

Western San Juan Community Energy Board meeting
November 15, 2011

3:00-3:45 - EAC's

In attendance: Kim Wheels, Bob Risch, Walter Wright, Randy Barnes, Deanna Drew, John Clark

Review of the "Waste hauling rate comparison" document. Walter walked the group through the document he has just completed. He pointed out that the major discrepancy is in the difference in cost for trash between Ridgway, MV & Telluride. Ridgway's contract has more little details, but is overall about 25% less. Recycling costs are just about the same for everyone across the board. (As an aside, Walter pointed out that all plastics other than #'s 1 & 2 are processed out of the country.) There was some discussion about how to possibly track the comparative volume (or weight) of waste being collected from all the communities. Kim also mentioned that we needed to research whether there is a separate trash contract in Norwood, as well as incorporating Ophir's data (which Randy supplied at the meeting, and is very comparable to Telluride). Comments / questions / items to note will be highlighted in a revised version of the document and then sent to all.

Kim & Walter reported on a group of graduate students from CSU that are researching the potential for a "synthetic gas" plant (generating energy from waste incineration or other process) in the region. Brad Zavorski (who joined the meeting at 3:35) reported that he was aware of the potential project, and that SMPA is supportive.

Kim then mentioned the idea of brainstorming specific projects that all the communities could cooperate on, for example a regional composting effort. She will put this on the agenda for next meeting.

Bob R. mentioned he'd compiled a list of specific action items that have either been accomplished or begun in Ouray County, and suggested that the EAC's from each jurisdiction do the same.

Elaine Fisher joined the meeting via speakerphone at 4:00.

Bob brought up the issue of SMPA transitioning to TWACS 'smart meters' and the controversy that has erupted over the issue. Bob would like our board to formally come out supporting the installation, particularly in light of the potential benefits in terms of energy use reductions. Discussion ensued about how best to proceed. Elaine said she would get with her fellow commissioners on the topic, and the other members of the group will do the same. It was agreed that Kim would try to get a resolution drafted by mid-December, with the help of other board members.

Kim then moved into the Advisory Board section of the meeting, beginning with a presentation of what she's learned about "Fostering Sustainable Behavior" at the recent Community Based Social Marketing (CBSM) workshop. She said she would likely be ready to make a more detailed, in-depth presentation to the group on this process early next year. She also pointed out the major difference between one-time actions (like installing CFL's or low-flow plumbing fixtures) and behavior modifications (like turning off lights or not idling a car). Both of these actions need to be treated differently in program development that includes "Fostering Sustainable Behavior" practices.

She also explained the differences between the SMPA/iCAST program and TNCC's EcoAction program, related to CBSM. The iCAST program is focused on one-time modifications to a building, that typically require significant investment, and thus frequently a bank loan in order to do energy efficiency improvements. TNCC's EcoAction Initiative is focused on the low-hanging fruit items that require a homeowner to engage in making both 1-time modifications and regular behavioral changes, covering all aspects of sustainability.

Kim then moved to the Greenhouse Gas Inventory. She's working on correcting some items in the GHG Inventory and then will send out the final document. Energy per jurisdiction analysis data – all comments from previous discussion have been incorporated or are in process and noted on the sheet. She expressed concern that analysis of the data seems to imply that all the multi-family residential structures weren't included in the residential-specific data (gathered by Jen Coates for her graduate school thesis). Obviously, this could have some impact on the accuracy of our data. Conclusion is that this data will continue to be analyzed and discussed as a group, not yet presented or discussed with specifics to the public until group feels confident in accuracy of the results and comparisons.

The group had a short discussion about electric demand rate structure issues, and the need to educate the general public on how huge demand spikes can cause them to have to pay the "demand rate" which will severely impact their bills. This affects everything from large 'trophy home' type structures to more normal sized structures, but which are extremely energy-inefficient. Brad stressed that the demand rate keeps the cost of the spikes from having to be spread amongst all SMPA members.

Kim also reported that she has been working to clean up and finalize all the GHG data in hopes of having it ready for public presentation (as well as simply having good baseline data). She asked about the ways the group wanted to proceed with these presentations regionally. This will be an ongoing discussion item? The group then turned to the issue of meeting dates in 2012. It was agreed that we would shoot for meeting the second Tuesday of every month (with January's meeting occurring on either the 3rd or the 10th).

Lastly, Kim & Randy reported on the ongoing effort to create a micro-hydro project in Ophir. The project has moved beyond the feasibility study phase and into gathering details based on their specific selected location.

The meeting was adjourned to the first regular meeting of 2012 in January.

Respectfully submitted, Nov. 15th 1011

John Clark