City of Lawrence
Mayor's Climate Protection Task Force
April 29, 2008 (4:00 PM) Meeting notes

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Mike Dever, David Dunfield, Steve Hughes. Chad Luce. Carey Maynard-Moody, Susan Rodgers, Simran Sethi, Jeff Severin, Dan Simons, Charles Gruber, John Geist, Bridgett Chapin
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Jeff Novorr
STAFF PRESENT:	Cynthia Boecker, Tammy Bennett, Brandon Womack, Kathy Richardson, Meghan Dodge
PUBLIC PRESENT:	Michael Almon
GUESTS:	Dennis Murphy, Beth Johnson

HOUSEKEEPING NOTES:

- Brandon Womack is the engineering intern who prepared the greenhouse gas inventory. He is attending this meeting, but will be leaving Lawrence for a professional position in May. Meghan Dodge will be working on the projects as needed for this task force.
- Three members of the task force will attend the MARC Sustainability Workshop – John Geist, Carey Maynard-Moody, and Susan Rodgers.
- Website enhancement: Staff regularly updates the Climate Protection Task Force website with additional resources, as those come to staff attention. Reference: http://www.lawrenceks.org/climate_protection --> resources link.

GREENHOUSE BASELINE REPORT – follow up discussion

- Task force member did not present follow up discussion items on the inventory report.
- Comparison to other communities:
    - Brandon contacted ICLEI to obtain comparative information from other communities who have completed their greenhouse gas inventories. ICLEI staff was clear in discouraging comparisons between cities and would not provide any specific emissions information. The focus of the inventory and climate protection plan should be on improving your cities performance over time. There are too many variables to compare cities directly. [General reluctance to compare emissions data between communities was confirmed later by Dennis Murphy, with examples of why it is not an effective or meaningful strategy.]
    - In an effort to obtain some comparative information for the task force, as requested, Brandon made contact with a number of comparison cities (list provided by city auditor) to get emissions data. A spreadsheet was presented with that emission information and is attached.
    - Discussion of comparison cities: The list of comparison cities provided by the auditor were determined for general governmental purposes to be appropriate comparisons based on the following factors: low population density, similarities of populations (demographics, education, income), trends in housing stock (e.g., 50% of housing built since 1978), and so on. The cities were not selected as comparison cities for this specific project and may have very different economic bases and patterns of greenhouse gas emissions.
- Electric data for municipal operations: A chart was distributed showing electric use (in dollars) by various facilities and work groups in the city. This will be a tool for targeting high use operations.

KANSAS CITY CLIMATE PROTECTION TASK FORCE PROCESS – Dennis Murphy

Dennis Murphy, Chief Environmental Officer for the City of Kansas City, Missouri, presented the efforts of that community to complete their greenhouse gas emissions inventory and establish a public process for creating their climate protection plan. KCMO has a steering committee (11 members) and 4 workgroups (approximately 20 members each). Detailed information on the make-up, activity, and progress of the Kansas City initiatives are found in the PowerPoint presentation attached.

KCCP Powerpoint
4.13.07.ppt

Primary lessons learned to date:

- <u>Partnerships.</u> Build partnerships among broad range of community leaders including diverse interests and perspectives. The ultimate recommendations will carry more weight politically, and many of the players needed to implement changes will already be on board.
- <u>Connect the dots.</u> Things are often connected in ways not inherently obvious. Find things that meet multiple goals (e.g., save money and reduce greenhouse gas).
- <u>Technology is not the solution.</u> Technology will be part of the solution in the end, but the solution is going to require behavioral change!

CHAMBER GROW GREEN INITIATIVE – Beth Johnson

Beth Johnson, Vice President Economic Development, presented briefly on the Chamber of Commerce Grow Green Initiative. One of the primary focuses is education. This may be a good opportunity for partnership or collaboration between the Chamber of Commerce and the Climate Protection Task Force. One of the first initiatives is a GREEN CHECKLIST for local businesses. The checklist is designed to recognize smaller environmental achievements in an effort to encourage more significant environmental changes. She is willing to work with the task force at any time.

TASK FORCE STRUCTURE / SUBCOMMITTEES – Chairperson Michael Dever

The task force was not able to have extensive discussion regarding structure and subcommittees within the time constraints of the meeting. A summary was provided that highlights some organizational units used by other communities in developing a climate protection plan. Chairperson Dever will develop some recommendations for subcommittees or work groups. He requests each task force member respond via e-mail before the next meeting. In addition, he requested that members begin brainstorming a list of community leaders who would be good appointees for the work groups.

