



Fort Collins Climate Task Force

May 13, 2008
215 North Mason, Community Room
MEETING MINUTES (DRAFT)



Present:

Board Members and Alternates

John Bleem	P			Garry Steen	P
William Farland	A	Blue Hovatter	P	Norm Weaver	P
Bill Franzen	A	Jeff Lebesch	P	Steve Wolley	P
Pete Hall	P				
Phil Friedman	A	Eric Levine	P		
Reiner Lomb	P				
Stephen Gillette	P	Liz Pruessner	P		

Others present: Art Bavoso, Facilitator

Judy Dorsey, The Brendle Group

Lucinda Smith, Natural Resources Department

Public Input

None

Task Force Member Input

Eric handed out a memo to the CTF and asked for support of a recommendation to Council to commit to reaching 2.466 million tons of GHG emissions by 2012 (comparable to the 2010 emissions target). This will be discussed later in the agenda.

Minutes Approval

Liz moved to approve the minutes from May 1. Steve Wolley seconded.

The task force unanimously voted to approve the May 1, 2008 minutes.

Longer-term Measures Discussion

Lucinda briefly reviewed the emissions inventory numbers and projections that had been provided in the “data memo”, explaining the update to the electricity coefficient had changed since the last emissions numbers the CTF saw. She also pointed out that the annual gap between 2010 Business-as-Usual and where 2010 falls on a straight-line path from 2008 to 2020 was only 227,000 tons. The Existing measures were reviewed too, to reflect a new baseline of ~ 2007. The benefit of the existing measures dropped from 400,000 tons in 2010 to ~ 82,000 tons because of only counting credit for benefits above 2007 levels.

Discussion about “15% Renewable Energy Measures”

Steve Wolley provided a summary of the Sub-Committee’s discussion, and that Option C was the primary approach the subcommittee members gravitated towards. (15% renewable energy, with a 40% energy: 60% REC mix). John Bleem pointed out these numbers include voluntary and policy-mandated energy. Pete asked if PRPA could actually get 18MW (Option C) on-line by 2010. John replied that he expects a 12MW commitment by Sept or Oct 2008 so the additional 18MW would need another RFP process and it might be difficult to get 18MW on the ground by 2010.

Steve move: Set a goal to achieve 15% renewable energy by 2010 2011, through a mix of 40% renewable energy resources and 60% RECS (PRPA invests in approx. 18 MW additional wind projects).

Jeff seconded.

- 74,000 tons CO2 avoided in ~~2010~~ 2011
- 74,000 tons CO2 avoided in 2020
- ~~2010~~ 2011 cost: \$4.1 million (60% REC, 40% RE)
- Approx. fraction of City electric power revenues = 5%
- Transition from 60% REC:40% RE ...to 70% RE:30% RECS by 2020 (PRPA’s goal)

Liz asked about the rate increase and how this affects the total cost bottom line for the CTF measures. Norm said is about a 5% increase over current annual operating budgets. Lucinda said the original 15% RE measure cost \$1.5 million/ year and this costs \$4.6/year.

John proposed saying ‘15% renewable energy by 2010 or as soon thereafter as possible’. Pete has concerns about “as soon as possible thereafter” and that it would be preferable to be clear, from a business perspective. John said it could be done by 2011. Jeff wondered if the mix could be altered to achieve 15% renewable energy by 2010, but the challenge is really getting the wind energy on the ground. Blue prefers the closer deadline of 2010.

John asked what the preferable mix is in 2020. Reiner recognizes that PRPA want to know for planning purposes, and he asked about how this fits into the complete roadmap to 2020. Lucinda said the CTF will not be developing a full plan to 2020, but their measures will be part of the map for that path.

Steve move: Set a goal to achieve 15% renewable energy by 2011, through a mix of 40% renewable energy resources and 60% RECS (PRPA invests in approx. 18 MW additional wind projects).
Jeff seconded. (Transitioning from 60% RECs:40 delivered to 30% RECS:70% delivered by 2020, consistent with PRPA’s goal.)
VOTE:~~10~~ 9 in favor, Stephen G opposed – concerns about the cost; John B abstain

The CTF discussed the additionality questions. John said he talked with the Climate Registry and they didn’t think that ‘additionality’ matters; John said it’s a value that people have, but they respond that new or existing renewable energy doesn’t really matter for carbon savings. Steve

recognized that there are citizen concerns and it might help counter arguments against this measure. Jeff pointed out that 40% of the entire measure is additional new wind. Norm also reiterated Jeff's point that Option C provides 18MW of additional new wind. Eric hopes that Fort Collins will go beyond this mix by 2020, but it's hard to predict now. John Bleem said that the National Renewable Energy Lab has estimated that the cost of delivered wind energy will go up 12%/year (so investing sooner is less expensive).

