MEETING of the Executive Committee of the
Clean Power Alliance of Southern California
Wednesday, December 18, 2019
1:30 p.m.

555 West 5th Street, 35th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90013

Meetings are accessible to people with disabilities. Individuals who need special assistance or a disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in this meeting, or who have a disability and wish to request an alternative format for the meeting materials, should contact Christian Cruz at ccruz@cleanpoweralliance.org or (213) 269-5892. Notification in advance of the meeting will enable us to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting and the materials related to it.

PUBLIC COMMENT POLICY: The General Public Comment item is reserved for persons wishing to address the Committee on any Clean Power Alliance-related matters not on today’s agenda. Public comments on matters on today’s Consent Agenda and Regular Agenda shall be heard at the time the matter is called. Comments on items on the Consent Agenda are consolidated into one public comment period. As with all public comment, members of the public who wish to address the Committee are requested to complete a speaker’s slip and provide it to Clean Power Alliance staff at the beginning of the meeting but no later than immediately prior to the time an agenda item is called.

Each speaker is customarily limited to two (2) minutes (in whole minute increments) per agenda item with a cumulative total of five (5) minutes to be allocated between the General Public Comment, the entire Consent Agenda, or individual items in the Regular Agenda. Please refer to Clean Power Alliance Policy No. 8 – Public Comments for more information.

In addition, members of the Public are encouraged to submit written comments on any agenda item to PublicComment@cleanpoweralliance.org. To enable an opportunity for review, written comments should be submitted at least 72 hours but no later than 24 hours in advance of the noticed Committee meeting date. Any written materials submitted thereafter will be distributed to the Committee at the Committee meeting. Any written submissions must specify the Agenda Item by number, otherwise they will be considered General Public Comment.
Clean Power Alliance Executive Committee Meeting  
December 18, 2019

Members of the public may also participate in this meeting remotely at the following addresses:

Beverly Hills City Hall  
4th Floor, Conference Room 4B  
455 N. Rexford Drive, Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Ventura County Government Center  
Channel Islands Conference Room, 4th Floor Hall of Administration  
800 South Victoria Avenue, Ventura, CA 93009

I. WELCOME AND ROLL CALL

II. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

III. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Approve Minutes from November 13, 2019 Executive Committee Meeting

IV. REGULAR AGENDA

2. Receive Report from the Executive Director

3. Discuss Greenhouse Gas Free Resource Allocation

4. Discuss California Electric Vehicle Incentive Program (CALeVIP)

5. Review Draft Agenda for January 9, 2020 Board of Directors Meeting

V. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

VI. ADJOURN

Public Records: Public records that relate to any item on the open session agenda for a Committee Meeting are available for public inspection. Those records that are distributed less than 72 hours prior to the meeting are available for public inspection at the same time they are distributed to all, or a majority of, the members of the Committee. The Board has designated Clean Power Alliance, 555 W. 5th Street, 35th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90013, as the location where those public records will be available for inspection. The documents are also available online at www.cleanpoweralliance.org.
MEETING of the Executive Committee of the
Clean Power Alliance of Southern California
Wednesday, November 13, 2019, 1:30 p.m.

MINUTES

555 West 5th Street, 35th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90013

Beverly Hills City Hall
4th Floor, Conference Room 4B
455 N. Rexford Drive, Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Ventura County Government Center
Channel Islands Conference Room, 4th Floor Hall of Administration
800 South Victoria Avenue, Ventura, CA 93009

I. WELCOME AND ROLL CALL
Chair Diana Mahmud called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m. and Interim Board Secretary Christian Cruz conducted roll call.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roll Call</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxnard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Hills Estates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pasadena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hollywood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT
There were no public comments.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Approved Minutes from September 18, 2019 Executive Committee Meeting

Motion: Vice Chair Kuehl, Los Angeles County
Second: Committee Member McKeown, Santa Monica
Vote: Item 1 was approved by roll call vote 5-0-3, Vice Chair Parks, Committee Member Ramirez, and Committee Member Zuckerman were absent. Committee member Zuckerman joined the Committee after the Consent Agenda vote at 1:40PM, and Vice-Chair Parks joined the meeting during Closed Session.

IV. CLOSED SESSION

1. CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATORS

Property:
   a. 660 S. Figueroa Street, Los Angeles, CA
   b. 700 S. Flower Street, Los Angeles, CA
   c. 801 S. Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, CA
   d. 633 W. 5th Street, Los Angeles, CA
   e. 444 S. Flower Street, Los Angeles, CA
   f. 800 W. Sixth Street, Los Angeles, CA

Agency negotiator: Theodore Bardacke for all properties

Negotiating parties, respectively:
   a. JADE Enterprises, LLC
   b. NREA-TRC 700, LLC
   c. CIM Group
   d. Overseas Union Enterprise Limited
   e. Coretrust Capital Partners, LLC
   f. Walter Kahn
Under negotiation: Price and Terms for all properties

Report out: Direction was provided.

2. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION
Potential initiation of litigation pursuant to paragraph (4) of subdivision (d)
of Government Code Section 54956.9: (1)

Report out: No reportable action

3. PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT
(Government Code Section 54957)
General Counsel Performance Evaluation Process

Report out: Direction was provided.

