MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

REGIONAL ENERGY WORKING GROUP
The Regional Energy Working Group may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Thursday, February 23, 2012
11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m.

SANDAG 7th Floor Conference Room
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

Staff Contact: Susan Freedman
(619) 699-7387
Susan.Freedman@sandag.org

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• SAN DIEGO REGIONAL ELECTRIC VEHICLE INFRASTRUCTURE WORKING GROUP
• SANDAG WORKING GROUP POLICIES AND PRACTICES

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.
Phone 511 or see www.511sd.com for route information.
Secure bicycle parking is available in the building garage off Fourth Avenue.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.
ENERGY WORKING GROUP
Thursday, February 23, 2012

ITEM #

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARIES

APPROVE

A) DECEMBER 15, 2011, MEETING SUMMARY
B) JANUARY 26, 2012, MEETING SUMMARY

PUBLICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the EWG on any issue within the jurisdiction of SANDAG that is not on this agenda. Anyone desiring to speak shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the EWG coordinator prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the EWG coordinator if they have a handout for distribution to working group members. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. EWG members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

REPORTS (4 THROUGH 6)

SAN DIEGO REGIONAL ELECTRIC VEHICLE INFRASTRUCTURE WORKING GROUP

The California Energy Commission awarded SANDAG, in collaboration with the California Center for Sustainable Energy (CCSE), a grant to establish the San Diego Regional Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Working Group and create a strategic plan for plug-in electric vehicle (PEV) readiness in the region. A similar PEV planning grant from the U.S. Department of Energy was awarded to CCSE with support from SANDAG. David Almeida from CCSE will present an overview of these grants, PEV planning efforts in the region, and the formation of REVI.

SAN DAE WORKING GROUP POLICIES AND PRACTICES

At the January EWG meeting, Chair Carrie Downey suggested an agenda item to discuss EWG policies, including having a standing agenda item related to actions taken on behalf of the EWG at external stakeholder groups. The EWG Charter and SANDAG guidelines for working groups are attached to aid in discussion.

UPDATE ON SANDAG INVOLVEMENT IN SOLAR RATE CHANGES

The Regional Planning Committee discussed possible SANDAG actions regarding San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) solar rates. Staff will provide a meeting summary and propose next steps.
7. SCHEDULING AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

Members of the EWG are invited to suggest topics for future meetings. The next EWG meeting will occur on Thursday, March 22, 2012, from 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m. A discussion of regional property assessed clean energy programs and an update on the SDG&E General Rate Case Phase 2 application are scheduled for March.

+next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
DECEMBER 15, 2011, MEETING SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 2A

Action Requested: APPROVE

DECEMBER 15, 2011, MEETING SUMMARY

FILE NUMBER: 3200300

ITEM #1: WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Carrie Downey, City of Coronado, called the meeting to order at 11:40 a.m.

ITEM #2: NOVEMBER 17, 2011 MEETING SUMMARY

Mike Evans, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce, motioned to approve the meeting summary from November 17, 2011. Claudia Valenzuela, San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E), seconded the motion. The motion carried without opposition.

ITEM #3: PUBLIC COMMENTS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Crystal Crawford, City of Del Mar private citizen, requested that the Energy Working Group (EWG) discuss private financing options such as Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) programs as a future agenda item. Ms. Crawford provided copies of an article describing the Sacramento PACE program for commercial energy retrofits. Ms. Crawford stated her support for the adoption of a PACE program for commercial retrofits in the County of San Diego and that a representative from Ygrene Energy Fund presented this information to the Chamber Energy and Water Committee for discussion as well.

Public comment also was received from Lane Sharman, who requested that the EWG discuss the formation of a San Diego Energy District (SDED). Mr. Sharman stated that a regional Joint Powers Authority could be created through Community Choice Aggregation (CCA) and that the SDED would be a public-private partnership. His goal is to formalize SDED as a CCA to be operational by the end of 2013 or early 2014. SDED is looking for input and support of public and private sectors. Mr. Sharman noted he can be contacted via e-mail at lane@solanaenergy.com.

Mr. Evans; Pamela Bensoussan, City of Chula Vista; Andrew McAllister, California Center for Sustainable Energy (CCSE); and Kayla Race, Environmental Health Coalition; all noted their interest in the suggested agenda items for future meetings.

Chair Downey commented that she will work with SANDAG staff on researching these topics as future agenda items.

Mr. McAllister announced CCSE was granted the Department of Energy Solar Rooftop Challenge award to work with local jurisdictional partners on permitting issues and facilitating lowering cost of getting solar systems installed.
Chair Downey explained a change to the order of the Agenda. She moved Item 6 ahead of Items 4 and 5 in order to provide enough time for discussion on SDG&E’s General Rate Case.

**ITEM #4: 2012 ENERGY WORKING GROUP MEETING CALENDAR**

Due to the lack of time, this item was not discussed. EWG meeting dates for 2012 were included in the Agenda packet. The EWG generally meets the fourth Thursday of every month from 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m.

**ITEM #5: ADDITIONAL SANDAG COMMITMENTS ADOPTED WITH THE 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY**

Due to the lack of time, this information item was not discussed. Information was provided in the Agenda packet on the additional commitments included in the motion to adopt the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and its Sustainable Communities Strategy.

**ITEM #6: SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC’S GENERAL RATE CASE: POTENTIAL IMPACTS FOR PUBLIC AGENCIES**

Susan Freedman, SANDAG, explained this is a continuation of the EWG discussion of SDG&E General Rate Case, Phase 2 application (GRC-2) from the November 2011 meeting.

Chair Downey noted that the EWG is continuing the GRC-2 discussion and will continue to serve as a forum for regional discussion. She referred members to the Agenda packet, page 9, for the questions discussed at the November EWG meeting. Chair Downey also explained that the EWG will need to decide whether to continue to gather more information in 2012 or potentially take the next steps to elevate a recommendation through the SANDAG committees.

Ms. Bensoussan commented that the City of Chula Vista Attorney had indicated there may be a decision soon from the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) determining the legality of the Network Use Charge (NUC) in SDG&E’s GRC-2.

J.C. Thomas, Government and Regulatory Affairs Manager, and Chris Yunker, Rates and Analysis Manager, from SDG&E presented responses to comments posed at the November EWG meeting and reiterated SDG&E’s position on residential rates for solar and non-solar customers.

Mr. Thomas explained that SDG&E’s goals are to make solar available to all customers, create a sustainable solar future for their service territory, invest in smart grid technology to meet the future needs of customers, and create an equitable rate structure.

Mr. Thomas added that currently there are 14,700 residential and 700 large commercial solar customers and the industry is expected to continue to grow. Additionally, if SDG&E is able to adjust the rate structure, the net energy metering (NEM) cap could potentially be lifted. Currently 2.5 percent of the 5 percent NEM cap has been met.
Mr. Yunker responded to a question from the November EWG meeting regarding how solar customers are providing energy capacity at peak times. He presented a graph of energy use and solar generation during a peak day. He noted that solar can provide for some peak demand during the day, but there are night peak loads into the evening that solar energy cannot address.

