



---

88470

**DATE:** October 12, 2017

**TO:** Finance and Government Operations Committee

**FROM:** Sylvia Gallegos, Deputy County Executive

**SUBJECT:** 2016 Annual Sustainability Report

### **RECOMMENDED ACTION**

Receive annual report from the Office of Sustainability relating to sustainability activities undertaken by the County organization.

### **FISCAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no fiscal implications in receiving this report.

### **REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

Pursuant to the objectives established by the County Board of Supervisors (Board) in 2010 for its Sustainability Program, the Countywide Annual Sustainability Report describes the progress made by the County organization toward its overall sustainability goals. In prior years, the Office of Sustainability has reported in different formats, originally in a data-intensive spreadsheet format, referred to as the Sustainability Matrix, and, in 2014, in a more narrative format, which included a County profile, an introductory overview of the County's commitment to high-performance, cost-effective sustainability practices and programs, and a renewed focus on the three pillars of sustainability – Equity, Environment, and Economy. This updated Annual Sustainability Report is one that endeavors to be more forward-looking.

Each of these report formats provided valuable information on the County's sustainability efforts, yet none incorporated the Environmental Stewardship Goals adopted by the Board in June 2009. These goals were intended to "assess the County's carbon footprint, identify actions and policies to reduce the County's greenhouse gas emissions, and promote environmental stewardship within the County" and were "meant to be targets where all County departments and employees could look to the County's environmental leadership." Given this context, OOS believes that annually tracking the County's sustainability progress toward these ESGs is important.

In April 2017, at the request of the Housing, Land Use, Environment, and Transportation (HLUET) Committee, OOS began reporting monthly on progress toward these ESGs. This Annual report summarizes progress to-date toward these goals.

## PART I – PROGRESS TOWARD THE ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP GOALS

Each of the ESGs and the progress toward attainment is addressed according to the order set with adoption on June 9, 2009:

### **1. Ensure that 100% of light fixtures owned and operated by the County, in buildings, on streets, and in parks are at the highest energy efficiency standard.**

Responsibility for light fixture operation and replacement is shared between Facilities and Fleet (FAF), and Roads and Airports (RDA). FAF also maintains all lighting operation and adoption for the Valley Medical Center (VMC). OOS obtained current data from FAF for all the facilities under its control except VMC, and all the information available from RDA with regard to street lighting. FAF is still in the process of collecting data from VMC staff regarding this goal.

Type of Light	Total Lights	Highest Energy Efficiency	Percentage at Higher Energy Efficiency	Future Retrofit	Percentage with Retrofits Planned
Roadway Fixtures	2,500	1,730	69%	770	100%
Exterior Fixtures	10,661	1,386	13%	9,275	100%
Interior Fixtures	202,554	26,332	13%	176,222	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>215,715</b>	<b>29,448</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>186,267</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based on the data received, 14% of all the roadway, exterior, and interior light fixtures have been upgraded to the highest energy efficiency standard. All remaining light fixtures are planned for replacement within the next two years.

## **2. Reduce per capita energy use by 50%.**

Whereas the County's Climate Action Plan for Government Operations addresses energy use in County buildings, this goal reflects broader community energy use, at a countywide or regional level. At the time the ESGs were adopted, Sustainability staff proposed working with the Silicon Valley Leadership Group, Joint Venture Silicon Valley, and Sustainable Silicon Valley to cooperatively address this goal, but while each group has made progress individually through its own programs, no collective effort to curb energy use has been pursued thus far. In the absence of collective programmatic data, OOS has gathered aggregated data from the California Energy Commission (CEC) and US Census Bureau (Census) to use in determining progress toward this goal.

The CEC provides an annual report of each county's total electricity and gas consumption spanning from 1990 to 2015 (see <http://ecdms.energy.ca.gov/>). In 2010, the first full year after adoption of the ESGs, the County had a total of 16,554 GWh (millions of kWh) of electricity. By 2015, the most recent report, total electricity consumption had only slightly increased to 16,812 GWh.

In 2010, in terms of gas usage, the County had a total of 446.4 Millions of Therms; by 2015, that usage decreased to 410.9 Millions of Therms.