V. REGULAR AGENDA

2. Receive Report from the Executive Director

Ted Bardacke, Executive Director, provided an update on the system Resource Adequacy (RA). Mr. Bardacke indicated that CPA has met all the RA obligations and submitted them to the PUC for the year ahead filing on October 31st. Mr. Bardacke highlighted that the Malibu City Council voted to move up to 100% green energy tier. Mr. Bardacke did state that this is the first time a member agency has moved tiers and CPA staff is in the process of developing an implementation policy to bring to the Board on how to handle this in the future, specifically on the procurement need side. The change in tier will take effect sometime in 2020. Mr. Bardacke also highlighted, for the Committee, the PSPS issue and the impact they are having both politically and regulatory. The PSPS issue will be a focal point at the PUC.

Chair Mahmud asked about the PUC decision on the once through cooling plants. Mr. Bardacke indicated that the Oxnard plant term of operation was extended for one year and the Redondo Beach plant was extended for two years. Matt Langer, CPA COO, did indicate that there will be another opportunity to challenge this decision.
There were no public comments made on this item.

3. **Review Draft Agenda for December 5, 2019 Board of Directors Meeting**

Mr. Bardacke introduced the December 5th Board of Directors agenda. Mr. Bardacke pointed out that the two financial items will be presented separately, so that staff can provide more detailed information on each item to better help educate the Board on CPA finances. These presentations will also help with the discussions on rate setting and building the CPA reserves. Additionally, Mr. Bardacke noted that there are a few key considerations to these topics, which include paying the Los Angeles County loan and meeting the 40% minimum reserve for operation needs. These presentations will help the Board understand the current CPA financial position.

Committee member Zuckerman asked about SCE rate setting. Mr. Langer clarified that CPA staff has received the initial ERRA filing key to establishing the 2020 rates. Mr. Langer highlighted that the filing indicates that SCE is looking to implement the 2020 ERRA rates at the same time the one-year $824 million under collection ERRA is set to come off. Mr. Langer clarified that this means SCE generation will come down 2%. However, there is cap to the PCIA at half a cent per kWh, because of the decline in cost for energy and other issues, the PCIA would have gone up more if not for the cap. There is a possibility that SCE could end up under collecting on the PCIA, in which case a PCIA trigger could be filed.

Vice Chair Kuehl asked if CPA would be able to provide funds to member agencies from CPA revenues. Mr. Bardacke clarified that staff is organizing local program funding or in the form of procurement to assist cities, but not in the form of direct local return. However, this can be developed in the future. Mr. Bardacke also indicated that funding could go to critical facilities
through an RFP process. Chair Mahmud requested that CPA consider ranking or prioritize the use of limited funds.

VI. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

Vice Chair Parks asked about the criteria for possible CPA funding for the PSPS events. Mr. Bardacke clarified that over the next year or so that there will be more outside resources devoted to this issue and part of the criteria could be for CPA to leverage these resources.

Committee Member McKeown commented that it would good to require scooters be charged with 100% renewable energy.

VII. ADJOURN

Chair Mahmud adjourned the meeting 2:48 p.m.
The Executive Director will provide an oral report on current CPA operations.
SUMMARY
Beginning in early 2020, CPA may have the opportunity to receive an allocation from Southern California Edison (SCE) of greenhouse gas (GHG) Free Energy at no cost. The source of this energy would be from existing hydroelectric and/or nuclear resources. CPA is likely to have the option of accepting or rejecting the nuclear portion of the allocation.

CPA does not procure nuclear energy but does procure a significant amount of large hydroelectric power and uses it to reduce the GHG content of both the Lean and Clean Power rate products (the 100% Green rate product is, by default, carbon-free and does not use power from large hydroelectric sources). Accepting the hydroelectric portion of the allocation will save CPA between $2.3 million and $3.2 million annually; accepting the nuclear portion would save CPA an additional $3.5 million to $5.0 million annually in energy costs.

Staff is seeking feedback from the Executive Committee on options, including one which would have CPA accepting both the large hydroelectric allocation and the nuclear allocation, with the nuclear allocation being utilized as part of the energy portfolio mix for the Lean Power product. In this option, the Clean Power product would still be 50% renewable energy and use only large hydroelectric power to further reduce its GHG content and be an affordable option for customers who do not want nuclear power. Under
all options, the 100% Green Power product would be unaffected, using only Renewable Energy.

**BACKGROUND**

As part of phase 2 of the Power Charge Indifference Adjustment (PCIA) rulemaking at the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), several proposals are under consideration for the future treatment of resources in SCE’s PCIA-eligible portfolio. One such proposal supported by both CalCCA and SCE would allocate a proportional share of the large hydroelectric and/or nuclear energy (GHG Free Energy) from SCE’s portfolio to CCA’s in SCE’s service territory. For example, if a CCA is 10% of SCE’s load, it would be able to receive 10% of the GHG Free Energy from SCE’s portfolio. CCA customers are already paying the cost of these resources through the PCIA, so accepting an allocation would result in no additional cost to the CCA and, in effect, reduce procurement costs for CCAs that currently buy GHG Free Energy.

In the California energy market, GHG Free Energy is distinct from Renewable Energy. Although nuclear and large hydroelectric resources may not emit GHGs, they are not eligible for the California Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS). CPA currently procures both Renewable Energy and GHG Free Energy. CPA does not use GHG Free Energy as part of the portfolio mix for the 100% Green Power product. The GHG Free Energy allocation proposal has no impact on CPA’s current or future Renewable Energy procurement.

