



## CLIMATE CHANGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

September 8, 2009

### MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, September 8, 2009, 2:00 PM at 2250 E. Broadway at the Community Foundation for Southern Arizona, Tucson, Arizona.

---

#### **Primary CCC Members in Attendance**

- Phil Swaim, Swaim Associates
- Paul Green, Tucson Audubon Society
- Pat Patton, UA Eller School of Business
- Jane Poynter, Paragon Space Development Corp
- Varga Garland, Community Food Bank
- Andy Laurenzi, Center for Desert Archeology
- John Schwarz, University of Arizona
- Joanie Sawyer, PRO Neighborhoods
- Tomas Leon, Community Foundation for Southern Arizona

#### **Alternate CCC Members in Attendance**

- Terry Galligan, Old Pueblo Community Foundation
- Barbara Warren, Physicians for Social Responsibility
- Rich Michal, Adolfson and Peterson Construction
- Neil Markowitz, Environmental Education Exchange
- Bryant Nodine, TUSD

#### **Staff in Attendance**

- David Schaller, Office of Conservation and Sustainable Development (OCSD)

#### **Public in Attendance**

- Mariana Gonzalez, Intern with OCSD
- Lee Comrie, PAG
- Sue Cotty, PAG
- Donna Branch-Gilby, Sustainable Tucson

### AGENDA ITEMS

#### **1. Call to Order / Roll Call**

- A quorum was established and the meeting commenced at 2:00 p.m.

#### **2. Welcome and Introductions**

#### **3. Approval of Amended Minutes for August 11, 2009**

- Jane Poynter moved to approve the August 11, 2009 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Tomas Leon. Motion passed unanimously by a voice vote of 9 to 0.

#### **4. Legislative Updates**

- Mayor and Council resumed their regular meeting schedule in September.

- Waxman-Markey is now in the Senate committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

## **5. General Updates**

- David Schaller reported that OCSD staff has been working with the DOE to refine the City's EECBG application. Funding is expected to be allocated within the coming month.

## **6. Presentation and discussion about carbon trading/economics**

- Staff distributed copies of a Carbon Management Overview sheet that outlines different approaches to financing greenhouse gas reducing measures.
- One approach is to ban certain products (that require high energy use), which takes them out of commerce entirely. It was commented that one way to do this is to look at all the externalities related to energy production, which is something that the ACC is looking into.
- Feebates- a fee that penalizes the use of products that have negative consequences. This is a revenue-neutral approach because the money that is collected from the fee is used to underwrite the up-front cost of products that use less energy but that may be more expensive. For example, a fee on vehicles that have low MPG can be used to provide rebates to people buying hybrid vehicles.
- Carbon tax- the tax is implemented early in the process, at the point at which the product is extracted or imported so the tax will trickle down to every product that is made with the product (i.e. oil).
- It was asked if economic analyses are conducted to determine how much the tax should be based on the damage function of the product. Staff commented that cost analyses are primarily used to determine the price of the taxes based on how much the price will offset use.
- Barbara will email a report on externalities to staff so it can be posted on the CCC website.
- Cap and Trade- the cap is lowered over time to gradually reduce the amount of allowable GHG emissions.
- One issue with the EU's cap and trade system was that they initially issued more credits than were needed so the price of the credits crashed, but have since recovered.
- An issue raised is how to deal with imports. For example, China thinks the U.S. or other importing nations should pay for their carbon because the product demand is what is driving production and resulting GHG emissions.
- Carbon Offsets- a price per unit of GHG emissions emitted is paid and the funds are used to pay for projects that sequester carbon. One of the issues with this system is transparency and oversight of the organizations that use the funding for projects to ensure the money is actually being used to offset GHG emissions effectively.

## **7. Discussion of screening criteria for evaluating mitigation measures and initial screening of measures**

- Staff distributed a list of 11 screening criteria for the committee to review.
- Staff reported that Dr. Julia Cole teaches a Global Change course at the UA and her class of undergraduate and graduate students will evaluate the mitigation measures and conduct a cost-benefit analysis. The analysis will be completed by early December.
- Dr. Cole asked that the original list of 103 measures be shortened to a more reasonable number that the class can handle in the 2 months they will be working on the project.
- David, Phil and Jane (the CCC Co-chairs) reviewed the list of 103 measures and reduced it to 61 priority measures. Dr. Cole would like the measures to be ranked in case they can not finish the analysis on all of them.
- Staff distributed copies of 61 priority measures for analysis from the draft greenhouse gas reduction measures inventory.
- The class may not have the skills necessary to provide all of the information on the measures that we need, so additional work may be done by others as well. Because of the changes the City had to make to the EECBG application, there may be a small amount of money available to help with the evaluation.

