



SFEnvironment

Our home. Our city. Our planet.



EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT**

***RESCHEDULED MEETING DRAFT MINUTES
TUESDAY, AUGUST 6, 2013, 5:00 P.M.**

**CITY HALL, ROOM 400
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102**

***NOTE: The July 23, 2013, 5:00 p.m. regular meeting of the Commission on the Environment that regularly meets at San Francisco City Hall, Room 416 had been rescheduled to Tuesday, August 6, 2013 at 5:00 p.m., San Francisco City Hall, Room 400.**

COMMISSION MEMBERS: Commissioners Joshua Arce (President); Angelo King (Vice-President), Ruth Gravanis, Nicholas Josefowitz, Heather Stephenson, Johanna Wald, Sarah Ching-Ting Wan

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public comment will be taken before the Commission takes action on any item.

- 1. Call to Order and Roll Call.** The Commission on the Environment meeting convened at 5:10 p.m. Present: Commissioners Arce, King, Gravanis, Josefowitz, Wald, and Wan. Excused: Commissioner Stephenson. Members Josefowitz and Wan were introduced and welcomed as new Commissioners.
- 2. Approval of Minutes of the May 28, 2013 Commission on the Environment Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: May 28, 2013 Commission on the Environment Draft Minutes) (Discussion and Action) Upon Motion by Commissioner Gravanis, second by Commissioner Wald, the August 6, 2013 Commission on the Environment Meeting Minutes were approved (AYES: Commissioners Arce, King, Gravanis, Josefowitz, Wald and Wan; Absent: Commissioner Stephenson).
- 3. Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Commission on matters that are within the Commission's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.

Mr. Roger Kim, Senior Advisor on the Environment, Mayor's Office, introduced himself and discussed his background in environmental policy, organizing environmental initiatives in low-income diverse communities, and his future plans for extending San Francisco's leadership in environmental issues.

Mr. James Bryant, Western Regional Director, A. Philip Randolph Institute, reported on his prior discussions with the Commission regarding activities in the Hunters Point Bayview neighborhood, which he believes to be one of the more toxic low-income areas in San Francisco. He expressed his concern that he has made unsuccessful attempts recently to discuss outreach for the new Blue Greenway project. Mr. Bryant stated that he hopes that the Commission understands the sensitivity of discussing door-to-door outreach in the Bayview neighborhood that includes low-income and public housing sites. He asked that the Commission consider organizations such as A. Philip Randolph Institute when making decisions about outreach to the community because of their success communicating with residents in the neighborhood. He stated that A. Philip Randolph Institute was the initiator of the power plant closure and demolition at Hunters Point. Mr. Bryant hopes to see the Commission at future meetings in the Bayview.

Mr. Steve Nakajo, Vice President, San Francisco Fire Commission, Executive Director of Kimochi Senior Center, thanked the Commission for their work, congratulated new Commissioners, and spoke in support of seeing an Asian Pacific Islander Commissioner. He stated that as an Asian Pacific Islander and Executive Director of Kimochi Senior Center, he is happy for the opportunity to bring the Asian Pacific Islander perspective to the community and plans to attend future Commission meetings. He discussed the importance of job training and bringing environmental initiatives to all San Francisco neighborhoods and to seniors. Mr. Nakajo stated that he applauds the Commission for scheduling a meeting in the Bayview neighborhood and encouraged holding meetings in all San Francisco neighborhoods to provide additional educational opportunities to the community.

Mr. Evan Motoshige, Environmental Science student, College of San Mateo, Kimochi Senior Center volunteer, resident of District 4, stated that environmental impacts affect the entire community, and especially immigrants from Asia, many of whom live in low-income places and are affected more by environmental injustices, such as toxic release inventories in Bayview Hunters Point. He spoke in support of the Commission televising their meetings and suggested that practices of sustainability be communicated more in Asian communities that can benefit from increased outreach.

Ms. Karen Huggins, President, Holly Courts Residents Council, member of the Black Leadership Coalition, congratulated new Commissioners and stated that she was speaking on behalf of Dr. Espanola Jackson in requesting that an Environmental Impact Report be prepared before the Wellness Center is to be constructed at 3450 3rd Street due to toxicity problems at the site. She discussed her concern that Hunters Point residents that are already suffering from toxic health problems would be going to a wellness center that could cause additional health problems. Ms. Huggins commended Laborers Union Local 261, indicating that she is a founder of the new San Francisco Tenants Union, but asked why the program that is being considered for a commendation Resolution in agenda item 10 did not include youth from public housing as part of the apprenticeship program.

