

January 31, 2002
Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Development
Business (8:30 – 10:40 a.m.) and Public (10:45 a.m. – noon) Meetings
Sierra Club, 85 Second Street, San Francisco
MINUTES

Michele Perrault, International Vice President of the Sierra Club, opened the meeting, **welcomed** everyone and provided introductory remarks. She expressed her gratification that the Bay Area Alliance members and other people associated with the Bay Area Alliance continue to “stay at the table” and find common ground. She noted that she recently attended a meeting of some 19 groups from throughout the state working on sustainability and came away with the impression that the Bay Area Alliance was among the leaders. There is also a potential for collaborating with these other groups to make changes at the state level when appropriate.

Business Meeting: Updates were provided on Bay Area Alliance activities.

Andrew Michael of the Bay Area Council reported on ***Draft Compact feedback***. Since March 2001, the Bay Area Alliance has worked with public affairs groups, and through the Internet, print and electronic media, and others to encourage feedback. Concurrently, the Bay Area Alliance retained a team of governmental liaisons to reach out to cities and counties. Notwithstanding the effort, feedback from the public has been minimal and the distribution of respondents skewed toward Alameda and Contra Costa counties. However, the support from respondents has been overwhelmingly positive for the vision, mission statement and goals. Along with expressing support, many people expressed concerns on a variety of issues, e.g., maintaining local control of revenues and expenditures, population stabilization, etc.

The next steps are to categorize by commitment to action (in the *Draft Compact*) all the comments and suggestions. Using these categorized comments as input the Steering Committee and staff will make recommended modifications to the Draft Compact and bring the recommended final *Compact* to the membership.

Surlene Grant reported that the four local government liaisons have contacted all but 12 cities in the Bay Area. Meetings with most of the remaining few cities are scheduled. To date, 68 of the 101 cities (including Oakland San Francisco and San Jose) and seven of the nine counties have formally endorsed in principle the provisions of the *Draft Compact* and the process undertaken by the Bay Area Alliance. The majority of cities in Alameda, Santa Clara, San Mateo and Sonoma counties have endorsed. Along with their endorsement several cities and counties have expressed concerns. The commitments of most concern to elected officials are related to housing, transportation and fiscal reform/revenue sharing. Among the specific comments provided by elected officials were:

- Make sure that the final *Compact* does not result in jurisdictions giving up local control.
- Education representation seems to be missing from the Bay Area Alliance yet it is a strong component of several of the commitments in the *Draft Compact*.
- Ensure that there is follow through on the *Draft Compact*, i.e., a final *Compact*, so that this doesn't become another futile exercise.
- While the Bay Area Alliance has invited many to participate in its processes, it needs to participate as a stakeholder in other sustainability and smart growth efforts in the region.

- Education on a variety of things, including terminology such as social equity, ecological footprint, etc., is essential.
- Rural communities and others supported the Draft Compact to the extent it fits with their general plans.
- Indicators should compare the Bay Area with the rest of California.
- Ensure consistency with California Environmental Quality Act.

Based on the team's experience, Surlene made several comments and recommendations to the Bay Area Alliance:

- Issues of local control are key.
- Need to distinguish this effort from Bay Vision 2020.
- Need to suggest how this can be implemented without money.
- Governmental liaisons should be involved in the finalizing of the *Compact* to ensure issues raised are addressed.
- Consider town hall type meetings for rolling out the final *Compact*.
- Give more exposure to the Community Capital Investment Initiative, a concrete example of something coming out of this process.

A question was raised on the future process related to the *Compact*. The process is to refine the *Draft Compact* to reflect comments received, seek ratification by the Bay Area Alliance membership, and then seek ratification from cities and counties. Ratification means that cities and counties would begin to integrate the principle of the *Compact* into their general plans as they are revised and other activities. The business community and others would implement within their organizations the provisions of the final *Compact* that are applicable, e.g., energy efficiency, etc.

