Environmentalists such as the Sierra Club, the San Francisco Green Party, 350.org and others were outspoken in their support for CleanPowerSF, but many saw the program as simply a stepping-stone to an eventual takeover of PG&E's electric utility in San Francisco by a municipally owned utility. There was also controversy about the definition of "green" energy, where it would be obtained, and how much of it CleanPowerSF could afford to provide to its customers and still offer competitive rates.

The purpose of our report is to examine these controversies and suggest a resolution for each one.

Will CleanPowerSF Be Financially Viable?

CCAs represent a legislative innovation. They balance the desire of cities for local independence from investor-owned utilities (IOUs), hoping to find cheaper power for their residents, with the IOUs' desire to continue to make money. The local CCA agency is only allowed to *purchase* power. *Distribution* of that power must remain in the hands of the local IOU if there is one. So it is that San Francisco's CCA program will buy power on the open market, and the local IOU, PG&E, will continue to distribute it. CleanPowerSF is basically an energy procurement program, not a distribution one.

One key feature of CCAs, as implemented in California, is that when a CCA is launched all electric customers within its service area automatically become customers of the CCA unless they "opt out" of the program. If a customer opts out, that customer has the right to continue to be served by the existing IOU.[7] This feature virtually guarantees the CCA a substantial customer base at launch, which contributes greatly to the program's financial stability. However it also provides an incentive for the CCA to keep its rates competitive with those of the existing IOU, to avoid "opt outs."

San Francisco has established ambitious goals for reducing its greenhouse gas emissions[i] that cannot be met unless local residents and businesses shift from using power generated by conventional sources to so-called "clean" power.[8] Accordingly, the purpose of CleanPowerSF is not only to sell power cheaply, but also to sell power that is "cleaner" or "greener" than the power provided by PG&E.[9]

"Clean power," "green power," or "renewable power" (the terms are interchangeable in this report) means electricity that is generated in a way that does not pollute the atmosphere or increase the emission of greenhouse gases. Clean power is renewable: the sources, such as the sun, wind, or water, are constantly replenished and for all practical purposes, will never run out. Energy generated by fossil fuels pollutes, contributes to climate change, and is non-renewable: oil pumped up from underground or coal dug from a mine, are finite. Their sources will eventually expire. See the Appendix to this report, and the documents cited therein, for a fuller description of renewable energy sources.

San Francisco will be buying clean power on the open market for its CCA program. The sellers can be producers, such as a water district that has more power than it

---

[i] Pursuant to the San Francisco Environment Code, Chapter 9 ("Greenhouse Gas Goals and Departmental Climate Action Plans") the City is committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions: 20% below 1990 levels by the end of 2012, 25% below 1990 levels by the end of 2017,40% below 1990 levels by the end of 2025, and 80% below 1990 levels by the end of 2050.

needs, and therefore elects to sell the excess. There are also nonprofit and profit-oriented vendors, who have jumped into the renewable energy market to meet growing demand and are hoping to make money doing so.

At present, clean power from these sources costs more than conventional power. While a CCA enjoys various tax and other financial advantages that make it somewhat cheaper to run than an IOU,[10] CleanPowerSF still faces a challenge, in that it seeks to provide an inherently costlier product – green energy – at rates that are competitive with those charged by PG&E for a less "green" product.[ii]

As recently as 2013, CleanPowerSF planned to provide 100% renewable energy to all San Franciscans. Due to the cost differential just noted, this would have required CleanPowerSF to charge its customers more than the rates charged by PG&E. This led to an outcry. Mayor Lee and others expressed concern that under the "opt out" provision of CCA law some low-income customers would be automatically enrolled in the program, inadvertently fail to "opt out", and find themselves paying more for electricity than they had been paying to PG&E.

For that reason and others, SFPUC rejected the 2013 program design and has since adopted an approach modeled on successful CCA programs in Marin and Sonoma Counties, that provides a mix of renewables and conventional power at rates that are expected to be lower than, or equal to those charged by PG&E for comparable products. These programs will be discussed below, comparing and contrasting them with the current plan for CleanPowerSF.

First, however, we must address a threshold issue. Also in 2013, CleanPowerSF proposed to use an accounting mechanism known as "unbundled" renewable energy credits ("RECs") to reduce its cost of acquiring green energy. Mayor Lee, the City's Commission on the Environment and members of the labor movement objected that unbundled RECs are not green energy, and using them in this way was misleading. Insofar as unbundled RECs figure in the program designs discussed below, we will begin by addressing this question.

Is an Unbundled REC Really Green?

Electricity is the same whatever its source. Whether created by wind, sun, fossil fuel or nuclear fission, the product is the same: a flow of electrons. The only way that a user of electricity can be sure of its origin is to connect directly to the source.

[ii] PG&E is required by law to include some green power in its product mix. Under California's Renewables Portfolio Standard ("RPS") program, all IOUs, electric service providers, and CCAs must increase procurement from eligible renewable energy resources to 33% of total procurement by 2020. For 2015, PG&E's RPS target is 23.3% of retail sales. See http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/energy/Renewables/hot/33RPSProcurementRules.htm

Few have this luxury. Most of us receive our electricity through the "grid" — that is, a shared transmission system that gathers electrons from many sources, mixes and transmits them over major trunk lines, then distributes this mixture to individual users. There is no way to know that electrons transmitted in this way come from any particular source. When power enters the grid from a green source it mixes with power derived from all other sources, many of which are not green. What reaches the user is this mixture. Thus, until all sources are green, there is no way to receive power over the grid that is identifiable as coming from a green source.

