



## Meeting #9 Summary

April 23, 2020, 12-2:00PM

Remote Meeting via Zoom: [link to recording](#)

(note that start of meeting was not captured, and recording begins mid-way through Agenda Item 2)

Agenda Item	Notes
1. Introductions & Project Updates	<p>Allison Osterberg did a role call of the Committee members present online and the public joining the meeting.</p> <p>Allison Osterberg gave a brief update of what has been happening with the plan.</p>
2. Communitywide Action List	<p>Allison Osterberg reviewed the steps toward developing a shorter list of priority actions from the full list of actions developed by the community and stakeholders. The priority actions will be quantified in the scenarios tool. Previously, the Steering Committee identified criteria to use to score actions, and the relative weights of those criteria. Allison laid out two approaches to developing a priority action list.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Option A includes the top-ranking actions in the multicriteria analysis. It leans heavily on actions in the buildings &amp; energy and transportation &amp; land use sectors.</li> <li>- Option B adjusts the list in Option A to include actions addressing some strategies missing from Option A, including fuel switching, sequestration, water, solid waste, agricultural emissions, and general education. These actions ranked lower in the multicriteria analysis, but are of interest to stakeholders.</li> </ul> <p>The Steering Committee will provide direction on the approach to identify priority actions for quantification (Agenda Item 4). This decision will not be approving the final list or committing jurisdictions to taking any individual actions. Steering Committee members provided their initial thoughts on the two priority list options. Olympia had provided feedback in advance of the meeting; Lacey and Tumwater indicated they also have additional comments.</p>
3. Scenarios	<p>Roel Hammerschlag reviewed the initial scenario planning results and displayed the scenario planning tool. The planning tool allows for users to input estimates for how much specified actions will affect different emissions sectors, such as energy consumption or passenger vehicles. The tool then calculates an estimate for greenhouse gas emissions reductions and users can see graphically if</p>



	target goals are being met. The tool can also show the impact of sequestration actions.
4. Communitywide Action List Approve list of priority actions	<p>The Committee was asked to provide direction on how to move forward with developing a priority action list: Option A or Option B. <b>Consensus was reached to move forward with Option B, but Option B will be modified to include sufficient actions to meet the emission reduction targets. The project staff team will work with the consultant to modify the Option B list, considering input provided by the jurisdictions.</b></p> <p>Thurston County policymakers were not present at the meeting, and did not provide a unified policy recommendation. Thurston County staff agreed to relay the discussion back to their policymaker representatives and respond on whether they support the direction of the Committee to move forward.</p> <p><i>EDIT 5/1/2020: Thurston County Commissioners met on April 30, 2020 and affirmed their support to move ahead with the direction of the Climate Plan, as decided by the other members of the Steering Committee.</i></p>
5. Spring Public Outreach	<p>Due to the COVID-19 virus response, public outreach will need to be completed in a different manner than originally planned. The Committee was asked about different plans for public outreach: having online open houses, delaying public outreach, spending more budget to create new, or different ways to get online public outreach. An online approach may include having a remote meeting at a set time with staff available for questions.</p> <p>Committee members expressed that time is still an issue and they want to move forward and not delay public outreach because of current restrictions on public gatherings. They would like as much engagement as possible within the current budget – by utilizing creative techniques which may already be available from the jurisdictions.</p> <p><b>Consensus was reached to move forward with online-only public outreach around the draft climate plan.</b></p>
6. Jurisdiction Updates on Early and Ongoing Actions	Due to time constraint this item was taken off the agenda.
6. Public Comments	<p>There were 7 public comments. Brief summaries follow:</p> <p><i>Tom Crawford:</i> parallels between COVID 19 and the crisis of climate change. Similar that they will have continued significant impact to the economy. Prevention is best. Encouraged by taking a proactive approach.</p> <p><i>Lynn Fitz-Hugh:</i> TCAT spent a lot of time going over Options A and B, and they came to a similar conclusion to the Committee. Allowing</p>



	<p>the consultant to cull the list in order to meet goal targets. Climate change will not end and there is no going back.</p> <p><i>Chris Van Daalen:</i> The plan needs to go further and be able to evolve and innovative as new technology comes out. The final plan needs big ideas. Shouldn't put as much weight into CETA reductions. Building efficiency actions have other co-benefits.</p> <p><i>Thad Curtz:</i> Thad sent in comments before the meeting about what should be added to and taken away from Options A and B. Latest TCAT Inventory shows increased emissions.</p> <p><i>Kelsey Hulse:</i> There has been a great deal of work ranking the actions, and Option A best reflects that process. Not considering all that work when an Option B is now being considered. Ending with a plan that is digestible to the public, helpful and useful.</p> <p><i>Ryan Campbell:</i> Option A is most effective for the biggest problems – buildings energy and transportation. Solar self-generation apparatus at residential units. Need to look at carbon sequestration since we already have a lot of trees being more cost effective. There are also unique energy solutions, like hydro-pump storage.</p> <p><i>Karen Messmer:</i> Climate action needs to be a way we do business, not a special program. We can do many actions that don't cost a lot of money. There are ways jurisdictions can pressure building regulations, and CETA. Finding the critical actions and the list that will get us to the target goals.</p>
--	---

## Meeting Attendance

### Steering Committee Present Online:

Chris Hawkins – Thurston County  
 Thomasina Cooper for Tye Menser – Thurston County  
 Rich Hoey – City of Olympia  
 Susan Clark – City of Olympia  
 Jim Cooper – City of Olympia  
 Lisa Parshley – City of Olympia

Jessica Brandt – City of Lacey  
 Rick Walk – City of Lacey  
 Cynthia Pratt – City of Lacey  
 Carolyn Cox – City of Lacey  
 David Ginther – City of Tumwater  
 Tom Oliva – City of Tumwater

### Public Present Online:

Karen Messmer  
 Lynn Fitz-Hugh  
 Mason Rolph

Laurel Haas  
 Joel Carlson  
 Chris Van Daalen



Frank Turner  
Tom Crawford  
Wayne Olsen  
Aaron D  
Thad Curtz

Ryan Campbell  
Kelsey Hulse  
Aaron Dumas  
Jeff Miller

**Staff Present:**

Allison Osterberg  
Marc Daily  
Karen Parkhurst  
Sara Porter  
Dave Read  
Les Tobias

**Next Meeting: To Be Determined**

Thurston Climate Mitigation Plan Coordinator:  
Allison Osterberg  
[osterbergA@trpc.org](mailto:osterbergA@trpc.org)  
360.956.7575 (main) or (360) 741-2513 (direct)

Link to project website: <https://www.trpc.org/Climate>  
TRPC website: <https://www.trpc.org/>

*This meeting summary is not a verbatim account – an audio recording of this meeting is available upon request.*