Mr. Richard Ow, discussed the first Environment Commission dating back twenty years ago and his experience working with advocates, Commissioner Emeritus Eric Mar, who is now a Supervisor, and Supervisor Emeritus Tom Shea about implementing an environmental waste collection

program in Chinatown, a neighborhood that was not included in the initial program. Mr. Ow discussed the work of young high school students who have now progressed into successful positions that had previously been hired by the Department of the Environment to provide outreach and education to the community about source separation. He asked that the Commission consider holding a community meeting in the Chinatown neighborhood where there are a lot of Single Room Occupancy units housing large families and have inadequate facilities.

Mr. Ted Fang, Executive Director, AsianWeek Foundation, founder of Green Initiatives for Asian Families, stated that it is his first time attending a Commission meeting and acknowledged the work of the Commission in reaching out to the community through neighborhood meetings and televising meetings. He stated that this type of outreach helps to take environmental work out of policy makers, bringing it to people in the community, and hopes these forums will inspire more people to be involved in environmental initiatives. He thanked Mr. Mr. Motoshige for attending the meeting, and stated that he hopes to see more Asian Americans become involved in the environment. Mr. Fang discussed San Francisco as a leader in sustainability and diversity and the importance of identifying innovative culture-specific ways to reach diverse communities to make San Francisco the greenest city in the world.

- 4. Presentation on Examples of Outreach Messaging.** (Explanatory Documents: Checkout Bag Ordinance and Healthy Homes Presentations) Speaker: Donnie Oliveira, Outreach Program Manager. Mr. Oliveira reported that presentations on the Checkout Bag Ordinance for Restaurants and Healthy Homes are for the purpose of sharing with the community messaging that is communicated to restaurants on the new ordinance and presentations made to tenants and/or home owners on pest prevention and safer cleaning and pest control. Informational presentations and material are available in multiple languages.
 - a. Checkout Bag Ordinance for Restaurants.** Speaker: Clark Hatchet, Community Outreach Coordinator (Informational Presentation and Discussion). Mr. Clark Hatchet reported that City leaders took action to solve plastic bag pollution in our environment by adopting the Plastic Bag Ban Ordinance in 2007 in all large City supermarkets and pharmacies and then expanded the Ordinance in 2012 to apply to all retail establishments, requiring the use of compliant bags, and that a consumer fee be charged on bags. As of October 1, 2013, the Checkout Bag Ordinance will apply to restaurants to require the use of compliant bags and a consumer charge for take-out and delivery bags. Mr. Hatchet reported on exemptions to the Ordinance, outreach activities, and material provided to help restaurants stay in compliance with the Ordinance and to make it more effective. Mr. Oliveira reported that there would be door-to-door and phone banking activities directed to restaurants through the fall and material available to help educate residents, consumers, and restaurants. (Reference presentation)
 - b. Integrated Pest Management and Healthy Homes for Residents.** Speaker: Sraddha Mehta, Senior Environmental Justice Coordinator (Informational Presentation and Discussion) Ms. Sraddha Mehta reported on the higher rates of asthma in the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood in San Francisco than other parts of the city and how indoor air pollutants can

trigger and in some cases cause asthma. She provided examples of common causes of indoor air pollution, reactions, and simple actions to take in maintaining a healthy home, including methods of preventing and controlling pests without the use of pesticides and cleaning without the use of toxic household cleaning products (reference presentation).

Commissioner Josefowitz inquired about follow-up material that can be provided to residents and restaurants that summarizes ordinances and presentations. He inquired about the proportion of restaurants that would be reached, methods for outreach, and compliance methods. He suggested that different staff provide compliance work than staff providing outreach. Mr. Oliveira reported on outreach and educational material that includes a door-to-door campaign, factsheets, placards, and the Department's website as a resource for residents and restaurants. He reported that the plan is to outreach to all San Francisco restaurants, present to merchants associations, and articulate the ordinance as a response to unique situations and concerns. The plan is to focus on outreach and education first and then compliance.

