

CAP Advisory Group Meeting Notes 1/23/2008

Present: Michael Reid, Amy Ellsworth, Pam Milmoe, Craig Eicher, Ann Livingston, Gwen Farnsworth, Jon Lindstrom, Dan Powers, Francoise Poinatte, Henry Mueller, Joe McDonald, Carol Tombari, Moe Tabrizi

Absent: Jeff Fiedler, Howard Geller, Jim Hill, Steve Mudd, Paul Norton, Brian O'Neill, Adriana Raudzens Bailey

Staff Present: Sarah Van Pelt, Kevin Afflerbaugh, Drew Bascue, Beth Powell, Yael Gichon, Danielle Koffler (CU Intern)

Agenda

- 3:00 – 3:05: Introduce Jon Lindstrom
- Review agenda
- 3:05 – 3:35: CAP Advisory Group Discussion of 2008 goals for the advisory group, and the groups' goals for CAP planning and implementation. See questions below.
- 3:35 – 3:50: Recap of goals discussion, vote on top priorities
- 3:50 – 4:20: Discussion of commercial recognition options. See attachment for initial ideas and questions for discussion.
- 4:20 – 4:30: Summarize recognition program recommendations and discuss next steps
- 4:30 – 4:40: Discuss future agenda topics
- 4:40 – 5:00: Updates from CAP Advisory Group and other items

Introduce Jon Lindstrom & Review agenda

Sarah introduced new member Jon Lindstrom, who works with HRH Insurance Company providing insurance for contractors and developers. Financing for green building comes up a lot in his work. He is exploring ways for developers to get involved in green building.

Dan Powers mentioned that insurance often does not cover “green” repairs.

Jon responded that only one company that will insure for full (green) value and will pay for green repairs.

Sarah reviewed the agenda and new format for meeting this year.

CAP Advisory Group Discussion of 2008 goals for the advisory group, and the groups' goals for CAP planning and implementation.

1. What are the 2008 goals of the advisory group, what do you want to accomplish this year? What are measures for the goals?
2. What goals should be established for CAP planning and implementation in 2008? What are measures for the goals?

3. Does the group want to add to the ideas or parking lot list generated from 2007 discussions?

Gwen – Goal: Advisory group can be more participatory – by providing information about initiatives and events in advance members can plan ahead and attend. Having a sense of what our agenda is for the year in relation to campaigns and events we are launching or participating in for the year (Relocalization, sweeps, etc). Knowing our initiatives will help the AG to prepare and support our efforts. Post a schedule to advisory group website.

Amy – Goal: What are we measuring to know if we're meeting goals – progress indicators. Constantly evaluating our work in relation to the target. Look at big picture goal (Kyoto) and points along the way we can measure so we can evaluate each case as much as possible in relation to how valuable it is to meet the goal.

Sarah added that we can discuss our CAP progress indicators

Ann asked at what interval and what should we measure?

Amy clarified – AG could provide input on evaluation and analysis

Joe mentioned inputs/impacts, possibly reporting on this progress every 3 months so it becomes more routine.

Pam talked about what individual members of the AG could do – bringing people to meetings, outreach in community, AG could be instrumental to enhance and pursue goals, can help get the word out on initiatives. Ann added - What can we bring to the group from our real jobs?

Dan talked about City Council retreat priorities and how they will touch on implementation of CAP, transit village/conference center. This group should bring in environmental impacts to these priorities.

Henry discussed the importance of having smart planning to reduce our carbon footprint. Density issue with Washington school – opposition in community – but carbon footprint argument provides validity. How can we use density to reduce carbon footprint? The BGBG wants to weigh in on this as well.

Francoise talked about how the denser developments are designed and that carbon reductions are missing from the conversation. Density can contribute to good quality of life; the design elements are really important.

Amy talked about the controversy with Washington School and Transit Village. Should this group discuss how to approach this controversy, bring carbon into the conversation? Create a structured strategy for dealing with carbon piece of this issue so it is not controversial? Role for AG is to make sure that piece of puzzle is not overlooked.

Joe talked about how this is a crucial issue since opportunities for re-development don't come up often – this is a 40 yr commitment. We would be remiss not to make a statement. Density is important and will have a big impact the way we develop.

Sarah suggested that we come up with principles that we could all try to support and write a letter to the editor focused on these principles.

Moe talked about how the AG can continue to act as a clearinghouse for programs and we can open up for additional value propositions and decide what we want to focus on. These goals need to be in SMART form – Specific, measurable, actionable, realistic and timely.

Pam mentioned that this group could be collectively successful in coming up with general principles, but not council priorities. Xcel is working on big package of DSM, this group could talk about these programs and how we can get more of them in Boulder County.

Ann mentioned that if we talk about density we should not only talk about transportation but also sharing of walls, house size is growing.

Michael R. said that as interesting as some of these issues are, it is not our place in an AG role to weigh in.

Sarah responded that it is not unreasonable for us to weigh in.

Michael- Goal: Overall, wants to be useful. Perhaps a listserv providing frequent and informal communication would be useful.

Francoise mentioned that how we function as a large group that meets once a month can be a bit unwieldy with so many layers upon layers of issues – density – program implementation – how the message gets out. There are lots of ways that programs could be going, she wonders if the structure of one large group is the best structure. Should we have one-hour subcommittees that report back to the larger group?

Sarah recapped goals to make sure we are on same page:

2008 Goals

- Provide a useful service to City by providing guidance and oversight to the CAP
- CAPAG more participatory in planning and preparing for events and outreach efforts. City should keep CAPAG informed.
- Understand metrics and progress indicators and refer back to these metrics to track success of meeting goals.