On population, the Census reports on a regular basis the population by county (see <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045215/06085>). In 2010, the County's population was reported as 1,781,642 residents; in 2015, the population had increased to 1,918,044. Using these aggregate totals to determine a per capita figure for energy use, in 2010, countywide electricity use 9,127 kWh/person and gas usage was 250.6 Therms/person.

In 2015, electricity decreased to 8,765 kWh/person as gas decreased to 214.2 Therms/person. Over this five-year period, electricity use per capita declined by 5.7% while gas use per capita declined by 14.5%.

## **3. Receive 100% of our electrical power from clean renewable sources.**

Progress toward this goal was originally led by the Renewable Energy Task Force (RETF). The RETF initiated County explorations into developing renewable energy projects, both collaboratively through the Silicon Valley Regional Energy Procurement Project with Joint Venture Silicon Valley, and independently through FAF. In the upcoming year, FAF will be

updating the Greenhouse Gas Inventory for Government Operations, the last iteration of which was last completed in 2009. This effort will collect more comprehensive data around County operational energy (including electricity) use.

For 2016, the latest full year available, 29.5% of total electricity consumed by County operations came from renewable energy sources. Total electricity consumption includes sources from both the County's own production along with the renewable portfolio portion of the electricity grid-supplied by Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E).

After reviewing the total electricity usage projected in County operations for 2017, FAF determined that 73 million kWh is to be sourced from traditional, grid-based sources. Of this figure, FAF staff estimate that 48 million kWh has transitioned in source from PG&E to Silicon Valley Clean Energy (SVCE). With automatic enrollment in the *GreenStart* program, SVCE's energy is delivered at a minimum of 50% renewable and 100% carbon free generation. This transition elevates the proportion of electricity sourced from a renewable production supply for County operations to an estimated 49.4%.

SVCE also offers a *GreenPrime* option to its customers that provides a 100% carbon free, 100% renewable source of electricity. If the County chooses to select the *GreenPrime* program option, this would increase the proportion of renewable electricity by 20.1%, up to a total of 69.5%.

At County properties, nearly 20 million kWh are sourced from onsite fuel cell production facilities. Staff has investigated converting the source for these units from compressed natural gas (CNG) to renewable-compressed natural gas (RNG), which would raise the renewable percentage another 16.4%. In combination with the *GreenPrime* program option, utilizing RNG could bring the County up to a total of 85.9% renewable electricity.

Staff projects total electrical costs for 2017 at \$23.4 million under the current renewable supply configuration. To fully reach the goal of 100% clean, renewable electricity, staff has investigated two pathways. All cost escalation proportions are based on that base resource cost estimate.

## Option 1

Under Option 1, the County would purchase 100% renewable electricity for all County accounts opted into SCVE under the *GreenPrime* option. For existing fuel cell-based electrical production, the County would purchase "biogas" through its natural gas supplier, State of California Department of General Services Natural Gas Program (DGS). "Biogas" in this sense is methane harvested from landfills, livestock, or wastewater treatment plants.

For all County accounts under PG&E service, the County would purchase 100% renewable electricity under PG&E's *Solar Choice* program. Staff estimates that implementing all Option 1 purchases would increase the County's annual cost of electricity by \$2.9 million, or approximately 12%.

## **Option 2**

Under Option 2, the County would still purchase 100% renewable electricity for all County accounts opted into SCVE under the *GreenPrime* option. For its fuel cell-based electrical production, rather than buying biogas, the County would transfer the Renewable Energy Credits (RECs) being generated under its Renewable Energy Self-Generation Bill Credit Transfer (RES-BCT) solar arrays and attach them to the electricity being generated by the fuel cells to convert that electricity to renewable. For all County accounts under PG&E service, the County would purchase 100% renewable electricity under PG&E *Solar Choice* program. Note that the County would need to purchase more *Solar Choice* program electricity under Option 2 since the RES-BCT solar RECs would be applied to the fuel cells rather than PG&E accounts. Staff estimates that implementing all Option 2 purchases would increase the County's annual cost of electricity by \$2.3 million, or approximately 10%.

The table below illustrates Options 1 and 2.

