

EAC Meeting 8-17-11
Ridgway, Colorado

Present: Kim Wheels, Ken Haynes, Deanna Drew, Bill Behan, Nina Kothe, Bob Risch, Kurt Johnson

Input on prioritized list of action items from EACs. See Karen G's summary

Karen G's questions include:

1. Do these results make sense?
2. Does the group believe that these results accurately represent the priorities that this group should work on together for the next 2 - 3 years? 1 year?
3. Are there any items that were not ranked high by the group that any EAC feels strongly should have been and therefore needs more discussion?

Kim sorted the list by priority total for group discussion. Group felt that TNCC could review, reduce any duplication, assess or assign specific actions under different items, and give some indication of measurables.

Kim wanted input on whether anything was missing. Showed the list of potential specific projects to request GHG emission info on from UCD. Question about transportation addressed in terms of it being a regional issue that is currently being worked on through a larger collaboration – Region 10.

Energy Data Management – recommendation from Trident Energy was to try to get everyone on the same Energy Management Program. Would be great if all jurisdictions would use the same one. One is Energy Navigator – through Garfield County and CLEER. Deanna liked this. Gunnison County uses Planet Footprint. Kim will be contacting both for input. Costs are apparently similar. Energy Navigator is 'live data management'. Tool can be put on a building to view and manage daily energy use through smart meters. We could compare building to building with all using (western slope).

Has been some talk about TNCC helping with energy tracking. Right now CLEER is doing it. Could be delegated to TNCC. Does every entity have to purchase and provide startup costs?

Deanna suggested a pros and cons of each with exact costs, start up and ongoing, how they compare data, etc.

How many buildings in the system have buildings with at least \$20K a year in energy costs?

Question about Smart Meters. Brad Z joined the meeting. They should be installed within 18 months.

Is it by meter or by building? **Would smart meters be compatible with Energy Navigator? Brad will check on this and work with the group.**

Brad- it's a unit that goes inside the meter. Meter has to be changed and then the smart card will be installed. (It's NOT a smart grid – important distinction.) AMI – automated metering infrastructure. Info goes back to the substations via power lines. Signal comes with the electricity – riding piggyback with the power. From the substation to SMPA they use whatever is affordable – cellular signal.

Folks are worried about EMFs associated with this. But this is contained in a conduit wire underground at least to the substation. Will give consistent billing cycles. Nina offered to be the guinea pig to help determine costs.

Question about capabilities of AMI with SMPA. How much info could be gathered? Real time energy usage is the goal. Could governments request prioritization once initial testing is done? Brad said it's prioritized by engineering – places that will test the entire route. Brad noted that they are planning on doing it by routes.

It's on ongoing data management tracking system to help troubleshoot energy uses.

Nina had a question about past data. Kim noted they can input up to two years of past data. Length of contract, ROI are questions. Ouray already does track in house. The live tracking might be helpful, but for smallest govts may not be worth it.

Brad asked about on-line bill payment, it will give you up to 18 months of your bills. You don't actually have to pay online, but sign up for it.

Future Funding Discussion

Kim highlighted items from the CEC funding proposal document. Current funding ends by July 2012. GEO is not looking to provide grants but rather technical assistance and coordination. They are working on a pitch to foundations to help provide supplemental funding in the future.

Jen Coates and Stu Fraser joined the meeting. 4:05

GEO shifting some to Economic Development focus.

John Clark joined the meeting. 4:07

CEC exist for every jurisdiction in the state. Being looked at as a potential model for the nation. Reviewed budget for past two years and are on track for rest of grant.

Kim would like input from EACs on CEC position. Ken suggested we review what we're working on as a group before looking at the budget. Kim thought that the group efforts would be a part (potentially small) of the CEC activities, but not all of it. Reviewed CEC job description.

Kurt suggested that each EAC could look at the list and determine what would be useful to support the EACs. The lens would be the extent to which the items would help them reach their goals. Stu noted that the EACs don't have responsibility for the citizens' energy – only their government. TNCC is still the entity that will look to work with the citizens. (Stu's energy use is down 12%).

Kurt wanted to discuss that issue. Other governments do plan and implement programs that affect their citizens. Stu noted the govt can encourage, put out challenges, etc. but does not have the ability to MAKE people make change. Stu felt that they try to put programs in place that the citizens can follow. Nina talked about 'ordinance' being a huge discussion with the citizenry. People resist being told that they 'have to do' something. Example is locking trash containers. It's the path of most resistance.

Building codes is an area where govts can 'do it'. But it is hard and does take time. It is Nina's understanding that her main focus is things she has direct control over – then when she can – she can work on other things with permission of commissioners and her supervisor (example: compost facility, hazardous waste). Ken noted as a volunteer EAC he will have to limit his duties and work directly with the governments on their energy reduction. If they decide on ordinances he will help, but he won't do community outreach unless he's being paid or directed by Norwood.

