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. Yasoghlili
  – 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
• **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 $\text{-value}$ 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