Gerry Raycraft of ABAG reported on the series of **Bay Area Regional Livability Footprint/Smart Growth Strategy** public workshops. The first round of workshops was completed in October and resulted in 105 land use scenarios. Since then these 105 scenarios have been distilled into three thematic alternatives which will inform and be the subject of a second workshop in each county. The three thematic alternatives are:

1. *Central Core and Existing Transit Network Focus*: This alternative locates most new growth in each county's largest city or cities and places regional emphasis on the region's central cities (San Francisco, Oakland, San Jose).
2. *Transit-Oriented Neighborhoods & Corridors (expanded transit network)*: This alternative locates growth in the same locations as Alternative #1, but at lower densities. It places the increment of growth that is not in Alternative #1 locations, in transit-rich and walkable communities and corridors along an expanded public transit network.
3. *Core-to-Edge Development*: This alternative locates growth in the same locations as Alternative #2, but at still lower densities. It places the increment of growth that is not in Alternative #2 locations in edge communities. In an effort to create balanced communities, this new development would bring housing to existing job-rich areas on the region's fringes and would bring employment to edge areas that are primarily residential. All new edge development would be at higher densities than exists today or is currently planned.

The expected result of each of the second round of workshops is a county-specific and countywide preferred land use alternative. After further analysis subsequent to the second round of workshops a region wide preferred alternative will be developed and shared with the ABAG Executive Board. Ideally, ABAG's Executive Board will adopt the region wide preferred "smart growth" land use alternative as the basis for ABAG's projections of growth in the region. MTC

and other regional agencies use these projections in their planning and funding programs. So, if the region wide preferred “smart growth” alternative were to be adopted, it would affect future funding decisions.

Currently, Bay Area Economics is analyzing the three thematic alternatives distilled from the 105 land use scenarios developed in the first round of workshops in detail, along with the base case, i.e., the current ABAG projections. These four cases will be presented in April and May in the second round of workshops. The schedule will be posted and other workshop information is available online at <http://www.abag.org/planning/smartgrowth/>.

The goals of the second round of workshops are to:

1. Disseminate and review the alternatives developed in the first round of workshops and the results of the analyses.
2. Reach agreement on the underlying regional smart growth principles.
3. Develop the county preferred alternative, within the context of the region.
4. Draw attention to and try to resolve inter-county issues, including the regional allocation of growth.
5. Fine tune and select proposed incentives and regulatory changes.
6. Build support for a region wide preferred alternative.

Each workshop will include a discussion on regulatory and legislative changes necessary to implement the preferred alternative. This is intended to ground in reality the workshop and the alternatives.

Janet Smithheimer and Paul Peninger of Bay Area Economics (BAE), an urban and real estate economics consulting firm, discussed the analytical work they are doing between the rounds of workshops. BAE is analyzing the base case and thematic alternatives, as related to:

- housing affordability, i.e., how well the region has done in the past and how well it is likely to do under the alternatives;
- jobs/housing match, i.e., how well future jobs/wages match housing costs; and
- development feasibility, i.e., will smart growth fit physically into the available land supply.

Additionally, BAE is working with Policy Link on displacement and social equity issues, i.e., the implications of smart growth on impoverished communities.

Community Capital Investment Initiative (CCII): Trina Villanueva of PolicyLink (and Community Council Manager of the CCII) characterized CCII as a regional effort to mobilize business, community, environmental and government leaders to collaborate to get capital into the 46 most impoverished neighborhoods in the Bay Area, i.e., those with income levels 80 percent below the county mean level of income. The purpose is to reduce poverty and promote smart growth by using market forces to invest in existing communities. CCII upholds the “double bottom line” of financial and social returns on investment. (Note that the “social” bottom line includes environmental benefits along with social equity.) The community, business and government councils govern the CCII and comprise the CCII roundtable.

James Nixon of Sustainable Systems, Inc. (and Business Council Manager of the CCII) applauded the close collaboration between the business community, government and community-based organizations working on the CCII. By agreeing on the type of development desired and the process for pursuing it, the CCII can help avoid traditional conflicts in the development process. The money saved by avoiding these conflicts flows through to both aspects of the double bottom line.

The CCII roundtable is comprised of top-level individuals in organizations, i.e., CEOs, executive directors, agency secretaries, who provide policy guidance, work to establish and maintain regional networks to assist in accomplishing CCII goals, and respond to and strengthen the outcome of the proposed neighborhood workshops. The CCII roundtable will also help all its constituents by sharing information on existing and ongoing governmental and other programs in the neighborhoods.

Each quarterly neighborhood workshop will be professionally facilitated, focus on two neighborhoods and involve local business, community and government teams working together with their regional counterparts to develop community investment strategies for investment in the communities.

In response to a question, Trina reported that there are currently no community-based organizations on the Community Council from Napa, Solano and Sonoma counties. She encouraged participation by CBOs in these areas and throughout the Bay Area and invited interested groups to contact her.

