

# **Third Annual Report from Statewide Local Government Energy Efficiency Best Practices Coordinator**

February 2013

## ***Introduction***

This is the third of three annual reports for the 2010-12 program cycle<sup>1</sup> from the Statewide Local Government Energy Efficiency Best Practices Coordinator (Coordinator) on tracking, on a statewide level, progress towards meeting the local government goals in the California Long-term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan (Strategic Plan). The Statewide Coordinator position was established in Decision 0909-47, which was adopted in September 2009. It is funded by the investor owned utilities (IOU), but is embedded in and reports to ICLEI – Local Governments for Sustainability (ICLEI), the Institute for Local Government (ILG) and the Local Government Commission (LGC). The Statewide Coordinator is an employee of the Local Government Commission.

The decision calls for the Coordinator to “facilitate a statewide focus both in gathering exemplary policies and practices, and tracking progress on a statewide level on government facility energy use, retrofits, and strategic plan metrics to be developed ... The [C]oordinator should also work to advance and track progress on local government Strategic Plan strategies, and assess progress toward market transformation on local government building retrofits, reach codes, etc.”

Chapter 12 of the Strategic Plan is devoted to local governments, although there are responsibilities for local governments in other chapters as well. The Strategic Plan identifies five goals for local governments:

1. Local governments lead adoption and implementation of “reach” codes stronger than Title 24 on both mandatory and voluntary bases.
  - At least 5% of CA’s local governments (representing 5% of CA population) each year adopt ‘reach’ codes.
  - By 2020, the majority of local governments have adopted incentives or mandates to achieve above-code levels of energy efficiency (or DSM) in their communities, or have led statewide adoption of these higher codes.
2. Strong support from local governments for energy code compliance enforcement.
  - The current rate of non-compliance with codes and standards is halved by 2012, halved again by 2016, and there is full compliance by 2020.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Coordinator position has been continued for 2013-14 and so these reports will also continue.

3. Local governments lead by example with their own facilities and energy usage practices.
  - The energy usage footprint of local government buildings is 20% below 2003 levels by 2015, and 20% below 1990 levels by 2020.
4. Local governments lead their communities with innovative programs for energy efficiency, sustainability and climate change.
  - By 2015, 50% of local governments have adopted energy efficiency/ sustainability/ climate change action plans for their communities and 100% by 2020, with implementation and tracking of achievements.
5. Local government energy efficiency expertise becomes widespread and typical.
  - By 2020, 100% of local governments have in-house capabilities devoted to achieving all cost-effective energy efficiency in their facilities and stimulating the same throughout their communities.

### ***Research Plan***

To gather the information to track Strategic Plan implementation, the Coordinator had several avenues including direct contact with local government energy staff, the semi annual reports the investor owned utilities provide on Strategic Plan activities of their local government partners and recipients of strategic planning grants, information gathered by the three non-profit members of the Statewide Energy Efficiency Collaborative, the California Energy Commission's (CEC) web page of local 'reach' codes, and the local government planning documents collected by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research.

The Coordinator had a goal of meeting in person with each of the IOUs' local government partnerships (LGP). The purposes of the meetings were to introduce the Coordinator and the position's duties; and to understand the interests, goals and needs of the LGPs related to the Strategic Plan and other energy issues related to the partnership. The Coordinator also used these visits to generate ideas for the best practices fact sheets which are also called for in the Decision. In 2010, 2011 and 2012, the Coordinator made visits to 40 of the 53 IOU LGPs. Coordinator connected by phone with one additional partnership, but did not get responses for a meeting from eight others. Three in San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) territory, Centre City Development Corporation, San Diego County Water Authority and University of San Diego, were not the typical city or county partnership.

The IOUs provided funding to their LGPs to take action on the Strategic Plan. Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) and Southern California Edison (SCE) had additional funds for innovator pilot programs and strategic planning activities, respectively. These additional funds were available to all local governments in PG&E's territory, but only to LGPs in SCE's territory. A menu of activities, from which local governments could choose, was developed by the IOUs, the Statewide Coordinator, and Energy

Division staff with input from LGPs at two workshops in 2009. The IOUs as part of their contract oversight of LGPs provided semi annual reports to the CPUC on the Strategic Plan activities of their partners and other funds recipients. These semi annual reports were also provided to the Coordinator to assist in developing this annual report. While the IOUs reported on individual LGP activities to ensure that the funds were expended in an appropriate manner, the Coordinator's report had a different focus. The Coordinator reported how well local governments as a group, whether or not they were LGPs, were doing toward implementing the Strategic Plan. For example, for the first goal above, the Coordinator tried to determine if 5% of local governments adopted reach codes each year.

The Statewide Energy Efficiency Collaborative (SEEC) consists of ICLEI, ILG and LGC along with the four IOUs. Each of the non-profits provided Strategic Plan support to local governments through its partnership activities. For example, ICLEI provided workshops, guidebooks and software to develop greenhouse gas inventories and climate action plans. ILG's Beacon Award program recognized cities and counties that reduced their energy use and greenhouse gas emissions by employing Strategic Plan strategies among other things. LGC coordinated networking meetings, webinars and an annual energy efficiency forum for local governments. The SEEC non-profits shared the information they collected as part of the collaborative with the Coordinator.

The Coordinator also used the CEC's Title 24 web page to identify communities that adopted local ordinances that exceed the State's minimum energy standards and have gained approval from the CEC, and the Governor's Office of Planning and Research's (OPR) *Book of Lists*, which includes Energy Elements and Climate Action Plans adopted by local governments.

The Coordinator also administered an online survey in 2011 to gather information from local governments that are not part of IOU partnerships.

### ***Status of Local Government Strategic Plan Activities***

This section includes the best information the Coordinator was able to collect regarding implementation of each of the five goals in the Local Government Chapter of the Strategic Plan. The information was gathered from LGP visits and other communications, the September 2012 IOU semi annual report on strategic planning activities, SEEC partners' information, the CEC's Title 24 web page, and OPR's *Book of Lists*.

