



Fort Collins Climate Task Force

June 28, 2007
MEETING MINUTES



Present:

Board Members and Alternates

John Bleem	P	Bruce Hendee	P	Gary Steen	P
William Farland	A	Blue Hovatter	P	Norm Weaver	P
Dick Johnson	P				
Bill Franzen	P	Jeff Lebesch	A	Steve Wolley	P
then 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

Ryan Staychock, Alternate for Natural Resources Advisory Board

Kip Carrico, Alternate for Air Quality Advisory Board

Dale Adamy

Public Input

Ryan Staychock offered two suggestions for the CTF:

- 1) short-term – substitute 20% wood chips for coal at Rawhide
- 2) Long-term – encourage urban forestry to capture more CO₂

Dale Adamy

- 1) Appreciated the public open house
- 2) Revise the metrics used to calculate Transfort effectiveness and replace near-empty Transfort busses with smaller busses

Introductions

Art Bavoso convened the meeting was convened at 5:40 p.m. All present introduced themselves.

Minutes Approval

Steve Wolley moved to approve the May 24 minutes as written. Blue Hovatter seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Agenda Review

Lucinda reviewed the agenda. She noted a change to the published agenda to remove the CO₂ IQ quiz and add a discussion on the definition for “local” GHG reductions. Reiner Lomb

suggested adding an item to each agenda each for “Task Force Member Input”, following Public input. All supported this idea.

Task Force Member Input

Reiner Lomb asked how much will this group or another group be involved in monitoring and executing the implementation of the updated plan. This issue was added to the parking lot for future discussion.

Clarify Inventory 2010 Forecast and Goal

Lucinda reviewed the emissions inventory and forecasts. She reviewed the assumptions in the original 2010 forecast that was prepared in 1998. Lucinda will send the 2000 LUTRAQ study to the task force that showed 4.9% annual VMT growth rate from 2000 onward. Lucinda will post to the Web the detailed emission inventory document when completed. Eric Levine feels that the 7% annual VMT growth used to create the original 2010 project was not realistic and sets the bars high so it's easier to get under it in 2010. He said the 7% annual VMT growth has not been used by any organization for planning purposes since then.

Lucinda also reviewed the assumptions for the updated 2010 forecast, based on the best info from 2005 onward. 2010 solid waste was based on population growth from 2005 to 2010 at 3.03%/year. Reiner Lomb felt that population growth was probably high; he had seen 1.9% annual growth in Colorado communities. John Bleem said PRPA also uses a 1.6% long term population forecast for Fort Collins, based on two independent consultant studies. Some CTF members asked staff to consider MPO and PRPA population growth projections for Fort Collins in the revised forecast. Questions were raised about the population assumption embedded in the utility forecasts. Steve Wolley felt it would be more defensible to use the same population growth assumptions.

Two questions were identified:

- 1) What is the best 2010 forecast to use?
- 2) Do we take 30% below that number, or 30% below original 2010 number?

Art stated it was an important for the CTF to get on the same page about how success is defined. Eric Levine raised questions about the municipal waste methodology and noted how much it changed, which isn't confidence-inspiring.

Lucinda reviewed possible elements of a banner that the group would agree on to define success. John Bleem said the baseline is not as important as the goal of reducing, especially if the baseline won't be that accurate. Judy reviewed the Council guidance on the goal:

WHEREAS, by the adoption of Resolution 99-137, the City Council has previously stated its commitment to reducing its greenhouse gas emissions to the equivalent of 2,466,100 tons of carbon dioxide or less by 2010; and

John Bleem stated that the group could argue a longtime about 10 or 20% or to reduce 1 million tons or 1.1 million tons, but the goal set by City Council is to reduce down to about 2.5 million tons. Reiner Lomb said if the underlying assumptions are wrong, we wouldn't have to achieve as many tons of reduction.

Judy said we won't know until 2011 about the accurate 2010 emissions inventory, so in the interim, the CTF should focus on putting together a package to reduce GHG that adds up to ~1.1 million tons. The only way now that we know if we will meet the goal is to develop a package of measures that add up to about 1.1 million tons. Eric Levine said this disparity in 2010 projections is a good argument to use per capita GHG goals; maybe a net tonnage wasn't the best way to go. Reiner Lomb said let's just put together a package of 1.1 million tons. Norm Weaver said that time is short between now and 2010. Blue Hovatter likes the idea of using a single number, but that there is a significant difference between 1.0 and 1.1 million tons; it's not minor. Norm Weaver said that as an engineer, he backs off on the level of precision especially when seeing how much the prediction assumptions can change.

The task force unanimously supported the goal to develop a plan to reduce 1.1 million tons of CO₂e in 2010.

John Bleem notes that through this exercise, the CTF is trying to accurately reflect the goal that City Council established, and not set a new goal. Judy notes that GHG emissions are currently above the goal, so we have to have measures to stop growth in emissions, but also to actually reduce emissions. John Bleem asked if the group is comfortable with the goal – is it realistic? What is in the purview of the CTF? Steve Wolley pointed out that when we send something to Council, we will have to show an updated graph.