Although the GHG Free Energy allocation proposal is well developed, the PCIA rulemaking is considering a variety of issues that remain under discussion and a final formal decision will not implement the allocation until 2021 at the earliest. In the meantime, CPA has approached SCE and entered into discussions to propose an interim GHG Free Energy allocation that could take effect in 2020. As part of the allocation process, CPA will need to decide if it wants to accept the large hydroelectric portion of the allocation, the nuclear portion, or both.
DISCUSSION

To date, CPA has procured GHG Free Energy from large hydroelectric facilities to contribute to its portfolio content targets. Staff estimates that accepting a full-year allocation in 2020 would result in CPA receiving 450-500 GWh of large hydroelectric energy and 675-725 GWh of nuclear energy. Staff recommends accepting the large hydroelectric allocation, as such an allocation is consistent with CPA’s procurement objectives and would save CPA $2.3 million to $3.2 million in 2020.

Based on direction from the Board in 2018 regarding CPA’s 2018 procurement activities, CPA’s has not procured nuclear energy. However, the potential for a free allocation of nuclear energy represents a new construct that has not been previously considered by the Board. Staff has identified three options for how to address the nuclear energy portion of the allocation:

1. Accept the nuclear allocation and apply the energy solely to the Lean Power product.
2. Accept the nuclear allocation and seek to re-sell the energy to another buyer.
3. Decline the nuclear allocation.

By pursuing Option 1, staff estimates a savings of $3.5 million to $5.0 million in 2020 in addition to the savings related to the large hydroelectric allocation, assuming the nuclear allocation displaces GHG Free Energy purchases CPA otherwise would have procured in the market. Some customers may not want nuclear energy in their portfolio mix. By including the nuclear energy solely in the Lean Power product, CPA can realize the financial benefit of accepting the allocation while excluding the Clean Power and 100% Green Power products from any impact. This approach supports the strategy of maintaining Lean Power as CPA’s most cost-competitive offering while continuing to offer customers choices in their energy mix.

Under Option 2, CPA would accept the nuclear allocation, but attempt to realize value by reselling the energy to a third party. This option carries two main risks. First, CPA may be unable to find a buyer. If a buyer is not found, CPA would be required to count the
nuclear energy as part of its portfolio content. Second, pricing for nuclear energy is uncertain and sales may not generate much revenue.

Under Option 3, CPA would forgo any additional savings, and SCE would retain the nuclear energy for its own portfolio. However, if the Board does not want nuclear energy to be a part of any portion of CPA’s power mix, this option provides certainty that it will not.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR THE POWER CONTENT LABEL**

The Power Content Label (PCL) is a standard template for reporting energy supply mix that is required to be published by every load serving entity (LSE) in California each year. The PCL shows a percentage breakdown of the power sources for the LSE including a line item for each power type (renewables, gas, coal, nuclear, large hydroelectric, etc.). CPA publishes a PCL for each of its product offerings: Lean Power, Clean Power, and 100% Green Power. CPA procures GHG Free Energy for the Lean and Clean products in addition to Renewable Energy to ensure CPA’s products are environmentally competitive with SCE.

CPA’s 2018 PCL is attached for reference. If CPA were to accept the nuclear allocation and apply it to the Lean product, the nuclear energy would show up only in the column for that product. The PCL does not report an LSE’s overall average portfolio mix.

**NEXT STEPS**

CPA is continuing discussions with SCE and if a final agreement is reached, SCE will likely submit the 2020 GHG Free Energy allocation proposal for CPUC approval in early 2020. Allocation of GHG Free Energy in 2021 and beyond will be subject to a statewide mechanism that applies to all CCAs and IOUs. Staff is looking for feedback on which of the above options to pursue and at what stage in the process this matter should be put before the Board.

**Attachment:** 1) CPA 2018 Power Content Label
# 2018 POWER CONTENT LABEL

**Clean Power Alliance of Southern California**  
https://cleanpoweralliance.org/power-sources/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENERGY RESOURCES</th>
<th>65% Renewable</th>
<th>Lean Power</th>
<th>Clean Power</th>
<th>100% Green Power</th>
<th>2018 CA Power Mix**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Renewable</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomass &amp; Biowaste</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geothermal</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Hydroelectric</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Hydroelectric</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified sources of power*</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* "Unspecified sources of power" means electricity from transactions that are not traceable to specific generation sources.

** Percentages are estimated annually by the California Energy Commission based on the electricity generated in California and net imports as reported to the Quarterly Fuel and Energy Report database and the Power Source Disclosure program.

---

**For specific information about this electricity product, contact:**

**Clean Power Alliance of Southern California**  
(888) 585-3788

**For general information about the Power Content Label, please visit:**

http://www.energy.ca.gov/pcl/

**For additional questions, please contact the California Energy Commission at:**

Toll-free in California: 844-454-2906  
Outside California: 916-653-0237
To: Clean Power Alliance (CPA) Executive Committee

From: Karen Schmidt, Regional Affairs Manager
      Gina Goodhill, Policy Director

Approved by: Ted Bardacke, Executive Director

Subject: California Electric Vehicle Incentive Program (CALeVIP)

Date: December 18, 2019

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that CPA submit a letter of intent to participate in a CALeVIP South-Central Coast Incentive Project to support the installation of electric vehicle chargers with a minimum financial contribution of $533,000 in 2021 and the potential for additional funding between 2021–2023.

Staff is looking for Executive Committee feedback on the recommendation, the level of investment CPA should provide and the timing of that investment, and whether the Board should be asked to approve the letter of intent submittal at its January 9, 2020 meeting.

