CANCELLED - ENERGY, CLIMATE CHANGE AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE COMMITTEE

Tuesday, February 20, 2018

ROOM 1010, CITY HALL - 1:00 PM 200 NORTH SPRING STREET, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

MEMBERS: COUNCILMEMBER NURY MARTINEZ, CHAIR

COUNCILMEMBER PAUL KORETZ
COUNCILMEMBER PAUL KREKORIAN
COUNCILMEMBER GILBERT A. CEDILLO
COUNCILMEMBER MITCH O'FARRELL

(Maria L. Espinoza - Legislative Assistant - (213) 978-1078 or email Maria. Espinoza@lacity.org)

Click here for agenda packets

Note: For information regarding the Committee and its operations, please contact the Committee Legislative Assistant at the phone number and/or email address listed above. The Legislative Assistant may answer questions and provide materials and notice of matters scheduled before the City Council. Sign Language Interpreters, Communication Access Real-Time Transcription (CART), Assistive Listening Devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, you are advised to make your request at least 72 hours prior to the meeting/event you wish to attend. Due to difficulties in securing Sign Language Interpreters, five or more business days notice is strongly recommended. For additional information, please contact the Legislative Assistant listed above.

Request to speak to ECCEJ Committee:

1) James E. Enstrom, PLD, MPH jenstrom eucla-edu (310) 472-4274

wants to disense problems with RecyclA and SCAGMD

2) Alex Epstein alex @ alexepstein.com (949) 829-3947

wants to present "The Moral Case for Fossi) Finels"

THE REGULAR MEETING FOR THIS DAY HAS BEEN CANCELLED

5,+



Alex Epstein - The Moral Case for Fossil Fuels

JORDAN SADLIER: Good evening, everyone. My name is Jordan Sadlier, and I am the President of Bruin Republicans at UCLA.

Bruin Republicans at UCLA is the premiere right-of-center organization on campus purposed to champion conservative ideals through advocacy, education, and fellowship.

And tonight, the Bruin Republicans have the privilege of hosting founder of the Center for Industrial Progress and energy expert, Alex Epstein, on a discussion on the Moral Case for Fossil Fuels.

Over the course of tonight's program, we anticipate that all members of our audience will uphold our shared True Bruin values and remain courteous and respectful of our speaker and all other guests. As such, disruptions will not be tolerated, and in the case that anyone presents a direct security threat or violates the student code of conduct, we have UCPD officers on the premises and may ask you to leave if you do not cease your misconduct following a verbal warning.

To introduce Mr. Epstein, please help me welcome our Professor Advisor, Professor James Enstrom.

Professor Enstrom: Alex Epstein is a philosopher and energy expert who argues that "human flourishing" should be the guiding

principle of industrial and environmental progress.

He founded Center for Industrial Progress (CIP) in 2011 to offer a positive, pro-human alternative to the Green movement.

Epstein is the author of The Moral Case for Fossil Fuels, a New York Times bestseller arguing that if we look at the whole picture, human flourishing requires that humanity use more fossil fuels, not less. The book has been widely praised as the most persuasive argument ever made for continuing use of fossil fuels, winning Epstein the "Most Original Thinker of 2014" award from the McLaughlin Group.

Epstein, known for his willingness to debate anyone, anytime, has publicly debated leading environmental organizations such as Greenpeace, the Slerra Club, and 350.org over the morality of fossil fuel use versus their own agendas.

He has made his moral case for fossil fuels at dozens of campuses, including Harvard, Yale, Stanford, and Duke. He has also spoken to employees and leaders at dozens of Fortune 500 energy companies, including ExxonMobil, Chevron, Phillips 66, Valero, Enbridge, and TransCanada.

In his speeches and consulting work, he helps companies take his pro-human messaging and use it neutralize attackers, turn non-supporters into supporters, and turn supporters into champions. One of his major goals is to teach employees in the fossil fuel industry - in the face of hostility from the media and the academy - to understand the value of what they do and how they communicate it.

After bungled launch, LA leaders threaten to end RecycLA trash-hauling program

Chuck Bennett/Daily Breeze/SCNG

Many folks are furious that trash fees are spiking for many businesses and multi-unit residential buildings in the city of Los Angeles as a result of the city's new waste removal system known as RecycLA. Chuck Bennett/Daily Breeze/SCNG

By Elizabeth Chou | echou@scng.com | Daily News

PUBLISHED: February 13, 2018 at 2:55 pm | UPDATED: February 13, 2018 at 4:24 pm

Los Angeles city leaders on Tuesday ratcheted up the tough talk around the city's new trash-hauling system, saying they want to look into the possibility of ending a program that has produced "disastrous challenges and shortcomings."

