File	No.	13	0829
------	-----	----	------

Committee	Item	No
Board Item	No	29

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee		Date		
Board of Supervisors N	leeting .	Date <u>September</u>	17 2013	
Cmte Board	n e Digest ealyst Report e Analyst Report on Form (for hearings) nt/Agency Cover Letter a rmation Form get ct Budget		77, 2013	
	ter	is needed)		
Completed by: <u>Joy La</u> Completed by:	mug Da	ite <u>September 5, 2013</u> ite	<u>3</u> -	

An asterisked item represents the cover sheet to a document that exceeds 20 pages. The complete document is in the file.

1 [Urging the Public Utilities Commission to Set Not to Exceed Rates for CleanPowerSF Without Any Further Delay]

2

3 Resolution reiterating the Board of Supervisor's support for CleanPowerSF, citing the

4 Board's role as the preeminent policymaking body in San Francisco, urging the Public

Utilities Commission to set not-to-exceed rates for CleanPowerSF without any further

delay, and promising further action if the Public Utilities Commission fails to set rates.

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

5

6

WHEREAS, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors unanimously established a Community Choice Aggregation (CCA) program in 2004 (File No. 040236), now called

10 CleanPowerSF; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors unanimously approved a CCA Governance Structure in 2007 (File No. 070777); and

WHEREAS, Again in 2007, a supermajority of The Board of Supervisors adopted a Community Choice Aggregation Program Description, Revenue Bond Action Plan, and Draft Implementation Plan, which established key aspects of the CCA Program and enacted further implementation measures (File No. 070501); and

WHEREAS, In 2009 the Board of Supervisors unanimously approved the issuance of a Request for Proposals (RFPs) for Community Choice Aggregation Services (File No. 091161); and

WHEREAS, The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), in response to direction from the Board of Supervisors, issued two RFPs seeking suppliers to provide key services for CleanPowerSF, and on February 8, 2011, the SFPUC authorized the General Manager to negotiate with one or more creditworthy firms for power supply services for CleanPowerSF; and

25

1	WHEREAS, SFPUC staff has negotiated a draft contract that would achieve the
2	Board's goals by: (1) mitigating program risks by using a phase-in approach, (2) offering
3	customers a 100% renewable product, (3) requiring a \$13.5 million initial appropriation to fund
4	program reserves, and (4) allowing for development of new renewable resources to be added
5	into the electricity portfolio as a customer revenue stream is established; and
6	WHEREAS, In December, 2011, the SFPUC approved Resolution 11-0194, which
7	endorsed the negotiated contract, and submitted a \$19.5 million appropriation request to the
8	Board of Supervisors for CleanPowerSF; and
9	WHEREAS, In September, 2012, a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors
10	authorized the PUC to launch the CleanPowerSF program, and authorized the General
11	Manager of the PUC to execute the negotiated contract for a term of up to five years for all
12	services required to launch CleanPowerSF (File No. 111340); and
13	WHEREAS, Also in September, 2012, a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors
14	appropriated \$19,500,000 of Hetch Hetchy funds to support CleanPowerSF's CCA program,
15	and added Administrative Code Sections 10.100.372 and 10.100.373 to establish the
16	CleanPowerSF Customer Fund and the CleanPowerSF Reserve Fund (File No. 111371); and,
17	WHEREAS The San Francisco Public Utilities Commissioners have reviewed the
18	CleanPowerSF program, including the proposed not-to-exceed rates, at 18 separate meetings
19	between September, 2012 and August, 2013; and
20	WHEREAS The Public Utilities Commissioners considered CleanPowerSF's proposed
21	not-to-exceed rates at a joint meeting of the SFPUC and the San Francisco Local Agency
22	Formation Commission (LAFCo) on March 25 th , 2013; and
23	WHEREAS The Public Utilities Commissioners reviewed CleanPowerSF's proposed
24	not-to-exceed rates in a "Commission Workshop" during the SFPUC's meeting on April 23,
25	2013; and