Yet some customers need to do just that. California requires electrical utilities to provide their customers with a certain percentage of power from green sources.[11] If utilities cannot connect directly to a green source, then they must buy green power that is transmitted over the grid. To allow these transactions to occur, government and the power industry have devised an accounting process that tracks green power at the point of production.

In its purest form the process is rather simple. When one unit of green power is produced, it is assigned one Renewable Energy Credit, or REC. The green producer sells that power and its associated REC to the buyer – we'll call him "Smith". The producer places one unit of power on the grid, and Smith withdraws one unit of power from the grid. It is mixed power at that point, because of the transmission system described above. However, Smith may count it as entirely green because he owns the associated REC. In this transaction, the REC is said to be "bundled" because it is sold with the underlying power.[12]

California also recognizes "unbundled" REC transactions, which take place as follows. One unit of green power is produced, and is assigned one REC. However, in this instance Smith buys only the power; Smith does not buy the associated REC. The green producer places one unit of power on the grid, and Smith withdraws one unit of mixed power at the destination, just as before. However, Smith may not count it as green because he doesn't own the associated REC. Meanwhile, the producer has sold that REC — but no power — to Smith's neighbor, whom we'll call "Jones". Jones may then buy one unit of conventional power from any source; have that unit placed on the grid; withdraw one unit of mixed power at the destination, and she may count that unit as green because she owns one REC.[13]

In both examples, one REC certifies that:

- one unit of power was generated by a green source; and
- someone, somewhere, bought and consumed that power, instead of one unit of power from a conventional source.

When a customer buys a REC — bundled or unbundled — he/she buys the assurance that one such substitution occurred; that one unit of green power replaced one of conventional power. It may be someone else, somewhere else, that

bought that green power, but the system as a whole is one unit greener for each REC.[14]

Critics in the environmental movement and organized labor argue that unbundled RECs are deceptive. One writes that they "paper over the fact that the [retail energy provider] is not delivering truly green power... just conventional power they call green by buying the credits."[15]

As explained above, no retailer that uses the transmission grid is "delivering truly green power" to its customers. The power received is a mix from all sources. The question remains: should a retail energy provider be allowed to buy power from conventional sources, and count it as green by buying unbundled RECs? The answer to this question varies according to the goals of the provider.

If the goal is to reduce greenhouse gas in the Earth's atmosphere as a whole, then unbundled RECs are an appropriate tool. As long as green power is replacing conventional power the system as a whole is greener, even though the power and its associated RECs are bought by different entities. For the same reason, if the goal is to reduce air pollution nationwide, or worldwide, then unbundled RECs are appropriate.

If the provider is in California, and the goal is to reduce *local* air pollution, then the benefits of using unbundled RECs are less clear. This is because at present most unbundled RECs originate outside California. For example, Marin Clean Energy (MCE) buys unbundled RECs from a cooperative of family farms near Mount Hood, Oregon that generates power from a small hydroelectric project and uses it to irrigate their orchards.[16] This replaces conventional power these farms would otherwise buy elsewhere, and since they have no need to count it as green, the cooperative sells the associated RECs to MCE. MCE then buys conventional power and uses these unbundled RECs to count it as green. Green power has replaced conventional power in Oregon, but this does little or nothing to reduce air pollution in Marin County, California — at least in the short term.

In the long term, however, it may do just that. Ultimately air pollution is not a local problem. Pollutants travel long distances and degrade air quality far from their source. Coal-fired power plants in China cause increased ozone levels in California.[17] Contributing to a global solution of this problem will eventually yield local benefits in Marin County and elsewhere.

In short, the use of unbundled RECs results in environmental benefit to the planet as a whole, and also to the local community.

Some of the most strident objections to the use of unbundled RECs have come from labor unions and others concerned about their impact on the local economy, or lack thereof. They argue that if the goal of a clean energy program is to create local jobs, or to stimulate the local economy, then unbundled RECs may be less appropriate than bundled power — again, because unbundled RECs usually represent power

generated at a distance that may not have any economic impact on the area where the retailer is located. Critics also argue that the sale of unbundled RECs does little to stimulate development of new sources of green power, because their price is too low to encourage development of new green sources.[18]

Others argue that while all of this is true, it is somewhat shortsighted. Using unbundled RECs to provide green power is indeed much cheaper than using bundled renewables. As Marin Clean Energy has demonstrated, this can help a newly formed CCA keep its rates competitive with those of the incumbent electric utility at the outset, when high start-up costs might otherwise put the CCA at a disadvantage. This, in turn, helps the CCA retain customers who would opt out if its rates were too high.

Unbundled RECs also allow clean power CCAs to begin operation before local sources of green power exist. This creates demand for green power, which acts as an incentive for private investment in new local sources. In some cases the new CCA itself may wish to build or buy these new sources, but will have difficulty borrowing money for this purpose until its customer base and revenue stream are established. Unbundled RECs offer an inexpensive way to deliver some of the environmental advantages of green power, while waiting for this to occur.

In this way, unbundled RECs can serve as a bridge to development of new local sources of green power, and the jobs and other economic benefits that such sources produce.

How Does CleanPowerSF Compare with Other Bay Area CCAs?

