

Environmental Quality Commission



REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

Date: 9/16/2020

Time: 5:00 p.m.

Special Meeting Location: Zoom.us/join – ID# 915 4675 0502

NOVEL CORONAVIRUS, COVID-19, EMERGENCY ADVISORY NOTICE

On March 19, 2020, the Governor ordered a statewide stay-at-home order calling on all individuals living in the State of California to stay at home or at their place of residence to slow the spread of the COVID-19 virus. Additionally, the Governor has temporarily suspended certain requirements of the Brown Act. For the duration of the shelter in place order, the following public meeting protocols will apply.

Teleconference meeting: All members of the Environmental Quality Commission, city staff, applicants, and members of the public will be participating by teleconference. To promote social distancing while allowing essential governmental functions to continue, the Governor has temporarily waived portions of the open meetings act and rules pertaining to teleconference meetings. This meeting is conducted in compliance with the Governor Executive Order N-25-20 issued March 12, 2020, and supplemental Executive Order N-29-20 issued March 17, 2020.

- How to participate in the meeting
 - Access the special meeting real-time online at:
[Zoom.us/join](https://zoom.us/join) – Regular Meeting ID 915 4675 0502
 - Access the regular meeting real-time via telephone (listen only mode) at:
(669) 900-6833 Regular Meeting ID # 959 6579 2741

Subject to Change: Given the current public health emergency and the rapidly evolving federal, state, county and local orders, the format of this meeting may be altered or the meeting may be canceled. You may check on the status of the meeting by visiting the City's website www.menlopark.org. The instructions for logging on to the Zoom webinar and/or the access code is subject to change. If you have difficulty accessing the Zoom webinar, please check the latest online edition of the posted agenda for updated information (menlopark.org/agenda).

Regular Session ([Zoom.us/join](https://zoom.us/join) – ID# 915 4675 0502)

A. Call To Order

B. Roll Call

C. Regular Business

C1. Approve August 19, 2020 minutes ([Attachment](#))

C2. Review and discuss electric vehicle charging gap analysis for multifamily properties and proposed next steps ([Attachment](#))

- C3. Review and discuss subcommittee's memorandum to move forward on strategies 2, 4, and 6 of the adopted climate action plan ([Attachment](#))
- C4. Discuss public engagement strategy for climate action plan strategies No.1 (existing building electrification and No.3 (electric vehicle charging infrastructure)
- C5. Discuss Chair's annual report to City Council

D. Reports and Announcements

- D1. Upcoming agenda items and requests
- D2. Staff and commissioner updates

E. Adjournment

At every Regular Meeting of the Commission, in addition to the Public Comment period where the public shall have the right to address the Commission on any matters of public interest not listed on the agenda, members of the public have the right to directly address the Commission on any item listed on the agenda at a time designated by the Chair, either before or during the Commission's consideration of the item.

At every Special Meeting of the Commission, members of the public have the right to directly address the Commission on any item listed on the agenda at a time designated by the Chair, either before or during consideration of the item.

For appeal hearings, appellant and applicant shall each have 10 minutes for presentations.

If you challenge any of the items listed on this agenda in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the City of Menlo Park at, or prior to, the public hearing.

Any writing that is distributed to a majority of the City Council by any person in connection with an agenda item is a public record (subject to any exemption under the Public Records Act) and is available by request by emailing the city clerk at jaherren@menlopark.org. Persons with disabilities, who require auxiliary aids or services in attending or participating in Commission meetings, may call the City Clerk's Office at 650-330-6620.

Agendas are posted in accordance with Government Code §54954.2(a) or §54956. Members of the public can view electronic agendas and staff reports by accessing the City website at menlopark.org/agenda and can receive email notification of agenda and staff report postings by subscribing to the "Notify Me" service at menlopark.org/notifyme. Agendas and staff reports may also be obtained by contacting City Clerk at 650-330-6620. (Posted: 09/13/2020)



REGULAR MEETING MINUTES – DRAFT

Date: 8/19/2020

Time: 5:00 p.m.

