

Submitted Time	Name:	Meeting Date:	Comment Type	Agenda Item	Comments:
12/28/2020 14:42	Wendy Mihalic	12/30/2020	City Council Comment	600	<p>A one-year extension of the SDG&amp;E Franchise Agreement is the right thing to do. The next Franchise Agreement will shape the future of energy in San Diego for decades to come. It involves one of the city's most financially valuable public assets and it's important that we get it right. The process that produced just one bidder, SDG&amp;E, took place during a pandemic, without the possibility for full consideration of the complexities and implications of such a far-reaching agreement. We are still in the throes of COVID-19 and conducting a vigorous, transparent public process and evaluation will take time. Let's take the time to do it right and get the best deal for San Diegans. Don't let SDG&amp;E hurry the City into another bad deal.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration,</p>
12/29/2020 8:09	Jason Anderson	12/30/2020	City Council Comment	600	<p>Cleantech San Diego supports the extension of the gas and electric franchise agreement with SDG&amp;E and recommends the City work with SDG&amp;E on an agreement that advances regional renewable energy goals, supports the growth of the region's cleantech economy and ensures the benefits of renewable energy are accessible to all.</p>
12/29/2020 8:10	Alexandria Abrams	12/30/2020	City Council Comment	600	<p>I am writing because the City needs to conduct a more thorough evaluation of its assets and a robust public process to explore all of its options and ensure we get the best deal for the City, our climate, and our communities. The franchise agreement terms put forth by SDG&amp;E are deficient, lack accountability, undervalue the monopoly use of our public lands, and do not invest in our communities or meet our clean energy goals. The terms proposed by SDG&amp;E are in direct contradiction to state and local policy, as well as the public consensus, to reduce the burning of fossil fuels and the emission of greenhouse gases.</p> <p>Instead, the City should get a one-year extension to the current franchise agreements to give it time to work with the community in a robust, transparent public process and a more thorough analysis of all of the city's options -- including public power -- so that we can secure the best franchise deal possible for the City of San Diego, community residents, and businesses. We have an opportunity to set up an energy distribution system that invests in our communities, meets our clean energy goals, and holds the franchisee accountable. Any franchise agreement must prioritize a climate equity fund and include a right to purchase clause, worker protections, and extended bill relief for those struggling to pay their energy bill during the COVID-19 crisis.</p> <p>SDG&amp;E has proven they are a bad faith actor in their relationship with our city-they fought against community choice energy; attempted to charge ratepayers for SDGE's own negligence in causing devastating wildfires; and, lobbied and made campaign contributions to boost its bottom line. There is a long pattern of violations by SDG&amp;E against the city and ratepayers, and they do not deserve a sweetheart deal giving away exclusive use of our city's lands.</p> <p>The City needs to restart a robust process to determine our franchise agreement terms to ensure we get the best deal for our climate and our communities. We want San Diego to be a leader in the equitable distribution of local clean energy. This is why I am asking that the Council reject SDG&amp;E's bad energy franchise deal.</p>
12/29/2020 8:24	Tyler Abrams	12/30/2020	City Council Comment	600	<p>I am a District 2 constituent. I am writing today to ask that you reject SDG&amp;E's bad energy franchise deal and instead the city should extend the current franchise agreements by a minimum of 1 year. The agreement terms need teeth to hold whoever the franchisee is accountable, including the right to purchase, something strongly recommended by the City's consultant. The bid from SDG&amp;E was unresponsive. It would have underpaid the city and allowed SDG&amp;E to evade accountability. It's a bid made in bad faith, by a franchisee who has acted in bad faith. We can't enable SDG&amp;E to continue the practices that have made them such a bad partner to our city. There is a long pattern of violations by SDG&amp;E against the city and ratepayers, and they do not deserve a sweetheart deal giving away exclusive use of our city lands. In order to do right by San Diego residents, we need the time to explore all our options, such as a stronger deal, alternative partners, and public power.</p> <p>In addition, the ongoing COVID-19 crisis has fully occupied the attention of the City Council, leaving little time to grasp the opportunity presented by a new agreement, or by forming a municipal utility. So let's pause the franchise award process until council members can ensure the city gets fair value for this franchise award or considers an alternative.</p>

12/29/2020 10:07	Laura Minna-Choe	12/30/2020	City Council Comment	600	<p>Dear City of San Diego Council Members:</p> <p>* The City of San Diego ("City") must extend the current franchise agreements by at least one ("1") year. This gives the City time to participate in a thorough, transparent process that involves the public. This also gives the City time to conduct a more complete analysis of all of the city's options (including public power and new technologies).</p> <p>* SDG&amp;E's current bid would underpay the City by not properly valuing real estate involved. The franchise agreements represent some of the City's most valuable public assets. The current proposed \$80 million minimum bid is set at less than 1% of the reported value of the \$37 billion agreements. Using the City's own best practices for real estate and business transactions outlined in the consultant's report, the minimum bid must be raised to reflect fair-market-value compensation for the use of our public lands.