

MEMORANDUM

TO: Climate Action Steering Committee (CASC)
 FROM: Allison Osterberg, Senior Planner, Thurston Regional Planning Council
 DATE: May 17, 2021
 SUBJECT: Long Term Governance Agreement Options

Requested Action

Discuss and provide guidance on options to include in a longer term governance agreement.

Background

Under Task 2 of the Phase 3 Interlocal Agreement, the CASC is charged with reviewing options to develop an agreement for longer-term governance to support a coordinated regional approach to climate mitigation.

Components of that agreement are to include:

- Oversight committee
- Role for key public and private sector partners in plan implementation and oversight committee
- Monitoring
- Public Outreach

In order to facilitate this discussion, staff have begun reviewing governance examples from other multijurisdictional climate collaboratives. Two key resources include [Lessons in Regional Resilience](#), a 2017 report by the Georgetown Climate Center based on six case studies, and [Regional Collaboratives for Climate Change](#), a 2019 report by the Institute for Sustainable Communities.

Below are some key questions for discussion to guide development of governance options.

Purpose/Goals

- What are the purpose and goals of the long-term governance agreement?

Currently, the purpose of the CASC is to “guide regional coordination of climate mitigation activities.” Identifying the overarching purpose and goals of the agreement will help define other pieces of the agreement.

Example #1 – The King County-Cities Climate Collaborative (K4C) agreement is founded on the following goals:

- **Outreach** – to develop, refine, and utilize messaging and tools for climate change outreach to engage decision makers, other cities, and the general public
- **Coordination** – to adopt consistent standards, benchmarks, strategies, and overall goals related to responding to climate change
- **Solutions** – to share local success stories, challenges, data and products that support and enhance climate mitigation efforts by all partners
- **Funding and resources** – to secure grant funding and other shared resource opportunities to support climate related projects and programs

Example #2 – The [San Diego Regional Climate Collaborative](#) has the following goals:

- Support regional efforts and advance comprehensive solutions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and prepare for local climate change impacts.
- Communicate about the leadership of the Climate Collaborative and the San Diego region to local, state, and national leaders, peers, and funding institutions.
- Build capacity within San Diego regional public agencies through networking, training and partnerships with academic institutions, businesses, and non-profits.

Membership

- What entities can be members of the agreement?

Currently, membership of the CASC is limited to the four jurisdictional partners of the *Thurston Climate Mitigation Plan*. The CASC could maintain this structure, or invite additional local governments, tribes, public agencies, nonprofits, or private partners to become members. Membership could be limited to ensure representation by certain interest groups (ie, business interests, environmental interests), have a cap on total number of members, or open.

There can be tiers to membership: one option used by some collaborative groups is to limit decisionmaking to a Steering Committee of local government representatives (who pay dues), but open membership to non-voting or ex-officio members. Figure 1 shows some of the range of approaches taken by other climate collaboratives.

FIGURE 1. SOURCE: GEORGETOWN CLIMATE CENTER

Figure 2: Comparison of Organizations Characteristics of Collaboratives Studied

Collaborative	Membership [†]				Administrative or Fiscal Host	Funding Source(s) [‡]				
	Local government	Public agencies & utilities*	Nonprofit, Academia	Business/Private		Member dues/ Cost-share	Philanthropic grants	State or federal grants	Other	In-kind services
<i>King County-Cities Climate Collaboration (K4C)</i>	✓	✗	✗	✗	County	✓				✓
<i>Capital Region Climate Readiness Collaborative (CRC)</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	Nonprofit – Local Government Commission	✓			✓	✓
<i>Sierra Climate Adaptation & Mitigation Partnership (Sierra CAMP)</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	Nonprofit – Sierra Business Council	~	✓		✓	✓
<i>Los Angeles Regional Collaborative for Climate Action and Sustainability (LARC)</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	University – UCLA	✓		✓		✓
<i>San Diego Regional Climate Collaborative (SDRCC)</i>	✓	✓	✓		University – USD	~	✓	✓	✓	✓
<i>Southeast Florida Regional Climate Change Compact (Compact)</i>	✓	✗	✗	✗	Nonprofit – Institute for Sustainable Communities; County – Broward (fiscal)	✓	✓	✓		✓

†Note on Membership: “✗” indicates entities/organization types that are not eligible at all for membership in the collaborative, while blank spaces indicate member types that are eligible but so far the collaborative does not have any from that category.
 ‡Note on Funding Sources: blank spaces indicate funding sources not used to date, while tildes (“~”) indicate mixed or optional dues structures (i.e., SDRCC, which does not charge dues to public agency members, and Sierra CAMP, which has a voluntary/suggested contribution structure).
 *Other public agencies include regional authorities like water and air districts, councils of government, port authorities, etc. Utilities (e.g., electric) are included in this category regardless of ownership.

Funding

- How should long-term coordination be funded?

Currently, each of the four founding partners pay an equal share of the total amount identified to complete an annual work plan.

Many climate collaboratives use annual dues to fund their work, either as equal shares or with a dues structure tied to population or other factors. Some require dues only of members with decision authority (if decisionmaking is limited to certain members), make dues voluntary, or allow for in-kind contributions (such as staff time) in lieu of dues.

Figure 1 (above) shows the range of approaches to funding taken by some existing groups.

Convening

- What type of regular meetings will be held?

Currently, the Climate Action Steering Committee meets 6-12 times in a year, a Multijurisdictional Staff Team meets 7-10 times a year, and the Phase 3 agreement allows the partners to create issue-specific work groups (not currently funded). The long term governance agreement should specify the type and frequency of meetings, including the potential for formal or ad-hoc subcommittees, and involvement of staff.

Example #1 – The [Capital Region Climate Readiness Collaborative](#) (Sacramento, CA area) hosts quarterly workshops for its full membership list on a topics of interest (like transportation or flood risk) and has a smaller Steering Committee that meets more regularly to guide work.

Example #2 – The [King County-Cities Climate Collaborative](#) (K4C) holds monthly meetings for staff from the partner jurisdictions (60-90 minutes), and an elected official work session two times per year, typically in spring and fall.

Example #3 – The [Los Angeles Regional Collaborative for Climate Action and Sustainability](#) (LARC) holds membership meetings every other month, and has a Governing Body limited to seven members, elected from among the full members, that meets quarterly.

Decision Options

No decision needed at this time. Staff will use committee feedback on the questions noted above to develop a draft agreement or additional options that will be brought back for the CASC's review.