Special Meeting Location: Zoom.us/join – ID# 915 4675 0502

A. Chair Price called the meeting to order at 5:15 p.m.

B. Roll Call

Present: Gaillard, Kabat, London, Martin, Payne (Vice Chair), Price (Chair)

Absent: None

Staff: Sustainability Manager Rebecca Lucky, City Arborist Christian Bonner, Sustainability Specialist Joanna Chen

C. Public Comment

- Vish Wasganesan commented on Yellow Tin, a company that provides an online platform educating community members on the benefits of electrification and clean energy.

D. Regular Business

D1. Approve June 24, 2020 minutes

Chair Price introduced item.

ACTION: Motion and second (Gaillard/London) to approve June 24, 2020, passed unanimously.

D2. Issue determination on appeal of staff's denial of three heritage tree removal permits at 2458 and 2460 Sharon Oaks Drive

Sustainability Specialist Joanna Chen and City Arborist Christian Bonner made a presentation (Attachment).

Appellant made a presentation (Attachment)

Permit applicant made a presentation (Attachment)

- Peter Edmonds spoke in opposition of removing the tree.
- Michael Young from Urban Tree Management spoke in support of removing the tree.

ACTION: Motion and second (Martin/London), to uphold staff's decision to deny tree removal, passed unanimously.

The Commission took a break at 7:21 p.m.

The Commission reconvened at 7:29 p.m.

D3. Review and discuss climate action plan subcommittee recommendations to move forward on strategies 2, 4, and 6 of the adopted climate action plan

Commissioner Gaillard provided an overview of the recommendations

ACTION: Motion and second (London, Price), to form an ad hoc subcommittee consisting of Commissioner Gaillard and Commissioner London, to clarify roles and refine scope for climate action plan items 2, 4, and 6 that would have minimal impact on staff resources and return to the EQC for further discussion, passed unanimously.

D4. Select chair and vice chair

Chair Price introduced the item.

- Peter Edmonds spoke about his experience and qualifications.

ACTION: Motion and second (Martin/Kabat) to select Commissioner Price as chair and Commissioner London as vice chair, passed unanimously.

E. Adjournment

Chair Price adjourned the meeting at 9:12 p.m.

Rebecca Lucky, Sustainability Manager



STAFF REPORT

Environmental Quality Commission

Meeting Date: 9/16/2020

Staff Report Number: 20-004-EQC

Choose an item.

Review and discuss electric vehicle charging gap analysis for multifamily properties and proposed next steps

Recommendation

Staff recommends the Environment Quality Commission review and discuss electric vehicle charging gap analysis for multifamily properties and proposed next steps.

Policy Issues

In 2019, the City Council declared a climate emergency (Resolution 6525) which committing to catalyze accelerated climate action. In July 2020, the City adopted a new Climate Action Plan (CAP) with the bold goal to reach carbon neutrality (zero emissions) by 2030.

Background

Since the adoption of Menlo Park's first Climate Action Plan (2009), the transportation sector has been the identified as the largest contributor to communitywide greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. As of 2017, transportation represents over 50 percent of communitywide emissions and without significant improvements to transportation demand management and/or shifts to low carbon fuel alternatives, they are predicted to increase by an additional 44 percent by 2030.

The City of Menlo Park recognizes the importance of immediate and meaningful climate action and has adopted the 2030 goal of carbon neutrality. Carbon neutrality is defined as defined as a 90 percent reduction of community GHG emissions with the remaining 10 percent to be sequestered through direct carbon sinks. The following 2030 CAP strategies are committed to addressing transportation emissions:

- Strategy number 2: increase electric vehicles (EV) and decrease gasoline sales
- Strategy number 3: expand access to electric vehicle charging infrastructure
- Strategy number 4: reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 25 percent

It is important to highlight, in order to achieve the deep reductions necessary in the transportation sector, an overall reduction of individual vehicle miles traveled (VMT) is essential. However, for unavoidable individual vehicle travel, zero-emission options are also necessary. Plug-in electric (battery and plug-in hybrid electric) vehicles are more efficient and less polluting than most conventional internal combustion engine (gasoline/diesel fuel) vehicles.