<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Kilowatt - Hours (kWh) to Offset</b>	<b>Cost Premium to Convert to 100% Renewable</b>	<b>Cost Premium to Convert to 100% Renewable per kWh</b>	<b>As % of Current County Electricity Costs</b>
Silicon Valley Clean Energy	48,257,359	\$386,059	\$0.01	1.65%
PG&E w RECs	43,499,808	\$1,304,994	\$0.03	5.57%
Fuel Cells w/ Biogas	21,637,200	\$1,170,602	\$0.05	5.00%
<b>Sum</b>	<b>113,394,367</b>	<b>\$2,861,655</b>	<b>\$0.03</b>	<b>12.21%</b>

<b>Option 2</b>	<b>Kilowatt - Hours (kWh) to Offset</b>	<b>Cost Premium to Convert to 100% Renewable</b>	<b>Cost Premium to Convert to 100% Renewable per kWh</b>	<b>As % of Current County Electricity Costs</b>
Silicon Valley Clean Energy	48,257,359	\$386,059	\$0.01	1.65%
PG&E no RECs	65,137,008	\$1,954,110	\$0.03	8.34%
Fuel Cells w/ RECs	0	\$0	\$0.00	0.00%
<b>Sum</b>	<b>113,394,367</b>	<b>\$2,340,169</b>	<b>\$0.02</b>	<b>9.99%</b>

## County Accounts in San Jose Community Energy Service Territory

The County's accounts in San Jose currently remain on PG&E service, as SVCE's territory excludes the City of San Jose. However, San Jose is currently in the process of launching its own community choice energy program in 2018. If the San Jose CCE offers a 100% renewable option similarly-priced to SCVE's *GreenPrime* option, the cost premium in Option 1 and 2 would decrease by approximately \$1 million and \$1.4 million, respectively.

In September, HLUET requested that the Administration present these two options to reach 100% renewable electricity to the Board for its consideration. HLUET endorsed Option Two, the lower cost option. A proposal will be presented to the Board in November.

- 4. Ensure that 100% of County buildings are LEED certified and require LEED standards for construction in county land use jurisdictions.**

Staff is currently conducting analysis to determine the cost implications to register and certify new County-owned and constructed facilities under U.S. Green Building Council's LEED certification program. This analysis will support recommendations for possible amendments to Policy 7.14 (Green Building Policy for County Government Buildings).

With regard to County leased facilities, current standard lease agreements contain the following language:

*County Green Building Standards. All Improvements shall meet and comply fully with the County of Santa Clara green building and sustainability standards, policies and ordinance code provisions as if they were County buildings and facilities, as amended from time to time, including but not limited to County Ordinance Code Sections C3-30 and C3-31; Board of Supervisors Policy Manual Section 7.10 (Energy Efficiency Standards for New Building Designs, Facility Leases, Equipment, and Exploration of Solar Energy and Other Renewable Resources); and, Board of Supervisors Policy Manual Section 7.14 (Green Building Policy for County Government Buildings); however, any reasonably equivalent green building and sustainability standards may substitute for any one or all of the County's green building and sustainability standards, provided such alternatives are first reviewed and approved by LESSEE.*

It should be noted that for leased facilities, Green Building Policy 7.14 requires LEED Silver certification for Commercial Interiors, as practicable. Length of lease, size of project and County's potential operational and utility costs are considered to determine practicability. Staff continues to seek LEED information for County leased facilities through polling of all of the property owners. As it stands, FAF Real Estate estimates that very few leased facilities are LEED-certified. Due to the time needed to gather this information and current limited staffing, it is estimated that information will not be available until early 2018. The Administrative Space Committee will ensure that LEED certification is considered during negotiations for all leased spaces.

Based on the County Board of Supervisors Policy 7.14.3, all new construction of County facilities requires a minimum of LEED Silver Certification. Currently, 100% of all the medical center clinics are LEED-certified.

Since 2009, the following buildings have been LEED-certified or will be upon completion:

- Crime Laboratory, LEED BD+C Gold
- Valley Health Center Milpitas, LEED BD+C Certified
- Valley Health Center Downtown San Jose, LEED BD+C Gold
- Valley Medical Center Receiving & Intake Center, On track for LEED BD+C Gold
- Anderson Park Office, Built to LEED BD+C Silver standard, but not submitted for certification by USGBC
- Martial Cottle Visitor Center, On track for LEED BD+C Silver upon completion, and
- South County Animal Shelter, slated for LEED BD+C Silver.

