CITY COUNCIL MEETING TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 2018

DOCUMENTS RECEIVED AFTER PUBLISHED AGENDA

PUBLIC COMMENT

CHARLIE PETERS

The Great Biofuel Swindle

By Haley Zaremba / Oil Price / November 26, 2018

Over the past decade, "biofuel" has been a major buzz word in the world of clean energy and environmental science. As the topic of advanced biofuels continued to trend over the years, investments and studies ballooned accordingly. Now, however, with a bit of hindsight it has become clear that the vast majority of chatter and speculation about the "next big biofuel" set to change the energy landscape was just hot air.

Many claims made by energy startups, blogs, and think tanks were a bit short of credible, to put it lightly. A laundry list of companies over time claimed that they would be able to efficiently convert biomass like straw, wood chips, algae, and other organics into biofuel in an economically viable way. Some of these hopefuls even claimed to be able to do so for as little as a dollar per gallon.

Investors and taxpayers alike funneled money into ventures that had little to no chance of success. Investment went to technologies that had been abandoned decades before, due to economic impracticality. The most striking example can be found in the case of cellulosic ethanol. Converting straw into ethanol is a prohibitively expensive venture, but companies continued--and still continue--to try. What's more, despite the fact that "commercial" cellulosic ethanol is only being produced at a very small fraction of the projected volumes, it's currently being sold into the fuel supply, in large part thanks to heavy subsidization from the Renewable Fuel Standard.

Coming in second, only behind cellulosic ethanol, as the most overhyped biofuel is biomass sourced from algae. The concept is not nearly as far-fetched as producing fuel from straw. Some species of algae do produce oils that can be converted into fuel, and crude oil itself is essentially prehistoric algae and plankton. That being said, we are not anywhere close to the point of making this process economically viable. Removing all waters and oils from the algae and providing the perfect balance of light and CO2 to successfully cultivate the finicky plants on a mass scale is

currently a staggeringly inefficient and expensive undertaking. The waste here is not the research--perhaps someday this will be a viable avenue--but the massive influx of cash and government funding into companies that loudly claimed to be able to create this industry in the short-term.

One by one, the vast majority of these algae biofuel companies who touted themselves as the next big thing went out of business. Last year Greentech Media published a far-from-complete list of 24 companies that had fallen victim to what they termed the "great algae biofuel bubble". Those that have not closed their doors entirely have moved into other, more profitable corners of the market for algae byproducts, such as cosmetics, nutraceuticals, pet food additives, and other specialty products.

The algal biofuel bubble was created and driven by a number of factors. Of course, there were CEOs, entrepreneurs and investors making outrageously outsized claims about their company's capabilities and the future of algae-based biofuels, but also to blame is the U.S. Department of Energy, which was granting enormous amounts of funds to these ventures through its bioenergy technologies office. And then there are all of the industry advocates, journalists, and bloggers who fed into the hype and supported claims that commercially viable algae-based biofuels were just around the corner. One of the most glaring examples of those spreading overblown claims comes from Jim Lane of Biofuels Digest, who published a stunningly incorrect market forecast that predicted that algal biofuel capacity would reach 1 billion gallons by 2014.

Perhaps the biggest tragedy in the great algae swindle is that it is certain to suppress investment into continued research into biofuels. It can no longer be denied that we certainly don't have the technology to create competitively priced algal biofuel, but that doesn't mean we never will. Some parts of the algae hype are very understandable. Certain species of algae contain 40 percent lipids by weight, which can be converted into diesel, synthetic petroleum, butanol or industrial chemicals. No company has been able to build a successful business model on this principal, but that doesn't mean they never will.

https://oilprice.com/Energy/Energy-General/The-Great-Biofuel-Swindle.html

Range Fuels breaks ground on cellulosic ethanol plant *By OGJ editors, Nov. 6, 2007*

HOUSTON, Nov. 6 -- Range Fuels Inc. broke ground on what the Broomfield, Colo., company is calling the nation's first commercial cellulosic ethanol plant, which is being constructed in Treutlen County, Ga., near the town of Soperton.

