

Climate Action Plan Task Force Meeting November 14, 2011

Attendees: Bonnie Bona, Mike Garfield, Wayne Appleyard, Mike Shriberg, Nancy Shore, Charles Hookham, Steve Manville, Laura Rubin
CEC: Jenny, Rebecca, Wendy
City of Ann Arbor: Nate, Andrew, Jamie, Kristin, Matt
Note Taker: Kristin Baja

Presentation of Homework

Residential:

- R-1: Follow the Berkeley example. When a piece of property changes hands there is an energy audit done- improvements limited to 1.5% of the value of the property. Allows the property to be assessed
The energy commission is currently working on this
- R-2: Property Assessed Clean Energy program where you do energy improvements. The city has a fund that supports it and you pay back the city (a special assessment)
- R-3: Creating an authority that is not replacing DTE but might be connected with the water department as a way to fund energy improvement
- R-4: The utilities in the state have a franchise that lasts forever. We are trying to work to get something more – it might be possible to do that again.
- R-5: Not sure what this would entail but this is definitely something coming down the road. Electric is more efficient than gas and can be supplied by green energy. Having places to charge them is important
- R-6: In furnaces – find a way to promote that. There are some issues with biodiesel but it's something to look at and consider
- R-7: It's something we've talked about in the past. Setting up a tariff to allow people to purchase green energy directly, not just the credits
- R-8: This could be putting up a several megawatt PV array at the old landfill and then selling shares to those who cannot put panels on their homes due to tree interference. This has been done in other states. This would require some state legislation. [Maybe a liner over a landfill that closes the landfill and provides energy?](#)
- R-9: Create some program to improve the affordable housing units in the community. It would reduce greenhouse gases from that sector and improve the ability to live in the community since they'd have lower energy bills
- R-10: Water pipes being run through the street in Wyandotte. Everything becomes electric based, more efficient and creates a clean source of home heating with no emissions
- R-11: A way of trying to educate the public. Schools and neighborhoods already have infrastructure so this is a good way of getting the word out
- R-12: Net-zero homes produce all their energy needs from renewable sources. Promoting development of these homes in the community
- R-13: Wide swath of stuff that could be passed on. Energy Commission working on this now
- R-14: educational piece

Residential Comments/Feedback/Questions:

- Shore*- who is going to do all of these things? Is this part of the process in the future?
- Brix*- that is part of our scoring criteria. Number of partners involved – cost, jurisdiction,
- Garfield*- what about a 1000 solar roofs program

Appleyard- we already have a 5000 solar roofs program by 2015 but we only have dozens thus far. We're just reaching the part of the hockey stick where it's hard to maintain and get that number. Through Solar Currents this worked but having no funding enticement makes this more difficult.

Brix- 5000 solar roofs is a target but a few things on this list is the way we can get there

Hookham- Where does U of M fit in this? Commercial? Land Use? They are a huge component of our overall climate action. How are we going to include them? What are they doing under planet blue? Shouldn't that be on our list? Terry might be the right person to bring that all in

[Bring in the actions from the planet blue plan](#)

Many of the things stated in their plan

Shriberg- I think the best thing happening at U of M right now is the planet blue operations. They have swat teams for energy conservation and doing technological upgrades and also behavior/usage changes. They are seeing huge changes. [Is there some way to export that model to the community?](#) There are other Universities out there emulating that model- is there a way that the city can do that as well? Imagine if the DDA got a hold of this. What is effective is that it's a one stop shop. You have demonstrated savings on a 3-5 year payback on average. You need initial funding

Bona- [R-13](#) I am working on the better buildings Michigan contract right now. That seems to be making a big difference. Add a qualified auditor list of those that do the entire package.

The other thing to consider is rentals. When do they become commercial? I didn't see anything here that addressed rentals. [Keep rentals in consideration](#) (recent greening rental housing grant application with the Count may help with this)

Appleyard- Certainly the PACE program that just rolled out is an option for the commercial housing

Bona- [Make the housing code a green housing code](#)

Shriberg- [1\) updating the code itself. 2\) energy bills should be disclosed prior to rental- this isn't happening right now- having energy info available.](#) We are working with the University to disclose this. [Rental housing has the most stock to upgrade because they have the least incentive to do so.](#)

Bona- does the University have a swat team that has gone out to student rental housing?

Shriberg- not yet.

Rebecca- upgrading existing housing stock – a campaign to bring the current housing stock up to a code.

Appleyard- a bunch of these would do that. The ordinance would require that houses be brought up to code upon sale. I think there are over a 1000 housing units sold in Ann Arbor per year. You'd get them eventually.