BACKGROUND
Staff will provide a presentation (Attachment 1) on the CALeVIP program. The State of California has set aggressive electric vehicle (EV) goals, including reaching 5 million EVs on the road by 2030 and 250,000 EV charging stations by 2025. Southern California faces a growing challenge in that regional EV adoption is outpacing the availability of infrastructure for EV drivers. CALeVIP was launched to spur the rapid deployment of publicly accessible Level 2 EV Chargers (L2) and Level 3 Direct Current Fast Chargers (DCFC) through targeted incentive projects based on regional needs. The State of California has allocated $58 million in current funding for the CALeVIP program and up
to $200 million in future funding, with the expectation of awarding a total of $20 million to $30 million annually for three to four regional initiatives.

In August 2018, four Southern California counties (Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino) were awarded $29 million in incentives for DCFC projects with no local partners. About one-third of those funds remain. CPA has begun discussions with CALeVIP about additional state funding potential for L2 chargers in CPA’s Los Angeles County territory should CPA offer a local match.

In the meantime, CALeVIP has begun to prioritize contributions from local partners in its decision to award new regional initiatives. CPA is exploring participation in 2021 in a South-Central Coast Incentive Project, which would provide incentive funding for Ventura, Santa Barbara, and San Luis Obispo Counties. CPA’s contributions would be directed solely to its Ventura County service territory and customers.

**CALeVIP PROJECT GUIDELINES**

The CEC establishes potential project funding based on a gap analysis of charging needs by county. Although not a requirement, CEC encourages local entities (referred to as “local partners”) to collaborate at the regional level on proposed projects, including providing local match funding. In the regional projects awarded to date, CCAs have been significant source of local match funding, along with regional air districts.

**2021 South-Central Coast Incentive Project**

Potential CEC funding for the South-Central Coast region is shown on the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Estimated Gap (Number of Chargers)</th>
<th>Potential CEC Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>DCFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Depending on the strength of local partner commitments, the Ventura County funding from CEC could potentially increase from $4.1 million to $6.4 million. CPA has participated in preliminary discussions with the following potential project partners for the South-Central Coast Incentive Project:

- Ventura County Air Pollution Control District
- Ventura County Regional Energy Alliance
- Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo County Air Districts
- Monterey Bay Community Power

After a project is selected by the CEC, the CEC and local partner funds are pooled and administered by the non-profit Center for Sustainable Energy (CSE). CSE utilizes the established CALeVIP online platform and process for public and private sector entities to apply for incentives/rebates to install publicly accessible EV chargers. CSE provides marketing and technical assistance to applicants and handles disbursement of incentive payments. To streamline the application process and expedite deployment of chargers, CEC has established “pillar requirements” for use of project funds:

- Rebates may be used to pay for: equipment (including electric vehicle supply equipment, transformers, panels, and advanced energy storage); planning/design; installation costs (labor and materials); utility service orders; demand management equipment; networking agreements; extended warranties; stub-outs; and signage
- Rebates may not be used for permit fees, solar panels, or costs paid by other incentive programs
- Applications for rebates are awarded on a first-come, first-served basis
- EV charging sites may be owned publicly (e.g. at a municipal facility) or privately (e.g. at a business), but they must be publicly accessible to any EV driver 24/7
- 25% or more of funding must allocated to disadvantaged communities (DACs)

Certain elements of the program design may be customized by the local partners, including incentive levels for L2 and DCFC chargers, increased funding for DACs, maximum connector limits per site, and “areas of focus” (e.g., multifamily housing).
Considerations for CPA Participation

CPA could benefit from participating in and providing financing to this program. CEC funding along with other partner funds would provide significant leverage for CPA’s investment, or approximately a 3:1 leverage ratio at the minimum level of $533,000 funding level. The turnkey platform and program administration provided by CSE would expedite program launch, fund disbursement, charger installations, and eliminate the need to build internal capacity and tools from scratch. The tri-county partnership would leverage regional resources, public agency collaborations and community outreach channels. CEC and partner funds allocated to Ventura County would be reserved for Ventura County applicants, and CPA funds will only be used for CPA customers. It would also provide CPA with access to EV customers for demand response purposes, although customer participation in any demand response program would be voluntary.

Other considerations include:

- CPA’s 2021 funding commitment would be distributed evenly between FY 20-21 and FY 21-22.
- The potential for additional funding from CPA beyond the minimum initial commitment could motivate CEC to increase its level of funding.
- CEC is considering future potential investment in Los Angeles County for L2 chargers; CPA is exploring whether and how to ensure that CEC matching funds there would be reserved for customers in CPA service territory if CPA provided a similar local match like it proposes to do in Ventura County.

Key Milestones

- February 4, 2020 – deadline for submission of letters of intent
- February-March 2020 – workshops between CSE and partners to finalize project requirements and discuss CSE SOW, budget and contract
- March 27, 2020 – deadline for submission of prospective project requirements with Partners
- May 15, 2020 – target to finalize tentative agreement (sans signature) on CSE scope of work, budget and contract
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

ITEM 4

- June 2020 – CEC selects projects, notifies partners
- July 2020 – Partner boards approve funding for 2021 project
- September 25, 2020 – Partners sign and execute scope of work, budget and contract with CSE
- By December 31, 2021 – Partners send 2021 local contribution to CSE

Staff recommends that CPA submit a letter of intent to the CEC proposing a minimum financial contribution of $533,000 in 2021 to the CALeVIP South-Central Coast Initiative Project, with the potential for additional funding between 2021 – 2023 conditioned on the level of funding awarded by the CEC, CPA Board approval, and project success/results. Staff is looking for Executive Committee feedback on this recommendation, the level and timing of investment, and whether the Board should be asked to approve the letter of intent submittal at its January 9, 2020 meeting.

