

**MARIN CONSERVATION LEAGUE**  
**Climate Action Working Group: September 26, 2014**  
**MCL offices, Mt. Tamalpais Conference Room**

Present: Co-chairs Pam Reaves and Doug Wilson; also Tamra Peters, Bill Carney, Kate Powers, Nona Dennis, Susan Robinson, Beckie Menten, Ed Mainland, and Judy Teichman

Pam and Doug opened the meeting at 9 a.m.

**Quick Intros:** Attendees introduced themselves.

**Approval of the Agenda:** Approval of minutes moved to end of meeting.

**Discussion Items:**

**1) Presentation by Beckie Menten, Efficiency Director of Marin Clean Energy**

Becky provided printed copies of her powerpoint titled “2016 & Beyond Energy Efficiency Programs in Marin” along with copies of “MCE Multifamily Program Logic Model” and “MCE Multi-Family Energy Efficiency 2016 Proposed Program Design”

Ed would like to see MCE’s work scale up on energy efficiency to a level commensurate with their commitment to clean power. That brought up the question of the fiscal impact for MCE of increasing energy efficiency.

San Francisco Chronicle article 9.26.14 on how solar will impact investor owned utilities’ profits. Net metering policy may be an important pressure point in which MCL should get involved.

<http://www.sfgate.com/default/article/Federal-report-shows-how-solar-panels-may-hit-5781107.php>

Bill suggested an opportunity for increasing energy production. He asked if MCE had the ability and commitment to ramp up to provide electric hook-ups and power if every car in the County were an electric vehicle and how would that relate to MCE’s business plan.

MCE is a mission-driven organization--its mission states commitment to GHG reduction. MCE is continuing to ramp up commitment to securing renewable energy. They recently contracted with a wind power plant in the Central Valley for 100 MW. MCE has an integrated resources plan. Their long-term goal is to have the default option with MCE be 100% Deep Green.

Cooley Porter quarry is a Sol Shares program site. This customer option is for purchasing a share in the facility, by paying a premium towards the cost of the project, then consumer’s rate is locked in for 20 years.

MCE also has a feed-in tariff rate offered at a cent above retail rate. It’s a subsidy offered to promote local renewable development in its service area. San Rafael Airport is an example.

MCE has its own rate setting authority unlike PG&E.

As more solar comes on to the grid, there are challenges to managing power flow. There are ways around that that don’t require suppression of solar generation. Becky is interested in the strategy of grid-to-vehicle integration as a possibility for energy efficiency. A parked electric vehicle would draw excess energy off the grid then release it back as it’s needed.

Ed mentioned “Living Pilots project”, in Southern California--a suite of advanced technologies providing reliability and resiliency to the grid without fossil fuels. A “new paradigm where renewables are the solution to stability of renewables”.

Solar is perceived as not paying into maintenance of the grid. A shift of the utilities business model is needed as utilities move to more distributive sources of energy and demand is shifting away from the grid. The various costs of the system should be carried by the whole system. PG&E currently charges a fee for transmission. PG&E’s profit is also contingent on how much money they’re putting into infrastructure and the grid.

The utility’s business model hasn’t figured out where their money will come from as the paradigm shifts. Utilities have a natural monopoly over pipes and wires (grid), and as a monopoly need to be regulated. Energy efficiency and generation, on the other hand, could be free market competition or under nonprofit management. Utilities could shift to just pipes and wires maintenance. It would involve shrinking significantly from current model and is unlikely to happen.

**Action Item:** Ed will circulate an article written for Sierra Club regarding a PG&E \$10 fixed fee on rooftop solar.

Currently PG&E is a for-profit corporation that is regulated. It tries to figure out how it can maximize its financial situation within the regulated system. PG&E has a guaranteed rate of return through the CPUC. Beckie would like the State to provide stronger direction into CPUC’s regulatory structure in order to enable a transformation in the utility business model. There are models around the State and the Country of publicly owned utilities. Bill mentioned the idea that something that is available to everyone should be maintained by everyone.

Existing investor owned utilities have gone through decoupling. They don’t make money per unit of energy sold. They are guaranteed a rate of return.

Unlike PG&E, MCE does not receive a guaranteed rate of return from the CPUC. They are not decoupled. If MCE’s customers improve energy efficiency significantly over time, MCE loses money. MCE’s long term picture of energy efficiency needs planning.

Beckie presented details on what MCE is doing to increase energy efficiency.

MCE is working on envisioning what their new efficiency programs will look like for 2016 and beyond. Beckie encouraged everyone to sign up on their Energy Efficiency Listserv at [marincleanenergy.org/ee](http://marincleanenergy.org/ee) They will be continuing research and analysis through October and will be designing program in November. There will be a public comment period Nov 14 – Dec 19.

Water Energy Nexus Grant Program. Ed would like to see MCE go after a portion of the \$19 million grant for projects offered through the California Dept of Water Resources. Each grant ranges up to \$2.5 million. MCE met with MMWD about partnering on a standard offer. MMWD is cautious. Energy rebates would be offered by MCE and water rebates by MMWD. The grant could pay to install data loggers. It would be possible to craft two phases in the standard offer. The grant request is due in December.

MMWD is a customer of MCE. They participate in demand response programs and have a lot of their technology switched to high efficiency pumps.

PG&E is currently restricting access to Smart Meters through third party manufacturers citing security to the grid. MCE does not currently get data from Smart Meters but they have a statutory right to it. They hope to be receiving it soon. It will help with energy efficiency.

Committee members mentioned there has been misinformation and propaganda on Next Door against not only MCE, but also Resilient Neighborhoods, affordable housing, SMART, and water issues. Similar comments have occurred on the editorial page of the Independent Journal.

