F 415.554.3161 TTY 415.554.3488



San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Citizens' Advisory Committee Power Subcommittee

MINUTES - APPROVED

Tuesday, August 7, 2012 5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m. 525 Golden Gate 2nd Floor - O'Shaughnessy Meeting Room, Section A

Members

Doug Cain – Chair Jessie Buendia Ted Ko Stephen Bjorgan Walt Farrell Avni Jamdar

Staff: Charles Sheehan & Teresa Young

ORDER OF BUSINESS

- 1. Call to order by Chair Doug Cain at 05:35 p.m.
- 2. Roll call: Present: D.Cain; W.Farrell; J.Buendia; T.Ko; A.Jamdar; S.Bjorgan
- 3. Approval of minutes of July 10, 2012
 Postpone voting to adopt July minutes until next meeting. C.Sheehan will revise minutes to include discussion guestions from July.
- 4. Public comment:
 - Eric Brooks: SF Green Party and local grassroots organization "Our City", member of the ad hoc coalition/alliance to get CCA up, member of the public.
- 5. Report from the Chair: D.Cain suggested each member choose a particular segment/topic of interest and learn more about it, so that members are more informed and up to speed for future presentations. After choosing area of interest, look at the Commission agenda for when those topics come up. A.Jamdar: Interested in energy efficiency.
 - ** Skipped to items 7 and 8.
- 6. Staff report: C.Sheehan introduced Teresa Young as new CAC staff liaison.

 ** Skipped back to items 9 and 10.
- 7. Presentation of Implementation of ERP Green Test Bed Report: Jonathan Cherry and Shaibya Dalal, SFPUC Power Enterprise W..Farrell: What would be a sample program that you'd recommend as a example?
 - S.Dalal: We didn't find a single program with a uniform program structure that fits our needs. New York has a municipal entrepreneurial testing system that is closest to what SFPUC could implement.
 - J.Cherry: Depending on the technology, the interest of the vendor and interest of the department, we could create a matching program for limited duration pilots. As technologies emerge, we could be giving technology developers real world testing sites for their projects on municipally-owned buildings. For the City, are there technologies that we could adopt as part of our programs? Secondly, if the vendors don't use CCSF and the technologies do work, to help publicize in the private sector showing that it works in SF.

T.Ko: There are some cleantech incubators in San Jose and I also know someone who starts cleantech incubator looking to launch something in SF. In your research, did you run into any or talk to incubators?

S.Dalal: We didn't run into incubators, but we were also specifically progressively looking at the public sector. At least in the initial stages, we wouldn't partner with incubators.

J.Cherry: There are different stages in technology development. What we're focused on is a little later than the start up phase, but before it is tested/launched on the public market. We have been in contact with the Mayor's Office of Workforce Development.

T.Ko will follow up as an area of interest – cleantech incubators.

A.Jamdar: What type of innovations are you looking to harness?

S.Dalal: Most of them were related to renewables and energy. Some expanded to water and wastewater. Overall, it was the same type of technologies – solar arrays, vertical axis turbines, etc.

J.Buendia: In terms of the criteria, if that would also include environmental impact of technology? Being able to look at it beyond economic quality, but also job creation.

J.Cherry: If you have ideas about assessing those benefits, it would be helpful to share with us. For example, energy beyond energy savings, but jobs, quantifying health benefits, etc.

S.Bjorgan: It'll be very interesting when we get into phase two (water and wastewater) because there's more technology there than energy generation. In any of the study cases, do they have any benchmark/metrics of success that we can see?

S.Dalal: There is a column with outcomes listed in the matrix. We tried to find out if any of the piloted technologies ended being purchased as result of the program.

S.Bjorgan: Sonoma published a guide to help other cities replicate what they've done instead of starting from scratch. In terms of funding sources, is there anything thought about in terms of City funds or matching with venture capital firms, state grants, etc.?

S.Dalal: Our report includes a few federal grants that we can apply for. What we're envisioning is to provide the site and program management, not so much the funding for the technology.