Prior to August 11, 2015, private construction projects in unincorporated Santa Clara County had to comply with the requirements of Build it Green/LEED and CALGreen systems, creating a redundancy in standards, checklists, and forms. After staff evaluation of both Build it Green/LEED and CALGreen, staff determined that CALGreen was preferred in terms of meeting appropriate building standards and recommended the Board of Supervisors adopt it as the only mandatory standard for building permit approval. Upon staff recommendation, the Board of Supervisors unanimously adopted an ordinance change to adopt CALGreen as the only mandatory Green Building standard. As a result, the Green Building Ordinance for all construction within the unincorporated county stipulates meeting, at a minimum, the CALGreen Mandatory Measures, and must meet Tier 1 Measures for the following building types:

- Single Family Residential & Duplex, greater than 3,000 square feet
- Multi-family Buildings, equal or more than ten (10) units
- Non-Residential Buildings, greater than 25,000 square feet

In comparison to the total project costs, the costs associated with LEED certification are minimal. Achieving LEED certification demonstrates the success of a government's green building program to the public. The third-party certification process promotes accountability and greater attention to sustainability issues among contractors, subcontractors, owners, and building occupants. LEED certified buildings engage and educate a broad spectrum of stakeholders, drive behavioral changes, generate market demand for sustainable products and services, create local green jobs, and encourage the private sector to build green.

Additionally, the government sector is at the forefront of green building. It should be noted that all Counties in the Bay Area include LEED language and target certification levels within their green building policies.

## **5. Divert 100% of County waste from landfills and convert waste to energy.**

In 2010, 7,424 tons of resources were recovered from County operations. Of that tonnage, 2,407 tons were diverted from the landfill as either mixed recycling or compostable material, yielding a 32% diversion rate. In 2016, the latest year for which data is available, the diversion rate has improved to roughly 76%, with 11,712 total tons of resources recovered and 8,900 tons of that diverted from the landfill as either mixed recycling, compost, or “other” recyclable materials.

Staff explored the conversion of waste to energy in the current management of operational resource recovery. Under the County’s current hauler contract with Republic Services, all compostable materials that pose the greatest opportunity for waste to energy conversion are managed at the Newby Island Resource Recovery Park (Newby Island). However, Newby Island does not currently operate an anaerobic digesting facility at that location as operational costs are too prohibitive. In contrast, the City of San Jose has a contract with a hauler that does employ anaerobic digestion at the Zero Waste Energy Development Center (ZWEDC) in its compost management. At this time, transitioning to a hauler that employs a waste to management facility like the ZWEDC has been found to be cost prohibitive.

Next quarter, staff anticipates submitting the existing solid waste hauling contract to the Board of Supervisors to exercise a two-year extension option. During the development of the next Request for Proposals for solid waste hauling services, staff will explore the possibilities for both anaerobic digestion and other technologies to potentially capture biogas during organic matter composting, in pursuit of the goal for converting waste to energy.

## **6. Reduce our consumption of water by 20% and recycle or beneficially reuse 100% of our waste water.**

Water conservation and water efficiency projects have been implemented at County facilities since the adoption of the ESGs. County facilities managed by FAF, which include office buildings and detention facilities, used approximately 176 million gallons of potable water in 2015. This represents a 27% in savings compared to 2009. The savings in 2015 are from a combination of conservation projects and temporary landscape irrigation reduction in response to the drought conditions. County Health and Hospital System facilities used approximately 105 million gallons of potable water in 2015. This usage represents the Valley Medical Center Campus and seven clinics. In terms of countywide water use, according to the Santa Clara Valley Water District, compared to 2013, there has been a 21% reduction in water use through the first two months of 2017.

Recycled water usage (purple pipe) at County facilities reduces the demand for potable water resources and has been utilized where recycled water infrastructure is available.

Recycled water usage at County facilities amounted to 11 million gallons in 2009, peaked in 2014 at 15 million gallons, and in 2015 roughly totaled nearly 12 million gallons.