Range Fuels will use wood and wood waste as its feedstock. First phase construction—a 20 million gal/year plant—is scheduled for completion in 2008. Plans call for the plant to produce more than 100 million gal/year in about 2011.

US Sec. of Energy Samuel W.
Bodman and Georgia Gov. Sonny
Perdue attended the groundbreaking.
Range Fuels was one of six companies
selected by the US Department of
Energy for financial support in
building a commercial cellulosic
ethanol plant.

As part of its \$76 million technology investment agreement with DOE, Range Fuels will receive \$50 million based upon first-phase construction. The other \$26 million will be provided for construction in the project's next phase.

Range Fuels uses a two-step, thermochemical conversion process to turn wood chips, municipal waste, paper pulp, olive pits, and other waste materials into ethanol.

The company is privately held and funded by Khosla Ventures LLC.

Mitch Mandich, Range Fuels chief executive officer, said the company's process for producing cellulosic ethanol will use 25% of the average amount of water required by cornbased ethanol plants.

Existing grain-based ethanol is produced through fermentation of sugars, distillation, and drying. Corn is low in sugar, but high in carbohydrate cellulose that must be turned into fermentable sugar (OGJ, Aug. 6, 2007, p. 20).

Researchers are working on methods to more efficiently convert cellulose to sugar. Many chemists see biobutanol as a potential game changer for biofuels because of its potential to integrate better than ethanol into the refining and gasoline distribution infrastructure.

http://www.ogj.com/display_article/311236/7/ONART/none/GenIn/1/Range-Fuels-breaks-ground-on-cellulosic-ethanol-plant/

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters (510) 537-1796 cappcharlie@earthlink.net

PUBLIC COMMENT

KIM HUGGETT





ITEM #7

APPROVAL OF FINAL MAP TRACT 8447
(SOHAY), ASSOCIATED WITH THE
PREVIOUSLY APPROVED TENTATIVE MAP FOR
TRACT 8428 AND PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT
OF 126 RESIDENTIAL CONDOMINIUM UNITS
AND A PUBLIC TRAIL ON A 10.91-ACRE SITE
LOCATED AT 29629 DIXON STREET; WILLIAM
LYON HOMES, INC. (APPLICANT/OWNER)

From: Miriam Lens

Sent: Monday, November 26, 2018 3:15 PM

To: Aisha Wahab (); Aisha Wahab; Al Mendall; Barbara Halliday; Elisa Marquez; Francisco Zermeno;

Mark Salinas; Marvin Peixoto; Sara Lamnin

Cc: Roxanne Epstein; Allen Baquilar; Colleen Kamai; Denise Chan; Rosalinda Romero; Kristoffer Bondoc;

Intern CityClerk; Adam Kostrzak; Alex Ameri; Chuck Finnie; Dustin Claussen; Garrett Contreras; Jane Light; Jennifer Ott; Kelly McAdoo; Laura Simpson; Maria Hurtado; Mark Koller; Michael Lawson;

Miriam Lens; Nina Morris Collins; Todd Rullman

Subject: City Council Meeting 11/27/18 - Item 7 (CONS 18-776: Final Map Tract 8447 SoHay) Amendment

Attachments: CONS 18-776 update signed by KM.pdf

Mayor, Council Members and Council Member-Elect:

Attached is an amendment to Item 7 (CONS 18-776 Final Map Tract 8447 SoHay) on tomorrow's Council agenda.

The item will be uploaded to the <u>City's website</u> under "Documents Received After Agenda Published".