Mr. Yunker stated that customer avoided cost impacts to residential NEM solar customers with the network use charge fully implemented would be $0.20 per kilowatt hour (kWh). Mr. Thomas noted that this is greater than the forecasted 2012 wholesale rate of $0.02 to $0.04 per kWh and average solar energy avoided commodity of $0.08 per kWh.

Mr. Yunker further described how installing solar systems would still hold value propositions for residential customers. Even with the NUC, residential customers would retain a discount of 69 percent on their electricity bills compared to non-solar customers. He explained that for commercial customers, there are several variables which factor into whether or not solar systems would still hold value propositions. On average, commercial systems export 20 to 25 percent of peak capacities from 70 kilowatt (kW) systems. Some commercial customers would be minimally affected and some would be more affected depending on how much solar is used to offset their load. SDG&E is currently examining trends and customer’s patterns and could have data publicly available on potential commercial impacts of the NUC in January 2012.

Mr. McAllister, CCSE, presented an independent assessment of potential impacts of the GRC-2 to public agency customers. While CCSE’s results are similar to those of SDG&E, they did not have access to information on how to incorporate the transmission and grid impacts into their analyses. Mr. McAllister stated that CCSE does have a stake in a growing solar market, and stated that the main drivers of the small-scale solar market are NEM and the federal tax credit.

CCSE analyzed data for water and school districts and found there would be negative bill impacts to public agencies that have already installed solar systems. For example, on average, schools would experience a 77 percent increase on bills due to the proposed changes to the rate structure. For schools the issue is not the NUC, but rather the large upward adjustments proposed by SDG&E for the ALTOU-DG-R (DG-R) rate, which most institutional accounts with solar systems are under. These increases are proposed for both energy and demand charges, meaning that bill increases would be inevitable and universal for this customer group.

Mr. McAllister noted that CCSE is not presenting an opposing case against SDG&E, and understands that there is a need for an equitable and sustainable rate system across sectors. However, the issue of how to continue promoting solar is a statewide policy call, and as such should fall outside of one utility’s rate case.

Mr. McAllister agreed with SDG&E that costs for solar installation are going down. He explained, however, that there are significant issues with the proposed changes to the Distributed Generation-Renewable Tariff (DG-R). Currently, public agencies that qualify for DG-R have lower demand charges in exchange for higher energy charges. This rate came out of the settlement decision for the last SDG&E General Rate Class (GRC) and was to encourage solar installations. Solar and other distributed generation (DG) customers could avoid heavy demand charge costs by switching to the DG-R; the DG-R’s higher energy charge could then be offset by onsite solar production. This structure has allowed PV systems at schools and other non-residential site to produce positive financials. However, the proposed rate structure change will result in large increases in both
demand and energy charges. Such that the DG-R would no longer offset sufficient costs from the electric bill for these projects to preserve their financial viability. The proposed changes would thus severely damage the value proposition for non-residential solar, both existing systems and those being contemplated for future installation.

Comments, questions, and discussion were as follows:

- Chair Downey requested clarification on the cost shifts occurring under NEM to non-solar customers versus Assembly Bill 1X (AB1X)-induced cost shifts to Tier 3 and Tier 4 customers.
  - Mr. Yunker explained that with the current 2.5 percent residential NEM solar customers, there is $15 million cost shift to upper tier customers. As of November, the cost per customer is $38 per year versus $28 per year at the end of 2010. Additionally, if the projected 250 megawatt (MW) of solar is installed in the San Diego region and the percent of peak load from NEM customers increases to 11 percent, non-solar customers would be paying $200 per year. SDG&E’s goal is to address this issue before this occurs.

- Mr. McAllister asked if the rates used by SDG&E took into account any other changes that may occur.
  - Mr. Yunker responded that the rates used were static and did not account for 2013 costs or any other changes in the future.

- Chair Downey asked if there was a separate analysis on how much the average rates would increase if no subsidies were in place for solar customers to view a static picture on what the fees for all SDG&E customers would be if they were charged equally.
  - Mr. Yunker stated that information related to this was provided at the November 2011 EWG meeting. He noted there is a bigger policy question on whether SDG&E’s proposed rate structure changes will prevent reaching solar or greenhouse gas emission goals set for the state. SDG&E believes that an unsustainable rate structure that structurally increases incentives, even as costs for installing solar systems drop, could lead to an solar market collapse.
  - Mr. McAllister noted that the California Solar Initiative was not the largest driver in the solar market, but instead the federal tax credit and NEM program are.

- Dave Weil, University of California San Diego, asked if adding more storage capacity would help lower SDG&E’s costs.
  - Mr. Yunker explained SDG&E filed a smart grid application around the issue of storage, but in order for the grid to manage new batteries or energy storage, the design of the system will have to be changed.

- Chair Downey asked if SDG&E has information available to address the public concerns for commercial issues.
  - Mr. Yunker explained SDG&E is currently gathering information to include in their presentation to address commercial concerns.

- Kayla Race, Environmental Health Coalition, asked how much longer it will take solar customers to obtain return on their solar investments.
  - Mr. Yunker stated there would be an additional one to two years for residential solar customers to see return on their investments (ROI).
Mr. McAllister commented CCSE found the value proposition for the residential sector will still be available with two to five years additional ROI. However, it is the non-residential sector (including public agencies) where solar vendors will no longer be able to develop a workable value proposition to potential customers. Chair Downey asked how much the cost of solar installation has decreased.

- Mr. McAllister explained that with third-party-owned systems, there are financial instruments available that bring the cost down to as low as $4 per watt or even lower; and the installed cost of residential solar systems has declined by 25 percent over the last 4 years.

Chair Downey commented that SDG&E’s proposed rate structure change would offset the savings from decreases in the cost of solar installations, and the ROI for residential solar would remain around eight years.

- Mr. McAllister stated while there would still be a positive value proposition for new residential solar customers, although it will be difficult to estimate for individual customer due to the complexity of the NUC; however, a positive ROI for solar projects at larger non-residential sites would become very rare.

Mr. McAllister commented that for residential rates, AB1X drives the difference between lower tiers and top tiers, and while AB1X helped solve the energy crisis in the state ten years ago, there are distortions that still exist today, including cost shifts to upper tier customers.

- Mr. Thomas explained there is distortion for top tier customers, but even without AB1X a value proposition still remains for solar. However, if there were no tiers and flat rates for all customers, solar customers would still use the grid without paying for the services that they receive. Moreover, at some point, utilities across the United States will face these same issues.

Ms. Race asked if SDG&E could get credits from NEM customers for their Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS).

- Mr. Yunker responded this issue was up to the CPUC, but SDG&E would be open to discussing if CPUC approved it.

- Mr. McAllister noted that this issue often arises in solar discussion. Currently, the energy generated by NEM solar systems does not count towards the RPS, except indirectly (i.e. by decreasing the utility’s gross energy sales, and thus reducing the amount of other renewable energy needed to comprise 33 percent of those sales). Additionally, the CPUC is currently discussing how the utilities calculate the capacity of NEM, with the expectation of developing a uniform methodology.

