

Talking points for Steering Committee Survey

29 Committee Members responded to the survey as yesterday Afternoon. Thanks to all who weighed in!

SURVEY RESULTS:

There were four basic poll questions, along with the opportunity to provide staff with some comment feedback.

The first poll question (Bar Chart 1) asked about the Committee's priorities in addressing the major goals of the CCE established by the Board of Supervisors. Staff hopes to use the results as a guide in determining a logical path for policy discussion and recommendations. All of the original goals (Question / Bar Chart 1) remain as important concepts - this survey simply helps us to organize our discussion about them going forward.

Out of 12 goal statements, the Committees priority preferences seemed to focus most strongly on Goal statements Nos. 1-3 and No. 12, along with a strong nod to number 4. These statements include, in approximate order of priority:

- An administering agency that is financially sustainable, responsive to County and regional priorities, and well-managed
- An electric supply portfolio with higher renewable energy content than is offered by PG&E and also meets/exceeds the State's renewable portfolio standard
- Overall rates and bills that are lower than or competitive with those offered by PG&E
- An electric supply portfolio with a lower Greenhouse gas intensity than PG&E; and
- An electric supply portfolio and CCE program offerings that support City and County climate action plan goals.

Staff gathers that these preferences in no way diminish the importance of the remaining goal concepts, but suggest that they would logically be addressed subsequent to discussion of the 5 described above.

Question 2 / Bar Chart 2 gets more to the idea of which topics the Committee finds most pressing / interesting overall. It is important to remember here that although the Committee may select a handful of these topics to begin the public discussion, these issues will also have myriad connections to all of the other topics listed in Question 2 and back to the Goals of Question 1. The discussion will naturally integrate these topics as the Committee proceeds, and the process of policy-making could be very iterative. Every topic is important, and each one should have a fair hearing.

Out of 12 topic categories, the Committees, there was a fairly clear ranking in terms of high interest. In order of highest interest ranking, the topics are:

(REFER TO CHART)

These issues are all important, but Staff gathers that the Committee has ranked them according to the complexity of the issues and desire to learn more about them. Staff will use this ranking to try to prioritize information for presentation to the Committee.

Pie chart 1 – asks about the best way to keep municipal colleagues informed about the process. The result is a near even split between Periodic updates at existing municipal meetings, such as mayor’s conferences, and periodic updates for City Councils. Perhaps we can schedule both types of presentations; Staff requests that any City reps who would like a specific presentation to their City Councils to let us know so we can begin schedule informational sessions for you.

Pie Chart 2 – asks about meeting frequency preference. Monthly meetings win a plurality of the poll, with the categories of “every other month” or “as-needed for action items” combined to round out most of the chart. Staff will take this info into account, and we’ll see what we can come up with. For now, to keep things moving, we will probably try to stick to monthly meetings.

Finally – we have a series of comments, both on Questions 1 and 2 and on the entire process. These comments are basically self-explanatory, most are substantive and useful, and that we’ll do our best to use the ideas in them to improve the process.

One comment I do want to highlight is No.2 on page 7 of your handout, which talks about creating a publicly observable online message board. This sounds like an interesting idea, but I am not certain that it meets the Brown Act standards under which this Committee operates. We need to check into that one more.