



---

## Fort Collins Climate Task Force

September 20, 2007  
215 North Mason, Community Room  
MEETING MINUTES

---



### Present:

#### Board Members and Alternates

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

Others present: Art Bavoso, Facilitator

Judy Dorsey, The Brendle Group

Seth Jansen, The Brendle Group

Lucinda Smith, Natural Resources Department

Reiner Lomb, Alternate for FCSG

Dale Adamy

Eric Sutherland

### Public Input

Dale Adamy raised a concern to the task force that the Transfort busses are not typically full and that is an inefficient use of these large busses. Dale rode one bus all day on August 20 to assess the total number of trip. He compiled data on total passenger minutes and calculated that the average number of people on the bus was four. CSU was not in session then, but if CSU ridership adds 37% additional ridership, that would have increased the ridership to six. He asked that the task force look into ways to remove barriers to reduce pollution, beyond just the transit issue. Dale thanked the task force for their work.

Phil posed the supply and demand question for transit, which drives which? If the transit system doesn't serve the needs of the people, it won't be used. On the demand side, education is needed. Phil asked Dale if he is asking the task force to address the supply or the demand side. Dale replied that "On Demand Vehicles" do exist and could be used in Transfort. It's important to look for innovations.

### Task Force Member Input

Liz expressed appreciation for the personal responses and thoughts provided by many task force members to the recent list of questions.

### Minutes Approval

Norm Weaver moved to approve the September 11 minutes. Phil Friedman seconded.

The task force unanimously voted to approve the Sept 11 minutes.

### Agenda Review

Lucinda reviewed the agenda and stated she would discuss the framework first, before the numbers update. There were no changes to the agenda.

### Framework

Lucinda provided a quick reminder of the process the task force used to get to this point and the planned steps ahead. Judy then reviewed the updated spreadsheet that summarized the measures and the gaps:

+ 454,000 Existing measures (likely to be implemented by 2010 w/out new action by the City)

+ 648,000 Conservative estimate for new measures

- 202,000 Double-counting to remove overlapping benefits

**900,000 total tons CO2 avoided in 2010 (Conservative approach)**

18% below the 2010 goal

+ 454,000 Existing measures (likely to be implemented by 2010 w/out new action by the City)

+ 916,000 Aggressive estimate for new measures

- 254,000 Double-counting to remove overlapping benefits

**1,116,000 total tons CO2 avoided in 2010 (Aggressive approach)**

1% above 2010 goal

She then spoke to the uncertainties in the process and outlined the method The Brendle Group used to remove “double-counting. Art asked whether task force members have any questions about the thought pattern or structure behind the summary/gap analysis, or the structure, noting that this is a key component of how you eventually defend this; can you support it? A question was raised about the magnitude of the “time of sale” 50% effect (double-counting), is it too large, given that the other measures are much smaller with respect to the total goal? Judy replied that this is not the final analysis for double-counting but a preliminary assessment.

Steve indicated we should not try to eliminate one of these candidates for double-counting because you picked one or the other (i.e. “time of sale” v. something else) based on the double-counting. Because one measure name is shown on the chart, it overlaps with another that is not shown.

Judy wants to encourage thinking around a package. Phil asked about the RECs vs. other mix. Judy replied that these pairs are “one or the other” not both. Judy says that some measures did not have an aggressive scenario done, so the exact same # as the conservative was carried over to the aggressive case in the double-counting table. Based on the presentation by John Bleem on RECs, CO2 #'s don't change, but implementation costs do change (\$/ton). Phil clarifies that in some cases, you have to choose one or the other option, because they offer different paths to the same outcome.

Eric is having trouble following the numbers. Judy will add the measure # reference to the double-counting table on the summary page.

Art asked for other questions and there were none.

Judy then referred the CTF to the printed handouts to discuss the new additions to the quantification spreadsheet. They added costs to both the City and participants (one-time implementation, annual operating, and annual savings), cost-effectiveness (net present value/tons reduced in 2020), scalability (which measures can be adjusted) and possible funding mechanism.