</p> <p>* SDG&amp;E's current bid terms would allow SDG&amp;E to evade accountability. SDG&amp;E's current bid goes against the City consultant's advice as it does not contain the Right-to-Purchase clause recommended in the City consultant's report. Thus, it eliminates the City's main avenue for holding the franchisee accountable.</p> <p>*SDG&amp;E's current bid fails to address equity concerns. The current bid does not include provisions for a Climate Equity Fund or any plan to invest in our most vulnerable communities. A portion of the funds from the Minimum Bid should be directed to this fund and for implementation of the Climate Action Plan.</p> <p>* A new administration and City Council should be the actors to address this issue. The new incoming administration and City Council need time to study this complex issue and consult with their constituents and stakeholders before making any decisions. Taking the necessary time is crucial on this issue that will shape San Diego for decades.</p> <p>Overall, we need the time to explore all our options, such as a stronger deal, alternative partners, and public power. Proceeding in this manner helps the City obtain the best franchise deal possible for the City, residents, and businesses. Please vote to extend the franchise agreements by one year.</p>
12/29/2020 12:34	Kyle Knoebel	12/30/2020	City Council Comment	600	<p>This is Kyle Knoebel in San Diego's 3rd District. The city should extend the current franchise agreements by a minimum of 1 year to allow time to hold a transparent analysis of all of the city's options -- including public power -- so that we can secure the best franchise deal possible for the City of San Diego, community residents, and businesses. The new administration and City Council have only been in office a few weeks, another reason why this major decision that affects all citizens should be studied more thoroughly. The extension of the franchise agreements should include extended bill relief for those struggling to pay their energy bill during the Covid crisis.</p>
12/29/2020 13:49	Scott M Borden	12/30/2020	City Council Comment	600	<p>I'm a long term resident of San Diego living in Mission Hills and I strongly support a minimum one year extension of the SDGE franchise agreement. Given COVID and the inadequate bid submitted by SDGE, one year is the least amount of time needed to secure an agreement that benefits our city. Once we are done with COVID, climate change will become our #1 threat and a good franchise agreement is necessary to achieve climate goals.</p>
12/29/2020 14:35	Mary Parrish	12/30/2020	City Council Comment	600	<p>The city should extend the current franchise agreements by a minimum of 1 year to allow time to hold a robust, transparent, participatory public process and to conduct a more thorough analysis of all of the city's options -- including public power -- so that we can secure the best franchise deal possible for the City of San Diego, community residents, and businesses.</p> <p>The bid from SDG&amp;E was unresponsive. It would have underpaid the city and allowed SDG&amp;E to evade accountability. It's a bid made in bad faith, by a franchisee who has acted in bad faith. We can't enable SDG&amp;E to continue the practices that have made them such a bad partner to our city. In order to do right by San Diego residents, we need the time to explore all our options, such as a stronger deal, alternative partners, and public power.</p> <p>The agreement terms need teeth to hold whoever the franchisee is accountable, including the right to purchase, something strongly recommended by the City's consultant. There is a long pattern of violations by SDG&amp;E against the city and ratepayers, and they do not deserve a sweetheart deal giving away exclusive use of our city lands.</p> <p>We have an opportunity to set up an energy distribution system that invests in our communities, meets our clean energy goals, and holds the franchisee accountable. For example, any franchise agreement must include a climate equity fund, an improved right to purchase clause, ensuring workers are fully protected during any transitions, and strong performance indicators.</p> <p>The new administration and City Council have only been in office for a few weeks. They need time to study this complex issue and consult with their constituents and stakeholders before making any decisions. Taking the necessary time is crucial on this issue that will shape San Diego for decades.</p> <p>The extension of the franchise agreements should include extended bill relief for those struggling to pay their energy bill during the Covid crisis.</p>

12/29/2020 15:34	David Gangsei	12/30/2020	City Council Comment	600	I'm a clinical psychologist with long experience working with San Diego non-profits and community organizations. I am a resident of District 9, living in the College Area since 2002. I participated in the campaign to establish community choice energy in San Diego. San Diego faces local versions of the worldwide crises of climate change and economic inequality. There is no logical or ethical alternative to bold action to fully and rapidly address these interlocking crises. The franchise agreement is an essential, concrete component of meaningful government action in this regard. I urge the City Council to extend the City's energy franchise agreements by at least one year. The City needs to conduct a more thorough evaluation of its assets and a robust public process to explore all of its options and ensure we get the best deal for the City, our climate and our communities. We have an opportunity to set up an energy distribution system that invests in our communities, meets our clean energy goals, and holds the franchisee accountable. For example, any franchise agreement must include a climate equity fund, an improved right to purchase clause, ensuring workers are fully protected during any transitions, and strong performance indicators.