- Mr. Yunker requested clarification if the calculations mentioned are to quantify how close utilities are to meeting the NEM cap.

- Mr. McAllister explained that the NEM cap is 5 percent of peak load, and the calculations will clarify how energy from net-metered solar systems is counted against the cap.

Peter Livingston, County of San Diego, stated there are general concerns from the County of San Diego Board of Supervisors on whether Power Purchase Agreements (PPAs) for solar systems will be viable in the future or rate structure will be too uncertain. Another concern is whether solar systems would be sized so that they never export energy as to not incur the network use charge. Mr. Livingston commented that the County also would like to know if SDG&E is open to discussing grandfathering for commercial industrial systems and
public agencies that have made long term PPAs for 20 years, which will now result in negative investments. He also requested more detailed data on the energy costs for different types of facilities and what the additional network use charges would be.

- Mr. McAllister responded that there are issues for commercial customers as they usually offset the energy charges by generating electricity behind the meter. However, changes in energy and demand charges will result in higher bills over the term of the solar investment, very often resulting in a negative project ROI for non-residential customers. Clearly such a situation would not be helpful to the solar industry. Chair Downey asked if SDG&E would consider a policy of grandfathering current solar customers under the current rate structure until their expected ROIs are met and then transfer them to the new rate structure.
  - Mr. Thomas responded SDG&E would consider discussing a policy of grandfathering, but there will still be interested stakeholders that will prefer to keep current rate structure in place.
- Chair Downey recommended the larger entities consult with SDG&E and CCSE in order to better understand how the proposed rate structure changes will impact them. At the next meeting, in January 2012, the EWG will discuss whether they would like to take a position or make a recommendation through the SANDAG process regarding SDG&E’s GRC. Chair Downey also requested comments from all interested stakeholders before the next meeting.
  - Mr. McAllister responded there was information at the pre-hearing conference about the potential for a ruling on Utility Consumers’ Action Network’s motion before the next meeting.
  - Ms. Bensoussan stated she will request more information on the schedule from the City of Chula Vista’s legal department and distribute.

- Ms. Bensoussan commented there are competing goals and a disincentive which could affect the state’s goals to encourage adoption of solar energy and to reduce GHGs and encouraged the EWG to keep these goals in mind.
- Mr. Evans stated he would like to know what rates should be in lieu of what SDG&E proposed and how much the state should subsidize solar. He noted other fundamental issues include how much of a subsidy non-solar generators should provide and how SDG&E’s proposal addresses other rate structure elements such as non-coincident peak charges. Mr. Evans noted if non-coincident peak charges are reduced, customers should receive benefits.
  - Chair Downey stated the CPUC will determine what costs SDG&E can recover.
  - Mr. Yunker explained smart meters gather more data on how customers impact the grid during different periods throughout the day. The pilot study for electric vehicles (EVs) included super off-peak periods and an exemption to network use periods during these periods to charge EVs. SDG&E will consider looking at super off-peak periods for all customers.

Members of the public provided additional comments to the EWG on this item:
- Rich Caputo, San Diego Renewable Energy Society, stated that his energy bill would increase from $60 to $340 per month due to the network use charge that SDG&E is proposing. He further commented that a $22 per month increase charge for customers who have large solar systems goes against the intent of NEM, which encourages solar installation and
acceleration of the solar market. Mr. Caputo commented that this is an issue that should be brought before the state legislature and should not be a rate case as SDG&E’s proposal would reverse state policy and result in negative impacts to the solar market. NEM is a valuable mechanism which promotes adoption of solar energy and can be changed through legislation once state goals are reached.

**ITEM #7: ADJOURNMENT AND SCHEDULING AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS**

The next scheduled meeting is on January 26, 2012, from 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:12 p.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPRESENTATION</th>
<th>JURISDICTION / ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MEMBER / ALTERNATE</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South County Subregion</td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Hon. Carrie Downey, Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Hon. Pamela Bensoussan</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal Subregion</td>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>Hon. Don Mosier</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Hon. Lesa Heebner</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland Subregion</td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Hon. Ed Gallo</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County Subregion</td>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>Hon. Rob McNeIlis</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego Subregion</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Hon. Sherri Lightner</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hon. David Alvarez</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego Subregion</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Peter Livingston</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit Operators</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System (MTS)</td>
<td>Sharon Cooney</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North County Transit District (NCTD)</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Public Agencies</td>
<td>San Diego County Regional Airport Authority</td>
<td>Paul Manasjan</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unified Port of San Diego</td>
<td>Michelle White</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cody Hooven</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Manasjan</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brett Caldwell</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed Gowens</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>San Diego State University</td>
<td>Dr. Heather Honea</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of California, San Diego</td>
<td>Dave Weil</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Utility</td>
<td>San Diego Gas &amp; Electric</td>
<td>Matt Burkhart</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Claudia Valenzuela</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Non-Profit</td>
<td>California Center for Sustainable Energy</td>
<td>Andrew McAllister</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charlie Buck</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Fuels</td>
<td>San Diego Clean Fuels Coalition</td>
<td>Greg Newhouse</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPRESENTATION</td>
<td>JURISDICTION / ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>MEMBER / ALTERNATE</td>
<td>ATTENDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Academics and Research</td>
<td>Energy Policy Initiatives Center, University of San Diego School of Law</td>
<td>Scott Anders, Vice Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nilmini Silva-Send</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment/Social Justice</td>
<td>Environmental Health Coalition</td>
<td>Nicole Capretz</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Kayla Race</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Powers</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carolyn Chase</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Mike Evans</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Nagy</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carmen Sandoval</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>North County Economic Development Council</td>
<td>David Lloyd</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South County Economic Development Council</td>
<td>Hon. Pamela Bensoussan</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER ATTENDEES:**
Rich Caputo, San Diego Renewable Energy Society
Laura Copiz, BLM
Crystal Crawford
Jamie Edmonds, Solar / Electric Vehicle
Michael Gervais
Peter Hasapopoulous, Sierra Club
Stephen Heverly
Catherine Sinh, City Walks
J.C. Thomas, SDG&E
Chris Yunker, SDG&E
Linda Wagner, City of Chula Vista
Lane Sharman, Solana Energy
Tom Blair, City of San Diego
David Hauser, City of Carlsbad
Elaine Lukey, City of Carlsbad
Mo Lasaie, City of Oceanside
Kathy Winn, City of Escondido
Susan Freedman, SANDAG
Rob Rundle, SANDAG
Allison King, SANDAG
Katie Levy, SANDAG
JANUARY 26, 2012, MEETING SUMMARY

ITEM #1: WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Carrie Downey, City of Coronado, called the meeting to order at 11:35 a.m. Chair Downey announced that the EWG had three new members [alternates] and asked all members introduce themselves.