FUTURE MEETINGS:

May 27, 2008	4:30, City Commission room	▪ Subcommittee structure, charge to work groups, and brainstorm work group membership ▪ Current efforts (municipal government) o Utilities Department (Environmental Management System) o Other
June 24, 2008	4:30, City Commission room	To be determined
July 22, 2008	4:30, City Commission room	To be determined
August 26, 2008	4:30, City Commission room	To be determined
September 23, 2008	4:30, City Commission room	To be determined
October 28, 2008	4:30, City Commission room	To be determined
November 25, 2008	4:30, City Commission room	To be determined

COMPARABLE COMMUNITIES SUMMARY & COMPARISON

1990 Equivalent CO_2 Emissions Breakdown by Sector (eCO2 Tons)									
City	Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Transportation	Waste	Other	Total	Population	Tons/Capita
Davis, California	53,222	46,601		131,905	(6,528)	0	225,200	52,711	4.3
Bloomington, Indiana	--	--	--	--	--	0	764,588	60,633	12.6
Bellingham, Washington	--	--	--	--	--	0	736,094	52,179	14.1
Lawrence, Kansas	361,966	374,775	281,562	204,501	11,316	1,007,570	2,241,690	65,608	34.2
Missoula, Montana	281,897	297,224	866,199	227,660	159,440	0	1,832,420	42,918	42.7

2000 Equivalent CO_2 Emissions Breakdown by Sector (eCO2 Tons)									
City	Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Transportation	Waste	Other	Total	Population	Tons/Capita
Bellingham, Washington	230,817	226,662	79,582	419,871	(6,140)	0	950,792	67,171	14.2
Lawrence, Kansas	507,075	527,100	279,685	278,970	33,881	805,152	2,431,863	80,098	30.4

2004 Equivalent CO_2 Emissions Breakdown by Source (eCO2 Tons)									
City	Natural Gas	Electricity	Transportation	Waste	Total	Population			Tons/Capita
Bloomington, Indiana	241,062	322,230	277,394	116,918	957,604	69,247			13.8
Lawrence, Kansas	240,984	1,020,465	312,813	37,730	1,611,992	87,184			18.5

2005 Equivalent CO_2 Emissions Breakdown by Sector (eCO_2 Tons)									
City	Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Transportation	Waste	Other	Total	Population	Tons/Capita
Bellingham, Washington	238,880	244,451	102,463	418,512	(6,935)	0	997,371	74,547	13.4
Lawrence, Kansas	534,315	547,816	220,702	320,678	37,536	0	1,661,047	88,541	18.8

GOVERNMENT

2005 Equivalent CO_2 Emissions Breakdown by Sector (eCO2 Tons)									
City	Buildings	Vehicle Fleet	Employee Commute	Streetlights & Traffic Signals	Water/ Sewage	Waste	Total	Population	Tons/Capita
Bellingham, Washington	5,347	1,836	1,640	2,265	9,396	(28)	20,456	74,547	0.3
Lawrence, Kansas	--	--	--	--	--	--	64,927	88,541	0.7

1990 Without the 'Other' Category

1990 Equivalent CO_2 Emissions Breakdown by Sector (eCO2 Tons)									
City	Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Transportation	Waste	Other	Total	Population	Tons/Capita
Davis, California	53,222	46,601		131,905	(6,528)	0	225,200	52,711	4.3
Bloomington, Indiana	--	--	--	--	--	0	764,588	60,633	12.6
Bellingham, Washington	--	--	--	--	--	0	736,094	52,179	14.1
Lawrence, Kansas	361,966	374,775	281,562	204,501	11,316	-	1,234,120	65,608	18.8
Missoula, Montana	281,897	297,224	866,199	227,660	159,440	0	1,832,420	42,918	42.7