Commissioner Josefowitz suggested that outreach presentations on the plastic bag ordinance include a slide stating that one of the Commission's top priorities has been to support an assembly bill that would focus on diverting plastics from the marine environment. He suggested that future presentations address additional chemicals other than the ones presented today that may cause health concerns and or harm the environment.

Commissioner King stated that televising meetings allows the community that may not otherwise have access to meetings the ability to access presentations that are part of a Department of the Environment Outreach team road show and to be educated on environmental initiatives. He asked the viewing audience to contact the Department of the Environment at 415-355-3700, to access the Department's website www.sfenvironment.org, or twitter sfenvironment for additional information and to state whether they have watched the broadcast and to make suggestions for future agenda items.

Commissioner Wald inquired whether the Outreach team would be educating the public as to what to expect in restaurants and about the venue for the Healthy Homes for residents presentations. Mr. Oliveira reported that there is a parallel communication campaign for residents and additional outreach would be provided once the Checkout Bag Ordinance goes into effect in the fall. He discussed the Department's promotion reusable bags by giving out canvas bags to the public. Ms. Mehta reported that her presentations would be targeted to public housing residents in San Francisco and that similar presentations were made at Housing Authority meetings and to the HopeSF Leadership Academy.

Director Nutter stated that it is important for messaging to be clear, practical, and actionable as well as culturally competent. She reported that outreach material would be available in as many languages as possible in order to reach all constituencies.

Public Comment:

Ms. Lurilla Harris stated that she lives next door to an open space and has a pest problem. She asked what she could do to release rodents that she has trapped live. Dr. Chris Geiger, Department of the Environment Integrated Pest Management program, reported that state law does not allow live rodents to be released anywhere other than from where they are captured.

Mr. Eric Brooks, San Francisco Green Party and Our City, commended the quality of the Outreach presentations especially because presentations are geared toward the public. He suggested that handouts be provided on all future presentations. Mr. Brooks discussed how his life improved when he removed all chemicals from his home and started using natural products.

Mr. Sade Tsang (spelled phonetically), discussed the importance of educating the young immigrant population on how to manage chemicals and pests so they can be a resource for their parents. He suggested providing flyers and educating people so they are able to apply methods and understand the environmental process.

5. Briefing from Mayor's Deputy Legislative Director on City Lobbyist Process and Protocol. Sponsor: Commissioner Ruth Gravanis; Speaker: Kelly Pretzer, Deputy Director for State and Federal Legislative Affairs (Informational Report and Discussion)

Commissioner Gravanis reported that the Policy Committee had been asked to consider an assembly bill that addresses producer responsibility for marine plastic pollution and had discovered that the City lobbyist was already supporting the bill. The Committee was unsure of the City lobbyist process so requested a briefing on how items are determined appropriate for the lobbyist and how the Commission can become involved in the process.

Ms. Kelly Pretzer reported that she is responsible for handling state and federal legislative affairs on behalf of the City. She reported that Charter Section 3.1 designates the Mayor with the responsibility for coordination of all intergovernmental activities for the City and County of San Francisco, and it is under that authority that she operates. Administrative Code Article 3, Section 5.5 delineates how the City weighs in on state legislative issues. Article 3 created the State Legislation Committee (SLC) in 1939. It is chaired by the Mayor, comprised by two Board of Supervisors members, Controller, Assessor, Treasurer and City Attorney, or their designees or representatives. The Committee meets at a regularly scheduled monthly public meeting on the second Wednesday at 11 am, City Hall, Room 201. At SLC meetings, both overarching state legislative agendas and specific legislative proposals are considered.

Ms. Pretzer reported that in January and February before the state legislative session begins, City departments bring forward an overarching policy agenda for the Committee to consider and endorse. As the year moves on, in approximately March and April, City departments will bring forth legislative proposals and specific bills for the SLC to take a position of support or oppose.

There are about twenty bills considered at each meeting and over the course of a year, quite a few positions are taken on a number of bills. Only the SLC can speak on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco.

The Mayor's Office retains the services of a lobbyist in Sacramento to advocate for items acted on and considered by the Committee. Lobbyists will send the Mayor's Office news and information from Sacramento, which is then sent to relevant City departments. Departments that receive news from their colleagues in Sacramento are asked to information share to the Mayor's Office to make sure one unified message is sent, and the issue is being advocated for effectively.

