



City of Madison

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Meeting Minutes - Draft SUSTAINABLE MADISON COMMITTEE

Monday, November 26, 2018

4:30 PM

210 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.
City-County Building, Room 357

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:30 p.m.

Staff present: Jeanne Hoffman, Stacie Reese and Karl van Lith.

Present: 15 - Michael J. Tierney; Rajan V. Shukla; Michael J. Vickerman; Lance E. Green; Sam J. Breidenbach; Jesse J. Shields; Bradley Campbell; Denise DeMarb; Jeannette E. LeZaks; Maria A. Schletzbaum; Kyla H.S. Beard; Richard A. Heinemann; Samuel J. Dunaiski; Joseph M. Ryan and Jessica M. LeClair

Excused: 2 - David Ahrens and Richard J. Pearson

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Breidenbach, seconded by Shields, to Approve the Minutes from September's meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

No meeting in October because of budget deliberations, ergo, no October minutes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jon Becker representing himself. He would like to see the present scenarios in some sort of pull out page for easier review by community members. He does not like the link between Renewable Energy Credits (RECs) and way it currently supports carbon sequestering and nuclear power. He had two questions he would like answered in the next version of the Energy Plan report:

- Q1. What is the energy reduction overall (net) for each of the three scenarios, compared to present day usage? to Business as Usual (BAU) ? How does this compare with efforts like that of MA, where >3%/yr. reductions from BAU forecasts recently were achieved for the first time?
- Q2. For each of the scenarios, if energy conservation overall is maximized, how much can the REC purchases offsetting current carbon emissions be reduced (or repurposed to offset historical emissions)?

Don Ferber-representing himself. Concerned that even with the maximum plan in 2030 that we are still only at a 45% reduction. Also feels we need to broaden the reach of Plan as it deals only with City operations which are only 4% of the electricity used in the community. Feels we need to look at community impacts and engage community more.

Sherrie Gruder-representing self. Agrees with Ferber that limiting plan only to City operations is problematic when most electrical use in community is with commercial buildings. Feels a section should be added to the report that addresses policies to get beyond City operations. Feels change in Governor will get support for green policies to a higher level and that now is the time to act. Can we get more carbon links like trees and parklands into the equations? Will bio-energy sources help us? Feels the need to link City outcomes to greater community.

DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

None.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. [50657](#) Report Regarding 100% Renewable Energy/Zero Net Carbon Goal

Attachments: [Madison 100RE SMC update 2017-2-22.pdf](#)
[SMC Report 4 2 2018 FINAL.pdf](#)
[Madison SMC City Operations - SEG update 2018-04-23.pdf](#)
[Scenario Summary by Department August 2015.pdf](#)
[Final Draft Madison Municipal Energy Analysis June 2015.pdf](#)
[City of Madison 100 Percent Renewable Energy Report - Public Draft.pdf](#)
[Comments on HGA Navigant 100 Renewable Draft Heinemann HGA respons](#)
[DRAFT100RE_SRcomments_10_1_2018_seg_Responses - JA.PDF](#)
[SMC_Draft 100 RE Plan Comments.pdf](#)
[100% RE Plan – Public Comments – Jon Becker \(via email\).pdf](#)
[Updated SMC Draft 100 RE Plan Comments 11 13 2018.pdf](#)
[100% Renewable Madison Report.pdf](#)
[CRANES-MADOPSCAP-Letter to SMC-2018-12-07final.pdf](#)
[100% Renewable Madison Report 2018-12-17.pdf](#)

Mike Barnett (HGA) and Josh Arnold (Navigant) presented a PowerPoint covering the three scenarios, with costs and additional steps that would get City to 100% renewable energy/Zero-net carbon targets by 2020, 2023 and 2030. Heinemann asked for ways that the scenarios could be prioritized and help guide policy makers understand elements of each scenario and also help them look at ways/actions City can take outside of RECs to meet goals. Barnett highlighted that the scenarios could be looked at as bookends. With Scenario 1, being the least transformative model and Scenario 3, being the most transformative model. LeZaks highlighted that the timeframes are short to long and what can we do immediately to help impact emissions and renewables without waiting and relying heavily on RECs. Shukla asked if she has specific areas for taking immediate action and LeZaks said that section 4 of the report seemed to have things we could quantify and take action on now. Barnett said modeling focused on getting to Net-zero and that section 4 was intended to include other things that could be done. Arnold said a total of 20 measures were quantified according to costs (Marginal Abatement Costs.) Barnett felt that buying RECs was the most cost effective way to reach the targets, but perhaps not the best in terms of having direct impact on carbon reduction. Green felt that we should minimize buying RECs with our limited resources, instead investing in efficiency and renewables in Madison, and look into replacing fossil fuel natural gas with gas produced from local organic waste sources. DeMarb asked if all SMC members had been briefed in detail on the report as it was important for all to be aware of what the numbers mean and that buying RECs is a way to meet the target but not actually reduce our emissions. Shukla said this was the initial briefing.