Given current market trends and to take advantage of Menlo Park's renewably sourced, greenhouse gas free electricity, the expansion of electric vehicle charging infrastructure with a focus on providing on-site charging to multifamily properties should be prioritized. These properties make up roughly 40 percent of the existing housing stock in Menlo Park, and less than 2.5 percent have charging available at or near (within

0.25 miles) their respective locations. Due to this lack of convenient charging, multifamily residents have the lowest purchase of electric vehicles.

This warrants local policy action to require a certain level of charging at or near multifamily properties. Without policy requirements in this area, Menlo Park will not be able to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030, and property owners will not realize on-site charging is a necessity and not an amenity in the face of climate change.

Staff has been working to complete an EV infrastructure gap and policy option analysis. Currently, the gap analysis portion is complete. Staff has found significant evidence that lack of on-site charging is the cause of substantial equity and barrier issues for multifamily residents to purchase electric vehicles. On-site resident charging is necessary to increase the purchase of EVs (strategy No.2) and to reduce VMT (strategy No.4).

The following is a high-level summary of gap analysis; a comprehensive gap analysis will be presented to City Council at a study session next month. The outcome of the City Council direction will define further work to analyze potential policies to close the equity gap and barriers faced by multifamily residents.

Analysis

The electric vehicle market is rapidly evolving. Plug-in electric vehicles are very efficient, and most newer models have enough range to meet a typical driver's needs for days without recharging. For most drivers, this means daily energy usage can be met with charging from a standard household (110-volt) outlet. It is no wonder that University of California, Davis reports access to home charging as the most influential location to encourage consumers to purchase PEVs. However, this places multifamily residents at a disadvantage.

Unlike private parking (e.g. adjoining driveways or garages) available to single family homes, multifamily parking is usually shared/centralized, separated from units by common or public spaces (e.g. sidewalks, roadways, etc.). Multifamily parking spaces also usually lack electrical outlets and intervening common or public spaces do not allow for connection to nearby interior outlets (i.e. connecting an extension cord from a driver's personal unit to an electric vehicle).

In fact, although roughly 40 percent of the current population resides in multifamily properties (e.g. apartment/condominiums, townhome, duplex, triplex, etc.), per California Clean Vehicle Rebate Project data, less than 14 percent of San Mateo County residents who have purchased PEVs, live in a multifamily property.

Electric vehicle charging access and equity

Consumer preference and electric vehicle charging behavior

Purchasing an electric vehicle is a large personal investment. In addition to purchase price, potential buyers often consider the lifetime ownership cost including how and where to charge their vehicle.

Electric vehicle charging occurs at four main locations:

- Home, at or near a residence: most common, 50-80% charging events
- Work, at workplace or commute locations: 15-25% of charging events (for drivers that do commute)
- Public, at publicly accessible locations such as grocery stores, parks, etc.: approximately 5 percent of charging events

- Destination, travel corridors where drivers stop during long-distance travel: approximately 5 percent of charging events

While workplace charging is a common alternative for drivers without at-home charging, it still promotes driving to work. This may inadvertently incentivize employees to drive when other even less carbon intensive transportation modes such as walking, biking, or riding public transportation are available. This may also unintentionally maintain the cultural preference for individual vehicle travel and continue to contribute to regional congestion/traffic concerns.

Furthermore, a disruption in commuting patterns, such as the COVID-19 shelter-in-place order, may, for some PEV drivers, remove access to charging completely. This situation can lead to increased competition for space at public and destination charging stations that cost more and are time limited due to high demand. More importantly, it can disrupt daily routines if a special charging trip is required. This can disproportionately impact low income and budget constrained drivers, and drivers with other exceptional circumstances (e.g. drivers who have been laid off or placed on extended furlough, single parents without access to childcare, etc.).