FISCAL IMPACT

CPA funding contributions would be allocated during CPA’s annual budget process for fiscal years 2020-21 and 2021-22, as well as future fiscal years if approved.

Attachment: 1) CALeVIP Overview Presentation
CALeVIP Program: Background and Opportunity

December 18, 2019
Staff Recommendation and Request for Input

- Submit letter of intent to Energy Commission by 2/4/2020
  - Formal but non-binding indication of expected level and timing of CPA investment in 2021 CALeVIP Incentive Project for Ventura County

- Input requested from Executive Committee:
  - Do we want to do this?
  - Level and timing of proposed investment
  - Should this go to the Board for approval in January?
California’s Aggressive Electric Vehicle (EV) Goals

- 5 million EVs by 2030
- 250,000 EV charging stations by 2025
- Challenge: regional EV adoption is outpacing infrastructure
California Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Project (CALeVIP)

• Goal: rapid deployment of public L2 and DCFC stations across California through targeted incentive projects based on regional needs

• $58 million in current funding through Clean Transportation Program, with up to $200 million in future funding

• Aim to award $20-30MM to 3-4 new projects per year
## CALeVIP Projects Awarded To Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentive Project</th>
<th>Launch Date</th>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fresno County</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>$4 million</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southern California</strong></td>
<td><strong>August 2018</strong></td>
<td><strong>Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29 million</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td><strong>DCFC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento County</td>
<td>April 2019</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>$15.5 million</td>
<td>SMUD, $1.5 million</td>
<td>Level 2 &amp; DCFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern California</td>
<td>May 2019</td>
<td>Shasta, Humboldt, Tehama</td>
<td>$4 million</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Level 2 &amp; DCFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast</td>
<td>October 2019</td>
<td>Monterey, Santa Cruz, San Benito</td>
<td>$7 million</td>
<td>MBCP, $1 million/3 years</td>
<td>Level 2 &amp; DCFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin Valley</td>
<td>Launching December 2019</td>
<td>San Joaquin, Kern, Fresno</td>
<td>$14 million</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Level 2 &amp; DCFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula-Silicon Valley Incentive Project</td>
<td>Launching Spring 2020</td>
<td>San Mateo, Santa Clara</td>
<td>$60 million total funding, 2-4 years</td>
<td>PCE; SVCE; San Jose Clean Energy; SVP; City of Palo Alto Utilities</td>
<td>Level 2 &amp; DCFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Incentive Project</td>
<td>Anticipated 2020</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>$17.66 million total</td>
<td>SANDAG; San Diego APCD</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma Coast Incentive Project</td>
<td>Anticipated 2020</td>
<td>Sonoma, Mendocino 23</td>
<td>$6.75 million total</td>
<td>SCP; Northern Sonoma County APCD</td>
<td>Level 2 &amp; DCFC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CCA partner funding italicized
CEC Seeking Higher Local Match Funding in Current and Future Rounds

**Proposed CALeVIP Incentive Funding by Select Regions ($M)**

- **Peninsula - Silicon Valley**: 33.0 ($60.0 total)
- **San Diego**: 15.8 ($21.8 total) + 6.0 ($21.8 total)
- **Sacramento**: 14.0 ($15.5 total) + 1.5 ($15.5 total)
- **Central Coast**: 6.0 ($9.0 total) + 3.0 ($9.0 total)
- **Sonoma**: 5.1 ($6.8 total) + 1.7 ($6.8 total)

**Funding Breakdown**:
- **CEC Funding**: $74M
- **Co-Funding**: $39M
- **Total**: $113M

**Public Funding Catalyst**
- Co-Funding to increase overall funds by 53%
2021 Opportunity: South-Central Coast Incentive Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Estimated Gap (Number of Chargers)</th>
<th>Potential CEC Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>DCFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- CEC will select 2021 projects based on regional needs, local readiness, and local partnerships.
- CEC's potential contribution in Ventura County is $4.1MM; could increase to $6.4MM based on strength of local fund commitments.
- Other potential local partners include:
  - Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD)
  - Ventura County Regional Energy Alliance (in-kind support)
  - Santa Barbara and SLO air districts; Monterey Bay Community Power
CALeVIP Program Requirements

- **Platform, process and technology requirements**
  - Sites must be publicly accessible 24/7
  - Public and private sector eligible to apply
  - First come, first served – no application scoring
  - Minimum 25% of funding must be reserved for DACs
  - Chargers must meet specified technical requirements
  - Rebates can be used for all project components except for permit fees, solar panels, and costs paid by other incentive programs
  - Administered by nonprofit Center for Sustainable Energy

- **Local partners can customize the programs for:**
  - Incentive levels (currently $5,200 for L2, $55,000 per DCFC)
  - DAC/Low-income $ adder amount and higher DAC/Low-income funding carve-out
  - Maximum connector limits per site
  - “Area of focus” (e.g., multifamily housing)
CPA Benefits and Considerations

- Significant leverage on CPA investment
- Turnkey program administration by CSE
  - Use of existing platform
  - Marketing and tri-county agency and CBO relationships
  - Technical assistance – consultation, siting, technical specs, hotline
- VC funds stay in VC
- CPA will have access to customers for demand response
- Starting point for discussion/negotiations with CEC
- CPA 2021 funding split between FY20-21 and FY21-22
- Potential for future CEC funding in Los Angeles County targeting CPA service territory
Key Milestones