While it has spent over eleven years debating a design for CleanPowerSF, San Francisco watched two neighboring communities plan and launch successful CCAs that are now far larger than CleanPowerSF as currently proposed. A comparison of these three programs is instructive.[iii]

Program Launch, Coverage

Marin Clean Energy (MCE) was the first CCA in California. Founded in 2008, it began serving customers in 2010. At first it served just 8,000 accounts, all in Marin County. By late 2014 it served approximately 125,000 customers, with an additional 25,000 expected from an expansion of its service area that is now underway. It now serves

---

[iii] Unless otherwise noted, the statistics and data in this section are taken from three sources: "MCE Integrated Resource Plan Annual Update," November 2014; "Sonoma Clean Power 2014-2018 Resource Plan, Draft Version V0.4"; and the program design for CleanPowerSF that was presented to SFPUC at its meetings on April 14, 2015 and May 12, 2015.

customers in four different counties including Marin, Napa, Solano and Contra Costa. Its total retail sales for 2015 are projected to be 1,595 gigawatt-hours (GWh).[iv]

Sonoma Clean Power (SCP) is a relative newcomer. Serious planning got underway in 2011, and in May 2014 it began a phased rollout of its service. By mid-2015 that rollout will be complete, and it will offer service to all electric customers in Sonoma County except those in Healdsburg, which has its own municipal utility. Its average annual sales at that point are projected to be approximately 2,300 GWh.

When CleanPowerSF is launched in early 2016 it plans to serve an average customer load of no more than 30 MW. Over the course of a year, this would result in annual sales of just over 260 GWh. If the program is successful and its governing bodies allow it to expand, that figure will grow. However, at the outset CleanPowerSF will be roughly 1/8 the size of MCE and 1/10 the size of SCP, based on annual sales.

Product Offerings

Like CleanPowerSF, MCE and SCP provide a "default" product to all who do not opt-out of the CCA, and a "premium" product to those who wish to "opt up" to a higher percentage of renewables at higher cost. MCE's default product at first contained 25% renewable energy, and has since increased to 50%. SCP's default product consists of 33% renewable energy. CleanPowerSF's default product is targeted to provide from 33% to 50% renewable energy, depending on the cost of these resources, the exact percentage to be determined later this year.

All three systems offer a premium product that is 100% renewable energy. However, in the case of MCE, fewer than 2% of its customers have "opted up" to this product. While it is hoped that this percentage will rise to 5% over the next few years due to increased marketing, the premium product remains a very small part of MCE's product mix.

Dependence on unbundled RECs varies. In 2010 almost all of MCE's renewable energy derived from unbundled RECs generated outside California. Today unbundled RECs represent about half of its renewable energy. SCP's default product uses unbundled RECs for approximately 10% of its renewable energy (3% of total power), while its premium product uses no unbundled RECs. CleanPowerSF plans

---

[iv] In this context, the *watt* (W) is a unit of measurement that describes the rate at which power is produced. One kilowatt (kW) means one thousand watts; a megawatt (MW) one million watts; a gigawatt (GW) one billion watts. All are used to describe the capacity of a power source: how much power it can produce in a given instant. A *watt-hour* (Wh) describes the volume of power that is produced over time. One watt-hour (Wh) means the amount of power produced by a one-watt source over a period of one hour. A gigawatt-hour (GWh) means the amount of power produced by a billion-watt source over a period of one hour. All are used to describe the cumulative output of a system: how much power it has produced over time.

to use only bundled renewables produced in California for both its products. It does not plan to use unbundled RECs.

Rates

At launch in 2010, MCE charged rates comparable to those charged by PG&E for its standard product. Since then its rates have sometimes been slightly higher, and sometimes lower than those of PG&E. Today it charges approximately 3% less than PG&E.

SCP's default product is designed to sell below the rate charged by PG&E to similar customers. The premium product sells at a rate that is about 20% more than the default product. As of March 2015, this resulted in total monthly bills for default customers that were 5% to 15% lower than those received by comparable customers of PG&E, while the premium product produced a bill that was 1% to 17% higher than PG&E.[19]

Under CleanPowerSF the default product is intended to sell at rates comparable to those charged by PG&E for its basic product. The premium product's price will be equivalent to PG&E's 100% renewable product that is expected to be available in late 2015 through the company's Green Tariff Shared Renewables Program.[20]

Power Acquisition

At launch MCE obtained its energy exclusively through SENA, the same private concern that CleanPowerSF once contemplated hiring for the same purpose. MCE has since signed contracts with other suppliers, and SENA'S contribution has diminished, although SENA still supplies 69% of MCE energy. Its contract with SENA expires in 2017, and thereafter MCE intends to buy energy directly rather than through an intermediary. Likewise, SCP has contracted with an energy provider known as Constellation Energy Group (a subsidiary of Exelon Corporation) to provide a majority of its energy. It also buys some energy directly from producers.

By contrast, CleanPowerSF plans to forego using an outside provider and buy all of its power directly, either from SFPUC or on the open market. It can do so because SFPUC, which administers the program, has long performed this function as part of its municipal power enterprise, and can do so for CleanPowerSF as well.

Power Sources

Sonoma's default product currently uses approximately 15% geothermal energy, 9% biomass and biowaste energy, and 9% wind energy, for a total of 33% renewable energy. Its premium product uses 100% geothermal energy. Marin's overall product mix currently includes approximately 32% wind, 12% biomass/landfill gas, 5% solar, 3% geothermal and 1% small hydro energy, for a total of 51% renewable energy. Both CCAs obtain renewable energy from a variety

of sources, most of which are located outside their service areas. Even SCP, which buys 15% of its energy from geothermal facilities in Sonoma and Lake Counties, obtains most of its renewable energy from other parts of the state, and a few from outside California.

CleanPowerSF's sources of renewable energy have yet to be determined. Its sales at the default rate are projected to generate almost no surplus over the cost of providing power. Sales of the premium product are projected to produce a surplus, which will be used to fund new local or regional sources of renewable power. These would include public projects built on City-owned and controlled property, and private projects built by CleanPowerSF customers and others, who would receive financial incentives from CleanPowerSF through "net metering," "feed-in tariffs" [v] and GoSolarSF. Also included would be energy efficiency and demand response programs,[vi] to be funded by charges collected from ratepayers statewide and administered by the California PUC.

