

Eagle County Community Climate Action Plan
Stakeholder Meeting Notes
August 22, 2016

This is the fifth of six stakeholder meetings to create a Climate Action Plan for the Eagle County Community. The focus of the plan is to recommend goals and projects to reduce greenhouse gas emissions throughout Eagle County.

Next stakeholder meeting: November 14, 2016

Today's Goals:

- GHG data forecasting presentation from Dr. Abel Chavez, Western State CO University
- Review and discuss feedback on draft climate action plan
- Discuss ideas for adoption and implementation of the plan

Stakeholder Questions for Dr. Abel Chavez during his presentation (see presentation slides)

Can we assume a similar reduction from commercial as residential? Answer: Yes.

Are the lines on the Eagle County GHG graph (wedges for buildings, transportation, energy, landfill, etc.) cumulatively stacked or independent? Answer: cumulative

Does the data forecasting for residential buildings take into account large-size second homes? Answer: no, but data could be forecasted in the future with more information

Did you take into account the change in renewable portfolio when considering charging vehicles? Answer: no, this does not take into account the electric grid for surface travel since 99% is still fossil fuels.

For large companies and data centers that are incorporating clean energy offsite, how do you account for that? For example, Apple in Nashville purchases solar energy from Utah, how do you account for that?

Is there a common metric in terms of commodity prices? Or simplified model? Answer: if we increase price of electricity, yes, we can include that. This model assumes flat prices. We could use Colorado's energy price to calculate.

What was included in landfill emissions? Answer: conversion factor from tons of waste dumped at landfill.

Is it feasible/possible to measure financial impact of switching to renewables? What is the cost per wedge? Answer: 100% renewables is one thing and smart planning is another item that will be costly. That can be calculated (but currently don't have calculations).

Review and Discussion of Stakeholder Feedback on Draft Climate Action Plan

What should be the title of the plan?

“Valley” is more personal to people who live here than “county.”

GHG emissions measurements includes all of Eagle County, so keep the geography of the data we are using in mind. The math is based on the Eagle County boundaries.

Define Eagle County upfront as a boundary, not focusing on government.

County-wide is OK with town stakeholders.

The “valley” excludes some parts of County.

It’s not the County staff planning dept. that is creating the plan, it’s community members in the room (stakeholders).

A lot of actions may be by sector, community, school district, etc. – we want this to include city, unincorporated, etc. We want the name to reflect whole group (not just the county).

Take focus off county government and emphasize county-wide community participation.

It’s about the people, not the government.

Keep it short and sweet.

Stakeholder agreement on title: *climate action plan for the Eagle County community*.

What should the tone of the language in the plan be?

How to balance seriousness without being too gloomy?

It was obvious more than one person wrote this. Edit to make it in one voice/tone. Make it consistent.

Appreciated the reality and seriousness and the aspiration.

It was too negative, a lot of people know what climate changes is. There are still deniers. If it’s too negative, then there’s increased apathy. We need more aspirational tone and highlight solutions.

What about including that we are higher than average emissions per capita?

- It lends credibility. We know we have a problem.
- Helps with call to action.
- It’s forthright and could win over some naysayers – we’re showing the data.
- The plan says that some of the impacts have been felt, but we don’t say what they are. We should include more examples of the impacts locally.
- The ‘why now’ paragraphs are a little doomsday
- Colorado data should be worked into the doomsday – include in the why now paragraphs. You can refer to studies earlier on in the plan.
- We should include that the county has higher than average and include a note that it’s because of tourism.

- Planning documents are written at a high level, when you include stats, it dates the plan then it makes it a short range plan rather than long term.
- We should highlight health aspect – speak to community values – emissions have health impacts and this will resonate with community members (for example the landfill emissions)
- Tone is important in this topic – will lose leaders if we're making excuses (because of visitors/tourism). Don't make excuses for the per capita stats.

Make it about the community, togetherness, draw people in, make them feel included, change has to happen in collaboration. Highlight values.

Success means the plan needs to support/relate to community values.

There's a very small full time population, people might ask how we're going to force the tourism/second home owners to be more efficient and start finger pointing. We need to have an answer for how we address ski/tourism industry.

We need to include visitors as part of the community, there's a group of people who are second home owners and feel part of the community. Let's ask them what message works.

How much emphasis should be put on fuel switching and infrastructure and transportation options?

Issues of renewables and power plants – There are infrastructure and technology challenges. Renewable technology is 10 years away, not there yet. We still need to have dispatchable generation.

