

City of Cambridge Climate Protection Action Committee

Meeting Notes, December 9, 2010

Members Present: David Rabkin (chair), Quinton Zondervan (vice chair), Marguerite Reynolds (Secretary), Tom Page, Jan D., Jackie C., Karen S., Bill Zamparelli, James E., Keren S., Terry S.

Staff Present: Susanne Rasmussen, Rosalie Anders, John Bolduc

1. Meeting began at 6:04pm
2. Vice Chair Quinton Zondervan reported that Cambridge Climate Emergency Action Group (CCEAG) had its Inaugural Forum and that the community is slowly getting more organized
3. Rosalie Anders reported that this year “Fresh Pond Day” & “Cambridge Science Festival” may be combined. She suggested that perhaps the group might want to discuss doing something for that event. (There seemed to be a general assent that this might be something worth pursuing.)
4. Report from the Environmental and Transportation Planning Director, Susanne Rasmussen:
 - Landlord energy efficiency workshop will be held at the City Hall Annex on Sat. Feb. 5th.
 - City View had a 2-page section on climate change in November that was sent out to all Cambridge residents.
 - Mead Wyman has resigned as a member of CPAC
 - All committee members whose 3-yr appointments to CPAC will soon be coming to an end in the Spring should tell John or Rosalie if they would like to be re-appointed for a new term beyond that
 - Massachusetts Division of Energy Resources (DOER) has put out a grant solicitation to cities and towns for installation of new electric vehicle (EV) charging stations for resident and city vehicles. The City is planning to respond this month and is thinking about developing about 6-8 charging stations in Cambridge. She said that they were thinking that one or more could be installed at Dept. of Public Works (DPW), perhaps at some schools and there had been some discussion about possibly another at Whole Foods. She requested group input and suggestions for locations for the grant application.
5. A general discussion then followed Suzanne’s request for input on suitable locations and possibilities for new EV charging stations throughout the city:

Summary of General Discussion:

It was suggested that perhaps some EV charging facilities could be installed at Alewife or other MBTA stations. Suzanne R. said that MBTA would be submitting their

own grant application for that site and others and that the city was interested in applying for 6-8 other stations elsewhere.

Committee members suggested a number of other sites including possibly at Harvard or MIT or maybe in front of City Hall? Suzanne suggested that perhaps Kendall Square would be a suitable location – on the street after the last space with a parking meter.

Bill Z. expressed concern regarding safety for residents if the charging stations were on the street. Others said that they thought that there ought to be at least a few on city streets.

Jan D. suggested that the chosen site be highly visible spaces in areas where many people currently park now (e.g. middle of Harvard Sq., in front of City Hall), so that users visiting those locations by car could top off their EVs. Others agreed and thought that greater visibility would help promote EVs and provide additional benefit to the owners of EV-only spaces.

Tom P. suggested that perhaps ZipCar should be contacted, since: they are headquartered in Cambridge, they used to have some EV vehicles at spaces they rent at Tufts, and most importantly, surely they have done some analysis of suitable locations for their vehicles throughout the city that are convenient for the greatest number of local residents. It was further suggested that perhaps ZipCar (or another similar car-share organization) might even be interested in collaborating with the city on a grant application for one of their current spaces or a EV station next to one of their lots.

It was also suggested that perhaps some EV stations could be in private lots or residential driveways, but Suzanne said that city ordinances currently do not permit private residents to rent their driveway spaces to others. Someone else suggested that to help deal with multiple EV owners wanting to use the same charging station. Maybe eventually the city owned (or rented) charging stations locations could have some sort of online registration for time at those spaces (as ZipCar does currently for hourly rental of their vehicles).

It was said that some EV charging stations could accommodate multiple vehicles simultaneously. So there could be multiple EV-only spaces in a lot next to a single charger.

6. The next topic the committee discussed was the Metrics Report. The group focused its discussion on several key questions, such as:
 - Who should be the intended audience for the report
 - How should the goals be set?
 - How should progress be measured?
 - What should the goals/targets be?
7. Summary of main point raised in Metrics Report discussion below:

Someone asked about timing of the report so that it will have the best fit with other city decision-making processes. Suzanne R. responded that the budgeting cycle is the most important goal-setting process that the city currently focuses on.

John B. said that the city also currently has a set of goals that is working on implementing as a result of becoming a state-recognized *Green Community*. With regard to what our new long-term goals ought to be JB noted that Harvard has set their long-term goals based on the (often cited) metric of reducing emissions by 80% by 2050.

Several people expressed problems with basing metrics solely on energy usage or emissions data, noting that this (among other things) does not adequately account for growth, nor relocation of businesses and people from one community to another. Karen S. suggested that perhaps some of the goals in the Metrics Report ought to be numbers of people made aware of the issue (or something like that) pointing out that at least that is a value that is (somewhat) measurable (unlike some other possible goals that might be included).

Quinton Z. said that Harvard has already done some analysis on this and thought that we could likely use that as a guide in our goal-setting process. QZ also expressed his view that the Cambridge Energy Alliance (CEA) is currently under-utilized (due to recent changes in their organizational goals) and that perhaps we could plan to use them more for any raising-awareness goals that are included in the report.

Bill Z. said that National Grid has a plan that has been very popular for its customers to reduce their consumption by 3% per year.

Quinton Z. added that we need to allow for sufficient public input to the metric report, but he thought that this was doable and that the proper timing for the report's development ought to be 6 mos. to a year.

David R. suggested that perhaps we should use the Cambridge Science Fest? Earth Day event as a means for raising awareness and promoting action generally and public input on new goals and metrics specifically (following up on Rosalie's suggestion at the start of the meeting).

Suzanne R. pointed out that the Cambridge City Council is already on-record as publicly supporting a long-term reduction goal of 80% by 2050. (So, this would not require additional approval.) QZ wondered whether our ultimate goal ought to be even *higher* than the 80% figure (since Cambridge is looked to as a leader in the effort to reduce GHG emissions). Tom P. pointed out that since Cambridge is already much more energy efficient on average than most cities (in other words, it started out at a higher baseline initially than most) and since it also has a much higher percentage of people using bikes and mass transit, adopting a long-term goal of 80% here is *already* a greater commitment than the average city with a climate plan.

Bill Z. suggested that perhaps we could propose a list of Top10 activities for residents to reduce GHG emissions that we could use at the Earth Day event (& others) to raise awareness and focus people on small steps goals

Tom P. suggested that perhaps a large overall goal (like 80% by 2050) maybe would be somewhat easier to understand or present to the public if described in smaller steps over a series of shorter term year to year goals – such as a 1% improvement per year (or whatever the value is that adds up to the overall reduction goal).

Jan D. warned that we should be careful in our goal-setting not to create such a grandiose plan that too much time is spent solely on that and we never get moving on actions. QZ reiterated that the conversation is already happening in the community and that we need to develop a means to leverage that interest into action.

8. David R. suggested that maybe we could come up with a rough draft with graphs of progress to date, etc. by January. (There was general agreement on this suggestion.)
9. Suzanne R. said that the Adaptation Report is also on-track to have something ready for January 2011.
10. John B. suggest maybe we could have someone from Akamai come to talk about their plan and process
11. Adjournment.

Notes taken by Tom Page.