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Utilities Operations							
WATER DEPARTMENT	$ 59,265.50	$ 50,789.05	$ 154,640.84	$ 109,775.87	$ 128,662.24	$ 253,344.79	$ 258,458.64
SEWER LIFT	$ 88,644.00	$ 83,318.10	$ 87,615.14	$ 114,756.10	$ 112,787.20	$ 109,746.94	$ 126,726.20
KAW WATER PLANT	$ 209,507.50	$ 220,723.63	$ 88,774.61	$ 129,611.12	$ 109,262.47	**	**
WASTE WATER PLANT	$ 283,864.14	$ 334,790.04	$ 372,450.52	$ 365,397.45	$ 381,285.74	$ 404,445.38	$ 400,456.57
CLINTON WATER PLANT	$ 139,308.26	$ 151,004.60	$ 148,671.62	$ 142,468.10	$ 143,343.31	$ 180,397.12	$ 154,669.44
Buildings and facilities							
BLDG & GROUNDS	$ 58,322.52	$ 63,259.53	$ 55,163.12	$ 57,948.16	$ 59,969.12	$ 71,521.09	$ 67,193.51
CARNEGIE ARTS CENTER	$ -	$ 11,773.08	$ 1,118.70	$ 541.54	$ 546.32	$ 728.16	$ 543.56
LAWRENCE ARTS CENTER	$ 7,102.80	$ 24,093.65	$ 35,761.86	$ 35,937.02	$ 36,659.38	$ 46,183.97	$ 43,414.38
COMMUNITY HEALTH FACILITY	$ 63,821.22	$ 64,983.51	$ 62,425.60	$ 63,427.47	$ 65,849.85	$ 80,239.38	$ 78,921.05
POLICE WEST	$ 24,668.82	$ 25,895.65	$ 24,655.05	$ 33,821.60	$ 38,533.98	$ 38,069.92	$ 36,322.28
NEIGHBORHOOD RESOURCES	$ 3,143.18	$ 7,283.11	$ 7,548.00	$ 7,456.68	$ 7,286.81	$ 7,453.67	$ 7,414.33
MUNICIPAL COURT	$ 5,046.31	$ 5,496.23	$ 5,557.75	$ 6,091.64	$ 6,580.98	$ 6,838.72	$ 7,177.17
PARK ADMIN/HUMAN RES		$ 1,893.72	$ 4,021.73	$ 4,502.75	$ 4,940.87	$ 5,891.50	$ 5,914.05
Parks and recreation							
PARKS DEPARTMENT	$ 137,458.62	$ 126,358.41	$ 123,905.02	$ 121,704.32	$ 124,912.96	$ 156,434.20	$ 174,314.80
CEMETERY	$ 1,714.74	$ 1,879.80	$ 1,955.66	$ 1,561.73	$ 1,390.94	$ 1,378.08	$ 1,385.20
UP DEPOT	$ 5,248.00	$ 5,571.21	$ 6,087.84	$ 5,948.52	$ 5,806.00	$ 6,578.78	$ 6,035.04
MUNICIPAL GOLF	$ 14,525.11	$ 14,485.43	$ 14,169.82	$ 13,317.44	$ 13,805.95	$ 17,561.97	$ 15,832.08
POOLS	$ 68,085.95	$ 107,874.02	$ 100,743.82	$ 97,853.03	$ 91,171.79	$ 103,140.49	$ 97,610.85
YSI		$ -			$ 33.09		$ 5,839.84
Fire Medical operations							
FIRE & MEDICAL	$ 36,505.34	$ 42,952.25	$ 43,385.27	$ 42,614.66	$ 45,239.16	$ 46,800.24	$ 54,389.70
Public Works operations							
AIRPORT	$ 12,968.45	$ 16,630.49	$ 14,925.26	$ 15,443.49	$ 14,786.87	$ 15,845.47	$ 15,996.38
CITY GARAGE	$ 14,340.48	$ 15,336.57	$ 15,316.73	$ 14,255.49	$ 15,078.09	$ 16,564.25	$ 17,496.18
SANITATION	$ 123.02	$ 117.14	$ 102.27	$ 102.06	$ 90.10	$ 134.10	$ 138.60
PUBLIC PARKING	$ 14,178.01	$ 36,971.49	$ 38,314.63	$ 37,974.71	$ 37,736.62	$ 40,728.59	$ 39,382.50
CIVIL DEFENSE SIRENS	$ 1,258.85	$ 1,293.12	$ 1,245.60	$ 1,244.17	$ 1,154.41	$ 1,513.48	$ 1,502.36
HHW BLDG 320 NE INDUSTRIAL LN	$ 7,312.63	$ 7,875.90	$ 7,985.03	$ 8,378.11	$ 9,016.84	$ 9,794.12	$ 9,551.46
HHW BLDG 1140 HASKELL	$ 643.16	$ 819.66	$ 825.96	$ 818.99	$ 659.78	$ 744.94	$ 1,001.31
HHW BLDG 23RD & BARKER	$ 280.25	$ 597.51	$ 945.68	$ 915.56	$ 2,514.79	$ 2,628.72	$ 1,795.07
HHW BLDG 711 E 23RD SHED	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 454.95	$ 647.33
THE LEVY/STORMWATER PUMPS	$ 12,394.82	$ 7,143.21	$ 7,571.76	$ 11,971.56	$ 14,135.04	$ 12,573.59	$ 12,020.21
Street lights, area lights, signals							
PARKING LOT	$ 13,391.67	$ 13,629.22	$ 13,520.50	$ 14,007.58	$ 14,072.92	$ 12,795.37	$ 10,006.06
STREET *(traffic signals, school beacons)*	$ 69,446.92	$ 74,348.21	$ 72,957.89	$ 72,921.76	$ 67,644.05	$ 75,368.61	$ 71,463.36
SPACE LIGHT	$ 15,464.05	$ 14,776.54	$ 12,846.57	$ 12,531.80	$ 13,276.56	$ 18,430.20	$ 21,042.30
DECORATIVE STREET LIGHTS							$ 117.12
Totals	$ 1,368,034.32	$ 1,533,964.08	$ 1,525,209.85	$ 1,545,300.48	$ 1,568,234.23	$ 1,744,330.79	$ 1,744,778.93
EXPENDITURES FOR STREET LIGHT PROGRAM							
BY YEAR (per fixture charge)	$ 439,423.11	$ 452,565.43	$ 487,600.86	$ 492,262.23	$ 493,772.92	$ 550,485.93	$ 536,760.69