With regard to waste water reuse onsite, beyond simply tapping into the purple pipe, the Consumer and Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Planning and Development continue to engage at the regional and state levels to aid the investigation of new regulations around waste water reuse. The County Executive Office (CEO) has been in discussions over the last year with NASA on a possible water reuse demonstration project at a County facility. In addition, FAF staff, working on the Civic Center Master Plan, have incorporated on-site water reuse as an option for inclusion in the design and development criteria currently being developed.

To coordinate more accurate water use metrics, FAF and OOS staff are meeting with RDA and Parks managers. With improved communication, it is believed that a more harmonized approach to water conservation accounting will be possible. FAF is currently working with the San Jose Water Company on a project to connect the Charcot Campus to the recycled water pipeline nearby for irrigation water usage.

**7. Adopt a County General Plan with measurable standards for sustainable development.**

The Board's adoption of the ESGs in 2009 established a 15-year timeframe for revisiting the adoption of measurable standards for sustainable development within the County General Plan. The current General Plan, which is intended to cover the period 1995 – 2010, was last updated in 1994, and is not currently scheduled for a full update. Planning has begun the development of a General Plan Sustainability Element, scheduled for completion as part of the 2018-2019 work plan.

**8. Ensure that 100% of public fleet vehicles are electric, hybrid electric, or run on alternative fuels.**

Since 2009, FAF has increased its percentage of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs). While the Comprehensive Vehicle Policy does not indicate a specific percentage goal for AFVs, FAF currently strives to achieve 50% alternative fuel vehicles by 2025. In 2010, 9% (150) of the

1,693 vehicles in the County's fleet were electric, hybrid, or ran on an alternative fuel source. By 2016, nearly 17% (268) of the 1,612 vehicles in the County's fleet are AFVs.

<b>YEAR</b>	Total County Fleet	Hybrid Vehicle	Electric Vehicle	CNG Vehicle	Hydrogen Vehicle	<b>TOTAL PERCENTAGE</b>
2009	1698	88	60	2	0	8.80%
2010	1693	88	60	2	0	8.90%
2011	1665	99	60	2	0	9.70%
2012	1587	127	60	0	0	11.80%
2013	1569	124	60	0	0	11.70%
2014	1594	124	60	0	0	11.50%
2015	1609	145	68	3	0	13.40%
<b>2016</b>	<b>1612</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>16.60%</b>

Staff will hold meetings to discuss constraints and identify strategies (short- and long-term goals) to achieve 100% penetration of AFVs. This will allow FAF to make recommendations for possible amendments to this ESG and the Comprehensive Vehicle Policy (3.52).

While FAF continues to increase its total number of alternative fuel vehicles, it is presented with the following challenges toward reaching 100% penetration of AFVs:

- a. Of the 1,612 fleet vehicles, 347 are pursuit-rated or under cover/other use Sheriff vehicles. At this time, no pursuit-rated alternative vehicles have been released or certified.
- b. Funding for maintenance of CNG vehicles is very costly.
- c. Original Equipment Manufacturers (OEM) reliability for order delivery of parts for alternative fuel vehicles. In the past, FAF has experienced occasions where parts are not available, as well as order cancellations.
- d. Production of alternative fuel vehicles is dependent on gas prices. When gas prices are low, manufacturers are inclined to produce traditional vehicles. This reduces the availability of alternative fuel vehicles.

Staff are formulating amendments to the Sustainability 8.0 and Comprehensive Vehicle 3.52 policies to incorporate Alternative Fuel Vehicle (AFV) language and long-term goals. Based on this conversation, the definition of AFV will be added to the Sustainability Policy, while the 50% by 2030 AFVs for vehicle fleet will be added to the Comprehensive Vehicle Policy. The year 2030 was selected as the target year to better align with State emissions

reduction mandates. Resolutions for both policies have been drafted and are pending review by County Counsel.

FAF is currently conducting a survey of Alternative Fuel Vehicle (AFV) goals among similar local governments. Staff will compare the County of Santa Clara's vision for converting its fleet to 100% electric, hybrid, or alternative fuels with the goals from the following cities and counties:

- County of Ventura
- City of San Jose
- City of Cupertino
- City of Oakland
- City and County of San Francisco
- County of San Mateo
- County of Alameda
- County of San Diego
- County of Los Angeles

Using the results from this survey, Fleet Management will further evaluate AFV goals by vehicle category and availability. These results will inform the preparation of a resolution to include AFV goals in the Comprehensive Vehicle Policy and increase AFV penetration in the County fleet beyond the existing level.

**9. Work with local governments and regional authorities to ensure that all existing County trails are interconnected with local and regional trails.**

On March 17, 2015, the County Parks and Recreation Department released an Informational Report titled *Countywide Trails Prioritization and Gaps Analysis*. This report describes the progress of the original 1978 *Santa Clara County Trails and Pathways Master Plan* that includes a 1995 update. There are 791 miles identified to connect all existing County trails with local and regional trails. In 1995, 147 miles (18%) were complete, 64 (8%) miles were partially complete, and 584 miles (73%) were simply mapped for future development. By January 2015, 316 miles (40%) are complete, 8 miles (1%) are partially complete, and 471 miles (59%) remain identified for future development.

## **10. Plant 1,000 trees in unincorporated urban county pockets and work with local governments and agencies to build a comprehensive urban forest.**

At present, 554 trees (55%) of the 1,000-tree goal have been planted. Between 2011 and 2015, trees were planted under a contract with the volunteer-based non-profit organization Our City Forest. On August 31, 2015, the most recent contract extension expired and no further trees are planned for planting in furtherance of this goal. After review with FAF and Parks and Recreation, there are no current plans underway to develop a comprehensive urban forest.

OOS coordinated with IPM in communication with OCF's Director of Urban Forestry. IPM recently completed contract negotiations and found approval to employ OCF's services to plant 200 trees over the next two years on County properties. After discussions, OCF confirmed it has the capacity and interest in planting an additional 250 trees on private landscapes in the unincorporated communities of Santa Clara County if the County so desires. If a change order were approved on current IPM contract for the additional 250 trees, OCF could coordinate the planting of the additional trees for an estimated \$57,500. OCF's estimate includes community outreach, tree planning and reporting, all administered under IPM's current contract parameters.

With an additional 250 trees planted over the next two years under the current IPM contract, the County can meet the 1,000-tree goal enumerated in 2009 under this ESG. Between 2011 and 2015, under a contract managed under the Facilities and Fleet department, 554 trees were planted in the unincorporated urban county pockets. Under the already authorized contract with OCF managed by IPM, another 200 trees are currently being planted. A contract extension to plant another 250 trees would bring the total to over 1,000 trees by the end of 2019.

One disclaimer is that the current IPM contract with OCF dictates that the 200 trees currently being planted be located on County properties shading streets, sidewalks and other spaces for the public. As such, these County properties identified for planting may not strictly fit the "unincorporated urban county pockets" definition written above in ESG #10.

Additionally, when the 1,000 tree plantings are complete, more efforts will be required to meet the second part of ESG #10; that is, the coordination of a comprehensive urban forest plan for all the cities, communities, and stakeholder properties within the Santa Clara County jurisdiction. OOS is currently soliciting members for a County-wide working group to network, reflect, and propose standards for environmental resource metrics. Through the creation of this working group, OOS is soliciting interest toward participation in the creation of a Santa Clara Valley-wide Urban Forest Plan.

**11. Increase the available blue and white collar "clean and green workforce" course/trainings available regionally and in Santa Clara County and help place 20,000 trainees and graduates in the regional labor force by the end of 2013.**

The most significant resource for assessing the green regional workforce has been the October 2010 report titled “California’s Green Economy: Summary of Survey Results” prepared by the State of California’s Employment Development Department’s Labor Market Information Division. This report found 120,030 “clean and green workforce” jobs in the San Francisco Bay Area as of October 2010, establishing a baseline for assessing future workforce development efforts. Unfortunately, though, the report was not repeated, making it difficult to assess progress past 2010.

Staff communicated with both Asset and Economic Development (AED) staff and the NOVA Workforce Board to determine local progress toward the goal of placing 20,000 “clean and green workforce” trainees and graduates in the regional labor force.

NOVA provided staff with data from a SolarTech Workforce Innovations Collaboration Job Report Summary from the Fourth Quarter of 2011, which noted that 590 solar jobs and 326 energy efficiency jobs had been created regionally by that point – just under 0.5% of the goal. Data was not broken down by geography, nor available beyond 2011.

Working with a NOVA data analyst specializing in workforce development, staff was unable to clearly identify either the courses taken, training provided, graduates or job placements in the “clean and green” industry since adoption of the ESGs. As the concept of a green workforce is relatively new in terms of employment tracking, a fitting and universal definition has not been created by workforce administration agencies, hampering ongoing reporting.

**PART II – ONGOING REPORTING THROUGH THE SUSTAINABILITY MASTER PLAN**

A survey of all the local governments within the San Francisco Bay area was undertaken this past summer in regard to the current status of the Bay Area Climate Change Compact (BACCC). OOS found that in 2009, 15 local governments signed the BACCC as a commitment to develop strategies to address the BACCC’s original ten ESGs. Of the 15, only four local governments including the County of Santa Clara, Cupertino, Los Altos Hills, and San Jose continue to have BACCC-specific goals. Three of those four report their collective progress on these goals with regularity. After staff review, it was found that while the BACCC’s ESGs were essential for fostering the alignment of sustainability goals among

local Bay Area governments, this intergovernmental mechanism is no longer guiding coordination between Bay Area community sustainability objectives.

Through the development of the Sustainability Master Plan, the County will have the opportunity to revise and improve its sustainability reporting, and extend that reporting externally to collaborate with neighboring communities on shared goals. Staff anticipates incorporating elements from each of the previous reporting formats, including the metrics and data-driven aspects of the matrix, the overall approachability and readability of the 2014 Annual Report, and the forward-looking goal-setting of the ESGs.

The Office of Sustainability welcomes the Board's input and direction on how these multiple objectives might best be incorporated into the ongoing reporting for the Sustainability Master Plan, in order to:

- Allow for greater public understanding of the County's sustainability actions and outcomes;
- Demonstrate that sustainability practices are not limited to the environmental arena, but also promote social and economic objectives;
- Deploy a format that is more compelling and conducive to referencing and sharing;
- Provide for streamlined, continuous tracking; and
- Enhance internal awareness and understanding of cross-pillar co-benefits.

OOS staff has updated the original Framework for the Sustainability Master Plan and incorporated feedback received during a pilot meeting of the Sustainable County Working Group. OOS staff anticipates presenting the updated Framework to Board committees shortly, once staff is able to incorporate input from the incoming Sustainability Director who is joining the County on October 30.

## **CHILD IMPACT**

Sustainability, energy and climate action programs, projects, and activities are undertaken by the County to serve the economic, environmental and social interests of the community, including those impacting children and youth.

## **SENIOR IMPACT**

Sustainability, energy, and climate action programs, projects, and activities are undertaken by the County to serve the economic, environmental and social interests of the community, including those impacting seniors.

## **SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS**

The recommended actions review, approve and support programs, projects, and activities that balance public policy and program interests, and which advance the Board's sustainability objectives to foster a healthy environment, protect resources and public health and safety, promote a diverse economy, and to advance social equity and safety.

## **BACKGROUND**

The County's Environmental Stewardship Goals originated from a regional effort called the Bay Area Climate Change Compact (BACCC). The BACCC was jointly created by three Bay Area cities (San Francisco, Oakland, and San Jose) and the Silicon Valley Leadership Group. These ESGs were initially proposed for consideration by the County at the FGOC meeting of February 19, 2009. The compact goals were first revised according to the committee's direction on May 14, 2009, presented for Board approval on June 9, 2009, when they were adopted with modifications. The original ten (10) goals proposed by the BACCC were expanded to eleven (11) to include tree planting.

The ESGs, predate the Office of Sustainability's establishment by the Board on August 24, 2010 and its operational commencement on November 8, 2010. The Sustainability Office was tasked with promoting sustainability approaches, policies and programs throughout the County's departments and offices, as well as enhancing the County's regional, state and national leadership in climate mitigation, adaptation, and all other sustainability resource, equity, and economic sectors.