Ms. Pretzer reported that there is not a Federal Legislative Committee to work on federal legislation, but that the process is similar to the state process. In December or January of each year, Ms. Pretzer reaches out to City departments to put forward a list of federal legislative priorities that are compiled into a single document that becomes the City and County of San Francisco's federal legislative platform for the year. Services of a lobbyist in Washington D.C. are retained to advocate on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco. Information sharing is critical in making sure the City's priorities are most effectively advocated for.

Commissioner Josefowitz inquired how the Commission can be more helpful to Ms. Pretzer in her work to take San Francisco's position to Sacramento or Washington on environmental issues. He asked if it is possible to personally advocate on legislation that was considered by the Committee in Sacramento. Ms. Pretzer indicated that Commission policy Resolutions or statements on what the Commission would like to see accomplished are an effective means of communicating priorities. Ms. Pretzer explained that once the bill goes through the SLC process, the City is free to advocate the City's position and is the time help is appreciated to move the City's priorities forward. Commissioner Josefowitz inquired about how priorities are prioritized. Ms. Pretzer stated that City departments prioritize issues and recommended that the most critical legislation be brought forward so as not to dilute the City's voice. She stated that legislative agendas are more of a reference document to see what the City thinks about an issue so more is better at that point to understand the Department's priorities.

Commissioner Josefowitz inquired about the process to express support of a portion of the bill but not for the whole bill and for pulling support if the bill were to be amended. He asked how a position could be communicated to Ms. Pretzer or to the City lobbyist at that point. Ms. Pretzer reported that the SLC meets once a month but may hold an additional meeting in April or May to make the body more reactive and proactive so City department staff may have a greater opportunity to provide input on an item. The City has been known to take a position that is more nuanced than support or oppose. She stated that the Department of the Environment has been effective in selecting parts of the legislation that are most important.

6. **CleanPowerSF Program Update.** (Explanatory Documents: CleanPowerSF Presentation) Sponsors: Commissioners Joshua Arce and Angelo King; Speaker: Kim Malcolm, Director, CleanPowerSF, Power Enterprise, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (Discussion and Possible Action)

Ms. Kim Malcolm reported on CleanPowerSF's program history beginning with the Board of Supervisor's endorsement of Community Choice Aggregation in 2004 as part of the City's broader energy strategy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, develop local renewable energy sources, increase conservation and energy-efficiency, and support the local economy. She discussed the current program's design and status, policy issues, rate and resource mix scenarios including local build-out strategies, not to exceed rates, and next steps. Presentation topics included (reference Presentation):

- Current proposed program components,
- The need to balance policy preferences,
- Changes to the program since the Board of Supervisors vote in 2012 and effects on proposed rates and in the environment,
- CleanPowerSF vs. PG&E base and green tariff option estimated 2014 rates,
- What are Renewable Energy Credits (REC's)?
- Preparing for build-out and status of work,
- SFPUC projects for renewable generation and energy efficiency,
- Expected short-term labor impacts, and
- Next steps.

Commissioners discussed topics that include:

- Ability and future potential of the currently-designed program for meeting the City's 100% renewable energy and 100% greenhouse gas reduction goals that would include a green power purchasing program with local in-city renewable generation, local build-out strategies, and creating unionized local jobs as required by the City's mandatory local hiring law.
- How SFPUC playing a larger role in managing energy-decision making and portfolio in house would affect the current Shell contract and potential reductions in program costs.
- Program phases into City neighborhoods and providing customer outreach to cultural-specific communities. Targeting customers that may not have access to the internet and do not speak English through the use of bilingual/cultural workers and meetings held with neighborhood associations.
- SFPUC and Department of the Environment EnvironmentNow partnership for providing customer outreach.
- Market changes and the availability of more accredited providers bidding on community choice aggregation programs in other jurisdictions.
- The challenge in balancing all goals and realizing that all goals cannot be achieved to an equal degree at the very beginning of the program. The need to construct a program that the majority of stakeholders, elected officials, and SFPUC believe is a program that at some definite period will meet all of the intended goals equally.

Public Comment: Mr. Edward Randolph, Director Energy Division, California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) reported on what is a Renewable Energy Credit (REC), CPUC definition of a REC, whether the use of an unbundled REC is good or bad based on policy goals, REC transactions (portfolio content categories) and limits (reference presentation). A discussion was held on the differences in bundled and unbundled REC's. Commissioners discussed the feasibility of RECs in promoting green-energy, achieving in-city generation goals, and promoting local jobs.