Community Outreach

As MCE expands to include portions of Contra Costa and Napa counties, it has launched CCA service in several large communities with diverse demographics, and a variety of income levels similar to those found in San Francisco. The MCE program has demonstrated that a well-organized and professionally administered community outreach program at all sorts of venues—farmers markets, Kiwanis Clubs, public libraries – makes a positive impact on the community's understanding of Community Choice Aggregation, and helps customers make timely and informed decisions about whether they wish to remain with the program or opt out.[21] The Sonoma County program used a similar outreach approach, and has experienced the same positive outcome.

Financial Viability: Conclusions

Based on the foregoing comparison, we conclude that when CleanPowerSF rolls out it will be a very modest program that serves a relatively small number of customers.

---

[v] In California a "feed-in-tariff" is a program that promotes investment in small-scale renewable generation projects by offering producers long-term contracts to sell energy to investor-owned utilities. See Cal. Pub. Utilities Code Section 399.20. "Net metering" is a service that allows customers of an electric utility who install a small-scale, renewable generation system on-site to receive a financial credit for power generated by their own system and fed back to the utility. The credit is used to offset the customer's electricity bill. See http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/energy/DistGen/netmetering.htm

[vi] "Demand response" programs create incentives — usually financial ones — that encourage end-use electric customers to reduce their electricity usage during periods of peak demand. See http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/energy/Demand+Response/

For that reason alone, it appears to be a low-risk enterprise compared with SCP, which has nearly ten times its projected annual sales, and also with MCE, which is intent on growing outside its original service area.

By the same token, CleanPowerSF has a great deal of up-side potential. It is projected that after just one year SCP will sell nearly ten times as much energy in Sonoma County (population 500,000) as CleanPowerSF plans to sell initially in San Francisco (population 850,000).[22] This points to the possibility of strong growth for CleanPowerSF.

The product mix and pricing strategy of all three CCAs are quite similar. All three acquire most of their renewables outside their local service area, mainly from elsewhere in California. Only CleanPowerSF plans to operate entirely without unbundled RECs — a benefit, perhaps, of its diminutive size. By contrast, MCE uses unbundled RECs in large numbers and will continue to do so for the foreseeable future, evidently as a way to control costs during a period of rapid growth. Even SCP, which has been a champion of using bundled resources, continues to use unbundled RECS as part of its mix. All of this suggests that there is no compelling reason why CleanPowerSF should not use unbundled RECs, if necessary, to support the growth of its enterprise.

And growth should be a priority. Like MCE and SCP, CleanPowerSF aims to increase the percentage of renewables in its product mix over time. However, if this impedes the growth of the program, by increasing its rates to a point where they are less competitive, this could have a negative effect on the environment. A 100% renewable program that serves 30 MW peak load is less "green" than a 50% renewable program that serves 200 MW. This is because the former "retires" only 30 MW of conventional generation, whereas the latter retires 100 MW.

% of renewable power	Peak load in MW	Amount of conventional power retired in MW
50%	200	100
100%	30	30
Additional MWs of conventional power retired		**70**

Moreover, the transition to green power is a key component of the City's plan to eliminate most of its greenhouse gas emissions by mid-century.[23] A small CleanPowerSF program that grows slowly, or not at all, will do little to achieve this goal.

Finally, the benefits of community outreach are clear. Particularly in light of the "opt out" provision of CCA law, customers deserve a well-designed and well-funded

marketing effort that explains the benefits of CleanPowerSF, and allows each one of them to make an informed choice as to whether to remain in the program.

Is CleanPowerSF A Jobs Program?

As recently as January 2015, Mayor Lee reaffirmed his insistence on local job creation as an essential element in a redesigned CleanPowerSF program, stating, "I call on the SFPUC to develop a program that is affordable for customers, greener for our planet, takes advantage of renewable technology being developed right here in our City and has a real plan for creating jobs for our residents."[24]

At a recent joint meeting of SFPUC and LAFCO considerable time was spent discussing this issue. It was noted favorably that, according to a report by the energy consulting firm EnerNex,[25] implementation of CleanPowerSF would result in the creation of new jobs. The estimates in the report are debatable and were criticized at the meeting as being too optimistic.[26]

CleanPowerSF was not originally intended as a jobs program. Job creation was not mentioned in the 2004 ordinance that first authorized a CCA. The program goals at that time were twofold: to provide clean, reasonably priced and reliable electricity to retail customers in San Francisco, and to exercise local control over electricity prices. The emphasis was on developing renewable energy resources, conservation programs and energy efficiency.[27]

Likewise, job creation was not mentioned in the Draft Implementation Plan for a CCA that was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 2007.[28] The concept first appears in an RFP authorized by the Board in November 2009, which cites job creation as an example of additional benefits that could come from the program but are not required by the program.[29]

The first mention of job creation as a program goal appears in a revised RFP issued in 2010, which states, "The City seeks to encourage local job creation through CleanPowerSF."[30]

By 2013 the labor movement and others were treating job creation as a non-negotiable core element in the CCA. The San Francisco Labor Council adopted a formal resolution stating that it would withhold its support for CleanPowerSF unless SFPUC and the Board of Supervisors formally adopted a set of principals dictated by the Council, designed "to ensure that CleanPowerSF program will create high wage, union jobs with benefits . . .."[31] Mayor Lee also opposed the program as then proposed, in part because it "doesn't produce direct local jobs."[32]

Be that as it may, the Civil Grand Jury concludes that "job creation" in relationship to clean power is a red herring, not helped by the EnerNex report. Job creation was not a core element of the program as originally constituted. It is a laudable goal but it does not bear a substantive relationship to the CleanPowerSF program. Why?