Charging time and costs

Aside from the convenience and confidence that access to home charging engenders, at-home charging is also less expensive than public charging. The cost of electricity varies by time of day and season and costs less when demand is down such as overnight, weekends, and holidays. Unlike multifamily residential customers who often share electricity services (i.e. shared meter), especially in shared/centralized parking areas, single family residential customers may select time of use plans based on how much energy they use and when they use it. These pricing structures further reduce the lifetime cost of electric vehicles, providing more incentive for single family residents to switch to purchasing a PEV and experience deep savings from not using gasoline. Table 1 provides average cost and time to charge based on PEV charging type:

Table 1: Average time and charge time for 100-mile battery electric vehicle			
PEV charging type	Estimated range per hour	Average cost	Total charge time
Level 1	5 miles/hour	\$5.00	20 hours
Level 2	13-25 miles/hour	\$12.00	8 hours
Direct current fast charging (DCFC)	100+ miles/hour	\$13.50	45 minutes

As noted in Table 1, the cost of Level 2 or DCFC (typical charging type available at workplace, public, and destination charging locations) can be more than twice the price of at-home charging (level 1). This increases the lifetime cost for PEV drivers that do not have at-home charging. Please note, the charge time and cost of charging may vary based by model and range of the vehicle. This means, low income or budget constrained drivers who purchase less expensive, shorter range vehicles may require longer and/or more frequent charging events.

Current electric vehicle infrastructure available to multifamily properties

Staff performed a geospatial analysis of current electric vehicle charging infrastructure in areas with

multifamily properties and it clearly displays a lack of convenient at-home charging. As noted in Table 2, less than 1 percent of multifamily residents citywide have access to PEV charging on-site. Furthermore, less than 2.5 percent have convenient access (within 0.25 miles) of their residence.

Table 2: Summary PEV charging spaces available to multifamily properties by type

Multifamily property type	Total units	Public PEV charging on-site	% living units with PEV charging on-site	Public PEV charging ≤0.25 miles	% living units with public PEV charging ≤0.25 miles
Total	5981	58	0.97%	147	2.46%
Owner-occupied condo	729	0	0.00%	18	2.47%
Non-owner occ condo	340	0	0.00%	12	3.53%
Duplex	364	0	0.00%	18	4.95%
Triplex	180	0	0.00%	12	6.67%
Fourplex	920	0	0.00%	12	1.30%
5-9 units	973	0	0.00%	12	1.23%
10-19 units	644	0	0.00%	12	1.86%
20-49 units	409	2	0.49%	39	9.54%
50+ units	1422	56	3.94%	12	0.84%

Owning and operating an electric vehicle without convenient and reliable access to at-home charging requires dedicated planning and lifestyle adjustment. This means, to purchase an electric vehicle, roughly 40 percent of community members must plan and adjust where they work, dine, shop, perform recreation activities and/or devote specific time to charge their vehicle.

Survey response

Considering the importance of at-home charging, multifamily residential property managers were surveyed to identify barriers for electric vehicle charging infrastructure installation. Multifamily properties, ranging in size from 5 to 400 units were contacted with properties 15 units or greater responding in the highest number. Please note, responses may be have impacted by the uncertainty of COVID-19 and its effects on rental market.

Survey respondents identified the following as primary barriers to PEV charging infrastructure installation on-site:

- **Cost:** the installation of electric charging infrastructure requires significant capital investment. Total project costs vary by electric vehicle charging equipment type, project size, and site-specific conditions.
- **Lack of tenant need/request:** tentant request are usually received from prospective tenants and early adopters who have committed to purchasing an electric vehicle. It is unlikely isolated requests for charging would be receieved by current tenants before vehicle purchase would result in the installation of a PEV charging space.
- **Parking reduction/lack of space:** to maximize charging efficiency, most commercial properties (including multifamily) elect to install faster charging options (i.e. level 2 or direct current fast charging), creating a dedicated PEV charging space. Menlo Park is an established community. Multifamily properties are

older and on-site parking is so limited residents require permits for overnight street parking.