Commissioner Arce inquired whether the environmental benefits from the CleanPowerSF program have increased or decreased from the program that the Commission supported in 2012. Ms. Danielle Murray, Department of the Environment Renewable Energy Program Manager, reported that the CleanPowerSF program will allow customers to choose renewable power. The greenhouse gas emission impact is the same regardless of what the mix will be. It will all be Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) eligible power that will be supplied for the program, and environmental impacts have not changed drastically. The difference may be more on the economic side in terms of local jobs and to a lesser extent on air quality. If we were talking about replacing in-city fossil fuel generation with in-city renewables it would be great, but since we've already closed the fossil fuel power plants in San Francisco, in this case we are not doing that. We might be adding additional renewable power in the city that is reducing the need for fossil fuels elsewhere in the region or the state, so instead of exporting our unclean emissions, we are helping other communities green up.

Director Nutter stated that from the description of the program tonight, the program has changed, and it seems it is still in flux. The vote next week by the SFPUC is about the not to exceed rates and not the mix of REC's and green power that we are directly procuring on the open market. With the information that we have, we know we want to meet all of the goals that have been stated here, whether it's reducing greenhouse gas emission reductions, serving our communities, creating jobs, creating in-city resources, stimulating the market for renewables, that is what we want out of a program. She stated that there is not yet enough information to say whether the program presented tonight is better or worse than the one proposed in 2012, but that she does agree that there are multiple goals that we want to make sure are met, and that we don't leave behind our communities, job creation, environmental goals and meeting greenhouse gas reductions goals set by the City, the next goal of which is to reduce our carbon by 25% below 1990 levels. There are a lot of different strategies that have been reviewed on how to achieve our goals, and Community Choice Aggregation has been and is a strategy that will continue to play a role in this effort. The question is how to ensure we have a program that meets all of those goals.

Public Comment (continued):

Mr. Jason Fried, Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) member, discussed LAFCo's composition and oversight of the SFPUC in implementation of the CleanPowerSF program. He reported that the increased procurement of Bucket 1 RECs has improved the program and has resulted in lower program costs. The Marin program was cited as an example of where a REC has helped produce new localized renewable energy generation. Mr. Fried suggested that people consider how program outcomes will be in ten to twenty years instead of day one in reaching local build-out goals and replacing fossil-fuel based products. He discussed the financing and time necessary for local build out that would require establishing a customer base. Mr. Fried suggested that experts at the SFPUC Power Enterprise Department be asked to hold a broader discussion on Commissioner's questions about the program.

Ms. Elizabeth Klebaner, representing IBEW Local 1245, thanked the Commission for their review of the program's environmental impacts of RECs, on socio-economics, and local hiring conditions.

She urged the Commission to not support the project and urged the SFPUC to comply with environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) before any action is taken and not to defer environmental review to a future date. She explained that SFPUC has determined that the Shell contract is not subject to CEQA. Ms. Klebaner stated that CEQA would consider alternatives and adverse and beneficial impacts of the actions being taken as well as provide an opportunity for public comment.

Ms. Karen Huggins, President, Holly Courts Residents Council, stated that it is an excellent time to install windmills in Hunters Point because of PG&E's high costs to residents. She suggested to the Housing Authority Commission without success that charging stations be installed in public housing developments and that a security guard be hired to oversee those stations. Ms. Huggins suggested that windmills be built in parks that are next to public housing, and that energy be sold to the public housing development, that could then sell energy to the rest to the City. She spoke in support of the Commission's support in advocating for local hiring and unionized jobs.

Mr. Eric Brooks, San Francisco Green Party and Our City, spoke on his work promoting the CleanPowerSF program and urged the Commission to support the current program as he believes it is much closer to what the Commission has been advocating for since Ms. Malcolm started work on the program. He stated that CleanPowerSF rates are now competitive with PG&E's rates and that without competitive rates, there would be no local build-out since there would not be a customer base. Mr. Brooks stated that there is now much more potential for local union jobs building local renewables and efficiency as analyzed in the local power analysis presented by Local Power to the Commission. He explained that the Shell program is less than four percent of the energy being provided in the next decade. The idea is that RECs are needed to make it inexpensive enough to compete with PG&E and reach that small 30MW of the eventual 100 megawatts that will be built locally so that the program can be started successfully and still compete with PG&E. Mr. Brooks reported that a community of advocates has called upon LAFCo to hold a workshop consisting of financial experts around California to review and implement the Local Power proposal. He urged the Commission to send a communication to LAFCo to work closely with advocates to make sure the workshop is successful.