The CCII-related Family of Funds has three investment tools: the Smart Growth Fund, California Environment Redevelopment Fund (CERF) and Community Equity Fund. James reported that 12 potential keystone developments are currently being considered within the context of the Smart Growth Fund. CERF has 14 potential developments under consideration statewide with 3-4 in the Bay Area. He expects that the first few investments from both of these funds will be consummated in the next few months.

Peter Melhus of the Bay Area Alliance reported that the **Indicators Project** is moving ahead with reporting on the 35 indicators included in the *Draft Compact*. The Bay Area Alliance and the Northern California Council for the Community have agreed to work together on the “Bay Area Progress Report and Sustainable Indicators Project.” The organizations are (or will be) jointly refining the indicators (working from the recommendations of the Bay Area Alliance Indicators Working Group), gathering data and creating a repository of sustainability data for the Bay Area, and reporting to the community on measurable indicators of progress.

The two organizations have retained two consulting firms, Applied Survey Research (ASR) and Natural Strategies, to gather data for the indicators. ASR is currently working on the 21 indicators common to both organizations and the 12 unique to the Bay Area Alliance. Natural Strategies will work on the Genuine Progress Indicator and Ecological Footprint.

Peter reported that, to the extent possible, the data will be provided for each of the nine counties as well as aggregated for the nine-counties. The individual county data will be nested on the website to avoid a voluminous report.

Michele Perrault of the Sierra Club provided an update on the **Best Management Practices** project. She thanked meeting participants for their prior responses to requests for examples of sustainable development in the Bay Area. The first version of the *Faces of Sustainability* is expected to be printed in about six months. Michele introduced Sierra Club Senior Conservation Fellow and *Faces of Sustainability* team leader Susan Gladwin who encouraged continued submission of such examples ASAP since the document is now being finalized. Information can be sent to Susan at sgladwin@cncdsl.com.

Dialogue with members : Peter Melhus opened the continuing dialogue with Bay Area Alliance Members and others by reiterating the framing questions articulated at the last meeting. Specifically, is the Bay Area Alliance meeting the needs and expectations of its member organizations? What should the Bay Area Alliance emphasize or do differently as we move forward? Following are the comments expressed:

- Chris Peeples, of AC Transit District, discussed two points. First, Los Angeles has been very successful in developing rapid transit bus lines along major corridors and drawing people out of their automobiles in fairly large numbers. AC Transit is working on something similar. It has two corridors in the pipeline and is seeking staff for eight additional corridors. Peeples offered to work with local communities on expanding bus rapid transit.

Second, Peeples urged the Bay Area Alliance to monitor the activities of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission especially as related to social equity. He suggested that MTC's transit investments sometimes seem to be used to promote sprawl and address interests of wealthier, rather than poorer people. Development in the inner cities as contemplated by smart growth will not happen without good transit.

- David Schonbrunn, of Transportation Solutions Defense and Education Fund (TRANSDEF), opined that transit problems are related to land use planning. He is concerned about the "policy-neutral context" in which Gerry Raycraft framed the alternatives in the Regional Livability Footprint /Smart Growth Strategy project. The current planning system based on local autonomy and optimizing a local environment creates a regional system that does not work.
- Sherman Lewis, of the Regional Alliance for Transit and the Sierra Club, expressed concern that BART extensions of service are very expensive in terms of cost per new rider and urged a change in priorities. He also expressed concern that the Bay Area Alliance has not adequately addressed the issue of how much growth the region should accommodate.

This concluded the business portion of the meeting.

Public Meeting: The public meeting consisted of a panel discussion focusing on energy-related issues and solutions in the Bay Area. Three panelists addressed the issue:

- Torri Estrada, Senior Program Director for the Environment and Sustainability, Latino Issues Forum;
- Abby Young, Director of the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives' (ICLEI) Cities for Climate Protection Campaign; and
- Ken Perkins, Vice President of Environmental, Health & Safety for Yamanouchi Consumer Inc., a diversified global consumer products company, which includes the Bay Area based Shaklee Corporation as a subsidiary.

As the panel discussion moderator, **Peter Melhus** Executive Director of the Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Development, opened the discussion and introduced the topic. Melhus characterized energy as the lifeblood of local, national and global economies and the fuel of the remarkably robust Bay Area economy but suggested that energy use also has down sides. Given the Bay Area Alliance's context of sustainable development, he defined an environmentally sustainable energy system as one that:

- takes resources from the biosphere at a rate no greater than the rate at which they are naturally replenished, and

- emits waste into the biosphere at a rate no greater than that at which the waste can be assimilated.