Schletzbaum felt selecting Scenario 1, the cheapest option, will get us off the hook for doing the hard work of actually reducing emissions, conserving energy or building more renewable options. DeMarb put forth the idea of perhaps combining some options and making a hybrid that provides for RECs at a higher level, but gives us more money for the other options. Discussion ensued on the hybrid approach, merit of including scenario II, use of RECs as a bridge to other scenarios, and dependence of City's carbon reduction efforts on incumbent utility progress in changing their own resource portfolio.

Committee consensus was to retain inclusion of all three scenarios. DeMarb emphasized that drafting an accompanying resolution will be key as a means of capturing changes as the plan evolves, directing staff to take specific actions and selling the overall plan to the Common Council. Discussion ensued on the resolution and all agreed. LeClair feels that health lens should also be applied and there is consensus around this as well. Hoffman indicated that staff will also conduct a Racial Equity and Social Justice (RESJ) analysis of the report as well to be sure that there are no adverse impacts on marginalized groups of any kind, but particularly people of color. Staff will try to meet with RESJ staff to initiate discussion in December, 2018. Group consensus on this. Vickerman says that report should address policies that take City away from renewable/Net-zero goals. Green feels departmental budgets should reflect their elements of Energy Plan activities and targets.

LeZaks raised the issue of what the Committee could do about community carbon reductions, versus just focusing on City operations. Breidenbach also felt the report should expand the reach to the greater community. One idea that might be explored in any one of the 3 scenarios is the notion that the city could develop a program of RECS that help residential and commercial building owners invest in behind the meter solar installations as long as they created "additionality". These RECS could be done on a sliding scale economic model that would also bring some social equity to the equation. Breidenbach felt that purchasing as many high quality RECS (as defined by SMC) by 2020 is the easiest way to get political buy-in (for scenario 1) for the low hanging fruit of meaningful and quantifiable carbon offsets, while the committee continues its work on the more difficult carbon reduction strategies that are much more comprehensive (and challenging) in nature, such as listed in scenario 2 and 3 and other goals articulated in our recent meeting Schletzbaum says a clear line needs to be drawn on this report—that scope is City operations and after discussion committee agreed to retain focus on City operations, but to include a paragraph discussing how the City can help the broader community make progress in its carbon-reduction efforts. DeMarb proposed to lead working group in drafting the resolution; Schletzbaum, Heinemann, Vickerman, LeClair and Green volunteered to help.

Green suggested adding something on urban forest impacts on heat reduction, air quality, energy costs savings and Stormwater control to each scenario. LeClair seconds with the link to human health as an emphasis. Staff will look into wording.

Campbell raised a concern about process and what exactly will SMC be looking at during next meeting. He would prefer a revised draft, not a list of committee comments. Schletzbaum would like to see what assumptions were made in each Scenario. Barnett will try to pull that together. Shukla asks staff to have minutes back to him by end of week, so he can send out.

Things to potentially incorporate in report:

Assumptions made in Scenarios 1-3

RESJ Equity Analysis: analysis is outside report document-findings may be incorporated in cover memo or resolution language

Use section 4 to explain further, future actions, including community-wide

Case study on air quality impacts-health impacts

Additional paragraph that reviews RECs investment / time trade-offs and other

options

Focus on Scenario 3 in resolution language

Next meeting will be Dec 17th to review the updated report. DeMarb suggests and members concur, that Committee should also set up 2019 objectives.

A motion was made to Discuss and continue. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

2. [53439](#) Integrated Pest Management Policy Review Task Force Meeting Materials

Attachments: [Pest management on City Property - Policy 051804.pdf](#)
[IPM Task Force survey memo 110518.pdf](#)
[IPM Policy Survey DRAFT 110118.pdf](#)
[San Francisco IPM Plan 2010.pdf](#)
[IPM Basics and Benefits Presentation Thomas Green 110518.pdf](#)
[IPMPRTF Project Charter and memo 11-20-18 draft.pdf](#)
[IPM Policy Survey DRAFT w. Cover 112018.pdf](#)
[2017 Pesticide Use Water Utility Combined.pdf](#)
[Public Health Pesticide Report and Plan 2017.pdf](#)
[Engineering 2017 Pest Management Report Final.pdf](#)
[2017 Parks Pesticide Report w.o policy.pdf](#)
[San Francisco IPM Ordinance 1996.pdf](#)
[Portland ME Pesticide Use Ordinance 2018.pdf](#)
[San Francisco IPM Plan 2010.pdf](#)
[City of Dubuque IPM Plan REVISED 2016.pdf](#)
[Carlsbad IPM Plan 2017.pdf](#)

Reese provides quick background and need for new SMC member on IPM-PRTF. Green volunteers. SMC will review report in of Task Force in March 2019.

[This item is Discuss and Continue].

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.