Phil asked for a specific definition of Net Present Value. Seth responds that it looks at inflow and outflow of cash in 2010. John – sum of all dollars over sum of all tons.

Judy reminded the CTF that there are a lot of assumptions embedded in these numbers (per the quality column, which refers to TBG's degree of certainty).

Judy clarified that the scalability column includes measures that the design parameters would best be revised. If measures were not included in this the column, TBG felt that the options were reasonably well captured in the conservative or aggressive options. Judy stated that key uncertainties can have as large an impact on the quantification as the design parameters. Key uncertainties such as

- Population growth rate
- Degree of percent reduction from DSM
- Degree of participation in voluntary programs
- Degree of synergies

They also added a column for possible funding mechanism for many measures.

Judy concluded the over-view and said she wanted to doubled-back on a few measures from last week. Item # 57 (labeled "Sales Tax to Fund Incentives for Low Emission Vehicles).

Judy said that last time the CTF was struggling with item # 57 to determine an appropriate design and the suggestion emerged to just estimate GHG reduction before clearly defining measure parameters, so a cost benefit analysis was not done yet.

Eric points out that #57 differs from the written description of measures from July. Judy said her understanding from the last meeting is that there were 3 things embedded in # 57... incentives for LEV, carbon tax, and facilities shortfall fee. But CTF wanted to keep carbon tax out because it was a funding mechanism.

Lucinda points out that the 'sales tax to fund incentives for LEV' should be called #70 (relating to vehicles). Eric says that his measure (original #57) was the only land use measure in the entire package and that is pretty straightforward. Where something is situated drastically affects transportation land use measure. Eric believes this measure acts as both a funding measure and a carbon reduction measure. Judy wondered what the impact would be short-term. Eric says we

could purchase REC very short-term but would be losing the opportunity to plan for the future, build sustainability and efficiency practices into the structure of the City (as part of the original authorizing task force resolution). Eric asks that the CTF pick a date after 2010 that it kicks in and evaluate the benefit. Eric points out that some of the best programs don't really kick in much by 2010. Norm says our immediate charge is the 2010 plan, but right on the heels of that is to look at the longer term scenario, its incumbent on us to be ready to speak to this as well. There is a logistical issue; TBG already put in 110% effort to get to this point. If we are really pushing the limit on existing resources, it would be \$ well spent to lobby for additional resources to look at a few other measures. Lucinda said, depending on the extent of additional resources needed we might need to look beyond NRD budget. Short-term measures and some solid waste measures don't fall into the short-term..do you want to go forward with strategies that will work in 2020 to get the ball moving forward OR stop up to extend the cope of the process, look for more resources, set a different time frame, which is almost starting over again.

Judy pointed out that even what went into the hopper was geared to have benefit in 2010. Steve points out that the CTF was chartered to work to 2010, but we see there are so many things that we could do that will have a huge impact late. **Part of our sales job to Council is to ask for additional time and funding to give Council more info at a later date ( a few months) to give them options for things that would make longer-term impact in the community. We saw things that have long-term impact, but took them out of the short-term list, but these need to be considered in some other program.** Reiner suggested adding a criterion for evaluating short-term measures that favors those that also have long-term benefit. Eric says we have some of that already thought the conservative cumulative tons reduced in 2020, though he would call 2020 mid-term not long term; 2040 or 2050 would be long term. Steve agrees. Art proposed putting this discussion of longer term measures that provide more benefit in the parking lot, but returning to ensure this is conveyed to City Council. He asked if anyone had any problems with this and no problems were indicated.

Eric wants all the measures in the package to be included and wants an analysis done for # 57 out to 2020. Eric said #57 would discourage sprawl therefore VMT and could fund transit. Mobile Model 6 can be used. Lucinda asks if it can be modeled. John asked for clarification about the measure. Eric said it would be a one-time fee for new developments, not after existing properties are re-sold. John asked if this has been once successfully elsewhere. Eric wasn't sure about the exact model, but that many land use approach are used elsewhere. Lucinda pointed out this measure originally got 5 votes (to put it originally above the line), where as the carbon tax and #70 originally got 4 (below the line) until the task force chose to raise them up for analysis as well. Judy said we will keep # 70 and add a quantification of # 57 and the group supported this. John points out that the transport measures contribute less than 1% of local CO2 reduction from the list of measures.

