

MEMORANDUM

TO: Climate Action Steering Committee (CASC)
 FROM: Allison Osterberg, Senior Planner, Thurston Regional Planning Council
 DATE: July 19, 2021
 SUBJECT: Long Term Governance Agreement Options

Requested Action

Discuss and provide guidance on options to include in a long-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 reviewed 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.

Draft Purpose and Goals

Based on member feedback at the May 24 CASC meeting, staff have drafted the following priority purpose and goals for a long-term agreement:

- To maintain **momentum** for local climate action.
- To develop efficient **regional solutions** for reducing sources of greenhouse gases.
- To provide **accountability** by tracking progress toward achieving regional climate targets.
- To **build public support** for climate action, and **coordinate outreach** on climate mitigation activities.

Committee members also affirmed that they would like to maintain the form of **chartered network**, where members maintain a set of agreed-upon rules to guide their interactions and decisions, rather than either a more formal legal entity or an informal communication network.

Work Program

- What type of work will the group do? How are priorities identified?

A regional body could take on many different types of work to support climate action. The work program should be tied to the purpose and goals of the group, as well as to the implementation strategy of the Thurston Climate Mitigation Plan.

Other regional climate collaboratives have taken on different types of work, including developing or contracting for resources like:

- Guidance, training, technical assistance, or tools targeted to specific sectors
 - *Example:* [K4C resources](#), including a Climate Action Toolkit and Communication Toolkit, and [GreenTools](#)
 - *Example:* [Southeast Florida Regional Compact Implementation Resources](#), including equity guidance, regional economic assessment, EV infrastructure, Health Impact Assessment.
- Climate or policy research and analysis
 - *Example:* Capital Regional Climate Readiness Collaborative, [Urban Heat Island Mitigation](#) Project
- Model policy or legislation
- Database of case studies to showcase ways partners have acted on specific actions
 - *Example:* [K4C partner case studies](#)
- Policy positions for advocacy at the state and federal level
 - *Example:* [Southeast Florida Policy Platform](#)

The Multijurisdictional Staff Team will meet in August to develop an initial proposal for a work program, based on a review of the Implementation Strategy included in the *Thurston Climate Mitigation Plan* and identifying key needs. This will be brought back to the Steering Committee as part of the draft ILA options.

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 be open to any interested groups.

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. COMPARISON OF ORGANIZATION CHARACTERISTICS OF CLIMATE COLLABORATIVES SOURCE: GEORGETOWN CLIMATE CENTER

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.

If membership is limited to local governments, the committee will need to identify the role of other public and private sector entities in providing either oversight of or input into the group’s work.

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.

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.

Figure 2 (below) shows the funding structure used by the King County-Cities Climate Collaborative.

FIGURE 2. FUNDING STRUCTURE OF KING COUNTY CLIMATE

<u>Population Categories</u>	<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>Population Categories</u>	<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Population</u>
Under 5,000	\$500	Level 1	20-39,999	\$1,200	Level 3
	Skykomish	198		Kenmore	20,460
	Beaux Arts Village	299		Maple Valley	22,684
	Hunts Point	394		Mercer Island	22,699
	Milton	831		SeaTac	26,909
	Yarrow Point	1001		Des Moines	29,673
	Carnation	1,786		Issaquah	30,434
	Medina	2,969		Burien	33,313
	Clyde Hill	2,984	40- 65,000	\$2,000	Level 4
	Algona	3,014		Sammamish	45,780
	Black Diamond	4,151		Kirkland	48,787
5,000 - 19,999	\$700	Level 2		Shoreline	53,007
	North Bend	5,731		Redmond	54,144
	Normandy Park	6,335		Auburn	62,761
	Pacific	6,514	Over 65,000	\$2,500	Level 5
	Duvall	6,695		Federal Way	89,306
	Newcastle	10,380		Renton	90,927
	Enumclaw	10,669		Kent	92,411
	Snoqualmie	10,670		Bellevue	122,363
	Woodinville	10,938	Over 250,000	\$5,000	Level 6
	Lake Forest Park	12,598		Seattle	608,660
	Bothell	17,090	King County	\$10,000	Level 7
	Covington	17,575			
	Tukwila	19,107			

Note: Population data from the Puget Sound Regional Council’s download of 2010 census data

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.