The biggest barrier to Strategic Plan implementation has been the financial constraints of local governments. This also served to make tracking of Strategic Plan progress more difficult. Many local governments have reduced staff, resulting in the remaining staff having to take on more responsibilities. Also, if a city or county had to decide between funding an energy efficiency project or keeping a public safety

person employed, public safety was funded. The utility partnerships with local governments have help to counter some of these constraints.

Goal 1: Reach Codes

The metric for this goal is 5% of California cities and counties (representing 5% of California's total population) adopt reach codes each year. There are 540 cities and counties (482 cities, 58 counties); 5% equals 27 cities and counties. California's population according to the 2010 census was 37,691,912; 5% equals 1,885,000.

According to the CEC's website

(<http://www.energy.ca.gov/title24/2008standards/ordinances/>), as of December 31, 2012, 43 cities and counties had adopted local ordinances, approved by the CEC, to exceed Title 24 minimum standards.

The list of cities and counties with 'reach codes' with their 2010 Census populations are below. Only Malibu is not part of a utility/local government partnership.

Belmont	26,000
Burlingame	29,000
Chula Vista	244,000
Cotati	7,000
Daly City	101,000
Fremont	214,000
Glendale	192,000
Goleta	30,000
Hayward	144,000
Healdsburg	11,000
Los Altos	30,000
Malibu	13,000
Manhattan Beach	35,000
Menlo Park	32,000
Morgan Hill	38,000
Mountain View	74,000
Napa	77,000
Oakland	391,000
Pacifica	37,000
Palo Alto	64,000
Petaluma	58,000
Portola Valley	4,000
Redwood City	77,000
Richmond	104,000
San Anselmo	12,000
San Carlos	28,000
San Francisco	805,000
San Jose	946,000

San Mateo	97,000
San Rafael	58,000
Santa Monica	90,000
Santa Rosa	168,000
Sebastopol	7,000
Simi Valley	124,000
Sonoma	11,000
Tiburon	9,000
Union City	70,000
West Sacramento	49,000
Windsor	<u>27,000</u>
	4,533,000
Marin County (unincorporated)	67,000
San Luis Obispo County (unincorporated)	117,000
Santa Clara County (unincorporated)	90,000
Sonoma County (unincorporated)	<u>146,000</u>
	420,000
Total Cities & Counties	4,953,000

These numbers indicate that for 2012, neither the population goal nor the goal for the number of jurisdiction was met. Assuming counting starts with the first full year after adoption of the Strategic Plan (2009), then 108 local governments (20%) should have adopted reach codes. The population goal for 2012 was 7,538,000. Instead, 8.9% of cities and counties (43 total) representing 13.3% of California's total population goal had adopted reach codes. One of the utility partnerships, San Mateo County, had a goal of all 21 jurisdictions adopting a reach code, 8 of which had done so to this point.

Most of these adopted reach codes were local green building ordinances. Many of the IOUs' local government partners were working on green building policies and ordinances, which may translate into reach codes in the future.

Coordinator searched for information about green building code adoption, specifically, CalGreen Tiers 1 and 2. The Governor's Office of Planning and Research surveyed all of California's cities and counties and found the following to have adopted CalGreen Tier 1 or Tier 2. The cities/counties above that have CEC-approved reach codes are not included in this list, although some are in both. Tier 2 communities are indicated with a #.

Adelanto	32,000
Apple Valley	69,000
Artesia	17,000
Avenal	15,000
Bakersfield #	347,000

Baldwin Park	75,000
Beverly Hills #	34,000 <sup>2</sup>
Biggs	2,000
Buena Park	81,000
Camarillo	65,000
Campbell	39,000
Carson	92,000
Clovis #	96,000
Corona	152,000
Culver City	39,000
Davis	66,000
East Palo Alto	28,000
El Cerrito	24,000
El Monte	113,000
Encinitas	60,000
Eureka	27,000
Fullerton	135,000
Gilroy	49,000
Glendale	192,000
Grass Valley	13,000
Hemet	79,000
Hermosa Beach	20,000
La Mesa	55,000
La Mirada	49,000
La Puente	40,000
Larkspur	12,000
Livermore	81,000
Lomita	20,000
Long Beach	462,000
Los Alamitos	11,000
Los Angeles County (unincorporated)	1,057,000
Madera	61,000
Mendota #	11,000
Mill Valley	14,000
Monterey	28,000
Newark	43,000
Orange County (unincorporated)	121,000
Oroville	16,000
Oxnard	198,000
Pacific Grove	15,000
Palm Springs	45,000
Pasadena #	137,000
Paso Robles	30,000
Perris	68,000

---

<sup>2</sup> Beverly Hills requires Tier 1 for buildings > 25,000 sq ft & Tier 2 for > 50,000 sq ft

Pismo Beach	8,000
Pomona	149,000
Poway	48,000
Rancho Cordova	65,000
Rancho Santa Margarita	48,000
Riverbank	23,000
Riverside	304,000
Rohnert Park #	41,000
Rolling Hills Estates	8,000
Roseville	119,000
Ross	2,000
San Bruno	41,000
San Gabriel #	40,000
Sanger #	24,000
Seal Beach	24,000
St Helena	6,000
Stockton	292,000
Trinity County #	10,000
Tulare	59,000
Victorville	116,000
West Hollywood #	34,000
Whittier	85,000
Yolo County	13,000
TOTAL	6,102,000
TOTAL Reach & CalGreen Tiers	10,863,000

Unfortunately, when Coordinator went to the web sites of about a dozen of the cities/counties on this list, he could not find mandatory energy savings that exceeded Title 24. Coordinator checked with the CEC's Joe Loyer and found that unless the CEC approves a reach code through its process, it is not an enforceable reach code. He suggested that the cities/counties on this list could have adopted non-energy parts of CalGreen Tier 1 or 2, or voluntary energy savings, but not enforceable mandatory energy savings.