12/29/2020 16:34	Dr. Scott Kelley	12/30/2020	City Council Comment	600	Dear Mayor and Members of the City Council, I respectfully ask you to vote to approve a ONE-YEAR extension to the current Franchise Agreement. The mayor was right to reject the SDG&E bid and ask for more time to look over the Franchise agreement.SDG&E has regularly treated the city with contempt. They overcharge us with the highest rates in California and have dumped their monopoly extracted profits into huge bonuses for executives and their massive fracked gas infrastructure scheme via their parent company Sempra. This will hook us on fossil fuels for the next 20 years and the leaking methane and CO2 emissions will accelerate climate change while diverting us from green energy.  We have to get a better deal and explore Municipalization, which would allow us to control our own energy future and lower rates for San Diegans. Thank you, Scott Kelley
12/29/2020 16:56	Yvonne Elkin	12/30/2020	City Council Comment	600	As a resident of San Diego, who is concerned about our economic recovery from COVID-19 and the climate crisis, I'm calling upon the new San Diego City Council and Mayor to ensure that we step back and reassess the value of this asset and not give it away for less than it is worth in this billion-dollar real estate deal. In particular, the value of the city's utility franchise can be reasonably estimated at more than \$15 billion – not the \$6 billion miscalculated by JVJ Consulting. It cannot be a reasonable "auction" when the process significantly undervalues the franchise's value in the first place. In these financially difficult times, the City needs to make sure there is no money left on the table in this deal. The Council and Mayor must get this deal right as our communities seek to recover economically and secure provisions in the final deal that create accountability and transparency from our next utility partner. Please approve a one-year extension to the current franchise agreements so we can conduct a robust public process to explore all of our options and ensure we get the best deal for the City, our climate and our communities Thank you.

12/29/2020 17:37	Jerry Wanetick	12/30/2020	City Council Comment	600	<p>Concerning the Electric and Gas Utility Franchise extension:  The new city council and mayor need time to analyze this complex issue and do their best for the people of San Diego. The valuation of the franchise agreement presented by the consultants was significantly understated; by some calculations, it's closer to \$16B over the earlier proposed 20 year agreement, not \$6.4B as reported by the consultants. SDG&amp;E is now making ~\$1Million/Day in net profits from the current franchise agreement with the City. Those profits have grown by 8% annually for the last few years. If the City chooses to move away from an Investor-Owned Utility to a Publicly Owned utility, those profits could be pumped back into the City to fund sustainable energy projects such as subsidizing rooftop solar for underserved communities, and lowering utility rates across the entire city.</p> <p>The report from the consultants the city hired to help them formulate the recently rejected ITB, JVJ Consultants, recommends that the city move to a Public Utility if we find ourselves in the situation we are currently in, i.e., if the bidding process results in a non-responsive bid (See the consultant's report: <a href="https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/jvj_6-22-20_report_to_the_city_of_san_diego.pdf">https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/jvj_6-22-20_report_to_the_city_of_san_diego.pdf</a> , page 3, ¶1).</p> <p>SDG&amp;E has been a bad-faith tenant occupying city-owned land. Not only did they submit a non-responsive bid, but they are out of compliance with their current franchise agreement related to the City's Pure Water Project and with the utility undergrounding fund. In addition, the city ratepayers have suffered the highest rates in California (Ibid, pp. 16), and below average customer service (Ibid, pp. 16) under SDG&amp;E's tenure. At the same time, the profits that SDG&amp;E takes from the ratepayers of San Diego go directly into the coffers of their parent company Sempra Energy, which in turn uses it to fund their fracked natural gas business, which is counter to the goals of the city's Climate Action Plan, and the future wellbeing of the planet.</p> <p>A public utility system can help the City address Environmental and Social Justice issues, while at the same time addressing the climate emergency we're currently facing. It can also help address the City's budget emergency brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic by redirecting the \$1Million/Day, which currently flows to SDG&amp;E, towards rate relief across the city; fund sustainability, equity, and grid modernization projects; as well as bolster the City's General Fund.</p> <p>Once the mayor and council study and understand the advantages of a Public Power System, with the help of local experts and a transparent public process, I'm sure that you will endorse this idea whose time has come for our City. Thank you,</p> <p>Respectfully,  Jerry Wanetick  District 1, University City</p>