The reality of what we can accomplish – local utilities' goal is to keep cost of energy low while meeting renewable energy goals, while keeping power on. They will buy from best option. Hard for community to emphasize renewables because out of our control. It should be a long-term policy, not our first achievable goal. It's a broader policy, like state level, but not local.

Energy efficiency is more tangible and impactful. Let's focus on what we can do – like energy efficiency

Eco-miles – there could be a tangible recommendation. Ex: 25% of miles on electric vehicles.

Do we want to spend money on natural gas? You would have to drastically upgrade infrastructure, meaning it would have to be the focus for substantially amount of time for payback. Or wait 5-10 years for EV technology. Let's focus on hybrids and electric vehicles.

Priority should be actionable items that people and towns can do.

The transportation wedge is a big one. Communities can buy into, for example, making electric bikes legal.

If you're looking at hybrids and electric vehicles, it sets an example to the community and they are accepting that mode of transportation. Get the community involved by demonstrating use of electric vehicles.

During public open houses, we can highlight local resources like Energy Smart and rebates for electric vehicles in Colorado, and other things people can do on their own.

Large multi-family is considered split between commercial because of large boilers and part residential (each unit is on a meter for residential) but the common area is commercial (like garage, halls, etc).

What is considered multi-family? 4 or more units.

What about proposing use of the railroad lines through the county?

There was a suggestion for a commuter rail line.

Elected officials have been discussing this topic for 20 years, and been told repeatedly “no” from Union Pacific. They say they need the line as a backup in case of emergency. Is it something we want to include when we can’t expect UP to change their mind. Is it a reasonable recommendation?

The goal is to get locals around the valley and reduce miles.

Is there an opportunity for more direct routes? We’re embarking on transportation development plan over the next 8 months we’ll be looking at that.

The Roaring Fork Valley has a direct bus route and it’s heavily used by locals.

We should mention solutions so people/readers of the plan know it was discussed, not ignored.

Cities like Zurich are taking out public parking and not adding more, forcing residents to use public transportation. It’s a thought that when you plan out \$5 parking daily or \$30 bus pass...it could change behavior.

Public transit isn’t available everywhere, we need more park and ride.

Charging for parking is the best way to get people to carpool, ride bus, etc.

Giving people tangible things you can reference in other places in other sectors, show then that action is being taken in other places. Or highlight what Eco Transit is already doing. Gives readers hope.

The problem to reduce miles is that there is not affordable housing near places where people work. People can’t walk to work.

How should we handle waste diversion? Significant increases in waste diversion from the landfill could put the landfill operations in financial risk.

Keep language easy to understand for reader (not tonnage, that’s confusing). We need to look at it purely as climate impact (not economic).

If you ignore economic impact, you lose audience of people who will pay for it. At least acknowledge economics. It doesn’t work if you can’t pay for it. Pay more as you dump is possible solution.

If we start reducing tipping fees, we have to make that up. Address economics of increasing diversion rates, going to need to charge fees somewhere else.

At a CNG meeting with state folks, one of the ideas is increasing diversion rates, there’s also a methane released that can be used. If you divert, you can’t use the methane.

Everything people are saying is true, how do you weave all these ideas in? If we can present all the information, then each town can decide what to implement in the pick list. How do you include it all to get the thought process going?

Everything costs money, but the current plan is not focused on finances, it's about reducing emissions.

On the 30% by 2025, suggestion for composting, we don't have the infrastructure. Landfill can't handle that, so why would we recommend composting when we don't have an outlet?

Maybe the community decides that cost is too high, but that's a discussion we need to have. We can get anything done if the money is there. Even though right now, we don't have the infrastructure.

The reason we chose these goals is to show that an 80% reduction is going to cause/need a huge change. We're not talking about small changes, but rather massive changes to get to 80% reduction

Hotel industry is biggest culprit of waste. This committee doesn't have restaurant people. Many properties have no recycling bins in rooms. We have to do a better job educating people who visit on opportunities for them to recycle and compost. How much are we educating second home owners? We can do better.

We should ask hotels/businesses about their recycling policy. The hospitality industry needs to get better on educating.

Currently not a local association of hospitality industry. Maybe Vail Economic Advisory Committee an outlet for getting info out about recycling. VVP is another association that is involved with businesses.

The calculation is just the CO2 from tonnage, we have to keep in mind that it's not just CO2, there's also methane and other gases. There are a lot of other factors – transportation, methane, etc. The CO2 measurement does not account for all the GHG.