Because just as the majority of new clean energy projects are geographically far away from San Francisco, so are the jobs associated with building them. See the section on Green Power Resources below for more on this issue.

More than one interviewee suggested that the real opportunity to create local jobs lies not in generating renewable energy, but rather in energy efficiency: in auditing, assessing, electrical contracting, and accounting. Other interviewees suggested that SFPUC should use the contracting process to ensure that clean energy developers, in and outside the City, comply with basic labor standards in contracting, procurement and hiring used by the City of San Francisco.

A further jobs issue related to CleanPowerSF is whether implementation will result in a substantial *loss* of current jobs. Based on our interviews and other research the Civil Grand Jury has found no evidence that creation of CleanPowerSF would result in substantial job loss. This is because by law PG&E will continue to provide distribution, metering, and billing to CleanPowerSF customers, and virtually all local employees of PG&E's regulated electric utility work in these areas. As a result, none of the many people interviewed nor any of the many documents reviewed have indicated that there would be job loss as a result of the implementation of CleanPowerSF.

Green Power Resources: Are There Enough?

Mayor Lee has stated his desire to see that "San Francisco remains the Greenest City in North America."[33] One hallmark of a "Green City" is the creation and implementation of new and diverse sources of green power or renewable energy. Where will this energy come from? How much is available?

Geography limits the amount of renewable energy that can be developed in San Francisco proper. Ours is an urban county: We don't have vast tracts of land available for wind farms or large solar arrays within the City limits. Nevertheless, the City has done an admirable job of developing clean energy resources in the City and on property it owns or controls elsewhere. Based on a 2013 study that is still accurate today, hydroelectric generation at powerhouses associated with the Hetch Hetchy system have a capacity of 380.5 MW.[vii] Small hydroelectric generation projects add 4 MW; solar photovoltaic projects, 7.5 MW; and renewable Biogas energy projects 3.1 MW, for a total installed capacity of 395.1 MW. Another 52 MW is estimated to be available.[34]

[vii] Although the Hetch Hetchy system is not considered a renewable power source, for RPS purposes, the power that it generates is effectively exempt from RPS requirements. Under California Public Utilities Code Section 399.30(j), SFPUC is required to procure RPS-eligible electricity resources, including renewable energy credits, to meet only the electricity demands that are not met by Hetch Hetchy, so long as Hetch Hetchy provides more than 67% of its electricity resources.

The issue, however, is whether sufficient clean energy is available statewide to meet San Francisco's needs and those of other communities. In light of the state's 2020 deadline for reducing carbon emissions to 1990 levels, and 40% below that by 2030,[35] it is reasonable to ask whether increased demand will cause the cost of clean energy to skyrocket, and the resources to be significantly diminished or tapped dry.

The California Energy Commission estimates that the state's total annual consumption of electricity will approach 290,000 GWH in 2015, and 300,000 GWH or more in 2020. Its peak demand is forecast to be approximately 64,000 MW in 2016, and as high as 69,000 MW in 2020.[36] Under current law, California utilities are required to serve 33 percent of retail electricity sales with renewable resources by 2020.[37] Based on the forecasts just cited, this means that by 2020 something like 100,000 GWH of total consumption, and 23,000 MW of peak demand will need to be served by renewable sources of energy statewide. See the Appendix to this report for information on where that energy might come from.

It is important to remember that renewable energy is exactly that: it can be renewed almost indefinitely, because it does not run out. So the concern is not whether there is enough, but rather how fast we can develop what we need.

SFPUC has three green energy programs: Municipal solar, which installs solar panels on schools and other city facilities, Energy Efficiency, which undertakes projects that help reduce energy consumption, and GoSolarSF (GSSF), which funds the installation of solar panels at private residences. Unfortunately, their funding has been cut in recent years due to the significant capital needs of replacing the aging infrastructure of the Hetch Hetchy Power System. Cuts to GSSF have been much smaller, among other reasons because the GSSF program has been so successful. See the Appendix to this report, and documents cited therein, for more information.

GSSF is a program that benefits private property owners but is funded by public money. It has been the subject of debate between policymakers and SFPUC staff regarding the appropriateness and legality of this funding arrangement.

A possible solution would be to integrate GSSF into the proposed CleanPowerSF program. CleanPowerSF could fund a portion, or all, of GSSF, as part of its overall local resource build-out plan. In this way CleanPowerSF could market GSSF to its own customers, help those that wish to install rooftop solar, and then purchase their excess power as a local clean energy source.[38] This complementary relationship would enhance both programs.

As to the question of whether the City government and the staff of SFPUC have the necessary competence and expertise to operate efficiently in the clean power market, the Jury finds good reason to believe that they do. SFPUC staff has purchased electricity for years to meet the needs of San Francisco civic facilities, which are not always satisfied by Hetch Hetchy production. They will be able to use

this experience in buying clean power for the rest of the city on behalf of CleanPowerSF.

Findings

Based on the foregoing discussion, we make the following findings:

F1 CleanPowerSF will be a relatively small, low-risk program at startup, but must grow quickly to meet the City's timeline for reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

F2 CleanPowerSF's rates will be lower and more affordable to all San Franciscans, if it is free to use unbundled RECs as needed, and to provide less than 100% green power.

F3 Local job creation, while desirable, is not the chief purpose of CleanPowerSF, and should not cause further delay in implementing the program.