Regards,

Miriam Lens City Clerk

City of Hayward | 777 B Street | Hayward, CA 94541

Phone: 510.583.4401 | Fax: 510-583-3636 | * Email: <u>miriam.lens@hayward-ca.gov</u>





DATE:

November 26, 2018

TO:

Mayor and City Council

FROM:

City Manager

THROUGH:

Development Services Director

SUBJECT

Approval of Final Map Tract 8447 (SoHay), Associated with the Previously Approved Tentative Map for Tract 8428 and Proposed Development of 126 Residential Condominium Units and a Public Trail on a 10.91-acre Site

Located at 29629 Dixon Street; William Lyon Homes, Inc.

(Applicant/Owner)

RECOMMENDATION

That Council accepts the amendment to agenda item #7, CONS 18-776, to correct the staff report to properly reflect the previously approved conditions of approval for SoHay which requires the mixed-use portion of the project to be completed no later than the 80% completion of the residential units.

Staff recommends that paragraph 2 under the DISCUSSION section of the staff report be updated with the changes shown as **bold** as follows:

"SoHay has a condition of approval that requires the mixed-use buildings located along Mission Blvd to begin vertical construction prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for the first condominium unit and shall be completed prior to issuance of **the 321st certificate of occupancy for the "for-sale" condominium units**. The mixed-use buildings are comprised of two (2) 55-foot buildings that will have a combined 20,000 square feet of commercial space and 72 apartment units."

Recommended by: Laura Simpson, Development Services Director

Approved by:

Kelly McAdoo, City Manager

AGENDA QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Items 2, 3, and 5

From: Miriam Lens

Sent: Tuesday, November 27, 2018 3:13 PM

To: Aisha Wahab (); Aisha Wahab; Al Mendall; Barbara Halliday; Elisa Marquez; Francisco Zermeno; Mark

Salinas; Marvin Peixoto; Sara Lamnin

Cc: Roxanne Epstein; Colleen Kamai; Denise Chan; Rosalinda Romero; Kristoffer Bondoc; Intern CityClerk;

Adam Kostrzak; Alex Ameri; Chuck Finnie; Dustin Claussen; Garrett Contreras; Jane Light; Jennifer Ott;

Kelly McAdoo; Laura Simpson; Maria Hurtado; Mark Koller; Michael Lawson; Miriam Lens; Nina

Morris Collins; Todd Rullman

City Council Meeting: 11/27/18 Agenda Questions and Answers Subject:

Attachments: 2018-11-27 MCC Q & As.pdf

Good afternoon Mayor, Council Members and Council Member-Elect:

Attached you will find Agenda Questions and Answers for Items 2 (CONS 18-748 – VEBA Plan), Item 3 (CONS 18-758 -Agreement with Red Bridget Partners) and Item 5 (CONS 18-772 - Sustainable Communities Grant application). Hard copies will be provided prior to the meeting.

Regards,

Miriam Lens City Clerk

City of Hayward | 777 B Street | Hayward, CA 94541

Phone: 510.583.4401 | Fax: 510-583-3636 | * Email: miriam.lens@hayward-ca.gov



From: Colleen Kamai < Colleen. Kamai@hayward-ca.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, November 27, 2018 1:34 PM

To: Miriam Lens < Miriam.Lens@hayward-ca.gov>

Cc: Kelly McAdoo <Kelly.McAdoo@hayward-ca.gov>; Maria Hurtado <Maria.Hurtado@hayward-ca.gov>; Kristoffer

Bondoc < Kristoffer. Bondoc@hayward-ca.gov >

Subject: MCC Q & A 2018-11-27

Hi Miriam,

The City Manager has approved the attached MCC Q&A's for distribution for tonight's meeting.

Thank you, Colleen

Colleen Kamai | Executive Assistant City of Hayward | Office of the Mayor & City Council 777 B St., 4th Floor | Hayward, Ca 94541 ph. 510-583-4340 | fax 510-583-3601 colleen.kamai@hayward-ca.gov











CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic mail message and any accompanying documents are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain **CONFIDENTIAL** and/or **PRIVILEGED** information. Any unauthorized disclosure, copying, distribution, use, or the taking of any action in reliance upon this communication is strictly prohibited. If you receive this communication in error, please contact the sender by reply e-mail or by phone and destroy all copies of the original message and any attachments. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of the City of Hayward shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by it.

