Climate Action Plan - Community Advisory Committee
Oct 11, 2018 12:00 – 2:30 pm
Colorado Room @ 222 Laporte

Anticipated Meeting Results: CAC Members will advise staff in the following ways…

- Provide perspective to city planners on the City Plan scenarios from the triple bottom line and CAP Goals perspective
- Debrief and continuous improvement of the 2019-2020 BFO process

Attendees:

CAC Members:

- Dana Villeneuve, New Belgium Brewing
- Bruno Sobral, One Health Institute, CSU
- Fred Kirsch, Community for Sustainable Energy
- Hunter Buffington, Fort Collins Sustainability Group
- Sheble McConnellogue, Northern Colorado Clean Cities
- Dawn Paepke, Kaiser Permanente
- Trudy Trimbath, Poudre School District
- Jean Runyon, Front Range Community College
- Steve Kuehneman, Care Housing
- Lisa Leveillee, First National Bank
- Scott Denning, Colorado State University
- Stacey Baumgarn, Colorado State University

CAC Members Not present:

- Ann Hutchison, Fort Collins Area Chamber
- Bob Gowing, Apex Engineering
- Todd Dangerfield, Downtown Development Authority
- Molly McLaughlin, Colorado State University
- Evelyn Carpenter, Solas Energy Consulting
- Todd Parker, Brinkman Development

Staff Members: Lindsay Ex, Carrie Frickman, Randy Reuscher, Ryan Mounce, Meaghan Overton, Aaron Iverson, Cameron Gloss, Lisa Rosentowski, Shawn, Dean Klingner

Facilitators: Chris Hutchison, Diana Hutchinson

Community members: Katie Wallace - New Belgium Brewing, Dale Adamy - Fort Collins Parity, JD Murphy – Foothills Rotary, Rose Lew – FC Sustainability Group

1. **Introductions and Brief Updates (Inform)** *(Chris Hutchinson, Lindsay Ex, Randy Reuscher, CAC Members)*
    - Introductions and purpose
    - Time of Day – starting in October
        - information is available on fcgov.com.
        - Not expecting customer rates to go up overall, the old average rate was 10c/kwh, now the off-peak price is 7c/kwh.
        - Some actions people can make are to move use of laundry, oven, dishwasher, electric vehicle charging, etc. to off-peak hours.

- Will reevaluate this program in a year. Success of this program will be customers can reduce bills, and reducing overall utility costs. May also reduce overall energy use as consumers identify where they are using electricity.

2. **City Plan Scenarios** *(CAC Members, Ryan Mounce, Meaghan Overton, Aaron Iverson)*
   - 3 scenarios with different development and transportation patterns were shown. CAC Member Q&A:
     - How are tiny homes considered? *These would be included in the variety of home styles*
     - How is water use considered? *There are several water providers within the Growth Management Areas, and they are working together. May be somewhat higher water use overall due to population increase but decrease per capita water use 14% per capita.*
     - What is housing unit capacity? *Number of units – average of 2.37 people per housing unit.*
     - Greenspace – how is that effected by scenarios? *TBD*
     - What is impact of electrification? *Will also impact but general direction of energy use will be similar*
     - Solar energy – how could the City encourage installation of solar on the rooftops for new development? *TBD*
     - Alignment of these scenarios with economic health? *The main impact being looked at is new job capacity.*
     - Job growth – what sectors are expected to grow? *Not sure where the jobs would come, job growth capacity is estimated based on square footage of commercial space.*
     - Economic impact to families? *The main cost being looked at in these scenarios would be taxes related to public transportation/bike/ped infrastructure.*
     - Has there been any discussion of targeting taxes on behaviors we want to reduce? *No, not yet.*
     - Have scenarios been looked at with an equity lens? *Yes, looked at more vulnerable population areas (youth, elderly, economic) and access to nature, etc.*
     - How is transportation modeling considering regional perspective? *TBD*
     - Other concerns of higher population are water use and open space that can sequester carbon. How to mitigate these? *TBD*
     - What would a scenario 4 look like, with more extreme version of scenario 3? *TBD*
   - What scenario elements best help us achieve our community values & priorities
     - Given the limited geographical boundary, would need to use Scenario 3 with higher density if we continue to grow, especially to have some housing people can afford.
     - Scenario 3 offers a lot of tangible benefits to a denser city; a downside is people's resistance to change, especially idea of high rises. (spoken from 35-year resident)
     - If we don't consider scenario 3, how will we be ready for the trends and other initiatives in the city such as bringing in younger workers, talent 2.0, etc.
     - Duplex, triplexes already being added to neighborhoods, residents have a fear of how that changes the dynamics of the neighborhood. May need to consider overall community benefits vs. specific neighborhood impacts.
     - Scenario 3 aligns well with values and priorities. We may be resistance to change, but as the population changes, this model may be more in line with the new residents' needs and desires.
     - Scenario 3 is best meeting values. Need to use reconciliation approach vs. compromise approach – to tone down rhetoric and recognize the merits behind each viewpoint.
     - Do extra work to bring in viewpoint of younger generation, they are the ones who will inherit the changes. Need to consider aspects and aspirations of younger people.
     - Scenario 3 will probably get more population growth; yet if we don't take this approach, will just end up pricing many people out of the city.
     - Scenario 3 is the most reasonable. When we are talking transit and transportation, need to bring in technology, first/last mile.