F4 There are ample affordable resources of renewable power to support CleanPowerSF, including local rooftop solar installations such as those funded through the GoSolarSF program.

F5 Political discord has at times delayed implementation of CleanPowerSF.

Recommendations

Based on the foregoing findings, we make the following recommendations:

R1 That CleanPowerSF be designed, first and foremost, to be financially viable and to grow quickly without undue risk.

R2 That CleanPowerSF be free to use unbundled RECs, and to provide less than 100% green power, as needed to meet its goals of financial viability and early expansion.

R3 That CleanPowerSF be designed to provide as many local jobs as it can, without compromising its financial viability and potential for early expansion.

R4 That SFPUC integrate the GoSolarSF program into CleanPowerSF to take advantage of their complementary relationship.

R5 That local officials, including the Mayor, put the full weight of their offices behind the success of the CleanPowerSF program.

Request for Responses

Pursuant to Penal Code Sections 933(c) and 933.05, the civil grand jury requests responses to all of the above findings and recommendations from each of the following:

Honorable Edwin M. Lee, Mayor

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

Response Matrix

Findings	*Recommendations*	*Responses Required*
F1 CleanPowerSF will be a relatively small, low-risk program at startup, but must grow quickly to meet the City's timeline for reducing greenhouse gas emissions.	R1 That CleanPowerSF be designed, first and foremost, to be financially viable and to grow quickly without undue risk.	SF Public Utilities Commission, Board of Supervisors, Mayor
F2 CleanPowerSF's rates will be lower and more affordable to all San Franciscans, if it is free to use unbundled RECs as needed, and to provide less than 100% green power.	R2 That CleanPowerSF be free to use unbundled RECs, and to provide less than 100% green power, as needed to meet its goals of financial viability and early expansion.	SF Public Utilities Commission, Board of Supervisors, Mayor
F3 Local job creation, while desirable, is not the chief purpose of CleanPowerSF, and should not cause further delay in implementing the program.	R3 That CleanPowerSF be designed to provide as many local jobs as it can, without compromising its financial viability and potential for early expansion.	SF Public Utilities Commission, Board of Supervisors, Mayor
F4 There are ample affordable resources of renewable power to support CleanPowerSF, including local rooftop solar installations such as those funded through the GoSolarSF program.	R4 That SFPUC integrate the GoSolarSF program into CleanPowerSF to take advantage of their complementary relationship.	SF Public Utilities Commission, Board of Supervisors, Mayor
F5 Political discord has at times delayed implementation of CleanPowerSF.	R5 That local officials, including the Mayor, put the full weight of their offices behind the success of the CleanPowerSF program.	SF Public Utilities Commission, Board of Supervisors, Mayor

Glossary of Abbreviations and Definitions

ABBREVIATIONS

CCA:	Community Choice Aggregation
CPSF:	CleanPowerSF
GSSF:	GoSolarSF
GW:	Gigawatts of power. A gigawatt is equivalent to 1,000 megawatts.
IBEW:	International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers
IOU:	Investor-owned utility, e.g. Pacific Gas & Electric Company
IP	Implementation Plan
KW:	Kilowatts of power. A kilowatt is equivalent to 1,000 watts.
LAFCO:	Local Agency Formation Commission
MCE:	Marin Clean Energy
MW:	Megawatts of power. A megawatt is equivalent to 1,000 kilowatts.
PG&E:	Pacific Gas and Electric Company
PV:	Photovoltaic, as solar PV
REC:	Renewable Energy Credit. A certificate of proof showing that one megawatt-hour of electricity was generated by a green source. When one megawatt-hour of green power is produced it is assigned one REC. The power and the REC can be sold separately or together. If the REC and the power are sold together, the REC is called a "bundled REC." If a customer buys only the power and not the REC, and the REC is sold elsewhere, it is called an "unbundled REC."
RFI:	Request for Information: a formal query from a government agency requesting vendors to suggest how they might implement a program idea, estimating details such as staffing and costs.
RFP:	Request for Proposals: a formal query from a government agency requesting vendors to propose how they would implement a program, including methodologies and costs.

SCP: Sonoma Clean Power

SENA: Shell Energy North America

SFPUC: San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

DEFINITIONS

BIOENERGY: Power generated from biomass, or plants

"DARK GREEN" OR "DEEP GREEN": An electricity product comprised of 100% renewable energy.

GEOTHERMAL ENERGY: Power generated from heat energy derived from hot rock, hot water, or steam below the earth's surface.

GRID (POWER): A system of power lines and associated equipment used to transmit and distribute electricity over a geographic area.

HYDROELECTRIC ENERGY: Power generated by the flow of water. For example, O'Shaughnessy Dam, which creates Hetch Hetchy Reservoir, is a large hydro project. Raising the height of an existing dam is one example of a small hydro project.

"LIGHT GREEN": An electricity product comprised of less than 100% renewable power.

OPT OUT: To choose not to join a program, e.g., CleanPowerSF

OPT UP: To choose to buy an optional, more expensive electricity product such as MCE's "Deep Green" product

PHOTOVOLTAICS: A solar power technology that uses solar cells or solar photovoltaic arrays to convert light from the sun directly to electricity.

RENEWABLE ENERGY: Energy for which the sources (sun, wind, water) are constantly replenished and for all practical purposes will never run out. Renewable energy is also called clean or green energy.

SOLAR ENERGY PROJECTS: A field of solar panels meant to provide a stream of power to a group of users is a large solar project. Solar panels on the rooftop of a residence, meant to heat the house's water, is a small solar project.

TARIFF: (As used in the the electric power industry) The price of electricity.

WATT: A unit of measurement that describes the rate at which power is produced.