- February 4, 2020 – deadline for submission of letters of intent
- February-March 2020 – workshops between CSE and partners to finalize project requirements and discuss CSE SOW, budget and contract
- March 27, 2020 – deadline for submission of prospective project requirements with Partners
- May 15, 2020 – target to finalize tentative agreement (sans signature) on CSE SOW, budget and contract
- June 2020 – CEC selects projects, notifies partners
- July 2020 – Partner boards approve funding for 2021 project
- September 25, 2020 – Partners sign and execute SOW, budget and contract with CSE
- December 31, 2021 – Partners send 2021 local contributions to CSE
Recommendation and questions

• Submit letter of intent to CEC indicating minimum level of CPA funding in 2021, with the potential for additional funding between 2021-2023, subject to:
  ○ Level of funding committed by CEC and other project partners
  ○ CPA board approval
  ○ Project results

• Input requested from ExCom:
  ○ Do we want to do this?
  ○ Level and timing of proposed investment
  ○ Should this go to the Board for approval in January?
Staff will provide an overview of the proposed agenda items for the January 9, 2020 Board of Directors (Board) meeting for review and feedback from the Executive Committee. The Draft Board agenda is attached to this staff report. Information on the two main items for Board consideration, Residential time of use (TOU) rates and an implementation process for changing community default tiers, is provided below.

RESIDENTIAL TOU
Summary of Proposed Recommendation
Staff recommends (i) that CPA transition its residential customers to time of use (TOU) rates at the same time as SCE's bundled customers; (ii) that CPA offer the same TOU periods as SCE; and (iii) that CPA offer similar bill protection provisions as SCE.

Actual rate design, which could differ from that of SCE, would be addressed closer to the residential TOU transition period.

Background
California’s IOUs, including Southern California Edison (SCE), will begin transitioning residential customers to default time of use (TOU) rates starting in October 2020 and continuing through 2022 in accordance with State law and CPUC directives. The law applies only to an IOU’s deployment of default TOU rates for residential customers. Under SCE’s planned implementation, bundled residential customers will be transitioned to TOU
rates as the default, with certain exceptions\(^1\). Tiered flat rates will remain an option for those that choose to opt-out of the default TOU.

CPA has the discretion to determine whether and how to transition its customers to the default TOU rates for the generation portion of their bill. Even if CPA does not transition its customers to default TOU, those customers are still subject to default TOU for the delivery portion of their bill. Should CPA decide to also default its residential customers to TOU rates, SCE has indicated that with enough forward planning, it could transition CPA’s residential customers to default TOU in late 2021 or early 2022 to coincide with SCE’s transition for bundled customers in Los Angeles and Ventura Counties.

**Policy and Operational Context**

Non-residential customers have long been on TOU rates along with approximately 10% to 20% of residential customers. California is now attempting to transition most remaining residential customers to TOU rates because these rates provide those customers with a price signal to consume energy during times when generation supply is plentiful and reduce consumption during periods of peak demand.

The benefits of TOU rates include:

1. Potential to shift load to off-peak periods to help absorb renewable energy that would otherwise be curtailed
2. Reduced GHG emissions resulting from shifting load from the evening when there are less renewables on the grid to the daytime when solar energy is abundant
3. Reduced system capacity needs
4. Air quality improvements though reducing use of gas peaker plants in the evening
5. Improved price signals for distributed energy resources such as behind-the-meter solar PV generation, energy storage, and energy efficiency.

---

\(^1\) The PUC has ordered that certain residential customers should be exempt from the IOUs’ default TOU, including medical baseline customers and CARE customers in hot climate zones. CPA expects to substantially mirror these exemptions.
Implementing TOU rates on residential customers is a significant policy shift that will have a direct impact on millions of residential customers across the State, regardless of what CPA does. To support the transition, millions of dollars of ratepayer funds have been allocated for statewide and regional marketing and outreach to customers.

If CPA chooses to include its customers in the transition, it is prudent to coordinate with SCE to make sure CPA’s timing and messaging are incorporated into the planned outreach. In order to ensure sufficient time for coordination with SCE, CPA must decide on several key issues early in 2020:

1. Whether CPA will default customers to TOU generation rates, and if so, should the transition take place at the same time SCE is defaulting CPA customers to TOU delivery rates.
2. Whether CPA will mirror SCE’s time of use periods and price structures.
3. Whether CPA will offer 12 months of bill protection like SCE.

Discussion
In June 2019, CPA engaged Energy and Environmental Economics, Inc. (E3) to conduct a study of the impacts of residential TOU default to CPA and its customers. The study was intended to aid staff in developing its recommendations to the Board on whether and how to transition residential customers to TOU rates. At the June 2019 CPA Board Retreat, Brian Horii of E3 gave a presentation on residential default TOU as a kick-off to the study. The study has now been completed and staff plans to present recommendations at the January 9 meeting of the full Board for adoption via resolution.

Recommendation #1: Default TOU Transition and Timing
Staff recommends that CPA default its residential customers\(^2\) to TOU generation rates at the same time that SCE defaults those customers to TOU delivery rates.

Staff believes that the transition to residential TOU rates is an important policy that complements CPA’s goals to decarbonize the grid while providing competitive rates to its customers. Coordinating the timing with SCE will maximize the benefits to CPA customers

\(^2\) Certain exclusions apply as noted above.
of local and statewide TOU education campaigns around the IOU default TOU transition. Additionally, matching the timing of SCE’s transition will minimize customer confusion.