One advantage that local governments currently have, but did not have in the past, is the provision by the IOUs of cost effectiveness studies for exceeding Title 24 by 15% for each of the 16 climate zones in California. Cities and counties no longer have to contract for these studies, which are required for CEC reach code approval.

Coordinator developed a fact sheet on Reach Codes, which can be found at [www.EECoordinator.info](http://www.EECoordinator.info).

### *Recommendation*

Since Proposition 13 was passed in 1978, some local governments have been competing for development, both residential and commercial, in order to garner property and sales tax revenues. Having more energy efficient buildings than the state requires may prove beneficial to some communities as a way to attract residents and businesses. This may balance perceived negative impacts from a reach code adoption. Some agencies have addressed the perceived unlevel playing field by adopting regional codes.

California's Title 24 is updated on three-year cycles: the 2008 update was effective as of January 1, 2010. Each time a new version of Title 24 is adopted, cities and counties have to re-apply to the CEC for approval of their ordinances to exceed State minimum standards. This works against achieving this goal in the long term because every three years local governments that had adopted reach codes would have to go through the process once again.

Since it is doubtful that 270 cities and counties will adopt a reach code in a three-year period, perhaps in the next iteration of the Local Government chapter of the Strategic Plan, an alternative goal could be developed that would support code compliance. Perhaps the CEC and CPUC could host a meeting or conference call with local governments and the IOUs to develop this goal.

### *Goal 2: Title 24 Compliance*

Title 24 compliance is the responsibility of local governments in their land use and building construction regulation authorities. The Strategic Plan goal for Title 24 compliance is that the rate of non-compliance is halved (from the rate in 2008) by 2012, halved again by 2016, with full compliance by 2020.

Work being done through local government partnerships includes conducting workshops on Title 24, or sending staff to IOU and other groups' trainings. Coordinator obtained from the IOUs a list of Title 24 trainings they provided in the 2010-12 period, including the cities/counties that sent staff. The IOUs reported that they sponsored 148 events that drew 3,450 participants from 279 jurisdictions.

While providing this type of education and training is important to ensure building department staff understand the requirements when checking plans and inspecting work, they alone do not measure improved compliance. In the 1990s, CEC staff suggested that T24 compliance was low. Coordinator checked with the CEC in 2011 to see if any recent studies had been done or are planned. The CEC response was:

“There have not been any studies to establish a baseline of compliance with the standards. Therefore, it will be difficult to try to document any factual increases in compliance. Until resources are identified to conduct such a



survey we are working on activities that *should* result in an increase in compliance.” (emphasis added)

Coordinator also found the following in the CEC Draft Report: *Achieving Energy Savings in California Buildings: Saving Energy in Existing Buildings and Achieving a Zero-Net-Energy Future* (CEC-400-2011-007-SD) that came out in July 2011:

“Achieving compliance with the Energy Efficiency Building Standards (Standards) is challenging. It is estimated that at least 30 percent of the energy savings potential of the Energy Efficiency Building Standards is lost to noncompliance, including failures to install HVAC systems and seal air ducts properly. California has agreed to develop a plan to achieve a 90 percent compliance rate with its Building Energy Efficiency Standards by 2017 in exchange for stimulus funds. To meet this aggressive goal, the Energy Commission needs to develop a method to determine the level of compliance, enforcement, and quality of installations throughout the industry and use this information as a benchmark against which to determine 90 percent compliance. Without this benchmarking, efforts to increase compliance cannot be effectively targeted or assessed.”

#### *Recommendation*

Coordinator is at a loss as to how to measure progress on this goal. If the resources of the CEC are not enough to track compliance even though they recognize the need, then Coordinator certainly will not be able to do so. What can be tracked are the efforts to improve compliance (attendance at utility T24 trainings, CalGreen trainings, other local government efforts). Since the Strategic Plan goal is to increase Title 24 compliance, continuing to work with local agencies and the building development community (for example, HVAC installers) to improve compliance is critical. But being able to show actual improvement in compliance may not be possible.

#### *Goal 3: Municipal Energy Reduction*

The energy usage footprint of local government buildings is 20% below 2003 levels by 2015, and 20% below 1990 levels by 2020.

In addition to taking advantage of utility rebates, and design and technology assistance, there are a number of Strategic Plan activities that local government partners can choose to work on. As of the September 2012 semi annual IOU report on their partners' activities, the following activities were reported. The numbers in the '# Cities/Counties Done' column also include activities that were not funded through partnerships.

	LGPs Planned	LGPs Done	# Cities/ Counties Done	# Cities/ Counties To Do
• Benchmarking	22	16	68	22
• Utility management software	25	13	28	43
• Revolving energy funds	16	11	11	5
• Municipal energy plans	27	4	11	87
• Municipal 'reach' programs	8	4	11	4
• (Retro)Commissioning of muni facilities	10	4	5	15

### *Benchmarking*

The 2009 Decision called for all commercial (including local government facilities) that receive IOU incentive funding to be benchmarked. This issue underwent review at the CPUC and resulted in setting aggressive numerical benchmarking requirements for the IOUs instead of requiring every incentive recipient to benchmark.

Many cities and counties in LGPs plan to benchmark their facilities. So far, 68 have completed benchmarking of some facilities and more are in some stage of the process.

### *Utility Management Software*

In addition to the 23 LGPs using PGC funding to manage their energy consumption, five cities and counties indicated they use a computer program to track municipal energy use. These five are LGPs, but had not chosen this as a strategic plan menu item.

Most local governments are using either US EPA's Portfolio Manager or a program called Utility Manager, and a few have in-house programs. Los Angeles County has developed the Enterprise Energy Management Information System, which is being made available for other cities and counties to use.

