



Board of Directors Meeting

Wednesday, September 18, 2024

6:00 pm

In Person

The Lake Merritt Room
Cal State East Bay - the Oakland Center
In the Transpacific Centre
1000 Broadway, Suite 109
Oakland, CA 94607

Or from the following remote locations:

- Clipper Club - 5 Captain Dr. Emeryville, CA 94608
- Dublin City Hall - 100 Civic Plaza, Dublin, CA 94568
- Conference Room - Irvington Community Center 41885 Blacow Rd. Fremont, CA 94538
- 1755 Harvest Landing Lane, Tracy, CA 95376
- C. Baldwin (Lobby), Curio Collection by Hilton, 400 Dallas St, Houston, TX 77002
- 24015 Wilcox Ln, Hayward, CA 94541

Via Zoom:

<https://ebce-org.zoom.us/j/87023071843>

Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location): US: +1 669 900 6833 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 929 205 6099 or +1 301 715 8592 or 888 475 4499 (Toll Free) or 877 853 5257 (Toll Free)

Webinar ID: 870 2307 1843

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 the Clerk of the Board at least 2 working days before the meeting at (510) 906-0491 or cob@avaenergy.org.

If you have anything that you wish to be distributed to the Board of Directors, please email it to the clerk by 5:00 pm the day prior to the meeting.

- 1. Welcome & Roll Call**
- 2. Pledge of Allegiance**
- 3. Public Comment**

This item is reserved for persons wishing to address the Board on any Ava Community Energy-related matters that are not otherwise on this meeting agenda. Public comments on matters listed on the agenda shall be heard at the time the matter is called. As with all public comment, members of the public who wish to address the Board are customarily limited to two minutes per speaker and must complete an electronic speaker slip. The Board Chair may increase or decrease the time allotted to each speaker.

4. Closed Session Public Comment

5. Closed Session

- A.** Conference with Real Property Negotiators pursuant to Government Code § 54956.8: 251 8th Street (Negotiators: CEO Howard Chang, General Counsel Inder Khalsa) (price and terms of payment).

6. General Report Out of Closed Session

CONSENT AGENDA

7. Approval of Minutes from July 17, 2024

8. Contracts Entered into (Informational Item)

9. EV Charging Community Investment Grant

Consider authorizing the CEO to negotiate and execute two grant agreements for the purpose of installing community-owned Electric Vehicle (“EV”) charging sites.

10. Solar and Storage Program Design Consultant

Consider contracting with consultant to support Ava’s Solar & Storage program design process

11. Ballot Initiative Discussion

Consider taking a position on Proposition 4

12. Hourly Pricing Pilots

Consider resolution to participate in hourly flex pricing pilots with PG&E.

REGULAR AGENDA

13. CEO Report

14. CAC Chair Report.

15. Nuclear Allocation Decision (Action Item)

Consider Diablo Canyon Nuclear Allocation

16. Board Member and Staff Announcements including requests to place items on future Board agendas

17. Adjourn

The next Board of Directors meeting will be held on Wednesday, October 16, 2024 at 6:00 pm.

The Lake Merritt Room
Cal State East Bay - the Oakland Center
In the Transpacific Centre
1000 Broadway, Suite 109
Oakland, CA 94607



Draft Minutes
Board of Directors Meeting

Wednesday, July 17, 2024
6:00 pm

In Person

The Lake Merritt Room
Cal State East Bay - the Oakland Center
In the Transpacific Centre
1000 Broadway, Suite 109
Oakland, CA 94607

Or from the following remote locations:

- Clipper Club - 5 Captain Dr. Emeryville, CA 94608
- Dublin City Hall - 100 Civic Plaza, Dublin, CA 94568
- Conference Room - Irvington Community Center 41885 Blacow Rd. Fremont, CA 94538
- The Diplomat Beach Resort, Curio Collection by Hilton – 3555 South Ocean Drive, Hollywood, FL 33019
- 1755 Harvest Landing Lane, Tracy, CA 95376
- 33349 9th Street (back office) Union City, CA 94587

Via Zoom:

<https://ebce-org.zoom.us/j/87023071843>

Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location): US: +1 669 900 6833 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 929 205 6099 or +1 301 715 8592 or 888 475 4499 (Toll Free) or 877 853 5257 (Toll Free)
Webinar ID: 870 2307 1843

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 the Clerk of the Board at least 2 working days before the meeting at (510) 906-0491 or cob@avaenergy.org.

If you have anything that you wish to be distributed to the Board of Directors, please email it to the clerk by 5:00 pm the day prior to the meeting.

1. Welcome & Roll Call

Present: Directors: Marquez (Alameda County), Qaadri (Dublin), Kaur (Emeryville), Cox (Fremont), Roche (Hayward), Diallo (Lathrop), Jorgens (Newark), Kalb (Oakland), McCarthy (Piedmont), Gonzalez (San Leandro), Wright (Stockton), Bedolla (Tracy), CAC Chair Hernandez (Community Advisory Committee), Vice-Chair Tiedemann (Albany) and Chair Balch (Pleasanton)

Not Present: Directors: Tregub (Berkeley), Barrientos (Livermore) and Patino (Union City)

Director Qaadri served as the alternate for Director Hu (City of Dublin)

Director McCarthy served as the alternate for Director Andersen (Piedmont)

Director Diallo joined the meeting at 6:33pm.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

(2:47) Director Kalb led the body in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Public Comment

This item is reserved for persons wishing to address the Board on any Ava Community Energy-related matters that are not otherwise on this meeting agenda. Public comments on matters listed on the agenda shall be heard at the time the matter is called. As with all public comment, members of the public who wish to address the Board are customarily limited to two minutes per speaker and must complete an electronic speaker slip. The Board Chair may increase or decrease the time allotted to each speaker.

(4:09) Public Comment - Audrey Ichinose, representing East Bay Clean Power Alliance and California Alliance for Community Energy, advocated for Ava to explore resilience hubs as a means to support local economic development, protect disadvantaged communities from climate impacts, and potentially serve as community microgrids that supply locally generated electricity.

(6:31) Public Comment – Colin Cook Miller, representing the Reclaim Our Power Utility Justice Campaign, urged the board to maintain Ava’s commitment to 100% local clean renewable energy by rejecting any future offers of nuclear power from PG&E.

(8:37) Public Comment – Celina Feliciano, representing East Bay Clean Power Alliance and Energy Democracy Project, urged the board to reject any future nuclear power allotments. Celina Feliciano also spoke about the need for clean, accessible energy that supports communities without harmful environmental impacts.

(10:43) Public Comment – Jessica Tovar, representing Local Clean Energy Alliance (LCEA), expressed concern that the nuclear allocation had been agendized before PG&E had filed its advice letter. Jessica Tovar also stated that LCEA has a petition with 238 signatures and sign-on letters from 27 organizations opposing the inclusion of nuclear power inclusion in Ava’s energy mix.

(13:04) Public Comment – Susan Silber, representing Collective Resilience and East Bay Clean Power Alliance, urged the board to reject PG&E's nuclear offer and expressed strong support for the board to fund resilience hubs.

(15:08) Public Comment – Beth Weinberger, representing Kehilla Community Synagogue, stated that as a public agency committed to clean energy, Ava should reject PG&E's nuclear offer and all future nuclear power proposals.

(16:40) Public Comment – Emily Ross, representing the Reclaim Our Power Utility Justice Campaign, urged the board to reject any future PG&E nuclear energy offers.

(18:01) Public Comment – Ayla Peters Paz, representing Local Clean Energy Alliance, thanked the board for their interest in resilience hubs and extended an invitation to organize a study session to discuss community resilience work within Ava's service territory.

(20:00) Public Comment – Hernando Sanchez, representing Local Clean Energy Alliance, urged Ava to reject nuclear allotments from PG&E and support in support of funding local resilience hubs.

CONSENT AGENDA

- 4. Approval of Minutes from June 12, 2024**
- 5. Contracts Entered into (Informational Item)**
- 6. Administrative Procurement Policy Update**
Update Ava's Administrative Procurement Policy to more correctly reflect Ava's management structure and to increase the threshold of spend that Vice Presidents and Senior Directors may approve.
- 7. Corsac Station Amendment**
Amendment to Ava's contract with FEC Nevada 1 for Corsac Station geothermal project
- 8. Thrive Mind Collaborative Contract**
Contract amendment to continue services in FY 24-25.
- 9. Extension to Existing Consulting Service Agreement with Gridscape Solutions**
Extend Consulting Service Agreement with Gridscape Solutions for engineering services
- 10. Consulting Service Agreement with Chen Design Associates**
New Consulting Service Agreement with Chen Design Associates for creative services
- 11. Treasurer's Report**
A report on Ava's bank account balances and other treasury items
- 12. "Exempt Surplus" 251 8th Street**
Approve a resolution declaring 251 8th Street to be "exempt surplus" property pursuant to Government Code Section 54221(f)(1)(B) and directing staff to take next steps, including exploring options for disposition of the property

(23:58) With regards to *Consent Item 6 – Administrative Procurement Policy Update*, **Chair Balch** stated that there is no stacking of authorities or dollar limits. It is à la carte

or individual for each of the authorities granted.

With regards to *Consent Item 12 – “Exempt Surplus” 251 8th Street*, **Chair Balch** stated that Ava would move towards surplus.

(24:30) Director Gonzalez motioned to approve the consent agenda. Director Wright seconded the motion, which was approved 13/0/0/4:

Yes: Directors: Marquez, Qaadri, Kaur, Cox, Roche, Jorgens, Kalb, McCarthy, Gonzelez, Wright, Bedolla, Vice-Chair Tiedemann and Chair Balch

No: none

Abstain: none

Recuse: none

Not Present: Directors: Tregub, Diallo, Barrientos and Patino

REGULAR AGENDA

13. CEO Report

(25:18) CEO Chang began by acknowledging his recent appointment as CEO and Nick's departure. He spoke about his priority to engage more deeply with board members, alternates, city staff, CAC members, and external stakeholders over the coming months.

CEO Chang also spoke about a significant milestone: the ribbon-cutting event for the Scarlet Solar and Storage Project in Fresno County¹. Ava is an off-taker for 100 megawatts of solar and 30 megawatts of storage from this 200 MW solar and 40 MW storage project. He spoke about the project's importance, noting its creation of over 250 union construction jobs and its capacity to power approximately 68,000 California homes.

He summarized recent committee meetings, including the Marketing, Regulatory and Legislative Subcommittee meeting on June 21st, which covered marketing efforts and equity initiatives. Chang detailed several equity programs, such as the California Arrearage Payment Program, which provided nearly \$14 million in COVID debt relief, and \$50 bill credits for CARE/FERA customers totaling over \$12 million. He also discussed ongoing efforts to increase enrollment in CARE/FERA programs through data science and targeted outreach.

CEO Chang mentioned the Finance, Administrative and Procurement Subcommittee meeting on July 10th, which covered topics like the R100 cost allocation methodology, Fremont's R100 citywide opt-up, and San Joaquin County's JPA membership.

Lastly, he introduced new staff members, including Molly Vasquez as HR Operations Manager, and several interns in the public policy (China Duff and Kendall Downey), marketing (Sarah Sprankle), and outreach teams (Avery Kelly). CEO Chang also noted ongoing recruitment efforts to fill additional open roles at the agency.

¹ For more information about the Scarlet Solar and Storage Project please see the July 17, 2024 Ava Press Release at <https://avaenergy.org/news-and-events/edp-renewables-cuts-ribbon-on-scarlet-i-solar-energy-park/>

(34:20) Public Comment – Igor Tregub asked about the possibility of tracking how many customers benefiting from the Net Energy Metering (NEM) adder had existing solar installations compared to those who may have been incentivized to adopt solar due to the adder or other incentives.

CEO Chang responded that it's difficult to distinguish whether the NEM adder was the decisive factor for CARE/FERA customers installing solar or if it was an independent decision. He said that while the adder likely had some impact, multiple factors influence such decisions.

14. CAC Chair Report

(36:37) CAC Chair Hernandez provided a summary of the recent Community Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting, highlighting the following key points:

1. The CAC expressed support for the Fremont R100 default request, new community inclusions, and the e-bike program.
2. The CAC expressed interest in a proposed resilience hub study session offered by the Local Clean Energy Alliance.
3. Member Pacheco provided information about AB 1373, which concerns centralized procurement of long-term resources, particularly 10 gigawatts of offshore wind by 2035.

(38:26) Public Comment – Woody Hastings, representing the Climate Center, stated that the original intention of Community Choice aggregation was to move away from polluting central station models like nuclear power, and instead focus on advancing local, clean energy resources that create jobs and promote environmental justice.

15. Renewable 100 Cost Allocation Methodology (Informational Item)

Review and discuss Renewable 100 and Bright Choice Cost Allocation Methodology

(41:12) CEO Chang presented three different R100 cost allocation methodologies (options A, B, and C). He explained that Option A maintains a blended REC price across both Bright Choice and R100 products, while Options B and C allocate higher marginal costs more towards R100, potentially widening the price differences between the two products. CEO Chang stated that the chosen methodology could have significant implications for Ava's value proposition, customer affordability, and operational complexity.

(1:02:11) Member Roche expressed concern about separating the R100 cost allocation methodology discussion from the Fremont opt-up decision, stating that the two topics are interconnected. **CEO Chang** clarified that the Fremont decision is primarily about approving the opt-up, not setting specific rates, and that any pricing changes wouldn't take effect until the next fiscal year. **Member Roche** also asked about alternative pricing models not based on PG&E's baseline. **CEO Chang** responded that while a few CCAs use different models, most index to their local investor-owned utility, and those using alternative models typically don't offer significant discounts.

(1:07:42) Member Kalb requested that the staff report for the September decision include an analysis of the environmental and climate impacts of different cost allocation options, not just financial considerations. **CEO Chang** acknowledged the difficulty in predicting customer behavior based on price changes but agreed to attempt some scenario analysis to address **Member Kalb's** request.

(1:11:53) Member Marquez asked about the implementation timeline for any new cost allocation methodology, which **CEO Chang** confirmed would not take effect until the next fiscal year. She inquired about customer outreach plans and potential opt-down rates, to which **CEO Chang** explained Ava's notification procedures and noted that historically, more customers choose to opt down rather than opt out when cities default to R100. **Member Marquez** also requested a comprehensive overview of all possible options and their implications when the matter is brought back for decision in September.

(1:15:31) Member Gonzalez asked about the market for Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs), their pricing trends, and how battery storage projects might affect REC prices. **CEO Chang** explained that REC prices are currently high but expected to decrease in the future. He also clarified that battery storage doesn't directly increase renewable energy generation but can serve as a financial hedge. **Member Gonzalez** also asked about the potential impact of different cost allocation options on customer utility bills. **Howard Chang** responded that Option A maintains the status quo while Options B and C would widen the price differential between products.

(1:22:14) Member Cox requested more detailed information about the potential phased implementation of different cost allocation options and their impacts on customer rates. **CEO Chang** explained that the presentation was intentionally simplified in order to focus on the structural impacts rather than specific phasing scenarios.

(1:25:25) Chair Balch asked about the potential for municipalities to opt down due to budgetary concerns and whether this was factored into the analysis of different cost allocation options. **CEO Chang** acknowledged that they had considered this and explained that while it would somewhat offset the impacts, the overall trends across options A, B, and C would remain directionally the same.

(1:27:56) Public Comment – Jessica Tovar spoke about the importance of investing in local renewable energy production as outlined in the local development business plan, arguing that this approach would reduce market dependency, stabilize prices, and generate wealth for local municipalities while transforming communities.

(1:30:21) Public Comment – Igor Tregub asked about the mix and cost implications of bundled versus unbundled RECs and suggested considering the avoided costs and benefits associated with local renewables and distributed energy resources in the 100% renewable alternatives.

(1:32:52) Member Roche asked for more detailed financial analysis of the costs associated with adding new cities like Fremont to the R100 program, particularly in relation to the agency's reserves. **CEO Chang** responded that the current analysis is based on short-term pricing, and that future price changes could significantly alter the

impact of different methodologies. **Member Roche** followed up that she is interested in seeing specific dollar amounts and budget impacts, similar to previous budget projections, to understand if the costs could be absorbed by the agency's reserves.

(1:35:01) Member Gonzalez spoke about the importance of presenting financial impacts in dollar amounts rather than percentages or cents, both for typical customers and the overall budget. He also expressed concern about potential cross-subsidization between different customer groups, particularly highlighting the need to be sensitive to lower-income communities in the Central Valley as the agency expands its service area.

(1:39:33) Chair Balch shared that Pleasanton recently considered switching from Renewable 100 to Bright Choice for budgetary reasons, ultimately voting to maintain Renewable 100 as their default. He suggested that similar discussions may become more common in other municipalities if economic conditions worsen. **Chair Balch** spoke about the importance of carefully considering pricing strategies, given constituents' concerns about electricity costs and reliability issues. He also questioned the agency's approach of basing revenue on PG&E's pricing while using cost-based tracking for expenses.

16. Fremont R100 Default Request (Action Item)

Request from the City of Fremont to opt up some or all customers to R100

(1:41:46) Alex DiGiorgio presented Fremont's request to default all its customers to the Renewable 100 (R100) program. Alex noted that Fremont, with about 17% of Ava's load, would be the largest jurisdiction to date to make this switch. He explained that the board needs to decide on the implementation timeline, either as a single enrollment in 2025 or a phased approach over 2025-2026, with the phased approach potentially mitigating cost impacts.

(1:53:28) Member Roche asked about the breakdown of residential versus commercial customers in Fremont and how phasing the R100 implementation might affect procurement decisions. **Alex DiGiorgio** explained that Fremont has a unique 70/30 split favoring commercial load and suggested that a phased approach could help mitigate cost impacts and allow for more gradual procurement adjustments.

(1:57:57) Member Cox, representing Fremont, expressed gratitude for the collaborative effort between Fremont city staff and Ava staff in planning the R100 default change. She advocated for a phased approach to the R100 implementation, suggesting that residential customers transition in 2025 and commercial in 2026.

(2:00:53) Public Comment – Jessica Tovar spoke about the need for a more coordinated and ongoing debt relief program to help eligible customers enroll in CARE/FERA/Medical Baseline programs. She stated that many qualified individuals are not currently enrolled due to lack of awareness or assistance. She also spoke in support of investing in local energy development to reduce reliance on market purchases.

(2:04:04) CAC Chair Hernandez reported that the Community Advisory Committee supports Fremont's inclusion in the R100 program and recommends that Ava staff and Fremont align on the best implementation strategy, potentially through phasing. He also

conveyed the CAC's encouragement for aggressive legislative and regulatory actions to reduce connectivity delays, lower energy costs, and explore debt relief programs to help vulnerable populations cope with escalating energy bills.

Director Cox motioned to approve the staff recommendation, and that the CEO is authorized to work with Fremont to identify and agree upon a timeline for a phased enrollment of residential customers in 2025 and commercial customers in 2026.

Director Marquez seconded the motion, which was approved 14/0/0/3:

Yes: Directors: Marquez, Qaadri, Kaur, Cox, Roche, Diallo, Jorgens, Kalb, McCarthy, Gonzelez, Wright, Bedolla, Vice-Chair Tiedemann and Chair Balch

No: none

Abstain: none

Recuse: none

Not Present: Directors: Tregub, Barrientos and Patino

17. New Community Inclusion – San Joaquin County (Action Item)

JPA membership request from San Joaquin County, and analysis

(2:15:20) Alex DiGiorgio presented San Joaquin County's request to join Ava Community Energy, explaining that this would include only the unincorporated areas of the county and could potentially begin service in 2026. He highlighted the qualitative benefits of inclusion, such as expanding access to renewable energy and advancing environmental justice, as well as the unique characteristics of the county's energy profile, including high solar adoption and significant agricultural load. DiGiorgio also presented financial projections for including San Joaquin County, noting that while historically such additions have been favorable to Ava's net position, current high energy costs could present challenges,

(2:32:47) Member Wright spoke about the unincorporated county pockets within Stockton's physical boundaries. He recommended bringing all county pockets into Ava's service area simultaneously and as close as possible to Stockton's launch date. He also spoke about the strong local support for Ava and the potential complications of staggered implementation.

(2:35:37) Member Roche asked about the potential phasing of San Joaquin County's inclusion in Ava Community Energy, particularly regarding agricultural load and specific projects like Valley Link. **Alex DiGiorgio** clarified that the quantitative analysis presented was based on a full year of service and that decisions about phasing and specific service plans were not being made at this meeting. **CEO Chang** added that while including San Joaquin County would increase the challenge of meeting Ava's 2030 renewable energy goals, it wouldn't directly change those goals.

(2:39:25) Public Comment – Woody Hastings, representing the Climate Center, spoke in support of San Joaquin County's inclusion in Ava Community Energy, citing their previous work with the county and the potential for local development and job creation.

Director Wright motioned to approve the staff recommendation. Director Roche seconded the motion, which was approved 14/0/0/3:

Yes: Directors: Marquez, Qaadri, Kaur, Cox, Roche, Diallo, Jorgens, Kalb, McCarthy, Gonzelez, Wright, Bedolla, Vice-Chair Tiedemann and Chair Balch

No: none

Abstain: none

Recuse: none

Not Present: Directors: Tregub, Barrientos and Patino

18. E-Bike Program Implementation Contract (Action Item)

Approve and execute a contract with APTIM

(2:43:34) Brett Wiley presented Ava's plans to relaunch their e-bike program with a new vendor, APTIM, after canceling a previous contract. The \$10 million program, funded by previously approved budgets and a grant from Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC), aims to distribute around 88,200 e-bikes (40% to income-qualified participants), making it one of the largest e-bike programs in California. Brett spoke about APTIM's experience in implementing similar programs, their proposed staffing plan, and the program's focus on equitable distribution and positive customer experience, with a planned launch in December 2024.

(2:56:33) Member Roche asked about the average e-bike voucher cost, to which **Brett Wiley** explained that the program offers two tiers of vouchers: \$400 for standard e-bikes and \$900 for cargo or adaptive e-bikes. **Brett Wiley** also noted that CARE/FERA customers would receive an additional \$500 on top of these amounts, potentially covering 80-100% of the average e-bike cost for income-qualified participants.

(2:58:03) Member Gonzalez asked about the actual cost of e-bikes in the program, rather than the subsidy amount. **Brett Wiley** explained that the program will offer a range of certified e-bikes sold through local bike shops, with prices ranging from \$1,000-\$1,300 for more affordable options to \$3,500-\$4,000 for premium models.

(2:59:37) Member Cox asked questions about the e-bike program, including safety training, repair services, equipment allowances, and charging infrastructure. **Brett Wiley** explained that while formal safety training isn't mandatory for purchasers, safety information will be provided, and the program will work with local bike shops across the service area for sales and repairs. He also clarified that e-bikes can be charged using standard 120-volt outlets, addressed concerns about APTIM's diverse business operations, and stated that Ava's program will be the most prominent e-bike initiative in the region.

Director Gonzalez motioned to approve the staff recommendation. Vice-Chair Tiedemann seconded the motion, which was approved 14/0/0/3:

Yes: Directors: Marquez, Qaadri, Kaur, Cox, Roche, Diallo, Jorgens, Kalb, McCarthy, Gonzelez, Wright, Bedolla, Vice-Chair Tiedemann and Chair Balch

No: none

Abstain: none

Recuse: none

Not Present: Directors: Tregub, Barrientos and Patino

19. Board Member and Staff Announcements including requests to place items on future Board agendas

(3:18:10) Member Gonzalez requested:

- Information on how account balances are changing over time (possibly last 24 months) in the Treasury Report
- A discussion on the potential changes to emissions computation methodology and its impacts

20. Adjourned at 9:19pm.

The next Board of Directors meeting will be held on Wednesday, September 18, 2024 at 6:00 pm.