ITEM #2: DECEMBER 15, 2011, MEETING SUMMARY

Andrew McAllister, California Center for Sustainable Energy, later requested some edits to the meeting summary be made due to the technical discussions regarding the San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) rate case. Chair Downey requested for a motion to void the previous approval of the meeting minutes to allow all members to review the minutes before next month’s meeting and the EWG would re-visit the approval of the December meeting minutes then. Scott Anders, University of San Diego Energy Policy Initiatives Center, motioned to re-visit the meeting minutes at the February 23, 2012, meeting. Mike Nagy, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce seconded the motion. The motion carried without opposition.

ITEM #3: PUBLIC COMMENTS/MEMBER COMMENTS

John Wotzka commented that Governor Jerry Brown is still supporting California’s High Speed Rail. He also stated that rooftop solar capacity statewide in California reached 1 gigawatt (GW) and that this is significant progress toward reaching the Governor’s goal of 12 GW of rooftop solar by 2020 and the 33 percent Renewable Portfolio Standard. Mr. Wotzka also discussed some national energy news items including the country’s natural gas resources exceeding national demand leading to the possibility for export; the percentage of fuel imported to the United States has declined from 22 percent in 2010 to 13 percent in 2011; there are a variety of uses for coal ash from power plants including making bricks; and the President’s rejection of the Keystone XL pipeline.

Don Mosier, City of Del Mar, commented that the January 6, 2012, issue of Science Magazine contains an article about California’s 2050 greenhouse gas reduction goals and what actions would be required economically and technologically in order to reach these goals. An abstract of the article can be accessed at the following link: http://www.sciencemag.org/content/335/6064/53.short. A subscription is required to view the entire article.
ITEM #4: SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC’S GENERAL RATE CASE OVERVIEW

Allison King, San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), presented an overview of SDG&E General Rate Case Phase 2 (GRC-2) proceeding at the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), which included a discussion of the Utility Consumers’ Action Network (UCAN) motion filed in October 2011, which argued SDG&E’s proposed network use charge is illegal and violates the net energy metering (NEM) statute. The UCAN also urged the CPUC to require SDG&E to re-submit their GRC-2 application. A summary of the UCAN motion was provided within the Agenda packet on page 29. Several intervenors including local jurisdictions, solar industry members, and renewable energy industry members have protested SDG&E’s application since the initial proceeding. The Assigned Commissioner’s Scoping Memo and Ruling was filed on January 18, 2012, and Commissioner Mark Ferron described his concerns including the legality of the network use charge under the NEM statute, the effect on others outside SDG&E territory, and that this is addressing a state-wide issue. Commissioner Ferron ruled that the network use charge is outside the scope of this GRC-2 and requested SDG&E re-submit their application without the network use charge.

Chair Downey emphasized the Commissioner’s position by reading aloud a section of the Scoping Ruling:

“[Based on the responses to UCAN’s motion and comments at the Prehearing Conference], I believe that the issue of whether to establish a [network use charge] should not be included within the scope of this GRC proceeding. Development of such a rate element could affect not only SDG&E and solar customers, but also [Pacific Gas & Electric], [Southern California Edison] and other distributed generation and self-generation customers. Furthermore, upon consideration of UCAN’s motion and the responses to it, I am concerned that this particular [network use] charge may be inconsistent with current law, regardless of whether it is justified by cost causation principles or an analysis of the cross-subsidies inherent in current policies.”

Chair Downey explained that there are separate issues at hand which the EWG has been discussing:

1) There may or may not be a cross-subsidies,
2) This [network use charge] may or may not be a way to address or close the gap, and
3) Having cross subsidies can potentially be acceptable as they may serve a greater purpose.

Moreover, the Commissioner ruled the GRC proceeding is not the correct forum to address two of these issues which are policy issues, but he did not rule that this is an issue that needs to be discussed state-wide.

Ms. King noted SDG&E will be required to submit an updated application for GRC-2 on February 17, 2012, intervener testimonies are schedule for May and June 2012, the public hearing is scheduled for during summer 2012, and a Draft Final Decision from the CPUC is scheduled for the end of year.

SANDAG staff will continue monitoring this proceeding and update the EWG.

ITEM #5: SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC SOLAR STAKEHOLDER COLLABORATION MEETINGS

Susan Freedman, SANDAG, provided information on SDG&E’s Solar Stakeholder Collaboration Group and that SANDAG Board Chair Jerome Stocks had appointed Chair Downey as
the EWG’s representative to the group. Ms. Freedman also provided an overview of the first meeting held on January 13, 2012. Consensus was reached during this meeting on three issues:

1) Hold a Rates 101 Educational Briefing (also available via pre-recorded webinars)
2) Create a website or blog to keep the public updated
3) Form a subcommittee to conduct an independent third-party study of residential, public, and commercial rates, if cross-subsidies are occurring, how to successfully continue encourage solar, and address charges in the rates in the distribution grid

Pamela Bensoussan, City of Chula Vista, representing the South County Economic Development Council, asked how the committee will oversee the study. Chair Downey responded that the subcommittee’s role will be focused on setting the scope and parameters for the study.

Mr. McAllister commented that there are additional components including general rate design elements and how to define and calculate benefits of distributed generation in the GRC-2 beyond the network use charge that will have a significant impact on commercial and public agency customers with solar.

Chair Downey also commented that the costs and benefits vary widely depending on where the distributed generation is installed and the demand of the system in that particular area. She added that the study would take closer to one year to complete rather than the shorter timeline assumed in the staff report.

**ITEM #6: SANDAG INVOLVEMENT IN THE SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC GENERAL RATE CASE PHASE 2 PROCEEDING**

Ms. King presented a summary of the comments received by SANDAG staff from SANDAG member agencies, EWG members, and other stakeholders regarding SANDAG’s possible involvement in the GRC-2. She stated that commenters generally suggested that the EWG serve as a public forum for regional dialogue and that SANDAG submit a letter to the CPUC. The suggestions were included as an attachment to this staff report.

Ms. Freedman presented a timeline for how SANDAG’s action could fit into the timeline for the GRC-2 proceeding at the CPUC. The EWG’s recommendations would be presented to the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) on February 10, 2012. Based on the RPC discussion, a recommendation would be made to the Board on February 24, 2012.

Ms. Freedman presented the suggested actions to be included in the EWG recommendation to the RPC. The recommendations were included in the agenda report. They are numbered below with discussion of each included under that number.

1. A SANDAG EWG representative continue to participate on the SDG&E Solar Stakeholder Collaboration group.

Chair Downey commented that it is important for SANDAG to be involved in these discussions with SDG&E and that was the intent of this recommended action. Chair Downey also explained that since the SANDAG Board appoints the representative, it would likely be an elected official.
Lesa Heebner, City of Solana Beach, suggested that an alternate also be appointed. Chair Downey agreed an alternated should be appointed.

Mr. Nagy asked whether the EWG recommendations would be voted on independently or as a whole. Chair Downey clarified that they would be voted on independently.

Ms. Bensoussan motioned to recommend action number one, Mr. Mosier seconded the motion, and Mr. Nagy abstained. The motion carried without opposition.

2. SANDAG EWG participates in subsequent energy-related stakeholder groups relevant to the successful implementation of the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) and Regional Energy Strategy (RES).