Mr. Jed Holtzman, San Francisco resident, representing 350 Bay Area, stated that affordability is one of the goals that SFPUC is required to consider. He expressed his concern that the IBEW representative was advocating for an alternative with less RECs, which would result in a higher rate to the customer. He discussed the "Stop the Shell Shock Campaign" that is influencing people against the program by advertising high rates that are no longer being considered for the program. Mr. Holtzman stated that with a lower price, there would be more buy-in from customers, with more buy-in there would be more revenue for the SFPUC; with more revenue, more build-out; with more build-out there would be more jobs and less REC's. With high rates, there would be no buy-in and no program. He stated that his goal as an advocate is to implement the Shell contract and the procurement of RECs as soon as possible in order to establish a robust program with local build out and local unionized jobs. He asked that the Commission consider the future potential of the project and not what it would only achieve on day one. The addition to the Shell contract that needs to be California and unionized is an exceptional addition to the contract. He stated that the LAFCo financial workshop would

provide an avenue for SFPUC staff to be convinced that a large amount of funds would be available to support a local build-out.

Ms. Monica Fish, Commission Secretary, reported that Mr. Hunter Stern from IBEW Local 1245 has submitted public comment requesting that the Commission demand the need for environmental review that will calculate how much the Shell contract will increase greenhouse gas emissions and other pollutants. For the record, 200+ letters had been received from Sierra Club members urging the Commission to move the program forward by supporting not-to-exceed rates that the SFPUC would be voting on at its meeting on August 13, 2013.

Commissioners discussed preparing a statement to submit to the SFPUC expressing a position on the current program. Commissioner Wald after collaboration with Commissioners King and Arce and Director Nutter proposed a statement as follows: "The San Francisco Commission on the Environment encourages the SFPUC to (1) adopt a rate structure for CleanPowerSF that has rates competitive with PG&E, (2) to make it clear that the City and the SFPUC do not want a future that is dependent on RECs, (3) is using the program to achieve the City's greenhouse gas goals, and (4) commit to a program that maximizes local union jobs. Our Commission has concerns about the current design of the program and the progress being made towards realizing the City's local renewable energy generation and local job training and placement goals which are vital parts of the program originally adopted by the Board and supported by this Commission. We are committed to following the development of this program."

Commissioner Arce moved with an amendment proposed by Commissioner Josefowitz that a letter to the SFPUC be prepared stating "The program as we heard it described tonight does not meet all of the Commission's original goals and that we encourage the SFPUC to work with the Department of the Environment to craft a program that is acceptable to the San Francisco Environment Commission." Commissioner Josefowitz seconded. Public comment was taken before the vote. The motion was not approved by the following vote 3-2 (AYES: Commissioners Arce, Josefowitz, and Wan; NAYES: Commissioners King and Wald; Absent: Commissioners Gravanis and Stephenson).

Public comment on the proposed action:

Mr. Jason Fried stated that the proposed action would be a detriment to the program and encouraged the Commission to vote no. He stated that while there are questions that need to be answered, everything that the Commission is requesting can occur over time. Mr. Fried stated that the program has a sensitive start time and could be derailed if the Commission were to adopt the statement and if Shell were to sell contracts to other vendors that want to buy the energy. He stated that concerns expressed do not have anything to do with the not to exceed rates being voted on and suggested that SFPUC staff be asked to hold additional discussions at a future date to address concerns.

Mr. Eric Brooks stated that the reason that advocates have recently voted and said to the SFPUC to proceed with the not to exceed rates is because they are now competitive with PG&E rates, and advocates are not concerned that there will be a large opt-out of the program. When the

Shell contract is underway and there's no large opt-out that is when the next phase of the build out will take place. He stated that the Board of Supervisors is empowered by AB117 to request advice from LAFCo on how to bid out the build out program regardless of whether the SFPUC wants to do it now, and the Department of the Environment would be the natural vehicle for doing that. Mr. Brooks suggested that the Commission express their concerns and state that it wants the not to exceed rates to be competitive with PG&E but to leave out the statement about REC's because if the Commission insists that local build out take place, we will get away from RECs right away.

