



Board Officers

Barbara Hale, CleanPowerSF
President

Geof Syphers, Sonoma Clean
Power
Vice President

Dawn Weisz, MCE
Secretary

Tom Habashi, Silicon Valley
Clean Energy
Treasurer

Joseph Moon, Apple Valley
Choice Energy

Jason Caudle, Lancaster Choice
Energy

Jan Pepper, Peninsula Clean
Energy

Matthew Marshall, Redwood
Coast Energy Authority

Affiliate Members

Central Coast Power
(*Santa Barbara, San Louis
Obispo, and Ventura County*)

City of Corona

City of Hermosa Beach

City of San Jose

County of Los Angeles

County of Placer

Valley Clean Energy

(*City of Davis and Yolo County*)

**California Community
Choice Association**

1125 Tamalpais Ave
San Rafael, CA 94901

(415) 464-6689
info@cal-cca.org
www.cal-cca.org

March 1, 2017

The Honorable Ben Hueso, Chair
Senate Energy, Utilities & Communications Committee
State Capitol, Room 4035
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: SB 618 (Bradford)—OPPOSE

Dear Senator Hueso,

The California Community Choice Association (CalCCA) writes to oppose SB 618 (Bradford), because it is unnecessary and contrary to the legislative and regulatory framework governing local control of Community Choice Aggregators (CCAs). The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) is already charged with certifying the resource plan of each CCA to ensure that it meets State law requirements.

CCAs have a mission to provide reliable, clean and affordable power while addressing the local needs of their communities. CalCCA's membership consists of 7 preoperational and 8 CCA members operating in more than 10 coastal and inland counties currently serving a peak load of 1917 MW and growing.

CCAs are local, non-profit agencies that are formed to respond to and invest in the needs of their communities. They are established by local governments to advance local policy priorities including procuring GHG-free renewable energy beyond the renewable portfolio standard, providing ratepayers with energy choice, providing less expensive energy and creating local programs for energy efficiency, storage and distributed generation, all while exercising local control over energy procurement. CCAs are governed and operated by boards consisting entirely of local elected officials who are directly accountable to their ratepayers/voters. Members of the community and public are active in this process and often show up to participate in city council meetings to hold accountable those ultimately responsible for the CCA.

In contrast, Investor Owned Utilities (IOUs) are for-profit corporations with a legal obligation to maximize profits for their shareholders. CPUC and CEC regulators exist, in part, to balance this motivation with the public interest. The CPUC must regulate IOUs to provide a degree of consumer protection including in the context of resource planning compliance with the RPS.

The CCAs were proud to support SB 350 (DeLeon, Clean Energy and Pollution Reduction Act of 2015), as it shared our mission of procuring more in-state renewable resources, while encouraging energy efficiency programs for our customers. SB 350 requires CCAs to participate in the same renewable portfolio standard program, subject to the same terms and conditions as an investor owned utility (IOU). In addition, all CCAs must submit an Integrated Resource Plan (IRP)

with the CPUC demonstrating that the CCA will meet regulatory mandates related to RPS, Greenhouse Gas reductions and Resource Adequacy. These plans are thoughtfully and substantively deliberated upon then approved by our own public governing boards in an open process.

Given CCAs are locally governed electricity providers without profit motive, SB 350 did not require CPUC approval of CCA IRPs. Rather, CCAs are required to submit these plans to the CPUC for certification. This ensures that CCAs meet the requirements of state law. Thus, like the California Energy Commission in the case of publicly owned utilities, the CPUC is already charged with ensuring that CCAs meet their statutory obligations.

SB 618 vests the CPUC with authority to approve or disapprove a CCA's IRP beyond assuring compliance with the requirements of state law. This unduly interferes with the ability of CCAs to locally control electricity procurement, subject to state mandates applicable to all load serving entities.

Finally, SB 350 became effective law on January 1, 2015, only 14 months ago. The CPUC is still in the process of implementing the CCA IRP process as directed in SB 350 and approved by the Senate. Thus, nothing has occurred since the passage of SB 350 that would warrant a change to the CCA IRP process established in SB 350. The Legislature should allow the CCA IRP process it created in SB 350 to operate before determining whether changes are needed.

For the above reasons, CalCCA must respectfully oppose SB 618 and asks that you not support the bill when it comes before your committee.

Sincerely,



Barbara Hale
President
CalCCA

Cc: Members of the Senate Energy, Utilities & Communications Committee
Jay Dickinson, Consultant, Senate Energy, Utilities & Communications Committee
Nidia Bautista, Consultant, Senate Energy, Utilities & Communications Committee
Kerry Yoshida, Republican Consultant, Senate Energy, Utilities & Communications Committee