- CAPAG could enhance and pursue some of the CAP goals by bringing in their expertise, experiences, and contacts.
- Develop strategy to consider and engage in council priorities and community planning and growth issues
- Act as clearinghouse for City ideas/plans/programs
- S.M.A.R.T. Goals!
- Work with Xcel and possible expansion of DSM \$\$
- Subcommittees utilizing various group member expertise to focus on certain issues
- Benchmarking with other cities/communities

Discussion about goal of keeping the group informed:

Dan asked if at end of each meeting we can provide bullets of what's next. Sarah responded that we could use updates for this. Beth said that she could share her outreach event spreadsheet - post on the web monthly. Amy asked if we could also share at each meeting what events are coming up so group could brainstorm. Pam said the sharing should go both ways so they members are on the hook to contribute. Gwen mentioned that we could also look at ideas like neighborhood competitions to see what that would look like.

Discussion about goal of tracking and evaluation:

Sarah mentioned looking at progress indicators in the CAP to enhance and pursue goals as well as council priorities and determine if there is a potential disconnect between social, environmental and economic goals.

Dan reminding group of stated council goal. Develop strategy to consider council priorities and community planning and growth issues.

Discussion of group's usefulness to the city:

Craig mentioned that the AG should make sure our CAP is on target. AG role is not to go over every detail of plan; it is for overall direction and oversight. How can AG help communicate to council that we are on target or that we need direction? Craig would rather us vet ideas through them, not so specific details. He wants 50,000 ft view.

Discussion of subcommittees:

Ann suggested that we could breakout into groups that focus on trends versus technical analysis.

Henry asked if we are evaluating what other cities are doing and what is working? Sarah replied that we are.

Moe added the goal of benchmarking to the list.

Joe reinforced that he feels that the group wanders. Craig's comment crystallized his feelings, he does not want this item (AG should provide overall direction and oversight, not specific details) to get lost as 'one item on the list'.

Discussion of commercial recognition options

Kevin briefly shared that we don't have a formal recognition program besides ads in newspaper recognizing businesses (list) that received audits, or highlighting individual businesses that have implemented measures from the audit.

Amy asked if we model businesses and test out. Kevin replied that we do not but rather look at specific measures. Amy asked if there is some way to tie a performance value to measures implemented.

Kevin asked the group how we should recognize businesses and divided the AG into three groups to answer questions in attachment (see website).

Group Break-outs

Group 1 recommendations:

- What is the value of recognition – to get someone to act; audits sitting on shelves don't help us. Set a date as an action forcing event.
- Keep one level of recognition.
- Instead of criteria set in stone, have criteria reviewed by panel, nomination, award process. Businesses in PACE, audit program would automatically be nominated. Also open to other businesses – innovation.
- Criteria could be – implementation of 3 yr payback measures, DSM rebate \$ applied for, % of actions in audit completed, criteria associated with educational efforts – to their employees or other businesses.
- Also recognize those businesses already doing this work for some time.
- Annual basis – large ad that mentions participants, mini-case studies of top five organizations to motivate action.

Group 2 recommendations:

- Recognition is really big for businesses, should be a key part of programs for this year. Good for PR.
- Utilize other programs – chamber award program example; also see value of having out own award system.
- Different tiers of accomplishment; ex: implement 50% of items in audit with 3 yr payback; other level could be above and beyond this.
- Tie awards to actual reductions – over coming years will have more data to tie it to actual reductions.

- Businesses that have already been doing this – how to recognize them? Maybe compare to industry average.

Group 3 recommendations:

- Look at EPA Green lights program
- Should be independent ClimateSmart program
- More than one level of recognition may be desirable
- Chamber, ESTF, green drinks, BGBG, CU – possible partners.
- Create a template for businesses to show customers how much they reduced energy and what measures they took.
- Need to factor in tenant/landlord issues and have different criteria for each group.

Gwen asked if we could we use energy star portfolio manager?

Henry - Let's make sure this is not green washing.

Kevin will compile recommendations and develop a program.

Discuss future agenda topics

SVP – future agenda topics

- February - Go thru analysis and suite of programs
- March – Going beyond 2012 goal, looking at programmatic analysis

Other topics:

- Progress indicators
- Land use and carbon connection
- Update and review of Xcel DSM programs
- Information on Berkeley solar project
- Commercial codes
- Commercial recognition
- CU – Greening of Government
- Countywide plan

Sarah provided an update on the Berkeley solar project: We are working with Boulder County, this could be a project that a subcommittee could work on. Involves city, county, Longmont to use bond capabilities to offer loans to properties for energy efficiency and renewable energy. We could use help developing this. How could we use this group to do this?

Craig asked if we are we bringing in consultants.

SVP replied that the GEO innovation grant could fund part of a consultant's time, Berkeley received a \$160K EPA grant

Ann added that we are working with folks at state level on funding and also legislation to make this possible in Colorado.

Updates from CAP Advisory Group and other items

Moe mentioned that CU is working on 2012 greening of state executive order – due at the end of this month. This plan is something he could present to this group, with scorecards and actual savings.

Pam updated on the County Sustainable Energy Plan, working to collaborate with different communities moving into 2009 budget process, she could present how this is unfolding.

Dan added a potential agenda item – Green Points for commercial – the new Council will likely prompt faster timeline.

Craig asked about increasing the CAP tax rate?

Sarah responded that this would be part of next 2 months discussions. Sarah also briefed about the April study session and that council might select an option that increases tax rates.

Dan shared about the Jan 29th – Chamber Climate Leaders – Making Green Going Green – Panel with Hunter Lovins, The Sink, Boulder Outlook Hotel, IBM – all speaking about processes in place. There will be more programs throughout year under umbrella of Climate Leaders. The Chamber surveyed membership – PR as recognition for efforts in sustainability was 2nd highest motivator.

Meeting Adjourned at 5:05.