The CTF decided not to pursue a recommendation to add "additionally" as another prerequisite for PRPA purchase of RECS.

John Bleem suggested adding a bullet about transitioning from 60:40 to 30:70 by 2020, consistent with PRPA's goal. All agreed with this.

Lucinda asked if everyone is also comfortable with the statements about REC and energy developed by the Subcommittee. She said that many are interested in what the CTF thinks about these things. Liz questioned that exclusion of tree-planting, since that may be part of the CTF recommendations and it's a viable carbon sequestration approach.

Since the subcommittee thought that point intended to focus RECs on renewable energy purchased, the group decided to strike this statement because the name "renewable energy credits" suffices. Steve and Reiner agreed, so this bullet point will be removed.

Long-term Measures

Lucinda reviewed the long-term measures briefly with the CTF, and the over-arching goals for transportation, green building and community engagement. Blue wanted to see transit be a priority, not just road -building. What about prioritization based on CO2 reduction capabilities? CTF supported adding an emphasis on transit on the transportation discussion.

Steve suggested saying "Support and pursue infill and refill development". Blue said the word 'pursue' can be a real red flag and suggested excluding it. Discussion about the pros and cons ensued. A straw poll showed that all agree that to say "promote" is okay. 4 wanted Promote and pursue, 3 were opposed, and 4 were indifferent. Blue changed his vote to enable the group to move on.

Reiner suggested a focus on existing buildings. Judy said existing buildings are addressed in existing measures through DSM programs, etc.

Pete wondered if LEED for neighborhoods would fit better under Green Building than Land Use. He also pointed out that LEED per se does not always result in an energy efficient building, so he's suggested setting performance standards. It was also recommended to "consider FortZED" on a community scale, not just the FortZED jumpstart zone. Blue moved to accept the long-tem goals. Liz seconded.

Blue moved to accept the (list) of long-tem goals. Liz seconded. VOTE: All in favor.

2020 Goal Discussion

Lucinda reviewed the concepts contained in the Council resolution to adopt the 2020 and 2050 goals. She also explained that the materials cannot be made public until they are published on the Council Web page (Thursday's prior to the Council meeting) so she was not able to hand out copies of the text, but she outlined the concepts. The proposed resolution calls for adoption of the 2020 and 2050 goals but does not set a milestone to meet 2.466 million tons by 2012, as Eric was asking for.

Eric has concerns about not having an interim commitment to progress. Eric felt that not having an interim goal would diminish greenhouse gas action's competitiveness in future budgeting processes. Setting milestones is one of the tools we need to keep on track.

Reiner expects the Council will vote and make a decision in September on the plan. Reiner likes that we have long-term goals in that it allows consideration of other strategies but we need steps along the way. Lucinda clarified that the CTF can include a 21012 milestone in the package and the questions is whether the CTF wants to have the 2012 milestones identified in the 2020 goal resolution.

Eric moves that the CTF recommend that Council include a statement in the May 20 Goal resolution calling for specifically achieving at least the 2010 goal of 2.466 million tons CO2 emissions no later than the end of 2012.

Reiner seconds.

Eric wants a 2010 goal that works for the city and in the budget process, and he would not support a 2012 number that was not achievable, but he feels that 2.466 million tons is achievable. He thought 2012 was appropriate, given that the next budget cycle is not until 2010.

Blue point out that all the package options in Lucinda's memo have the measure started by 2012, and would 2.466 million be achieved.

Blue also noted that Council won't have the CTF package in hand when making this decision. Eric points out we've had a commitment to the 2010 since 1999, and now we are removing this goal. Blue supports the 2012 goal since we can't fiscally achieve the 2010 goal in 2010. John suggests removing 'no later that the end of 2012'. Eric thinks this will be a harder sell because Council may not have the funds by 2010.

Norm points out that the short-term measures add up to ~ 600,000 tons, and we only need to meet ~ 300,000 tons in 2010. The package adds in some breathing room; it should be doable.