Bill said this kind of a perspective is important for us in terms of talking about what we have done to reach 2010 measures and what could be done to look at longer term activities. What we have shown here is we chose measures for 2010. We've indicated the strategies show a significant carbon reduction by 2020, so we've chosen measures whose benefits don't drop off right after 2010. Some have a shallow slope to start with and then take off at a later time and that

is a good perspective to talk about what we've done. Bill doesn't think that doing the analysis helps in terms of the 2010 goal. Steve said it does mean that in the sales job we really need a slide to tell City Council there are a whole lot of measures that make a whole of sense beyond the charter you gave us.

Judy and Seth explained the new quantification of #35 Local REC option, noting that many dollars are currently leaving the Fort Collins economy as consumers by offsets (TerraPass, airline mile offsets, etc.) The analysis is based on a recent World Bank recent study indicating that there is a \$100 million global market for voluntary RECs that would lead to 250 million metric tons of voluntary (citizen and business) offsets in 2011. If you apply this per capita rate to Fort Collins, it yields 0.89 tons CO2/person. This could provide a significant local funding mechanism for renewable energy projects. Aspen has just started a similar program called Canary Tags, with the help of the Governor's Energy Office. They are selling at @20/ton. Judy noted that PennyFlats developer is looking for RECs at \$2.50/Watt to be able to build a solar ready project. This measure would have to have a mix of project that would come out to about \$20/ton carbon to be competitive. Aspen's program is also funded by foundation donations and individual donations. Bill asked if this would be funding renewable energy project NOT already on their Tier II list, or else it would be double-counting. Judy suggested it could be double-counting with elements of # 38.

Phil points out that the authorizing resolution encourages economic development and some of the measures on the Tier II list clearly support that clause. Phil said the cost of PV will drop significantly in the next five years to \$1-4/Watt by ~ 2012. Norm registered a concern with this measure that funding projects by 2010 could be difficult (as with enhanced DSM and RE) there is a certain limit in the community to find the funds to make this happen, yet if they were viewed in a five year timeframe, the (funding) potential would be so much higher. \$8/Watt for PV is equivalent to \$600 MWh for electricity. At \$2/Watt for PV, it is still a much higher cost than traditional electricity.

Eric supports the program (local RECs) but is very skeptical of the funding source/capacity and pointed out that last plan failed due to some big measures not being implemented. He urged close scrutiny of the assumptions in the large measures in this list to avoid that problem again. Steve asked how the funds would be solicited; an ad in the newspaper or would the project be developed first and then the funding sought.

## **BREAK**

Art asked Lucinda to write key points from the previous discussion in order to seek final decision on them. Art said we are going to start to put a package together but before that, he will ask the CTF to review the summary of the first part of the meeting and that some of the points will need to be resolved by vote.

Lucinda reviewed the following five points below. Art then asked the group to vote on these points.

1) Add quantification of measure # 57 ( Point of sale fee-based facilities shortfall tax)

Discussion: Bill feels this won't have much impact on 2010 calculations but this might be an example of a measure with a longer-term benefit.

Bill moved *"to defer the analysis of this strategy to later when the mid-term benefits are considered. Stephen seconded.*

Discussion:

Eric wants the analysis done out to 2020. Judy says the 2020 analysis still assumes the program at 2010 and runs the annual benefits out to 2020, and doesn't account for program growth between 2010 and 2020. Eric says this is straight forward, the number of businesses and homes. The more the City grows the less potential there is for this to work.

Arts called the question:

**(1:54) Vote: 10 in favor, two dissent (Eric and Phil??), motion passes.**

2) Quantification of the voluntary REC measure (#35)

Lucinda asked, "Does the CTF want TBG to double back and tone down the benefit of this measure?"