Brix- does it make sense to include both these approaches? A more focused campaign

Bona- one thought I think of is catching people when their furnace breaks or a campaign focused around that purchase opportunity

Hookham- DTE is doing that right now

Brix- Michigan Saves loan program is also doing that so maybe that's something to add as far as [promoting existing programs such as Michigan Saves](#)

Jenny- an idea I had is a green building ordinance that set standards beyond state code

Appleyard- that would require a change in state code

Bona- [working with the State to change the State code](#) is an option

Appleyard- the homebuilders association is who initially helped set the state law – they fought more intense regulations

Garfield- maybe there is something that could achieve the same ideas. [Design or energy guidelines suggested to builders?](#)

Brix- existing law is you can build a bigger building if you do a certain percentage of energy efficiency

Jenny- the [planning process preferences/ incentives for energy retrofit projects](#)

Brix- there is less of a line than there was 3 years ago

Bona- that's certainly something to keep on the list- projects go through really quickly

Naud- I would add that maybe it's a perception. Saying it's on the fast track may give people the idea that things will move quicker if they are on the "green fast track"

Appleyard- another step to review of whether to put them on the green fast track

Hookham- [effective to reuse facilities- better incentives for this rather than building a new building](#)

Geisler- [encouraging utility level incentives for solar](#)

Hookham- you can't build a wind turbine in all areas but solar is more likely

Steve- R-6- add biodiesel – E-fuel, ethanol fueling station. Be able to do your own ethanol

Commercial

Divided into: Mobile Sources, Point sources, Energy Sources

C-13: some businesses that could use methane from the landfill as it decays for these businesses rather than burning coal. A glass business is one that was very interested and spoke with Energy Commissioners.

Commercial Comments/Feedback/Questions:

Hookham- we have a nice green space. Chicago has a huge urban heat source. If you look at Ann Arbor we have the same thing. If there is a way for us to look at a biomass project with all the green spaces In midland we are putting in energy crops around campuses. We should use Michigan's assets (growing trees) to do this- create more tree canopy.

Brix- move the mobile sources to transportation

Shore- C-6 and C-7 could be moved to Transportation

Shore- C-5 seems more like a zoning issue rather than a commercial issue. Is the place of is correct?

Hookham- if you have a local business that is using local products can you provide incentives and tax breaks for them? Reduces the footprint of those products

Brix- the mechanism is a property tax abatement. In terms of the rents, real estate use to be an alternate source of income for some people- some rents charged pushed out local businesses. Is there a mechanism to stop that?

Naud- the farmers market and the Michigan theatre we own. We need to find money to buy spaces and give them back to the community to incentivize and subsidize local. If the city wanted to subsidize local they would have to find money to buy space and own it

Garfield- many of these require a lot of money. Is there some way of using local taxes to promote those services

Naud- certain things are easier than others. Solar hot water- we have a water utility. There is a nexus to build a solar with the water. Creating a laundry list and then determining how to make these happen

Shore- C-5. At one point the co-op had a pilot program where they were showing the green impacts of the produce. [It would be interesting to have that in the restaurants and other businesses to have a climate-friendly or local label that incentivizes people to purchase those products.](#) Green impact label

Hookham- Leopold brothers is a good example

Geisler- [Contradictory element of R-7 and C-24 is something to look at](#)

Criteria Scoring and weighing exercise results

Brix- This is a tool that will give us feedback on the lists we are working with. In the end it will be up to the task force to determine if this is the best method. We use to have a very subjective scoring criteria tool. The goal was to do something more objective that produced different results. The tool itself was developed by a consultant who was doing a water treatment plant facilities master plan. We repurposed it for the CIP and had a positive experience with it.

Step 1- what are the criteria you use to evaluate? What are the different components you use when making decisions?

Step 2- weighing the criteria from 0 to 100

Step 3- Take each criteria and determine how applicable the criteria is

Step 4- Put all of them together and create a spreadsheet. Rows are actions and criteria are columns. Produces a graph that shows which projects are higher priority based on all the criteria. The chart also shows where that benefit comes from.

There is another output from this tool where you add in the upfront cost of the project and then give the budget you have. The tool organizes projects based on the ones that are affordable.

The results from our criteria weighting from our last meeting:

100 Feasibility, 99.2 Cost, 70.6 Impact, 48.4 Jurisdiction, 46.4 Co-Benefits, 46.0 Timeframe, 43.3 Measurability, 22.2 Visibility

Breakdown of how we would score these. This will be on the google docs if you would like to review it after the meeting.