### *Revolving Energy Funds*

At least six communities (Alameda County, Arvin, El Cerrito, Long Beach, San Jose and Visalia) have implemented revolving energy funds outside of any utility partnership strategic planning activity funds. Coordinator created best practices fact sheets on two of these revolving fund programs.

At least 11 local governments have created revolving funds, including five LGPs in the September 2012 IOU reports. Some of these funds are very small (El Cerrito and Mendocino each started with \$15,000), others are larger (Riverside County started

with about \$185,000 and San Diego County started with \$400,000). Five more LGPs intend to create the funds.

### *Municipal Energy Action Plans*

Given the severe budget constraints facing cities and counties, funding from the utilities to complete energy action plans and/or climate action plans made it possible for more cities and counties to undertake these projects. In order to advance in the Energy Leader Program, SCE partners were required to develop, and eventually adopt, Energy Action Plans (EAP). SCE had 22 LGPs, which include 126 local governments, which should result in the same number of EAPs. PG&E, SDG&E and Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) encouraged but did not require EAPs of their partners.

In addition to the LGPs reporting municipal plans as part of their IOU funded work, an additional seven cities and counties reported such plans in the online survey; each of these are in IOU partnerships. Santa Monica and Berkeley in particular have good examples of Action Plans (that include both municipal and community energy and climate change activities) that are available on line and have regular 'report cards' of how well the community is doing. Santa Monica's report card is at: <http://www.smgov.net/Departments/OSE/progressReport/default.aspx>, and Berkeley's reporting is at: <http://www.cityofberkeley.info/climate/>.

These municipal plans are closely related to municipal facilities policies and programs that either encourage or require higher energy performance than State law, and to Climate Action Plans. A community may have such a policy or program, or a broader community Climate Action Plan, and not report it as a municipal energy action plan but as one of the other categories.

### *Municipal Facility Energy "Reach" Policies and Programs*

Only eight LGPs selected higher energy requirements for municipal facilities as part of their partnership activities, however, a number of cities and counties are leading by example in this area. The survey showed that seven communities (Alameda, Chula Vista, Riverside County, San Bernardino County, San Jose, Santa Monica, and Sonoma County) require better than State minimum energy performance, and eight more encourage it.

Most municipal requirements apply to new construction or major remodels only.

### *Municipal Commissioning and Retro-commissioning*

Twenty cities and counties (all part of LGPs) reported they are doing retro-commissioning. They are Blythe, Cathedral City, Coachella, Desert Hot Springs, El Segundo, Indian Wells, Indio, La Quinta, Palm Springs, Rancho Mirage, San

Bernardino, Santa Barbara, Santa Monica, Simi Valley, South Gate, Inyo County, Lake County, Los Angeles County, Riverside County and San Diego County.

### *Recommendations*

Pursuing these activities should help to reduce the amount of energy consumed by local government facilities, however, they do not provide a measurement for how much reduction has occurred. That will require some reporting, either from the city or county itself if it is measuring its energy reduction for a climate action plan for example, or from the utilities that service them. SCE's Energy Leader Program has recognition and incentive levels based on municipal and community energy reduction; the platinum level is reached when both the community and municipal operations achieve 20% reduction. This could be used to help measure the progress of cities and counties in SCE's territory.

Another issue this goal raises is the years (2003 and 1990) against which this reduction is to be measured. In discussions with utilities, local governments and ICLEI, finding energy consumption data that is accurate before 2003 is problematic. Perhaps a more easily measurable goal could be developed with the CPUC, utilities, local governments and ICLEI that would satisfy the spirit of this goal.

### *Goal 4: Community Leadership*

By 2015, 50% of local governments have adopted energy efficiency/ sustainability/ climate change action plans for their communities and 100% will have adopted them by 2020, with implementation and tracking of achievements. There are 482 cities and 58 counties in California for a total of 540. Therefore, 270 should have action plans by 2015 if this goal is to be met. Using existing data collection activities of the SEEC partners (ICLEI and ILG) and the State (OPR) provided the most complete documentation of these planning activities.

### *Climate, Energy, Sustainability Plans*

The Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) collects local government plans addressing climate change (<http://www.opr.ca.gov/>). These plans usually involve setting emission reduction goals and adopting implementation measures to achieve those goals. According to OPR, this is a representative list of local government plans, but is not comprehensive and does not include adopted General Plan goals, policies, and objectives. ICLEI also provided a list of its members and former members that have completed Climate Action Plans. The complete list can be found in Appendix A.

There are 169 cities and counties on this list, representing approximately 31% of the 540 cities and counties in California. The 2010 annual report found 105 adopted plans (19.5%) and the 2011 report showed 136 adopted plans (25%). More LGPs

are working on inventories. If the rate of adoption continues, the goal for 2015 could be met.

### *General Plan language*

In the online survey to cities and counties with utility partnerships, seven respondents indicated that municipal energy use was addressed somewhere in their General Plan, not necessarily in an Energy Element, and nine reported that community-wide energy use was addressed. One county (Sonoma) reported that energy policies are part of the Land Use Element of its General Plan and another (San Bernardino) said they are in the Conservation Element; both of these counties are LGPs. Another county (Kern) indicated that its Energy Element deals with resource management and protection, and not energy efficiency.

Each year OPR compiles the *California Planners' Book of Lists* (<http://www.opr.ca.gov/index.php?a=planning/publications.html#pubs-C>), which contains valuable local government planning information. Below is a list of cities and counties that have adopted an Energy or Sustainability Element as part of their General Plan. The year the Element was adopted is also included. Energy Elements are optional (required elements are Land Use, Circulation, Conservation, Housing, Noise, Open Space, Safety and Air Quality).

OPR's list of energy elements in the 2012 *Book of Lists* includes fewer cities and counties than the previous year (those on the 2011 list, but not the 2012 list are indicated by #). Coordinator included local governments on either list, since it is unlikely a city or county would 'un-adopt' an element.