The below table summarizes the benefits and risks of default TOU transition for CPA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aligns rates with procurement costs and provides more accurate price signals to customers</td>
<td>Bill increases for customers with high on-peak usage (mitigated by bill protection in first year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports CPA grid decarbonization goals</td>
<td>Potential customer confusion and dissatisfaction with TOU design and rollout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports greater adoption of DERs and energy management technology</td>
<td>Operational, timing, and billing coordination for rollout dependent on SCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinates with changes being made to delivery portion of customer bills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant funds available for customer education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides customers with an opportunity to reduce their electricity bills by shifting consumption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Recommendation #2: TOU Time Periods*

Staff recommends following the same TOU periods as SCE.

The CPUC approved the following TOU offerings from SCE:

- TOU-D-4-9PM, a seasonal TOU rate structure with a peak period from 4pm to 9pm. The summer mid-peak and off-peak rates vary on weekends versus weekdays.
• TOU-D-5-8PM, a seasonal TOU rate structure with a peak period from 5pm to 8pm. The summer mid-peak and off-peak rates vary on weekends versus weekdays.
• Schedule D, for customers desiring to opt out of default TOU rates; a 2-tier, non-TOU design with a high usage charge applied to usage in excess of 400% of the applicable baseline allowance, similar to the existing default residential rate.

The CPUC directed SCE to default eligible domestic customers to their least cost rate among the two TOU-D-4-9PM and TOU-D-5-8PM rates based on 12 months of their historic usage.

E3’s study recommended that CPA offer default TOU generation rates with the same peak periods as SCE, because it will eliminate customer confusion that could be caused by a mismatch in TOU periods between the SCE and CPA portions of the customer bill. Deviating from SCE’s TOU periods would create confusion and could result in customers opting out of TOU rates and/or CPA. Additionally, CPA procures wholesale energy from the same market as SCE and incurs its highest energy costs during the hours of 4PM-9PM, therefore the peak periods defined in the SCE rate structures provide appropriate price signals to CPA’s customers.

Recommendation #3: Bill Protection
Staff recommends offering the same 12 months of bill protection as SCE to support the customer transition to default TOU.

The purpose of the bill protection is to mitigate adverse bill impacts by guaranteeing that customers will not pay more than they would have paid under their old rate structure. Bill protection gives customers time to learn about their new rates and adjust their behavior to mitigate potential negative impacts.

The CPUC has required that the IOUs provide 12 months of bill protection for residential customers transitioning to default TOU. For large rate design changes in other states,
E3’s study confirmed it is common to provide customers with bill protection during a learning period (typically one year).

The main risk related to bill protection is financial impact. The cost of bill protection is difficult to estimate because the impact of TOU rates on customer behavior is uncertain. E3’s study indicated one-time bill protection costs would range between $75,000 to $1.5 million depending on a variety of factors. CPA has the ability to mitigate this risk by including the estimated costs of bill protection as part of the rates charged to all customers. A final decision on how to address the cost of bill protection will be considered in more detail prior to the actual TOU transition in 2021. However, staff believes that the cost of bill protection is worthwhile as a measure to protect customers from bill increases during the default TOU transition period.

**Next Steps**
If approved by the Board, Staff will share CPA’s policy with SCE and proceed with the necessary coordination steps related to the rollout.

As the implementation date for default TOU approaches, staff will evaluate the exact rate design needed to fully implement the transitions. One approach studied by E3 would be to match the same on-peak, mid-peak, and off-peak TOU periods as SCE TOU rates (as already recommended by staff) but base actual rates on CPA’s revenue requirements, rather than mirroring SCE’s TOU rates. SCE’s TOU rates are designed to be revenue neutral based on SCE revenue requirements for all customers across its larger, and generally hotter, service territory. CPA’s revenue requirements for customers in a more milder climate are different.

Basing rates on CPA’s revenue requirements would result in different price differentials (ratios) between the on-peak and off-peak rates than those offered by SCE and those ratios could be optimized rates for different policy or financial goals. This type of approach, and others, would be looked at in the context of a larger policy discussion about transitioning to Cost of Service based ratemaking.
MEMBER JURISDICTION’S CHANGE IN DEFAULT RATE POLICY

On January 9, staff will seek direction from the Board on a specific policy to guide the implementation process for when a CPA member jurisdiction changes its default renewable energy tier. The core recommendations are:

- Require at least six months between when a jurisdiction notifies CPA of its decision to change its default and implementation of the default change.
- Set October as the implementation month for community-wide default changes.
- Require a minimum of two direct customer notifications to communicate the default change.
- Authorize staff to make key operational decisions, including the ability to delay changing the default rate of certain customer classes for administrative or financial reasons.

Background

In October, the City of Malibu became the first CPA jurisdiction to decide to change its default with its City Council voting to change its community-wide default from Clean Power (50% renewable energy content) to 100% Green Power. This decision was a follow up to the City’s formal endorsement of the declaration of a “climate emergency.” The Council requested “regional collaboration on an immediate just transition and emergency mobilization effort to restore a safe climate.” The City committed to eliminate all greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions at emergency speed and specified that opting its default tier up was a pathway for doing so, while also advocating for other cities and levels of government to do the same.