The Lake Merritt Room
Cal State East Bay - the Oakland Center
In the Transpacific Centre
1000 Broadway, Suite 109
Oakland, CA 94607



Consent Item 8

To:	Ava Community Energy Authority
From:	Howard Chang, Chief Executive Officer
Subject:	Contracts Entered Into
Date:	September 18, 2024

RECOMMENDATION

Accept the CEO's report on contracts that Ava Community Energy has entered into, as required by the Administrative Procurement Policy, from July 11, 2024, through September 11, 2024;

C-2024-077 Calibrant California II, LLC Project Site Addendum No. 1 To Electric Vehicle Charging Master Services Agreement, provides proposed project site information of Livermore L Street Garage, 1200 Veteran's Way, Livermore, CA 94550, effective June 27, 2024.

C-2024-078 Calibrant California II, LLC Project Site Addendum No. 1 To Electric Vehicle Charging Master Services Agreement, provides proposed project site information of Livermore L Street Lot, 1200 Veteran's Way, Livermore, CA 94550, effective June 27, 2024.

C-2024-079 Calibrant California II, LLC Project Site Addendum No. 1 To Electric Vehicle Charging Master Services Agreement, provides proposed project site information of Piedmont Lot, 4050 Howe Street, Oakland, CA 94611, effective June 27, 2024.

C-2024-080 Calibrant California II, LLC Project Site Addendum No. 1 To Electric Vehicle Charging Master Services Agreement, provides proposed project site

information of Piedmont Curbside, 711 Highland Ave, Piedmont, CA 94611, effective June 27, 2024.

C-2024-081 Franklin Energy Services Induction Stove Installation Services Agreement, provides induction stove installation services effective July 10, 2024 through December 31, 2025, with a maximum compensation of \$1,500,000.

C-2024-083 MassMailer Amendment-1 to Subscription Agreement, prorated monthly recurring subscription renewal with a cost of \$1,586.71 effective June 5, 2024.

C-2024-084 MissionCTRL Third Amendment to CSA, adds \$98,000 in compensation for a total amount not to exceed \$394,000, extends the term of the Agreement to June 30, 2025, and updates the hourly rate of compensation.

C-2024-085 GB Endeavors, LLC Consulting Services Agreement, provides Executive Coaching services, effective July 11, 2024 through January 31, 2025, with a maximum compensation of \$8,400.

C-2024-086 Braun Blasing Smith Wynne Third Amendment to CSA, adds \$25,000 in compensation for a total amount not to exceed \$84,000, updates the hourly rates, and extends the term of the Agreement to June 30, 2025.

C-2024-087 Project6 Design First Amendment to CSA, adding \$99,000 in additional compensation for Fiscal Year 2024-2025 and extending the term through June 30, 2025.

C-2024-088 PC Professional Fourth Amendment to CSA, adds \$100,000 in additional compensation, extends the term of the Agreement to June 30, 2025, and updates references to Ava.

C-2024-089 Meyers Nave Third Amendment to Engagement Letter, adds \$1,150,000 in additional compensation for the term of July 1, 2024 to June 30, 2025.

C-2024-090 Pivotal Talent Search Third Amendment to CSA, adds \$95,000 in additional compensation for Fiscal Year 2024-2025.

C-2024-091 Thrive Mind Collaborative Second Amendment to Master Service Agreement, adds \$182,000 in additional compensation for Fiscal Year 2024-2025, extends the term of the Agreement through June 30, 2025, and adds additional services to the scope.

C-2024-092 Fractal Business Analytics Second Amendment to CSA, adds \$15,000 in additional compensation, updates the hourly rate, and extends the term through December 31, 2025.

C-2024-093 Impec Group, LLC Consulting Services Agreement, (Santa Clara, CA) provides interior branding/signage planning, design management, fabrication, and application services, effective May 16, 2024 through June 30, 2026, with a maximum compensation of \$60,000.

C-2024-094 Piseni & Brinker, LLP Consulting Services Agreement, (Santa Rosa, CA) provides auditor services, effective July 1, 2024 through December 31, 2029, with a maximum compensation of \$191,000.

C-2024-095 Lunar Energy Limited Consulting Services Agreement, (London, United Kingdom) provides distributed energy resources management services, including Service Provider-hosted "software as a service" services, effective July 3, 2024 for 2 years and 3 successive 1-year term renewals, with base platform fee of \$76,000 per year and tiered delivered capacity fee.

C-2024-096 Calibrant California II, LLC Site Sublicense Agreement, provides Calibrant California II access to and use of Hayward Municipal Lot 4, through City of Hayward license with Ava, to install, own, and operate EV Charging Systems at the Project Site, effective July 22, 2024.

C-2024-097 Gridscape Solutions First Amendment to CSA, adds \$1,800,000 in additional compensation and additional services to the scope, and extends the term through March 18, 2025.

C-2024-098 Compass Group USA, Inc (Canteen) Services Agreement, (Concord, CA) provides pantry and related products and services, and coffee and water services and equipment, with a not-to-exceed maximum compensation of \$80,000 from July 1, 2024 through June 30, 2025.

C-2024-099 Charge Across Town Consulting Services Agreement, (San Francisco, CA) provides consulting and consumer engagement services effective May 10, 2024 through June 30, 2025, with a maximum compensation of \$60,000.

C-2024-100 City of Oakland Second Amendment to Charging Station License Agreement, amends all East Bay Community Energy (EBCE) references to Ava Community Energy ("Ava"), language concerning 1250 Martin Luther King Junior Way, Oakland, CA, and Ava address to Suite 2300, adds Section 17: Public Records Act, and replaces Exhibit A and part of Exhibit B.

C-2024-101 Calibrant California II Site Sublicense Agreement, provides Calibrant California II access to and use of Project Site at Piedmont Curbside, through City of Piedmont license with Ava, to install, own, and operate EV Charging Systems at the Project Site, effective May 7, 2024.

C-2024-102 Calibrant California II Site Sublicense Agreement, provides Calibrant California II access to and use of Project Site at Piedmont Lot, through City of Oakland

license with Ava, to install, own, and operate EV Charging Systems at the Project Site, effective May 7, 2024.

C-2024-103 Abbott, Stringham & Lynch Consulting Services Agreement, (Campbell, CA) provides data audit services effective August 8, 2024 through October 1, 2024, with maximum compensation of \$12,000.

C-2024-104 Aptim Environmental & Infrastructure, LLC Consulting Services Agreement, (Baton Rouge, LA) provides electric bike program development, implementation, and management services effective July 26, 2024 through December 31, 2026, with a maximum compensation of \$10,000,000.

C-2024-105 Texas Market Research Group, LLC (dba ReConMR) Consulting Services Agreement, (San Marcos, Texas) provides market research services effective July 19, 2024 through August 1, 2025, with a maximum compensation of \$50,000.

C-2024-106 Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) Amendment 31 to Exhibit A, Task Order 2, updates CRM so that email address displayed in the "From" line of automated confirmation emails will appear as customer-support@avaenergy.org, with Optional Service Fees totaling \$2,325.

C-2024-107 Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) Amendment 32 to Exhibit A, Task Order 2, creates customized credits for SBP customers as outlined in the "Client Specifications Ava (Custom adders) v1.1.docx", with Optional Service Fees totaling \$53,400.

C-2024-108 Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) Amendment 33 to Exhibit A, Task Order 2, updates Ava webforms to provide Ava customers the ability to perform self-service opt-up, opt-down, opt-in and opt-out transactions through a single flow as outlined in approved Wireframes and copy edits, with Optional Service Fees totaling \$90,000.

C-2024-109 Davis Wright Tremaine Fifth Amendment to Consulting Services Agreement, adds \$250,000 in additional compensation, additional services to the scope, updates the hourly rates of compensation, and extends the term through June 30, 2025.

C-2024-110 Alan Comnes dba New Energy Works Consulting (NEW) Third Amendment to CSA, adds \$75,000 of additional compensation.

C-2024-111 AIQUEOUS Amendment 5 to Consulting and Online Services Agreement, extends term through June 30, 2025, renews the delivery by Consultant of ECOIQ online platform and related support and consulting services, and adds additional compensation by increasing the not to exceed amount by \$140,000.

C-2024-112 LHi Group, Inc (Piper Maddox) Staffing Services Agreement, (New York) provides staffing services effective August 12, 2024, with a \$5,000 engagement fee and a 25% of remuneration Placement Fee.

C-2024-113 Two Pitchers Brewing Company Private Event - Service Agreement, in person meeting space for staff August 14, 2024 with a minimum spend of \$1,000.

C-2024-114 Comcast Effectv Agreement, 1 year Agreement for digital ads, total compensation not to exceed \$42,000.

C-2024-115 LHi Group, Inc (Piper Maddox) Search Assignment Form, provides for talent search pertaining to Ava's specified vacancy of Senior Data Engineer, with a retainer fee of \$5,000 per specified vacancy, effective August 14, 2024.

C-2024-116 LHi Group, Inc (Piper Maddox) Search Assignment Form, provides for talent search pertaining to Ava's specified vacancy of Strategic Controller and Treasurer, with a retainer fee of \$5,000 per specified vacancy, effective August 14, 2024.

C-2024-117 LHi Group, Inc (Piper Maddox) Search Assignment Form, provides for talent search pertaining to Ava's specified vacancy of Salesforce Developer, with a retainer fee of \$5,000 per specified vacancy, effective August 14, 2024.

C-2024-118 Market Advisory Board for California Heat Pump Partnership California Heat Pump Partnership Market Advisory Board Participation Agreement Participant, participation on the Market Advisory Board (MAB), identify and evaluate market barriers and opportunities, inform the blueprint, and guide consumer inspiration and education; each participant will contribute \$50,000 for each calendar year this Agreement remains in effect, excluding 2027; effective July 1, 2024 through January 31, 2027, unless terminated earlier.

C-2024-119 Gail Salmo Productions Inc. Still Photography Assignment, (San Marino, CA) provides still photography services and three years of printed advertising and digital web use, with an estimated total compensation of \$99,999.50, effective August 9, 2024.

C-2024-120 EMC Research, Inc Consulting Services Agreement, (Seattle, WA) provides market research services, effective July 30, 2024 through August 1, 2025, with a maximum compensation not to exceed \$75,000.

C-2024-121 Equilibrium Collaborative, LLC Consulting Services Agreement, (South Lake Tahoe, CA) provides organizational assessment and change management services, effective September 3, 2024 through June 30, 2025, with a maximum compensation not to exceed \$50,000.

C-2024-122 Chen Design Associates Consulting Services Agreement, (Oakland, CA) provides creative services, including graphic design, photography, videography, and

booth design, effective July 18, 2024 through June 30, 2025, with a maximum compensation of \$200,000.

C-2024-123 Afaf Translations LLC Fourth Amendment to CSA, extends term through June 30, 2025, adds additional compensation by increasing the not to exceed amount by \$5,000, and updates the hourly rates of compensation.

C-2024-124 First Aid and Safety, Inc. Automatic External Defibrillator (AED) Lease Agreement, (San Francisco, CA) Lease for Defibtech Lifeline AED, Compact AED Cabinet, and CPR Prep Kit, providing delivery, installation, and activation of equipment, with lease term starting September 16, 2024 through September 15, 2027, and a monthly payment of \$135 per month.

C-2024-125 Granicus Order Form, provides Granicus' DisclosureDocs Sign-on, Setup and Configuration, Subscription, Full Review Subscription, e-Disclosure Subscription, and Conflict of Interest Subscription for \$2,674, with a 12-month term, effective September 9, 2024.



Consent Item 9

To:	Ava Community Energy Authority
From:	Heidy Ramirez, Local Programs Reporting Analyst
Subject:	Approving Resolutions to Award Two Community Investment Grants for Electric Vehicle Charging
Date:	September 18, 2024

Summary/Recommendation

Approve two Resolutions authorizing the CEO to negotiate and execute two (2) Grant Agreements each up to \$300,000 over three years, for the purposes of installing community-owned Electric Vehicle (“EV”) charging sites. Grants awarded to California Interfaith Power and Light (“CIPL”) and Green The Church (“GTC”).

Financial Impact

The two grants will be for up to \$300,000 each, for a total not-to-exceed amount of \$600,000 from the previously approved Local Development-Community Investment grant budget.

Analysis and Context

The Local Development Business Plan identified the opportunity for Ava, then EBCE, to create a Community Investment Fund as a multi-faceted grant program to accelerate innovative products, services, or programs.

Ava staff completed a community workshop in June of 2023 to solicit ideas for community grants that foster program enrollment, education and awareness and workforce development. One outcome of the workshop was the need to develop early career pathways into the clean energy sector.

Ava staff developed a Request for Proposals (“RFP”) for local organizations to install EV charging stations within the service territory. The RFP was issued in May and intent to award notifications were sent in August.

Respondents were asked to submit proposals to identify sites and install Level 2 EV chargers that will be available to the public along with maintenance plans to ensure that chargers will continue to be operable. The sites will provide the electricity for the charges and can decide how they choose to recover payment from customers that use the equipment. All sites are required to be in Ava service area and receive electricity service from Ava.

Ava received four proposals which were evaluated by staff using the following criteria:

- Organizational Capacity: Budget & History of Meeting Grant Deliverables (22.5%)
- Quality of Proposed Plan: Meeting Grant Program Goals (25%)
- Project Budget (20%)
- Demonstrated Capacity of Delivering: Local Community Benefits (20%)
- Ava Energy Special Procurement Preferences (12.5%)

The two proposals from California Interfaith Power and Light and Green the Church were very strong and serve different regions and constituencies within the Ava service territory. Considering the need for this important work and the current funding in the Community Investment Grant budget, staff recommends issuing two grants from this solicitation to the following organizations:

CA Interfaith Power and Light engages faith communities in climate action, focusing on sustainability and energy issues. They promote the adoption of EVs and help places of worship install EV charging stations, offering resources and support to reduce their carbon footprint. CIPL's work highlights the moral responsibility of faith communities to care for the environment.

CIPL has identified 16 potential church sites for EV chargers. This grant would deliver 12 chargers across 4 different sites.

Green The Church is a national initiative that empowers Black churches to lead in environmental and economic sustainability efforts within their communities. They focus on educating and mobilizing congregations to address climate justice issues, with a particular emphasis on renewable energy and sustainable practices. In partnership with other organizations, Green the Church promotes the installation of EV charging stations at churches, helping to increase access to clean transportation options in underserved areas while fostering environmental stewardship among faith communities.

Green The Church has identified 14 potential church sites for EV chargers. This grant would deliver 11 chargers across 3 different sites.

Attachments

- A. Resolution Awarding California Interfaith Power and Light an EV Charging Community Investment Grant
- B. Resolution Awarding Green The Church an EV Charging Community Investment Grant

RESOLUTION NO. R-2024-XX
A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OF AVA COMMUNITY ENERGY AUTHORITY
AWARDING CALIFORNIA INTERFAITH POWER AND LIGHT AN EV
CHARGING COMMUNITY INVESTMENT GRANT

WHEREAS Ava Community Energy Authority (“Ava”) was formed as a community choice aggregation agency (“CCA”) on December 1, 2016, under the Joint Exercise of Powers Act, California Government Code sections 6500 *et seq.*, among the County of Alameda, and the Cities of Albany, Berkeley, Dublin, Emeryville, Fremont, Hayward, Livermore, Piedmont, Oakland, San Leandro, and Union City to study, promote, develop, conduct, operate, and manage energy-related climate change programs in all of the member jurisdictions. The cities of Newark and Pleasanton, located in Alameda County, along with the City of Tracy, located in San Joaquin County, were added as members of Ava and parties to the Joint Powers Agreement (“JPA”) in March of 2020. The city of Stockton was added as a member to Ava in September of 2022. The city of Lathrop was added as a member to Ava in October of 2023. San Joaquin County was added as a member to Ava in July 2024. On October 24, 2023, Ava legally adopted the name Ava Community Energy Authority, where it had previously used the name East Bay Community Energy Authority since its inception.

WHEREAS The Ava Board has approved funding for Community Investment Grants for local Community Based Organizations working on local initiatives that support community development; and

WHEREAS Community Investment Grants are intended to re-invest Local Development funds and empower communities within Ava’s service area; and

WHEREAS Ava Community Energy issued a Request for Proposals (“RFP”) for projects that foster Electric Vehicle charging and received a strong, conforming proposal from California Interfaith Power and Light (“CIPL”) for the purposes of developing community-owned and operated Electric Vehicle (“EV”) charging sites, particularly in equity-priority communities. The grant aims to support the creation of level 2 EV chargers across three or more sites, encouraging local innovation, community engagement, and sustainable practices in the transition to electric mobility; and

WHEREAS Ava staff and California Interfaith Power and Light have agreed upon the major terms of the grant and are preparing a Grant Agreement for execution.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF AVA COMMUNITY ENERGY AUTHORITY DOES HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Authorizes the CEO, in coordination with Ava staff and General Counsel, to negotiate and execute a Grant Agreement and award for an EV Charging Community Investment Grant of up to \$300,000 over three years to CIPL.

ADOPTED AND APPROVED this 18th day of September 2024.

Jack Balch, Chair

ATTEST:

Adrian Bankhead, Clerk of the Board

RESOLUTION NO. R-2024-XX
A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OF AVA COMMUNITY ENERGY AUTHORITY
AWARDING GREEN THE CHURCH AN EV CHARGING COMMUNITY
INVESTMENT GRANT

WHEREAS Ava Community Energy Authority (“Ava”) was formed as a community choice aggregation agency (“CCA”) on December 1, 2016, under the Joint Exercise of Powers Act, California Government Code sections 6500 *et seq.*, among the County of Alameda, and the Cities of Albany, Berkeley, Dublin, Emeryville, Fremont, Hayward, Livermore, Piedmont, Oakland, San Leandro, and Union City to study, promote, develop, conduct, operate, and manage energy-related climate change programs in all of the member jurisdictions. The cities of Newark and Pleasanton, located in Alameda County, along with the City of Tracy, located in San Joaquin County, were added as members of Ava and parties to the Joint Powers Agreement (“JPA”) in March of 2020. The city of Stockton was added as a member to Ava in September of 2022. The city of Lathrop was added as a member to Ava in October of 2023. San Joaquin County was added as a member to Ava in July 2024. On October 24, 2023, Ava legally adopted the name Ava Community Energy Authority, where it had previously used the name East Bay Community Energy Authority since its inception.

WHEREAS The Ava Board has approved funding for Community Investment Grants for local Community Based Organizations working on local initiatives that support community development; and

WHEREAS Community Investment Grants are intended to re-invest Local Development funds and empower communities within Ava’s service area; and

WHEREAS Ava Community Energy issued a Request for Proposals (“RFP”) for projects that foster Electric Vehicle (“EV”) charging and received a strong, conforming proposal from Green the Church (“GTC”) for the purposes of developing community-owned and operated EV charging sites, particularly in equity-priority communities. The grant aims to support the creation of level 2 EV chargers across three or more sites, encouraging local innovation, community engagement, and sustainable practices in the transition to electric mobility; and

WHEREAS Ava staff and GTC have agreed upon the major terms of the grant and are preparing a Grant Agreement for execution.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF AVA COMMUNITY ENERGY AUTHORITY DOES HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Authorizes the CEO, in coordination with Ava staff and General Counsel, to negotiate and execute a Grant Agreement and award for an EV Charging Community Investment Grant of up to \$300,000 over three years to GTC.

ADOPTED AND APPROVED this 18th day of September 2024.

Jack Balch, Chair

ATTEST:

Adrian Bankhead, Clerk of the Board



Consent Item 10

To:	Ava Community Energy Authority
From:	Forrest Csulak, Distributed Energy Resources (DERs) Associate
Subject:	Approval of Consulting Services Agreement with ICF
Date:	September 18, 2024

Summary/Recommendation

This memo proposes executing a consulting services agreement with ICF Resources, LLC (ICF) for a term of three years to assist with our Solar and Storage program design process.

Financial Impact

This agreement will be paid based on delivery milestones and have a not-to-exceed ("NTE") budget of \$350,000. The funds for this work will come from the approximately \$20 million budget authorization to develop and execute the solar and storage incentive program.

Analysis and Context

In April 2024, Ava's Board of Directors confirmed the allocation of 40% of Ava's forecasted 2023-2024 revenue surplus, or approximately \$20 million, to support a solar and storage incentive program. This program will promote new solar and storage installations across our residential customers (market rate and CARE/FERA) and community-benefiting resilience hubs. In June 2024, Ava's Board of Directors approved a contract with Lunar Energy to be our Distributed Energy Resources Management System ("DERMS") provider. Lunar's DERMS platform, Gridshare, will enable us to verify in real-time that the proper equipment is installed, online, and optimizes customers' batteries for customer and grid benefits.

Our solar and storage program proposes to feature both an upfront and a monthly ongoing participation incentive to encourage both initial installations and ongoing battery participation in our solar and storage program. Upfront incentives are proposed to be open to customers, who

install a new battery-backed solar system or retrofit an existing solar system with a battery. Ongoing incentives will be available to these customers and those with existing battery-backed solar systems, which they want to bring to the program. Ava is planning to launch this program in Q1 2025, though many program design elements are still in development. The Local Programs team has been engaging with the solar and storage industry on these design choices, yet additional development is needed to arrive at a program design that benefits our customers, the solar industry, and Ava.

To help us develop a comprehensive program that provides the greatest benefits to our customers and the solar industry, we need a consultant with Distributed Energy Resources (“DER”)-based program design experience, a deep knowledge of the current solar and battery market, and strong ties to the industry. We requested written quotes and scope from qualified vendors, obtaining written proposals from six parties. After thoroughly reviewing each of these proposals, we recommend selecting ICF due to their vast experience with developing similar programs for utilities and their team’s deep connections to the solar and battery industry. We are in the final stage of negotiating the contract with ICF.

When contracted, ICF will be responsible at a minimum for:

- Developing recommendations for program rules based on market and industry knowledge, including engagement with solar industry;
- Market research as directed by Ava to inform program design choices;
- Developing a program manual for internal usage by the program team and its partners;
- Conducting contractor training for accurately representing our program to customers and properly connecting battery systems to Lunar’s Gridshare platform.

Ava staff recommends a three-year contract with ICF.

Attachment:

- A. Resolution

RESOLUTION NO. R-2024-XX
A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OF AVA COMMUNITY ENERGY AUTHORITY APPROVING A CONSULTING
SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH ICF for SOLAR AND STORAGE PROGRAM
DESIGN

WHEREAS Ava Community Energy Authority (“Ava”) was formed as a community choice aggregation agency (“CCA”) on December 1, 2016, under the Joint Exercise of Powers Act, California Government Code sections 6500 *et seq.*, among the County of Alameda, and the Cities of Albany, Berkeley, Dublin, Emeryville, Fremont, Hayward, Livermore, Piedmont, Oakland, San Leandro, and Union City to study, promote, develop, conduct, operate, and manage energy-related climate change programs in all of the member jurisdictions. The cities of Newark and Pleasanton, located in Alameda County, along with the City of Tracy, located in San Joaquin County, were added as members of Ava and parties to the Joint Powers Agreement (“JPA”) in March of 2020. The city of Stockton was added as a member to Ava in September of 2022. The city of Lathrop was added as a member to Ava in October of 2023. San Joaquin County was added as a member to Ava in July 2024. On October 24, 2023, Ava legally adopted the name Ava Community Energy Authority, where it had previously used the name East Bay Community Energy Authority since its inception.

