

**Climate Impact Advisory Committee**  
APPROVED Meeting Minutes



Date: March 5th, 2020

Location: RE Store, 2309 Meridian St, Bellingham

QUORUM	Y
<b>Members Present</b>	
Kaylee Galloway	X
Casey Harman	X
Erika Lautenbach	X
Treva Coe	X
Phil Thompson	X
Ellyn Murphy	X
John Yakawich	X
Katherine Kissinger	X
David Kershner	X
Cynthia Mitchell	X
Alex Ramel	
STAFF Chris Elder	X

**1) Meeting Began at 5:33 PM**

Meeting began with introductions of all CIAC members and members of the public in attendance.

**2) Review and Approval of Minutes**

Phil moved to approve the minutes, Cynthia seconded, none opposed, motion carried.

**3) Cascadia Consulting Presentation**

Christi provided a presentation on the Climate Action Plan and Vulnerability Assessment Update, the Community GHG Update, Government Operations GHG Inventory, an d2007 Climate Protection and Energy Conservation Action Plan. The presentation is provided. The minutes include just the questions by the committee.

Questions:

Cynthia asked about process – what’s the protocol on these types of situations – do the CIAC members respond directly or copy all the other members? Christi replied that the consultant would prefer to get one consolidated set of questions. Chris had been adding everyone’s comments to a Sharepoint file.

Will Cascadia track the comments and provide responses to each comment? No, the committee will have the opportunity to review the next iteration.

The committee would like larger, overarching questions to have a response. Christy said they can provide responses to the high-level questions.

Erika mentioned that she was more interested in breaking out emissions by building versus department. Individual departments don't have authority to make changes, the facilities department does. Other committee members agreed.

Ellyn asked whether the county buildings are within distinct campuses. No, it's been more opportunistic when properties are available, although there are some "clusters". Ellyn then recommended consolidating the data more into campuses to help shrink the data.

John recommended perhaps providing more detail on each facility to provide more ways to display energy efficiency, energy intensity for example. Christy mentioned that due to the data this may make it challenging. Cynthia suggested this be pulled in to the Building and Energy Workgroup.

Phil asked about the electricity calculations and where the MW/CO<sub>2</sub> value came from. Phil mentioned that the generation mix has changed recently such as Colstrip closing, was this included? Christy responded that the MW/CO<sub>2</sub> data came from PSE in 2017. At that time only the County Courthouse was receiving PSE Green Direct electricity. The remaining county buildings were converted to PSE Green Direct program in August? 2019 and this will show up in a future GHG footprint. Christy also mentioned that the changes in energy supply would be a future discussion.

Phil asked about a public comment regarding the Lummi Island Ferry – the public comment suggested that the new Ferry would emit almost three times the CO<sub>2</sub> of the current ferry, is this mentioned in the report somewhere? Chris responded that the emissions are somewhat speculative, but a comment will be added in the report.

Casey asked about CO<sub>2</sub> use of contractors. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from county contracts are not included. A fair amount of discussion followed. The upshot was that the report will include a note that contractors fuel usage was not included for the 2017 inventory. A suggestion was made to require contractors to provide fuel use as part of contracts. John mentioned that a similar suggestion can be made for collecting building data.

Phil asked if the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions of vehicle were calculated from fuel purchases. Yes, the data is from the fuel purchase data.

Kaylee asked whether the Employee Commute data was county personal vehicles? Yes, the numbers are an estimate of commute based on where county employees live and work.

Casey asked about the solid waste emissions and what it represents. The Solid Waste represents the lifecycle Methane emissions from the solid waste. Cynthia asked for a note providing a comment that solid waste is not just about carbon, it's the waste stream. Christy replied that they would include it.

Chris asked about how Cascadia would develop a comprehensive list of potential mitigation and adaption measures. Christy replied they will generate a list by looking in a number of different sources including the committee and prior work and bring it to the committee. Cascadia would then work with the committee to develop the criteria and rank the measures.

Ellyn noticed that there were names associated with roles and responsibilities in the 2007 Climate Action Plan and asked if any of those people still at the County. Chris mentioned that most are not.

Christy asked about whether the workgroups had started looking at the 2007 plan. Chris replied that no, the workgroups have not yet looked at the 2007 plan.

Chris asked Christy whether she wanted to listen into some of the workgroups to get a sense how Cascadia can engage with the workgroups. Christy responded that they would prefer to work with committee as their budget would not allow the time needed to work with each workgroup.

Ellyn mentioned that the workgroups could list out different strategies. Chris mentioned that in the land use workgroup they can quickly come up with a large list. Christy mentioned she can provide a template for strategies. Cynthia replied she would prefer not to have any template.

Chris asked Christy when the strategies from the workgroups would fit into their work. Christy replied that by April would be fine.

Kaylee preferred to get a template from Cascadia. Christy replied that they can provide one as an example. Cynthia mentioned that the workgroups also need the 2007 measure updates. Chris mentioned that a lot of the county recommended measures could be determined fairly quickly.

Chris asked if Cascadia could provide a template in a week or so. Christy replied that an initial template could be provided, and once the criteria is agreed upon the template can be updated and the information brought into updated templates.

#### **4) Workgroups**

Natural Resource/Land Use Updates: Chris mentioned they met three times. They put together a workplan and have started compiling strategies.

Ellyn mentioned that workgroups should bring at least 5 strategies to the next committee meeting.

**Energy/Buildings: Hasn't met yet.**

**Transportation:** Phil explained that the workgroup has met once and have a few more meeting scheduled. They talked about all the reports that are already out there, and reviewed them. He also mentioned he liked the near term and long-term action items.

Ellyn suggested we begin to use specific terms such as strategies, measures and actions items. Cynthia volunteered to provide the definitions to the group.

Phil brought up that adaptation and mitigation also need to be defined. Dave suggested using the 2007 plan terminology.

**Communication and Community Engagement:** Ellyn reported that the group has met. Dave talked about a meeting with Steve Garey to discuss how to communicate with a particular demographic like refinery workers.

Ellyn mentioned there were interesting insights in the Garey meeting such as don't use the term "just transition" - workers interpret this as "you're taking my job." It was also suggested to push the economic reality - reduced demand for fossil fuels coupled with growth in renewable energy. Also, large investors are divesting fossil fuel stocks. The suggestions were provided to help properly communicate with various stakeholders. Ellyn also mentioned the article in the Whatcom Watch on the ICLEI forest inventory.

#### **5) Old/New Business**

Ellyn asked for bios. John will get his to Ellyn.

#### **6) Public Comment**

Atul: The action of the county to reduce emissions will be quite modest, so the county may focus more on adaptation. He also recommended looking at the Hilary Franz report.

Bob Burr: He said he was frustrated and wants to know what the county is doing now. He pointed out that organizations can get bogged down in analysis. He asked to the committee, "If you submit the report tomorrow, what would you recommend?" He then states that If the recommendations would not change with more data, send the recommendations now.

Art Hiatt: Art said that acceptance will be determined by the economics and politics. The refinery workers may feel threatened by the changes, but others may already be feeling the impacts.

Eddy Ury: Eddy wanted to relay information to the committee regarding the proposed code amendments that cite the CIAC to review the SEPA checklist. That has been edited to remove the reference to the CIAC and the planning commission will review this change.

**7) Next meeting discussion topics**

Presentation by planning committee of Cherry Point code amendments

Chris may present on aspects of his new job and how they relate to the CIAC.

Presentation on updates to state legislation.

**8) Meeting Adjourned at 7:48 PM.**

Recorded by Casey Harman

Staff contact Chris Elder - (360)778-6225