Chair Downey suggested that the EWG create a standing agenda item for EWG representatives to report back to the group about these meetings. Kayla Race, Environmental Health Coalition, asked if the reporting back needed to be included in the recommendation. Chair Downey explained common practice for recommendations to the Board and issues that the EWG could address on its own. Chair Downey suggested that the February EWG meeting include an agenda item to discuss EWG policies, including having a standing agenda item related to actions taken on behalf of the EWG.

Mr. McAllister commented that this action seems to already be included in the SCS and RES.

Ms. Bensoussan commented that the wording of “successful implementation of the SCS and RES” was important to this action and recommended this language stay intact throughout the SANDAG process.

Ms. Race expressed her concerns about having only one representative at these meetings and wants to ensure that the representative reports back to the EWG frequently. Chair Downey commented that the representative would be using the SCS and RES to guide their participation at these meetings, and would present information to the EWG if time allows. Mr. Nagy commented that the individual EWG members also could participate in these public meetings on behalf of their own individual organizations.

Mr. Anders commented that the action should explicitly state that an elected official would be the representative. He also expressed his concerns about having individual public agency interests differ from SANDAG interests as a whole. Mr. Nagy commented that the representative should bring all opinions of the group to the table at these meetings. Chair Downey explained that it is generally SANDAG practice for these representatives to be elected officials, so it does not need to be explicitly written out. Also, the representative would focus on the adopted policies of SANDAG as a guide.

Ms. Bensoussan suggested that an official alternate be appointed and attend all meetings.

Ms. Freedman cautioned the EWG from requiring that an alternate be an elected official due to small number of elected officials on the working group and the potential burden that could place on them. She stated that SANDAG practice has been to have staff attend stakeholder meetings in addition to the appointed representative. The staff role generally is to take notes, report back to SANDAG, and serve as a back-up to the representative when needed.
Mr. Mosier motioned to recommend to the RPC that:

The Board appoint a SANDAG EWG representative and alternate to participate in subsequent energy-related stakeholder groups relevant to the successful implementation of the SCS and RES.

Ms. Bensoussan seconded the motion. The motion carried without opposition.

3. At a CPUC public participation hearing, SANDAG submit a letter in support of the consensus position of the Solar Stakeholder group, as long as it is consistent with the SCS and RES.

Mr. Mosier suggested that the action state that the letter needs to be consistent with the SCS and RES. Ms. Bensoussan added that the action be stated in the positive and similar to the second recommendation that includes supporting the successful implementation of the SCS and RES.

Mr. McAllister and Pete Hasapopoulos, Sierra Club, asked what consensus means at the SDG&E stakeholder meetings, if it means 100 percent group consensus, and whether consensus could actually be reached. Chair Downey added that reaching consensus included SDG&E.

Peter Livingston, County of San Diego, commented that SDG&E told the stakeholder group that the utility would include whatever the consensus opinion was in its GRC-2 filing.

Sharon Cooney, Metropolitan Transit System, and Ms. Heebner commented that, as written, the recommendation would tie the EWG to the decision made at the external stakeholder group and would like the position brought back to the EWG. Mr. Anders suggested removing the language referencing the stakeholder group.

Mr. Hasapopoulos asked whether the consensus decision would be clearly consistent with the SCS and RES. Chair Downey responded that the EWG would make that determination. Mr. McAllister added that the letter could comment on the level of consistency.

Ms. Heebner asked why the SANDAG Climate Action Strategy was not included in the recommendation. Ms. Freedman responded that the Climate Action Strategy served as a foundation to the SCS, so the SCS is now SANDAG’s climate strategy. It would be duplicative to include both. Mr. Anders asked if the SCS was relevant to the GRC-2 issues since the SCS is a component of SANDAG’s long range transportation plan. Ms. Freedman stated that one of the SCS action items is to implement the RES.

Mr. Hasapopoulos asked if the letter would address the entire GRC-2 application and whether SANDAG is supporting or opposing GRC-2. Chair Downey stated that SANDAG would not be taking a position on the entire rate case.

Ms. Race asked what else would be included in the GRC-2 now that the network use charge is removed. Chair Downey explained there are many other rate changes included in GRC-2. Claudia Valenzuela, SDG&E, added that we will know more after SDG&E re-files the GRC-2 application on February 17, 2012.
Mr. Anders motioned to recommend to the RPC that:

At a CPUC public participation hearing for the GRC-2, SANDAG submit a letter commenting on the level of consistency of the GRC-2 filing and consensus position, should one be reached by the Solar Stakeholder Collaboration group with the SCS and RES.

Ms. Bensoussan seconded the motion. The motion carried without opposition.

4. SANDAG does not become an intervenor in CPUC Proceeding A. 11-10-002.

Ms. Cooney asked what the latest date is to become an intervenor in the proceeding and suggested that EWG remove action number 4 from the recommendation in order to keep the option open to intervene in the future. Chair Downey responded that the CPUC prefers that parties intervene prior to the testimony and rebuttal phase, but that there is no set timeline and intervenors enter the proceeding at different times.

Mr. McAllister added that SANDAG could still participate in the proceeding without becoming an intervenor by receiving all of the proceeding documents and submitting a public letter. He continued that becoming an intervenor is not so important at this time, but rather when the proceeding becomes a settlement hearing. Additionally, historically the EWG has been productive when its participation is based on SANDAG’s interests like ensuring there are no barriers to implementing the RES and SCS. It is also likely that in order for SANDAG to ensure it can implement its policies, [we] should leave open the possibility of submitting a letter and for now, remain silent on whether SANDAG should become an intervenor.

Ms. Bensoussan commented it is premature to decide on action number 4.

Chair Downey stated that the EWG did not have to address recommendation number 4. The EWG did not act on recommendation 4.

**ITEM #7: ADJOURNMENT AND SCHEDULING AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS**

Chair Downey stated that Kurt Kammerer, K. J. Kammerer and Associates, submitted a letter requesting a future agenda item on energy storage. She stated that the EWG would include this topic in a future meeting.