Unfortunately, no respondents were currently in the process of installing nor reported having interest in installing charging in the near term (<2 years), though all confirmed electric vehicle charging is a desired amenity. However, nearly all expressed interest some time (>2 years) in the future if the project was most or fully funded by a third party. Contrary to consumer preference and market research, all respondents identified charging as an amenity not a necessity.

Next steps

Unfortunately, rapid adoption of zero-emissions vehicle, especially for multifamily residents, through market forces alone will not achieve the deep emissions reductions required to reach carbon neutrality by 2030. In order to fully implement Climate Action Plan strategies No. 2 (increasing EVs and decreasing gasoline sales) and No. 4 (reduce VMT by 25 percent) significant improvements to the availability of at or near home charging for multifamily residents must be made. This will require a shift in the perception of on-site charging as a necessity opposed to an amenity which will require city policy and programs, in alignment with regional efforts and funding.

The addition of city requirements or policies for multifamily properties is also strongly suggested to further incentivize use of significant funding opportunities. However, additional financing may be needed for any requirements placed on property owners. The next phase of this project includes determining a public engagement strategy, and in-depth policy options analysis. Examples of potential policy options may include, but are not limited to:

1. Require a percentage of electric vehicle charging spaces at existing multifamily properties. For example, if Menlo Park’s current electric vehicle charging code for new construction is applied to existing multifamily properties, it would result in over 900 new charging spaces and provide 15 percent of all multifamily living units with access to on-site charging:

Table 3: Potential EV charging infrastructure for existing multifamily properties

Multifamily property type	Total living units	Current PEV charging spaces on-site	New PEV charging spaces if current building code is applied	% living units with access to PEV charging on-site if current building code is applied
Condominium	1069	0	160	15.00%
Duplex	364	0	55	15.00%
Triplex	180	0	27	15.00%
Fourplex	920	0	138	15.00%
5-9 unit building	973	0	146	15.00%
10-19 unit building	644	0	97	15.00%
20-49 unit building	409	2	63	15.42%
50+ unit building	1422	48	254	17.87%
Total	5981	50	940	15.71%

2. Allow private installation of electric vehicle charging stations in the public right of way adjacent to existing multifamily properties
3. Require all existing private and limited public access (e.g. locations include those in controlled/gated parking area such as hotel or car dealership) located within 0.25 miles of an existing multifamily properties be readily available for public use (including overnight parking). For example, this requirement would make 300 existing PEV charging spaces available to multifamily residents:

Table 4: Potential increase of EV charging infrastructure available to existing multifamily properties

Multifamily property type	Total units	Private PEV charging ≤0.25 miles	Potential increase of living units with access to PEV charging spaces	Limited public access PEV charging ≤0.25 miles	Potential increase of living units with access to PEV charging spaces
Total	5,981	36	0.60%	274	4.58%
owner-occupied condo	729	0	0.00%	51	7.00%
non-owner occ condo	340	0	0.00%	51	15.00%
duplex	364	0	0.00%	51	14.01%
triplex	180	8	4.44%	8	4.44%
fourplex	920	6	0.65%	8	0.87%
5-9 units	973	6	0.62%	8	0.82%
10-19 units	644	11	1.71%	5	0.78%
20-49 units	409	0	0.00%	47	11.49%
50+ units	1422	5	0.35%	45	3.16%

4. Require all publicly accessible, privately owned parking lots and garages within 0.25 mile of an existing multifamily property to install electric vehicle charging spaces
5. Aggressively expand city owned and operated electric vehicle charging infrastructure for public use, prioritizing installation within an area of convenience (≤0.25 miles) for multifamily properties. Potential sites could include, but are not limited to city parks and public rights of way

The Environmental Quality Commission may want to advise the City Council to proceed with the next steps and confirm the policy direction for CAP strategy No.3 (expand access to EV charging infrastructure) at this time or provide further input on policy options.