WHEREAS Ava is currently designing a Solar & Storage incentive program to promote new solar and storage installations across our residential customers and resilience hubs;

WHEREAS Ava has been engaging with the solar and storage industry on program design options and requires additional consultation to develop a program manual;

WHEREAS Ava staff requested written quotes for a defined scope of services from qualified vendors, obtained written proposals from six parties, and recommends working with ICF due to their vast experience developing similar programs for utilities and their deep connections to the solar industry; and

WHEREAS Ava is aiming to launch our solar & storage program in Q1 2025. To meet this timeline, it is critical that we bring in a qualified consultant as soon as possible, so they can fully support our program design process.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF AVA COMMUNITY ENERGY AUTHORITY DOES HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Approve recommendation authorizing the CEO to negotiate and execute, in consultation with Ava staff and legal counsel, a Consulting Services Agreement with ICF to provide consulting services to develop Ava’s solar and storage incentive program.

ADOPTED AND APPROVED this 18th day of September 2024.

Jack Balch, Chair

ATTEST:

Adrian Bankhead, Clerk of the Board



Consent Item 11

To:	Ava Community Energy Authority
From:	Todd Edmister, Senior Director of Public Policy and Deputy General Counsel
Subject:	Discussion of Potential Proposition 4 Position (Action Item)
Date:	September 18, 2024

Summary/Recommendation

Vote on Resolution in support of Proposition 4.

Financial Impact

On net, Proposition 4 likely would result in savings to local governments, as it could replace local government money that would otherwise be needed to pay for a project. The estimated cost to California taxpayers to repay the bond would be about \$400 million annually over a 40-year period. Adopting a Resolution in support of Proposition 4 would have little to no fiscal impact.

Analysis and Context (with deadlines as applicable)

In the November 2024 General Election, California voters will vote on Proposition 4, the Safe Drinking Water, Wildfire Prevention, Drought Preparedness, and Clean Air Bond Act of 2024. The measure would authorize \$10 billion in general obligation bonds for drought, flood, water resilience, wildfire and forest resilience, biodiversity, climate smart agriculture, park, and open space, and more. The \$10 billion would be allocated as follows:

- \$3.8 billion for drought, flood, and water supply
- \$1.5 billion for forest health and wildfire prevention
- \$1.2 billion for sea-level rise and coastal areas
- \$1.2 billion for land conservation and habitat restoration
- \$850 million for energy infrastructure
- \$700 million for park creation and outdoor access programs
- \$450 million for extreme heat mitigation programs; and
- \$300 million for farms and agriculture

Proposition 4 would also require that 40% of the bond revenue be used to fund activities that benefit communities with lower incomes or that are affected by environmental changes or disasters.

Of these allocations, the most relevant to Ava, as detailed in the authorizing legislation SB 867 (Allen), include:

- Energy Infrastructure (\$850 million)
 - Transmission Lines: \$325 million for the public financing of clean energy transmission projects that are necessary to meet the state's clean energy goals to reduce or offset ratepayer costs associated with the public benefits of transmission projects. Preference may be given to projects under this section that provide multiple benefits, including, but not limited to, reducing the risk of wildfire, reducing reliance on fossil fuel plants in disadvantaged communities, and reducing rate pressure, including reconductoring and other grid-enhancing technologies.
 - Battery Storage: \$50 million to support the Long-Duration Energy Storage Program, including zero-emission distributed energy backup assets, virtual power plants, and demand side grid support.
 - Offshore Wind: \$475 million to support various activities related to offshore wind, including construction of port facilities for manufacturing, assembly, staging and integration of wind generation components; and expansion and improvements of port infrastructure to accommodate vessels involved in the installation, maintenance, and operation of offshore wind generation.
- Wildfire and Forest Resilience (\$1.5 billion)
 - \$35 million to reduce wildfire risk related to electricity transmission.
- Extreme Heat (\$450 million)
 - Community Resilience: \$60 million to the Office of Emergency Services and the Strategic Growth Council for competitive grants for the creation of

strategically located community resilience centers across diverse regions of the state at eligible community facilities.

- The remainder of the funding will go to activities to minimize the heat island effect, including urban greening; grants for local communities to conduct activities that provide environmental benefits, such as reducing air pollution; and upgrades to fairgrounds to enhance their abilities to act as a resilience center.

California law strictly limits the actions that Ava can take in support of a ballot measure, and it is not considered as part of the agency's legislative policy platform. Ava may only take a position on a voter initiative by a resolution of the Board of Directors, separate from its legislative policy platform. After adopting the resolution, Ava may publish the resolution and position on its website and provide the resolution to the relevant campaign. Ava cannot participate in any advocacy efforts beyond this formal position statement.

Committee Recommendation

The Community Advisory Committee has placed this item on its agenda for September 16, 2024.

Attachments (if applicable)

- A. Draft Resolution in Support of Proposition 4
- B. California Attorney General Summary of Proposition 4

RESOLUTION NO. R-2024-xx

**A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OF AVA COMMUNITY ENERGY AUTHORITY IN SUPPORT OF
PROPOSITION 4**

WHEREAS The Ava Community Energy Authority (“Ava”) was formed as a community choice aggregation agency (“CCA”) on December 1, 2016, under the Joint Exercise of Powers Act, California Government Code sections 6500 *et seq.*, among the County of Alameda, and the Cities of Albany, Berkeley, Dublin, Emeryville, Fremont, Hayward, Livermore, Piedmont, Oakland, San Leandro, and Union City to study, promote, develop, conduct, operate, and manage energy-related climate change programs in all of the member jurisdictions. The cities of Newark and Pleasanton, located in Alameda County, along with the City of Tracy, located in San Joaquin County, were added as members of Ava and parties to the Joint Powers Agreement in March of 2020. The city of Stockton was added as a member to Ava in September of 2022. The city of Lathrop, was added as a member to Ava in October of 2023. San Joaquin County was added as a member to Ava on July 17, 2024. On October 24, 2023, the Authority legally adopted the name Ava Community Energy Authority, where it had previously used the name East Bay Community Energy Authority since its inception.

WHEREAS in the November 2024 General Election, California voters will vote on Proposition 4, the Safe Drinking Water, Wildfire Prevention, Drought Preparedness, and Clean Air Bond Act of 2024. The measure would authorize \$10 billion in general obligation bonds for drought, flood, water resilience, wildfire and forest resilience, biodiversity, climate smart agriculture, park and open space, and more;

WHEREAS Proposition 4 would also require that 40% of the bond revenue be used to fund activities that benefit communities with lower incomes or that are affected by environmental changes or disasters; and

WHEREAS on net, Proposition 4 likely would result in savings to local governments, as it could replace local government money that would otherwise be needed to pay for a project. The estimated cost to California taxpayers to repay the bond would be about \$400 million annually over a 40-year period.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF AVA COMMUNITY ENERGY AUTHORITY DOES HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The Board of Directors hereby declares its support for Proposition 4, which would provide funding for energy infrastructure, wildfire and forest resilience, and community resilience projects.

ADOPTED AND APPROVED this _____ day of _____, 2024.

Jack Balch, Chair

ATTEST:

Adrian Bankhead, Clerk of the Board

PROPOSITION

4**AUTHORIZES BONDS FOR SAFE DRINKING WATER, WILDFIRE PREVENTION, AND PROTECTING COMMUNITIES AND NATURAL LANDS FROM CLIMATE RISKS. LEGISLATIVE STATUTE.****OFFICIAL TITLE AND SUMMARY**

PREPARED BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

The text of this measure can be found on page 75 and the Secretary of State’s website at voterguide.sos.ca.gov.

4

- Authorizes \$10 billion in state general obligation bonds for various projects to reduce climate risks and impacts: \$3.8 billion for safe drinking water and water resilience; \$1.95 billion for wildfire prevention and extreme heat mitigation; \$1.9 billion for protection of natural lands, parks, and wildlife; \$1.2 billion for protection of coastal lands, bays, and oceans; \$850 million for clean energy; and \$300 million for agriculture.
- Prioritizes projects benefitting disadvantaged communities.
- Requires annual audits.
- Appropriates money from General Fund to repay bonds.

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATIVE ANALYST’S ESTIMATE OF NET STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT FISCAL IMPACT:

- Increased state costs of about \$400 million annually for 40 years to repay the bond.

State Bond Cost Estimate

Amount borrowed	\$10 billion
Average repayment cost	\$400 million per year over 40 years
Source of repayment	General tax revenue

FINAL VOTES CAST BY THE LEGISLATURE ON SB 867 (PROPOSITION 4)
(CHAPTER 83, STATUTES OF 2024)

Senate:	Ayes 33	Noes 6
Assembly:	Ayes 66	Noes 6

ANALYSIS BY THE LEGISLATIVE ANALYST**BACKGROUND**

State Pays for Natural Resources and Climate Activities. The state pays for many activities aimed at conserving natural resources, as well as responding to the causes and effects of climate change (“natural resources and climate activities”). These activities focus on increasing the amount of water available for use, conserving land to benefit fish and wildlife, increasing recreational opportunities at state and local parks, and other purposes. In some cases, state government agencies perform natural resources and climate activities. In other cases, the state provides grants and loans to local governments, not-for-profit organizations, and businesses to support similar activities.

State Pays for Natural Resources and Climate Activities in Various Ways. Sometimes the state pays up front for natural resources and climate

activities with money it already has. In other cases, the state pays for these activities by using bonds. Bonds are a way that the state borrows money and then repays the money plus interest over time. (For more information about bonds, please see “Overview of State Bond Debt” later in this guide.)

Over the past decade, the state has spent an average of about \$13 billion each year (annually) on natural resources and climate activities. About 15 percent of this amount has been from bonds. The state still has a few billion dollars remaining from prior natural resources and climate bonds that have not yet been committed for specific activities.

Local and Federal Governments Also Pay for Similar Activities. In addition to the state funding, other entities also pay for natural resources and climate activities. For example,

ANALYSIS BY THE LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

CONTINUED

in some areas, local governments pay for water and energy infrastructure as part of their roles as local utilities. Local governments such as cities and counties also pay for local parks. The federal government also pays for various natural resources and climate activities. For example, the federal government provides money to improve local drinking water systems and to build energy infrastructure.

PROPOSAL

New Bond for Natural Resources and Climate Activities. Proposition 4 allows the state to sell a

\$10 billion bond for natural resources and climate activities. Much of the bond money would be used for loans and grants to local governments, Native American tribes, not-for-profit organizations, and businesses. Some bond money also would be available for state agencies to spend on state-run activities.

Funding Would Pay for a Variety of Activities.

As shown in Figure 1, Proposition 4 pays for activities within eight broad categories, each with different goals. Some of the main activities in each category are summarized below:

Figure 1

Key Goals of Proposition 4 Bond Funds

(In Millions)

Category	Key Goals	Amount
Drought, Flood, and Water Supply	Increase the amount and quality of water available for people to use and reduce the risk of flooding.	\$3,800
Forest Health and Wildfire Prevention	Improve the health of forests and protect communities from wildfires.	1,500
Sea-Level Rise and Coastal Areas	Reduce the risks from sea-level rise, restore coastal areas, and protect fish.	1,200
Land Conservation and Habitat Restoration	Protect and restore natural areas.	1,200
Energy Infrastructure	Support the state's shift to more renewable sources of energy, such as offshore wind.	850
Parks	Expand, renovate, and repair local and state parks.	700
Extreme Heat	Reduce the effects of extreme heat on communities.	450
Farms and Agriculture	Help farms respond to the effects of climate change and become more sustainable.	300
Total		\$10,000

PROPOSITION
4 AUTHORIZES BONDS FOR SAFE DRINKING WATER, WILDFIRE PREVENTION, AND PROTECTING COMMUNITIES AND NATURAL LANDS FROM CLIMATE RISKS. LEGISLATIVE STATUTE.

ANALYSIS BY THE LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

CONTINUED

4

- Drought, Flood, and Water Supply (\$3.8 Billion).** Roughly half of this money would be for activities to increase the amount and quality of water available for people to use (\$1.9 billion). This would include storing water so it can be used during future droughts, as well as cleaning polluted water to make it safe to drink. Money would also be used to help reduce the risk of floods, such as by repairing dams and capturing and reusing stormwater (\$1.1 billion). The rest of the money would be used for various activities, such as restoring rivers and lakes.
 - Forest Health and Wildfire Prevention (\$1.5 Billion).** All of this money would support activities to improve the health of forests and reduce the risk of severe and destructive wildfires. This would include thinning trees in forests that are overgrown and clearing vegetation near where people live. Money would also be used for other activities, such as helping homeowners make their properties more resistant to wildfire damage.
 - Sea-Level Rise and Coastal Areas (\$1.2 Billion).** Most of this money would pay for activities to restore coastal areas and protect them from the effects of rising sea levels (\$890 million). This could include restoring wetlands so they can serve as buffers to rising sea levels. The rest of this money would be used to improve ocean habitats and protect fish and other marine wildlife (\$310 million).
 - Land Conservation and Habitat Restoration (\$1.2 Billion).** This money would be used to protect and restore land for the benefit of fish and wildlife. For example, it could support purchasing land to set aside so that it is not developed.
 - Energy Infrastructure (\$850 Million).** More than half of this money would support the development of wind turbines off the California coast (\$475 million). Most of the remaining money would pay for building infrastructure such as transmission lines to carry electricity long distances (\$325 million). The rest of the money would pay for projects to build large batteries that store electricity for when it is needed (\$50 million).
 - Parks (\$700 Million).** The bulk of this money would support various activities that expand recreational opportunities at parks or reduce the impacts of climate change on parks (\$300 million). These activities could include adding new trails and parking areas. Some of this money would provide grants to local communities to build new parks or renovate existing parks (\$200 million). The rest of this money would be used to repair state parks and provide nature education (\$200 million).
 - Extreme Heat (\$450 Million).** Much of this money would pay for activities focused on protecting communities from extreme heat (\$200 million). These activities could include adding trees and greenspaces. Money would also support places for people to go during heatwaves or disasters (\$100 million). The rest of the money would provide grants for local communities to conduct activities that provide environmental benefits, such as reducing air pollution (\$150 million).
 - Farms and Agriculture (\$300 Million).** Much of this money would be used for activities that encourage farmers to improve soil health, reduce air pollution, and use less water (\$105 million). This money would also support community gardens and farmers' markets, such as by purchasing shade canopies (\$60 million). The rest of this money would support a range of other activities, such as purchasing vans to transport farmworkers and conserving farmland.
- Establishes Other Requirements for the Use of Funds.** Proposition 4 requires the bond money to be used in certain ways. For example, at least 40 percent of bond money must be used for activities that directly benefit communities that

ANALYSIS BY THE LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

CONTINUED

have lower incomes or are more vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. Proposition 4 also requires regular public reporting of how the bond money is spent.

FISCAL EFFECTS

Increased State Costs of About \$400 Million Annually for 40 Years to Repay the Bond. The estimated cost to repay the bond would be **about \$400 million annually over a 40-year period.**

Payments would be made from the state General Fund. (The General Fund is the account the state uses to pay for most public services, including education, health care, and prisons.) This would be less than one-half of 1 percent of the state's total General Fund budget. Since the state has to pay interest on the money it borrows, the total cost of the bond would be about 10 percent more (after adjusting for inflation) than if the state paid up front with money it already has.

Likely Reduced Local Costs for Natural Resources and Climate Activities. The availability of state bond funds could have various fiscal effects on local governments. In some cases, the additional state funding could replace local government money that would otherwise be needed to pay for a project. For example, this could include using bond funds to help support an essential water treatment facility the local government otherwise would have needed to fund by itself. In other

cases, however, the availability of state funds could encourage local governments to spend more money to build larger projects than they otherwise would. For example, this could include adding additional amenities to a local park. On net, Proposition 4 likely would result in savings to local governments. The amount of these savings is uncertain but could average tens of millions of dollars annually over the next few decades.

Potential State and Local Savings if Funding Prevents Disasters. To the extent the bond funds result in completing activities that reduce the risk or amount of damage from disasters, it could reduce state and local costs for responding to and recovering from those events. For example, improving a levee could reduce the amount of flooding that occurs. Additionally, thinning trees in a forest could reduce the severity of wildfires. The amount of such potential savings is uncertain.

Visit sos.ca.gov/campaign-lobbying/cal-access-resources/measure-contributions/2024-ballot-measure-contribution-totals for a list of committees primarily formed to support or oppose this measure.

Visit fppc.ca.gov/transparency/top-contributors.html to access the committee's top 10 contributors.

★ ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 4 ★

4

YES on 4: TO CLEAN AND PROTECT OUR DRINKING WATER, PREVENT WILDFIRES

Prop. 4 makes urgent, commonsense investments to protect our communities, health, economy, and natural resources by:

- Cleaning up and protecting water supplies
- Preventing devastating wildfires
- Protecting forests, beaches, fresh water sources, and wildlife habitat

Voting Yes on 4 is urgently needed. California faces increasing threats from wildfires, water pollution, and extreme heat. Investments *today* can prevent future costs and damage from a changing climate and more frequent natural disasters.

PROVIDING CLEAN, SAFE DRINKING WATER

Prop. 4 will clean up and protect California’s drinking water supplies in all regions of California—remove toxic pollutants from our drinking water, addressing infrastructure risks like weakened dams and levees, and increasing supplies.

Today, nearly 1 million Californians lack access to drinking water that meets safety and reliability standards, according to the State Water Board. Yes on 4 helps ensure we all have safe water to drink.

PREVENTING DEVASTATING WILDFIRES AND SMOKE

Recent California wildfires have burned 2 million acres, released toxic smoke into our air, and polluted drinking water supplies. Fire damage and smoke have harmed quality of life and health, including children’s lungs, in every corner of California. Prop. 4 invests in projects to prevent wildfires, reduce their intensity when they do occur, and improve disaster response.

“Giving firefighters the tools to prevent wildfires is the best, most cost effective way to prevent the human and financial costs of these disasters. Prop. 4 makes the right investments to save lives and billions in response and recovery costs.”—Tim Edwards, President, CALFIRE Firefighters

PROTECTING FORESTS, BEACHES, RIVERS, STREAMS, AND WILDLIFE

Our beaches, forests, and mountains make California special, and we have a responsibility to protect them for our children and future generations. Protecting natural areas and wildlife is more urgent today than ever before, as we lose wildlife habitat, farm and ranchland, and even beaches wash away. Prop. 4 protects these natural areas from wildfire, pollution, and other threats from a changing climate.

PROTECTING PUBLIC HEALTH

By removing pollution from the air and toxins from our water, Prop. 4 protects the health of vulnerable seniors and children.

STRONG FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY, ACCOUNTABILITY & TRANSPARENCY

California is already paying the price for failing to adequately prepare for drought and a changing climate. This measure helps shift from disaster response to *prevention*.

Our state and communities will save billions more by avoiding and reducing damage from wildfires, droughts, and floods.

Prop. 4 contains strict fiscal accountability and transparency:

- Annual independent audits
- Full public disclosure of all future funding

Join California firefighters (CalFire Local 2881), the National Wildlife Federation, the Nature Conservancy, Clean Water Action, and water agencies including San Diego Co Water Authority: YES on 4.

Jennifer Clary, State Director
Clean Water Action

Tim Edwards, President
CALFIRE Firefighters

Beth Pratt, California Regional Executive Director
National Wildlife Federation

★ REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 4 ★

Clean drinking water and preventing destructive wildfires are necessities, not luxuries. These should be addressed within our state budget, not by demanding \$10 billion more from the taxpayers in the form of a bond that will cost nearly double to repay—\$19.3 billion.

The challenges we face with wildfires and water supply are the result of decades of neglect and mismanagement of our resources. Empowering tribal leaders for forest management and investing in water infrastructure could have prevented these crises. These aren’t random occurrences, but repercussions of misguided policies.

Despite politicians’ frequent promises for accountability, since 2000 California voters have approved over \$30 billion in natural resources bonds—with little to show. After years of refusing to prioritize spending on forest management, we are suffering the aftermath of major wildfires that could have been prevented, or at least minimized. After years of refusing to invest in water storage, we are facing water supply instability.

Instead of burdening taxpayers with a bond that overpromises, we should tackle these issues in the budget. *Real change stems from commitment, not quick fixes.* This isn’t just policy, it’s our future. Let’s choose pragmatism over procrastination.

Sacramento politicians should not demand more money from the taxpayers or pressure voters to pass an unrealistic bond package that lacks any lasting change to state policy. Vote NO on Proposition 4.

Vote NO on deferring our environmental responsibility at double the cost. Let’s invest in a greener tomorrow today.

Senate Minority Leader Brian W. Jones
Assemblyman Jim Patterson

Jon Coupal, President
Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association

★ ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 4 ★

TOO MUCH DEBT, TOO LITTLE BENEFIT: THE PROBLEM WITH PROPOSITION 4

Bonds are the most expensive way for the government to pay for things. Proposition 4 would add a whopping \$10 billion in debt to the taxpayers—PLUS an estimated \$9.3 billion in interest—to pay for climate-related programs. This funding would also cover administrative costs and salaries for grant recipients. But remember, this is borrowed money.

At the start of the year, California already had over \$78 billion of bond debt. Proposition 1 in March added another \$6.38 billion. Now there's a proposal to add an additional \$10 billion for ambiguous climate programs. Guess who's going to foot the bill? That's right—we taxpayers. Our tax dollars will be diverted from essential services to cover interest payments and principal repayment of the bond.

Bonds are borrowed money that must be paid back, PLUS INTEREST, no matter what the state must cut to do it. Governor Newsom already declared a budget emergency because the state spends more than it takes in. How many programs will have to be cut in the future to pay for Proposition 4? According to the nonpartisan Legislative Analyst's Office, we had a \$62 billion deficit this year. What will happen when we have both a deficit AND the obligation to repay this enormous bond debt?

Two years ago, California had a nearly \$100 billion SURPLUS. If these climate projects had been prioritized then, we could have covered the entire cost of this bond with just 10 percent of that surplus. Now, due to the government's inability to manage its spending, they are asking voters for more of their hard-earned money.

AS A VOTER, YOUR TAX DOLLARS SHOULD FUND YOUR HIGHEST PRIORITIES, NOT PET PROJECTS.

Bonds should be reserved for financing essential projects that will build infrastructure lasting beyond the 30-year payoff period. However, many elements of Proposition 4 fail to meet that standard, resulting in \$10 billion of spending just being added to the taxpayers' credit card—with a lack of accountability or measured metrics for success! Proposition 4 is full of money being funneled to unproven technologies that may sound promising on paper but have no concrete evidence of success. By committing funds to speculative projects, Proposition 4 overlooks long-term water storage and critical wildfire fuel management programs in favor of short-term, unproven projects.

IT'S RECKLESS TO USE COSTLY BORROWED MONEY TO PAY FOR UNPROVEN PROGRAMS.

Proposition 4 represents a reckless increase in state debt with questionable benefits. The government should prioritize essential services and ensure that any borrowing is reserved for projects that provide lasting, tangible benefits to the state and its residents. Vital programs should be funded in the budget with the taxes we already pay, not through costly borrowing. What's in the budget that's a higher priority than safe drinking water and wildfire prevention? Politicians should answer that question before racking up another \$10+ billion in debt that will have to be paid back, WITH INTEREST.

Senate Minority Leader Brian W. Jones
Assemblyman Jim Patterson
Jon Coupal, President
Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association

4

★ REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 4 ★

YES on 4: ADDRESSES CALIFORNIA'S HIGHEST PRIORITY DRINKING WATER and FIRE PREVENTION NEEDS

California firefighters, clean water organizations, public health experts, and conservation groups urge YES on 4, to address our state's *most vital needs* for a safe water supply, wildfire prevention, and clean air.

The opposition itself admits, clean water and wildfire prevention are critical priorities.

Prop. 4 makes efficient, sensible investments in proven solutions: upgrading drinking water treatment to remove contaminants, fixing crumbling dams and levees to prevent floods, creating groundwater storage and recycling plants to boost supply and prepare for drought, and investing in effective wildfire prevention and containment strategies.

