

NWCAA

Dec 22nd 2011

Notes from GHG Mitigation Funding - Measurement/Communication Roundtable

Karl Unterschuetz's notes

Mark:

We value communication of the results of the proposal. To create transparency and sharing of the results, learning's from projects.

This money may need to go to the law suit that was leveled at the regional clean air agency.

Our expectation is that the money would be not used for the attorney fees but rather will one or more projects make a significant impact on climate change.

Introductions:

Diane Kamionka – NW Innovation Resource Center, on economic development. Especially in the renewable energy area.

Jay Larson - Snohomish Public Works –trip reduction

Jennifer Haus (sp?) – community transit – trip reduction and TDM

Gabe Philips - Skagit County - regional non motorizes plan – bicycle and peds.

Bob mchfarlen – Roadboard motors

Paul Schilsler – Urban Planer also with Roadboard motors

Karl Unterschuetz – Independent

Kevin Mass – Farm Power

Kaci Radcliffe– coordinator for Skagit County – looking for opportunity for GHG reductions

Alex Ramel – Sustainable Connections in Whatcom county – energy efficiency program

Regan Clover – resource conservation analyst with Whatcom County – Galbrath Mt.

Mark Bussel – Chemistry WWU- Whatcom technology center – renewable energy tech center.

Brad Johnson– Physics and astronomy WWU –solar technology

Ryan Nelson - City of Bellingham resource conservation

Sam Ship – City of Bellingham hydro project.

Brad Tuning – Bellingham tech collage- curriculum and renewable energy lab. Work force education.

Rex:

NWCAA funding Goals for 2012 -Fair in how we spend the money

What NWCAA can do to be the facilitator - we will run it like business

The board will make the final decision on the project or projects that will be funded.

GHG measurement:

Using the EPA performance measures handout as a guide or place to start.

Mark – what do you think? If this was all we used what was the feed?

Alex – nightmare for the selection committee – you will get apple to oranges in proposals. The unites of reductions will very different from each other.

Kevin – feds may not be the best example – California may be a farther ahead in having language and examples for this type of solicitation.

Mark – it will be very helpful to know the value given to future reductions verses immediate reductions. Because tech development is not immediate.

Gale – this will allow lots of flexibility. It will give the burden on applicant. As reviewer I am do not need it tightly defined.

Mark NWCAA – I am thinking the flexibility creates an advantage for the applicants.

Alex – agree don't create a tight formula. But need to nail down key variables
Example – how pounds of methane equivalent may be able to use math short or long term.

Gale – GHG not at the agency reporting level but say we are doing this project “what we think” the reduction is. Don't get into the weeds on the accounting but give the big picture.

Alex – suggest using the same coefficients that you want to be used so everyone can do the same math.

Gale – suggest gong to Climate Registry and look at their protocol.

Rex – relationship will change at point of release -Buyer and seller relationship will commence at the time of RFP release.

Rex – do you want to have a pre RFP meeting?

From the group – Yes

Alex – it needs a good FAQ page.

Kevin – good to have some weighting designed in for blue sky and for those less than blue sky projects.

Kevin – WA RFP pre bidders meeting was a good example where the RFP is clear.

Rex- we will be scoring against the criteria not against each other.

Alex – suggest comparing direct reductions to indirect reductions.

Break:

Geographic area – Agency sees carbon reductions as being equal regardless of location of reduction, but local area may be biased for. It will value local some how because we want the money to be local.

Rex- We are going to be looking for outcomes not outputs – staff time for example is not outcome. Sell us the outcome.

Kevin – what are the outcomes you will be looking for GHG or other outcomes? if it can be a model for other communities will there be more weighting?

Rex - Tangible outcomes will be weighted higher than less tangible outcomes.

Matching or cost sharing. If it's a once in 20 year opportunity we want it to have legs so will look for other money invested in the project.

Diane - what type of match will they score? Will types of matches be scored differently? – in-kind vs cash...

Show partnerships – to show community engagement. Also help to demonstrate feasibility and verification of idea.

The match needs to occur within the time of the grant money being used.

Will the money be played in Advance or as reimbursement? Not yet able to answer.

The metrics used from the state energy program may be a good example, make the it clear weather it is total project dollars project coast and/or the amount grant money per ghg reduction.

How valuable will the matching ratio be? If applicants bring more will they be rated higher?