All potential policy options and engagement strategies are tentatively scheduled to be presented to City Council next month for direction. All policy options selected for further analysis will include possible risks, an assessment of costs and benefits, legal constraints, any associated cost to property owner, impact on rental prices, and implementation process.

Impact on City Resources

There are no additional City resources required for this item. However, resources may be required in the further analysis or implementation of any policy or program option.

Environmental Review

This action is not a project within the meaning of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines §§ 15378 and 15061(b)(3) as it is a minor change that will not result in any direct or indirect physical change in the environment.

Public Notice

Public notification was achieved by posting the agenda, with the agenda items being listed, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.

Attachments

None.

Report prepared by:
Candise Almendral, Sustainability Contractor

Reviewed by:
Rebecca Lucky, Sustainability Manager

MEMORANDUM

Date: 9/11/2020
From: EQC Subcommittee for CAP Actions No. 2, 4 and 6
To: EQC
Re: Resourcing Plan for CAP Action Nos. 4 and 6

This memo seeks EQC approval of a resourcing plan for advancing Actions No. 4 and 6 from the City's approved Climate Action Plan (CAP).

Background

On July 14, Menlo Park's City Council unanimously approved the EQC-approved Climate Action Plan (CAP), which sets a goal of reducing the city's greenhouse gas emissions by 90% from 2005 levels by the year 2030. Recognizing the City's current COVID-related staffing constraints, Council adopted staff's recommendation to move forward this fiscal year on Actions No. 1, 3 and 5 and defer Actions No. 2, 4 and 6 until 2021 and 2022.

Meanwhile, climate change continues to accelerate and a study published in the July issue of Reviews of Geophysics (<https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2019RG000678>) shows that humans are extremely unlikely to keep global temps below 1.5 degrees C, as targeted by the Paris Climate Accords. Instead, it is likely (66%) that temperatures by the end of the century will range from 2.6 to 3.9 degrees C. This is a concerning development, given the much greater damage that will result from this higher temperature range. While it is difficult to predict exactly how much more damage, or how many more feet of sea level rise, will happen in a world that is 2.6-3.9 degrees C warmer, World Resources Institute has estimated that damages roughly double with a half degree temperature increase from 1.5 to 2.0 degrees C (<https://www.wri.org/blog/2018/10/half-degree-and-world-apart-difference-climate-impacts-between-15-c-and-2-c-warming>).

This concerning development compels the EQC CAP subcommittee to recommend accelerating our climate action efforts using whatever means at our disposal, no matter how unconventional. The subcommittee recognizes that City staff is currently time constrained and therefore recommends that members of the EQC and Complete Streets Commission, who are willing and able, assume responsibility for CAP Actions No. 2, 4 and 6, until City staff can begin work on these actions.

Below are two of the three CAP actions that City staff recommended be deferred and that EQC wishes to advance through commissioner effort:

Action	#	Description	Reduction (tons/yr)	Investment for FY 202-2021
Reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 25% or an amount recommended by the Complete Streets Commission	4	<p>Reduce VMT, especially by gasoline vehicles, through a two- pronged approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change zoning to encourage higher density (esp. for housing) near transit • Make the City easier to navigate without a car by accelerating implementation of the Transportation Master Plan with an emphasis on developing a clear network of protected pedestrian/bike paths throughout town <p>Current projects underway that help achieve this goal: SB2 Housing grant, Transportation Management Plan, Transportation Management Association, and implementation of new VMT guidelines for new development</p>	31,743*	Explore in 2021 or 2022 after current and complimentary projects are completed
Develop a climate adaptation plan to protect the community from sea level rise and flooding	6	Develop a climate adaptation plan focused on protecting areas of the community vulnerable to sea level rise and flooding, as forecasted by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and California State agencies. Consider requiring developers to fund efforts to protect the community.	0	Flood and Sea Level Rise Resiliency District to Lead

During the July City Council meeting where the CAP was approved, Council Member Nash requested that relevant City commissions be empowered to work on the deferred actions, until such time as staff has the capacity to begin working on them. Assistant City Manager Mr. Nick Pegueros expressed concern about the level of staff resources needed to support commissioner activity on these actions and required time to assess those needs. This memo is meant to assist City Council and staff in answering any outstanding questions about the staff time and resources needed to support commissioner work on CAP Actions No. 4 and 6.