## **2) Review of Marin County's 2014 Draft Climate Action Plan**

Meeting scheduled Monday October 6, 6 p.m., at Marin Exhibit Hall will be the team presenting and receiving input from audience. On Monday, October 13, 1 p.m., at Marin County Planning Commission, there will be a presentation. This meeting's purpose is to receive info on the Climate Action Plan. No action will be taken. The CAP is for unincorporated Marin.

Pam handed out notes from a meeting she had with Debbie Raphael about CAP. One of Debbie's recommendations was that language around Climate Change should be changed in order to sound more relevant to people's lives. "Mitigation" should be changed to "Prevention". "Adaptation" should be changed to "Preparedness".

Susan said it's unclear in the Draft plan how the coordination will move between the cities and the County. She said there is a wealth of ideas and issues in the Plan. However how to analyze the Plan, where the critical vulnerabilities are, what the priorities are among those, and who will address them is unclear, especially with adaptation to sea level rise.

Questions to bring to the meeting on October 6th, might include what's going to happen with the Plan and who's going to read it. There are also questions about the accuracy of the section on agriculture. Judy said the agriculture assumptions, don't apply necessarily to Marin's agriculture, much of which is organic.

Marin Climate Energy Partnership began sometime around 2007, right after AB32, and they would be the coordinating body.

Ed would like to see MCL target in its advocacy going forward the fact that Governor Schwarzenegger issued an executive order in 2006, separate from AB32, that set off trajectory to reduce GHGs by 80% by the year 2050. Sierra Club hopes that every county and city in their Climate Action Plans will contain the word "climate stabilization" and will abide by that law. Today's science is telling us we need an 80% reduction in GHGs by 2030. Sierra Club thinks that is feasible and is rolling out a plan to reach those goals. Ed would like us to ask the County to try to achieve those numbers in its CAP.

**Action Item:** Ed will write up info on the 2006 Executive Order and send it to group.

CA's Attorney General, with others including the Sierra Club, has entered a suit against San Diego litigating that their CAP is insufficient under the law. They received a favorable decision that is now under appeal. 80% should be in Marin's plan. It needs to have the words "climate stabilization". Marin's plan proposes 30% below 1990 levels by 2020. The County's CAP states it will be on track to reduce by 80% by 2050 but it should be emphasized more. The CAP pats itself on the back throughout yet Marin has the largest carbon footprint in the world. It states the need for coordination with other

jurisdictions but it doesn't state how. Both aspects, "Prevention" and "Preparedness", of climate change need coordination.

### **3) Discussion of strategy for coordinating efforts countywide to adapt to sea level rise**

There is a need to be prepared to comment on CAP on question of how "preparedness" or "adaptation" will be implemented, possibly starting with a Countywide vulnerability assessment. Within that comment, need for coordination can be folded in. The County of Marin is not only unincorporated 20% of the population, but it is all of us. We need County's CAP to also be lead document for coordination, particularly on issue of "adaptation". It can only be effective if dealt with collectively with all jurisdictions. Global Warming Solutions Act asked every municipality to do a plan. County doesn't have control over what cities do. But there is a missing entity, MCEP is the closest thing we've got, to pull all the jurisdictions together. Some City CAPs are not serious. There is a need for a sense of urgency. There is a need to use "preparedness" to spur more "prevention". "Preparedness" and "adaptation" imply, for some, that we cannot have an impact on the future. We lose focus on need for "prevention" when we're talking about "preparedness". There has been some decoupling of the two aspects.

Organizations that were signatories of document of Community of Marin met to talk about how coordination piece of plan can happen. Nona, and a few others, met with Kate Sears, who is heading up Sea Level Rise program in Southern Marin and is on BCDC, over need for countywide coordination. She is hosting participatory workshop on Sat. morning, November 1, with intent of getting people engaged and to do assessment of vulnerability. It is being organized as invitation only event. Nona's group encouraged Kate Sears to include City Councilmembers from around Marin to attend and give input. Members of the Community of Marin group also met with Steve Kinsey, who they feel has a natural leadership presence in the County and is Chair of the Coastal Commission that has the new C-SMART program to deal with sea level rise on the coast. The Community of Marin group's goal is to get leadership coordination from jurisdictions that adjoin on the Bay to address adaptation to sea level rise. Supervisor Sears' meeting is a pilot that would be advantageous for others to see what is going on and possibly use as a model. Leadership coordination is not necessarily resource coordination. One source of coordination is info on who is doing what and what is going on around the Bay. The Council of Mayors has a committee on Sea Level Rise. Council of Mayors should go to Kate Sears meeting. Environmental equity needs to be part of it.

#### **Information items:**

- Sustainable San Rafael holding meeting on October 8 at 7 p.m. "Rising Waters, Rising Voices" panel.
- San Francisco will soon release their response to Sea Level Rise. It will be a matrix of how SF will assess risk of asset, vulnerability, asset's significance and its ability to be resilient.

- Judy announced MCL's and Carbon Cycle Institute's Fibershed event on October 19 at Nicasio Native Grass Ranch.
- Nona announced MCL's Business Breakfast on October 3, at McInnis Park. The topic of discussion is Proposition 1, the Water Bond.
- Pam announced that Tamra Peters was honored by the City of San Rafael as a "high impact volunteer". Resilient Neighborhoods helped Marin County achieve reduction of 2.25 million tons of carbon reduced by 166 households. The language RN uses in motto is "less carbon, more community". They define community resilience as their "adaptation" piece. Community resilience is emergency preparedness and supporting strong business and agriculture. Go on low carbon diet for "mitigation".

**Approval of August 22, 2014 Minutes:** August minutes will be approved next meeting.

**Next Meeting:** October 31, 9:00 – 11:00 a.m. at MCL office, Mt. Tamalpais Conference Room

Meeting adjourned 11:03 a.m.

Notes: KP