    - Would like equity more pronounced in whatever is brought to our community.
    - Millennials are important, but also need buy-in and champions from older generations to really make this happen.
- Cost comparisons
    - Scenario 3 has the highest transportation/infrastructure costs. $15/20M per year is $150/person/year.
    - What is the overall cost? If we can look holistically – what are housing costs? If cost of housing is tripled because there is not enough supply, that could far outstrip the $150/person/year.
    - Need to consider how costs are communicated. What are the costs of doing nothing? What are we paying for in that scenario such as increased housing, transportation from driving farther. Will there be wage increases, and how does that compare?
- Other ways to give input into the plan - https://ourcity.fcgov.com/cityplan
    - Online survey
    - Events at CSU, and other locations

3. **2019-2020 Budget Process (Collaborate)** *(Lindsay, Tim McCollough, CAC Members)*
    - Not a lot of CAP-related items were included in recommended budget, projected is to get to 19.7% GHG reduction in 2020. Utility scale wind coming online by 2020 will get us to 30%
    - Utility has been spending reserves for 8 of the last 10 years. Now there is a need to increase 5% to operate with balance budget. Part of increase is to update underground cables that were started in 1967 and are starting to have reliability concerns. An optional rate increase would allow for CAP opportunities to be funded – 0.63% increase. City Council was not supportive of going above the 5% increase, so Utilities is relooking at what to delay, scale, or not fund.
    - **Support/concerns about utility rate discussion and impact on CAP goals**
        i. Rate increase varies by rate class, average is 5%. Residential is slightly lower. Wholesale rate provider (PRPA) is increasing 2% on retail rates.
        ii. TOD and population changes are considered. Expect 2% reduction in use from TOD.
        iii. PACE financing and on-bill financing may impact need for rebates and rebate structure. Some people may do projects anyway with or without rebates, how do we know where we are getting "free-rider" use of rebates vs. make or break decisions on doing projects.
        iv. CAP projects seem pretty small $ compared to the overall Utilities budget.
        Most part of budget, 80% goes to PRPA, about $10M goes to energy services division. Have had to cut to capital requests as well. Past efforts for infrastructure and CAP needs were paid out of cash reserves.
        v. SP3 – solar power purchase program is not recommended to fund. More cost effective for the utilities to use ground mount tilted access; this approach is more efficient, cheaper (for example at Rawhide). More expensive for parking lot mounted or leasing commercial rooftop space.
        vi. Success stories with efficiency works – PSD was able to convert parking lot lighting to LED because it was "free" with rebates. This started a chain to allow funding next efficiency projects on the list, given the restriction on borrowing for the schools.
        vii. It's hard to answer in a useful way, need more contextualizing the CAP portion rather than the overall utilities budget which is not within our purview.
        viii. Would not prioritize energy efficiency if that will jeopardize reliability of electrical delivery
        ix. 9.90 Energy Efficiency program – has a lot of visibility, momentum, and direct impact on GHG reduction. Would recommend including at least a little of this program even if it goes a little above 5%.

4. **Evaluation and Next Steps** *(Chris Hutchinson, Lindsay Ex, CAC Members)*
    - Continue
        - Advance material/homework

- Facilitation – timeframes, question, outcomes defined ahead of time
- Brought into budget process early, transparency on impact the group had
- Willingness to add more meetings on special topics
- Offering food + dessert
- Hear about influence CAC is having

- Stop
  - Too short time to move car during breaks
- Start
  - Happy hour :o)
  - Surveys after the fact (pre/post meeting have changed opinion due to discussions)
  - CAC members could contribute to specific topics
  - Set dates for CAC 4 meetings as far ahead as possible

- **Prioritization of topics for next year**
  - Equity/Inclusion & CAP - 11
  - Renewable Energy Supply & Distribution - 9
  - Climate Action Plan/Energy Policy Update – 8
  - Climate Economy - 8
  - Adaption & Resiliency - 7
  - Engaging with Larimer County - 7
  - Building Stock & Efficiency – 7
  - See picture for remaining topics