The next scheduled meeting is on February 23, 2012, from 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:04 p.m.
## ENERGY WORKING GROUP MEETING ATTENDANCE
### January 26, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPRESENTATION</th>
<th>JURISDICTION / ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MEMBER / ALTERNATE</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South County Subregion</td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Hon. Carrie Downey, Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Hon. Pamela Bensoussan</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal Subregion</td>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>Hon. Don Mosier</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Hon. Lesa Heebner</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland Subregion</td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Hon. Ed Gallo</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County Subregion</td>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>Hon. Rob Mc Nelis</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego Subregion</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Hon. Sherri Lightner</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego Subregion</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Peter Livingston</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit Operators</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System (MTS)</td>
<td>Sharon Cooney</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North County Transit District (NCTD)</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Public Agencies</td>
<td>San Diego County Regional Airport Authority</td>
<td>Paul Manasjan</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brett Caldwell</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed Gowens</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unified Port of San Diego</td>
<td>Michelle White</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cody Hooven</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>University of California, San Diego</td>
<td>Dave Weil</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego State University</td>
<td>Dr. Heather Honea</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Utility</td>
<td>San Diego Gas &amp; Electric</td>
<td>Matt Burkhart</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Claudia Valenzuela</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Non-Profit</td>
<td>California Center for Sustainable Energy</td>
<td>Andrew Mc Allister</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charlie Buck</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Fuels</td>
<td>San Diego Clean Cities Coalition</td>
<td>Greg Newhouse</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer Case</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Academics and Research</td>
<td>Energy Policy Initiatives Center, University of San Diego School of Law</td>
<td>Scott Anders, Vice Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nilmini Silva-Send</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment/Social Justice</td>
<td>Environmental Health Coalition</td>
<td>Nicole Capretz</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kayla Race</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Bill Powers</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pete Hasapopoulos</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Mike Evans</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Nagy</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carmen Sandoval</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>North County Economic Development Council</td>
<td>David Lloyd</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South County Economic Development Council</td>
<td>Hon. Pamela Bensoussan</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OTHER ATTENDEES:
Josh Brock, SDG&E
Crystal Crawford
Mike Grim, City of Carlsbad
Daniel King
Judy Klyver
Mo Lasaie, City of Oceanside
Lianna Rios, SDG&E
Dinah Willier, SDG&E
John Wotzka
Susan Freedman, SANDAG
Allison King, SANDAG
Heather Oberly, SANDAG
Rob Rundle, SANDAG
February 23, 2012

**Action Requested:** INFORMATION

**SAN DIEGO REGIONAL ELECTRIC VEHICLE INFRASTRUCTURE WORKING GROUP**

**File Number 3200300**

**Introduction**

The San Diego region is at the forefront of plug-in electric vehicle (PEV) deployment with the highest per capita amount of PEV purchases and car charging equipment installations in the United States. The region’s early PEV experiences have identified barriers to widespread PEV adoption, which could best be addressed in a strategic and coordinated manner. Two grants, from the California Energy Commission (CEC) and the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), support the formation of the San Diego Regional Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Working Group (REVI) and strategic planning for PEVs in the San Diego Region. SANDAG and the California Center for Sustainable Energy (CCSE) will be administering these PEV planning grants. David Almeida, CCSE, will provide an overview of the PEV planning efforts to be conducted under these grants.

San Diego REVI will hold its inaugural meeting on Thursday, March 15, 2012, from 2 to 3:30 p.m. at CCSE, 8690 Balboa Avenue, Suite 100, San Diego, CA 92123. The meetings will be open to the public at CCSE and agenda materials will be made publicly available on the CCSE, Clean Cities Coalition, and SANDAG Web sites. Currently, staff and CCSE are contacting regional stakeholders in preparation for the kickoff. All member agencies are being invited to participate as advisory members of San Diego REVI.

**San Diego REVI**

**Purpose**

San Diego REVI plans to leverage previous PEV readiness efforts to prepare the San Diego region for “Life after the EV Project.” Members of REVI will include local jurisdictions, regional public agencies, the San Diego Regional Clean Cities Coalition, CCSE, San Diego Gas & Electric (SDGE), local universities and community colleges, and members of the business community. REVI will develop a regional readiness plan and prepare fact sheets and other user-friendly best-practice materials that address the major components of the readiness plan: regional PEV permit and inspection processes, multi-unit dwelling constraints, and new construction design with PEV chargers.

**Logistics**

As part of the CEC contract, a multi-stakeholder group must be formed that will advise the development of a regional electric vehicle (EV) strategic readiness plan. San Diego REVI will serve this purpose through bimonthly meetings at the CCSE offices in Kearny Mesa. Interested stakeholders and members of the public are encouraged to attend.

A standing meeting date and time will be established by REVI members after the kickoff meeting. The CEC grant provides funding to hold meetings over a two-year period. SANDAG is scheduled to
adopt a Board Resolution in support of the formation of San Diego REVI at its Board Meeting on February 24, 2012.

San Diego REVI is to serve as a technical working group that includes staff from SANDAG, CCSE, SDG&E, local jurisdictions, and regional agencies. The EWG will receive periodic updates on the REVI and development of the regional PEV readiness plan and associated materials.

**Background**

**Plug-in Electric Vehicle Planning Grants**

The CEC issued a solicitation to provide funding opportunities under the Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program to help regions develop PEV strategic plans for electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE), establish best practices for “PEV-ready” building and public works guidelines, and help to streamline EVSE permitting, installation, and inspection processes. In response, SANDAG, in partnership with the CCSE, submitted an application and was subsequently awarded a grant to prepare a regional PEV readiness plan that is supported by formation of the San Diego REVI.

The California PEV Collaborative submitted one statewide proposal to DOE that included several regional projects. In April and May 2011, early in the proposal preparation, the EWG and the Executive Committee discussed this grant opportunity for the San Diego region. As a result, SANDAG submitted a letter of intent to DOE stating this region’s interest in addressing barriers to PEV deployment through this grant. Subsequently, a statewide proposal developed which was able to enhance each region’s independent projects. SANDAG asked CCSE to serve as lead entity for the DOE proposal, while the agency led submittal of the CEC proposal.

The DOE award provides funding for six regional PEV infrastructure plans in California and the creation of a statewide PEV readiness guidelines document. The DOE and CEC projects are being coordinated together and are intended to complement each other. The activities performed under the CEC and DOE grants will work toward the common objective of preparing the region for an increasing number of PEVs.

Attachments:
1. San Diego Regional PEV Readiness Project: Executive Summary
2. California PEV Community Readiness Project (Department of Energy)

Key Staff Contact: Allison King, (619) 699-1973, Allison.King@sandag.org
San Diego Regional PEV Readiness Project: Executive Summary

The San Diego Region is at the forefront of plug-in electric vehicle (PEV) deployment with the highest per capita amount of PEV purchases and electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) installations in the United States. By the end of 2011, the electric vehicle (EV) Project will have installed 1,000 home (or fleet) Level 2 EVSE; 1,400 publicly accessible Level 2 EVSE at commercial properties, city streets, municipal buildings, and San Diego destinations like Balboa Park; and 30 DC fast charge EVSE along the region’s transportation corridors. Several barriers have been identified through our early experiences, which need to be addressed in a strategic and coordinated manner to enable widespread regional PEV adoption and efficient deployment of EVSE. These barriers need to be addressed before the second wave of PEVs are released in 2012-2014.

In addition to a PEV readiness plan, the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) proposes to document and disseminate key plan components in user-friendly formats over the course of a two-year grant period. The regional PEV readiness grant will enable SANDAG, partnered with the California Center for Sustainable Energy (CCSE), to leverage and build upon existing PEV readiness efforts through the:

1. Formation of the San Diego Regional Plug-in Electric Vehicle Coordinating Council (PEVCC), or equivalent, that is open to the public,
2. Development of the San Diego Regional PEV Readiness Plan,
3. Preparation of fact sheets and other user-friendly best-practice materials that address the major components of our readiness plan, and
4. Dissemination of the component materials throughout the two-year project period via the PEVCC, workshops, a SANDAG PEVCC Web site, and Web sites of regional partners including CCSE, local governments, and the San Diego Regional Clean Fuels Coalition.