Deanna feels responsible for govt, commercial and residential at MV. Government facilities are such a small piece of the pie. But – she is not a volunteer. Kurt is a volunteer and is happy to knock on doors. Noted that there are only 74 homes in his community and that makes a difference.

Stu noted that with smaller communities, limited staff and limited budget things are different than in communities like Aspen and Boulder. Brad noted it might help to go back to the first 6 months to the mission and vision. Action items included all at the start – and it's now changed.

Kim noted that Boulder has the funds in the govt to hire a Sustainability Action Coordinator that does an outreach to the community. Govts here funded TNCC to work on this, but it is different that the govt having a staff to do so. Their success stories are not necessarily what you'd expect.

Nina was adamant about her position only dealing with govt energy. Jen added that is a key question. **Does the CEC role continue in some way and does TNCC take on some supportive role with the other govts. CEC – does it have value? YES. What is that value? Technical resources, filtering the larger national and international information, is there a price to put on those meetings and updates. Jen believes there is – and will ask for their commitment in 2012 through the budget process.**

Second piece is TNCC – EcoAction, GBRs, etc. TNCC has shared resources and information. Is there a price on that? YES. Jen said it might be more of a fee for service type approach. There is value in a cohesive, well-rounded conversation that TNCC can help provide. They would like to see a price on those services.

Stu - Everyone is looking for quantifiable actions and TNCC may morph into a contractual or fee for service relationship with more entities.

Kris responded that this kind of input was exactly what was requested. CEC funding is one thing, potential TNCC efforts another. Kim requested that each person give it some thought and respond back.

GEO is **hoping** to be able to match any funding committed through foundation support.

Kurt – the philosophical question is: does the responsibility for measurable results lie with the EACs or TNCC?

Stu – TOTs EAC is responsible to work on govt reduction of GHG and energy use. Don't have the money for a full time person just for that. All but Deanna will be focused on govt. Others will have to follow. Education always happens.

Ken – CEC can help keep everyone on the same page, keep data in same systems, etc.

Deanna asked if TNCC was coming before each govt.

Earliest for ToT is Sept 13th.

Govts could make a list of things that they do annually that affect more than just governmental energy use for distribution. Hazardous waste, zero waste....

EACs will provide ancillary info to their residents in addition to their govt goals.

Kim reported on other Region 10 CECs and proposal for application for HUD Sustainable Communities. ORE is taking lead on pre-application for that grant. Kim will update EACs later.

GHG Inventory and Presentations – working with Z to provide recommendations – requested all look at email for things they UCD need to provide GHG reductions for – and see if anything is missing. Nina wanted to add TRANSIT to that.

Presentation given at Sustainable Communities workshop noted that transportation (about 20%) of pie, getting the numbers are very challenging – as is waste. For future discussion.

Draft does include benchmarks for GHG against other communities. Might affect the items chosen for actions. Would like to review again (in final form) prior to giving presentations to govt. Request from group okay for Kurt to present draft data as is at Ophir tonight.

Brad noted all their recommendations are targeted at the region, not town-specific. Kim noted it is a Regional GHG inventory.

Brad Zaporski – SMPA – info on Demand Charges

KW – measures **DEMAND** also measures **CAPACITY**

kWh – measures **USAGE**

showed a chart with KW over time = load profile

Must build (have the responsibility) generation to provide as much energy as people want to use within their service territory. Must build generation for DEMAND, not USAGE.

How much you pay for your energy doesn't depend so much on fuel costs but rather the generation (and building generation costs). Demand is a moment in time.

SMPA – like a big ice cream company with no freezer. Must make it right when people want it. No storage for SMPA on utility scale.

When they charge for Demand on a distribution level. They have to build transmission to meet that peak.

Rate making – an art and a science. Cost causation – they want people to pay for the costs they cause SMPA to have (facilities reinforcement).

Happens all over the country and world. Level and amounts vary

20kw is the threshold. If they hit 20 kw for any average rolling 15 minute interval during the day they are automatically on a demand rate. Regular meters do not measure demand only usage.

Could be used as an alternative to incline block rates. The rate charges more money to the people who cause more demand currently. SMPA gets charged for demand just like members do.

The tariff is in place for demand. Big energy users are paying a lot. SMPA is going for a tiered system. At 4000 kwh/month members will get a letter. "You're using a lot of energy, we will work with you." But if you keep it up you may get a demand rate. At 5000 they will install a new meter that will measure better. May not put demand charge in place. When someone hits 20kw in the 15 min. they will go on demand UNLESS they come in and create an approved plan.

Meeting ended 5:13 pm