Eric moved *to offer the program as voluntary but take no carbon credits for it and fund another source of funding and take credit under the other funding source.*

**No second, motion fails.**

Phil thought the question was about the value of the \$/ton of carbon in the analysis. What are we concerned about, participation rate or carbon value?

John said 3 points were raised: 1) is the value of the carbon credit correct 2) will people really step up, 3) is this already counted in another RE measure, are these the same measures as others on the list (can the community absorb another vehicle)

Norm adds that there is also the question of technical feasibility in this timeframe.

Art- what question do you want to answer out of this?

Norm moved to *revisit #35 with the question raised above with local projects (1) is the value of the carbon credit correct 2) will people really step up, 3) is this already counted in another RE measure, are these the same measures as others on the list (can the community absorb another vehicle).* Steve seconded. Blue suggests adding the criteria that it is a local project (~ 2:00) Revised motion: *revisit #35 with the question raised above with local projects.*

Steve suggested that maybe this should be looked at as a one-time shot. Like United Way, you pay once into the fund. Does that help mitigate the concern of double-counting? Phil asked if a lot of these measures have the potential of pulling dollars away from activities that people are

already doing? Bill said what we are giving here is giving choices to people – I concur that this is vying for dollars, some more voluntary, some more structured.

Eric looks at measures where consumer invest and save \$ over the long term, to have more discretionary dollars in their pockets over the long term.

Bill points out that the analysis is conservative and uses low participation rates, and the interaction rate is low we shouldn't have that problem of people having to choose one strategy over the other.

Art calls the question.

**(2:06) All but one in favor, Eric opposes. Motion passes.**

3) Pursue the cost analysis of # 70 (sales tax/incentives for LEV)

Judy said that right now there is no policy measure designed on the table right now. Liz asked if this is a sales tax on all cars? Judy says it's not designed yet, their GHG calc is just an order of magnitude, and it comes up as a "medium" benefit measure.

Eric suggests that free parking for LEV could also be an incentive. Norm suggests a locally generated \$1-2K incentive for LEV's.

(2:20) Blue talked about small measures

Norm moved to *Revisit the analysis of #70, with a locally generated \$1-2K incentive, with appropriate evaluation or review of funding mechanisms.* Eric seconded. John seconded round 2.

John asked about a fee for all vehicle registration. Steve said that part of the registration fee goes to school district and part goes to the City of Fort Collins. Bill said the original analysis suggests how many vehicles might participate, so the analysis could assess the feasibility of alternative implementation. Eric suggests a revenue neutral sales tax (like a feebate). Norm said that this allows us to put this approach on the table, not matter what the approach ultimately is. Judy points out that some implementation approaches are out of local control. Blue suggest exempting LEV's from sales tax as another model. Phil suggest considering any legal locally feasible approach. Blue points out there are smaller incentives that can be provided, such as parking measures.

Art calls the question.

**All in favor, no opposed. Motion passes.**

4)Interest in ensure high-benefit mid-term measures for 2020 told as part of the story and brought to Council

Steve moved to *Revisit the list of 200 (and beyond the list) for mid and longer term benefit and inform City Council of those and ask Council for more resources to analyze them.* Norm seconded.

Blue suggests looking beyond the list as well. Steve said he didn't think we are authorized to study things beyond 2010. Liz reminded that we are authorized to look to the future.

**(2:26) All in favor: Motion passes.**

Blue moved to *Add # 70a to include non-dollar parking management incentives for the use of LEVs.* (Steve seconded, and Phil seconded), narrowed down to parking management.

**All in favor: Motion passes.**

5) Transport measures don't provide an equitable share of the current list of measures.

Lucinda suggested that this is not an issue that needs to be voted on.

Art said we doubled back to cover these issues as a way to set up the next part of the discussion. Do we want to have that discussion? Judy points out that given the margin of error, we may not have a gap.

John says that if the margin of error is 20%, we are close enough to the goal. I think this package is good enough.

Norm showed the graph that:

- 1) the Business As Usual (BAU) trajectory shows increasing carbon use
- 2) the middle dotted line is the goal, 2010 and beyond, and
- 3) if the actual measure benefit line show significant progress and a very positive trajectory by 2012, this is a good indicator that we are on the right track... we may have missed it by a year or two but we are on track.