** Verifying Annual Data from Utilities Department

General reference information for the Climate Protection Task Force

SAMPLE information break-down from Climate Action Plans or work-group structures

Climate Protection Manual for Cities

Chapter breakdowns:

- Municipal operations (buildings, infrastructure, municipal transportation, waste reduction / recycling, municipal purchasing programs, utilities)
- Municipal interface with business and residents (business, climate friendly residences, residential transportation
- Long term initiatives
    - Urban planning
    - Agriculture
    - Transition to alternative fuels
    - Sustainable energy
    - Education
    - Waste management

Kansas City, Missouri

Planning section outline

- Policy, research, planning, education
- Energy efficiency in the built environment
- Transportation and land use planning
- Energy resources
- Carbon offsets

Work group organization

- Steering Committee
    - Carbon offsets and waste management work group
    - Energy work group
    - Policy and outreach work group
    - Transportation work group

Madison, Wisconsin

Not clear that a subcommittee approach was used, but the following were categories of recommendations:

- Energy
- Transportation
- Solid waste and recycling
- City government

Cambridge, Massachusetts

Established short, medium, and long-term goals in each of the following)

- Energy
- Transportation
- Land use, buildings, vegetation management
- Waste management

Fort Collins, Colorado

Report sections:

- General
- Energy
- Transportation
- Solid waste
- Vegetation

	• Purchasing / city administration • Climate change education and outreach Completed a separate document for their Municipal Climate Protection Plan: Included sections on utilities, transportation services, operations services, natural resources department, building and zoning, parks division, forestry, and purchasing.
Seattle, Washington	
	Climate Action Plan report sections (updated 2006): • Reduce Seattle dependence on cars • Increase fuel efficiency and use of bio-fuels • Achieve more efficient and cleaner energy to our homes and businesses • Build on Seattle's leadership • Sustain our commitment
US Mayor's Climate Action Handbook	
	Suggested sample actions / measures: • Land use (including urban forestry) • Transportation • Green power • Energy efficiency • Green building • Water and wastewater management • Recycling and waste reduction • Education and outreach

SAMPLES of greenhouse gas emission reduction goals:

Community / other	Base year	Target year	Reduction goal
Kyoto protocol	1990	2012	7% decrease
Kansas City, Missouri	2000	2020	30% reduction (gov't operations goal) 20% reduction (community wide goal, pending)
Minneapolis, Minnesota	1988 1988	2012 2020	12% decrease in CO_2 emissions Long term goal to decrease CO_2 emissions by 20% by 2020
Cambridge, Massachusetts	1990	2010	20% decrease
Fort Collins, Colorado	1990	2010	30% decrease based on worst-case scenario for 2010 emissions
Madison, Wisconsin	1990		7% decrease (community wide goal) 20% decrease (internal gov't operations)
Carbondale, Colorado	2004		25% reduction (community wide and government operations)
Seattle, Washington	1990 1990	2012 2050	7% decrease (Kyoto protocol) Long-term vision is 80% reduction
Norman, Oklahoma	1990 1990	2012 2020	7% decrease by 2012 20% reduction by 2020
Bellingham, Washington	2000 2000 2000 2000	2012 2020 2012 2020	7 % reduction (community wide goal) 28% reduction (community wide goal) 64% reduction (gov't operations goal) 70% reduction (gov't operations goal)