

CAP Advisory Group Meeting Notes April 23rd, 2008

Present: Blake Jones, Moe Tabrizi, Paul Norton, Pam Milmoie, Amy Ellsworth, Sheila Horton, Francois Poinatte, Gwen Farnsworth, Adrianna Raudzens Bailey, Dan Powers, Henry Mueller, Ann Livingston, Ron Shaw, Carol Tombari

Absent: Jeff Fiedler, Howard Geller, Steve Mudd, Craig Eicher, Michael Reid, Jon Lindstrom, Brian O'Neill, Kai Abelkis, Jim Wilson

Staff Present: Sarah Van Pelt, Kevin Afflerbaugh

Member Announcements

Moe Tabrizi: Announced that CU applied for solar project through Xcel SolarRewards program. If approved, it would produce 3% of CU's power use.

Pam: Launching of Sustainable Energy Plan on April 24th. Come Celebrate!

Sarah introduced Ron Shaw to the group. He is the Sustainability Coordinator from the City of Longmont

Discussion of April 8th Study Session

Sarah: Overall, it ended with some good discussion. However, there were some challenges. Complicated matter for City Council and because there were other priorities, and they were not able to focus on the information in the packet. This negatively impacted the presentation. However, they brought up some good questions regarding what to do. We completed a recap of the conversation and next steps and are submitting to them this week in the study session summary.

Council supported analyzing and discussing commercial and residential energy efficiency codes with community groups.

There was general support for increasing the CAP tax. However, some of the council had difficulty interpreting the analysis data. We may go to council for the tax increase later this year.

They asked we emphasize SmartGrid and to optimize the franchise agreement with Xcel.

Council decided to postpone the discussion of setting additional/new goals for carbon reduction.

Council wants to meet and exceed Kyoto. They thought we might have been too timid with our proposal.

Dan: Didn't think council read the material to allow them to fully grasp the info. Is there going to be a protocol for having the CAPAG info presented to Council? At the study session, Francois presented and he was not sure if the CAPAG should have a formal process.

Francois: Had a hard time distilling the CAPAG info. Thinks we should have a straw poll or head count on various issues to help determine the overall position of the CAPAG.

Dan: Does Council perceive that what we are presenting to Council has been vetted through the CAPAG? What if the group has some dissension on certain issues like increasing the commercial CAP tax? The group may support it, but the Chamber might not, and there should be an option to present the dissenting opinion.

Sarah: The ideas from CAPAG are absolutely part of the CAP team decisions and we make council aware of the group's input including when votes are taken. Additionally, we acknowledge what happens in the meetings on a form regarding decisions of boards/commissions. We can acknowledge who approved or didn't.

Francois: What does the group think about us taking a vote on certain issues, but also having a dissenting opinion and note who was absent?

Sarah: We could use the help of the CAPAG to determine what we should vote on.

Dan: As long as there is a mechanism to get our viewpoints to Council that is great. How should we select person to present to Council?

Moe: For major topics, we need to state our view on the issue, and select a member to talk.

Paul: What is the possibility of having a Council member sit on the CAPAG?

Sarah: Great idea.

Henry: Supports the idea as well

Carol: Are there issues of concern from the Council going forward?

Sarah: Data. We need to share with them the analysis that we have done. The other major Council concern is how we are evaluating programs to make sure we are investing in the right programs. We need to make sure the Council becomes familiar with the CAP because the program rationale is located there.

Gwen: Council was also mixing up info that was not included in the inventory, like embodied energy in construction and food.

Sarah: We could have a brownbag lunch to discuss the basics of the cap with Council. CAPAG members could also come.

Discussions of Additions/Expansions of ClimateSmart Efforts

Sarah: We wanted to discuss the options that we took to council regarding our possible expansion of ClimateSmart programs with the increase in budget. Does the CAPAG have any questions/issues with some of our recommendations?

Sarah Review of the Neighborhood Sweep efforts.

Carol: How is success defined for the Sweep?

Sarah: Residential satisfaction, information taken from the bulbs given out etc. We targeted areas with known less efficient homes.

Francois: Perhaps we could give out a checklist for residents to look at the own house, like insulation levels, etc. Then we could check back to see what they have installed.

Sarah: Good idea. We do follow up. We also received grant funding from GEO for insulate and seal programs.

Amy: Have we talked to local hardware stores about coupons in packets for caulk and other sealing stuff? She has worked with a utility that provided coupons for residents who received audits. These coupons would be for products that would improve the energy efficiency of their house.

Dan: Is there a metric where the energy saved and GHG saved from switching out the bulbs?

Sarah: Yes

Dan: With any of these programs, is the 2009 budget based on the actual reductions? How are we analyzing the current program reductions and is there an analysis of what an increase in the budget will produce in terms of GHG reductions?

Sarah: Yes, and yes. These questions get to our strategies in the CAP. We believe the programs we selected in each area are the most effective energy efficiency programs in terms of cost and GHG reductions.

Pam: It is important to have the impact assessment as part of the analysis. It is impossible to reduce it down right to the carbon number that it will reduce. There are intangibles that go into the analysis. It is a helpful and important tool...but it doesn't tell the whole story.

Sarah: We do a cost impact assessment on our work. We look at what our cost will be and what reductions we will see. But you can't use these numbers to do a cost per ton. There are a variety of costs/benefits that are difficult to quantify.

Pam: There is a ripple affect from our work which can impact other people/businesses and this is hard to quantify, but vital.

Sheila: It may be hard to quantify, but we need to give Council some sort of analysis. We have to sell it to council and the community if we are asking for a tax increase. We need solid numbers. Also, we shouldn't spend time going back to the people that we have done Sweeps with. We should go to others that we haven't talked to in order to spread the message even further.