Creation of Ad Hoc Subcommittee for Actions No. 2, 4 and 6

After reviewing the CAP Subcommittee’s recommendation to move forward on Actions No. 2, 4 and 6, at an August 19 meeting, the EQC expressed support for the recommendation but decided it needed more information on the staff time that would be required to support commissioner work on these actions. An ad hoc subcommittee was formed to draft resource plans for Actions No. 2, 4 and 6, and to clearly define any needs for staff support so that both could be presented to City Council for consideration. A complete resource plan is presented for Action No. 2 in a separate memo.

Moving Forward on Action No. 4

In order to move forward on CAP Action No. 4, the subcommittee proposes that the EQC recommend to City Council that it empower the Complete Streets Commission do the following:

- 1) Propose a VMT reduction target for Menlo Park and present to Council for approval
- 2) Sort projects in the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) by VMT reduction potential and present those with the highest potential to City Council in October for implementation

Staff time required: None expected

Moving Forward on Actions No. 6

In order to move forward on CAP Action No. 6, the subcommittee proposes that the EQC recommend to City Council that it take one or both of the following steps:

- 1) Request a Council update at least quarterly from City staff who already attend monthly meetings of the **San Mateo County Sea Level Rise Resiliency District Board of Directors**

Staff time required: 3 hours* per quarter to prepare a brief update to Council

* Time estimate made by EQC and not yet confirmed by staff

- 2) Request that EQC send a commissioner every month (4-6pm on the 4th Monday) to meetings of the San Mateo County Sea Level Rise Resiliency District Board of Directors and update Council at the EQC's quarterly updates to Council

Staff time required: None expected

Note: The **San Mateo County Sea Level Rise Resiliency District Board** is comprised of two County Supervisors and Council members from five cities in San Mateo County: San Mateo, Portola Valley, Half Moon Bay, Burlingame and East Palo Alto. Critical decisions, such as whether and where to pursue different sea level rise adaptation strategies throughout the County, for example "managed retreat" versus levees, will likely be deliberated by this body. Assuming that is the case, it will be important for Menlo Park's City Council to stay informed about the Board's activities and upcoming decisions, even if the City does not have an active role on the Board. Environmental Quality Commissioners Gaillard and Kabat learned recently that City-specific adaptation plans submitted to the District for funding may receive priority based on when those plans are submitted, although this has not been confirmed by the District. If this information is correct, it will be important for Menlo Park to expedite the creation of a city-specific plan for adaptation to sea level rise. Currently, Menlo Park staff is not working on such a plan. An April draft of the CIP included \$150,000 for this purpose, but it is unclear whether that allocation was included in the final CIP approved by City Council. District Board meetings are open to the public and any member of the Menlo Park City Council, commissioners or staff can attend. Meetings happen 4-6pm on roughly the 2nd and 4th Mondays of the month and are conducted remotely during COVID. The next meeting is September 28th and the Board meeting calendar is visible here: <https://onshoreline.org/events/2020-09/>.

Recommendation

Given the acceleration of climate change and the catastrophic threat it poses to Menlo Park, we recommend that EQC advance Actions No. 4 and 6 by asking City Council to empower commissioners to address these actions in their free time as outlined above. Action No. 6 probably warrants both staff and Commissioner participation. As demonstrated, the staff time required to support this work, estimated to be just 0-3 hours per quarter, is small, when compared to the significant gain to the City of empowering commissioners to keep moving forward quickly on climate change.