Agoura Hills 2010  
Alameda 1979  
Alturas 1993  
Apple Valley 2009  
Arcata 2008 #  
Banning 2006  
Beaumont 2007  
Belvedere 2004  
Benicia 1999 #  
Big Bear Lake 1999 #  
Buellton 2007 #  
Calabasas 1995  
Cathedral City 2002  
Corona 2004 #  
Corte Madera 2009 #  
Davis 2001  
Desert Hot Springs 2000 #  
Dixon 2010  
Downey 2005 #

Emeryville 2009  
Escondido 2001 #  
Fort Bragg 2008 #  
Fremont 2011 #  
Gilroy 2002 #  
Indian Wells 2009 #  
Irvine 1999  
La Puente 2004 #  
Laguna Woods 2003 #  
Lawndale 1991  
Loma Linda 2009  
Los Gatos 1985 #  
Lynwood 2003 #  
Ontario 2010  
Orland 2003 #  
Palm Desert 2004 #  
Palo Alto 1998  
Paradise 1994 #  
Pasadena 1983  
Petaluma 2008 #  
Pleasanton 2009  
Portola 2001 #  
Poway 1991 #  
Rancho Cucamonga 2010 #  
Rancho Mirage 2005 #  
Redwood City 2010  
Rosemead 2010 #  
San Bernardino 2005 #  
San Clemente 1993 #  
San Francisco 1982 #  
San Jose 1994 #  
San Luis Obispo 1981 #  
Santa Ana 1982  
Santa Cruz 1992  
Shafter 2005  
Taft 2010  
Ukiah 1995  
West Hollywood 1988 #  
Wheatland 2006  
Yucca Valley 1995

Alameda County 1994 #  
Alpine County 1999 #  
Glenn County 1993  
Humboldt County 2011 #  
Kern County 2004

Lassen County 1993 #  
Madera County 1995  
Marin County 2007  
Modoc County 1993  
Mono County 1993  
Monterey County 1982 #  
Placer County 1994 #  
Riverside County 2012  
Sacramento County 1993  
San Diego County 1977 #  
San Joaquin County 1992 #  
San Luis Obispo County 1995 #  
Santa Barbara County 1994  
Santa Cruz County 1994 #  
Shasta County 2004  
Sierra County 1996  
Siskiyou County 1993  
Solano County 2008 #  
Ventura County 2004  
Yolo County 1982 #

According to OPR, 84 cities and counties have adopted Energy Elements. Note that some of these elements date from the 1980s and early 1990s when the CEC had funding to help local governments develop and adopted them. Many of the rural counties' elements focus on protecting energy resources (biomass, geothermal, etc.) and not energy efficiency. Energy efficiency is often incorporated into required elements, such as the Conservation Element, instead of in a separate Energy Element.

Coordinator looked at these Energy Elements (the ones available on line) in 2011. Many focused on preserving energy resources (biomass, petroleum, etc.), few had more than a policy or two, and barely qualify as energy elements. There were about fifteen that had good policy and implementation language that the coordinator shared with LGPs working on General Plan language. That document is included at the Coordinator's website: [www.EECoordinator.info](http://www.EECoordinator.info).

### *Local Government Partnership Activities*

A number of LGPs have chosen to work on energy or climate action plans as part of their partnership strategic planning work. PGC funding is limited to working on the building energy efficiency portions of these plans. ICLEI's assistance through SEEC is also increasing the ability of all local governments statewide to develop these plans. The Institute for Local Government's Beacon Award program also may serve as an incentive for more cities and counties to prepare climate action plans.

Sixty LGPs, or cities receiving SCE strategic planning grants, are working on some aspect of energy/climate action planning (Goal 4) in their relationships with the utilities. The following LGPs are regional partnerships working on Climate Action Planning and represent more than one local government: AMBAG (21), CVAG (9), East Bay (37), Eastern Sierra (4), Kern COG (12), Lake County (3), Mendocino County (6), Napa County (6), Orange County (5), Redwood Coast (8), San Diego Association of Governments (16), San Gabriel Valley COG (31), San Joaquin Valley (8), San Mateo County (21), Santa Barbara County (9), Silicon Valley (15), South Bay Cities COG (15), VCREA (8) and Western Riverside COG (11). These efforts will have much larger impact as these projects include the members of the regional agencies as well.

In addition, Pacific Gas & Electric has a goal of helping each of the local governments in its service territory to complete greenhouse gas inventories and eventually Climate Action Plans.

### *Recommendations*

Cities and counties in the State appear to be on track to achieve the 2015 goal of climate action plan adoption.

### *Goal 5: Competency Building*

By 2020, 100% of local governments have in-house capabilities devoted to achieving all cost-effective energy efficiency in their facilities and stimulating the same throughout their communities.

Local government partnerships require interaction with the utility to coordinate the energy work. The level of engagement varies greatly among the partnerships, with some very involved partners taking an active role in developing and implementing programs and others simply being grateful to have the utility take the lead on upgrading municipal facilities.

While many local governments recognized the value of having in-house staff that could work on reducing the energy use, greenhouse gas emissions and utility bills of the municipality and its constituents, this was a difficult economic time for them. For those communities that could afford to develop this capacity (through revolving energy funds for example) or that invested in these positions in the past, remaining financially competitive will be easier than for those that have not.

A number of regional partnerships were instrumental in helping smaller jurisdictions apply for ARRA funding from the California Energy Commission, which they otherwise would not have had the time or expertise to do.

Measuring progress on this goal comes anecdotally and from the Survey. Several cities and counties have had staff and programs dedicated to energy reduction for



years, and in some cases decades. From the survey and Coordinator's visits and prior knowledge, the following local governments have existing or are building internal energy efficiency capacity. The asterisks (\*) indicate municipal electric or gas utilities.