SANDAG is requesting $200,000 from the California Energy Commission and will provide a 20 percent in-kind match from our Energy and Climate Change Planning Program’s adopted fiscal year 2012 budget. CCSE will perform PEV readiness tasks including preparation of PEVCC agenda reports, fact sheets, best-practice guides, and the drafting components of the readiness plan. SANDAG will establish the PEVCC, develop and distribute meeting agendas consistent with our internal procedures, publicly notice meetings. Through considerate agenda preparation and staff support at PEVCC meetings, SANDAG will drive consensus and resolution of PEV issues facing the region. PEVCC meetings will be held at the San Diego Energy Resource Center at CCSE, which is centrally located in San Diego County.

Project Objectives for the San Diego Regional PEV Readiness Plan

1. **Regional PEV Readiness.** Establish and institutionalize the PEVCC to serve as the venue to discuss PEVs and EVSE, coordinate regional efforts, and build consensus on difficult issues. Unlike the EV Project’s Advisory Committee (which will have ended prior to the start of this grant), the PEVCC will be open to the public and conducted similarly to SANDAG’s working group structure. Measureable goals: 1) create a SANDAG PEVCC Web page to house PEVCC meeting agendas, charter, mission, relevant documents, and presentations, 2) prepare, distribute, and post all PEVCC meeting agendas three days prior to each scheduled meeting, and 3) create an electronic distribution list for members and interested stakeholders.
2. **Address Residential EV Readiness.** Develop fact sheets that provide guidelines and best practices for residential EVSE installations across 19 local jurisdictions, with the ultimate goal of making these installations as routine as the installation of any major household appliance. Measurable goals: 1) develop fact sheets for at least three variations of residential EVSE installations, and 2) disseminate the materials to local governments, and through meetings held by primary partners. Materials will be made available on the SANDAG PEVCC Web site along with the CCSE and Clean Fuels Coalition Web sites.

3. **Address Multi-Unit Dwelling (MUD) Readiness Constraints.** San Diego is one of the strongest multi-family markets in the country and this is forecasted to grow through 2050. Fact sheets and other user-friendly educational materials are needed that lay out the likely steps preceding the permit stage, that a PEV buyer may need to maneuver through with its homeowner association (HOA); Convents, Conditions, and Restrictions; Condo Board; etc. The utility is not permitted by the CPUC to develop these types of educational materials, so the PEVCC would fill an educational gap by collaborating with San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) and supporting workshops to break down local barriers to siting EVSEs. Measurable goals: 1) EVSE scenarios for various multi-unit configurations, 2) use of materials at SDG&E’s workshops, and 3) dissemination online and to stakeholders such as Property Owners, HOA, property managers, EVSE manufacturers, contractors and municipalities.

4. **Address EV Readiness in New Construction.** SANDAG, the region’s transit agencies, jurisdictions, and commercial entities undertake construction projects that include large-scale parking structures. Standard practice does not consider EVSE in the design phase of these projects. New home construction does not account for the possibility of Level 2 EVSE in garages. Measurable goals: 1) develop general specifications for Level 1, Level 2 and DC fast charge EVSE that could be included in design specifications of these large parking structures, and 2) develop Level 1 and Level 2 EVSE specifications for consideration in new construction of single and multi-family homes. The potential for integrating this effort into local building codes or company standard practices will be assessed.

**San Diego Regional PEVCC Founding Members**

1. City of Carlsbad
2. City of Chula Vista
3. City of Coronado
4. City of Del Mar
5. City of Escondido
6. City of San Diego
7. County of San Diego
8. City of Solana Beach
9. SD County Regional Airport Authority
10. SD Air Pollution Control District
11. SD Unified Port District
12. SD Regional Clean Fuels Coalition
13. San Diego Gas & Electric
14. University of California, San Diego
15. Miramar College ATTE
16. ECOtality North America
17. AeroVironment
California PEV Community Readiness Project  
(Department of Energy)

Introduction

In October 2011, the U.S. Department of Energy awarded the Plug-in Electric Vehicle (PEV) Collaborative and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) a $1 million grant to prepare a comprehensive statewide PEV readiness plan. While the PEV Collaborative and South Coast AQMD will manage the overall project, the project team includes five additional regions that will produce local PEV readiness plans. The California Center for Sustainable Energy (CCSE) represents the San Diego region for this project and received $100,000 to prepare a regionally focused PEV infrastructure plan.

The table below provides a list of the regions represented in the project as well as lead agencies and their associated funding level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Lead Agencies</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area</td>
<td>Bay Area Air Quality Management District</td>
<td>$300K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>South Coast Air Quality Management District</td>
<td>$300K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>California Center for Sustainable Energy</td>
<td>$100K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>Sacramento Municipal Utility District</td>
<td>$75K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley</td>
<td>San Joaquin Air Pollution Control District</td>
<td>$75K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast</td>
<td>Central Coast Clean Cities Agency</td>
<td>$50K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Coordination</td>
<td>Plug-in Electric Vehicle Collaborative</td>
<td>$100K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Goals

The overall goals of the project are to:

- Address barriers to PEV infrastructure deployment and find recommended solutions to overcome these challenges.
- Align local and state PEV infrastructure planning approaches to support and expand the PEV market in California.

Project Deliverables

The primary deliverable for this project is a comprehensive statewide PEV infrastructure deployment plan that will build off of the individual regional plans developed across the state.

Each of these plans will focus on the following five core areas:

- Streamlining PEV Infrastructure Permitting (e.g. residential and commercial)
- Implementing PEV/Infrastructure Training and Education Programs (e.g. electrical contractor and emergency first responder)
- Update Building Codes to Promote PEV Infrastructure Deployment
- Update Zoning and Parking Rules
- Creating and Implementing an Effective Marketing and Outreach Plan
In regions with greater funding, plans will also include some of the following additional components:

- PEV Infrastructure Site Selection
- Workplace Charging and PEV infrastructure in Multi-Unit Dwellings
- Increasing PEV Adoption in Local Government Fleets

**Project Contact**

David Almeida, Plug-in Electric Vehicle Program Manager, CCSE, (858) 244-1190, david.almeida@energycenter.org
SANDEG WORKING GROUP POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Introduction
At the January Energy Working Group (EWG) meeting, Chair Carrie Downey suggested an agenda item to discuss EWG policies, including having an agenda item related to actions taken on behalf of the EWG at external stakeholder groups such as the San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) San Diego Solar Stakeholder Collaboration group meetings. The EWG Charter (Attachment 1) and SANDAG guidelines for working groups (Attachment 2) are attached to provide more background on the EWG’s purpose and how working groups operate. Staff should be able to implement any proposed changes to current practice in time for the March EWG meeting.

Discussion
A standing agenda item can be used to ensure that the EWG receives regular updates on the SDG&E San Diego Solar Stakeholder Collaboration group meetings. The following topic heading and description are consistent with language used by SANDAG policy committees. EWG members can discuss the item and whether they would like to have it added to future EWG agendas.