Cost

Hookham- How you're going to deal with impact related to cost? [You either need to separate the two or combine them](#). If you have a project that costs x and might save y and another project that costs x and might save y +2. You need to keep cost and impact separate. You can equate everything to one scale just make sure you don't double dip. You have to keep the scale the same. Dollars per ton needs to be the same in all scales.

Impact

Hookham: Is this lifecycle? Peak annual impact? Reducing emissions by x percent in year y

You'll have decay. Landfill gas is a decaying curve so you have to factor in cost difference

Brix- another way of doing that could be to create bins based on the modeled impacts and reduction impacts could be. I don't know if people had preference one way or another. The bins are not linear. We could create linear bins

Garfield- I like the first approach best

Hookham- my suggestion is to keep both options open and run a test.

Appleyard- why wasn't it linear? What was the case to have non linearity?

Brix- first bin less than a households worth, neighborhood scale next, then significant beyond a neighborhood or city block. That's where the break points came in. If I was honest, I'd say I like this first approach best

Jurisdiction

Shriberg- the number of entities doesn't seem like the best way

Shore- where the entity is should be a factor.

Shriberg- if it was non-profit partners vs. the State Legislature

Brix- do we need to specify a larger entity?

Shriberg- the number doesn't seem like the right thing but I don't have any other suggestions

Appleyard- you could say only action from the city, from an agreeable party, etc...

Brix- to some extent that is captured under feasibility but

Shriberg- wouldn't you build from the city to congress?

Brix- City, county, state, federal- Do we need to capture DTE in this as well?

Hookham- might be useful to have a little example in here for how these are structured

Brix- how do folks feel about city implementation as a 10, then lowering as county, state and federal action is required?

Garfield- this is one where we have to make a judgment call between total control and some control

Brix- our internal group walked through a few examples last week and found as a group we were able to come to consensus

Steve- maybe seeing the feasibility part will help and we should leave it like this for now

Shriberg- jurisdiction partners- who legally can do this? In the middle is who are the partners you need to get this done?

Garfield- I'm not sure how you can separate this from feasibility.

Brix- [So we should make changes to this that covers level of jurisdiction and city control](#)

Co-Benefits

Consensus is easier to come by with a lot of opinions in one room

Rubin- how broad are the city's environmental goals?

Kidwell- they are very broad

Brix- good with co-benefits the way it stands?

Bona- yes, we'll see how it plays out

Timeframe

If you're after 2050 it's a bit late, between 2020 and 2050 is good, before 2020 is better, within the next year is best. This may shift based on the targets the task force sets and this can be amended.

Shriberg- I would recommend 2030

Bona- this might be a case where a less linear line is more helpful

Brix- [so we are going to change this to 2020 and 2030](#)

Measurability

What shows up in the data we are able to collect varies. We may not have a way to determine why kind of impact this has on behavior but it may show up in the data we get from DTE. If it's measurable but doesn't show up in the data we can take another step to add it in. Encouraging people to fly less as an example

Hookham- what does your inventory data look like? Source and accuracy may have an impact on numbering and how you weigh it. How things directly impact the city vs. things from outside of the city.

Visibility

Shriberg- a local level is the priority. I was thinking percentages rather than national and international recognition

A would be no one in Ann Arbor knows about it

B would be

C would be

D would be 80% of the people in Ann Arbor could tell you something about it

Appleyard- I can understand why you did it this way but it could also be looked at from a local level

Garfield- I understood it the way Mike means it- more locally

Bona- our goal is to reduce local emissions

Brix- [we'll play with some percentages Mike and change it up](#)

Shore- a rain barrel is an example- ["infecting" others with your ideas](#) (sneezer ideas)

Jenny- maybe we should go back to the Criteria weighting and see if anyone has any changes to make
Brix- good idea. We can also take ones close to each other and round them to be around the same
Shore- is this the mean?

Brix- yes

Garfield- the big picture is an issue. How are we measuring climate impact in this? How are we weighing the value of that as a group? It seems to me that every action we are proposing is valuable because of the impact it will have on climate emissions. That's our goal here but the things we are ranking highest here are feasibility and cost way above impact. My concern about this process is that we are constrained by imagination. I suspect if we go through all of them we would still fall well short of the impact that we want to have on climate emissions. We struggled with this at the state level as well. [You get to the chicken before the egg problem with this](#). I'm concerned about going down this path and finding that our best efforts will get us to a 0.5% emissions reduction.

Without talking about the [bigger ambitious goals/actions](#) we are missing out on a lot of the big picture. I realize there are the constraints of reality but I wanted to throw this out to the group and understand how we plan to measure climate emissions impact.

Hookham- is that the goal of what we are doing here with CAP?