YES on 4: SMART, URGENT INVESTMENTS WITH STRICT ACCOUNTABILITY REQUIREMENTS, PROTECTS COMMUNITIES AND PREVENTS BILLIONS IN FUTURE COSTS

Yes on 4 is fiscally responsible and fully transparent.

Nearly 1 million Californians lack access to clean drinking water. Yes on 4's investments strengthen safe water

supplies and flood control infrastructure—saving billions in temporary fixes and economic losses.

A UCLA study found 10 years of wildfire smoke have caused 50,000 premature deaths and \$400 billion in economic losses. Wildfire prevention saves six times its cost in reduced damage, while protecting our health.

“California's financial health is vulnerable to natural disasters, neglected infrastructure, and a changing climate. Without raising taxes, Yes on Prop. 4 saves California money while helping state and local governments protect our communities.”—Tim Gage, former state Director of Finance. California communities can't wait.

YES on 4: CLEAN DRINKING WATER, WILDFIRE PREVENTION, and OUR HEALTH.

Susana De Anda, Executive Director
Community Water Center
Sarah Gibson, Fire Manager
The Nature Conservancy

Christopher Chavez, Deputy Policy Director
Coalition for Clean Air



Consent Item 12

To:	Ava Community Energy Authority
From:	Michael Quiroz, Senior Regulatory & Data Analyst
Subject:	Approving a Resolution authorizing Ava participation in PG&E Hourly Flex Pricing Pilots
Date:	September 18, 2024

Recommendation

This report proposes the Board adopt a Resolution approving Ava’s participation in Hourly Flex Pricing (“HFP”) pilots thereby complying with the California Energy Commission’s Load Management Standards requirements.

Financial Impact

The potential financial costs and benefits to Ava of participating in the hourly pricing pilots are:

Costs	Benefits
Administrative staff time	\$20/kW-year state incentive to Ava for enrolling customers
Bill credits to customers who reduce their usage	Reduced procurement costs due to customer load shift

Numbers for each of these categories are necessarily uncertain as there is little available data on the likely number of customers that will participate, or the extent to which participants will change their behavior in response to price signals.

In light of the uncertainties above, staff modeled multiple scenarios with various levels of customer adoption and price responsiveness.

Table 1: Financial estimates

Projected maximum cost of bill credits, less procurement savings, over 3-year pilot period			
Peak load reduction	Low adoption	Medium adoption	High adoption
Non-res customer count	15	31	62
1%	\$ 7,068	\$ 14,137	\$ 28,273
5%	\$ 23,605	\$ 47,211	\$ 94,421
10%	\$ 57,315	\$ 114,630	\$ 229,259

These estimates do not include:

- Estimated administrative and implementation costs (\$225,000) across 3 years
- Estimated state incentives paid to Ava totaling (\$300,000)

These estimates assume that Ava staff participates in customer outreach to commercial and industrial (C&I) customers, and that these customers do not shift or increase consumption in response to low hourly prices. As such, these estimates could be considered the **maximum possible cost** in each scenario. It is worth noting that with the \$300,000 in state incentives, Ava recoups more than its total costs in several scenarios.

See appendix A for more information on the methodology for this financial analysis.

Analysis and Context

Overview

California Energy Commission (“CEC”) regulations, 20 CCR § 1623.1, *Large POU and Large CCA Requirements for Load Management Standards* (“LMS”), require Community Choice Aggregators (“CCAs”) to offer customers voluntary participation in hourly marginal cost-based rates (“hourly rates”) by 2027. The LMS provide that a CCA may modify compliance with this requirement if implementing hourly rates is found not to be technologically feasible, equitable, safe, or cost-effective.¹

The Board approved Ava’s Load Management Standards Compliance Plan (“Compliance Plan”) in March of 2024. At the time, the plan concluded that:

“Ava does not currently have sufficient information to conclude that proposing and implementing dynamic rates would be cost effective or provide benefits to Ava customers. Significant uncertainties exist related to the level of incremental load shift potential, customer response to market price risks, customer acceptance and adoption of a complex new rate design, the administrative costs of dynamic rate implementation, and potential cost shifts between participants and non-participants. To address these uncertainties, Ava is considering participating in dynamic pricing

¹ LMS §1623.1(a)(2)

pilots and rates with PG&E... Ava will re-evaluate the proposal of dynamic rates in the next update of this plan with the benefit of additional information from pilots.”²

Since the adoption of the Compliance Plan, Ava staff has been coordinating with PG&E on the development of California Public Utilities Commission (“CPUC”) approved hourly pricing pilots that could better inform Ava’s evaluation of hourly rates. Most immediately, PG&E is preparing to launch 1) the Expanded Pilots and 2) the Vehicle to Grid Integration (“VGI”) Pilots, as authorized by the CPUC in Resolution E-5192³ and D.24-01-032⁴ respectively.

The Expanded Pilots

The Expanded Pilots are an extension of Valley Clean Energy and PG&E’s Agricultural Pumping Dynamic Rate Pilot (“Ag Pilot”), which was authorized in D.21-12-015.⁵ The Ag Pilot used hourly rates to incentivize large agricultural customers to pump water when energy is cheapest. The pilot also leveraged pump automation controllers to increase the responsiveness of customers to the hourly price signal.

An evaluation of the pilot found that automation technology facilitated significant reductions in load during peak times, and that dynamic pricing improved price responsiveness outside of the peak period relative to time of use rates.⁶ Encouraged by these results, the CPUC authorized the expansion of the Ag Pilot with the following characteristics:

- Eligibility for bundled and unbundled agricultural, commercial, industrial, and residential customers on agriculture, medium-large commercial/industrial, and residential tariffs: AG-A1, AG-A2, AG-B, AG-C, B-6, B-10, B-19, B-20, E-ELEC, and EV-2AAAn enrollment target of 100MW for all of PG&E’s territory; a minimum enrollment level of 20MW; and no cap on total enrollment
- Administration by PG&E with the option of participation by CCAs
- An incentive of \$20 per kW-year enrolled in the pilot for participating CCAs
- A marketing, education, and outreach strategy developed by PG&E

² Ava Community Energy Load Management Standards Compliance Plan, at 17

³ Resolution E-5192, Pacific Gas and Electric Company Advice Letter 6259-E requests approval of four vehicle-grid integration pilots pursuant to Decision 20-12-029, issued May 6 2022

⁴ D.24-01-031, Decision to Expand System Reliability Pilots of Pacific Gas and Electric Company and Southern California Edison Company, issued Jan 26 2024

⁵ D.21-12-015, Phase 2 Decision Directing Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company to Take Actions to Prepare for Potential Extreme Weather in the Summers of 2022 and 2023, issued Dec 6 2021

⁶ Mid-Term Evaluation of Valley Clean Energy’s Agricultural Pumping Dynamic Rate Pilot, Daniel G. Hansen and Michael Ty Clark, December 22 2023

The Vehicle to Grid Integration (VGI) Pilots

Dually motivated by legislation and the recommendations of a working group,⁷ the CPUC authorized PG&E to propose VGI pilots that would test the effectiveness of bidirectional chargers in enabling smart charging and grid services.⁸

On July 15, 2021, PG&E filed AL 6259-E, which proposed the VGI Pilots. The CPUC approved the pilots with the following characteristics:

- Eligibility for bundled and unbundled residential and commercial customers on a variety of residential and non-residential rates: EV2-A, E-ELEC, B6, B10, B19, BEV, and B20;
- Enrollment targets of 1,000 residential customers with light duty EVs, and 200 commercial chargers that enable VGI for light, medium, and heavy duty EVs across all PG&E's territory;
- Upfront incentives for installation of bidirectional chargers;
- Administration by PG&E with the option of participation by CCAs.

Ava is aware of at least one commercial customer that is interested in participating in the VGI Pilots. If Ava does not offer this customer hourly rates via the VGI pilot, the customer would have to opt-out of Ava's service to receive those rates through PG&E's exclusive service.

Rate design and billing

The Expanded and VGI pilots will share the same rate design. The rates would include:

- Marginal Energy Cost ("MEC"): an hourly rate that reflects the incremental costs that a utility incurs to supply one more kilowatt-hour of electricity. The MEC would be based on the day ahead California Independent System Operator ("CAISO") price for PG&E's service territory.
- Marginal Generation Capacity Cost ("MGCC"): an hourly rate that reflects the cost associated with adding one more unit of generation capacity to meet peak demand. The MGCC would be based on PG&E's calculations, which are approved by the CPUC.
- A day ahead hourly distribution rate designed to recover primary distribution capacity costs ("PDCC"), depending on the customer's location.
- A transmission rate equal to the transmission rate on the customer's otherwise applicable tariff ("OAT").
- A subscription component that collects revenue equal to the customer's OAT rate applied to a predefined, customer-specific load profile. This component helps protect the


⁷ Senate Bill 676 (Ch. 484, Stats. 2019) requires the CPUC to establish strategies and quantifiable metrics to maximize the use of feasible and cost-effective electric vehicle integration in the grid by January 1, 2030. The VGI working group evaluated potential VGI use cases and provided policy recommendation in a June 30 2020 report.

⁸ D.20-12-029, Decision Concerning Implementation of Senate Bill 676 and Vehicle-Grid Integration Strategies, issued December 21 2020

customer from bill volatility caused by the hourly price signal. See Figure 1 below for further details on the subscription component.

During the pilot, participating customers will continue to pay their normal monthly electric bill according to their OAT. In addition to their normal monthly bill, customers will receive a performance report that reflects credits or charges based on the customers' performance under the hourly price. Customers are credited at the hourly price for reduced consumption. Every 12 months, the customer's monthly credits and charges will be trued-up, and the customer would receive a credit if they paid less on the hourly pricing pilot compared to their current plan. The customer would not be charged extra if they incur net charges. With this bill protection, participating customers can only benefit from the pilots.

Figure 1: customer subscription



Effect on Ava's Value Proposition

By engaging in these pilots, Ava would be offering participating customers the same hourly rates as PG&E. As such, any applicable credits from customers' participation in hourly pricing would not reflect Ava's value proposition. However, participating customers will never pay more than under their standard Ava OAT due to the pilots' annual bill protection. In addition, the performance report's billing structure ensures that customers on Bright Choice continue to receive a discounted rate compared to those on Renewable 100.

Implementation Plan and Timeline

The VGI pilot is targeted to launch at the end of September 2024, and the Expanded Pilots are targeted to launch in November 2024. Participation in the Expanded Pilots will initially be available to Ava customers on eligible commercial, industrial, and residential rates (agricultural customers will not be eligible initially). Ava plans to expand eligibility to customers on

agricultural rates as early as 2026. Customers will be able to enroll in the pilots through PG&E's webpage.

PG&E is working with automation service providers ("ASPs") to help automate and optimize customer load in response to hourly price signals. PG&E plans to include unbundled customers in their outreach efforts regardless of whether Ava decides to participate. If participation is approved, Ava will supplement PG&E's enrollment efforts through targeted and direct outreach to eligible commercial and industrial customers.

Conclusion

By participating in these pilots, Ava will gain valuable information about hourly rates, including how many customers are interested in adopting them; how customers respond to more granular price signals; how automation can increase the responsiveness of load; how to communicate with customers about complex rate design; and how the impact of hourly price signals varies across customer classes and demographics. This information is key to informing Ava's decision of whether to eventually adopt hourly rates and how to otherwise comply with the Load Management Standards.

Committee Recommendation

This item is slated for discussion during the September 11, 2024, meeting of the Financial, Administrative, and Procurement Committee. A PowerPoint presentation from that meeting is attached and has been updated based on board member feedback.

Attachments


- A. Financial estimate methodology and assumptions
- B. Presentation from September 11 Financial, Administrative, and Procurement Meeting
- C. Resolution Authorizing Ava Participation in the PG&E Hourly Flex Pricing Pilot

Appendix A: Financial estimate methodology and assumptions

Methodology for estimating bill credits

1. Estimate reduced peak consumption under hourly pricing (see Figure 2 below)
2. Estimate customer-specific subscription loadshapes by averaging the usage in each hour of all matching day types (weekday/weekend) in a given month
3. Find Δ (kWh) between customer subscription and consumption
4. Multiply Δ (kWh) by the hourly price (\$/kWh) in each hour and sum across all hours to find the annual cost of bill credits
5. Combine projected costs (bill credits, administrative costs) and benefits (\$20/kW-yr incentive) across all three pilot years to find the total financial impact to Ava

Figure 2: Average BEA customer consumption and peak reduction scenarios



Key assumptions

- **2022 test year:** Ava staff used historical customer data from 2022.
- **Reduction in procurement costs:** Procurement savings due to customer load shift can be approximated by the day ahead marginal energy cost ("MEC") which is the PG&E DLAP \$/kWh in each hour. For example, if a customer reduces consumption by 5 kWh in a given hour, and the MEC is 30¢/kWh, the reduction in procurement cost would be 5 kWh * 30¢ = \$1.5. In other words, that's 5 kWh that Ava doesn't have to purchase at 30¢/kWh. Procurement cost savings are incorporated into table 1.
- **CPUC Incentives for CCAs:** For participation in the expanded pilots, CCAs receive \$20 per kW-year of customer enrollment subject to a \$3,600,000 cap for all CCAs, or \$300,000 for each of the 12 CCAs in PG&E's service territory. Staff calculated each customer's capacity as their annual maximum hourly demand and found that in each scenario multiplying aggregate capacity by the \$20/kW-year incentive yielded an amount in excess

\$300,000. As such, staff assume that Ava receives the maximum of \$300,000 in incentives in each scenario. It is unclear how the CPUC will define and calculate enrolled customer capacity; a different methodology could potentially reduce the incentives Ava receives.

- Load reduction: Customers may increase or decrease their usage in response to hourly price signals. We assume that customers will decrease usage from 4-9PM, when hourly price signals are typically higher than time-of-use rates. We do not incorporate potential increases in customer usage during other times of the day.
- Customer adoption: Staff believe that large energy-conscious customers, such as those enrolled in Ava's Building Efficiency Accelerator (BEA) program, are more likely to adopt hourly rates. The "medium adoption" scenario assumes 31 current BEA customers enroll in the pilots. These customers currently take service on B6, B10, B19, B20, E20, and TC1. The "high adoption" scenario assumes double the enrollment, and the "low adoption" scenarios assume half.
- Residential customers: Ava staff modeled residential customer outcomes separately and found minimal financial impact. As such, this analysis focuses on large commercial and industrial, who might be more likely to adopt hourly rates.

Ava participation in hourly pricing pilots

September 11, 2024 Financial, Administrative, and Procurement Meeting



Summary

- Staff is seeking September board approval for Ava's participation in Hourly Flex Pricing (HFP, also known as real time pricing) as hourly rates will deviate from the existing value proposition
- Staff analyzed the financial impacts of voluntary customer participation
 - HFP pilot participation could result in a net benefit of **\$67,932** or cost of **\$154,259** depending on customer adoption and CPUC incentives, and not including reduced procurement costs

Background on hourly pricing

- The goal of hourly pricing is to align electricity prices more closely with the actual cost of generating/delivering electricity through the day, determined by supply and demand fluctuations
- Objectives include:
 - Incentivizing customers to optimize energy usage
 - Promoting grid efficiency by reducing strain during peak periods and increasing consumption when low-cost renewables are abundant
- Increased complexity relative to time of use ("TOU") rates

Objectives of HFP participation

- **Compliance with Load Management Standards (LMS)**
 - The CEC's Load Management Standards (LMS) require CCAs to evaluate and adopt hourly marginal cost rates/programs by 2027
 - Ava's LMS Compliance Plan, approved by the Board in March 2024, considered participation in hourly pricing pilots with PG&E to address uncertainties regarding hourly rates
 - CEC Staff has indicated that Ava's participation in RTP pilots is key to maintaining compliance.
- **Offer rate options comparable to PG&E**
 - Ava is aware of at least one commercial customer who will participate in the VGI Pilot. If Ava does not participate in the HFP pilots, interested customers would have to opt-out of Ava's service to receive those rates through PG&E's exclusive service.
- **Inform future HFP rate design & participation**
 - Ava will gain valuable information about hourly rates which is key to informing Ava's decision of whether to eventually adopt hourly rates and how to otherwise comply with the Load Management Standards.

Implementation

- **Launch timeline**

- September 2024 – VGI/V2X (residential & business EV rates, non-res customers that provide EV charging services)
- November 2024 - Expanded Pilots (C&I, residential rates)
- 2026 - Expanded Pilots (Ag rates)
 - Pilot available to Ag rates earlier; Ava is looking to participate in 2026 with new agriculture customers in unincorporated San Joaquin County

- **Billing**

- Customers receive an annual credit for responding to hourly price signals
- Annual bill protection; customers will not pay more than under their Ava otherwise applicable tariff (OAT)
- Customers will receive "shadow bills" reflecting what they would have been billed under hourly price signals; limited implementation work is required from Ava

- **Outreach**

- PG&E will market to unbundled customers regardless of whether Ava decides to participate
- Ava to supplement PG&E outreach with direct outreach to select C&I customers

Analysis overview


- Potential financial costs and benefits to Ava include:

Costs	Benefits
Bill credits to customers who reduce their usage	\$20/kW-year state incentive to Ava for enrolling customers
Administrative and implementation costs	Reduced procurement costs due to customer load shift

- There is uncertainty in how many customers will participate (enrollment is voluntary) and how customers will respond to hourly price signals
 - PG&E is working with automation service providers ("ASPs") to help automate and optimize customer load in response to hourly price signals
- To address uncertainty, staff modeled multiple scenarios with various levels of customer adoption and price responsiveness

Analysis overview

Figure 1: customer usage and estimated peak reduction



Analysis results

Projected maximum cost of bill credits, less procurement savings, over 3-year pilot period			
Peak load reduction	Low adoption	Medium adoption	High adoption
Non-res customer count*	15	31	62
1%	\$ 7,068	\$ 14,137	\$ 28,273
5%	\$ 23,605	\$ 47,211	\$ 94,421
10%	\$ 57,315	\$ 114,630	\$ 229,259

- These estimates do not include:
 - Estimated administrative and implementation **costs (\$225,000)** over 3 years
 - Estimated state **incentives** to Ava (**\$300,00**) over 3 years which recoup all costs in some scenarios
- Key assumptions:
 - Ava staff participates in customer outreach to C&I customers
 - Customers do not shift load or increase consumption in response to low hourly prices


*Ava staff modeled residential customers and found minimal financial impacts, so the financial analysis focuses on large C&I customers

Appendix



Customer subscription and bill credits

Figure 1: customer subscription and bill credits



Analysis results without procurement savings

Projected maximum cost of bill credits over 3-year pilot period			
Peak load reduction	Low adoption	Medium adoption	High adoption
Non-res customer count	15	31	62
1%	\$ 16,924	\$ 33,847	\$ 67,694
5%	\$ 99,970	\$ 199,939	\$ 399,878
10%	\$ 273,687	\$ 547,375	\$ 1,094,749

- These estimates do not include:
 - Estimated administrative and implementation **costs (\$225,000)** over 3 years
 - Estimated state **incentives** to Ava (**\$300,00**) over 3 years which recoup all costs in some scenarios
 - Reduction in procurement costs due to customer load shifting
- Key assumptions:
 - Ava staff participates in customer outreach to C&I customers
 - Customers do not shift load or increase consumption in response to low hourly prices

RESOLUTION NO. R-2024-XX
A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OF THE AVA COMMUNITY ENERGY AUTHORITY AUTHORIZING
PARTICIPATION IN THE PG&E HOURLY FLEX PRICING PILOTS

WHEREAS Ava Community Energy Authority (“Ava”) was formed as a community choice aggregation agency (“CCA”) on December 1, 2016, under the Joint Exercise of Powers Act, California Government Code sections 6500 *et seq.*, among the County of Alameda, and the Cities of Albany, Berkeley, Dublin, Emeryville, Fremont, Hayward, Livermore, Piedmont, Oakland, San Leandro, and Union City to study, promote, develop, conduct, operate, and manage energy-related climate change programs in all of the member jurisdictions. The cities of Newark and Pleasanton, located in Alameda County, along with the City of Tracy, located in San Joaquin County, were added as members of Ava and parties to the Joint Powers Agreement (“JPA”) in March of 2020. The city of Stockton was added as a member to Ava in September of 2022. The city of Lathrop was added as a member to Ava in October of 2023. San Joaquin County was added as a member to Ava in July 2024. On October 24, 2023, Ava legally adopted the name Ava Community Energy Authority, where it had previously used the name East Bay Community Energy Authority since its inception.

WHEREAS the California Energy Commission (“CEC”) Load Management Standards (“LMS”), require CCAs to offer customers voluntary participation in hourly marginal cost-based rates (“hourly rates”) by 2027, and

WHEREAS The LMS provide that a CCA may modify compliance with this requirement if implementing hourly rates is found not to be technologically feasible, equitable, safe, or cost-effective, and

WHEREAS Ava does not currently have sufficient information to conclude that proposing and implementing dynamic rates would be cost effective or provide benefits to Ava customers, because significant uncertainties exist related to the level of incremental load shift potential, customer response to market price risks, customer acceptance and adoption of a complex new rate design, the administrative costs of dynamic rate implementation, and potential cost shifts between participants and non-participants, and

WHEREAS Participating in the Vehicle to Grid Integration (“VGI”) and Expanded Pilots with Pacific Gas & Electric (“PG&E”) could inform Ava’s decision of whether to eventually adopt hourly rates and how to otherwise comply with the Load Management Standards.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF AVA COMMUNITY ENERGY AUTHORITY DOES HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Ava is authorized to participate in the VGI Pilots and Expanded Pilots in partnership with PG&E and offer customers the associated dynamic rates.

ADOPTED AND APPROVED this 18th day of September, 2024

Jack Balch, Chair

ATTEST:

Adrian Bankhead, Clerk of the Board



CEO Report Item 13

TO: Ava Community Energy Board of Directors

FROM: Howard Chang, Chief Executive Officer

SUBJECT: CEO Report (Informational Item)

DATE: September 18, 2024

Recommendation

Accept Chief Executive Officer (CEO) report on update items below.

Executive Committee Meeting

An Executive Committee Meeting was held on Wednesday, September 4, 2024. Members received an update on Ava's resilience initiatives. This includes our Critical Municipal Facilities program, a variety of grants, and our solar & storage incentive program. We are currently reviewing Grant Applications for the Community Organizing and Capacity Building for Resilience Hubs Community Innovation Grant. The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, October 2, 2024 at 9am.

Financial, Administrative and Procurement Subcommittee Meeting

A Financial, Administrative and Procurement Subcommittee meeting was held on Wednesday, September 11, 2024. Members received updates on the status of the fiscal audit and Ava's participation in Hourly Flex Pricing pilot programs. The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, November 13, 2024 at 1pm.

New Employees

Colin Krenitsky, Director, Clean Energy Structured Finance

Colin joined Ava's Clean Energy Structured Finance team on 8/22/2024 as a Director, Clean Energy Structured Finance. Colin is responsible for structuring, negotiating, and closing strategic Ava financial transactions

Prior to Ava, Colin has spent 9 years in renewable energy project finance and capital markets, including roles at SolarCity, Tesla, Sunrun, Sunlight Financial, and Swell Energy. He has overseen the closing and management of over \$5 billion in renewable energy transactions across various asset classes including tax equity, warehouse financing, asset-backed securitizations, whole loan sales, and more.

Colin holds a B.S. in Business Administration from Boston College, and Master in Business Administration from Boston University.

Community Grants Update

Ava staff have several workstreams in flight related to community grants.