The goal of NWCAA is to have the RFP out within the first quarter of 2012

Provide proposal examples so applicants could get a idea of the look of what you want?

Will RFP require applicants to be compliant with the NWCAA – yes

Break for lunch:

Laura - Global warming is a cognitive and behavior change challenge.

The issues that we face today are pivoting on human behavior and choices. So we are looking for projects that engage the public to make different choices.

Outreach ideas - Transportation – direct mail, community event calendars. Where people work and at home. Pave pounding. One on one work on tailor messaging to promote behavior change behavior best for people.

Market penetration will county as outreach.

Stacy – public outreach and practice. Think of the demographics – underserved populations. Public engagement component.

Stacy – tailored communication to specific groups and identify values of those groups, for example, health, energy independence... how to tailor to the markets.

Stacy will be available for advice.

Alex – we will be putting in the outreach information regardless if it is in the RFP. We could argue that x home would cost x amount and would have x amount of ghg reduction.

Rex- that is what we want to see.

Will the agency be a hub for the outreach or place for the information dissemination to the public? and advertise the successes of the program.

Agency will be the dissemination of periodic information of the successful applicants at a time line.

Will part of the funds be used to document the project as they progress?

It has not been decided – but the agency may take some of the money to use for marketing or other aspects of the projects. It is best to do it with the applicants or the agency.

Stacy- if you don't do the public engagement part project will not grow within a community. Public engagement can be more costly part.

Alex – affective public engagement is an important to sell to other to use your program. Community education can result in longer term results.

Diane - the practitioner would be the business owner, or entrepreneur.

Local government perspective- we are looking at the quantifiable number.
Low risk

There may be a bridging capacity – if a project may be able to give a GHG reductions but does not have an outreach component, there may be a way to couple the projects effects and the communications that may not be related directly to the project.

Mark – education may be the means to the ends of GHG reduction.

Break:

There will be a large mile stone when NWCAA goes to the board with the pre-RFP

So if NWCAA makes some definite choices before the RFP goes out it would be helpful to know.

Mark – when the RFP comes out it will give the clarity with the weighting and ranking.

FAQs to be posted before the RFP to see if anything missed or should be dropped.

8 weeks is better than 6, 10 may be better for RFP response time.

It would be helpful to have the money signed even if the money ends up not arriving for many months. This could help many with planning budgets.

Require to register to get the rfp?

Yammer is professional networking site that may be able to be used for communication.

Adjourned

GHG Mitigation Funding 'Measurement/Communication Roundtable'
December 22, 2011 Melissa Ugurlu's Notes

10:00 – 12:00 Open discussion - quantifying/qualifying measurement of GHG reductions

-The project needs to show the bigger picture of greenhouse gas mitigation

- How will these ideas be adapted? Sold? Promoted?

- Who will determine the difference between blue skies ideas versus realistic blue skies ideas as far as getting funding and what will help the short term vs what will help the long term. Which ideas will have a better chance? The ones that help out in the next twenty years, or the next fifty years and so on.

-Reduce energy consumption! (as much as possible) this idea is really what needs to happen, no matter the project, this idea would like to be seen. The outcome of the project will be important to the criteria we are using to judge.

-How can questions be asked in the next few weeks? Should there be a FAQ page to help narrow down the important questions before presenting?

-Each idea is getting vote on with certain material, but not necessarily against each other's projects.

1:00 - 3:00 Open discussion of communication strategies for potential mitigation projects

- Determining human behavior versus human opinions on climate change, and what areas need what focus

-we need to address the public in these projects and have an outreach connection. That is the way to get people involved and to show the point of the project

-send mailers to home and work, tailor each idea/change to each person. Changing human behavior takes time, but if you tailor the idea to their needs, the change in behavior will be a permanent change

-changing people's way of life and trying to convince them that the environmental bigger picture is worth changing for. This concept doesn't come easily, but rather takes time and good example.

-identify value sets of for each community –health

-energy

-environment

- effective public engagement is a good tool to help communities understand.

-the proposal would be most efficient if it included (and not limited to): an idea for public outreach, an idea to human behavioral changes including the communities value sets, quantitative numbers, and the urgency to reduce consumption (even if in general).

-the public engagement aspect can be more costly and tougher to include, who will decide how much can be used for what? The results of getting the community involved will be more beneficial in the long term successes