- Staff will meet with Dr. Cole and her class frequently over the next few months to answer any questions they may have and make sure the committee is getting useful information from their analysis.
- It was commented that the key assumptions for the analysis should be standardized for consistency. For example, using EPA standard data for fuel mix estimates vs. using TEP data for each of the measures.
- It was clarified that the column labeled “status” indicates whether the measure was actually implemented in a given city.
- It was commented that in some cases the assumptions that the calculations are based on may be arbitrary. Is there a way to capture which measures are based on solid data and which may have a greater margin of error? This could be done with a sensitivity analysis.
- It was suggested that one way to narrow the list of measures further is to start with the regulatory measures because it will be more difficult politically to get support for these measures than other voluntary measures so it will be more important to have good data on these measures. A second group of measures can be prioritized if the class has more time.
- Another suggestion was made to start with the measures that can have the greatest impact.
- It was suggested that similar measures can be grouped so work isn’t duplicated.
- David outlined the Denver Climate Challenge, where businesses were challenged to compete and reduce their GHG measures.
- It was asked if staff can evaluate some of the measures. David indicated that there may be some EECBG funding available to help.
- The expected GHG emissions impact is the most important data point to get for each measure.
- Another way to prioritize the measures is to start with the ones that have been implemented elsewhere because there is data available.
- Some of the screening criteria don’t require data analysis and the committee can start evaluating the measures against those criteria while the class is working on the evaluation.
- It was commented that the class should look at all of the measures that were included in the Denver analysis, plus measures that have been completed in other cities.
- It was suggested that the screening criteria be prioritized for each measure so the committee can get the GHG emissions impact numbers back first and then the class can evaluate the measures against the other criteria.
- It was asked if wastewater treatment GHG emissions are included in the Regional GHG Emissions Inventory. This data was included in the governmental operations portion of the inventory and will be addressed in the City’s internal sustainability plan. City government operations contribute 2% of Tucson’s GHG emissions and an even smaller percent is from water.
- A three part mitigation plan was suggested: low-hanging fruit (biggest bang for the buck), low-cost measures that may have a small impact but are easy to implement, and long-term policy changes that are needed to change the trajectory of the community over time so we can continue to see increases in GHG reductions.
- It was commented that a real culture shift is going to be necessary to implement all of the measures successfully. Some of the regulatory measures themselves will cause a culture shift.
- It was commented that educational measures won’t be enough. But, they are still low-cost measures that can help enable a culture shift in the community.
- Education is included in the committee’s Roadmap for the Mitigation Plan in the spring. This will provide another opportunity to start educating the public about GHG mitigation.
- A suggestion was made to keep the list of 61 measures, but prioritize them in groups of 30 for the class.
- Staff was directed to group the measures into related areas and request further analysis be conducted first on those measures that have been implemented by other jurisdictions.
- Water was identified as an important evaluation criterion because the committee doesn’t want to implement a measure that increases water use.
- It was commented that there aren’t any food-related measures included in the inventory. Staff commented that this is because the City can’t regulate food production and the mitigation

plans reviewed from other cities don't include food-related measures. Food will be addressed in the Adaptation Plan. It was suggested that the committee still get educated about food-related costs.

- Agriculture is included in California's adaptation plan.
- It was suggested that the Mitigation Plan include a section that addresses the issues that the City can't regulate so those aspects aren't ignored.
- Staff will email the matrices of GHG emissions mitigation measures to the committee. CCC members were asked to email comments on the measures to David Schaller by September 22nd.

#### **8. Creation of subcommittees**

- The Adaptation subcommittee will have their first meeting in September. Any member of the CCC can attend the meeting as a member of the public.

#### **9. Future Agenda Items**

- a. Education about building energy use
- b. Discussion of mitigation measures related to building energy use
- c. Update from Adaptation subcommittee
- d. Update from UA team conducting analysis of mitigation measures

#### **10. Call to the Audience**

- The USGBC Annual GreenBuild conference will be held in Phoenix November 11<sup>th</sup> -13<sup>th</sup>.
- Lee Comrie from PAG distributed a brochure with the community's GHG emissions information from the Regional GHG Emissions Inventory.
- Donna Branch-Gilby commented on the importance of the CCC's work and role in pushing the needed culture change.

#### **11. Adjournment** at 4:03 p.m.