Council members Mitchell Englander and Paul Krekorian introduced a motion calling on the city attorney to report back with the steps need to exit out of the RecycLA "exclusive waste franchise" program.

The program was "purportedly established in order to move towards the city's zero waste goals, improve air quality and reduce traffic congestion," the motion said. "However, the program's implementation has brought disastrous challenges and shortcomings."

Englander said he has had enough, saying "there comes a time when we must recognize that the fault lies not with the service providers but with the program itself."

"Rather than persist in error, it's time for the city to clean up this mess," he said.

Krekorian, who last week lashed out at the trash haulers that won "exclusive" contracts form the city, said in a statement that "waste haulers are not holding up their end of the bargain with the city."

The motion "puts the haulers on notice that we're ready to do whatever it takes to hold them accountable and ensure a higher level of service for customers," he said.

The motion was assigned to the Energy, Climate Change and Environmental Justice Committee.

City leaders and officials have received an avalanche of complaints — as well as some of the blame — related to the numerous missed trash pick-ups and increase hauling costs that plagued

the launch of the program, which affects 80,000 apartment, condo and commercial property accounts throughout Los Angeles.

RecycLA was rolled out over six months, starting last summer, and grants "exclusive" contracts to a single hauler in each of 11 geographic zones around the city. Before this, trash service had been worked out privately between property owners and hauling companies. The city sanitation bureau handles single-family home and small apartment pick-ups.

When city leaders adopted the RecycLA program in 2014, the stated goal was to streamline the process, reduce the number of diesel trucks on the road and improve the condition of workers in the waste pick-up and recycling industry. There was debate at the time about whether it was better to go with an "exclusive" system in which a single hauler is awarded the contract for each zone, or if the same goals could also be met through a "non-exclusive" system that allowed more than one hauler to work in a particular zone. City leaders ultimately went with an exclusive system.

Supporters of the program, which include a coalition of environmental and workers' rights groups, said it is still early for the program and things appear to be improving.

"The recycLA program has been in full implementation for less than two weeks," said Rob Nothoff, director of Don't Waste LA, the coalition that worked to get the program in place.

"While any number of missed pickups is unacceptable, the 28,000 service complaints comprise less than 1 percent of the 3.5 million pickups made over the same timespan," he said.

He added that the city only just began exacting penalties starting Feb. 1, after the initial transition period has ended.

"That's why we're now seeing improvements," he said.

Get the latest news delivered daily!



Elizabeth Chou

Elizabeth Chou has reported on Los Angeles City Hall government and politics since 2013, first with City News Service, and now the Los Angeles Daily News since the end of 2016. She grew up in the Los Angeles area, and formerly a San Gabriel Valley girl. She now resides in the "other Valley" and is enjoying exploring her new San Fernando environs. She previously worked at Eastern Group Publications, covering Montebello, Monterey Park, City of Commerce, and Vernon.

https://www.dailynews.com/2018/02/16/the-scaqmd-wants-to-raise-your-taxes/

Los Angeles Daily News February 17, 2018 Opinion

The SCAQMD wants to raise your taxes

By The Editorial Board | opinion@scng.com | February 16, 2018 at 6:30 am

In what appears to be the very definition of an out-of-control government agency, the staff of the South Coast Air Quality Management District has decided to pursue its own plan for raising the sales tax in four counties by a quarter-percent.

The SCAQMD doesn't have the authority to put tax-increase proposals on the ballot, but on Monday, the staff revealed a new strategy: Conduct a poll to see if voters would be willing to pay the higher tax, then quickly get a bill introduced in Sacramento to give the agency the power to put the tax increase before the voters.

Orange County Supervisor Shawn Nelson and San Bernardino County Supervisor Janice Rutherford said they were blindsided by the staff's plan to move forward and pursue legislation without first bringing the poll results to the board for consideration of next steps.

The SCAQMD is governed by a 13-member board comprised of 10 elected officials — four county supervisors and six city council members — and three people appointed by state elected officials. The agency is extraordinarily powerful. By issuing and enforcing regulations designed to meet ever-tightening federal and state air quality goals, the regulators hold vast power over business enterprises from refineries to dry cleaners.

However, the SCAQMD has authority only over stationary sources of pollution, not mobile sources like cars and trucks, which are regulated primarily by the state and federal governments. The agency acknowledges that even the complete shutdown of all stationary sources would not be enough to meet the region's air quality targets.

Still, the law requires that the agency come up with a plan to explain how it will reach "attainment" of federal and state standards. The 2016 Air Quality Management Plan calls for offering about \$14 billion in incentives to businesses to convert from diesel to electric vehicles over the next 15 years.

Where will the money come from? That was never in the plan.