He suggested that the Bay Area is failing to meet these criteria and is seeing the consequences of its failure. To support his contention, he drew energy-related data from the Bay Area Alliance's forthcoming Sustainability Indicators Report.

Electricity usage in the Bay Area increased by 14.5 percent from 1993 to 2000. Natural gas usage went up 19.2 percent in the same time frame. Gasoline consumption, the largest portion of the Bay Area's energy usage, increased by 21.7 percent. Total energy usage went up 19.1 percent and per capita energy usage went up 11.3 percent.

Melhus opined that this trend does not indicate any increase in efficiency or progress toward an environmentally sustainable energy system, especially since the largest increase in use is not in manufacturing of the products but the movement of people, products and services. He cited several negative consequences of energy use – carbon emissions, ground level ozone and particulate matter.

Carbon emissions alter the chemistry of the atmosphere and are linked to the phenomenon of global climate change. Total carbon emissions in the Bay Area increased by 27 percent from 1993 to 2000; carbon emissions per capita increased by 18.4 percent. The largest source of carbon emissions in the Bay Area, slightly over 50 percent in 2000, is the combustion of gasoline.

High levels of ground level ozone can be hazardous to human health, and is manifested by chest pain, coughing, nausea, shortness of breath, congestion and throat irritation. In the eight year time horizon of the report, air pollution monitoring stations in the Bay Area reported 163 days when contaminant levels were greater than the one hour average standard set for California.

Particulate matter is comprised of small solid particles or liquid droplets in the air that are less than 10 microns in size, often called PM_{10} . Studies link high levels of PM_{10} to aggravated asthma and acute respiratory symptoms, chronic bronchitis, decreased lung function and even premature death. The most common sources of PM_{10} are dust from paved and unpaved roads, grinding operations, fuel combustion, agricultural burning and wood stoves. Air pollution monitoring stations in the Bay Area reported 57 days between 1993 and 2000 when PM_{10} levels exceeded the 24-hour average standard.

Melhus concluded his remarks by recommending that the Bay Area and the nation progress to a more environmentally sustainable energy system by developing a comprehensive long-term energy policy deeply rooted in efficiency. To the extent supply side options are pursued he recommended the energy policy emphasize renewable technologies.

Torri Estrada, discussed the apparent racial divide inherent in California's energy policy. The Latino Issues Forum (LIF) recently completed research of the location and siting of new peaking power plants in California.

Peaking power plants are those that are used intermittently, only during the periods highest consumer demand for electricity or when other base load power plants are unexpectedly not available. Peaking power plants are usually the least efficient power plants in the fleet and the most expensive to operate. As the least efficient units in the fleet, peaking power plants typically effect air quality to a greater extent per unit than the base load and other facilities. As with other power plants, peaking facilities usually have hazardous material on site.

The LIF research focused on power plant applications submitted between January and June 2001, largely in response to California's energy crisis. There were 18 such applications. The research assessed the distribution of the location of the proposed power plants as related to low-income communities and people of color. It also looked at the extent to which these proposals met the California Energy Commission (CEC) standards related to power plant siting, standards intended to ensure fair treatment of people of color and low income. The CEC has a number of siting processes, related to the urgency of need of the new power plants. The processes range from a 12 month permit process to a 21-day Application for Certification emergency permit. Public participation in the review process decreases with the time of the approval process, as does the extent to which the California Environmental Quality Act is considered.

The results of the study indicate that both racial and economic injustices are prevalent in power plant siting. Sixteen of the 18 power plant applications studied violated the CEC standards and were located in communities predominately comprised of people of color (over 50%) and low-income. These communities have been shown to already have a large number of environmental hazards and health-related issues, including severe air quality problems.

The research concludes that:

- the executive orders associated with faster track approvals directly conflict with protecting the environment, health and welfare;
- the CEC has failed to meet its own standards for environmental justice review in the wake of California's energy crisis; and
- the CEC standards for environmental justice review and mitigation may be arbitrary and capricious, rather than scientifically defensible.

Estrada concluded his remarks with 5 recommendations:

1. the California Power Authority Integrated Energy Plan should be reevaluated to ensure it meets all statutory standards;
2. older, environmentally inferior power plants, should be retrofitted or decommissioned;
3. energy efficiency and conservation should be the priority for the state, especially programs that are implemented by community-based organizations and/or directly benefit low-income communities of color;
4. the state should support renewable and distributed electricity generation sources over conventional, central station fossil fuel generation; and
5. operationally, fossil fuel power plants should be the power plants of last resort.