Brix- it will be up to group of how you want to set the goals. We are coming up with ideas and determining how we can close the gap with creative thinking if necessary. The CIP tool is just one lens on the project. It's a short abbreviated response to a much larger issue.

Garfield- I hope we will have an opportunity to look at some creative approaches. I worry that we are looking at feasibility and cost more than the impacts. I'm not sure where high impact difficult to achieve actions will shake out in this

Brix- I think as a group we can state whether or not something is a high priority regardless of how it scores.

Jenny- the scoring is not meant to be the final result.

Appleyard- how much variation was there in how these were prioritized? We people relatively close? The order these things were ranked in

Jenny- there were a couple outliers that swung but putting most of their pot into one area that really shifted things.

Appleyard- it would be interesting to see how the distribution was. Also to determine if we throw out the outliers

Garfield- I think the most important part of this process is to engage the community in what we are doing. It's going to be really hard to do. If this isn't going to be a plan that the city adopts and uses, it won't be useful. Needs to be a way to build interest and I realize it's not an easy thing to do but it's why I'm raising the issue.

Brix- there is public involvement

Rubin- is it part of this process or after this process?

Jenny- it's part of it but there is thought that we'd like to have a draft of it before starting the public engagement

Garfield- I am making a case to increase the importance of impact. Everything I've learned about climate science – these very aggressive targets are probably not even good enough for us. I think in reality it's going to take some quantum leap of community engagement to do that. I hope this process will involve/incorporate that.

Hookham- (IEA) scientists just came out with facts stating that the impacts would be twice as much as originally thought. The data continues to be more striking

Appleyard- the downturn in the global economy is a factor

Brix- [we may want to be aggressive in our target setting is what I am hearing](#)

Hookham/Appleyard- yes

Jenny- sounds like we can [look at the weighting again and send it out to the group, leaving names off](#).

We can also look at [removing the outliers and see how that impacts it](#).

Appleyard- the importance of cost and feasibility is just so we get things done

Steve- I think Mike brings up a good point though

Brix- when Mike said chicken and egg I think he hit the nail on the head here.

Presentation of Homework Continued...

Transportation

The biggest issue was in VMT because where people are living versus where they are working is a big consideration. We broke them down by policies, programs,

T-2: look at other communities in the east coast that do this

T-3: use tools like walkscore

T-4: densify the downtown

T-6: use social and target marketing to try and change behavior. The Get Downtown Program is a good example to look at for residents. Also look at retrofits to make areas more walkable/bikeable

T-10: transportation reauthorization bill will play a factor in this

Shore: [I would add municipalities using zipcars for their fleet instead of having own cars and maintaining them](#)

Transportation Comments/Feedback/Questions:

Brix- [T-18 and R-5 could be combined or stay separate but be sure to make the link](#). This could be under commercial as well. They are tied somehow

Bona- The two challenges of encouraging people to live closer to work and making it more efficient for people who do commute to work. Absorbing 60,000 on the bus system by 2050 likely isn't possible. It's unlikely we can get everyone living in the city, but that will be [a struggle to dis-incentivize what we are trying to incentivize](#).

Hookham- the affordability factor is a big issue with this

Barrott- it also gets wrapped up in the inertia

Hookham- how do you overcome it?

Shore- incentivizing vs. restricting. It may be more effective in some ways, but isn't very likely

Hookham- the east-west light rail would work but not enough people come in from Jackson to make it feasible

Jenny- [local businesses providing incentives to their employees for taking public transit or alternative commuting](#). That funding can also be used to support bicycle. Sort of an expansion of C-6

Shore- depends on the employee size

Jenny- Cities I've worked in have done 10-20 employees

Rebecca- What about employers who are requiring people to get to them without any other method than car?

Shore- in terms of commuting patterns that would be hard to figure out

Bona- I think the employers outside of the transit are probably outside of the Ann Arbor limits

We could campaign to employees to move back into the city limits.

Natural Resources and Waste

Rubin- A lot of this is trying to reduce materials in the purchasing process

Waste

N-3: we didn't know what the city has done thus far

Local Food

Water

N-18: this has been an effective tool but maybe we can get more bang for the buck out of that

N-22: connection with residential housing

N-25: we don't know all the history

Forestry

We know that [Kerry Gray is working on this plan right now so we would look at a lot of the goals/actions established in her plan.](#)

Kidwell- I would also work with [solid waste and Tom to look at the update they are doing](#) to the plan.