9/16/2020

From: EQC Subcommittee for CAP Actions No. 2, 4 and 6

To: EQC

Re: **Resourcing Plan for CAP Action No. 2**

This memo seeks EQC approval to present a Resourcing Plan to City Council for advancing Action No. 2 from the City's approved Climate Action Plan (CAP), using virtually no city resources, and instead taking advantage of outside resources valued at up to \$375,000 to complete this Action.

Background

The minutes of the City Council July 14, 2020 meeting on p4 reflect that the CAP was adopted, including Action 2 relating to gasoline sales reduction and EV adoption goals:

ACTION: Motion and second (Combs/ Nash) to adopt Resolution No. 6575 to **adopt the 2030 Climate Action Plan** as amended with staff's implementation strategy that would initiate work this year on three of the six actions which are No. 1 (existing building electrification), No. 3 (electric vehicle infrastructure), and No. 5 (greenhouse gas free municipal operations); and update action No. 1 to explore the conversion of 95% of existing buildings to all electric by 2030; **and for Environmental Quality Commission to prepare advice this year in partnership with staff on how to accomplish the remaining three actions (No. 2, 4, and 6)**, passed unanimously (Attachment).

Proposal: Adopt Resourcing Plan for CAP Action 2

A prominent regional entity proposes to add a "Beyond Gasoline" initiative (BGI) to its initiatives, to be run by Commissioner London's nonprofit Coltura. If this initiative is approved on September 25 as anticipated, BGI would dedicate resources to creating a communications campaign targeting Silicon Valley gasoline reduction and EV adoption, including in Menlo Park. For Menlo Park it would begin with the goals stated in CAP Action 2, recognizing that City Council may adjust those goals and/or the approach in the future as needed. BGI would provide regular updates to Council and staff on its progress.

Key goals of the Beyond Gasoline Initiative (BGI)

- *Build consensus and buy-in* among key stakeholders (businesses, groups/orgs, schools, frontline communities, etc) on gasoline reduction goals and how to achieve them.
- *Build momentum with a communications campaign.* Use social media and a website to educate residents, businesses, community leaders about goals, progress, how-to, pledge etc.
- *Track success.* Track, publicize, celebrate progress toward goals, primarily via website and social media.
- *Ensure equity for all* and a just transition for those adversely impacted by moving Beyond Gasoline.

Resources:

- City resources: maximum of 1 hour/month
- Outside resources: 4 staff, around 200 hours/month
- Estimated value of outside resources: up to \$375,000

Minimal City Resources

BGI would adopt Menlo Park’s public communication standards and use them to draft one social media post per month conforming to those standards. The City’s Public Engagement Manager would review the draft, and, to the extent possible, include the post in one or more of the city’s social media channels, such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, city electronic newsletter or citywide Nextdoor post.

Full Resource Plan: Oct 2020 to Oct 2021

Staffing	Resource	Est. Value
Project Lead	BGI	\$90k
Project Manager	BGI	\$80k
Comms Director	BGI	\$75k
Development Director	BGI	\$80k
Contracted Services, Materials	BGI	\$50k
TOTAL		\$375,000
Tasks	Resource	
Present to stakeholders/obtain input/refine plan	BGI	
Design/develop/host BGI website*	BGI	
Develop metrics dashboard/obtain metrics	BGI	
Develop BGI comms plan	BGI	
Develop BGI toolkit for community leaders	BGI	
Draft social media posts	BGI	
Draft press releases	BGI	
Design celebration events	BGI	
Approve up to 1 post/month (drafted by BGI) for city social media platforms (FB, Twitter, Insta, City newsletter, NextDoor)	City Public Engagement Mgr	

*Website to be built and maintained by the BGI. Pages planned include:

- Metrics, milestones and progress:
 - Gasoline sales
 - EV adoption
 - EV prevalence
- Gasoline-free vision
- The case for cutting gasoline use
- How to cut your gasoline use
- Supporting equity and a just transition for gas station owners
- Take the Beyond Gasoline pledge
- Incentives/programs for Zero Emissions Vehicles (ZEV)
- Myths/facts about EVs
- Success stories