Francois: Agree with Sheila in terms of getting actual on-the-ground reductions. Important to quantify this number. But it is also important to go back to those we have worked with to see what the implementation is. We should increase the number of volunteers.

Sheila: It is important to follow up to know if measures installed. If we have them send their receipts in for the work, then we can enter them in a drawing.

Amy: Following up is key because we can uncover barriers if nothing is installed. Also gives us an additional contact with the resident that can lead to more implementation.

Paul: If we measure cost per ton, it should also include the total tonnage available for reduction. So it may be cheap, but it might not have great potential. It eliminates the temptation to focus all of our \$\$ on the cheapest measures that might not reach our goals.

Moe: So our options for council are to stay the course, increase the budget to what was suggested by Sarah or to be even more aggressive.

Sarah: Yes

Gwen: With the grants and matching funds that the City is receiving, were those included in the funds for programs for 2009?

Sarah: No.

Amy: How much are we going to be working with Xcel on their DSM programs?

Sarah: We are working with them and participate in their roundtables. We included Xcel's data regarding their ideas for DSM projections in the study session. We want to maximize DSM dollars coming to Boulder.

Amy: Are we using Xcel data as measure of progress? Are we utilizing the Xcel data for inventory...does it account for our efforts?

Sarah: For planning, we are using projections on what we think we can achieve with our various programs. For the actual inventory, we use actual data on energy use from Xcel.

Sheila: How are we planning to do the refrigerator roundup? Because Western won't take the refrigerators and it is costly to recycle.

Sarah: We are using a vendor that is in the business of doing frig pick ups. They handle the pick up and disposal. We also have grant requests to help us fund this program.

Sheila: Doesn't think that we can get this many refrigerators. And that the expense might not be worth it.

Sarah: Fridge program is good for us because it is very quantifiable and cities such as Fort Collins have had a lot of success.

Amy: Are we looking at sorority/fraternity houses to improve energy efficiency?

Kevin: Yes, we working with Rob Hall at CU and have presented to these organizations.

Gwen: Why is there not a larger proposed increase for the MFU program?

Kevin: Hard to recruit appropriate MFUs and there is a small pool to choose from. We wanted to be reasonable in terms of what we thought we could accomplish.

Moe: What if we kept our request to Council at the current level of funding? But the balance would be to help residents and commercial to achieve more DSM funding from Xcel?

Sarah: Our efforts with all of our programs are promoting the DSM rebates.

Francois: I am still having trouble with knowing what these increases are going to bring in terms of GHG reductions. What about a relative metric?

Pam: If we do give a specific number to cost per ton, then we need to give the other benefits that accompany the reductions. There are benefits that don't have a cost per ton

Blake: Have a relative cost per ton such as excellent, good, average. Rather than having specific dollars associated with the programs. Then for each program, you could have a category for cost per ton, educational activity, public benefits, etc. And each category would be rated as excellent, good, or average etc.

Amy: What about costs for codes both residential and commercial? Are they included in this analysis?

Sarah: Only staff time now--no direct costs yet.

Gwen: As a package, we are showing that we are reaching 85% of goal. Can staff give various options for funding levels like the transportation did about options to choose from (dial)?

Sheila: With the DSM dollars and grants rewarded, we have more than paid for our staff time. This should be recognized.

Sarah We should vote. 3 options. 1st option: Should we move forward with 85% of target and present to council? 2nd Option: Do not go forward with this plan. 3rd Option: Unsure

6 voted for Option #1 Amy, Pam, Blake, Adrianna, Gwen, Carol

0 for Option #2

5 vote for Option #3 Sheila, Dan, Henry, Francois, Moe

Dan: Unsure because feels it is important to highlight quantifiable actions, and need to show more info on the non quantifiable as far as ripple effects. While reluctant to put a dollar measure on the reduction per ton, he thinks that is what we need. The option presented by Blake might be a great option.

Francois: Wants more fine grain analysis. Prioritization of our efforts. We can compare to what we are doing and that there is constant evaluation of what we are doing.

Henry: He is not sure that we are going after the meat of the carbon footprint. He sees lots of great programs for the residential program. We are not really addressing the commercial sector. More funding for the commercial sector. So much effort for so little fruit.

Carol: Maybe we need to go back to square one and think about what our goals were. Need to remember our rationale for our strategies in the CAP.

Sarah: The CAP and our current efforts focus on residential for a variety of reasons. But mainly that Xcel has programs and rebates for the commercial sector but not the residential sector.

Henry: There should also be more educational opportunities for brokers and property managers. California has a lot going on. With more thinking and effort, we can crack the nut.

Pam: We can do it, but it is important to remember that California has higher energy prices and greater DSM.

Discussion of CFL's

Sarah: What should the city's recommendation be on CFLs? Should we have recommendations on the positive and negative attributes of CFLs? What information should we share? We can make recommendations about where to put them during the Neighborhood Sweeps. Michael Reid's analysis he provided to the CAPAG was very helpful.

Sheila: I am concerned about the liability of a broken CFL and the necessary clean up measures for property managers. What if someone gets sick and says it is because of CFL? Similar to issues regarding mold. What about improved incandescent lights? LED lights? Concerned that city would be requiring CFLs.

Sarah: The city is not discussing the requirement of CFLs. We have not and will not require this technology.

Moe: CFLs have same amount of mercury as two cans of tuna. We should provide a list of good places to put them and where not to.

Blake: How about a Top 5 places good for CFLs and a Top 5 list where CFLs are not recommended.

Ann: The county is requiring a technology standard to reach. If the resident chooses not to implement CFLs, then they choose other options.