

Breakout Session 1

Question 4



Question 4

- Is it possible to provide a \$-value to environmental damage in the US? What are the methods to balance cost vs GHG (GHG calculators for network level; Policies for management; What decisions are we ready for)?

Group 7

- Facilitator
 - N. Santero
- Members
 - L. Francke
 - A. Mukherjee
 - M. Shakiba
 - T. Tietz
 - M. Wood
 - O. Yasoghli
 - N. Anthonissen
 - D. Maskey

Q4: Monetize impacts?

- PROS:** practical tool for decision makers
- Incentives aligned with objectives
 - Can provide incentives toward tangible environmental goals
 - Reduces learning curve
 - Tangible measurement for all (simple)

Q4

- **CONS**

- Virtual, 'not real money', 'not real value'
- Can use clear policy to mandate goals, why \$?
- Can be manipulated
- Oversimplifies complex problems

Q4

- **NEXT STEP?**
- Conceptually, we recognize potential value in monetization but acknowledge that it will always have limitations and/or unintended consequences.

Group 8

- Facilitator:
 - T. Van Dam
- Members:
 - L. Wathne
 - S. Kang
 - A. Fraser
 - S. Cliff
 - R. Rosenbaun
 - D. Wu
 - J. Meijer
 - I. Zaabar

Q4: Is it possible to provided a \$-value to environmental damage ...

- Possible but cost is completely arbitrary because there is no method to accurately capture costs of environmental damages
- We do not understand systemic impacts of these environmental emissions
- Uncertainty in current LCA tools makes it unfair to charge industry/individuals based on estimated emissions/impacts

Q4: What are the methods to balance cost vs. Environmental Impact

- Context Sensitive
- Compare alternatives
- Low to start, simple, such that it gets incorporated in policy
- Actual cost of impact is less important than finding prices that drive emergent behaviors