1. Work continues with consumer education through live induction cooking demonstrations through our grant with Channing Street Copper. Live demonstrations were conducted at four different events in August and three events in September.
2. The board gave authority in May to staff to negotiate and execute contracts with Rising Sun Center for Opportunity and Advancing Green Apprenticeship Pathways (AGAPE) for clean energy jobs training and awareness. Those contracts are nearly complete.
3. We received four proposals to our solicitation for community electric vehicle charging. Two contract awards are listed on tonight's consent agenda for board approval resulting from the solicitation.
4. A request for proposals was issued in July for a community partner to support the workshops, development of case studies, and project support for community resilience hubs with a deadline of 8/30. Proposals are being evaluated by Ava staff and recommended contracts will be brought to the board in October.

Habitat for Humanity Groundbreaking

On August 28th, Ava staff were part of a ceremonial groundbreaking for the new Habitat for Humanity community called Sequoia Grove – 10 all-electric homes in Hayward. Ava provided funding for the installation of induction stoves, heat pump water heaters, heat pump heating and cooling systems, and battery storage to supplement the photovoltaics that will also be installed on the homes. New homeowners are expected to move in during the Summer of 2026. Ava will develop content throughout the construction of these homes to support our customers' understanding of home electrification. More information can be found at avaenergy.org/habitat-for-humanity.



Community Sponsorships

Ava provides approximately 10-12 community sponsorships three times a year. Each award can be up to \$2,500. Examples of community sponsorship recipients include but are not limited to youth sports teams, STEM programs, performing arts programs, and environmental groups. Applications are open now through November for sponsorship awards that will be granted in December. More information can be found at avaenergy.org/community/grants-sponsorships/community-sponsorships.

New Website

As part of the on-going work to deliver on our brand promise, an updated website was launched on September 9th. The design of the website supports more frequent and relevant content updates to further engage with our customers. There is also a new feature – each member jurisdiction has its own landing page that includes key statistics about Ava's service in that area.

The jurisdiction-specific data will be refreshed regularly. The web address remains unchanged at AvaEnergy.org.

Upcoming Events

To raise awareness of our service, support our community, and stay close to our customers, Ava sponsors and staffs events throughout our service territory all year long. We welcome board members, customers, and the public to stop by to say hello at any of these upcoming events. Email sluo@avaenergy.org if you have any questions.



Date	Event	Location
9/22/2024	Newark Days - Community Information Faire	Newark Community Center
9/29/2024	Oakland Roots VS. FC Tulsa	CSUEB Pioneer Stadium, Hayward
10/5/2024	Emeryville Harvest Festival	Huchiun Park, Emeryville
10/5/2024	Science in the Park	CSUEB, Hayward
10/5/2024	Alameda County Emergency Preparedness Day <i>(Ava staff will not be present at this event, but we are an underwriter)</i>	Ed Roberts Campus, Berkeley
10/10/202	Lincoln Summer Nights	Lincoln Square Park, Oakland
10/12/202	Oakland Roots VS. Phoenix Rising FC	CSUEB Pioneer Stadium, Hayward

July 2024 Rate Change Analysis, in brief

In comparison to June 2024, Ava's effective rates (which includes the Power Charge Indifference Adjustment) decreased by about 12% in July 2024. In comparison to July 2023 rates, Ava's effective rates increased by 0.5% while PG&E's delivery rates have increased by about 30%.

July 2024 Compared To	Bright Choice Generation Rate	System Fees [PCIA + FFS]	Total Generation Costs	PG&E Delivery Rate
July 2023	-4.6%	184.5%	0.5%	31.5%
June 2024	-12.2%	-1.4%	-11.4%	7.0%



Staff Report Item 15

To:	Ava Community Energy Authority
From:	Howard Chang, Chief Executive Officer
Subject:	PG&E Nuclear Allocation Decision (Action Item)
Date:	September 18, 2024

Summary/Recommendation

Staff is seeking Board guidance in consideration of the nuclear greenhouse gas free (“GHG-free”) attributes being offered as a result of extended operations at Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant (“DCPP”). If the Board desires to accept the nuclear attributes, staff recommends the adoption of the attached Resolution. Opting to decline the nuclear attributes requires no formal action by the Board.

Financial Impact

Fiscal impacts of this item are specific to energy procurement cost savings for the Bright Choice product and are realized beginning in 2025, when nuclear could offset large hydro procurement needs. There are no costs associated with acceptance of the allocation.

Analysis and Context

In 2020, load serving entities (“LSEs”) within PG&E service territory were offered GHG-free attributes from large hydro and nuclear power proportional to the LSE’s load. Ava, then EBCE, brought forth multiple informational and action items to the Board regarding the allocations. At the April 2020 Board meeting, the Board voted to accept the large hydro allocation and reject the nuclear allocation.

While Ava has received an allocation of GHG-free energy from PG&E's portfolio of large hydro resources from 2020 through 2024, there is uncertainty around what allocation structure will be in place for future years, or whether there will be an allocation to customers with a cost responsibility. Weather variability also plays an important factor in annual availability of large hydro generation.

When the Board acted in 2020, it was anticipated that DCPD would shut down in 2024-2025. On December 14, 2023, however, the California Public Utilities Commission ("CPUC") conducted a formal review process and adopted a final Decision¹ that extended operations at DCPD until October 31, 2029 for Unit 1 and October 31, 2030 for Unit 2 due to concerns related to grid capacity and reliability. This Decision requires PG&E to continue to offer LSEs the ability to use their share of DCPD's GHG-free attributes for their power content label using the existing process for voluntary offering as a model. This allocation process for the GHG attributes from extended operations at DCPD was formalized in an Advice Letter filed by PG&E on June 12, 2024²

There is no obligation to accept an allocation of nuclear energy, and acceptance or rejection of the nuclear allocation will have no impact on the extension of DCPD, which has already been approved. All customers pay for, and will continue to pay for, PG&E nuclear generation costs through the Power Charge Indifference Adjustment ("PCIA"). Whether or not Ava accepts the nuclear allocation has no impact on PCIA charges as the PCIA is a non-by-passable charge set annually by the CPUC.

The volume of nuclear power to be offered is still being determined and will be made to all LSEs across California, not just those within PG&E territory. Staff estimates that the allocation PG&E offers to Ava may contain ~610,000 mega-watt hour ("MWh") of nuclear power. Resource Adequacy is also included across all LSEs, as part of the allocation.

Scenarios for Board Consideration:

Scenario 0 – Do not accept nuclear. This would continue the status quo.

Scenario 1 – Ava accepts nuclear allocation up to Ava's load share percentage and uses it to offset large hydro procurement starting in 2025.

Scenario 2 – Ava accepts nuclear allocation and uses it to offset our carbon intensity, reducing unspecified power to 9% in 2025

Scenario 3 – Ava accepts nuclear allocation and further reduces our carbon intensity with additional large hydro or nuclear purchases.

Depending on the Board's action, the nuclear allocation could offset from 0% up to 100% of the unspecified emissions listed in the Bright Choice Power Content label in year one.

Should the Board opt to accept the nuclear allocation, the Board will need to specify which scenario Ava would follow as provided above. A Resolution is provided to formalize that action with the different scenarios provided in brackets, which would be selected as directed by the Board.

No formal action is required to decline the nuclear allocation as that is Ava's current status quo.

¹ D.23-12-036.

² Advice Letter 7295-E

Committee Recommendation

This item was presented to the Community Advisory Committee (“CAC”) on May 13, 2024. The CAC recommended delaying approval and expressed opposition to accepting the nuclear allocation.

Attachments

- A. Scenario 1: A Resolution of the Board of Directors of Ava Community Energy Authority to Accept Ava’s Allocation of GHG-Free Attributes from Extended Operations at DCPD through 2030, using the allocation to offset large hydro procurement with immediate savings starting in 2025
- B. Scenario 2: A Resolution of the Board of Directors of Ava Community Energy Authority to Accept Ava’s Allocation of GHG-Free Attributes from Extended Operations at DCPD through 2030, reducing unspecified power in direct proportion to the allocation amount year one, then offsetting large hydro procurement
- C. Scenario 3: A Resolution of the Board of Directors of Ava Community Energy Authority to Accept Ava’s Allocation of GHG-Free Attributes from Extended Operations at DCPD through 2030, and additional procurement of large hydro or nuclear to reduce unspecified to 0% in 2025
- D. Nuclear Allocation Decision Presentation

RESOLUTION NO. R-2024-xx

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

OF AVA COMMUNITY ENERGY AUTHORITY APPROVING AVA'S ACCEPTANCE OF THEIR ALLOCATION OF GHG-FREE ATTRIBUTES FROM EXTENDED OPERATIONS AT DIABLO CANYON NUCLEAR POWER PLANT (DCPP)

WHEREAS Ava Community Energy Authority ("Ava") was formed as a community choice aggregation agency ("CCA") on December 1, 2016, under the Joint Exercise of Powers Act, California Government Code sections 6500 *et seq.*, among the County of Alameda, and the Cities of Albany, Berkeley, Dublin, Emeryville, Fremont, Hayward, Livermore, Piedmont, Oakland, San Leandro, and Union City to study, promote, develop, conduct, operate, and manage energy-related climate change programs in all of the member jurisdictions. The cities of Newark and Pleasanton, located in Alameda County, along with the City of Tracy, located in San Joaquin County, were added as members of Ava and parties to the Joint Powers Agreement ("JPA") in March of 2020. The city of Stockton was added as a member to Ava in September of 2022. The city of Lathrop was added as a member to Ava in October of 2023. San Joaquin County was added as a member to Ava in July 2024. On October 24, 2023, Ava legally adopted the name Ava Community Energy Authority, where it had previously used the name East Bay Community Energy Authority since its inception.

WHEREAS the California Public Utilities Commission's ("CPUC") December 14, 2023 final decision D.23-12-036 ("Decision") extended operations at Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant ("DCPP") until October 31, 2029 (Unit 1) and October 31, 2030 (Unit 2) due to insufficient CAISO grid capacity and reliability concerns;

WHEREAS the Decision requires PG&E to offer load serving entities the ability to use their share of DCPP's Greenhouse Gas-free ("GHG-free") attributes for their power content label; and

WHEREAS Ava is eligible to receive their share of GHG-free attributes from extended operations at DCPP.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF AVA COMMUNITY ENERGY AUTHORITY DOES HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The Board of Directors approves Ava's acceptance of their allocation of GHG-free attributes from extended operations at DCPP through 2030, using the allocation to offset large hydro procurement with immediate savings starting in 2025.

ADOPTED AND APPROVED this 18th day of September, 2024.

Jack Balch, Chair

ATTEST:

Adrian Bankhead, Clerk of the Board

RESOLUTION NO. R-2024-xx

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

OF AVA COMMUNITY ENERGY AUTHORITY APPROVING AVA'S ACCEPTANCE OF THEIR ALLOCATION OF GHG-FREE ATTRIBUTES FROM EXTENDED OPERATIONS AT DIABLO CANYON NUCLEAR POWER PLANT (DCPP)

WHEREAS Ava Community Energy Authority ("Ava") was formed as a community choice aggregation agency ("CCA") on December 1, 2016, under the Joint Exercise of Powers Act, California Government Code sections 6500 *et seq.*, among the County of Alameda, and the Cities of Albany, Berkeley, Dublin, Emeryville, Fremont, Hayward, Livermore, Piedmont, Oakland, San Leandro, and Union City to study, promote, develop, conduct, operate, and manage energy-related climate change programs in all of the member jurisdictions. The cities of Newark and Pleasanton, located in Alameda County, along with the City of Tracy, located in San Joaquin County, were added as members of Ava and parties to the Joint Powers Agreement ("JPA") in March of 2020. The city of Stockton was added as a member to Ava in September of 2022. The city of Lathrop was added as a member to Ava in October of 2023. San Joaquin County was added as a member to Ava in July 2024. On October 24, 2023, Ava legally adopted the name Ava Community Energy Authority, where it had previously used the name East Bay Community Energy Authority since its inception.

WHEREAS the California Public Utilities Commission's ("CPUC") December 14, 2023 final decision D.23-12-036 ("Decision") extended operations at Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant ("DCPP") until October 31, 2029 (Unit 1) and October 31, 2030 (Unit 2) due to insufficient CAISO grid capacity and reliability concerns;

WHEREAS the Decision requires PG&E to offer load serving entities the ability to use their share of DCPP's Greenhouse Gas-free ("GHG-free") attributes for their power content label; and

WHEREAS Ava is eligible to receive their share of GHG-free attributes from extended operations at DCPP.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF AVA COMMUNITY ENERGY AUTHORITY DOES HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The Board of Directors approves Ava's acceptance of their allocation of GHG-free attributes from extended operations at DCPP through 2030, reducing unspecified power in direct proportion to the allocation amount in year one, then offsetting large hydro procurement.

ADOPTED AND APPROVED this 18th day of September, 2024.

Jack Balch, Chair

ATTEST:

Adrian Bankhead, Clerk of the Board

RESOLUTION NO. R-2024-xx

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

OF AVA COMMUNITY ENERGY AUTHORITY APPROVING AVA'S ACCEPTANCE OF THEIR ALLOCATION OF GHG-FREE ATTRIBUTES FROM EXTENDED OPERATIONS AT DIABLO CANYON NUCLEAR POWER PLANT (DCPP)

WHEREAS Ava Community Energy Authority ("Ava") was formed as a community choice aggregation agency ("CCA") on December 1, 2016, under the Joint Exercise of Powers Act, California Government Code sections 6500 *et seq.*, among the County of Alameda, and the Cities of Albany, Berkeley, Dublin, Emeryville, Fremont, Hayward, Livermore, Piedmont, Oakland, San Leandro, and Union City to study, promote, develop, conduct, operate, and manage energy-related climate change programs in all of the member jurisdictions. The cities of Newark and Pleasanton, located in Alameda County, along with the City of Tracy, located in San Joaquin County, were added as members of Ava and parties to the Joint Powers Agreement ("JPA") in March of 2020. The city of Stockton was added as a member to Ava in September of 2022. The city of Lathrop was added as a member to Ava in October of 2023. San Joaquin County was added as a member to Ava in July 2024. On October 24, 2023, Ava legally adopted the name Ava Community Energy Authority, where it had previously used the name East Bay Community Energy Authority since its inception.

WHEREAS the California Public Utilities Commission's ("CPUC") December 14, 2023 final decision D.23-12-036 ("Decision") extended operations at Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant ("DCPP") until October 31, 2029 (Unit 1) and October 31, 2030 (Unit 2) due to insufficient CAISO grid capacity and reliability concerns;

WHEREAS the Decision requires PG&E to offer load serving entities the ability to use their share of DCPP's Greenhouse Gas-free ("GHG-free") attributes for their power content label; and

WHEREAS Ava is eligible to receive their share of GHG-free attributes from extended operations at DCPP.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF AVA COMMUNITY ENERGY AUTHORITY DOES HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The Board of Directors approves Ava's acceptance of their allocation of GHG-free attributes from extended operations at DCPP through 2030, and additional procurement of large hydro or nuclear to reduce unspecified to 0% in 2025.

ADOPTED AND APPROVED this 18th day of September, 2024.

Jack Balch, Chair

ATTEST:

Adrian Bankhead, Clerk of the Board

Nuclear Allocation Decision

September 18, 2024



1. Introduction
2. Background
3. Baseline Facts
4. Scenarios for Board consideration
5. Appendix



Introduction

- In light of the extension of Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant (DCPP) to 2029/2030 timeframe, staff is seeking direction from the board on future acceptance or rejection of the GHG-free energy attributes
- CA State Legislature & Governor's office voted to extend DCPP operations in 2022 for system reliability and GHG emissions reductions purposes while requiring further development of a Clean Energy Reliability Investment Plan
 - CPUC subsequently formalized the extension in 2023
- PG&E will offer an allocation this fall, likely in the October/November timeframe, with delivery beginning Jan 2025
- PG&E 2023 power content is anticipated to be ~53% nuclear, 34% renewables, 13% large hydro
 - PG&E elects not to disclose significant natural gas emissions due to excess generation
- Ava Bright Choice 2023 power content is ~55% renewables, 34% large hydro, and ~11% unspecified system power



Summary

- Ava's decision to accept or reject the allocation of nuclear GHG-free attributes will not impact the operational extension of DCPD and will not impact CA's energy mix
 - Resource adequacy benefits are shared across all load serving entities regardless of this decision
- Energy resource diversification is critical to attaining Ava's and CA's clean energy goals. DCPD will continue to operate through 2030 regardless of Ava's decision and therefore is not additive to system diversification
- The benefits of accepting nuclear are cost savings, GHG emissions reductions, and more transparent GHG emissions disclosures from PG&E, which should be considered along with our customer & community preferences on power mix
- Accept/Reject Scenarios:
 - Scenario 0: Do not accept nuclear
 - Scenario 1: Accept nuclear, procure less large hydro = ~\$20MM savings in 2025 relative to budget
 - Scenario 2: Accept nuclear, procure less system power = \$0 impact in 2025 with future savings
 - Scenario 3: Accept nuclear, procure more GHG-free energy to eliminate system power = ~\$10-16MM cost in 2025



Background



Information on Pending GHG-free Nuclear Offer

- The pending nuclear offer will be made to all load serving entities across California, not just those within PG&E's service area.
- PG&E filed Advice Letter 7295-E on June 12th outlining the allocation process. They will offer both nuclear and hydroelectric power which we could select together or separately
- PG&E will offer the nuclear power based on load share through 2030 on an annual basis. Offers will need to be accepted annually.
 - Historically, there has not been flexibility to accept a partial allocation – it has been acceptance or rejection only
- PG&E is expected to make the allocation offer in fall 2024. Deliveries would begin in January 2025.
 - Historically PG&E has issued a notice with a draft confirm in early November of each year followed by approximately two weeks to review the agreement, a PG&E review period, and another approximately three weeks for execution to arrive at a fully executed agreement in December.
- Staff is seeking board feedback in consideration of these anticipated nuclear GHG-free attributes being offered.
- Note that acceptance or rejection of these nuclear attributes will have no impact on the extension of Diablo Canyon, which has already been approved.



Overview:

- SB 846 (Dodd) authorizes the extension of the DCPD beyond the previous expiration dates (2024 for Unit 1 and 2025 for Unit 2), to up to five additional years (no later than 2029 and 2030, respectively)
- Signed by Governor Newsom in September of 2022

Further Details:

- Requires the CPUC to set new retirement dates for DCPD
- Authorizes \$1.4B loan (appropriated \$600M in 2022 and \$400M in 2024) to PG&E to facilitate the extension of the plant
- Provides expedited permitting to facilitate relicensing of DCPD
- Authorizes collections of non-bypassable charges from electric ratepayers from all LSEs (including Ava) for ongoing DCPD costs
- Requires CEC to develop a Clean Energy Reliability Investment Plan to accelerate clean energy resources and reliability

Voting Process:

- SB 846 passed by a wide, bipartisan margin: 69-3 in the CA Assembly and 31-1 in the CA Senate

Bill Rationale:

- SB 846: extending the DCPD "may be necessary to improve statewide energy system reliability and to reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases while additional renewable energy and zero-carbon resources come online, until those new renewable energy and zero-carbon resources are adequate to meet demand." The Legislature finds "...a renewed license term is prudent, cost effective, and in the best interests of all California electricity customers."



Regulatory Background

- **On December 14, 2023, the CPUC adopted a final Decision that extended operations at Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant (DCPP) until October 31, 2029 (Unit 1) and October 31, 2030 (Unit 2) due to insufficient CAISO grid capacity and reliability concerns.**
 - The Decision requires PG&E to offer LSEs the ability to use their share of DCPP's GHG-free attributes for their power content label using the existing process for voluntary offering as a model.
 - Ava has used estimates of the GHG free attributes in the included scenarios in this ppt as final allocation ratios will not be released until summer 2024.
 - Note: Resource Adequacy is not a voluntary allocation and is included across all LSEs
- **While Ava has received an allocation of carbon free energy from PG&E's portfolio of large hydro resources from 2020 through 2024, there is uncertainty around what structure will be in place for future years and whether a new market price benchmark will be incorporated, or if there will be an allocation to customers with a cost responsibility.**
 - Note that large hydro allocations may be reduced going forward as PG&E may have discretion over allocation offerings and large hydro market purchases are increasingly scarce and variable year to year.
- **The current emissions accounting methodology is tracked on an annual basis and the enclosed emissions estimates in this presentation reflect the current rules. Hourly emissions accounting rules are being contemplated for the Power Source Disclosure (PSD) program beginning in 2028. This could meaningfully change Ava's emissions levels.**



Safety Committee (DCISC)

- Requires continuation of the Independent Safety Committee for DCP, and requires the PUC to fund the committee
 - PUC under existing authority, has already established the Diablo Canyon Independent Safety Committee (DCISC) to make recommendations to review and enhance safety of operations at DCP
 - DCISC holds regular public meetings, with the last meeting held February 21-22, 2024.
 - Presentations and fact-finding reports (on risk assessment, maintenance, seismic assessments, training etc.) are posted publicly to their website
 - Fact-finding reports include Nuclear Regulatory Commission inspection findings (summarized through over 5600 Inspection hours at DCP in 2023)
- Required that an updated seismic and risk assessment be done prior to August of 2024 when the (current operating license expires)
- An updated seismic assessment was conducted from 6/2023 to 1/2024 in response to SB 846 (no updates recommended)
- Ava staff is reliant on DCISC determinations on safe operations and does not have deep expertise on nuclear operations and safety. DCISC findings and reports are provided at <https://www.dcisc.org/annual-reports/>



Baseline Facts

- Current 2030 Bright Choice Procurement Schedule
- Ava and PG&E 2023 Power Content
- CCA Nuclear Allocations



2030 Goal for 100% Clean Bright Choice Service

- The board approved the following Renewable Energy and Carbon Free Procurement schedule in April 2022
 - *Indicates subsequent board approved changes to the procurement schedule

	Bright Choice				CA-RPS %
Year	Renewable %	Carbon Free %	Unspecified %	Estimated PSDR Emission Factor	Renewable %
2018	41%	62%	38%	n/a	29%
2019	60%	87%	13%	n/a	31%
2020	40%	55%	45%	591	33%
2021	42%	60%	40%	564	36%
2022	49%*	72%*	28%*	496	39%
2023	54%*	76%*	24%*	503*	41%
2024	52%	81%*	19%*	403*	44%
2025	56%	81%*	19%*	371*	47%
2026	60%	81%	19%	315	49%
2027	64%	85%	15%	241	52%
2028	67%	90%	10%	163	55%
2029	71%	95%	5%	83	57%
2030	75%	100%	0%	-	60%

Source: Board Item from October 18, 2023 plus subsequent changes indicated by *



2023 Draft Power Content

(most recent reporting year)

	Bright Choice	Renewable 100	PG&E
	Percent of Total Retail Sales	Percent of Total Retail Sales	Percent of Total Retail Sales
Renewable Procurements	54.6%	100.0%	34.0%
Biomass & Biowaste	13.0%	0.0%	
Geothermal	2.2%	0.0%	
Eligible Hydroelectric	2.5%	0.0%	34.0%
Solar	5.6%	67.5%	
Wind	31.3%	32.5%	
Coal	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Large Hydroelectric	34.1%	0.0%	13.0%
Natural gas	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Nuclear	0.0%	0.0%	53.0%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Unspecified Power	11.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

GHG Emissions Intensity (converted to lbs CO₂e/MWh)

374

-

PG&E claims 0 emissions in 2023

Source: <https://investor.pgecorp.com/news-events/press-releases/press-release-details/2024/PGE-Customers-Electricity-100-Greenhouse-Gas-Free-in-2023/default.aspx>



PG&E Historical Power Mix

	2020	2021	2022	2023
Renewables	31%	48%	38%	34%
Large Hydroelectric	10%	4%	8%	13%
Natural Gas	16%	9%	5%	0%
Nuclear	43%	39%	49%	53%

- Based on today's Power Content Regulations, if generation exceeds load a load serving has discretion for what it discloses.
- PG&E has considerable natural gas generation that it elects not to disclose
- Ava has sought to adjust the Power Content Label rules to require gas emissions unsuccessfully