Mr. Jed Holtzman pointed out that Mr. Brooks and the advocate coalition and LAFCo would be the entities that have worked the longest and hardest making this program what the Commission wants it to be. He urged the Commission to take the advice of the LAFCo representative and the representative of the advocates. Mr. Holtzman spoke in support of Commissioner Wald's comments that it is all of our responsibilities as citizens, as advocacy organizations, and the Commission on the Environment to make sure that this happens and convincing ourselves not to pay attention going forward would be unrealistic and result in negative program outcomes.

Ms. Elizabeth Klebaner stated that IBEW Local 1245 would be supportive if the statement be revised to state that the program does not meet all goals and does not comply with the state's environmental laws. The decision on the rate structure will determine the scope of the program and its environmental impacts, and that SFPUC is required to conduct environmental review before making a decision on the program in accordance with CEQA.

Items 7 – 18 were not heard due to a loss of quorum. The meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

- 7. Briefing on Implementation of the Healthy Air and Clean Transportation Ordinance for Fiscal Year 2012-13.** Sponsors: Commissioners Ruth Gravanis and Nicholas Josefowitz; Speaker: Robert Hayden, Manager of CommuteSmart and Clean Vehicle Programs (20 minutes) (Informational Presentation and Discussion)
- 8. Update on Proposed Agenda for Bayview Commission Meeting in September and Proposal for Future Commission Meetings Plan in the Community.** Sponsor: Commissioner Joshua Arce; Speaker: Donnie Oliveira, Public Outreach Program Manager (10 minutes) (Informational Report and Discussion)
- 9. Discussion of Options for the Commission on the Environment's Annual Retreat and Policy Committee Input.** Sponsor and Speaker: Commissioners Ruth Gravanis and Johanna Wald (Informational Report and Discussion)
- 10. Review and Approval of Resolution Commending the Laborers Local 261/City and County of San Francisco Gardeners Apprenticeship Program for Graduating the Program's First Class of Community Workers.** (Explanatory Document: Draft Resolution File 2013-11-COE) Sponsor: Commissioner Joshua Arce; Speaker: Commissioner Arce and Laborers Program Representative Vince Courtney, Jr. (Discussion and Action) (5 minutes)
- 11. Operations Committee Chair's Report.** Review of the Agenda for the August 14, 2013 Meeting. (Information and Discussion)
- 12. Policy Committee Report.** (Information and Discussion)

Chairs Report: Highlights of the June 10 and July 8, 2013 Meetings and review of the Agenda for the August 12, 2013 Meeting to be held at City Hall, Room 421.

- 13. Commission Secretary's Report.** (Explanatory Document: Commission Secretary's Report and Correspondence Log) (Information and Discussion)
Monica Fish, Commission Secretary
- **Communications and Correspondence**
 - **Update on City Legislation**
- 14. Director's Report.** Updates on Department of the Environment administrative and programmatic operations relating to Budget Planning, Strategic Planning, Clean Air/Transportation, Climate, Energy, Public Outreach and Education, Environmental Justice, Habitat Restoration, Green Building, Zero Waste, Toxics Reduction, and Urban Forestry. (Explanatory Document: Director's Report) (Information and Discussion)
- 15. Announcements.** (Information and Discussion)
- 16. President's Announcements.** (Information and Discussion)
- 17. New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Information, Discussion and Possible Action)
- 18. Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Commission on matters that are within the Commission's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.
- 19. Adjournment.** The Commission on the Environment meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

The next meeting of the Commission on the Environment is scheduled for Tuesday, September 24, 2013 at 5:00 p.m. Location is to be announced.

Monica Fish, Commission Secretary;
TEL: (415) 355-3709; FAX: (415) 554-6393

*** Copies of explanatory documents are available at (1) the Commission's office, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, California between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., (2) on the Commission's meeting website at <http://www.sfenvironment.org/commission/agendas> included with minutes by meeting date; (3) upon request to the Commission Secretary, at telephone number 415-355-3709, or via e-mail at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org. For an audio recording of Commission meetings, access this link <http://www.sfenvironment.org/commission/audio> and select the meeting date.*

Approved: