



**MEETING MINUTES  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING  
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2025  
9:00 A.M.**

---

**CALL TO ORDER**

(9:02 a.m. - Video Time Stamp: 00:02:15)

Chair Hopkins called the meeting to order.

Board Members present: Chair Hopkins and Vice Chair Barnacle, Directors Lands, Lemus, Elward, Fleming, Farrar-Rivas, Haschak, and Alternate Director Carter. Director Koogle and Potter were absent with prior notice.

Staff present: Geof Syphers, Chief Executive Officer; Stephanie Reynolds, Director of Internal Operations; Scott Lawrence, Senior Commercial Accounts Manager; Neal Reardon, Director of Regulatory Affairs; Miles Horton, Legislative Policy & Community Engagement Manager; Ryan Tracey, Director of Planning & Analytics; Rebecca Simonson, Director of Capital Projects & Engineering; and Josh Nelson, Special Counsel.

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS CONSENT CALENDAR**

(9:03 a.m. - Video Time Stamp: 00:03:12)

1. Approve December 5, 2024, Draft Board of Directors Meeting Minutes
2. Ratify Generation Rates Effective February 1, 2025, Consistent with Prior Board Direction
3. Receive Investment Activity Report for the Month of December 2024

Public Comment: None

Motion to approve February 6, 2025, Board of Directors Consent Calendar by Director Lands

Second: Director Lemus

Motion passed by UNANIMOUS affirmation.

## **BOARD OF DIRECTORS REGULAR CALENDAR**

4. Nominate and Approve the Appointments of Chair and Vice Chair of the Board of Directors

(9:04 a.m. - Video Time Stamp: 00:04:28)

Chair Hopkins asked the Board of Directors (Board) if the term for Chair and Vice Chair should be lengthened to a two-year term as opposed to a one-year term. Director Fleming stated that she supported a 2-year terms for their stability. Chair Hopkins asked the Board when the extension should begin. Director Lands stated that the 2-year terms should start now. Director Elward questioned the equity of extending the term. Director Lemus said she would like to try 2 concurrent 1-year terms. No decision was made on extending the terms.

Chair Hopkins opened nominations for Chair of the Board.

Director Lands nominated Vice Chair Barnacle to be Chair of the Board.

Public Comment: None

Motion to Appoint Vice Chair Barnacle as the Chair of the Sonoma Clean Power Authority by Director Lands

Second: Director Elward

Motion passed by UNANIMOUS affirmation.

The gavel was passed from Director Hopkins to Chair Barnacle. Chair Barnacle thanked the Board and staff.

Chair Barnacle opened nominations for Vice Chair of the Board. Director Fleming nominated Director Elward. Director Lemus nominated Director Farar-Rivas. Director Hopkins nominated Director Lemus.

Directors Lemus and Farra-Rivas declined their nominations.

Public Comment: None

Motion Appoint Director Elward as Vice Chair of the Board by Director Fleming

Second: Director Lands

Motion passed by UNANIMOUS affirmation.

Vice Chair Elward thanked the Board and staff.

*9:25 a.m. Director Hopkins exited the meeting.*

5. Receive Welcome Orientation to the Sonoma Clean Power Authority Board of Directors

(9:26 a.m. - Video Time Stamp: 00:26:42)

Geof Syphers, CEO, gave a welcome orientation to the Board. Alternate Director Carter thanked SCP and said he likes the Customer Center and their bill reading classes. Vice Chair Elward requested that the orientation video be uploaded to SCP's website. Director Lands asked what constitutes large hydro and CEO Syphers responded that it was anything over 30MW.

Public Comment: None

6. Receive Internal Operations and Monthly Financial Report and Provide Direction as Appropriate

(9:57 a.m. - Video Time Stamp: 00:57:53)

Stephanie Reynolds, Director of Internal Operations, gave a brief introduction to the operations report and discussed the December Humboldt County Earthquake. Director Reynolds then introduced Scott Lawrence, Senior Commercial Accounts Manager, who gave an update on SCP's outreach to small businesses.

*10:02 a.m. Director Fleming exited the meeting.*

Director Lemus asked if the small business outreach was ongoing, and Mr. Lawrence answered that it was. Chair Barnacle thanked SCP and asked how the Board could help to get the information out and Mr. Lawrence said that SCP is currently analyzing data and working on a campaign. Director Reynolds then gave a Financial Report update and announced that going forward the Finance Department will address the monthly reports as part of a recurring financial department item.

*10:07 a.m. Director Hopkins re-entered the meeting.*

Chair Barnacle said he would like to dig into SCP's financial information deeper to increase overall understanding and financial literacy across the Board. Director Farrar-Rivas would like to have a maturity analysis for investments.

Public Comment: None

7. Receive Legislative and Regulatory Updates, Approve Legislative Positions, and Provide Direction as Appropriate

(10:12 a.m. - Video Time Stamp: 01:12:42)

Neal Reardon, Director of Regulatory Affairs, discussed PG&E pulling their support from the CSU Monterey Bay electrification project because the project has become too difficult, is taking too long, and the stakeholders are complaining, and he added that the CPUC is hearing PG&E's motion.

Alternate Director Carter asked what role SCP could play and Director Reardon answered that SCP can advocate in which areas are impacted by the CPUC decision. Director Haschak asked if PG&E would replace the gas lines at CSU Monterey Bay and Neal Reardon answered his understanding is PG&E would leave gas connections for years to come.

*10:40 a.m. Director Fleming re-entered the meeting.*

Miles Horton, Legislative Policy & Community Engagement Manager, announced that SCP would be holding a GeoZone Town Hall in Cloverdale. Mr. Horton then discussed the legislative positions that SCP currently is working on, and the coalition of partners SCP is building.

Chair Barnacle said he supports SCP's stated legislative positions and added that Petaluma is having issues with mobile home park energy rates and asked SCP to investigate this issue. CEO Syphers said that Director Reardon would reach out to the Chair. Chair Barnacle then asked what the impacts of potential tariffs from the Trump Administration would be and CEO Syphers said that SCP would have to wait and see.

Public Comment: Tim Frank said the Environmental Justice Alliance offers legal guidance for Mobile Homeowners and is excited for GeoZone. Ben Peters stated he was supportive of legislative positions.

Motion to Approve Positions of NEPA/CEQA alignment, a Geothermal Action Plan, and allowing Geothermal Power to use the "opt-in" process by Director Hopkins

Second: Director Farrar-Rivas

Motion passed by UNANIMOUS affirmation.

## 8. Receive Geothermal Opportunity Zone Update

(10:50 a.m. - Video Time Stamp: 01:50:24)

Ryan Tracey, Director of Planning and Analytics, mentioned the GeoZone Town Hall and announced that Chevron had disclosed its site in the GeoZone as Pocket Ranch, but at the same time Chevron made an internal decision to defer their decision on drilling an exploration well on the site. Director Tracey explained that delays are to be expected but this is still disappointing because Chevron would be unable to receive the Department of Energy's geothermal grant.

Director Farrar-Rivas announced that the State of California was able to capture a lot of funding from the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA). CEO Syphers added that both the Biden and Trump Administrations agree on geothermal energy. Alternate Director Carter asked if SCP could form an investment vehicle and Director Tracey said that it had been discussed. Chair Barnacle said that he would like to see an option "b" for the loss of the grant.

Public Comment: None

## 9. Approve Purchasing Policy for Local Energy Projects

(11:04 a.m. - Video Time Stamp: 02:04:49)

Rebecca Simonson, Director of Capital Projects & Engineering, gave a presentation on the Draft Purchasing Policy for Local Energy Projects for SCP. Director Simonson stated that SCP currently has a local investment fund, and the intention of the policy is to ensure the funds would be used for SCP to own and/or operate its own energy projects with the goal of lowering customer rates. CEO Syphers added that SCP will see purchasing opportunities in the future and wants SCP to be nimble and available to consider opportunities as they arise, usually without much prior notice.

Chair Barnacle said he would like to be notified for anything requiring a Federal Permit and Director Hopkins added that active real estate negotiations would need to be discussed in Closed Session.

Public Comment: None

Motion to Approve Purchasing Policy for Local Energy Projects by Director Haschek

Second: Director Elward

Motion passed by UNANIMOUS affirmation.

#### 10. Receive Presentation and Provide Input on a Draft Energy Project Selection Criteria

(11:21 a.m. - Video Time Stamp: 02:21:57)

CEO Syphers gave a presentation on the proposed draft energy selection policy for SCP, and he thanked everyone for their input and eyes on the project. He stated that he had received great feedback, and he agreed with recommendations such as methods of waiving and some forms of disclosure. He added that the item would be brought back to the Board two more times after this meeting.

Alternate Director Carter asked if there was an equity component for where projects would be built, and CEO Syphers answered the policy was not set up like that. Vice Chair Elward asked if a comparison can be shown between the draft policy and what labor is requesting and CEO Syphers answered that the intent is to show them side by side. Director Hopkins asked when the initial engagement with labor began and CEO Syphers said that he began discussing the plan 2 years ago, but it really kicked off in earnest about 8 months ago. Director Farrar-Rivas requested more clarification on priority hires. Director Hopkins discussed the County of Sonoma's selection policy and stated that this policy falls in line with labor's view, but she would like to keep the discussion going. Chair Barnacle said that anything that SCP owns should operate under a labor agreement.

Public Comment: CCA Workforce & EJ Alliance discussed outstanding gaps in the Draft Energy Project Selection Criteria, their comment is attached. Tim Frank discussed the size of projects and the effect on apprentices. Jared Mumm discussed the apprenticeship community and working with trade unions. Woody Hastings discussed energy resources and the CAISO community. Ben Peters discussed locations and dual use.

#### **BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEMBER ANNOUNCEMENTS**

(12:13 p.m. - Video Time Stamp: 03:13:47)

Public Comment: Director Haschak stated that he was happy to be on the Board. Director Lands announced the GeoZone Townhall in Cloverdale. Director Fleming announced the Climate Subcommittee for Santa Rosa meets the 1<sup>st</sup> Wednesday every

month. Director Farrar-Rivas announced that the City of Sonoma is a Climate Smart City. Director Lemus announced the 2-day North Coast Resource Climate Project. Chair Barnacle discussed his recent tribal consultation.

**PUBLIC COMMENT ON MATTERS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA**

(12:17 p.m. - Video Time Stamp: 03:17:33)

Public Comment: Michael Heffer discussed solar panels on city buildings and his comment is attached.

**ADJOURN**

(12:18 p.m. - Video Time Stamp: 03:18:24)

**Respectfully Submitted,**



**Darin A. Bartow, JD  
Clerk of the Board**



# CCA Workforce & EJ Alliance



February 5, 2025

Chair Hopkins and Honorable Directors  
Sonoma Clean Power  
431 E Street  
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

## Re: Item 10, Draft Energy Project Selection Criteria—Addressing Outstanding Gaps

Chair Hopkins and Honorable Directors,

Thank you for your continued leadership in developing a strong Energy Project Selection Policy for Sonoma Clean Power. We appreciate the collaborative efforts with staff and the thoughtful work invested in this process.

While meaningful progress has been made, key gaps remain that limit the policy’s ability to fully align with best practices in workforce standards, environmental sustainability, and community benefits. Closing these gaps is essential to strengthening SCP’s leadership, ensuring that the benefits of clean energy development reach all communities, supporting local economies, and enhancing long-term project success.



To support this effort, we have attached the **SCP Project Selection Policy Guidelines Analysis** table, which outlines **specific areas for refinement**. We urge you to review these recommendations and incorporate them into your deliberations at tomorrow's meeting.

We are available to meet ahead of the March Board meeting to discuss solutions and continue working toward a **comprehensive, best-in-class policy** that reflects SCP's values. We appreciate your dedication to this effort and look forward to continued collaboration.

Sincerely,

Eric Veium, Tim Frank, & Leslie Austin  
Co-coordinators, CCA Workforce & EJ Alliance

Attachments:

- *SCP Project Selection Policy Guidelines Analysis*

# SCP Draft Project Selection Policy Guidelines—CCA Alliance Analysis

Feb. 5, 2025

#	Issue	Issue Description	Policy Reference	Section	SCP Proposed Language / Staff's Comments	W&EJ Alliance's Response	W&EJ Alliance's Recommendation
0	General: Reaffirm: Preference-based framework	The CCA W&EJ Alliance policy is primarily a set of preference-based standards that signal values to the market and reward compliance. These are voluntary goals, not mandates as stated in the introduction to the policy.		Introduction	Language: "This project selection methodology adds new voluntary goals relating to the workforce constructing new energy, capacity and energy storage resources and the community and environmental impacts of those construction projects."  Language: "The SCP Board Chair and Vice Chair may waive this Project Selection Methodology, or any portion thereof, to:  Address an emergency or unforeseen situation that jeopardizes the safety or feasibility of a project; or  Comply with a California State or Federal executive or regulatory order or law."	The Alliance supports this Board authority. The goal of this policy is to offer a holistic approach using clearly defined and implemented standards for clean energy projects that reduce CCA development risk, support workers and communities, and protect and promote positive public perception of clean energy development to accelerate progress toward achieving our clean energy and climate goals. We aim to discourage and devalue poor projects, not inadvertently kill good ones.	Recognizing the preference-based framework of this policy, the CCA Workforce & E.J Alliance encourages the SCP Board to adopt the strongest possible standards.
1	General: Reaffirm: Reservation of Authority to Waive Project Selection Methodology	Further reaffirming the volunteer nature of these standards, the Board has broad authority to waive all or parts of the project selection methodology.	IV	Reservation of Authority to Waive Project Selection Methodology		The Board has broad authority to waive all or part of the project selection methodology. Recognizing this power, the CCA Workforce & E.J Alliance encourages the SCP Board to adopt the strongest possible standards	
2	Workforce: Apply highest out-of-state prevailing wage	California prevailing wages are typically more up to date and higher than federal prevailing wages. This is also true for some other western states. Where this is the case, we want to be clear that the higher of the two should be the target.	II.C.2.ii	Workforce: Medium-priority projects	Language: Missing in staff's draft	California's Department of Industrial Relations conducts its own surveys to determine prevailing wages and often provides more up-to-date results with higher wages than the federal prevailing wage. Some other western states also have higher state prevailing wages. The priority here is to signal to project developers the expectation that they adopt the higher of the state or federal prevailing wage.	For out-of-state projects, add language that 'prefers the highest prevailing wage between state and federal schedules.'
3	Workforce: Commit to utilize apprentices	The commitment to using apprentices on public works jobs was one of the key innovations of New Deal-era labor law. This is a 'pay it forward' strategy that ensures every public works project contributes to training the next generation of skilled construction workers. Every city and county in the SCP territory follows this practice.	II.C.2.ii	Workforce: Medium-priority projects	Comment: "This is under review but has met with enough concern by developers that we are cautious."	This is an important practice for workforce development and social equity. All public works projects, even very small ones, conform to this standard. It is also current practice for the majority of utility scale projects in California. SCP should be able to commit to this.	"Utilization of apprentices at the same ratio of apprentice hours to journey/person hours as required for public works projects."
4	Workforce: Commit to PLA for large SCP-owned projects	Establishing a clear commitment to Project Labor Agreements will signal expectations, but still reserves the flexibility to change policy if unforeseen exigencies require it. The clear commitment assures that staff will not make a commitment to any project that lacks an agreement before securing explicit board approval for the exception. Note that the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors just made a commitment that all public works projects greater than 1 million will be covered by a Project Labor Agreement. We think this is the right example to follow.	II.D.	Workforce: Large Owned Resources	Comment: "(Shall commit to PLA is) not acceptable."  Language: 'Commercially reasonable efforts'	Commercially reasonable efforts' leaves room for avoidance. The County of Sonoma set the example on Tuesday (2/4) when the Board of Supervisors voted 4-1 to sign a PLA with the Building Trades covering all projects that are \$1 million or more. SCP can commit to signing a PLA, as well.	For Large SCP-owned projects: Replace "Commercially reasonable efforts" to negotiate a multi-trade project labor agreement with "Shall" negotiate a multi-trade project labor agreement.

# SCP Draft Project Selection Policy Guidelines—CCA Alliance Analysis

Feb. 5, 2025

#	Issue	Issue Description	Policy Reference	Section	SCP Proposed Language / Staff's Comments	W&EJ Alliance's Response	W&EJ Alliance's Recommendation
5	Workforce: Reasonable efforts to negotiate PLA on smaller SCP-owned projects	<p>Most of the utility scale projects located within the SCP territory are likely to be in the \$1M to \$10M dollar range, which means that is where most of the local employment opportunities will come from. This should be the heart of SCP's commitment to quality local jobs.</p> <p>The Sonoma County Board of Supervisors, which voted 4-1 to ensure that every project larger than \$1M is covered by a PLA, has set an example for how to address projects of this size. SCP should follow the County's example.</p> <p>For projects under 1MW or less than \$1M, reasonable efforts are sufficient.</p>	II.E.	Workforce: Small Owned Resources	<p>Comment: "Under review. This is not typical for small systems, and could limit our options for local investments."</p>	<p>PLAs are, in fact, common on renewable energy projects that meet this definition of small. They are even common in rural settings. Note that the County of Sonoma just revised its definition of 'small' under the County PLA to a new threshold of under \$1 million.</p>	For Small SCP-owned projects: apply "Commercially Reasonable Efforts" standard regarding the commitment to negotiating multi-trade project labor agreement, and change the definition of 'small' to be projects that are less than 1 MW.
6	Location: Prefer project located in California	<p>The issue here is to prioritize projects that are local or in California before considering out-of-state projects. This specific policy is about maximizing workforce and environmental benefits.</p>	II.G.2.	Location	<p>Comment: "Understand the preference, but it does not align with energy market jurisdictions, project development risks or competitive solicitations. For these reasons, I'll be recommending the board stay with existing language"</p>	<p>Staff's default approach to project selection is to choose projects based on technical and financial requirements. The purpose of having a locational preference for California-based projects is to encourage—assuming all other factors are similar—the selection of projects to be built within the state. California has highest workforce and environmental standards, which should be achieved if possible, especially in light of the federal government. Staff's suggested policy treats out-of-state projects connected to CAISO on the same level as in-state projects connected to CAISO. We believe there is important value in pursuing this approach.</p>	<p>We suggest the following locational preference:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Projects located within Sonoma and Mendocino Counties</li> <li>2. Projects within the state of California with the first point of connection to CAISO</li> <li>3. Projects outside the state of California with the first point of connection to CAISO</li> <li>4. Other out-of-state projects or all other projects</li> </ol>
7	Community Benefits: Community engagement throughout the project	<p>Conduct meaningful community engagement during pre-development, entitlement, construction, and operations.</p>	III.1.2.	Benefits Accruing to Underserved and Low-Income Communities	<p>Comment [Community engagement throughout the project is] "Not feasible"</p> <p>Language: Commit to meaningful community engagement DURING ENTITLEMENT AND CONSTRUCTION PROCESSES ...</p>	<p>To meet our climate and energy goals, we need to build a massive amount of new clean energy. Developers can no longer get away with trying to have their project fly under a community's radar—especially now, in light of the battery fires at Moss Landing. Poor community engagement practices lead to increased community opposition, which raises project development risk and contributes to widespread public opposition to future clean energy projects.</p>	<p>Replace 'entitlement and construction processes' with 'entire project lifecycle.'</p> <p>Reward projects proposers that clearly demonstrate due diligence in understanding community dynamics, communicate their commitment to meaningful community engagement, and provide a clear, thoughtful plan to conduct community engagement while identifying and communicating benefits and impacts.</p>
8	Reporting: Report at time of project approval	<p>Performance reporting for this policy should occur both at time of project approval and at project completion.</p>	III.	Reporting	<p>Comment: "Will work with our team to come up with a practical solution."</p>	<p>For this policy to be impactful, staff must communicate their recommended projects against this policy in comparison to other project options at time of project approval, ensuring transparency and informed decision-making by the Board and community.</p>	<p>Add to the Reporting section: 'SCP will assess and select project proposals in accordance with this Project Selection Methodology. While quantifiable metrics may not be available at the time of board approval, the known details of project commitments and targets will be provided at the time of board approval.'</p>

I recently reviewed the Climate Action Committee recommendations for the city of Sonoma and was struck by an issue I haven't heard discussed at the SCP meetings I've attended - perhaps it has been covered and I am just unaware.

The City is considering adding solar panels to various city buildings in a way that doesn't appear to reflect optimal usage of solar.

It seems to me there should be solar and battery backup in city buildings, or city designated buildings, that can be used as shelter in times of power outages. But for other buildings not designated for this emergency purpose, the city might very well be better off financially by using the Evergreen service.

Has this been discussed or look at previously. If not is it worth considering providing city's and town this guidance?

Regards,

Michael Heffler