

## **Energy & Solid Waste Work Group Core**

Meeting Notes of December 20, 2006, 4:00 p.m. Howes House, West Tisbury

---

*Members Present:* Phil Forest, Kitt Johnson, Paul Pimentel, Bart Smith, Paul Strauss

*Members Absent:* Don Hatch, Dick Knabel, Fred Lapiana, Russell Smith (Chair), Kate Warner

*MVC Staff Present:* Bill Veno, Mark London

*Others Present:* John Abrams, David Nash, Sharon Strimling Florio, Susan Wasserman

The meeting started at 4:10

### **1. Core Group Membership and Operation**

In light of several factors, the group discussed whether to add members to the core.

Due to interest expressed from the Dec 6 meeting of the full work group, David and Sharon agreed to accept the commitment of being on the core group. The other members welcomed them and will request the Steering Committee to appoint them to the Core group. David is retired from the waste management industry and Sharon operates Vineyard Alternative Heating.

### **2. Energy vs. Waste**

John and Susan, both members of the Steering Committee's Process Committee, were aware of the challenges posed to the work group by combining both energy and waste. Core members acknowledged that discussions on energy have usually overshadowed discussions on waste and that, while there is overlap among the subjects, there are also areas where they have little in common. Ultimately, the core concluded that the input from each subject enhances discussion of the other. The two subjects should remain a single work group, but a subgroup of the core members interested in waste issues should meet separately to advance goals and strategies that would be reported back to the entire core group. The entire core group would be less involved with matters that were purely waste related.

Bart voiced concern that the energy discussion needs to broaden its focus beyond renewables and conservation – reliability of existing energy sources is vital. John emphasized the importance for the core groups to focus their efforts to the elements mandated by the Steering Committee. For each issue, identify:

- 1) What is the goal?
- 2) What are barriers to attaining the goal? / Why haven't we gotten there?
- 3) What strategies can we pursue?

The work group is to forward a draft report to the Steering Committee by June 1 of next year. Mark added that each meeting could be even more productive if the core identifies the points of concurrence and the areas where more understanding/discussion is needed.

### **3. Core Group Leadership**

Some core members noted a void in leadership. Russell, as Steering Committee liaison, was serving as chairman until the core selected someone. No one has stepped forward to accept the responsibility.

Paul Pimentel said Russell had told him the previous day that he is currently involved in some matters that interfere with his ability to participate as much as he would like. Bill agreed to speak with Russell on the degree to which he felt he could continue as the chairman. The group discussed the merits of distributing among a few members the responsibility of chairing and facilitating the meetings. Paul Strauss offered that perhaps Russell, Kate, and Phil – who has demonstrated a solid understanding of both subjects – together with the support of Bill, could adequately direct the efforts of the core. Kitt said a single person is what's needed. He recalled that it was Kate's vision the pushed Vineyard Energy Project to cohesion. Others acknowledged Kate's stated reservations in the past about assuming the chair. John said he would speak with Kate further on the matter.

#### **4. Assessment of Work Group Input**

The core decided that each member would review and prioritize the results from the Dec 6 meeting of the work group. Using a point system, items of low priority will be given a "1" and items with high priority given a "5". Items where the priorities are not clear will each be given a "3". Members will share their rankings at the next core meeting.

Phil elected to assign each item into the draft matrix developed by the core to help consider the multiple aspects of the energy and waste issues. The core will also review Phil's assignments at the next meeting.

Members were invited to share their work on the islandplan website or email prior to the meeting.

#### **5. Miscellaneous**

- Mark suggested the group think about how to implement the emerging ideas. The Green Building Code of Aspen could be a model to implement not just energy strategies, but objectives of many other topics. Links to the Aspen website should be given to the core members.
- Mark asked what members thought of the Aquinnah selectmen's proposal for an Island-wide energy DCPC. Several said it is premature and is likely to fail. They feared that the effort might be counterproductive. Susan said a DCPC should not be the only vehicle for implementation. It was acknowledged that there is much misunderstanding about DCPC's generally.
- Kitt commented that the information provided to the group on community-based social marketing was very enlightening. He recommended that one of the deliverables of the work group's report should be a pilot or demonstration project. Such controlled experiments could measure the impact of efforts before too much time and money was spent. Susan said that studies repeatedly show that personal contact is what gets people to change their behavior. The Vineyard being such a tight community, this should be easier to do here than elsewhere.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, January 3, 4:00 p.m. at the Howes House

Agenda: Prioritize and categorize input from Dec 6 Work Group meeting

**Homework for core members:** Review Dec 6 meeting notes and assign 1,3,or 5 prioritization (low to high) to the Work Group's suggestions (See item 4 above)

The meeting concluded at 5:50

Notes prepared by Bill Venio