12/30/2020 4:48	Daniel Beeman	12/30/2020	City Council Comment	600	<p>As SDGE has taken Undergrounding fees for OVER 50 years and still has decades worth of planned on undergrounding because HASN'T gotten the job done...even added more above ground, fire hazard lines, that portion of the franchise/ utility agreement should be divided out, and put up for outside bid. Second as the controlling body, City of San Diego, Pandemic Emergency to rules should be administered to END or Reduce Utility Franchise fee on Utility bill FOR ALL Costumers of Duel Monopoly SDG&amp;E. Third open and free alternative energy generation, including micro-grids coordination should have ALL Fees waived, and should be set-up to Charge up MTS Electric Buses now &amp; coming, in Neighborhoods where utilized! Giving Communities Power/Energy/Utility control locally! Also a Open Market system should be fostered in Communities to trade Alternative Energy Generated Power so that Municipalities, Agencies, and businesses can purchase energy/power at lower rates than just Franchised Utility{currently SDGE/Sempra}: Monopoly!(which is illegal under federal law).</p> <p>We CAN do better San Diego! We should do better, WE MUST DEMAND BETTER! This is nearly a BILLION DOLLAR A YEAR profit business in San Diego City, more County/Region wide!! Which has been run by a manipulative[according to judge ruling &amp; penalitized] entity. A Monopoly corporation that has profit stock wise double digits returns while still raising rates to nearly highest in U.S., but also having 4th highest homeless population! Things DO add up!</p> <p>People can have the Power to get &amp; do better. Future generations deserve it!! And WE as A COMMUNITY have been doing BETTER according to Climate Goals here for City (&amp;region) of San Diego! OUR Significant to U.S.&amp; World Climate Action Plan(CAP)!!</p> <p>You have Great Opportunity Mayor Todd Gloria and Whole San Diego City Council to set STATEWIDE presidency! Maybe National &amp; World influence for positive change!!! Constituents need your help. END or Reduce Utility Franchise fee on bills!!! End UNDERGROUNDING fees and implementation ABUSE!! Make Plan for Open Market Alt. Energy Generation Trading system for EMPOWERING San Diego Communities for Wealth Growth, Pollution reduction, and asset creation!</p> <p>PS Federal and Grant funding might be available for last item too!!</p> <p>Sincerely,  Daniel M. Beeman  20+ year Alt.Energy Advocate  FreedomPlease.Org (originally 1998)  Solar, Bio-Fuels, Ground/Elements storage, and Wind Generation.  #YesWEcanSD #IfWEwillSD @FreedomPleaseOr Twitter  Along with #7footApartHikes !</p>

12/30/2020 7:37	Tama Becker-Varano	12/30/2020	City Council Comment	600	<p>I'm writing to urge the City Council to extend the City's energy franchise agreements by at least one year. 4.5 months as proposed by Mayor Gloria is not sufficient to allow a robust public process to explore all of our energy options, including a Public Power option. We have an opportunity to set up an energy distribution system that invests in our communities, meets our clean energy goals, and holds the franchisee accountable. For example, any franchise agreement must include a climate equity fund, a right to purchase clause, ensuring workers are fully protected during any transitions, and strong performance indicators. Please hit reset and begin your term by listening to the people of San Diego, not special interests.</p>
12/30/2020 4:10	Daniel Beeman	12/30/2020	Non-Agenda Comment		<p>With HUNDREDS getting sick at Convention Center why doesn't City open City parking lots and land for Unhoused(vehicle dwellers) and homeless?! Let poor use parking spaces and Land from 7pm to 7am for rest and coordination. Help with port-o-potties and Hot showers (and maybe portable kitchens: like military &amp; Calfire have, lend to Communities during fire Emergencies). Hire and ask for Ex- &amp; Laid-off Restaurant workers to volunteer. Open Downtown Johnny Browns (educate culinary student Mesa and Jacobs center, etc). And because of Stay-at-home orders take temporary possession of parking lots around 120 Ash St. AND Civic Plaza/Center. City has authority to do JUST AS IT HAS TOOK AWAY CA BROWN ACT RIGHTS: Pandemic Emergency!!</p> <p>There is ALL of Mission Bay Parking lots, including Belmont Park, and Sports Arena too!!! WORLD PANDEMIC EMERGENCY!!!! Also Balboa Park has many open parking lots! Including City Maintenance Yard/lots on Pershing NEAR WHERE YOU ALLOWED, HOSTED Homeless/Unhoused tents, Services previously! Poor are Constituents too! Or are they??? (Volunteers might shop services/museums?!?)</p> <p>There is Land off Governor and also Nobel Drive near 805 Freeway! Library Parking Lots could be set-up as poor, unhoused, homeless, Triage/midigation Areas. Planning, implementation needed NOW!! PLEASE</p> <p>Daniel Beeman, CONSTITUENT, VOTER, formerly Unhoused, previous City committee member, community representative, and elected community boardmember. Ran for Todd Gloria's old Seat: District 3, 2000 prior to Gloria elected. Thankfully still alive, but barely, if it matters. 858-572-6058 FreedomPleaseOrg@gmail</p>