The SCAQMD has received hundreds of millions of dollars from the state in cap-and-trade funds, money collected from fees charged to businesses that emit greenhouse gases. That's not enough to fund the incentive plan, which calls for \$1 billion per year. Rutherford said she would like to see the state do more, and opposes a regressive new tax that would "let the state off the hook." Nelson said there is no emergency and taxes should be "absolutely the last resort."

But Nelson and Rutherford were outvoted 3-2 at a special meeting of the legislative committee on Monday, and the staff's plan squeaked through. The full governing board, which meets on March 2, will have the option to pull the report from the agency's agenda and stop the staff from finding a legislator in Sacramento to sponsor the taxauthorization bill.

That's exactly what the board should do. A powerful regulatory agency should not have the additional power to go directly to the voters to ask for tax increases, or the implied power to coerce regulated businesses into paying for campaign advertising to get the tax approved.

It's the SCAQMD's job to control air pollution. It's everybody else's job to control the SCAQMD.

general and the second of the

Los Angeles Daily News February 7, 2018 Opinion

Cap and trade is looking more and more like a tax

By Susan Shelley

PUBLISHED: February 6, 2018 at 7:30 pm | UPDATED: February 6, 2018 at 8:54 pm

The veneer that keeps everybody from seeing that the cap-and-trade program is really just a tax is coming unglued.

Last weekend, Mayor Eric Garcetti blasted out an email newsletter happily announcing that the Jordan Downs public housing development in Watts will be refurbished with money from the hidden tax you're paying for gasoline and electricity.

Watts will receive a \$35 million grant of cap-and-trade funds, which Garcetti said will help make "dreams come true" with "improved quality of life, a renewed focus on public health, and better access to affordable housing."

The city said the work on Jordan Downs will include rebuilding "distressed" units, creating recreational programs, and opening "about 165,000 square feet for retail."

The funds will also pay for solar panels, a food waste prevention program, and 10 electric buses.

The cap-and-trade money comes from the state's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, which takes in revenue from the sale of allowances to emit greenhouse gases. The allowances, sold at state auctions, are purchased by companies that generate electricity, refine petroleum, make cement and process food. The prices of those things in California now include the cost of buying these permits to emit greenhouse gases.

Other states don't do this, but in 2006, to save the planet from global warming, California passed a law to require a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. Under the mandate now set in current law, greenhouse gas emissions statewide must be 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030.

To achieve this goal, the California Air Resources Board developed the cap-and-trade program. It puts a statewide limit on GHG emissions, and businesses that are under the law are required to have a permit for each ton of GHG emitted. Every year fewer permits are issued, and the minimum price is a little higher.

The money that's paid to the state for these permits looks a lot like a tax. But a state appeals court ruled that it's not a tax, because it's not compulsory. Any business that doesn't want to pay it, the court reasoned, could simply go out of business.

Now you know why other states don't do this.

For California politicians, the cap-and-trade funds are like a gift from heaven. Gov. Jerry Brown

is spending them on the bullet train, which is barred by law from being funded with a tax increase. And the Legislature can hand out the rest of the loot to local governments and organizations seeking funding for pet projects.

To help spend the money, lawmakers created a committee called the California Strategic Growth Council and tasked it with advancing the revitalization of local communities. The SGC oversees the Transformative Climate Communities program, which considers grant applications from community groups, like the Watts Rising Collaborative, an advocacy organization made up largely of departments of the city government.

So your city tax dollars are being spent to lobby for cap-and-trade funds that come from the extra money you're paying for electricity, gasoline and anything that's made or moved in California.

Some of the \$35 million grant for Watts will be spent to connect residents with new jobs created by TCC projects, and in a hint of how the spending will work out in practice, the funds will also be used for a "displacement avoidance plan" which will provide resources to "educate residents about their housing rights." In other words, gentrification.

But nobody's admitting that. It's all under the banner of fighting climate change.

The president and CEO of the Housing Authority of the city of Los Angeles, Douglas Guthrie, said the Housing Authority is "proud to be leading this transformational initiative to build a healthier Watts" with "greenhouse gas reduction strategies."

It's just a tax. All of California accounts for only 1 percent of worldwide greenhouse gas emissions, so cutting emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels is an exercise in futility, if what you're really worried about is climate change.

Politicians are not really worried about climate change.

The cap-and-trade program is turning into a tax for community redevelopment and for a plain old slush fund. It doesn't help Earth's climate, but it does real damage to California's business climate. Cap-and-trade is a hidden tax on energy that is making everything in California more expensive than in other states.

The biggest challenge for regulators is to prevent the prices of the allowances from going up too sharply. It might bring the game to a crashing end if people noticed the economic damage they're enduring. When the voters put two and two together, things can heat up fast.

Susan Shelley is an editorial writer and columnist for the Southern California News Group. Reach her at Susan@SusanShelley.com and follow her on Twitter: @Susan_Shelley.