Cities

Alameda\*  
Anaheim\*  
Azusa\*  
Bakersfield  
Beaumont  
Berkeley  
Burbank\*  
Chula Vista  
El Cerrito  
Fresno  
Glendale\*  
Healdsburg\*  
Huntington Beach  
Irvine  
Long Beach\*  
Los Angeles\*  
Oakland  
Palm Desert  
Palo Alto\*  
Pasadena  
Richmond  
Riverside\*  
Roseville\*  
San Diego  
San Jose  
Santa Barbara  
Santa Clara\*  
Santa Monica  
Simi Valley  
South Gate  
Turlock\*

Counties

Alameda County  
Imperial County\*  
Inyo County  
Kern County  
Lake County  
Lassen County\*  
Los Angeles

Marin County  
Mendocino County  
Merced County\*  
Napa County  
Riverside County  
Sacramento County\*  
San Diego County  
San Francisco City and County  
San Luis Obispo County  
San Mateo County  
Santa Barbara County  
Santa Clara County  
Shasta County\*  
Sonoma County  
Tulare County  
Ventura County  
Yolo County

Fifty-five cities and counties (10%) have or are developing internal capacity to implement energy efficiency programs. In addition, there are regional entities (COGs, energy offices) that are providing joint energy capacity for their member constituents, which may be a more cost-effective delivery system for energy efficiency programs. The 26 regional local government partnerships provided assistance and/or services to 327 local governments in California.

Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments  
Coachella Valley Association of Governments  
Community Energy Partnership (The Energy Coalition)  
East Bay Energy Watch  
Eastern Sierra Energy Leader  
Kern County Council of Governments  
Lake County Energy Watch  
Marin County Energy Authority  
Mendocino County Energy Watch  
Napa County Energy Watch  
Orange County Local Government Partnership  
Redwood Coast Energy Authority  
San Diego Association of Governments  
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments  
San Luis Obispo County Local Government Partnership  
San Mateo Energy Watch  
Santa Barbara County North  
Santa Barbara County South  
Sierra Nevada Energy Watch  
Silicon Valley Energy Watch  
Sonoma County Energy Watch

South Bay Cities Council of Governments  
Valley Innovative Energy Watch  
Ventura County Regional Energy Alliance  
Western Riverside Council of Governments  
Yolo County Energy Watch

The Association of Bay Area Governments, California Center for Sustainable Energy and Great Valley Center also provided energy services to cities and counties in California.

In addition, the work of the Statewide Energy Efficiency Collaborative helped to build internal capacity for cities and counties. ICLEI's free trainings, guidebooks and software for example, allowed local government staff members with the time and internal direction to pursue climate action planning to do at least some of the work themselves, and not rely totally on contractors. The Institute for Local Government's Beacon Award, webinars and on-line resources, which included best practices case stories and a climate action plan framework, also helped build competency. And the Local Government Commission's networking opportunities (local government partnership meetings and annual statewide forum) and webinars were also designed to increase the amount of program, policy and other idea sharing between local governments in California.

The new Regional Energy Networks approved in the 2013-14 Energy Efficiency decision will also provide direct assistance to the cities and counties in Southern California and the Bay Area.

### *Recommendations*

The utility-local government partnerships and the regional efforts continue to help more local governments develop internal capacity or have access to competent shared energy staff. This, in conjunction with municipal utility districts, means a solid majority of cities and counties now are accessing California's energy programs and resources.

### ***Statewide Coordinator Activities in 2010, 2011 & 2012***

One of the most useful methods to help local government partners and to track their activities were the personal visits the Coordinator made to the LGPs. They served to introduce the Coordinator to those who may not have known him before, to ensure the LGPs understood the purpose of the position and types of assistance the Coordinator could provide, and to give the Coordinator a better understanding of what the LGPs hoped to accomplish in their Strategic Planning activities. Coordinator visited 40 LGPs in 2010, 2011 and 2012.

Partner Visits

- ABAG
- AMBAG Energy Watch
- Balboa Park Cultural Partnership
- Beaumont
- Chula Vista
- Community Energy Partnership
- CVAG (Desert Cities Partnership)
- Eastern Sierra Energy Watch
- Fresno Energy Watch
- Great Valley Center
- Kern County Energy Watch
- Lake County Energy Watch
- Marin County Energy Watch
- Mendocino County Energy Watch
- Napa County Energy Watch
- Orange County Cities
- Port of San Diego
- Redlands
- RCEA – Humboldt County Energy Watch
- Riverside County
- San Bernardino County
- SANDAG Partnership
- San Diego City
- San Diego County
- San Francisco
- San Gabriel Valley COG
- San Joaquin City
- San Joaquin Valley Innovative Energy Watch
- San Luis Obispo Energy Watch
- San Mateo County Energy Watch
- Santa Barbara County Partnership (SCE)
- Santa Clara Energy Watch
- Sierra Nevada Energy Watch
- Simi Valley Partnership
- Sonoma County Energy Watch
- South Bay Cities COG
- South Gate
- VCREA Partnership
- Western Riverside COG
- Yolo County Energy Watch

### Speaking Engagements and other meetings

Coordinator was invited to participate in conferences, workshops, meetings and webinars.