The LIF currently works with regional partners in the Central Valley, Los Angeles, and San Diego to address the disproportionate impacts of plant siting and state energy policy on low-income communities of color. LIF and its partners are also working at the regional and state level to advance the five policy recommendations described above.

Abby Young described the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives' (ICLEI) as an international non-profit membership organization with 450 members that offers information, technical assistance and other help to local governments as they address global environmental issues at a local level. Founded in 1990 and headquartered in Toronto, ICLEI's mission is to improve global environmental conditions through the cumulative actions of local governments.

ICLEI's Cities for Climate Protection Campaign, launched in 1993, today includes 530 local governments around the world that are actively working to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions. One

hundred seventeen of these local governments are in the U.S. The program consists of a five-milestone process:

1. Inventory green house gas emissions in the entire community, i.e., residential, commercial, industrial, transportation, landfill methane, etc., and estimate the emissions in 20 years under a business as usual scenario.
2. Adopt an emissions reduction target.
3. Develop a detailed plan of new policies and programs, including quantified estimates of each policy and program and its contribution to achieving the adopted target.
4. Implement the program.
5. Regularly review and assess progress toward the target.

ICLEI provides software, training, technical assistance and occasionally grant assistance to local governments to help them develop their comprehensive climate protection plans.

Young indicated that most of the cities in the U.S. that have adopted greenhouse gas emission reduction targets, including San Francisco, adopt targets in the range of 20 percent. She speculates that local governments see global climate change as a real threat and also see the multiple benefits associated with the programs and polices to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions, e.g., energy efficiency resulting in cost savings, etc.

In the Bay Area, ICLEI is working with the cities of San Francisco, Berkeley, Oakland, San Jose, Fairfax, Santa Rosa, Santa Cruz and Sebastopol in its Cities for Climate Protection Campaign. ICLEI is also working with the cities of Davis and Sacramento. Some of the actions taken by the local governments in the Bay Area are:

- Traffic lights are being retrofitted with light emitting diodes (LEDs), which are 86 percent more efficient than the incandescent lamps they replace. Berkeley has replaced about 2000 incandescent lamps and is saving about 700,000 kWh and 375 tons of greenhouse gas emissions per year. Oakland's energy use reduction due to the same technology is about 3.5 million kWh per year.
- The City of Berkeley has a commercial technical assistance program in which the City provides an energy audit for local businesses and guarantees a two-year payback for any energy saving actions.
- The City of Oakland has retrofitted for energy efficiency about 56 percent of its municipal buildings and facilities. Furthermore, Mayor Brown has ordered an additional 10 percent reduction in energy use in municipal facilities in response to California's energy crisis.

Another ICLEI program, Communities 21, provides local governments with a methodology and practical tools to help them achieve ecological sustainability. Among the tools is a sustainability inventory process to help in sustainability planning.

As Vice President of Environmental, Health & Safety for Yamanouchi Consumer Inc., **Ken Perkins** is responsible for regulatory compliance and integrating the company's resource efficiency program into everything it does. He shared some of examples of energy related resource efficiency programs implemented in the Shaklee Corporation, the only California based subsidiary of YCI.

When Shaklee moved its facilities from San Francisco to a new facility in Pleasanton a few years ago, it committed to build a green building. As part of this effort, Shaklee has:

- reduced its energy costs by 30% because of energy efficiency designed into the building;
- used certified sustainably harvested wood;
- located in front of the BART station which resulted in the highest rate of employee use of public transit and carpooling in the area;

- become the first company in the U.S. to use the hybrid Toyota Prius in its fleet of cars for its sales force;
- in partnership with the NRDC and the Rocky Mountain Institute, developed a program to become the first climate-neutral company in the U.S. As part of this program, Shaklee uses the concept of carbon offsets in which Shaklee calculates its total carbon emissions and invests in third party projects related to energy efficiency to capture the emissions reduction to the point of zero net carbon emissions. In one case Shaklee provided the funds necessary for the school district in Portland, Oregon to convert its fuel oil fired boilers to natural gas in four schools. The results of the project were a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions by 25,000 tons and a lifetime saving to the schools of \$250,000.