CCA Background

- Approximately half of all CCAs statewide have accepted nuclear historically (see slide 15), while half have rejected
- The majority of PG&E-territory CCAs have historically rejected nuclear (see table below)
- Several CCAs are currently revisiting the decision on accepting/rejecting nuclear:
 - MCE brought this topic to their Technical Committee and Executive Committee with unanimous approval to accept nuclear; plan to bring to their full board in September
 - Sonoma Clean Power, Peninsula Clean Energy, and other CCAs are currently evaluating based on affordability concerns

Retail Suppliers	Retail Sales (MWh)	GHG Intensity (lbs CO ₂ e/MWh)	Eligible Renewables (TOTAL)	Large Hydro	Natural Gas	Unspecified Power	Nuclear
Pacific Gas and Electric Company - Base Plan	30,291,314	56	38.3%	7.6%	4.8%	0.0%	49.3%
Pioneer Community Energy - Base Service	1,633,901	343	44.1%	1.3%	0.0%	27.0%	27.6%
San José Clean Energy - GreenSource	3,476,520	116	59.2%	7.4%	0.0%	8.6%	24.8%
Silicon Valley Clean Energy - Green Start	3,605,920	72	44.9%	30.8%	0.0%	0.0%	24.3%
Sonoma Clean Power Authority - CleanStart	2,081,597	112	50.3%	40.0%	0.0%	8.7%	0.9%
MCE - 2022 MCE Light Green Power Mix	5,307,105	44	59.6%	39.5%	0.0%	0.5%	0.4%
East Bay Community Energy - Bright Choice	5,076,143	496	49.4%	21.9%	0.0%	28.4%	0.2%
Central Coast Community Energy - 3Cchoice	5,020,658	637	35.8%	5.9%	0.0%	58.3%	0.0%
CleanPowerSF - Green	2,621,385	47	59.9%	37.2%	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%
Peninsula Clean Energy Authority - ECOplus	3,089,082	9	51.8%	48.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Redwood Coast Energy Authority - REpower	591,992	49	50.0%	45.0%	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%
Valley Clean Energy Alliance - Standard Green	732,719	709	17.5%	7.4%	0.0%	75.1%	0.0%



2022 Power Content Labels for CCAs with nuclear content >5%

Attachment Staff Report Item 15D

Retail Suppliers	Retail Sales (MWh)	GHG Intensity (lbs. CO2e/MWh)	Eligible Renewables (TOTAL)	Large Hydro	Natural Gas	Unspecified Power	Nuclear
San José Clean Energy - GreenValue	202,231	210	40.2%	9.2%	0.0%	19.8%	30.9%
Pioneer Community Energy - 2022 Pioneer Community Energy Base Service	1,633,901	343	44.1%	1.3%	0.0%	27.0%	27.6%
Orange County Power Authority - 2022 OCPA Basic Choice	177,052	503	62.3%	12.4%	0.0%	0.0%	25.3%
San José Clean Energy - GreenSource	3,476,520	116	59.2%	7.4%	0.0%	8.6%	24.8%
Silicon Valley Clean Energy - Green Start	3,605,920	72	44.9%	30.8%	0.0%	0.0%	24.3%
Energy for Palmdale's Independent Choice - 2022 EPIC Power	52,416	458	34.3%	0.0%	0.0%	42.8%	22.9%
Lancaster Choice Energy - 2022 Clear Choice	611,814	588	33.6%	0.4%	0.0%	56.4%	9.7%
San Jacinto Power - 2022 SJP PrimePower Power Mix	172,810	633	30.8%	3.3%	0.0%	60.1%	5.8%
Rancho Mirage Energy Authority - 2022 Base Choice	282,288	612	32.3%	3.0%	0.0%	59.0%	5.7%
Pomona Choice Energy - 2022 Pomona Choice	423,784	611	32.9%	3.2%	0.0%	58.3%	5.7%
Apple Valley Choice Energy - 2022 AVCE Core Choice	254,247	693	23.6%	3.2%	0.0%	67.6%	5.6%
Pico Rivera Innovative Municipal Energy - 2022 Prime Power	211,547	538	40.8%	3.3%	0.0%	50.5%	5.4%
Pacific Gas and Electric Company - Base Plan	30,291,314	56	38.3%	7.6%	4.8%	0.0%	49.3%
Pacific Gas and Electric Company - 50% Solar Choice	31,563	46	67.2%	3.8%	4.3%	0.0%	24.6%
Ava/East Bay Community Energy - Bright Choice	5,076,143	496	49.4%	21.9%	0.0%	28.4%	0.2%
2022 CA Utility Average and Total Retail Sales	243,240,118	430	35.8%	9.2%	36.4%	7.1%	9.2%



Source: https://www.energy.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2024-02/2022_Power_Content_Labels_Sortable_Table_ada.xlsx

Scenarios for Board Consideration



Scenarios for Board Consideration

Attachment Staff Report Item 15D

Scenario 0 – Do Not Accept Nuclear

- Continue towards 2030 Renewable Energy (RE) and Carbon Free (CF) targets

Scenario 1 – Accept Nuclear + reduce large hydro

- No change to 2030 RE or CF targets
- Use nuclear to offset hydro with immediate cost savings in 2025
- ~\$20MM savings in 2025

Scenario 2 – Accept Nuclear + reduce unspecified

- No change to 2030 RE or CF targets
- Reduce unspecified to 9% year one, then offset hydro needs

Scenario 3 – Accept Nuclear + eliminate system power

- No change to 2030 RE or CF targets
- Buy additional large hydro/nuclear to reduce unspecified to 0%
- ~\$10-16MM cost in 2025



Details: Scenario 0 – Do Not Accept Nuclear Allocation

- No financial impact given this is the base case
 - Note that based on energy market volatility and increased demand for renewables staff is evaluating whether an upward rate adjustment of R100 is needed
- Power content follows plan for 2030
- * Indicates board approved procurement changes based on annual budgeting process

	Bright Choice				CA-RPS %
Year	Renewable %	Carbon Free %	Unspecified %	PSDR Emission Factor Estimate	Renewable %
2018	41%	62%	38%	n/a	29%
2019	60%	87%	13%	n/a	31%
2020	40%	55%	45%	591	33%
2021	42%	60%	40%	564	36%
2022	49%*	72%*	28%	496	39%
2023	54%*	76%*	24%*	503*	41%
2024	52%	81%*	19%*	403*	44%
2025	56%	81%*	19%*	371*	47%
2026	60%	81%	19%	315	49%
2027	64%	85%	15%	241	52%
2028	67%	90%	10%	163	55%
2029	71%	95%	5%	83	57%
2030	75%	100%	0%	-	60%



Details: Scenario 1 – Accept Nuclear Allocation

General

- No change to Renewable Energy (RE) or Carbon-Free (CF) targets
- Procure less large hydro resulting in cost savings year one

Financial

	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
Potential savings on hydro	\$ 19,560,851	\$20,661,212	\$21,706,103	\$ 21,438,734	\$21,976,609	\$20,484,860

Power Content

Bright Choice Power Content (estimated)	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
Renewable Energy	56%	60%	64%	67%	71%	75%
Large Hydro	15%	10%	10%	12%	14%	15%
Nuclear	10%	11%	11%	11%	10%	10%
Unspecified	19%	19%	15%	10%	5%	0%
GHG Emissions	371	371	284	191	97	0
<i>Reference: Current Plan Unspecified</i>	<i>19%</i>	<i>19%</i>	<i>15%</i>	<i>10%</i>	<i>5%</i>	<i>0%</i>



Details: Scenario 2 – Accept Nuclear Allocation + Reduce Unspecified to 9%

Attachment Staff Report Item 15D

General

- No change to RE or CF targets; Reduce unspecified to 9% year one, then offsets hydro needs
- Reduced emissions starting in 2025 and savings starting in 2027

Financial

	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
Potential savings on hydro	-	-	\$5,751,975	\$15,399,916	\$10,920,175	\$20,484,860

Power Content

Bright Choice Power Content (estimated)	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
Renewable Energy	56%	60%	64%	67%	71%	75%
Large Hydro	25%	21%	18%	15%	19%	15%
Nuclear	10%	11%	11%	11%	10%	10%
Unspecified	9%	8%	7%	7%	0%	0%
GHG Emissions	273	262	207	162	97	0
<i>Reference: Current Plan Unspecified</i>	19%	19%	15%	10%	5%	0%



Details: Scenario 3 – Accept Nuclear Allocation + Additional large hydro or nuclear

General

- No change to RE or CF targets; Reduce unspecified and buy additional large hydro or nuclear to eliminate unspecified in 2025 (emissions would be from PCC2s only)
- Then offsets hydro needs starting in 2028

Financial

	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
Potential savings on hydro	-	-	-	\$1,309,341	\$10,920,175	\$20,484,860
Cost for add'l nuclear (\$20)	\$9,647,593	\$8,162,906	\$2,083,163			
Cost of add'l large hydro (\$34)	\$16,400,908	13,876,940	\$6,249,488			

Power Content

Bright Choice Power Content (estimated)	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
Renewable Energy	56%	60%	64%	67%	71%	75%
Large Hydro	25%	21%	21%	22%	19%	15%
Nuclear	10%	11%	11%	11%	10%	10%
Add'l Hydro or Nuclear	9%	8%	4%	0%	0%	0%
Unspecified	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
GHG Emissions	191	190	141	96	50	0
<i>Reference: Current Plan Unspecified</i>	<i>19%</i>	<i>19%</i>	<i>15%</i>	<i>10%</i>	<i>5%</i>	<i>0%</i>



2025 Bright Choice Estimated Power Content by Scenario

2025 Bright Choice Power Content (estimated)	Scenario 0*	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3
Renewable Energy	56%	56%	56%	56%
Large Hydro	25%	15%	25%	25%
Nuclear	0%	10%	10%	10%
Additional Hydro or Nuclear	0%	0%	0%	9%
Unspecified	19%	19%	9%	0%
GHG Emissions	371	371	230	191
Estimated (Savings)/Cost	\$0	(\$20MM)	\$0	\$10-16MM

*Based on board adopted 2030 Carbon-Free Goal plus subsequent budget approvals



Conclusion

- Staff is seeking board direction at this time in preparation for the pending nuclear allocation from PG&E in Fall 2024
- Ava's decision to accept or reject the allocation of nuclear GHG-free attributes will not impact the operational extension of DCCP and will not impact CA's energy mix
- The benefits of accepting nuclear are cost savings, GHG emissions reductions, and more transparent GHG emissions disclosures from PG&E, which must be considered along with our customer & community preferences on power mix
- Accept/Reject Scenarios:
 - Scenario 0: Do not accept nuclear
 - Scenario 1: Accept nuclear, procure less large hydro = ~\$20MM savings in 2025 relative to budget
 - Scenario 2: Accept nuclear, procure less system power = \$0 impact in 2025 with future savings
 - Scenario 3: Accept nuclear, procure more GHG-free energy to eliminate system power = ~\$10-16MM cost in 2025
- Recommendation to the board to consider a phased voting:
 - Phase A: Vote on Reject or Accept Nuclear GHG Free attributes from Diablo Canyon through 2030
 - Phase B: If accepted, then vote on Scenarios 1, 2, or 3



Appendix



Ava Background

- Ava brought forth multiple informational and action items to the Board regarding Nuclear allocations in 2019 and 2020.
- In the **April 2020** Board meeting, a decision was passed to accept the large hydro allocation and reject the nuclear allocation.
 - Decision passed with a vote of 10 yes and 5 no; No's were in favor of accepting the nuclear allocation
 - No votes: Hayward, Newark, Pleasanton, Piedmont, Livermore
 - 80+ public comments in opposition to accepting Nuclear
- In the **December 2020** Board meeting, a decision was passed to accept the nuclear allocation to resell the attributes at equal to or >\$0.
 - This decision was in part passed because PG&E is able to disclose a lower GHG emissions level due to high nuclear content. It is able to elect not to disclose its natural gas procurement in favor of carbon-free nuclear.
 - Decision passed with 10 yes and 2 No; No's were in favor of accepting and retaining the nuclear
 - No votes: Hayward, Albany
 - 10+ public comments in opposition to this structure
- Following the formal extension of Diablo Canyon, the 2024 allocation decision was brought forward as an informational item to the Ava board for consideration in April 2024




Energy Market Background

- **Energy Market Pricing Dynamics**

- Historically PCC1 Renewable Energy Credits (RECs) have generally priced in the \$10 to \$15/MWh range and are currently pricing in the \$80 to \$90/MWh range.
- Historically Large Hydro GHG-free attributes have generally priced in the \$3 to \$6/MWh range and are currently pricing in the \$25 to \$35/MWh range.
- Historically nuclear GHG-free attributes have not been transacted and CCAs have shown varying interest with low interest in procuring it outside of accepting the PG&E allocation. There appears to be increasing interest from CCAs to accept and potentially procure additional nuclear currently.
- The **sharp increase in pricing** is driven by several factors, including limited generating capacity in CAISO, significant increased clean energy demand in California by CCAs and Corporates accelerating beyond SB100, increased clean energy demand outside of California impacting imports, and increased weather variability impacting supply. This weather variability has a particularly pronounced effect on large hydro resources inside and outside of CAISO.
- There continues to be upward pressure on pricing on the horizon and there are indications that there will likely be market demand for nuclear by other load serving entities.
- Pricing implications on the following slides are based on current market conditions and subject to increased volatility.



Large Hydro Production in California



Source: California Energy Commission [“Total System Electric Generation 2009-2022 with totals_ada.xlsx”](#)



Nuclear Power Production

- Nuclear plants operate at a steady state with small variations for maintenance
- Nuclear power covers about 2,000 MW of baseline load
- Nuclear power production represented by the grey strip in the charts below.


6/01/23

1/01/24

3/01/24


Supply trend

Energy in megawatts broken down by resource in 5-minute increments.




Supply trend

Energy in megawatts broken down by resource in 5-minute increments.



Supply trend

Energy in megawatts broken down by resource in 5-minute increments.



Questions?

Additional Resources:

1. <https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Published/G000/M521/K496/521496276.PDF>
2. https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220SB846
3. <https://www.pge.com/assets/pge/docs/about/pge-systems/seismic-assessment.pdf>
4. <https://www.dccsc.org/>
5. <https://www.dccsc.org/annual-reports/>



Tally of "No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy" Petition organized by the Local Clean Energy Alliance

	Yes	No	Total		
Albany	0	3	3		
Berkeley	1	28	29		
Castro Valley	0	4	4		
Dublin	0	1	1		
Emeryville	0	1	1		
Fremont	0	9	9		
Hayward	0	2	2		
Livermore	0	3	3		
Lompoc	0	1	1		
Newark	0	1	1		
Oakland	0	36	36		
Piedmont	0	2	2		
San Francisco	0	1	1		
Union City	0	2	2		
	1	94	95		



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Mara Duncan (maraduncan@pacbell.net) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
12:59 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Mara Duncan <maraduncan@pacbell.net>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

It is absurd to spend money on Nuclear energy, when we have not even found a safe place to store the radioactive waste we already have, and as importantly we could be using the money to expand alternative safe energy production. Now!

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Mara Duncan
848 Solano Ave
Albany, CA 94706
maraduncan@pacbell.net
(510) 526-0073

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

LII F (msldill@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at 1:29 PM

Reply-To: LII F <msldill@yahoo.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

LII F
900 madison
Albany, CA 94706
msldill@yahoo.com
(510) 222-2255
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Lynn Quirolo (quirol5@earthlink.net) Sent You a Personal Message

Sat, Sep 7, 2024 at
3:04 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Lynn Quirolo <quirol5@earthlink.net>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Keep our energy free of dirty nuclear energy that produces radioactive waste that lasts thousands of years. We need clean energy to keep the lights on. Where would the radioactive waste go anyway? No one wants it in their backyard.

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Lynn Quirolo
1033 Pomona Ave
Albany, CA 94706
quirol5@earthlink.net
(510) 527-0709

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Mimi Abers (mimiabers2@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
12:54 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Mimi Abers <mimiabers2@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Mimi Abers
1122 Oxford St
Berkeley, CA 94707
mimiabers2@gmail.com
(510) 525-6002
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Inger Acking (imamsw@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
12:57 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Inger Acking <imamsw@yahoo.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Inger Acking
851 Jones St
Berkeley, CA 94710
imamsw@yahoo.com
(510) 616-1374
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Stuart Ambler (kidledivydo-6@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
4:56 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Stuart Ambler <kidledivydo-6@yahoo.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Stuart Ambler
1335 Shattuck Ave
Berkeley, CA 94709
kidledivydo-6@yahoo.com
(720) 334-6720
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Traude Buckland (avenidacats@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Sat, Sep 7, 2024 at
11:58 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Traude Buckland <avenidacats@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Did you know that the cost of keeping Diablo Canyon open has skyrocketed to over \$1 billion a year in losses? And can you guess who is forced to pay for it? We are! PGandE offloads these costs to all customers in their territory.

I urge you to vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Traude Buckland
155 Avenida Dr
Berkeley, CA 94708
avenidacats@gmail.com
(510) 540-5780

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Wendy Diamond (wendy@musichael.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
2:00 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Wendy Diamond <wendy@musichael.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Wendy Diamond
523 Santa Barbara Rd
Berkeley, CA 94707
wendy@musichael.com
(510) 527-6617

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Antonia Frankhuijzen (antoniajoma@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
12:50 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Antonia Frankhuijzen <antoniajoma@yahoo.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Antonia Frankhuijzen
1161 Sutter St
Berkeley, CA 94707
antoniajoma@yahoo.com
(510) 604-5744

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Christine Goldin (cwgoldin@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
5:04 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Christine Goldin <cwgoldin@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Christine Goldin
2543 Hilgard Ave
Berkeley, CA 94709
cwgoldin@gmail.com
(510) 847-0289

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Ian Hart (ian@ianhartart.com) Sent You a Personal Message <kwautomail@phone2action.com> Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at 10:26 PM

Reply-To: Ian Hart <ian@ianhartart.com>
To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Nuclear energy has always been at best a disaster waiting to happen. At worst, it causes permanent (from a human point of view) local devastation. I believe everyone should refuse the devils bargain that is Diablo Canyon.

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Ian Hart
1614 Tyler St
Berkeley, CA 94703
ian@ianhartart.com
(347) 255-0525

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Carole Kalous (carolejk777@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
10:35 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Carole Kalous <carolejk777@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Carole Kalous
2230 Durant Ave
Berkeley, CA 94704
carolejk777@gmail.com
(510) 548-0131
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Marjory Keenan (marjkeenan44@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
5:03 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Marjory Keenan <marjkeenan44@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Marjory Keenan
1816 Vine St
Berkeley, CA 94703
marjkeenan44@gmail.com
(510) 525-2649
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Jacob Klein (jacob.klein@sierraclub.org) Sent You a Personal Message

Tue, Sep 3, 2024 at
10:33 AM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Jacob Klein <jacob.klein@sierraclub.org>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Jacob Klein
PO Box 2663
Berkeley, CA 94702
jacob.klein@sierraclub.org
(510) 545-2273

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. If you need more information, please contact Member Care at Sierra Club at member.care@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5673.



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Karl Knobler (karl.knobler@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
1:00 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Karl Knobler <karl.knobler@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Karl Knobler
1256 Monterey Ave
Berkeley, CA 94707
karl.knobler@gmail.com
(510) 524-3247

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Judy Maclean (judymac@igc.org) Sent You a Personal Message

Fri, Sep 6, 2024 at 11:32

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

AM

Reply-To: Judy Maclean <judymac@igc.org>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

I signed up for Ava Community Energy because it's a small way to help reverse the climate crisis. I didn't sign up to support nuclear energy, which can cause catastrophic meltdowns, and even without accidents, leads to highly toxic radioactive waste that lasts for centuries.

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Judy Maclean
2610 Regent St Apt 201
Berkeley, CA 94704
judymac@igc.org
(510) 725-2209

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Howard Matis (hsmatis@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at 1:31 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Howard Matis <hsmatis@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

I support nuclear energy. It is the only way we can prevent global energy. Please ignore the ill-informed activists.

SUPPORT NUCLEAR

Howard Matis

The petition will not let me change the headers.

Sincerely,

Howard Matis
6824 Sherwick Dr
Berkeley, CA 94705
hsmatis@gmail.com
(510) 540-6718

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Cynthia Papermaster (cynthia_papermaster@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Fri, Sep 6, 2024 at 1:16 AM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Cynthia Papermaster <cynthia_papermaster@yahoo.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Nuclear energy is NOT clean energy. Don't accept dirty nuclear from PGandE!

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Cynthia Papermaster
1907 McGee Ave
Berkeley, CA 94703
cynthia_papermaster@yahoo.com
(510) 365-1500

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Janice Pardoe (jrp44074@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
1:26 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Janice Pardoe <jrp44074@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Nuclear power has always had great potential, but lack of waste disposal options and safety oversight mean that it just doesn't work out.

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 and voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Janice Pardoe
2230 Woolsey St
Berkeley, CA 94705
jrp44074@gmail.com
(510) 555-0100

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

David Payne (payne@monmouth.edu) Sent You a Personal Message

Sat, Sep 7, 2024 at
10:38 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: David Payne <payne@monmouth.edu>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Nuclear energy is dirty energy. We must focus on renewables.

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

David Payne
2628 Telegraph Ave Apt 202
Berkeley, CA 94704
payne@monmouth.edu
(732) 483-0132

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Anne Richards (tannerichards@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
5:54 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Anne Richards <tannerichards@aol.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

There are other less dangerous ways to go about this. No to Nuclear please!

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Anne Richards
1529 Acton St
Berkeley, CA 94702
tannerichards@aol.com
(510) 558-1638

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Carol Rothmao (carolrothman@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
2:12 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Carol Rothmao <carolrothman@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

I have so far chosen not to get solar panels because I thought I could get Green energy from ACE. Nuclear is not Green!!!!!!

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Carol Rothmao
1539 Parker St
Berkeley, CA 94703
carolrothman@gmail.com
(510) 684-1931

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Peter Schorer (peteschorer@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
12:48 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Peter Schorer <peteschorer@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

No goddamn nuclear energy in the East Bay. -- Peter Schorer

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Peter Schorer
2538 Milvia St
Berkeley, CA 94704
peteschorer@gmail.com
(510) 548-3827

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

David Sherertz (ddsherertz@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
2:53 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: David Sherertz <ddsherertz@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Nuclear power is a neverending bad idea!

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

David Sherertz
2236 Grant St
Berkeley, CA 94703
ddsherertz@gmail.com
(510) 520-5228

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Anne Smith (charanne80@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
12:47 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Anne Smith <charanne80@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Please do not put me and the health of all the people you serve at risk because you are more interested in making money.

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Thank you!!

Anne Smith

Sincerely,

Anne Smith
37 San Mateo Rd
Berkeley, CA 94707
charanne80@gmail.com
(510) 207-8364

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Anne Smith (charanne80@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
12:47 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Anne Smith <charanne80@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Please do not put me and the health of all the people you serve at risk because you are more interested in making money.

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Thank you!!