REPORTS ON MEETINGS AND EVENTS ATTENDED ON BEHALF OF SANDEG REGIONAL ENERGY WORKING GROUP (INFORMATION)

Regional Energy Working Group (EWG) members appointed to represent the EWG outside of SANDAG will provide brief reports orally or in writing on external meetings and events attended on behalf of the working group since the last EWG meeting.

In addition or alternatively, staff can e-mail announcements to the EWG distribution list of any meetings of the Solar Stakeholder Collaboration group, and of future external meetings that are to be attended by an EWG representative appointed by SANDAG.

Attachments: 1. Regional Energy Working Group Charter
2. Basic Rules of Order for Committee Proceedings

Key Staff Contact: Susan Freedman, (619) 699-7387, Susan.Freedman@sandag.org
WORKING GROUP CHARTER
Regional Energy Working Group

PURPOSE
The Regional Energy Working Group (EWG) provides input to the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) and the SANDAG Board of Directors on issues related to the coordination and implementation of the Regional Energy Strategy (RES), including measures to reduce energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions related to electricity, natural gas, and transportation fuels. The EWG serves as a forum to discuss regional energy issues in order to build consensus among diverse stakeholders.

BACKGROUND
The EWG was formed based on the recommendations of the Energy Task Force, which had been established to advise the Board of Directors on the best way to implement the RES. The Energy Task Force recommended SANDAG as the most appropriate agency to implement the RES and recommended that an Energy Working Group, comprised of a diverse group of stakeholders, be formed to provide input and comments to the RPC and Board of Directors on energy issues.

LINE OF REPORTING
The EWG reports to the RPC, which in turn reports to the SANDAG Board of Directors. The RPC approves changes to the EWG Charter.

RESPONSIBILITIES
The EWG provides input and comments to the RPC related to the development and implementation of the RES and regional energy planning as prioritized by the Board of Directors in the Overall Work Program (OWP). The EWG may be asked to provide input on a variety of energy issues to the RPC and the Board of Directors.

The EWG will ensure that regional energy planning activities align with the objectives of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), and the Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy (REPS).

The EWG will bring stakeholders together to develop ideas on state and federal energy matters and bring them forward through the RPC and the Board. The EWG also will work with various stakeholders at the local level to discuss the best ways to provide energy-saving programs and services as they relate to the implementation of the Regional Energy Strategy, and then provide feedback to the RPC.

MEMBERSHIP
The EWG will have a maximum of 20 voting members. Membership is voluntary and will include a diverse group of regional stakeholders. Members are selected by the bodies they represent and serve at the discretion of the RPC. Members are allowed to have alternates which, like members, are selected by the bodies they represent.
Elected officials serving on the EWG are appointed by the six subregions they represent: North County Coastal, North County Inland, East County, South Bay, the City of San Diego, and the County of San Diego. In the event that an elected official cannot serve, a subregion may appoint a non-elected government employee to serve as either a primary or alternate member.

MEETING TIME AND LOCATION
The EWG generally meets from 11:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. on the fourth Thursday of the month. Meetings are normally held in the 7th Floor Conference Room at SANDAG offices.

SELECTION OF THE CHAIR
The EWG chair is selected by the RPC and should be rotated on a periodic basis unless otherwise determined by the Chair of the Board of Directors. The vice-chair is elected by the members of the EWG.

DURATION OF EXISTENCE
EWG status is that of a standing working group. An evaluation of the group’s work will be conducted annually as part of the SANDAG Executive Committee’s annual committee/working group review process.
BASIC RULES OF ORDER FOR COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS

ALL SANDAG committee, committee, task force, stakeholders or working group (hereinafter collectively referred to as “committee”) members should use the following guidelines regarding rules of order during a SANDAG procedure.

1) The Presiding Officer or Chair of the committee shall call the meeting into order and dismiss the meeting when all prescribed business is concluded. The order of business should be as follows:
   1. Reading and approval of minutes
   2. Public and committee member comments
   3. Consent items on agenda
   4. Items on the agenda for discussion
   5. Adjournment

2) All SANDAG committee, committee or working groups must have a quorum (majority) of members who must be present at the meetings in order to legally transact business.

3) All motion procedures should be as follows:
   1. Person making motion must be a member of the committee (other than Chair)
   2. Person requests recognition by the Chair (or Chair calls for a motion)
   3. The Chair recognizes the member by name or title; member then has the floor
   4. Member makes the motion in words member wishes the committee’s final official statement of action to be
   5. Member passes the motion to the Chair as soon as motion is made
   6. Another member seconds the motion
   7. The Chair restates the motion
   8. The motion is then open for debate and discussion
   - All discussion and debate must relate to the motion, if no debate is necessary than the Chair may call for a direct vote
   9. When all debates and discussions have been heard, the Chair will call for the motion to be voted upon or a member may “call for the question” if they feel sufficient discussion has occurred.

4) Members vote on the motion by a show of hands or by stating “aye” or “no.” The result should be stated by the Chair.

5) Adding an issue not on the agenda is done as follows:
   1. After a motion is seconded, the Chair may call for a vote on the motion to add the issue if:
      (1) The issue requires immediate action
      (2) The need for action on the issue came to the attention of the committee subsequent to the posting of the agenda
   2. In order for the issue to be heard before the committee, two-thirds of the voting members must be present and two-thirds of those voting members present must vote in favor of adding the issue to the agenda.
6) Ways to amend a motion:
   1. After a motion has been made and before the question has been stated by the chair, any member can suggest modifications:
      - The motion maker can accept or reject these modifications as they wish.
      - This method should be limited to minor changes where it is unlikely that members will disagree.
   2. After a motion has been made and after the question has been stated by the chair, the maker of the motion can request unanimous consent to modify the motion:
      - If any member objects the modification must be introduced in the form of a motion to amend.
   3. If the above options do not apply, then members other than the maker can make a motion to amend the proposed motion:
      - Proposed changes to the wording (inserting, striking, and substituting words) and limited changes to the meaning of the motion can be made.
      - If someone wants to substantially modify the wording, he/she can make a substitute motion.
      - Amended and substitute motions must be voted on before the original motion.
      - Amended and substitute motions must be:
        - seconded,
        - are debatable, and
        - require a majority vote for adoption.
      - If the amended or substitute motion passes the original motion is dropped, however, if the amended or substitute motion fails a vote can then be taken on the original motion.

7) When the normal Chair is not present, ways to appoint a temporary Chair:
   1. The Chair can appoint a temporary Chair if there is not one already approved of in advance.
   2. A temporary Chair is elected by the committee:
      - Can be nominated by: the Chair or by a committee member.
      - A vote takes place immediately and terminates upon the arrival of the pre-elected Chair or vice-chair.

8) Filling vacancies with alternates:
   1. If the Chair is not present, the vice-chair takes his/her place.
   2. If members were not selected for their individual qualifications then a certain number of alternates equal to the number of members can be selected by the members or the groups they represent if the committee so desires.