1	WHEREAS The Public Utilities Commissioners again considered CleanPowerSF's
2	proposed not-to-exceed rates on May 14, 2013 and voted to continue the matter to a later
.3	date; and
4	WHEREAS, On July 9th, 2013, at another joint meeting of the SFPUC and LAFCo, the
5	LAFCo board including four members of the Board of Supervisors voted unanimously to urge
, 6	the SFPUC to approve PUC staff's recommended not-to-exceed rates, while the Public
7	Utilities Commissioners voted, both at the joint LAFCo meeting and the Commission's
8	regularly scheduled meeting, to continue consideration of the rates to a later date; and
9	WHEREAS, On August 13, 2013, the Public Utilities Commissioners voted three to two
10	to reject a motion approving the recommended CleanPowerSF not-to-exceed rates; and
11	WHEREAS, According to its presentation to the PUC, the San Francisco Rate Fairness
12	Board, a voter-mandated adjunct of the PUC, has met nine times since January, 2012 to
13	consider CleanPowerSF, with six meetings from November 2, 2012 to March 15, 2013,
14	focusing on the not-to-exceed rates; and
15	WHEREAS, The Rate Fairness Board determined that CleanPowerSF's "Proposed
16	Phase 1 Program rates are technically fair" and the "decision to proceed with [the] Phase 1
17	Program is a policy choice;" and
18	WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors is the preeminent policymaking body of the City
19	and County of San Francisco; and
20	WHEREAS, Over the course of nine years and numerous changes in the Board's
21	composition, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors has consistently and overwhelmingly
22	expressed its policy directive in support of CleanPowerSF; and
23	WHEREAS, Irrespective of the particular policy decision, the Board of Supervisors
24	must protect and defend its authority to make policy decisions; and

25

1	WHEREAS, In failing to set not-to-exceed rates for CleanPowerSF, the Public Utilities			
2	Commission is contradicting the policy directives of the Board of Supervisors and neglecting			
3	its own obligations under Charter Section 8B.125 to "set rates, fees and other charges in			
4	connection with providing the utility services under its jurisdiction;" and, now therefore be it			
5	RESOLVED, The Board of Supervisors refuses to acquiesce its policymaking authorit			
6	to the Executive bureaucracy; and, be it			
7	FURTHER RESOLVED, The Board of Supervisors urges the Public Utilities			
8	Commission to approve not-to-exceed rates for CleanPowerSF without any further delay; and			
9	be it	•		
10	FURTHER RESOLVED, If the Public Utilities Commiss	sioners fail to se	et not-to-exceed	
11	rates, or hereafter fail in any way to timely implement CleanPowerSF, the Board of			
12	Supervisors shall, whether at the Board Chambers or the ballot, exercise every means at its			
13	disposal to enact its policy objective and preserve its role as the elected policymaking body of			
14	San Francisco.		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
15				
16				
17		C		
18 .				
19			• .	
20				
21				
22			•	
23				
24		•		
25				

Miller, Alisa

From:

Ronen, Hillary

Sent:

Tuesday, September 03, 2013 3:59 PM

To:

Johnston, Conor; Miller, Alisa

Cc:

Pollock, Jeremy; Hsieh, Frances; Lauterborn, Peter

Subject:

RE: CleanPowerSF Res

Yes - please add Supervisor Campos as a cosponsor. Thanks.

----Original Message-----

From: Johnston, Conor

Sent: Tuesday, September 03, 2013 3:54 PM

To: Miller, Alisa

Cc: Pollock, Jeremy; Hsieh, Frances; Ronen, Hillary; Lauterborn, Peter

Subject: RE: CleanPowerSF Res

Lisa,

Yes, they were confirmed after I printed the intro form.

Avalos then Mar. I haven't heard from Campos' office. Supervisor Breed may have spoke to him directly. Hillary, can you please confirm?

Conorj

----Original Message----

From: Miller, Alisa

Sent: Tuesday, September 03, 2013 2:52 PM

To: Johnston, Conor

Subject: CleanPowerSF Res

Hi Conor,

Supervisor Breed just indicated during Roll Call that the LAFCo members are cosponsoring, but it's not indicated on the Intro Firm or Resolution. Can you please confirm the cosponsoring and order in which they should be listed?

Thank you... Lisa

Sent from my iPhone

Introduction Form

By a Member of the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor

I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):	or meeting date
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. Request for Closed Session (attach written motion).	
10. Board to Sit as A Committee of the Whole.	
11. Question(s) submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the BOS on	
Please check the appropriate boxes. The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the fo Small Business Commission Youth Commission Ethics C	llowing: ommission
☐ Planning Commission ☐ Building Inspection Comm	ission
ote: For the Imperative Agenda (a resolution not on the printed agenda), use a Impera	itive
ponsor(s):	
Breed, Avalos, Mar, Campos	
ubject:	
Jrging the Public Utilities Commission to Set Not-to-Exceed Rates for CleanPowerSF Without	out Any Further Delay
he text is listed below or attached:	
Resolution reiterating the Board of Supervisor's support for CleanPowerSF, citing the Board' olicymaking body in San Francisco, urging the Public Utilities Commission to set not-to-exceleanPowerSF without any further delay, and promising further action if the Public Utilities (ates.	reed rates for
Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor:	cece
or Clerk's Use Only:	

130829