Definition of “Local” Reductions

Judy reviewed the issue of ‘Local reductions’ that was raised at the public open house. The resolution that formed the task force calls for the updated plan to encourage local participation in actions reduce emissions within Fort Collins. But while the policy basis calls for local reduction, there is room for interpretation.

She defined Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs) (also known as Green tags, Renewable Energy Credits, or Tradable Renewable Certificates (TRCs)) as the property rights to the environmental benefits from generating electricity from renewable energy sources. These certificates can be sold and traded and the owner of the REC can legally claim the environmental benefits associated with generation of renewable energy. While traditional carbon emissions trading programs promote low-carbon technologies by increasing the cost of emitting carbon, RECs incentivize carbon-neutral renewable energy by providing a subsidy to electricity generated from renewable sources. She illustrated that Fort Collins already has taken credit for wind-energy purchased where the wind energy is generated outside of Fort Collins but Fort Collins' citizens and businesses fund the purchase. She also discussed the example of recycling which traditionally takes credit for GHG reductions upstream. For example, recycling an aluminum can allows credit for methane reduction at the landfill as well as reduced need for energy to extract raw aluminum for new cans.

Blue Hovatter asked are there any other considerations that take into account upstream emissions. Judy said the norm is not to account for embodied energy in technology of measures. But recycling is the exception.

The CTF agreed to allow RECs to stay on the list of possible GHG reduction measures.
The CTF agreed to allow GHG credit for recycling, including downstream energy/GHG savings.

local can be added to the list, then her firm will figure out how to quantify it and whether precedents exist? He also asked about reducing an individual's carbon footprint, regardless where the reductions occur, especially in the transport sector.

Judy suggested that the group allow these things to remain on the list of possible measures. They would then be subject to the filtering process and the quantification. The group supported this.

Measure Selection process

Art reviewed the proposed process to filter and select measures for quantification. Eric Levine suggested removing items from the list that are only applicable after 2010. The group supported the filtering process proposed by Art. Then Judy reviewed the sample worksheets for Tier I and Tier II. The CTF was asked to provide any comments on these tools to Judy.

Initial List of Measures

Lucinda reviewed the open house and comments obtained, and Web comments. She then reviewed the initial list of measures collected through CTF, open house and the Web, and explained her draft organization and combination approach.

John Bleem moved to remove the Existing measures from the list for filtering; it was seconded. Enhancements to existing strategies, however, would be kept in the list for filtering.

The CTF unanimously agreed to remove the Existing measures from the list for filtering, but they will be analyzed for GHG benefit in 2010.

Art then asked the group about the initial long list; is there anything missing, anything that should be removed, anything that should be combined?

Reiner Lomb said it seems rushed to develop a complete, analyzed list by July 11. The CTF has not had a chance to create synergy within the group through discussion, workshop style. Art points out that if a tremendous idea comes up, it can be added, even by the end of August.

Blue Hovatter asked whether there is a sense of what is a substantial size project to aid in meeting the goal. The Brendle Group will provide a qualitative assessment of the initial list of measures. (The CTF does support having The Brendle group fill out the qualitative assessment prior to their initial filtering exercise.)

Norm Weaver reviewed the major strategies that Portland, OR used to achieve 12.5% percent GHG reduction and a slight net decrease in emissions from 1990. (See <http://www.portlandonline.com/osd/index.cfm?&a=111833&c=32927> .)

Reiner Lomb mentioned that the State of Washington plans to achieve 20% of it's total GHG reduction through an aggressive CFL campaign.

It became apparent that an additional meeting was in order to allow an adequate chance for CTF agreement on the scope of measures that are on the initial list for filtering. The CTF developed the following short-term schedule:

July 3 (close of business)- provide any feedback you have on the initial "Long List" of measures attached here, including ways to group things, additions or subtractions. Recall that we will remove and analyze separately any "existing" actions. Please send any comments to jdorsey@brendlegroup.com (and copy me at lsmith@fcgov.com).

July 6 - you will receive a Tier I list of measures and descriptions from The Brendle Group.

July 6 thru July 11 - read and think about the Tier I list

July 11 meeting - Workshop to clarify the scope/definition of the measures on Tier I list
Receive and review the QUALITATIVE analysis of the Tier I list
Meeting at Fort Collins Utilities, 700 Wood St., 5:30 - 8:30

July 12 - You will receive the updated Tier I list reflecting the discussion of 7/11 for initial filtering by e-mail

July 16 NOON - Submit your initial filtering (Top Third) selections to Lucinda

July 16 meeting - review initial filtering, discuss and finalize package of measures for quantitative analysis. Meeting at 281 N. College, Conf Rooms A&B, 5:30 - 8:30

Art closed the meeting by asking everyone what they learned today that they didn't know before.

Next Meeting

Wednesday, July 11

Utilities, 700 Wood Street

5:30 – 8:30 p.m.

(Dinner served starting a 5:15 p.m.)