D.Cain: What is the GHG-free strategy to implement across the City and which goals would be executed over a time period?

J.Cherry: We can definitely share the ERP, which may answer that question. W.Farrell: Are you looking at private versus public entities to participate in these projects?

S.Dalal: The technology companies will all be private companies.

J.Cherry: Targeted test sites would be our customer sites. For example, start with SFPUC sites.

W.Farrell: In terms of metrics, are these supposed to be beneficial in terms of economical?

J.Cherry: We want performance data out of this. Part of the agreement with the company would be that this wouldn't be a completely private project.

C.Sheehan will send a link to the ERP where the idea of the green test bed was flushed out.

Public Comment:

E.Brooks: Community benefits and workforce benefits – talk to Juliet Ellis to start tapping into those opportunities and ask what opportunities are available through the Southeast Community Center. The urban composting toilets report from Tommy Moala addresses reworking the wastewater system. We need various test pilots of these technologies. Wastewater also ties into energy. J.Cherry: We're trying to create a framework to pursue these technologies and strategies.

E.Brooks: Last year, we got the Power enterprise to do a study for CleanPowerSF for the build out component, which is hundreds of MW of energy efficiency and renewables. A lot of the questions you're asking will be answered by that study, because it is scoping data and customer relations. The

answers will be in the ERP and the study that will be done at the end of the year. Local Power is doing the study. How are you going to differentiate that is not really off the shelf or almost off the shelf that will automatically be done under CleanPowerSF? Things that really need a test bed versus things ready to go for CCA?

J.Cherry: I don't know the answer to your question, but will probably be a combination of working with the Mayor's Office of Economic Development, companies that fit the criteria, etc.

E.Brooks: Please be very circumspect on biofuels and biomass.

 Possible Resolution in Support of CleanPowerSF: J.Buendia provided background on CleanPowerSF and shared draft resolution with members.
 J.Buenda moved for subcommittee to discuss and approve and bring to full CAC meeting; T.Ko seconded for discussion.

W.Farrell suggested removing the word "full" from the last paragraph.

J.Buendia: We want to get this resolved so that it can be presented to the full CAC before the Board of Supervisors (BOS) review and approve the contract in September.

T.Ko: How big will the local build out be?

J.Buendia: There may be a phased approach in rolling the out.

C.Sheehan: We are still studying what a local build out is. The contract with Shell has a resource substitution clause. The current program before the BOS is to start 20-30MW as a first phase to study how a local build out will compliment that.

T.Ko: Are there numbers and targets or mechanisms to study metrics? C.Sheehan: That's a component that we're studying. There are no RFPs embedded in the legislation package, but the local build out is a goal and we're studying with consultants. The build out is being developed as it is being implemented as well.

A.Jamdar: Suggestion for the resolution to address more details of local build out, such as adding in the final paragraph "approving... contingent upon the integrated program for energy efficiency, green jobs, etc."

D.Cain: The staff needs so much money to fund this program, which they don't have and this is a "keep going, don't give up" type of resolution.

T.Ko: There is no integrated program to approve. We should remove "the" because we can't ask the BOS to approve something that currently does not exist.

D.Cain: Suggest to revise "the" to "an".

T.Ko: Suggest adding approving and directing the SFPUC to implement/or establish an integrated program...and establish financing mechanism.

Public Comment:

E.Brooks: The Subcommittee could include original implementing language in 2007 that describes the basic parameters of the program into resolution. The Subcommittee could refer to ordinance 147-07 to give guidelines in the last paragraph, which would read "direct the SFPUC to… as ascribed in Ordinance 147-07…"

D.Cain moved: T.Ko seconded

In favor: D.Cain; J.Buendia; T.Ko; A.Jamdar; S.Bjorgan

Not in favor: W.Farrell

- ** Skipped back to item 6,
- 9. Announcements/Comments none.
- 10. Adjournment at 07:00 p.m. S.Bjorgan moved; J.Buendia seconded.