WATT-HOUR: A unit of measurement that describes the volume of power produced over time.

Appendix

SOURCES OF RENEWABLE ENERGY

There are at least seven types of renewable energy.[39]

Solar energy projects can be small (panels installed on a rooftop to heat the water in an individual residence) or large (fields of panels meant to provide a stream of power for a group of users).

Hydroelectric power is energy generated by the flow of water. Large hydroelectric projects, such as O'Shaughnessy Dam at Hetch Hetchy, generate clean power but are not eligible for inclusion in the Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) program. A small hydroelectric power project might be raising the height of a dam, or generating power from water running downhill through a pipe. One report shows that, provided there is no negative impact on water delivery, small hydro projects can be a viable renewable generation technology. The report further states that it should be considered along with solar, wind, and geothermal projects. Some preliminary studies indicate that small hydro projects have some of the lowest costs of all renewable sources.[40]

Wind power projects capture the wind in turbines that create energy. Although California's high wind areas are growing more and more limited, there are still opportunities for development available. Wind has the advantage of being a mature technology with requirements that are well understood. The primary challenges are environmental and permitting: the projects are highly visible and thus not necessarily welcome in some communities. Also, it has been difficult to accommodate the needs of birds occupying wind power sites.

The sun causes plants to grow, and the result is a biomass. Biomass can be turned into electricity, which is called bioenergy. Although it does not offer large opportunities for expansion, this form of green power does generate 3.1 MW of power for San Francisco.

Hydrogen gas can be burned to generate power if it is separated from the other elements with which it is usually combined – to form water, for example.

Sonoma County uses geothermal energy for 15% of its overall energy mix. Treated wastewater is pumped into deep cracks in the ground, where hot rocks heat the water, creating steam, which runs turbines.[41] In other areas of the state, extremely hot water is "flashed" into steam within the power plant, and that steam turns the turbine.[42] New or operating geothermal projects are limited, and they too have challenging siting and permitting issues. Among the difficulties is access to transmission lines.

Ocean energy in various forms—tidal movement, temperature differences based on depth, wave power—can all be used to create power. But this opportunity is too

limited and too expensive to meet a major portion of the renewable requirements of San Francisco.

As of December 31, 2014 the total wholesale renewable energy capacity in the State was 18,800 MW.[43] The breakdown of these sources is as follows: [44]

SOLAR PHOTOVOLTAIC	4,800 MW
SOLAR THERMAL	1,100 MW
SMALL HYDRO	1,700 MW
WIND	7,100 MW
BIOMASS	1,300 MW
GEOTHERMAL	2,800 MW
TOTAL	18,800 MW

The state also has additional 2,200 MW of self-generation capacity (e.g. rooftop solar) for a total operating capacity of 21,000 MW. [45]

Wind, solar photovoltaic (PV), and geothermal projects are the primary sources for renewable energy available to the SFPUC, [46] although geothermal projects present problems as noted above.

Solar thermal and solar PV have shown the most growth. Commercial in-state generation from these sources has increased more then 250% since 2013. [47] This trend is expected to continue throughout the State of California. The cost of solar installation is also going down.

New rooftop solar units seem to be the least problematic of the green energy programs.[48] SFPUC currently funds GoSolarSF (GSSF). The program subsidizes the installation of solar panels on the roofs of private residences, and has been lauded as beneficial for local citizens because it reduces carbon-based fuel use and greenhouse gas emissions.

Data provided to the Jury by SFPUC show that residential and business solar installations are growing as well. SFPUC estimates there is a total achievable solar potential of 60 MW if every available roof were covered. The City has a laudable goal of installing 50 MW by 2020. Currently there are 28 MW of solar installed, so SFPUC is over halfway towards reaching that goal. The breakdown is as follows:

- Owned or under contract by SFPUC – 8 MW
- Projects owned by residents or businesses that received a GSSF incentive – 10 MW
- Projects owned by residents or businesses that did not receive a GSSF incentive – 10 MW (either installed before the program started in 2008 or the owner opted not to receive an incentive and worked with a private company.)

SFPUC's statistics on solar activity as of December 2014 are impressive:

- SFPUC has completed 3106 solar installations
- These installations generate 10 MW
- 132 jobs were created since 2008 for disadvantaged San Franciscans; 29 are currently employed, 10 in this Fiscal Year alone, and they are paid on average $17.00 an hour.

The GSSF program was funded at $5 million in 2014-15; $5 million is expected to be spent in 2015-2016.

Solar PV is a growth program at SFPUC. Projects are in development and design stage at: Downtown High School, Cesar Chavez and Marina Middle School, and at the SF Police Academy. SFPUC also has plans to install additional solar projects on municipal sites as their 10-year capital plan funding allows.

