

**City of Cambridge
Climate Protection Action Committee**

Minutes

**December 8, 2011
City Hall Annex**

1. Guest: Charlie Heaps, Director, Stockholm Environment Institute
 - Presented on the state of climate change science, where are we, what is needed, how do we address the challenge, etc.
 - Did a sales pitch for LEAP software used by cities to plan mitigation.
 - Showed us status / results of two recent efforts, Massachusetts and Seattle.
 - Discussed the process for identifying and prioritizing mitigation options, technical and behavioral.
 - MA effort looked at almost all options, regardless of scope of emissions. Seattle effort focused only on the core emissions that they have control over.

2. CPAC Recommendations on Cambridge Climate Protection Goals
 - Milton asked about comments on memo
 - Karen suggested a straw poll vote
 - David emphasized stressing importance in letter
 - Nathan thought not enough on entrepreneurship
 - Terry thought entrepreneurship was implied by / supporting achieving other goals
 - Torrey commented on the organization,
 - Terry emphasized this is a framework and we can't present these actions as be all / end all; probably just a formatting issue to fix
 - John B. thought this would be put out for public comment to receive comments
 - Tom suggested extra language about involving stakeholders to develop actions
 - David had a comment about vehicle miles reduction goal needing to be average miles per vehicle, not absolute; comment about needing an objective about building energy use; comment about needing a statement about what it would look like if we were successful
 - Sarah supported John B. that we only want goals that we can measure (don't want goal about all emissions if we can't measure)
 - Terry suggest for building efficiency that we look at building efficiency starting at the end goal – suggest easing codes and roadblocks / helping to facilitate green construction and retrofits
 - Peter concerned that the 4 objectives highlighted rose to the top ahead of others – thinks it doesn't reflect our message / mandate; asked about metrics for T ridership and recycling
 - Nathan suggested combining objectives (like miles traveled and alternative vehicles) / picking uber metrics and then having multiple metrics
 - Ted
 - David suggested having two broad categories of objectives – directly measureable and not directly measureable (move buildings to directly measureable) – and then go to public comment
 - Torrey wondered why we got away from tying objectives to specific goals – she can see the actions being separate
 - John B. mentioned that ideally we would have objectives for each goal, but some are hard to set and explained the current layout thinking
 - Rosalie suggests having objectives with metrics and including buildings but indicate that the metrics are uncertain at this time
 - Lauren thought we were going in circles, we should vote and get some feedback
 - John let us know that the city manager has already seen them once and thought they were OK – would could hold off and make more changes between now and February

- Quinton told people to provide their comments ahead of meetings to facilitate improvements / being effective
- Johanna wanted to know how our draft plan compares to others – are we leaders?; was comfortable consolidating objectives, going forward now, and then defining metrics later
- Quinton suggested we vote on going to City Manager now or waiting 1 month and going then
- Nathan asked about process after goes to City Manager – John B. described the public comment process and stakeholder engagement piece and told of a 1 year timeline for a final product
- Lauren made motion to send “working draft” to City Manager and continue to refine before meeting with him in February – David seconded – Everybody voted in favor except for Milton, who voted against

3. Meeting Planning – Didn’t get to this agenda item