Art then revised the expectations he had for the night:

1) **Are the measures numbers understood?** YES

2) **Discuss elements of provisional plan:**

**2010 goal** – Art said he's hearing we may not need to move the goal posts

He asked if the group want to change the goal; do you need to change the goal? No? The group is okay with the goal. (2:34)

**Add measures or delete; Are there any you can't live with?** The group indicated there were no measures in the package they could not live with.

Reiner said we are just about making the goal, what happened to the additional ideas that have come up? Art asked if these new ideas need to be discussed? Phil agrees they do, and asked how is the input from last week's questions going to be incorporated?

Lucinda said she thinks the group is at the point of needing to make a decision about adding new measures. There will be small adjustments to the existing measures, based on direction provided; some people may feel the package close enough and others may feel the package may not be close enough for their comfort level, so she thinks CTF should discuss this now.



John moved to that *the number of measures are sufficient in the arrange between the conservative and aggressive packages and that they are sufficient for at least the first half. All other measures will be part of the mid-long term discussion.* Norm seconded.

Norm said that some of the initial suggestions look at longer term impacts, so he supports keeping a manageable package now and not losing the other ideas. John pointed out that the group plans to recommend to Council that they continue this process and evaluate the longer-term measures later.

Phil asks when these would be analyzed when, by whom, under what authority. He is concerned about discarding measures now. Art says we are not talking about discarding – this would fall out under the second role of the CTF. Garry said the task force should be an on-going effort. Lucinda thinks it is in this CTF purview to discuss longer term-measures, but there is no funding for comprehensive analysis.

Eric is concerned if it goes to Council on Nov 27<sup>th</sup>, we won't be ready for the longer term discussion. What if the short-term plan goes to the work session and Council takes some items off the plate? How can the CTF then meet its charge if this goes to Council without contingency measures? We must make the large (6) measures clear to Council.

Art says that we were going to ask for volunteers for an outreach committee (soon) to help with how to present this information.

Eric asks for friendly amendment to highlight the big ticket items to Council. Art says this should be a separate motion.

Art calls the question.

**All in favor except Eric opposes. Motion passes.**

Eric move that *we present the package to Council, highlight big ticket times so they know right up front that if any are removed we will not come within striking distance of the goal (and show each measure as a percent of the whole)* Phil second.

Bill said you are focusing on the 2020 benefit but that there is not as much difference in the measures in 2010. Eric agreed. Lucinda suggested that the CTF might want to prioritize the measures after receiving public input and that Council might appreciate that. Eric points out there are some big ticket items in 2010, too. Steve says that this must be presented as a package to Council and remind them that not taking the package means we won't meet the goal. Bill say that prioritizing measures works against that point (of a package). Prioritizing suggests that some measures can go away. We already did a prioritization process. Blue suggested just adding a column showing "percent of total goal" to help highlight the big ticket times. Steve suggested making bar charts to better illustrate various elements (CO2 reduction, cost-effectiveness, etc.) of the measures to show that we have considered this all different ways. Judy made the caveat that some of the measures represent pairs.

Lucinda asked if the group feels it has a package yet. Art pointed out that there will be some revisions but the group has moved toward a general framework. The idea also was made to collapse some measures into pairs (A or B approach to achieve the same end).

**The group supported this approach, just not by formal vote.**

Art asked the group if there were any volunteers for an outreach committee. Blue, Eric, and Phil volunteered. Bill pointed out that we are not ready to turn this over to marketing staff just yet. We've "collected the data" but not "written the summary". The summary needs to happen before an outreach committee can figure out how to present it. Members said that a "case statement" still needs to be developed for this package.

In order to allow time to review the revision and develop/review a "case statement, an additional meeting was set up on October 10<sup>th</sup>. Art closed the meeting by asking everyone what he or she learned today that they didn't know before.

**Next Meeting**

Wednesday, October 10

4:30 – 6:30 p.m.

Utilities Training Room, 700 Wood Street

---