Rubin- the public engagement process of all of these and how we engage the public is important

Natural Resources and Waste Comments/Feedback/Questions:

Brix- [N-6 may also want to add bi-weekly recycling.](#) The real challenge becomes remembering when people should put out their recycling. This is all stuff to check out with Tom

Steve- maybe an iphone app

Geisler- the water rate structure is one that is really effective and shows the impact of regulation alone

Rubin- the city doesn't have anything regarding summer days and conservation. Most communities do have something about when you can water and when you cannot

Shore- in regards to local food. St. Joes has turned the large lawn into community gardens. [Maybe an urban food assessment- encouraging community gardens in large open lawn spaces](#)

Brix- many communities have done this- Portland is a good example. Another consideration is opening landfill gas to small businesses – [greenhouses connection there](#)

Rubin- one last thing based on adaptation. The city toyed with [stormwater funds/requirements but paying into some sort of stormwater system is an idea.](#)

Brix- how you allocate cost between newer customers and older customers. It makes so much sense to pay into a big fund

Rubin- One place didn't do an ADA entrance because of the stormwater fund. Those are considerations to take into account

Shore- [Zero-waste events policy](#) if the city closes down the street

Discussion on target setting

Jenny- ICLEI's recommendation process for setting targets is to complete emissions inventory, align goals with existing state or regional goals while reviewing what other communities are doing, then set short, medium and long-term targets. Most cities goals are based on the US Mayors Agreement and Kyoto Protocol.

Connecting to the Michigan Climate Action Plan: That plan has medium and Long term goals; no short term goals.

Ann Arbor currently has a short-term target of 8% reduction by 2015. The question we have is do we want to set the medium and long-term goals right now?

Appleyard- I think it might be a good thing to set them now so we have something to keep in mind and use when working on actions and goals. The further out you get

Geisler- we don't have the U of M 2025 goals up here as well. Maybe to [encourage camaraderie with the University consider that target, since most mid-range goals are 20-30% in that timeframe](#)

Hookham- the scientist in me still wants to know what the inventory is, how the economic crash impacts the inventory, how accurate the inventory is, etc... I agree the long term goal should be 2025 and the medium term goal would be 2020.

Geisler- the University is doing an every-five-year reassessment approach.

Appleyard- there is a part of me that says the goal should be 100% as soon as possible- period.

Barrott- related to that- engaging Ann Arbor citizens politically

Hookham- it would be nice to set in Shore how we are doing it.

Bona- I agree with all of this. I agree setting the goal as high as possible. Just because it fits the list we've come up with. [Setting a goal that's higher than what we can achieved may promote us being more aggressive and being more creative](#)

Hookham- is it too early to ask the general public what they think the reduction levels should be?

Rubin- [the goal is for the public. It shouldn't be completely outrageous but pushes them](#). I don't think we spend too much time on it now.

Barrott- these 8% and 20% don't have any tangibility for residents. Maybe we need to set the goals that are tangible to people. Like getting all homes on solar power or 10 trees on every block. Maybe goals should be translated into something else that are tangible to the community

Geisler- maybe as we do the prioritization we can find the ones that bubble to the top

Bona- that may be the value of setting the short term goals. We can bunch those things we know we can do easily and put those in the 2015 goal list. Then the ones that may change based on technology and through time can be re-evaluated throughout the process and further defined later.

Appleyard- I personally don't think you can ask the public what the percentages are since they are difficult to conceptualize as Wendy said. You have to educate them to come along

Bona- what was U of M's goal?

Geisler- 25% by 2025 with 2006 as their base year.

Appleyard- we should take theirs and know that it's harder. 25 by 2025 has a good ring to it.

Bona- we just have to work harder for it

Jenny- what I hear is [people leaning towards alignment with U of M](#). We can keep that in mind until after the inventory follow-up

Brix- create an inventory folder in google docs

Discussion of models available

Geisler- CAPP is the most comprehensive spreadsheet that breaks up into energy efficiency, waste, energy generation, forestry, etc... It's fed by other models and assumptions.

Starting tomorrow we will go through and see if CAPP captures some of these things.

Everything else done in Excel

Geisler- A new calculator ACEEE that Andrew, Wendy, Matt and I explored. It's more limited than CAPP. It has a lot of depth and variables that can be set.

Another resource is the 2009 PHD pilot

Rubin- are you still doing the Ann Arbor Energy Challenge this spring?

Geisler- we are thinking of doing a modified version of it as part of new A2Energy roll-out, but maybe less focused on one month or so many actions built in.

Steve- does the EPA have any tools to model?

Geisler- yes, many (such as WARM for waste) are built into ICLEI CAPP and CACP

Review overall timeline, confirm future meeting dates

Next meeting is Monday, December 5th is the next meeting date from 10m-12pm