Anne Smith

Sincerely,

Anne Smith
37 San Mateo Rd
Berkeley, CA 94707
charanne80@gmail.com
(510) 207-8364

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Debbie Tenenbaum (debbietenbaum@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
3:16 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Debbie Tenenbaum <debbietenbaum@aol.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Debbie Tenenbaum
1639 Grant St
Berkeley, CA 94703
debbietenbaum@aol.com
(510) 843-3816
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Vance Vaughan (vance@berkeley.edu) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
4:43 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Vance Vaughan <vance@berkeley.edu>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Vance Vaughan
1721 Hopkins St
Berkeley, CA 94707
vance@berkeley.edu
(510) 527-4354

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Ana Vertel (anavertel@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

1:12 PM

Reply-To: Ana Vertel <anavertel@hotmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Ana Vertel
1176 Spruce St
Berkeley, CA 94707
anavertel@hotmail.com
(510) 912-1985

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Jonathan Weinstock (jstock522@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
9:07 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Jonathan Weinstock <jstock522@yahoo.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Jonathan Weinstock
2208 7th St
Berkeley, CA 94710
jstock522@yahoo.com
(415) 595-0222
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Vivian Zelaya (zelaya9@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
7:27 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Vivian Zelaya <zelaya9@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Vivian Zelaya
2021B Lincoln St
Berkeley, CA 94709
zelaya9@gmail.com
(510) 845-4740

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Morissa Zuckerman (morissa.zuckerman@sierraclub.org) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
4:43 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Morissa Zuckerman <morissa.zuckerman@sierraclub.org>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Nuclear power is not renewable or safe, and is not the way towards a sustainable and just future. Please keep nuclear out of renewable energy tiers.

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Morissa Zuckerman
2127 Woolsey St
Berkeley, CA 94705
morissa.zuckerman@sierraclub.org
(510) 282-7057

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Sue Hall (otterone77@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at 6:46 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Sue Hall <otterone77@aol.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Sue Hall
4800 Sorani Way
Castro Valley, CA 94546
otterone77@aol.com
(209) 477-2536

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Sandra Hodges (saunhodes@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Sat, Sep 7, 2024 at
11:42 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Sandra Hodges <saunhodes@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Nuclear energy is NOT clean energy. It is fraught with possible problems that could release highly dangerous contaminants that could lasting consequences. That is not what I signed up for when I selected clean energy when I had that opportunity. Including nuclear energy inappropriately in that selection would cause me to reject it going forward.

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Sandra Hodges
4212 Omega Ave
Castro Valley, CA 94546
saunhodes@gmail.com
(510) 889-8132

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Reina Robinson (tisreina@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Fri, Sep 6, 2024 at
3:18 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Reina Robinson <tisreina@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Reina Robinson
18583 Carlton Ave
Castro Valley, CA 94546
tisreina@gmail.com
(510) 506-6713

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Robert Russell (rruss@rruss.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
2:35 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Robert Russell <rruss@rruss.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Robert Russell
6689 Crestwood Dr
Castro Valley, CA 94552
rruss@rruss.com
(415) 407-0646
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Mohan Sakhrani (mssakhrani@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
1:44 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Mohan Sakhrani <mssakhrani@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Mohan Sakhrani
4072 St Helena Way
Dublin, CA 94568
mssakhrani@gmail.com
(510) 995-0597

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Jonathan Loran (jonloran@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
2:26 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Jonathan Loran <jonloran@yahoo.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Jonathan Loran
24 City Limits Cir
Emeryville, CA 94608
jonloran@yahoo.com
(510) 558-1317

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Taoching Chi (taochiungchi@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
2:05 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Taoching Chi <taochiungchi@yahoo.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Taoching Chi
40859 Calido Pl
Fremont, CA 94539
taochiungchi@yahoo.com
(510) 770-9358
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Lacey Hicks (laceyhicks@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
12:52 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Lacey Hicks <laceyhicks@hotmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Lacey Hicks
4463 Hyde Cmn Unit 218
Fremont, CA 94538
laceyhicks@hotmail.com
(619) 410-8181

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Carin High (cccrhigh@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at 5:03 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Carin High <cccrhigh@yahoo.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

The environmental consequences of dealing with nuclear radioactive waste, the potential for leaks, security issues, and the reality that we live in an active earthquake zone, should all lead to the decision that this does not make sense for our communities - a "no" vote against development of a nuclear power plant. There is no such think as "clean nuclear energy" and will not be until there is a way to safely deal with the nuclear radioactive waste generated by such plants.

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Carin High
38536 Logan Dr
Fremont, CA 94536
cccrhigh@yahoo.com
(510) 378-2120

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Gina Jager (ginacjager@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
12:57 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Gina Jager <ginacjager@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Gina Jager
4247 Bora Bora Ave
Fremont, CA 94538
ginacjager@gmail.com
(510) 683-9142

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Janet Klein (jlklein432@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
3:56 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Janet Klein <jlklein432@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Janet Klein
39684 Lahana Way
Fremont, CA 94538
jlklein432@gmail.com
(510) 684-5379

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Ray Lorenson (bluefin28@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
1:52 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Ray Lorenson <bluefin28@aol.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Ray Lorenson
4100 Oroville Ct
Fremont, CA 94555
bluefin28@aol.com
(510) 797-0000
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Greg Piligian (gppiligian@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
10:48 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Greg Piligian <gppiligian@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

We have been using Ava from the time it became available as an alternative. We did that because we believe in Ava's mission. I believe that including nuclear in Bright Choice is going against that mission. Please do not go in this direction.

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Greg Piligian
4582 Northdale Dr
Fremont, CA 94536
gppiligian@gmail.com
(408) 506-2176

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Stephanie Rouse (bug54@sbcglobal.net) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
12:37 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Stephanie Rouse <bug54@sbcglobal.net>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Surely we can utilize safer renewable energy sources!

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Stephanie Rouse
40326 Grimmer Blvd
Fremont, CA 94538
bug54@sbcglobal.net
(510) 651-5352

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Christopher Ware (cmdubb@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
1:55 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Christopher Ware <cmdubb@yahoo.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Christopher Ware
45746 Bridgeport Dr
Fremont, CA 94539
cmdubb@yahoo.com
(510) 996-2324

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

H GRAY (hgrayiv@duck.com) Sent You a Personal Message <kwautomail@phone2action.com> Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at 12:45 PM

Reply-To: H GRAY <hgrayiv@duck.com>
To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

RADIATION KILLS GENERATIONS.

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

H GRAY
22568 Mission Blvd
Hayward, CA 94541
hgrayiv@duck.com
(777) 777-7777

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Mike Hoffman (hoffmiester@comcast.net) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
1:23 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Mike Hoffman <hoffmiester@comcast.net>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

I look to Ava as a source of clean energy. Please do not add Nuclear Energy..

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Mike Hoffman
522 Corrine St
Hayward, CA 94544
hoffmiester@comcast.net
(510) 610-8679

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Paula Cavagnaro (cavagnaropaula@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Sat, Sep 7, 2024 at
3:39 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Paula Cavagnaro <cavagnaropaula@yahoo.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Paula Cavagnaro
4087 Stanford Way
Livermore, CA 94550
cavagnaropaula@yahoo.com
(925) 245-9430

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Sally Marone (sallymarone@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
1:24 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Sally Marone <sallymarone@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Sally Marone
844 S H St
Livermore, CA 94550
sallymarone@gmail.com
(925) 292-5497
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Sarah Mattern (hello@sarahmattern.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
4:01 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Sarah Mattern <hello@sarahmattern.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Sarah Mattern
746 Dana Cir
Livermore, CA 94550
hello@sarahmattern.com
(925) 321-1603
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Hod Gray (bosshod@mac.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at 1:31 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Hod Gray <bosshod@mac.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Hod Gray
1000 e maple ave
Lompoc, CA 93436
bosshod@mac.com
(805) 698-4143
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Maureen Fry (msfryohio@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
3:08 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Maureen Fry <msfryohio@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Maureen Fry
5042 Chelsea Dr
Newark, CA 94560
msfryohio@gmail.com
(937) 750-4494
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Carrie Austin (carrieaustin123@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
12:57 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Carrie Austin <carrieaustin123@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

I'm a CA licensed civil engineer who practices environmental engineering. Nuclear waste lasts longer than any human civilization. Also, accidents happen, and nuclear accidents have a high chance of bring widespread.

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Carrie Austin
1111 El Centro Ave
Oakland, CA 94602
carrieaustin123@gmail.com
(510) 967-1163

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

William Balderston (bbalderston@earthlink.net) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
2:14 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: William Balderston <bbalderston@earthlink.net>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

William Balderston
2321 Humboldt Ave
Oakland, CA 94601
bbalderston@earthlink.net
(510) 866-9278
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Lorenzo Bavoso (bavoso@att.net) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
12:35 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Lorenzo Bavoso <bavoso@att.net>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Lorenzo Bavoso
6227 Virgo Rd
Oakland, CA 94611
bavoso@att.net
(510) 541-2762
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

James Bettencourt (jjbetten@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Fri, Sep 6, 2024 at
2:12 AM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: James Bettencourt <jjbetten@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

NO, NO, NO! We won't cover PGandE's costs not here and not in San Diego! Clean Energy is NOT nuclear!

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

James Bettencourt
500 Vernon St Apt 310
Oakland, CA 94610
jjbetten@gmail.com
(510) 653-8343

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Amity Buxton (amitypb@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
1:12 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Amity Buxton <amitypb@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Amity Buxton
33 Linda Ave Apt 2504
Oakland, CA 94611
amitypb@gmail.com
(415) 632-8593

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Sylvia Chi (sylviachi@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
12:37 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Sylvia Chi <sylviachi@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Sylvia Chi
936 46th St
Oakland, CA 94608
sylviachi@gmail.com
(860) 803-0649
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Ester Deel (intoucan@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
1:32 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Ester Deel <intoucan@yahoo.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Ester Deel
2362 109th Ave
Oakland, CA 94603
intoucan@yahoo.com
(510) 568-6686
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Maura Fitzgerald (fitzms57@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
4:47 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Maura Fitzgerald <fitzms57@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

PLEASE SAY ?NO? to NUCLEAR ENERGY

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Maura Fitzgerald
1412 Barrows Rd
Oakland, CA 94610
fitzms57@gmail.com
(510) 913-0925

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Kenneth Gibson (kennethgibson@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
12:49 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Kenneth Gibson <kennethgibson@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Never accept nuclear power! The uranium fuel cycle is more hazardous than the carbon fuel cycle and probably of longer hazardous duration. Nuclear power plants are also a ready target should there be a time of war involving our shores. "Diablo Canyon" is aptly named. We must try to let it sleep forever.

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Kenneth Gibson
5090 Kearney Ave
Oakland, CA 94602
kennethgibson@gmail.com
(510) 555-4321

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Scott Grinthal (sgrinthal@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Sat, Sep 7, 2024 at
1:04 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Scott Grinthal <sgrinthal@yahoo.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Scott Grinthal
2721 55th Ave
Oakland, CA 94605
sgrinthal@yahoo.com
(650) 578-9704

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. If you need more information, please contact Member Care at Sierra Club at member.care@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5673.



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Nancy Havassy (n.havassy@att.net) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
12:34 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Nancy Havassy <n.havassy@att.net>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Nancy Havassy
5940 Thornhill Dr
Oakland, CA 94611
n.havassy@att.net
(510) 339-3043

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. If you need more information, please contact Member Care at Sierra Club at member.care@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5673.



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Brad Hoover (bradley.hoover@dnv.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
1:56 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Brad Hoover <bradley.hoover@dnv.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

I am opposed to spending any additional funds on Nuclear Energy. We need other solutions.

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Brad Hoover
155 Grand Ave Ste 500
Oakland, CA 94612
bradley.hoover@dnv.com
(510) 229-9312

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Carole Howard (cqhoward@sonic.net) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
5:59 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Carole Howard <cqhoward@sonic.net>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Please stick with safer, cheaper renewable energy sources. Nuclear energy still has too many problems.

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Carole Howard
6415 Regent St
Oakland, CA 94618
cqhoward@sonic.net
(510) 555-5555

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Spencer Koffman (spencer2022@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
1:24 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Spencer Koffman <spencer2022@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Spencer Koffman
2050 Manzanita Dr
Oakland, CA 94611
spencer2022@gmail.com
(510) 338-0201
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Belinda Kremer (belindakremer@mac.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at 12:50 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Belinda Kremer <belindakremer@mac.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Please do not further burden the East Bay, which already carries more than its fair share of pollutants ? and don?t stick us with unwanted nuclear just be:c we are less powerful than the wealthy, ultra-privileged powerful NIMBY neighborhoods and cities around us .

More importantly: PLEASE NO NUCLEAR AT ALL!! It shouldn?t just be not us ? it shouldn?t be the power source. Period. Solar and wind ? YES. Nuclear: NO!

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Belinda Kremer
2886 Georgia St
Oakland, CA 94602
belindakremer@mac.com
(347) 446-1815

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Amaury Kruggel-Diazandi (amaury@thewatershedproject.org) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at 1:00 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Amaury Kruggel-Diazandi <amaury@thewatershedproject.org>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Amaury Kruggel-Diazandi
838 22nd St
Oakland, CA 94607
amaury@thewatershedproject.org
(510) 812-7355
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Tom Kunhardt (tt101@mac.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at 2:16 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Tom Kunhardt <tt101@mac.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

I don't want fossil fuels in my city!

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Tom Kunhardt
2506 Delmer St
Oakland, CA 94602
tt101@mac.com
(510) 866-2407

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Jonas Lamattery-Brownell (jlamabrow@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
12:48 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Jonas Lamattery-Brownell <jlamabrow@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

I helped stop the Ward Valley Nuke Waste Dump proposal because there was no safe way then to dump nuclear waste. There still is no safe way to conduct nuclear power. That's why we must do better, and turn to the proven, clean green energy sources?not nukes.

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Jonas Lamattery-Brownell
Po Box 10761
Oakland, CA 94610
jlamabrow@gmail.com
(510) 435-7966

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Paulette Langguth (pl2gs@sbcglobal.net) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
1:23 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Paulette Langguth <pl2gs@sbcglobal.net>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Paulette Langguth
3 Captains Cv
Oakland, CA 94618
pl2gs@sbcglobal.net
(510) 549-9081

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Judith Levin (judithlevin2006@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
3:44 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Judith Levin <judithlevin2006@yahoo.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Judith Levin
4609 Dolores Ave
Oakland, CA 94602
judithlevin2006@yahoo.com
(510) 697-3947

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Tim Little (tim.little100@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
5:04 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Tim Little <tim.little100@yahoo.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Tim Little
201 4th St Apt 102
Oakland, CA 94607
tim.little100@yahoo.com
(510) 658-2929

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Marina Marcroft (marinamarcroft@msn.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
1:30 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Marina Marcroft <marinamarcroft@msn.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Marina Marcroft
3352 Victor Ave
Oakland, CA 94602
marinamarcroft@msn.com
(801) 661-5942
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Edward Mechem (ed@mechem.org) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
7:02 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Edward Mechem <ed@mechem.org>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Edward Mechem
217 John St
Oakland, CA 94611
ed@mechem.org
(510) 652-2694

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Vasu Murti (vasumurti@netscape.net) Sent You a Personal MessageThu, Sep 5, 2024 at
5:13 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Vasu Murti <vasumurti@netscape.net>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

The Democratic Party platform should support: Animal Rights, Defending the Affordable Care Act, Ending Citizens United, Ending Marijuana Prohibition, Giving Greater Visibility to Pro-Life Democrats, Gun Control, Net Neutrality, Raising the Minimum Wage to \$15 an Hour, Responding to the Scientific Consensus on Global Warming, and a Sustainable Energy Policy. Democrats for Life of America, 10521 Judicial Drive, #200, Fairfax, VA 22030, (703) 424-6663

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Vasu Murti
30 Villanova Ln
Oakland, CA 94611
vasumurti@netscape.net
(510) 339-8155

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Carolyn Norr (carolynclara@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
4:11 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Carolyn Norr <carolynclara@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

As the mom of three kids, I am certain there is no place her for nuclear energy. We deserve real clean energy!

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Carolyn Norr
2725 26th Ave
Oakland, CA 94601
carolynclara@gmail.com
(510) 220-5707

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Miriam Pinchuk (mirorrrup@yahoo.co.uk) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
12:47 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Miriam Pinchuk <mirorrrup@yahoo.co.uk>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

It is absolutely unconscionable for Ava to be considering nuclear power, a dirty energy source that brings with it long-term problems. If Ava goes ahead with this plan it is unclear what the difference will be between Ava and PGandE. I will likely cancel my agreement with Ava.

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Miriam Pinchuk
300 Olive Ave
Oakland, CA 94611
mirorrrup@yahoo.co.uk
(510) 999-9999

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Ann Pinkerton (annp23@att.net) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
12:36 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Ann Pinkerton <annp23@att.net>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Ann Pinkerton
5467 Lawton Ave
Oakland, CA 94618
annp23@att.net
(510) 654-6436
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Wally Ransom (gayleransom@sbcglobal.net) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
12:43 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Wally Ransom <gayleransom@sbcglobal.net>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Wally Ransom
3974 oakmore rd
oakland, CA 94602
gayleransom@sbcglobal.net
(510) 967-2178

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Lucymarie Ruth (lucymarieruth@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
3:29 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Lucymarie Ruth <lucymarieruth@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Lucymarie Ruth
3761 Park Boulevard Way Apt 301
Oakland, CA 94610
lucymarieruth@gmail.com
(510) 842-3399

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Linda Smith (lindabreauxsmith@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
1:52 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Linda Smith <lindabreauxsmith@yahoo.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Linda Smith
3045 56th Ave
Oakland, CA 94605
lindabreauxsmith@yahoo.com
(510) 568-6808

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Roberta Stern (rozydeco50@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
1:30 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Roberta Stern <rozydeco50@hotmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Roberta Stern
5665 Ocean View Dr
Oakland, CA 94618
rozydeco50@hotmail.com
(510) 655-6221
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Hale' Tokay (haletokay@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
12:55 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Hale' Tokay <haletokay@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Hale' Tokay
3160 Wisconsin St
Oakland, CA 94602
haletokay@gmail.com
(415) 222-2367

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Amy Voge (amy.lu.voge@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
6:20 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Amy Voge <amy.lu.voge@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Amy Voge
2945 California St
Oakland, CA 94602
amy.lu.voge@gmail.com
(510) 530-1542
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Liana Warren (liana.warren@sierraclub.org) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
12:35 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Liana Warren <liana.warren@sierraclub.org>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Nuclear energy is dangerous! Don't bring it to our communities!

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Liana Warren
11 Warren Ave Apt 8
Oakland, CA 94611
liana.warren@sierraclub.org
(209) 918-9813

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Ramona Wilkerson (wilker2son@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

1:36 PM

Reply-To: Ramona Wilkerson <wilker2son@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Ramona Wilkerson
PO Box 29534
Oakland, CA 94604
wilker2son@gmail.com
(510) 534-0519
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Matt Williams (mwillia@mac.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
12:34 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Matt Williams <mwillia@mac.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Matt Williams
4140 Oakmore Rd
Oakland, CA 94602
mwillia@mac.com
(510) 326-6893
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Abram Blackwood (abramdb@me.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
2:32 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Abram Blackwood <abramdb@me.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Abram Blackwood
215 Greenbank Ave
Piedmont, CA 94611
abramdb@me.com
(510) 747-9022

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Marianne Mitosinka (georgewick@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
12:38 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Marianne Mitosinka <georgewick@aol.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Marianne Mitosinka
250 Sheridan Ave
Piedmont, CA 94611
georgewick@aol.com
(510) 601-9236
[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Ttriss Williams Renard (christinawilliams333@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
12:43 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Ttriss Williams Renard <christinawilliams333@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Please do the right thing - consider Bay Area kids? futures and do not continue to move forward energy initiatives at the expense of low income communities and communities of colour in particular.

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Ttriss Williams Renard
2223 19th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94704
christinawilliams333@gmail.com
(510) 412-0327

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Isaac Ramirez (isaac2022rr@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Fri, Sep 6, 2024 at
4:45 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Isaac Ramirez <isaac2022rr@gmail.com>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

We need climate action that focuses on clean renewable energy including local energy investments, that will help with our transition to renewable energy sources we do not need nuclear power because we have more sustainable solutions that are much more efficient and cleaner, please reject the nuclear option as it only seeks to distract and undermine our transition.

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Isaac Ramirez
2445 Cameron Dr
Union City, CA 94587
isaac2022rr@gmail.com
(510) 754-2523

[Quoted text hidden]



Adrian Bankhead <abankhead@avaenergy.org>

No on Ava Community Energy accepting Nuclear Energy

Ernest Walters (ernwalt@comcast.net) Sent You a Personal Message

Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at
8:52 PM

<kwautomail@phone2action.com>

Reply-To: Ernest Walters <ernwalt@comcast.net>

To: abankhead@avaenergy.org

Dear Adrian Bankhead,

Dear Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PGandE's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 ? Do not accept nuclear!"

Sincerely,

Ernest Walters
2437 Tartarian Way
Union City, CA 94587
ernwalt@comcast.net
(510) 579-2851

[Quoted text hidden]

Dear Ava Community Energy Board and Community Advisory Committee members,

I respectfully submit this public comment to change the way we address energy prices.

In the past Ava staff and board members have had many discussions on keeping generation prices low. This has been identified many times as the key value proposition for Ava customers

I'm concerned that these discussions have been missing the point. Customer are concerned with total electricity bills, not the relative price between Ava and PG&E generation charges. Most of us do not distinguish between generation and distribution when we pay our electricity bills. And we have no way of comparing what our bills would have been if we were not Ava customers.

The total rates for electricity have been rising at an unprecedented speed for the past few years. This is primarily due delivery rate increases by PG&E. These have completely overwhelmed any savings customers see by getting generation Ava.

This increase in total rates is also making Ava member jurisdiction goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by promoting building electrification much harder to achieve without imposing additional cost burdens on Ava customers.

To investigate this in more detail I reviewed my very own household electricity bills for the last 10 years to examine at what's been happening. Please see the attached chart below.

The points on the plot show our total electricity rates, delivery rates and generation rates. These are effective rates. They were calculated by dividing the charges for delivery and generation in each of our bills by the number of kWh we used in that billing period. The total electricity rate is the sum of the generation and delivery rates.

Because of our enthusiasm for benefits of local generation of clean electricity we joined EBCE as soon as we could in 2018. Thus prior to July 2018 only total electricity rates are available.

There are still some missing data and probably some more quality assurance work I should do. The seasonal fluctuation in rates starting in 2021 is due to differing winter and summer rates and baselines. However there are enough data here to show clear and disturbing trends.


After we joined EBCE in 2018, our total electricity rates remained relatively constant until about 2020. After that the delivery rates started climbing dramatically. Because EBCE (now Ava) sets rates relative to PG&E rates, the generation rate increases generally lag PG&E's rate increases by about one year. In some of our bills for 2021 the charges for delivery were over two and a half times higher than the generation rates. With the latest PG&E rate increases delivery rates are once again approaching twice the generation rates.

Since we became Ava customers, our total electricity rates have doubled! This increase completely swamps any savings Ava was able to pass on by keeping its generation rates a few pennies below PG&E's generation rates. This is making a complete mockery of Ava's claimed "value proposition" of lower electricity rates.

As a concerned Ava customer and member of the Community Advisory Committee, I call upon the Ava's Board members to take concerted action to protect Ava customers from these outrageous price increases both within in their own jurisdictions and within Ava Community Energy in their directions to staff.

Sincerely,

Jim Lutz



Ava Community Energy Board Members, Community Advisory Committee + Alternates,

304 people have signed a petition on Action Network telling you to _Keep Ava Community Energy from accepting PG&E's Nuclear Energy!.

Here is the petition they signed:

Ava Community Energy (formerly East Bay Community Energy - EBCE) has promised us the power to choose cleaner energy and local investments. Nuclear energy is a distraction and disinvestment from true renewable energy. We urge you to take action by upholding the decision from April 2020 by voting against accepting PG&E's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy in Ava Community Energy.

Vote for "Scenario 0 – Do not accept nuclear!"

You can view each petition signer and the comments they left you below.