Shaklee is encouraging other businesses to strive to become climate-neutral companies. Shaklee believes its commitment to the environment will translate into higher profitability as society demonstrates its increasing environmental commitment in its purchasing choices.

Perkins concluded his remarks with an announcement that Shaklee has just been notified that it is one of 20 businesses and teams globally to be recognized with a U.S. EPA Climate Protection Award for its investments in its climate neutral program.

Q&A

In response to a question why Shaklee did not focus on the Bay Area when it sought investments for its climate neutral program, Ken attributed it to timing and the relative cost per ton for carbon emissions reductions of the projects considered. Ken and Abby agreed that their organizations might collaborate in the future, should Shaklee be searching for additional investment opportunities in this program.

In response to a question regarding greenhouse gas emissions, specifically a “reasonable target for reduction, not pie-in-the-sky, but a good stretch goal” for Bay Area Alliance to consider for the region, several thoughts were presented.

- Abby Young explained the inherent difficulty in the question, suggesting that there are many ways to come up with a target. With a greenhouse emissions inventory and forecast and in the context of budget constraints, a reasonable reduction target could be identified. However, from an ecological carrying capacity perspective, the target might be significantly different. Young suggested that these perspectives cannot be separated as they often are. Scientists are telling us that a 50% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions is essential. Young suggested that this be the driver and that 50% reduction in carbon emissions be the goal.
- Ken Perkins expressed concerns from the business perspective of the base year chosen. Depending on how a target is selected, early movers on reducing greenhouse gas emissions may be penalized for having taken those early steps. A comprehensive program must include credit for early retrofits that resulted in reductions.
- Peter Melhus suggested that a 25 percent reduction in carbon emission over a ten-year period is a reasonable stretch goal.

The meeting **adjourned** at 12:05 p.m.

BAY AREA ALLIANCE MEETING ATTENDANCE SHEET

DATE OF MEETING: *Thursday, January 31,*
LOCATION OF MEETING: *Sierra Club, San Francisco*

Bone, Diane – Ariel Events
Campbell, Alexandra – WSP Environmental
Chatfield, B – ICLEI
Cheng, I Chin – Sierra Club
Dawid, Irwin – Sierra Club
De Geofrey, Isabelle
Ellis, Juliet – Urban Habitat Program
Estrada, Torri – Latino Issues Forum
Gladwin, Susan - Sierra Club
Goldblatt, Judi - RIDES
Gottlieb, Steven – Bay Area Council
Grant, Surlene –Local Government Liaison/BAASD
Haas, James
Holtzclaw, John – Sierra Club
Hough, Bill – Presidio Challenge
Hurwitz, Eliot – NOAA/BCDC
Jones, Tom – CFN
Jordan, Mark – BASOC/WaterKeepers
Kittermaster, Carol – Sustainable San Mateo Co.
Koshland, Yvonne – LWVBA
Lewis, Sherman – Regional Alliance for Transit (Sierra Club)
Lilly, Paul – “Interested Public”
Mackenzie, Jake – City of Rohnert Park
Madden, Marc – Schnitzer Steel Products
Marquardt, Frank
McPeak, Sunne Wright – Bay Area Council
Melhus, Peter – Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Development
Michael, Andrew – Bay Area Council
Milks, Linda – California Women’s Agenda
Moberg, Malana
Nelsen, Andy – Urban Strategies Council
Nixon, James – Sustainable Systems, Inc/CCII
Page, Paul – F.T.A.
Peeples, H. E. Christian (Chris) Alameda/CCCo. Transit District
Peninger, Paul – BAE
Perrault, Michele – Sierra Club
Perkins, Ken – Yamanouchi Consumer Inc. (Shaklee Corp.)

Peterson, Rachel – Urban Ecology
Preston, Nancy
Quaid, Allison – Communications 21 (ICLEI)
Rabkin, Mark
Raycraft, Gerry – ABAG
Reeves, Evan – CA Center for Land Recycling
Rolfe, Norman – SF Tomorrow
Scandone, Ceil – ABAG
Schoenberger, Ed – No. CA Council for the Community
Schonbrunn, David - Transdef
Silva, Enrique – UC Berkeley IURD
Smithheimer, Janet - BAE
Steinbach, Tom – Greenbelt Alliance
Tippett, Joanne – Holocene Design Co.
Venugopal, Kala – CCRL
Villanueva, Trina – PolicyLink
Villarreal, Jose – Joint Venture: Silicon Valley
Wallace, Mike – CA Center for Land Recycling
Young, Abby – ICLEI