#### Speaking

- Benicia's Energy Symposium on *Getting from Here to There – Energy in Benicia*
- California Sustainability Alliance *Sustainability Awards* luncheon
- Community Energy Partnership Team Leaders webinar on *Statewide Local Government Energy Efficiency Best Practices Position*
- El Segundo City Council presentation on *Energy Efficiency & Local Governments*
- Joint Venture Silicon Valley panel on *Revolving Energy Funds*
- League of CA Cities Annual Conference on *Local Government Facilities Energy Efficiency Programs*
- PG&E Networking meeting on *Statewide Local Government Energy Efficiency Best Practices Position*
- San Bernardino Energy Efficiency Tour & Summit on *Energy Efficiency Planning & Local Governments*
- SANDAG meeting on *Statewide Local Government Energy Efficiency Best Practices Position*
- SCE/SCG Networking meeting on *Statewide Local Government Energy Efficiency Best Practices Position*
- SDG&E mixer on *Statewide Local Government Energy Efficiency Best Practices Position*
- SEEC webinar on Funding (host)
- 2010, 2011 and 2012 SEEC Annual Forums (host)
- South Gate City Council on *Energy Efficiency Planning & Local Governments*
- UC Davis Energy Seminar Series on *Community-Based Energy Efficiency Programs*
- Utility Energy Forum on *Policy Drivers Past and Future*

#### Meetings

- CARB – introduce Statewide Coordinator position, CARB's Local Government Toolkit
- CEC – workshop on AB 758
- CCSE – introduce Statewide Coordinator position
- CPUC – discuss utilities' annual energy forum, California Long-term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan tracking, and Zero Net Energy program
- City of Riverside – introduce Statewide Coordinator position
- Local Government Energy Network meetings (2010, 2011 & 2012)
- PACE Solutions Seminar
- PG&E Networking meetings (2010 & 2011)

- Small Communities Energy Network meeting (2012)
- SCE/SCG Networking meetings (2010, 2011 & 2012)
- SDG&E mixers (2010, 2011 & 2012)
- Yosemite Conference (2010, 2011 & 2012)

### Best Practices Fact Sheets

Coordinator produced 15 best practices fact sheets in 2010, 2011 and 2012, and researched several more. The completed fact sheets were:

- Alameda County's *Revolving Energy Fund and Municipal Utility Surcharge*
- AMBAG's *Regional Inventory Collaborative*
- Berkeley's *Financing Initiative for Renewable & Solar Technology (FIRST)*
- Chula Vista's *Free Resource & Energy Business Evaluations (FREBE)*
- *Energy Managers*
- *Local Ordinances Exceeding State Building Energy Efficiency Standards*
- San Diego's *North Park Main Street Small Business Energy Makeover*
- San Diego's *Peer-to-Peer Regional Street Lighting Working Group*
- San Jose's *Energy Fund*
- San Rafael's *Green Building Ordinance*
- San Mateo County's *Regionally Integrated Climate Action Planning Suite*
- Sierra Nevada's *Local Green Jobs*
- Sonoma County *Energy Independence Program (SCEIP)*
- Valley Innovative Energy Watch *Benchmarking Guide*
- West Covina *Energy Action Plan*

The over-burdened staffing issue above has also affected the development of these case studies. Several draft case studies have been waiting for local government edits and additional input. Also, the Coordinator tried to highlight local governments from around the state, and of varying levels of experience. For example, Coordinator tried to highlight more Southern CA examples and some of the second tier adopters (not just Santa Monica, Berkeley, etc.). Many of the new LGPs do not yet have a full enough story to tell. That should change as their partnerships mature. Each of the IOUs has provided Coordinator with best practices ideas for the 2013-14 period.

### Web Portal

Coordinator was asked to administer the local government pages of the *Engage360* web site. *Engage360* is the CPUC's energy efficiency marketing campaign that is replacing *Flex Your Power*. Coordinator started working with the web site in March 2010, and provided ideas to the site developer for making it more user-friendly. Coordinator invited a few local government energy staff to Beta-test the site, although only one actually did. When the site went public for energy professionals in October 2010, Coordinator sent an email inviting local government energy professionals to join the site.

Coordinator used the site to post the best practices fact sheets, workshop announcements for the SEEC partnership (and others), and program announcements.

In September 2011, the CPUC froze Engage360, and the Coordinator could no longer post information there. In December 2011, Coordinator developed a new website ([www.EECoordinator.info](http://www.EECoordinator.info)), which went live in January 2012. This new site houses all of the information the Coordinator had been placing on *Engage360*, and more.

The website was developed using free WordPress software. Coordinator developed about 20 pages with links to resources, and downloadable resources such as the best practices fact sheets. Coordinator also developed pages for the email alerts that he sends and is placing some information from the emailed announcements on this page. At the suggestion of the IOUs, Coordinator worked with a web designer to make the site more professional looking and more easily negotiable. Unique visitor counts for the months of November and December 2012 were 194 and 79 respectively.

#### Other Assistance - emails

From February 2010 until the end of 2012, Coordinator sent email alerts on 585 different topics (sometimes reminders were sent for particular events, but the event was counted only once). Most of the emails related to upcoming events (workshops, conferences, webinars, etc.). This list serve was used to provide peer-to-peer advice on such topics as templates for energy consultant Requests for Proposals, energy job descriptions, and advice on doing energy efficiency upgrades on a building with historic designation. There were 50 peer-to-peer requests in 2010, 2011 and 2012.

#### Summary of emails (Feb 19, 2010 – Dec 31, 2012)

- Event Announcements 243
- Job Announcements 95
- Program Announcements 94
- Peer-to-Peer Requests 50
- Publication Announcements 70
- Funding Announcements 20
- Other 13

For 2012, Coordinator sent weekly announcements instead of individual emails for each item.

#### CURRENTS: An Energy Newsletter for Local Governments

The Coordinator has written *CURRENTS: An Energy Newsletter for Local Governments* since 1998. During 2010, 2011 and 2012, Coordinator wrote 12 issues

of the newsletter. In January 2013 statistics were gathered on the number of visits to the *CURRENTS* web site.

Number of visits to:



One expects the earlier issues to have more visits than the later issues as they have been available for a longer period of time.



## APPENDIX A

### LIST OF CITIES AND COUNTIES WITH ADOPTED CLIMATE ACTION PLANS

The following is a list of plans and initiatives adopted by California cities and counties, and collected by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, to address greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions through 2012. These plans usually involve setting emission reduction goals and adopting implementation measures to achieve those goals. According to OPR, this is a representative list of local government plans, but is not comprehensive and does not include adopted General Plan goals, policies, and objectives. ICLEI also provided a list of its members and former members that have completed Climate Action Plans. The ones not on the OPR list are highlighted in red.