Thank you,

East Bay Clean Power Alliance (EBCPA)

1. Barbara Stebbins (*ZIP code: 94702*)

2. June Brashares (*ZIP code: 95472-5315*)

3. Hernando Sanchez (*ZIP code: 94502*)

4. Beth Weinberger (*ZIP code: 94619*)

5. Elizabeth Ferguson (*ZIP code: 94708*)

Nuclear energy is never a good choice. It's selling out our children and grandchildren's health (not to mention putting our entire ecosystem at risk).

6. Gopal Shanker (*ZIP code: 94558*)

7. Constance McKnight (*ZIP code: 94606*)

Nuclear energy is definitely not clean energy! We need to transition to a healthier environment, not focus on making money and creating new problems for our descendants. Nuclear energy is a inferior choice for many reasons, and we should not be promoting it, when we should be using our time and financial resources to transition as quickly as possible to the best alternatives.

8. Spencer Veale (*ZIP code: 94612*)

9. Margaret Lewis (ZIP code: 94619)

10. Robin Latham (ZIP code: 95472)

NUkes and nuclear energy put us all at greater risk. Clean power now and if climate change or some nuclear disaster does not kill us hopefully we can live we clean energy into the future for our descendants.

11. Will Wil (ZIP code: 94710)

12. Jerry Rivers (ZIP code: 11575)

13. Paul Smith (ZIP code: 94601)

14. Miguel Morales (ZIP code: 94612)

This is sick! When's it gonna click?!

We said "NO!" in 2020, and your lazy governance refuses to understand no means no!

Nuclear is an irresponsible and grossly short-sided poison!

No more toxic decisions cosplaying as solutions benefiting special interests, and deliver on your stale promises: WE NEED CLEAN ENERGY NOT A LAZY REBRAND!!

15. Susan Bassein (ZIP code: 94704)

Nuclear is not clean, renewable energy and I do not want it injected into the Renewable 100 that I pay for.

16. jennifer tanner (ZIP code: 90036)

17. Ayla Peters (ZIP code: 94607)

18. Jean Merrigan (ZIP code: 95641)

19. Linda Seeley (ZIP code: 93402)

Nuclear power is dirty, dangerous, and expensive. No Community Choice energy program should accept it as part of its portfolio!

20. Karl Young (ZIP code: 95445)

21. Robert Gould (ZIP code: 94114)

Supporting this petition as President of San Francisco Bay Physicians for Social Responsibility, representing hundreds of health professionals in SF Bay Area

22. Susan Schacher (ZIP code: 94619)

23. John Smigelski (ZIP code: 93405)

you should be better than this.

24. Ann Harvey (ZIP code: 94609)

Nuclear energy is not renewable, safe, sustainable, or clean.

25. Sheela Shankar (ZIP code: 94710)

26. Elsa Wefes-Potter (ZIP code: 94609)

27. Aaron Lehmer (ZIP code: 94611)

28. Colin Cook-Miller (ZIP code: 94610)

Yes to Resilience, No to Nuclear!

29. Marty Brown (ZIP code: 93422)

Go with clean energy providers. Nuclear is not clean and it is dangerous. The waste lasts forever.

30. Jill ZamEk (ZIP code: 93420)

Nuclear energy is dirty and dangerous.

31. Ernest Pacheco (ZIP code: 94544)

32. Jane Swanson (ZIP code: 93401)

San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace strongly agrees with the positions in this petition. Keep PG&E's dangerous nuclear energy out of Ava Community Energy's program!

33. Briseida Ayala (ZIP code: 94544)

34. Emily Johnston (ZIP code: 98112)

35. Maryam Tahmasebi (ZIP code: 91364)

We don't want nuclear power in CA

36. Mina Fardeen (ZIP code: 94117)

37. Julian Nesbitt (ZIP code: 94605)

38. Julie Mansfield-Wells (ZIP code: 93402)

Nuclear is NOT clean energy. It is dirty, dangerous and expensive. Please do not accept nuclear power--it must be phased out and Diablo Canyon NPP must shut down at the end of their current license.

39. Zoria Temple (ZIP code: 94536)

Do not accept energy from PG &E!!!

40. Nahal Ipakchi (ZIP code: 94702)

41. Lauren De Arman (ZIP code: 94611)

42. Adele Watts (ZIP code: 94605)

43. Kara Brodfuehrer (ZIP code: 94601)

44. Ashly (ZIP code: 94608)

45. Naima Sudjian-Carlisle (ZIP code: 94805)

46. Adan Deeb (ZIP code: 94121)

47. Kyle Crider (ZIP code: 35080)

48. Ceyda Durmaz Dogan (ZIP code: 06901)

49. Alice Madden (ZIP code: 55407)

50. Julie Ann Wireman (ZIP code: 93442-2603)

Please do not contribute to the poisoning of San Luis Obispo county & my long time home, with continuing nuclear power from Diablo Canyon!

51. Timothy DenHerder-Thomas (ZIP code: 55407)

52. Steve Ongerth (ZIP code: 94801)

53. Craig Ickler (ZIP code: 44120)

54. Maria Stamas (ZIP code: 94610)

As an Oakland resident, customer/member of Ava Energy, and an energy justice attorney, I strongly oppose purchasing energy from PG&E's Diablo Canyon.

55. Liz Veazey (ZIP code: 68132)

56. Victoria Benson (ZIP code: 94605)

57. Maclovia Quintana (ZIP code: 94608)

58. Paul Fenn (ZIP code: 01039)

Taking PG&E's nuclear power would permanently damage AVA's otherwise solid reputation as a green power leader, and send a harmful message to other CCAs in California and throughout the United States. - Paul Fenn, author of California's Community Choice Aggregation law.

59. Selena Feliciano (ZIP code: 94607)

As an Ava customer and resident of Oakland, I urge the decision-makers at Ava to listen to community voices: we don't want nuclear energy here--not now, and not ever!

60. Vanessa Ramirez (ZIP code: 92253)

Nuclear is not a sustainable and safe resource. Protect the people and the planet, all of California is watching

61. Carli Yoro (ZIP code: 94609)

62. luke k (ZIP code: 94610)

63. Carole Hisasue (ZIP code: 93402)

64. Bryan Vega (ZIP code: 92250)

We are sending solidarity from the Salton Sea! We send an unequivocal and unilateral message to energy actors that there is no space for energy actors that have previously harmed our collective community of California. The clean energy transition will not come at the expense of Californians. La lucha sigue!

65. Ronnie Lipschutz (ZIP code: 95064)

66. Janet Martinez (ZIP code: 94538)

67. Jesus Gutierrez (ZIP code: 94518)

CSEUB Public Health

68. Kate Harrison (ZIP code: 94702)

69. Valeria Mora (ZIP code: 94544)

Valeria Mora

70. Tanishka Chellani (ZIP code: 94539)

71. Sarah Shanley (ZIP code: 94609)

No nukes!!

72. Sergio Sanchez (ZIP code: 94502)

73. Blanca Sanchez (ZIP code: 94502)

74. Tiffany Vu (ZIP code: 95132)

75. Larry Kelp (ZIP code: 97402)

I was an EBCE/Ava customer since its inception, before we moved to Eugene, OR. I can't believe that Ava staff have once again tried to shove nuclear down the communities' throats!

76. Emily Ross (ZIP code: 94801)

77. Emi Yoko-Young (ZIP code: 94604)

78. Calvin Chai (ZIP code: 94579)

79. Jim Lutz (ZIP code: 94609)

80. Suzanne Baker (ZIP code: 94609)

81. Kelly Lin (ZIP code: 94104)

As a public health student at UC Berkeley, I strongly urge Ava Community Energy to reject PG&E's nuclear energy. The health risks associated with nuclear power—including potential accidents, radioactive waste, and the dangers of uranium mining—are too great to ignore. These risks disproportionately impact low-income and vulnerable communities.

Ava Community Energy should continue to invest in genuinely clean and renewable energy sources. This approach not only protects public health but also promotes environmental justice and sustainability. Please prioritize our community's well-being by saying no to nuclear energy.

82. Kimberly Espinoza (ZIP code: 94601)

83. Ojan Mobedshahi (ZIP code: 94803)

84. Lara Clayman (ZIP code: 94602)

85. Jack Fleck (ZIP code: 94619)

86. Nyah Tisdell (ZIP code: 94606)

87. Jeffrey Gould (ZIP code: 94501)

No More Fukushimas!

88. 2015-junk@atothet.com t (ZIP code: 94608)

Let's shoot down all the nuclear options, both for cost and liability reasons. We don't need it and the cost to shutter the plant needs to fall on PGE, not ava

89. Audrey Ichinose (ZIP code: 94705)

We should not support nuclear generation in this country until 1) there are permanent storage sites in the U.S for all of the nuclear waste that has been accumulating since the end of WWII and development of the atomic bomb and 2) we have cleaned up most or all of the 50 plus abandoned uranium mining sites in the country, most of which are found on tribal lands.

90. Leonsrdo Gonzalez (ZIP code: 94577)

91. Antonio Díaz (ZIP code: 94110)

92. Navreet Purewal (ZIP code: 95991)

93. Jose Espinoza (ZIP code: 94606)

94. Erika Morgan (ZIP code: 92101)

It is completely frustrating that AVA, other CCAs, CalCCA, etc, keep bringing these 'nuclear allotments' back into the mix. CCA customers don't want this, and arguments in support are thinly-disguised, weak rationales to maintain unsafe, uneconomic nuclear plants that should have been shut down long ago.

95. Tracey Brieger (ZIP code: 94703)

96. Rogelio Velazquez (ZIP code: 80210)

97. Thane Silva (ZIP code: 94531)

98. Gabrielle Sloane Law (ZIP code: 94603)

I am a resident of Oakland, a Nuclear-free city. Nuclear has no place in Oakland!

99. Vicki Charbonneau (ZIP code: 93402)

100. Amara I. (ZIP code: 94044)

101. Moira Birss (ZIP code: 94606)

102. Sheila Baker (ZIP code: 94952)

Stop making nuclear power which makes nuclear waste.

103. Alvaro Ramos (ZIP code: 94577)

104. Alice Sung (ZIP code: 94611)

Accepting PG&E's nuclear power would definitely mean a breach of trust of AVA Community Energy , especially for all those current Bright Choice and Renewable 100 customers, of which I am one. We can't believe you are trying to slip this one over us again!

I urge Ava Community Energy Board of Directors to reject PG&E's offer of nuclear energy and focus on increasing investments in true local clean energy infrastructure and support the closure of Diablo Canyon and defend us customers from having to shoulder the burden of cost of PG&E's bad energy investments. Thank you.

105. Valeria Gonzalez (ZIP code: 94518)

106. Cynthia Campos (ZIP code: 94542)

107. Ryan Madden (ZIP code: 11225)

108. alvina wong (ZIP code: 94621)

109. Nora Elmarzouky (ZIP code: 19143)

110. Kimberly Hui (ZIP code: 94121)

111. Srinidhi Sampath Kumar (ZIP code: 94706)

112. Michael Eisenscher (ZIP code: 94601)

No nukes is good nukes! Radioactive waste is not "clean energy"

113. Steve Morse (ZIP code: 94619)

114. Tony Marks-Block (ZIP code: 94610)

115. Nicole Inaba (ZIP code: 94609)

116. Kenneth Gibson (ZIP code: 94602)

Please don't make me, as consumer connected to the grid, criminally complicit in the continuation of uranium use for nuclear power or nuclear weapons. Family friends in Dine-tah, and probably my own father owe their cancer driven deaths to nuclear testing, uranium mining and/or uranium processing. Now we also know the hazards of spent nuclear fuel. Our region, like most of the world, is blessed with the emanations of the sun. We should encourage every roof-top - residential, commercial, industrial, educational and administrative to be endowed with solar panels. We should selectively install, well planned fleets of wind generation assets - perhaps over crop land - to generate all the energy the world needs. Don't institute policies, procedures and subsidies that will expand nuclear power. Rather shut it down. The potential for nuclear warfare is everywhere there is a nuclear power plant since a non-nuclear weapon can strike it to spread carcinogens through the atmosphere. Peace, out.

117. Deirdre Snyder (ZIP code: 94609)

I do not want Diablo Canyon's nuclear energy included in my "renewable" energy. It is not renewable!

118. Martha Booz (ZIP code: 94803)

119. Elizabeth Katz (ZIP code: 94611)

120. Margaret Rossoff (ZIP code: 94609)

121. Bonnie Lockhart (ZIP code: 94610)

122. Nadra Ehrman (ZIP code: 93117)

123. Peri Caylor (ZIP code: 94025)

Nuclear energy is not our future!

124. Ingrid Behrsin (ZIP code: 94708)

125. Brian Hines (ZIP code: 95407)

Nuclear Power and Waste are not clean.

126. Joe Houde (ZIP code: 92084)

127. Rebecca Tamiru (ZIP code: 94612)

128. Lucia Sayre (ZIP code: 94703)

Nuclear energy is not the answer and is not necessary. Diablo Canyon is a huge accident waiting to happen and efforts to shut it down for yrs have not been successful. Ava, please stay clean and true to your mission!

129. Jean Tepperman (ZIP code: 94703)

Diablo Canton is a disaster waiting to happen. Not local, not clean energy

130. Gladwyn d'Souza (ZIP code: 94002-3819)

Clean energy alternatives to nuclear and cheaper, faster, deflationary, resilient, clean and non threatening. Even the operators want out of nukes. Stop subsidizing failure.

131. Patricia Blevins (ZIP code: 95118-1808)

Nuclear power is NOT "clean" energy.

If this outdated and dangerous nuclear

plant is allowed to stay online past 2025, when it was scheduled to be shut down for good, the people living in San Luis Co and those all the way to the Central Valley could be at risk of death from nuclear fallout when this plant

erupts like Fukeshima did and spread nuclear waste for miles wiping out the crops in the Central Valley for centuries.

This is a 1.5 billion dollar waste of taxpayer money Newsom HAD to give in payback to the felon PG&E to keep Diablo Canyon functioning despite PG&E's agreement some years back to shut Diablo Canyon for good in 2025.

Nuclear power is NOT clean energy and it can kill residents of this State.

Where will they put the nuclear waste?????? NO NO NO The entire world should be nuclear free, and certainly the entire state of California.

132. Nancy Nadel (ZIP code: 94608)

I don't consider nuclear power to be clean energy. Please do not include it in your portfolio.

133. Jan Warren (ZIP code: 94598)

134. Lenore Olmstead (ZIP code: 94606)

Nuclear power is not safe and is too costly. Keep the focus on solar, wind, and thermal. Don't pass nuclear energy costs on me and other customers.

135. T L Rosenberg (ZIP code: 94619)

Incorporating PG&E nuclear energy is essentially kow-towing to their efforts to kill local renewable energy development. Acquiescing to this sales pitch merely reinforces their business model, which is burdening their ratepayers excessively. This is why we were so interested in creating CCA in the first place. Please stay true to the values that launched AVA/EBCE in the first place

136. Madeline Stacy (ZIP code: 94612)

137. Karen Rusiniak (ZIP code: 94710)

138. Phoebe Sorgen (ZIP code: 94708)

My last name is now Thomas, but people here in Berkeley know me as Phoebe Sorgen, so I still use that name too. I signed up long ago for EBCE and was wondering if I'm still signed up. At the time, it did not cost more than being only with PGE. Is that still the case? Thanks for keeping our energy clean and nuke free.

139. Tim Little (ZIP code: 94618)

"No nukes is good nukes"

140. Martha Kuhl (ZIP code: 94609)

As a nurse I know all of us need a healthy and safe environment. There are grave immediate and long term dangers for all involved with nuclear energy. Do not use!

141. An anonymous signer (ZIP code: 94609)

142. Jeffrey Gould (ZIP code: 94501)

No More Fukushima's!

143. Al Sandine (ZIP code: 94707)

144. Rosana Francescato (ZIP code: 94608)

145. Janie Pinterits (ZIP code: 94707)

146. Patrick Kennedy (ZIP code: 94608)

Vote for "Scenario 0 – Do not accept nuclear!"

147. Bob Martin (ZIP code: 94609)

Nuclear energy is dangerous, expensive, and certainly not clean energy. I am adamantly opposed to this proposal.

148. Marion Gerlind (ZIP code: 94603)

Nuclear power is dangerous and unacceptable, not clean energy. Remember the nuclear power plant accidents in Harrisburg, Chernobyl, and Fukushima! Say a clear No to nuclear power!

149. Sally Marone (ZIP code: 94550)

150. J B (ZIP code: 94603)

PG&E needs to be more closely regulated and reigned in. They're not operating in the public's best interest.

151. Gabriel Lautaro (ZIP code: 94610)

152. Manisha Rattu (ZIP code: 94565)

153. Micaela Morse (ZIP code: 94619)

154. Mav Moorhead (ZIP code: 10014)

NO PG&E Nuclear Energy!

155. Albert Yuan (ZIP code: 20002)

156. Janice Cecil (ZIP code: 94705)

157. Susan Park (ZIP code: 94602)

158. Gabby Reynoso (ZIP code: 94587)

159. Rosa Gonzalez (ZIP code: 93905)

160. Sara Zimmerman (ZIP code: 94702)

No to nuclear energy from Diablo Canyon. Let's use community energy to support clean renewables, not to justify nuclear waste, environmental harm, and potential nuclear catastrophe from an aging plant.

161. Dave Shukla (ZIP code: 90803)

Making me wait 4 hours only to pull the PG&E nuclear allocation item at their May board meeting was not appreciated. Nor were the pro-nuclear-energy lobbyist that may or may not have been invited by the Ava's President behest.

162. Josephine Galdamez (ZIP code: 90037)

163. Domenichi Morris (ZIP code: 94801)

164. Michelle Ralston (ZIP code: 94702)

165. Cynthia Landry (ZIP code: 94607)

SEIU 1021 Climate Justice Committee rejects the use of nuclear energy in AVA Community Energy portfolio!

166. Aniya (ZIP code: 94603)

167. Mmakgantsi Mafojane (ZIP code: 94602)

168. Mari Rose Taruc (ZIP code: 94606)

169. Shina Robinson (ZIP code: 94601)

170. Abbot Foote (ZIP code: 94706)

171. ena coleman (ZIP code: 94611)

172. Kiernan Rok (ZIP code: 94606)

173. Bonnie Borucki (ZIP code: 94703)

Using PG&E's Diablo Canyon nuclear energy is unacceptable. We need to reduce the demand for electricity by encouraging off peak use and using energy more efficiently.

174. Brandy Hyatt (ZIP code: 94607)

175. Kathy Dervin (ZIP code: 94707)

176. Megan Moran (ZIP code: 94710)

177. An anonymous signer (ZIP code: 94705)

NO NUCLEAR ENERGY — IT IS DANGEROUS AND DESTRUCTIVE OF THE EARTH.
RESOURCES MUST BE INVESTED IN CLEAN, RENEWABLE ENERGY THAT DO NOT
COMPROMISE THE HEALTH OF THE EARTH.

178. Peter Rubin (ZIP code: 94111)

179. Jackie Barshak (ZIP code: 94116)

180. Cheryl Davila Former Councilmember (ZIP code: 94710)

181. Kathy Labriola (ZIP code: 94710)

Nuclear power is NOT an alternative to fossil fuels! It causes even more harm than the climate change which is being powered by fossil fuels! PLEASE oppose any nuclear energy for Ava Community Energy.

182. Woody Little (ZIP code: 94605)

We need to keep building out new renewables!

183. Lauren Poor (ZIP code: 90027)

184. David S. Gill (ZIP code: 94546)

185. Edwin Dimarucut (ZIP code: 94544)

186. do_a deVroede (ZIP code: 94611)

187. Don Eichelberger (ZIP code: 94117)

188. Domonique Insixiengmay (ZIP code: 94547)

189. SOLOMON MOHABBAT (ZIP code: 94587)

190. Tina Coverdale (ZIP code: 95377)

191. Mariana Longoria (ZIP code: 94565)

192. Constance Pierre (ZIP code: 94611)

193. Margarita Torres (ZIP code: 94580)

Oposición a la energía nuclear.

194. Liliana Cuamatzi (ZIP code: 94601)

Apoyo la petición de oposición a la energía nuclear

195. Margarita Rojas (ZIP code: 94594)

No

196. Mars Keith (ZIP code: 94115)

197. Ren D (ZIP code: 94606)

198. Corrine Van Hook-Turner (ZIP code: 95133)

199. Gregory Stevens (ZIP code: 94110)

200. Irene Calimlim (ZIP code: 95206)

201. Diana C. (ZIP code: 94607)

202. Celia Kitchell (ZIP code: 94607)

203. John Broberg (ZIP code: 93420)

Close Diablo. Its a disaster and a health risk to me.

204. Susan Purcell (ZIP code: 94803)

Nuclear energy is not safe, as evidenced very well by insurance companies' refusal to cover it. No nuclear-powered energy, PG&E!

205. Joe Galliani (ZIP code: 90277)

206. Andrew Christie (ZIP code: 93401)

When PG&E tried to insert the output of Diablo Canyon into the power mix of the Community Choice agency here in San Luis Obispo County, the home of California's last nuclear power plant, we told our CCA to reject the offer, as should you. Nuclear power is the antithesis of clean, renewable energy. As it is unscalable, it is often responsible for crowding renewables off the grid. But as California's renewable energy generation and battery storage capacity have soared, the output of the Diablo Canyon plant has become increasingly irrelevant. It is now a political football, with PG&E seeking ways to justify extending the life of Diablo and billing ratepayers for the increasing cost of doing so, conservatively estimated at \$10 billion. Diablo's energy has no place in a CCA's energy mix, and Ava Community Energy should not aid PG&E in its quest to soak ratepayers for the privilege of propping up an aging nuclear power plant.

207. Katharine Bierce (ZIP code: 94706)

I live in Ava's territory and don't want nuclear in my power! It's not clean or renewable because it's a finite resource that pollutes communities where we mine uranium.

208. Susanna Porte (ZIP code: 94703)

Shameful and dangerous. The cost of keeping Diablo Canyon open has skyrocketed to over \$1 billion a year in losses, and we're paying for it via the PCIA fee. Berkeley is supposed to be a nuclear-free zone. Do better.

209. Charlene Woodcock (ZIP code: 94709)

It is horrifying to think that the output of the Diablo Canyon nuclear energy plant would be brought to the Bay Area as "clean" energy. Quite aside from the huge carbon footprint embodied in the aged-out physical plant, the radioactive wastes will pollute the environment for eons into the future. Who knows how future generations will be warned about the toxicity of these plants. NO to nuclear energy, as the people of California have said since the 70s.

210. Jean Woo (ZIP code: 94709)

No nuclear keeps the promise of clean energy and relieves the guilt of a nuclear footprint on the future. There is no truly good answer for nuclear waste. The risk of nuclear power plants in case of attack (note: Ukraine) or meltdown is far too great to justify continuing to employ nuclear when better alternatives exist. Geothermal and hydro for baseload, solar and wind for day time and evening renewable power.

211. Jenifer Lomeli (ZIP code: 94603)

212. Esther Goolsby (ZIP code: 94621)

213. Sylvester Enriquez (ZIP code: 94544)

214. Larry Chang (ZIP code: 94803)

We said no to nukes once already, let's make sure this is the FINAL time!

215. Joseph Avakian (ZIP code: 94501)

This is a danger __ do not let it happen

216. blanca Moran (ZIP code: 94545)

217. Timothy Judson (ZIP code: 13206)

218. Shoshana Wechsler (ZIP code: 94708)

219. Jim Stewart (ZIP code: 90712)

220. MaryAnn Furda (ZIP code: 94707)

Diablo Canyon should already BE closed__ Why are you even considering extending its life?

221. Brett Garrett (ZIP code: 95060)

Community Choice Agencies should focus on local renewable energy. Please avoid dangerous energy sources such as nuclear.

222. Jenna Ludwig (ZIP code: 94705)

Please, no!

223. Jessica Mitchell (ZIP code: 94611)