Eric moves that the CTF recommend that Council include a statement in the May 20 Goal resolution calling for specifically achieving at least the 2010 goal of 2.466 million tons CO2 emissions no later than the end of 2012.

Reiner seconds.

Vote:9 in favor, 2 opposed.

Norm doesn't support this because he doesn't have the same fear that Council won't act. John Bleem prefers to let the process play out.

Sequencing Poll Results

Lucinda summarized the results of the 6 CTF members who voted on sequencing. She also reviewed 3 package options compiled to reflect these sequencing results in different ways. The lowest package included the 2010 level of "50% Waste Diversion Goal", because this is the approach staff might recommend (as opposed to the 2015 level by 2010).

Compiling a Package

John B asked about the group's interest in guidelines and ground rules for compiling a package. Judy replied that we need 227,000 tons of reduction to meet the linear progression in 2010. ~ 370,000 tons are needed to meet the 2.466 million tons in 2012. Lucinda clarified one data entry mistake but noted it did not make a big difference in the overall sequencing results.

The CTF subtracted the 80,000 ton benefit from the existing measures and then started filing in the highest priority measures as follows:

John Bleem notes that Phase I is good because it is basically a marketing and education campaign. Blue asks how it became so easy to meet this goal, when we worked so hard to meet the goal and now it's so easy; this doesn't pass the smell test. He wants to see the package pass and wants to see everything be done by 2012. Reiner says that it's not bad if the early-on goals are easy because there is still much work that is needed to hit the 2020 and 2050 goals. Blue points out the Mason Corridor will come on line by 2011 so we should push for more development along it, if we are looking long-term. He uncomfortable with sequencing over a long term. He thinks Phase I is a good way to start this, but then it's time to move forward.

John asks if the CTF is now working towards the 2020 goal. Blue said we are trying to push to 2010 deadline back to 2012, but some other group will develop a 2020 plan.

Short-term is 2010, next is 2011, and everything else by 2012. Judy points out that the whole package sums to 550,000 tons and the year that reduction is needed to stay on the straight-line trajectory in 2013.

CTF clarifies that the dates are completion dates, not start dates.

John points out that we haven't considered costs in this sequencing. Steve said he did consider the costs and identified some of the costs to the City.

Blue thinks it okay to recommend these based on size, but he anticipates staff will place the cost filter on them.

Art suggests developing a second package based on costs. Steve points out that the sequencing votes did consider costs. John B points out that energy efficiency is the most cost-effective approach and it's not shown up there in early actions. Norm pointed out that Climate Wise, for example, does have good cost-effectiveness and partners might be taking advantage of DSM programs. John B questions whether energy efficiency should replace renewable energy. How far can we go with efficiency by 2011? The energy efficiency in 2011 is 11,000 tons. Norm

pointed out that we can only ramp up efficiency measures at a certain rate. It can be done for renewable energy if we go from 6% to 15%, but efficiency might be constrained by this slower ramp-up feasibility. But John points out it is so much more cost-effective.

Jeff said that the electric rate structure and smart meters are also part of energy efficiency. Lucinda advised that it would be good to build padding into the package. Lucinda asked for clarification that Phase III was “all other” by 2013.

2010 BAU

2.466 original 2010 goal

0.372 tons reduction needed

++++++

First Phase (completion by 2010, starting now)

227,000 gap (linear path)

- 82,000 Existing
- 22,000 Local gov ghg goal
- 9,000 Community climate challenge
- 132,000 Expand climate wise

Phase II (completion by 2011)

456,000 annual gap in 2012

- **6,000 Energy Efficiency (more cost-effective)**
- **226,000 50% waste diversion goal**
- **74,000 15% RE by 2011**

Phase III – all other (completion by 2013)

Reiner moves to submit the sequencing along with the package. Steve seconds.
10 in favor, John abstains.

Draft Transmittal Letter

Judy drafted a cover letter but it needs some updates following today’s meeting. Lucinda will send out a revised version for the CTF to comment on. It would accompany the May 27 recommendations that will be presented to the SIT Team. Steve asked that the letter add a paragraph that the CTF has specifically focused on a short-term package

Next Steps

Lucinda will try to get as much as possible of the draft package reflecting the CTF recommendations to them for review by next Monday, this would allow for their comment by Thursday, May 22 with the final packet to be provided to SIT by May 27. Art then asked everyone to share some final comments about the process.

Final Wrap-Up and Thank you

June 10, 2006; 4:15 – 5:00; 215 North Mason, Community Room