*Note:* some from last year's adopted list are now listed as in progress. OPR thinks the reason there are so many in progress vs. completed is that many cities/counties are updating their already completed plans and so marked themselves 'in progress.' This list includes the CAPs that were listed as adopted on either the 2011 or 2012 OPR and ICLEI lists.

City of Adelanto  
City of Agoura Hills  
City of Alameda – *Climate Protection in Alameda*  
City of Albany – *Climate Action Program*  
City of Aliso Viejo  
City of American Canyon  
City of Antioch  
Town of Apple Valley – *Climate Action Plan*  
City of Arcata – *Community Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan*  
City of Artesia  
City of Beaumont  
City of Belmont  
City of Benicia – *Climate Action Plan*  
City of Berkeley – *Climate Action Plan*  
City of Beverly Hills  
City of Brawley  
City of Buena Park  
City of Burbank – *Sustainability Action Plan*  
City of Burlingame – *Climate Action Plan*  
California City  
City of Calistoga  
City of Chico  
City of Chino  
City of Chula Vista – *Climate Action Planning*  
City of Citrus Heights

City of Corona  
Town of Corte Madera  
City of Cotati  
City of Cupertino  
City of Daly City  
Town of Danville  
City of Davis – *Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory*  
**City of Desert Hot Springs**  
City of Dublin  
City of East Palo Alto  
City of El Cerrito  
City of Emeryville – *Climate Action Plan*  
City of Encinitas  
City of Escondido  
Town of Fairfax  
City of Fontana  
City of Fort Bragg – *Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory*  
**City of Foster City**  
City of Fresno – *Fresno Green*  
City of Fullerton  
City of Garden Grove  
**City of Gilroy**  
City of Goleta  
City of Hawaiian Gardens  
City of Hayward – *Climate Action Plan*  
City of Healdsburg  
City of Hemet  
City of Hermosa Beach  
City of Hesperia – *Climate Action Plan*  
City of Hillsborough – *Hillsborough Climate Action Plan 2010*  
City of Indian Wells – *Getting Greener: Indian Wells' Path to Sustainability*  
City of Irvine – *Sustainability Strategic Plan*  
**City of Lafayette**  
City of Laguna Beach – *Climate Protection Action Plan*  
City of Lakewood  
City of Larkspur  
City of Livermore  
City of Lodi  
City of Long Beach  
**City of Los Altos**  
City of Los Altos Hills  
**City of Los Angeles – *Green LA Plan***  
City of Manhattan Beach – *Green Report*  
City of Martinez – *Climate Action Plan*  
City of Mendota  
City of Menlo Park – *Climate Change Action Plan*

City of Merced  
City of Millbrae  
City of Modesto  
**City of Monterey – *Climate Action Plan***  
City of Monrovia  
City of Monte Sereno  
City of Moraga  
City of Mount Shasta  
City of Murrieta  
City of Napa  
City of National City  
City of Newark – *Climate Action Plan*  
City of Novato  
**City of Oakland**  
City of Ontario  
City of Palm Desert  
City of Palmdale  
City of Palo Alto – *Climate Protection Plan*  
City of Palos Verdes Estates  
City of Perris  
City of Piedmont – *Climate Action Plan*  
City of Pinole  
City of Pleasanton  
City of Port Hueneme  
City of Portola Valley  
City of Rancho Santa Margarita  
City of Redlands  
Redwood City – *Community Climate Action Plan*  
City of Riverbank  
**City of Riverside – *Green Riverside Action Plan***  
City of Rohnert Park – *Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Action Plan Analysis*  
City of Roseville  
Town of Ross – *Climate Action Plan*  
**City of Sacramento – *Sustainability Implementation Plan***  
City of Saint Helena  
Town of San Anselmo  
City of San Carlos – *Climate Action Plan*  
City of San Clemente  
City of San Diego – *Climate Protection Action Plan*  
City of San Dimas  
City and County of San Francisco – *Climate Action Plan*  
City of San Gabriel  
City of San Jose – *San Jose Green Vision*  
City of San Juan Capistrano  
City of San Leandro – *Climate Action Plan*  
City of San Luis Obispo

City of San Mateo  
City of San Rafael – *Climate Change Action Plan*  
City of San Ramon – *Climate Action Plan*  
**City of Santa Ana**  
City of Santa Clarita  
City of Santa Cruz – *Climate Action Program*  
City of Santa Monica – *Sustainable City Plan*  
City of Santa Paula  
**City of Santa Rosa**  
City of Santee  
City of Sebastopol – *Sustainable Sebastopol*  
City of Signal Hill  
**City of Simi Valley – Green Community Action Plan**  
City of Solvang  
City of Sonoma  
City of Sonora (use of OPR guidelines)  
City of South Lake Tahoe  
City of Stanton  
City of Sunnyvale  
City of Taft  
**City of Temecula**  
Town of Tiburon  
City of Tracy  
City of Tulare (GHG Reduction Plan)  
City of Union City  
**City of Vallejo**  
City of West Hollywood  
Town of Williams  
Town of Windsor – *Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Action Plan*  
City of Woodland – *Greenhouse Gas Inventory*  
Town of Yountville

Alameda County  
Butte County  
Contra Costa County – *Municipal Climate Action Plan*  
Humboldt County  
Kings County  
Lake County  
Marin County – *Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan*  
Mendocino County  
Monterey County  
Napa County  
Nevada County (Energy Plan)  
Riverside County  
San Diego County  
San Luis Obispo County

Santa Clara County – *Climate Action Plan for Operations and Facilities*

**Santa Cruz County**

Solano County

Sonoma County – *Climate Protection Campaign*

Sutter County

Ventura County

Yolo County