REPLY ADVISORY: Please be advised that messages sent to me on the City of Hayward e-mail system are not confidential and may be reviewed by other persons without my knowledge. Please do not send messages or attachments that may violate the City of Hayward e-mail policy.

AGENDA QUESTIONS & ANSWERS MEETING DATE: November 27, 2018

Item #2: Adoption of a Resolution Approving an Amended Side Letter Agreement between the City of Hayward and the Unrepresented Executives, Management, City Manager, Human Resources and City Attorney Employees to Revise Current Contributions to the Voluntary Employee Beneficiary Association (VEBA) Plan

The staff report mentions an employee's ability to cash out up to 200 hours of leave on page 2. On page 3 it mentions 300 hours. The resolution mentions 300 hours on page 1, paragraph 6. Please verify the correct number of hours and update the staff report and/or resolution, as needed.

The information is correct as it's written. The first mention of the contribution schedule (and cash out hours) in the Background section, is a statement of what the agreement currently reflects.

The Discussion section describes what the new structure will be, (following Council approval) with the new changes.

Item #3: Authorization for the City Manager to Negotiate and Execute an Exclusive Negotiating Agreement with Red Bridge Partners for the Purchase of Three Parcels Located at the Northeast Corner of C and Main Streets for a Mixed-Use Housing and Commercial Project. This Action Is Exempt from CEQA Pursuant to Section 15332- In-Fill Development Projects

For the proposed ENA with Red Bridge Partners, have the concerns with the Green Shutter improved or been resolved?

Red Bridge has been receptive to the feedback from Council regarding their project proposal. The ENA period will give both of us an opportunity to ensure that any project meets the City's goals.

Item 5: Authorization for the City Manager to Submit a Sustainable Communities Grant application to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Division of Transportation Planning in the amount of \$354,120

Is the planning that would be covered by the Sustainable Communities Grant different than what is already proposed as part of the Downtown Specific Planning process? The Downtown Specific Plan (DTSP) presents a broad global vision for infrastructure and land use goals within the downtown. It would be akin to Haywards 2040 General Plan which presented a framework for the community absent detailed plans for future infrastructure improvements.

The Sustainable Communities Grant is the "Next step" in the process in which we obtain more refined technical analyses, conceptual design alternatives and initial cost estimates. It provides a level of specificity that the DTSP is not designed to produce. This focused planning effort will allow us to program the proposed multi-modal improvements with our regional partners and seek funding for the short-term, mid-term and long-term projects.

COUNCIL REPORTS

COUNCIL MEMBER LAMNIN HANDOUT FROM STOPWASTE



Reducing Contamination

Recycling and organics carts can become contaminated by improperly sorted materials. Common contaminants include food, liquids, and food-soiled paper in recycling carts, and glass, metal, or plastic in organics carts.

Contamination has real consequences, degrading the value of recyclable materials collected, reducing the amount of beneficial compost that can be produced from the material collected in organics carts, and increasing the costs to process these materials.

Reducing contamination is necessary for maintaining the economic viability of recycling and compost development. Residents, businesses, processors and local jurisdictions all have an important role to play.

Methods to reduce contamination include:

- Utilizing the proper size carts for the amount of waste generated.
 Garbage carts that are too small increase the likelihood of putting overflow materials into the other carts.
- A renewed focus on properly sorting materials into the correct carts.
 Items going in the recycling cart should be empty, clean, dry, and
 free of food and liquids. No plastic, glass, or metal should ever go in
 the organics cart. The proper home for some items is the garbage
 cart.
- Adding staff and/or slowing down processing at recycling materials recovery facilities. This can help weed out contaminated materials but increases the cost of processing.
- When necessary, using deterrents like fines and penalties for contamination of recycling and organics carts. StopWaste is using this approach via the Waste Management Authority as part of its Mandatory Recycling Ordinance for commercial customers.