CPA anticipates that more jurisdictions may change their default renewable tier (Lean Power, Clean Power, 100% Green Power) from the original selections made in 2018. (current list of defaults provided as Attachment 1). For example, Los Angeles County’s 2019 sustainability plan indicates the County will change its default from Clean Power to 100% Green Power by 2025.

Policy Considerations
Policy Component #1: Advance Notice by Member Agencies
The proposed policy would require jurisdictions to give CPA a minimum six months advance notice of its decision to change the default prior to CPA implementing the change. This is required from an energy procurement and operational planning standpoint, ensuring that CPA and its partners have enough time to adequately prepare.

On the procurement side, the six month advance notice is needed for CPA to purchase enough renewable resources to meet the expected change in demand when the default rate is updated, while taking into account anticipated opt-out rates similar to CPA’s approach during mass enrollment. The policy would also allow CPA time to determine what regulatory compliance and reporting is needed, if any, in response to changes in CPA members’ default tiers.

Six months advance notice will also allow sufficient time for CPA and Calpine to manage any data management and operational adjustments, for CPA to examine any rate setting implications, to work with SCE on any necessary billing considerations, to prepare the Customer Service Center for additional contacts, and to plan for any other backend accommodations.

Policy Component #2: October Default Change Implementation
The proposed policy would establish that default changes go into effect in October. CPA believes that implementing any community-wide default increase on a customer’s October meter-read date of each year is preferable so that an increase in customers’ rates corresponds with the change between summer (higher) and winter (lower) rates, and the month-to-month bill comparison impact of the default change is less substantial.

Policy Component #3: Customer Communications
The policy would establish minimum guidelines for communicating default changes to customers, specifically that CPA notify (via direct communication / mailer) customers at least twice ahead of the default change, as is used for initial customer enrollment.
During the time period between when a member jurisdiction makes a decision to change its default and the October implementation, CPA will work with the jurisdiction to develop and implement a comprehensive communication and outreach plan. It is likely that more localized city/county branding will be used for the change in default rate tiers (compared to mass enrollment) since it is the specific jurisdiction making the determination to change the default, not CPA. In addition, customized communications for highly price conscious non-residential customers will be required.

*Policy Component #4: Operational Considerations*

The policy would specify other considerations and authorizations to guide CPA and its members in the implementation of community wide default changes, such as:

- Establishing the right of customers to proactively notify CPA of their desire to remain with their current choice and not be opted to a different default.
- Keeping customers who have affirmatively opted to an energy rate option (different from their initial default rate) at their selected rate.
- Authorizing staff to alter the timing or method of default change for particular customer classes, including CARE/FERA/Medical Baseline customers, master metered customers, and subset customers, among others. These alterations could be necessary for fiscal, marketing or other operational reasons.

Staff is seeking feedback from the Executive Committee on the proposed policy components. Staff will continue to engage in discussions with Calpine and incorporate input from the Executive Committee prior to presenting a policy and implementation for Board consideration in 2020.

**Attachments:**

1) Draft January 9, 2020 Board Meeting Agenda
2) List of CPA Member Agency Default Tiers
REGULAR MEETING of the Board of Directors of the Clean Power Alliance of Southern California
Thursday, January 9, 2020
2:00 p.m.

I. WELCOME AND ROLL CALL

II. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

III. CONSENT AGENDA
1. Approve Minutes from December 5, 2019 Board of Directors Meeting

IV. REGULAR AGENDA
2. Residential Time-of-Use (TOU) Rates
3. Implementation Process for Community Default Tier Change

V. MANAGEMENT UPDATE

VI. COMMITTEE CHAIR UPDATES
Director Lindsey Horvath, Chair, Legislative & Regulatory Committee
Director Julian Gold, Chair, Finance Committee
Director Carmen Ramirez, Chair, Energy Planning & Resources Committee

VII. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

VIII. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

IX. ADJOURN – TO REGULAR MEETING January 9, 2019
**Member Agency Default Tier Choices - As of November 6, 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Name</th>
<th>Default Power Product</th>
<th>Renewables Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agoura Hills</td>
<td>Lean Power</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>Lean Power</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calabasas</td>
<td>Lean Power</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camarillo</td>
<td>Lean Power</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne</td>
<td>Lean Power</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramount</td>
<td>Lean Power</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simi Valley</td>
<td>Lean Power</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>Lean Power</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>Clean Power</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hills</td>
<td>Clean Power</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>Clean Power</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont</td>
<td>Clean Power</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>Clean Power</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian Gardens</td>
<td>Clean Power</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>Clean Power</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malibu*</td>
<td>Clean Power</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan Beach</td>
<td>Clean Power</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorpark</td>
<td>Clean Power</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redondo Beach</td>
<td>Clean Power</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Madre</td>
<td>Clean Power</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittier</td>
<td>Clean Power</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver City</td>
<td>100% Green Power</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ojai</td>
<td>100% Green Power</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxnard</td>
<td>100% Green Power</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Hills Estates**</td>
<td>100% Green Power</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>100% Green Power</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pasadena**</td>
<td>100% Green Power</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thousand Oaks</td>
<td>100% Green Power</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura City</td>
<td>100% Green Power</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura County</td>
<td>100% Green Power</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hollywood</td>
<td>100% Green Power</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lean 8
Clean 13
100% Green 10

*The City of Malibu will change its default power product to 100% Green Power in 2020.

**The Cities of Rolling Hills Estates and South Pasadena have 100% Green Power as the default for residential customers, and have Lean Power and Clean Power, respectively, as the defaults for non-residential customers.