Endnotes

[1] California Assembly Bill 117 (Migden), Chapter 838, Statutes of 2002 – "An act to amend Sections 218.3, 366, 394, and 394.25 of, and to add Sections 331.1, 366.2, and 381.1 to, the Public Utilities Code, relating to public utilities"
[2] San Francisco Ordinance (hereafter "Ordinance") 86-04
[3] Ordinances 146-07, 147-07
[4] Ordinance 232-09
[5] See San Francisco Board of Supervisors Resolutions (hereafter "Resolutions") 348-12, 331-13; SFPUC Resolution 11-0194.
[6] See Resolution 331-13.
[7] See Cal. Public Utilities Code Section 366.2(a)
[8] See "San Francisco Climate Action Strategy" (SF Department of the Environment, 2013), Table 2.
[9] See Ordinances 86-04, 147-07.
[10] See, "The Economics of Community Choice Aggregation" (Bay Area Economic Forum, 2007), at pp. 7-8.
[11] See footnote ii at page 9 of the text.
[12] See information provided by the California Public Utilities Commission at http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/energy/Renewables/FAQs/05REcertificates.htm
[13] Ibid.
[14] Ibid.
[15] Stern, Hunter, "Mixed report on Clean Power in San Francisco", an opinion piece published in the *San Francisco Chronicle* on December 30, 2014.
[16] See MCE Integrated Resource Plan Annual Update, November 2013, p. 11.
[17] See http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/ten-percent-san-joaquin-valleys-ozone-pollution-comes-outside-california
[18] See, e.g., Stern, op. cit.; Press, Daniel, "Opinion: 'Renewable energy certificates' are a feel-good scam" (*San Jose Mercury News*, April 9, 2009), at http://www.mercurynews.com/opinion/ci_12049267
[19] "PG&E – SCP Comparison, at http://www.pge.com/includes/docs/pdfs/myhome/customerservice/energychoice/communitychoiceaggregation/scp_rateclasscomparison.pdf
[20] See http://www.pge.com/en/about/environment/pge/greenoption/faq/index.page
[21] See MCE Clean Energy, "MCE Benicia Community Outreach Plan", February 2015.
[22] See U.S. Census Bureau, "State & County Quick Facts", http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06/06075.html
[23] See San Francisco Environment Code, Chapter 9, Sec. 902.
[24] News Release, January 26, 2015, "Mayor Lee & Board President Breed Announce San Francisco Exceeds Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Goal"
[25] EnerNex, "Local Build-Out of Energy Resources of the Community Choice Aggregation Program" (LAFCO, 1-30-15) (hereafter "EnerNex Report")
[26] "Minutes, Special Joint Meeting of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission with the Local Agency Formation Commission, Friday, January 30, 2015" (as approved February 10, 2015)
[27] Ordinance 84-04
[28] See Ordinance 147-07 and "Community Choice Aggregation Program Description and Revenue Bond Action Plan and Draft Implementation Plan" dated June 2, 2007, attached thereto and adopted therein.
[29] Request for Proposals, Agreement No. CS-978R, SF PUC Power Enterprise, November 5, 2009, at p. 32; and see Ordinance 232-09.
[30] Revised Request for Proposals, Agreement No. CS-160, "Electricity Supply Services for Community Choice Aggregation Program" (SF PUC Power Enterprise, September 30, 2010), at p.8

[31] "Resolution Supporting A Labor Friendly Community Choice Aggregation Proposal For San Francisco" adopted by the Delegates of the San Francisco Labor Council on May 13, 2013.
[32] Mayor's Appearance before the Board of Supervisors, 9/10/13; see video at sfgovtv.org
[33] News Release, May 1, 2014, "Mayor Appoints Deborah Raphael as SF Environment Director"
[34] SFPUC, "Generating Clean Energy for San Francisco" (July 2013).
[35] See Executive Order B-30-15, issued by Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr. on 04/29/2015, at http://gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=18938
[36]California Energy Commission, "California Energy Demand Updated Forecast" (February 2015), pp. 2-4, see http://www.energy.ca.gov/2014publications/CEC-200-2014-009/CEC-200-2014-009-CMF.pdf
[37] Senate Bill X1-2, signed by Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr., in April 2011; see also http://www.energy.ca.gov/portfolio/
[38] See EnerNex Report, pp. 82, 154-158.
[39] These definitions are based on material contained in RenewableEnergyWorld.Com, "Types of Renewable Energy", see http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/index.html
[40] EnerNex Report, p. 139; see also Olson, Scott and Jon Pietruskiewicz et al, "Renewable Energy Assessment—Final Report" (Black and Veatch for SFPUC, 2014)
[41] See https://sonomacleanpower.org/about-scp/power-sources/
[42] See http://energyalmanac.ca.gov/renewables/geothermal/types.html
[43] See http://www.energy.ca.gov/renewables/tracking_progress/documents/renewable.pdf
[44] Ibid., figure 1
[45] Ibid., p. 2
[46] See Olson and Pietruskiewicz, op. cit., p. 1-1.
[47] See http://energyalmanac.ca.gov/electricity/electricity_generation.html
[48] See Olson and Pietruskiewicz, op. cit., pp. 4-4 to 4-28.

Print Form

Introduction Form

By a Member of the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2015 JUL 17 AM 9:

Time stamp or meeting date

I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

☐ 1. For reference to Committee. (An Ordinance, Resolution, Motion, or Charter Amendment)

☐ 2. Request for next printed agenda Without Reference to Committee.

☒ 3. Request for hearing on a subject matter at Committee.

☐ 4. Request for letter beginning "Supervisor [ ] inquires"

☐ 5. City Attorney request.

☐ 6. Call File No. [ ] from Committee.

☐ 7. Budget Analyst request (attach written motion).

☐ 8. Substitute Legislation File No. [ ]

☐ 9. Reactivate File No. [ ]

☐ 10. Question(s) submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the BOS on [ ]

Please check the appropriate boxes. The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following:

☐ Small Business Commission ☐ Youth Commission ☐ Ethics Commission

☐ Planning Commission ☐ Building Inspection Commission

Note: For the Imperative Agenda (a resolution not on the printed agenda), use a Imperative Form.

Sponsor(s):

Clerk of the Board

Subject:

Hearing - Civil Grand Jury Report - CleanPowerSF At Long Last

The text is listed below or attached:

Hearing on the recently published 2014-2015 Civil Grand Jury report entitled, "CleanPowerSF At Long Last."

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor:

For Clerk's Use Only:

150604