There's a cost of doing nothing. That's the motivating factor. Not just cost to change, the cost to do nothing. For example, if hotels divert everything to compost/recycling, then there will be other challenges. How can we make it feasible for waste facility to handle all these changes? Community would rather spend money to help than do nothing at all.

How should we include soil and water in the plan?

We removed soil carbon sequestration from list, how should we weave it back in?

Should we include adaptation? This would be included in adaptation

We should add trees/forest management and address development in forested areas.

Since there's proven science about carbon sequestration, it seems important to include. If people don't understand, it may turn them off. If included, make it simple. Be careful how it's included.

Cost of doing nothing. Attach a cost on carbon. The sheer amount of money we're spending on energy. The social cost of carbon is \$36 per metric ton. Like health impacts and other costs. This addresses the cost of action because there is also a cost to do nothing.

Whatever the plan is intended to accomplish – people take notice and it resonates, there's personal actions, there's industry actions. The plan could include motivational factors. We value the health of our families, the recreation, and it has to make sense. Talk in the context of values, rather than climate.

It's important to point out that we adopted percentages based on IPCC recommendations, and their reasons for those percentages. 80% by 2050 GHG reduction target is an effort to keep humanity alive. We have to convey the importance of global climate change.

Tie in the local effort/our values/roles into the larger picture.

How does this become an ongoing thought process? How do you keep reminding yourself to make personal changes and keep thinking about it?

Discussion about Adoption and Implementation of the Plan

This is a long-range plan, creating a roadmap for community and ourselves. What are the first steps, long-term phases, the path?

To keep this an active document, is it worthwhile to have a MOU across municipalities to solidify? Are we trying to get communities to adopt entire plan? Or just a pick and choose approach? Ask businesses to just adopt GHG targets they decide strategy? Should there be an MOU?

Keep in mind that municipalities are independent, we want to give them options.

I like the MOU route and with that you can clearly call out that not every goal/strategy will be applicable to every entity. We're willing to work cooperatively toward larger goals within our capacity. The MOU could include required check in points from entities 3 yrs, 5yrs, etc and require entities to provide data back to group. This will create buy in and accountability for current and future councils and others.

Towns have a variety of types of documents, maybe not an MOU, but there needs to be check ins as boards change, that you re-up the support for CAP. New councils may make changes.

Getting signatures could be a sticking point. Trying to get governments and private industry to endorse could be difficult. Success has been more on encouraging implementation without asking for official commitment. Organizations have to incorporate it into existing plans, rather than adopting new document.

List of signatures, peer pressure into signing, citizens signing could be helpful.

Towns may adopt the plan but not commit to all goals. They could pick and choose policies and action. It would depend what's in the MOU. Move toward how we accomplish MOU's with private sector included.

Keep an MOU very high level. So we're not signing on to specific actions, but rather agreeing with general outline.

As example, the hospital has MOU's for disasters, water, etc. This kind of MOU is not a legally-binding document. It's a statement that we'll work together and do our best. MOU is best way to incorporate

agreement. We could have board sign off on MOU, as long as there are not specific commitments just that we'll try to do our part in the county-wide effort.

If MOU is too formal, maybe Letter of intent Letter of support, etc. So it's not perceived as legally-binding.

MOU's are important, but letter of support, might be a better way. Some form of resolution that recognizes participation in CAP. There needs to be some sort of formal resolution.

First step is the targets. We can ask towns and businesses what they want to sign.

Public meetings will help inform the public and representatives. If public has strong feelings about investments (like housing, transportation), that might help inform the adoption piece. For example, MOU or letter or adoption. Ideas like invest 1% in sustainability.

Remind public to express their thoughts to their leaders, attend councils, etc.

Homebuilders association – we should talk to them.

Anything in Spanish that we could do outreach? Invite Spanish speakers to open houses.

Drop language like mandate/require and include language like support/encourage so it's more empowering, incentives, and encouragement.

Maybe there could be an intergovernmental task force. Also include builders, and other industry. For example, a focus group on building, transportation, other working groups.

The task force and working groups should be included in the LOI.

Call out in plan to include staff resources to participate in task force.

We need to keep working forces in alignment/integrated. Need working groups to talk to each other.

Municipalities should focus on what they can accomplish, like committing to assessing buildings owned in municipality. Like tracking investments like solar and EV's. Same thing for hospitality. Everyone should focus on what they can realistically do.

Upcoming open house sessions (5-7 PM):

- Wednesday September 14 at Brush Creek Pavilion
- Monday September 19 at GrandView in Lionshead
- Thursday September 22 at Miller Ranch Community Room